

3 Nephi 19

■ 3 Nephi 19:1

*And now it came to pass that
when Jesus [had 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPQRST | has M] ascended into heaven . . .*

The 1905 LDS edition reads in the present perfect: “when Jesus **has** ascended into heaven”, an obvious typo. The subsequent 1911 LDS edition, set from the 1905 edition, has the correct past perfect, the reading of the earliest text.

Summary: Retain the use of the past perfect in 3 Nephi 19:1: “when Jesus **had** ascended into heaven”.

■ 3 Nephi 19:2

*and that he would also [shew 1GHKPS | show ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT] himself on the morrow
unto the multitude*

The printer’s manuscript reads *shew* while the 1830 edition reads *show*. As discussed under Helaman 15:3, the evidence is very clear that the 1830 typesetter, not Oliver Cowdery, was prone to mix up the verb forms *shew* and *show*. The critical text will therefore accept *shew*, the reading in \mathfrak{P} , as the original reading here in 3 Nephi 19:2.

■ 3 Nephi 19:4

*and it came to pass that on the morrow
when the multitude was gathered together
behold Nephi and his brother
[1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |, A]
whom he had raised from the dead
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
whose name was Timothy
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and also his son
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
whose name was Jonas
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and also Mathoni . . .*

The question here is whether the relative clauses are restrictive or nonrestrictive; that is, should there be commas separating these relative clauses? In the current text, the last two relative clauses

(which have the form “whose name was X”) are separated from their antecedents by commas. But the first relative clause is not (“and his brother whom he had raised from the dead”). The 1830 edition had a comma, but the 1837 edition dropped it (perhaps accidentally). The question is: Is the relative clause “whom he had raised from the dead” telling us which brother of Nephi’s was one of the twelve? In fact, one could ask if the use of “whose name was Jonas” was to tell us which son was chosen. My own inclination is to give a nonrestrictive interpretation to all three of these relative clauses. Nephi has one brother and one son (or only one of each with respect to membership in the twelve). Presumably, “his son” refers to the son of Nephi, not the son of Timothy, but one cannot be sure. The use of the *also* supports that reading.

Overall, this interpretation suggests that a comma should be placed in front of the first relative clause, so that all three relative clauses are nonrestrictive. One might also use dashes to indicate that “also his son” refers to Nephi’s son:

3 Nephi 19:4 (with revised accidentals)
 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 . . .

Summary: The punctuation in 3 Nephi 19:4 should be revised to show nonrestrictively that Nephi had raised his brother, one of the twelve, from the dead and that the name of this brother was Timothy; dashes could be placed around these two nonrestrictive relative clauses in order to show that the later reference to “his son” is a reference to Nephi’s son rather than Timothy’s; and finally, a comma after “his son” would show nonrestrictively that the name of this son was Jonas.

■ 3 Nephi 19:4

and Kumen

and [*Kumenonku* > *Kumenonhi* > *Kumenonki* 1 | *Kumenonhi* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Kumenonku*, which he first corrected to *Kumenonhi*. But then he changed the spelling once more, this time to *Kumenonki* by overwriting the *h* with a *k*. The 1830 compositor set *Kumenonhi*.

The problem here seems to have been that in the manuscripts Oliver Cowdery’s *h* sometimes looked like a *k* (and vice versa). This problem has already been noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:10 regarding the spelling of the name *Zenoch/Zenock*. For instance, in Helaman 8:20 of \mathcal{P} , Oliver apparently intended to write *Zenock*, but his *k* could be read as either a *k* or an *h*. The 1830 compositor interpreted the *k* as an *h* and set *Zenoch* there.

It is possible, then, that the same thing occurred here in 3 Nephi 19:4—that is, the original manuscript read *Kumenonki*, but the *k* looked like an *h*. In other words, Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 compositor were both confused, but Oliver ultimately corrected the text to read *Kumenonki*. Yet it is equally possible that the intended spelling in \mathcal{S} was *Kumenonhi*, but since the *h* looked like a *k*, Oliver became confused as he was copying from \mathcal{S} into \mathcal{P} .

Given this ambiguity, it is probably best to let internal evidence from the spelling of other Book of Mormon names and Nephite words determine whether we have *Kumenonhi* or *Kumenonki*.

Elsewhere, we get the following sequences of a nasal followed by a voiceless obstruent (that is, a noise-like consonant without voicing); for each sequence I list all the examples except in the case of *nt* (which has numerous examples):

nc	Moriancumer, Ripliancum, Teancum
nch	Paanchi
mh	Limhah, Limher, Limhi
nh	Giddianhi
mt	Rameumptom
nt	antion, Antipus, Coriantumr, Gaddianton, Irreantum, Lehonti, Morionton, onti, Seantum, etc.

Historically, the *p* in *Rameumptom* may be considered intrusive, just as it is in the spelling of the English name *Thompson* (from *Thom* + *son*). In any event, there are no examples of *nk* (or *mk*) in Book of Mormon names or Nephite words. But a nasal (*m* or *n*) can definitely be followed by an *h* sound. Thus internal evidence argues that the 1830 spelling *Kumenonhi* is more consistent with other spellings in the Book of Mormon and should therefore be retained. A name like *Kumenonki* runs contrary to all the other Book of Mormon names and words.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 19:4 the 1830 reading *Kumenonhi* since the form *Kumenonki* (the final reading in \mathcal{P}) has the sequence *nk*, which is uncharacteristic of Book of Mormon names and words.

■ 3 Nephi 19:6

and the twelve did teach the multitude
 [*but* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold*
they did cause that the multitude should kneel down upon the face of the earth
and should pray unto the Father in the name of Jesus

The use of *but* in the printer's manuscript does not seem appropriate, while the use of *and* in the 1830 edition does. One could argue, of course, that the difficult reading with *but* was the reading of the original manuscript and that the 1830 typesetter changed the difficult *but* to *and*. Another possibility is that Oliver Cowdery accidentally substituted *but* for an ampersand when he was copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Such a change could have been caused by the visual similarity of *but* with the beginning of the next word, *behold*.

We can find evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally mixed up *and* and *but*; in fact, we have evidence for his making errors in either direction, as in the following two examples:

2 Nephi 15:7
 and he looked for judgment and behold oppression
 for righteousness [*&* > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold a cry

2 Nephi 27:27
 [*but* >+ *&* 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] woe unto them
 that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord

The first error (in 2 Nephi 15:7) was probably influenced by the preceding use of *and* in “and behold oppression”. The second example clearly shows that Oliver can accidentally replace an

ampersand with *but*. (For other examples where Oliver mixed up *and* and *but*, see the list under 1 Nephi 8:20, in the discussion regarding *straight* versus *strait*.) On the other hand, we also have evidence that the 1830 typesetter was occasionally willing to edit out what he considered inappropriate uses of *but* when *and* was expected or worked better. As an example, see the (rather complex) discussion under 3 Nephi 4:15–16.

Given this mixed evidence, it is probably best to assume that the original text made sense, which would imply that the original manuscript read “and behold” here in 3 Nephi 19:6. The critical text will assume as much and accept the 1830 reading as the original one.

Summary: Accept the 1830 reading “and behold” in 3 Nephi 19:6 since the original manuscript could well have read this way; in addition, *and* works much better than *but*.

■ 3 Nephi 19:8

and when they had ministered

[*them* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *same words which Jesus had spoken . . .*

Here the printer’s manuscript has the nonstandard reading “them same words” while the 1830 edition has the standard “those same words”. ☉ is not extant here, so we cannot be sure how it read. The question is whether Oliver Cowdery might have replaced an original *those* with *them* or whether the 1830 typesetter might have changed *them* to *those*. There are three other cases in the text where the earliest text used the dialectal nonstandard *them* (rather than *those* or *these*) as the determiner for a noun:

Alma 37:30

and thus the judgments of God did come upon

[*them* 01 | *these* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *those* CGHK] workers of darkness
and secret combinations

Helaman 7:8

yea if my days could have been

in [*my* > *them* 1 | *them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMP | *those* NOQRST] days . . .

Helaman 13:37

and this shall be your language

in [*them* 0A | *them* >js *these* 1 | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] days

For the two instances of “in them days” (found in the book of Helaman), the 1830 typesetter refrained from changing them to “in those days” (such editing occurred only later in the history of the text). But in the first example, the 1830 typesetter made the grammatical change of *them* to *these* (although *those* would have also been possible). Thus there is evidence that the 1830 typesetter could be responsible for introducing into the text the standard *those* here in 3 Nephi 19:8. On the other hand, we have no clear evidence of Oliver Cowdery replacing a standard *these* or *those* with *them* as the determiner for a noun. But there are two cases in ☽ where he replaced the standard *those* or *these* with *them* in the context of a following relative clause (the second of which was only momentary):

1 Nephi 13:18

and also that the wrath of God was
upon [*all those* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *all them* >]s *all those* 1 | *them* A]
that were gathered together against them to battle

Alma 14:15

behold ye see that ye had not power to save
[*them* >+ *these* 1 | *these* ABDEPS | *those* CGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *these* > *those* F]
which had been cast into the fire

However, there were quite a few examples of *them* followed by a relative clause in the original text (see the brief discussion under 1 Nephi 1:20), so it is not surprising that Oliver might have accidentally introduced one into the text. But of greater importance here, the 1830 typesetter always set these instances of *them* followed by a relative clause. Only in later editing (chiefly by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition) were instances of nonstandard *them* replaced with a standard determiner like *those*. But when we restrict the discussion to cases of *them* followed by a head noun, the minor evidence that we do have suggests that it would have been the 1830 typesetter who would have changed the nonstandard “them same words” to “those same words”. The critical text will therefore restore the nonstandard reading in \mathcal{P} for 3 Nephi 19:8.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 19:8 the nonstandard *them* before *same words*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; the standard *those* in the 1830 edition was most likely the result of editing on the part of the 1830 typesetter.

■ 3 Nephi 19:12

and he [*did baptize* 1 | *baptized* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all they*
whom Jesus had chosen

Here the printer’s manuscript has the *do* auxiliary (“he did baptize”) while the 1830 edition has the more standard verb form without the auxiliary *do* (“he baptized”). As explained under 3 Nephi 1:27, there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally add the auxiliary *do*. There are also examples of him omitting the auxiliary *do*. In fact, there is one example of this earlier in this same chapter:

3 Nephi 19:1

And now it came to pass that when Jesus had ascended into heaven
the multitude [*dispersed* > *did disperse* 1 | *did disperse* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and every man did take his wife and his children and did return to his own home

On the other hand, the 1830 typesetter had only minor difficulty with the *do* auxiliary: there are no examples where he deleted the *do*, although there is one case where he added it (in 1 Nephi 17:1). Thus the critical text will accept the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 19:12 (“he baptized”).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 19:12 the 1830 reading without the *do* auxiliary (“he baptized”) since the evidence is considerable that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally add the *do* auxiliary in his transmission of the text; on the other hand, there are no cases where the 1830 typesetter omitted the *do*.

■ 3 Nephi 19:14

and behold they were encircled about

as [*if* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | G] *it were* [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *by* RT] *fire*

There are two minor variants in this verse. First, in the 1858 Wright edition the subordinate conjunction *if* was omitted, probably accidentally. The 1874 RLDS edition followed the reading of the 1840 edition with the *if*. As explained under Alma 36:7, either reading, with or without the *if*, is textually possible. The critical text will maintain the *if* here.

The second variant was introduced in the 1920 LDS edition, namely, the addition of the preposition *by* (thus changing “as if it were fire” to “as if it were **by** fire”). Such an emendation is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 22:17	they shall be saved even if it so be as by fire
Helaman 5:23	Nephi and Lehi were encircled about as if by fire
Ether 4:9	and at my command the inhabitants thereof shall pass away even so as by fire

The second example is quite similar to the example here in 3 Nephi 19:14 in that both refer to being “encircled about”. Ultimately, there is nothing particularly wrong with the earliest text in 3 Nephi 19:14 (“they were encircled about as if it were fire”); in initially reading the sentence, one could misinterpret the pronoun *it* as referring to a specific object. Maybe that is why the 1920 editors decided to add the *by* (the addition was clearly intentional since it was marked in the committee copy). The critical text will restore the original reading since there is nothing particularly wrong with it.

One could propose that the original text actually read like the 1920 text and that somehow the preposition *by* was accidentally omitted during the dictation of the text. Although this is possible, there is no specific evidence for such an error in the history of the text. In contexts where *by* is syntactically optional, there are no examples of the loss of *by* except when that *by* is a repeated *by* in a conjunctive prepositional phrase; for discussion of those examples, see under Alma 2:38.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 19:14 the earliest reading without the preposition *by* since there is nothing especially difficult about “they were encircled about as if it were fire”; also maintain the subordinate conjunction *if* in this sentence since it occurs in the earliest text.

■ 3 Nephi 19:14

*and the multitude **did** witness it*

→ *and* [*do* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *did* RT] *bear record*

*and angels **did** come down out of heaven*

*and **did** minister unto them*

In this passage, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the earlier reading, the present-tense “do bear record”, with the past-tense “did bear record”. This editing is consistent with the fact that all the other verb phrases in this passage use the past-tense form of the auxiliary verb *do* (“did witness it . . . did come down . . . did minister”). Such an emendation suggests that during the dictation of the text an original *did* was somehow replaced with *do*. Yet there appears to be

no present-tense verb form in either the preceding or following verses that could have triggered such a change. Moreover, there are other instances of a present-tense reference to bearing record embedded within a past-tense narrative, including one in this same chapter that was not edited to the past tense in the 1920 LDS edition:

3 Nephi 19:33
 and the multitude **did** hear
 → and **do bear record**
 and their hearts **were** open
 and they **did** understand in their hearts the words
 which he **prayed**

In both verses 14 and 33, the original text first says that the multitude perceived something, then the multitude “do bear record” (that is, in the present tense), and then the text continues the narrative in the past tense. This is as if the multitude’s bearing record continues into the present, which is actually reasonable when one considers that one’s witness may be eternal. A further example of the present tense in statements of bearing record is found earlier in 3 Nephi:

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

In addition, as noted under 3 Nephi 17:21, all of these examples of present-tense *bear* are immediately preceded by a past-tense reference to witnessing. The critical text will therefore follow the original present-tense references to bearing record in 3 Nephi 17:16, 3 Nephi 19:14, and 3 Nephi 19:33. This present-tense usage seems fully intended.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 19:14 the original use of the present-tense “do bear record”; also maintain the two other instances of “do bear record” that have never been emended to the past-tense “did bear record” (in 3 Nephi 17:16 and 3 Nephi 19:33).

■ 3 Nephi 19:14–15

and angels did come down out of heaven and did minister unto them
and it came to pass that while [1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] angels were ministering
unto the disciples
behold Jesus came and stood in the midst and ministered unto them

Here in verse 15, the printer’s manuscript reads “while angels were ministering unto the disciples”, but the 1830 edition has the definite article *the* for the noun *angels*. In the previous verse, the angels are introduced; as a consequence, there is no definite article there: “and angels did come down out of heaven”. The most probable reading for the original manuscript in verse 15 is with the *the*. There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in \mathfrak{D} , tended to omit

the definite article *the* (for a long list of examples, see under Alma 14:5). On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that the 1830 typesetter sometimes supplied an unnecessary *the*:

1 Nephi 15:15

yea at that day will they not receive
[01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] strength and nourishment
from the true vine

1 Nephi 19:21

for he surely did shew
unto [01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophets of old
all things concerning them

2 Nephi 30:17

and there is nothing which is sealed
upon [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth
save it shall be loosed

Mosiah 3:3

for behold I am come to declare unto thee
[1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] glad tidings of great joy

Alma 32:4

there came a great multitude unto him . . .
which were poor in heart because of their poverty
as to [01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things of the world

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

It turns out that the evidence from transmission errors is about equally divided. The critical text will therefore adopt the expected reading here in 3 Nephi 19:14—namely, the original text had the *the* before *angels*, which means that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the definite article (either in \mathcal{O} or when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P}).

Summary: Retain the 1830 reading in 3 Nephi 19:15 with its use of the definite article for *angels* (“while **the** angels were ministering unto the disciples”); the angels were introduced in the previous verse, so the definite article is expected in the subsequent reference to those angels in verse 15; there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally omitted the definite article in this case.

■ 3 Nephi 19:22

thou hast given them the Holy Ghost
because they [believd 1 | believe ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | believe F] in me

At the juncture of verses 20 and 21 of 3 Nephi 19, Oliver Cowdery turned over his copywork to the unknown scribe 2, who then acted as the scribe for \mathcal{P} from 3 Nephi 19:21 to the end of Mormon.

For this portion of the text, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 are, from Helaman 13:17 to the end of Mormon, firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} , but now we have to consider scribe 2's scribal practice rather than Oliver Cowdery's when evaluating \mathcal{P} against the 1830 edition.

Here in verse 22 of 3 Nephi 19, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *believed*—that is, he wrote down the verb *believe* in the past tense. The 1830 edition, on the other hand, has the present-tense *believe*. The rest of the verse is in the present tense, including one more instance of the present-tense *believe*; we end up, then, with three present-tense statements, each of which ends in a *because*-clause in the present tense (at least in the 1830 edition):

3 Nephi 19:22 (the 1830 text)

- (1) thou **hast** given them the Holy Ghost
because they **believe** in me
- (2) and thou **seest** that they **believe** in me
because thou **hearest** them and they **pray** unto me
- (3) and they **pray** unto me
because I **am** with them

The parallelism in the passage argues that the first *believe* should be in the present tense. In fact, in the second statement (listed above as 2) Jesus is explaining that the Father can see that his twelve disciples believe in him, Jesus, because he, the Father, can hear the prayers that they are praying while Jesus is praying, as explained just before Jesus starts his own prayer to the Father:

3 Nephi 19:17–18

and it came to pass that when they had all knelt down upon the earth
he commanded his disciples that they should pray
and behold they began to pray
and they did pray unto Jesus
calling him their Lord and their God

And, of course, the disciples had been baptized and received the Holy Ghost just before (described in verses 11–14), so here in 3 Nephi 19:22 the text is not referring to some remote event. The twelve had just received the Holy Ghost; thus the use in verse 22 of the present-tense *believe* (in fact, in both instances) is wholly appropriate. The critical text will retain the 1830 reading with its consistent use of the present tense in 3 Nephi 19:22.

We don't have much evidence for a tendency on scribe 2's part to replace the present tense with the past tense, although there is the following example from earlier on in his copywork (from Mosiah 25:14 through Alma 13:20, where he acted as the main scribe for \mathcal{P}):

Alma 11:36

behold thou hast lied
for thou sayest that
I [*spea*k 0 | §2 *spake* > §1 *spea*k 1 | *spake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
as though I had authority to command God

In this case, \mathcal{C} is extant and reads in the present tense: “I **spea**k as though I had authority to command God”. Oliver Cowdery, when he later proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , corrected scribe 2's past-tense *spake* to *spea*k. Scribe 2's error in this other case may have been the result of the preceding

perfect usage (“behold thou **hast lied**”) or the result of the past-tense subjunctive *had* that follows (“I speak as though I **had** authority to command God”). We note that here in 3 Nephi 19:22 there is a preceding perfect (“thou **hast given** them the Holy Ghost”) that could have prompted scribe 2 to write *believed* rather than *believe* in the immediately following clause.

Summary: Retain in 3 Nephi 19:22 the present-tense *believe* (the 1830 reading) since the entire verse is in the present tense; parallelism between the three statements in the verse argues that the present-tense *believe* is correct in “because they **believe** in me”.

■ 3 Nephi 19:24–25

*and it came to pass that
when Jesus had thus prayed unto the Father
he came unto his disciples
and behold they did still continue without ceasing to pray unto him
and they did not multiply many words
for it was given unto them what they should pray
and they were filled with desire*

*and it came to pass that
Jesus [beheld 1PS | blessed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] them
as they did pray unto him
and his countenance did smile upon them
and the light of his countenance did shine upon them
and behold they were as white as the countenance and also the garments of Jesus
and behold the whiteness thereof did exceed all whiteness
yea even there could be nothing upon earth so white as the whiteness thereof*

Here in verse 25, the printer’s manuscript has “Jesus **beheld** them as they did pray unto him”, while the 1830 edition reads “Jesus **blessed** them as they did pray unto him”. The 1908 RLDS edition adopted the reading in \mathfrak{P} , but the LDS text has retained the 1830 reading.

The use of the verb *ble* is supported by the subsequent text that refers to Jesus’s countenance smiling upon the twelve disciples and the light of his countenance shining upon them. As David Calabro points out (personal communication), this act on the part of the Lord is directly related to the blessing that Aaron and his priestly sons were commanded to give to the children of Israel:

Numbers 6:22–27

and the LORD spake unto Moses saying
speak unto Aaron and unto his sons saying
on this wise ye shall **ble** the children of Israel saying unto them
the LORD **ble** thee and keep thee
the LORD make his face **shine** upon thee and be gracious unto thee
the LORD lift up his **countenance** upon thee and give thee peace
and they shall put my name upon the children of Israel
and I will **ble** them

Both 3 Nephi 19:25 and Numbers 6:25–26 refer to the Lord’s countenance shining upon the people—and, of course, this is a blessing from the Lord. Interestingly, here in 3 Nephi 19:25 the Lord

himself bestows the blessing directly upon his disciples rather than through his high priest. (It should be pointed out that this passage from Numbers 6:22–27 is cross-referenced in a footnote for 3 Nephi 19:25 in the 1981 LDS edition.)

Of course, the text gives numerous examples in 3 Nephi of Jesus beholding people (including his disciples), although the verb used is not actually *behold*; also note that in each case, after beholding either the twelve disciples or the multitude, Jesus speaks to them:

3 Nephi 13:25

And now it came to pass that
when Jesus had spoken these words
he **looked upon** the twelve whom he had chosen
and saith unto them . . .

3 Nephi 15:1

and now it came to pass that
when Jesus had ended these sayings
he **cast his eyes round about on** the multitude
and saith unto them . . .

3 Nephi 17:1

behold now it came to pass that
when Jesus had spoken these words
he **looked round about** again **on** the multitude
and he saith unto them . . .

3 Nephi 17:5–6

and it came to pass that
when Jesus had thus spoken
he **cast his eyes round about** again **on** the multitude
and behold they were in tears
and did look steadfastly upon him
as if they would ask him to tarry a little longer with them
and he saith unto them . . .

3 Nephi 18:26

and now it came to pass that
when Jesus had spoken these words
he **turned his eyes** again **upon** the disciples whom he had chosen
and saith unto them . . .

In each instance, the text has the same phraseology, “and (he) saith unto them”. But here in 3 Nephi 19:24–25, nothing is spoken, which makes the reading with *behold* unusual. Also note that later in verse 30, after praying to the Father, Jesus returns and beholds the twelve disciples still praying:

3 Nephi 19:30

and it came to pass that when Jesus had spake these words
he came again unto his disciples
and behold they did pray steadfastly without ceasing unto him
and he did smile upon them again
and behold they were white even as Jesus

In this case there is no reference to a blessing; although there is an implication of beholding, yet once more Jesus does not speak.

One important factor to consider here is that the use of *beheld* in \mathcal{P} for verse 25 is excessively redundant; in the previous verse, Jesus has already beheld the twelve disciples praying unto him:

3 Nephi 19:24–25 (the reading in \mathcal{P})
 he came unto his disciples
 and **behold** they did still continue without ceasing to pray unto him . . .
 and it came to pass that Jesus **beheld** them as they did pray unto him

But this problematic reading suggests what probably happened here in 3 Nephi 19:25: namely, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} replaced the unexpected *blessed* with *beheld* under the influence of the previous verse and its clear implication of beholding. Not only do we have the word *behold*, but there is also the statement that Jesus has already seen the disciples praying. On the other hand, it seems quite implausible that the 1830 typesetter would have mistakenly replaced *beheld* with the unexpected *blessed*. There is no nearby reference to any blessing. Moreover, this is the only time in the text where someone blesses someone else while just looking at them. As Don Brugger points out (personal communication), we expect the Lord to have used words if he had blessed the twelve disciples.

The critical text will therefore maintain the difficult 1830 reading: “Jesus **blessed** them as they did pray unto him”. The striking resemblance with the language in Numbers 6:25–26 argues that *blessed* is indeed correct here in 3 Nephi 19:25. The odds are that the original manuscript read this way, which means that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally misread *blessed* as *beheld* when he copied the text from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} . Such an error is natural enough since Jesus was indeed beholding the disciples as they prayed.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 19:25 the 1830 reading: “Jesus **blessed** them as they did pray unto him”; the larger passage refers to the Lord’s countenance smiling upon the disciples as well as to the light of his countenance shining upon them; in this passage we have a direct enactment of the priestly blessing in Numbers 6:22–27.

■ 3 Nephi 19:25

and behold the whiteness thereof did exceed

[*the >+ all 1 | all the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *whiteness*

yea even there could be nothing upon earth so white as the whiteness thereof

In the printer’s manuscript scribe 2 initially wrote “did exceed the whiteness”; then he crossed out the definite article *the* and supralinearly inserted *all*. The level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier; but his crossout and his insert mark are of the same level of ink flow, so scribe 2 may have simply dipped his quill just before writing the supralinear *all*. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} does not appear to be an “editing” scribe; that is, his only purpose was to faithfully copy the text. There is virtually no evidence of him ever trying to correct “mistakes” in the text. Therefore, his correction to “all whiteness” was probably the reading of the original manuscript. On the other hand, the 1830 compositor himself set “all the whiteness”, which doesn’t sound quite right (but which has been maintained in all the printed editions, including the RLDS ones).

The question is why would scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially write “**the** whiteness” and the 1830 compositor set “all **the** whiteness” if there was no *the* in \mathcal{C} ? One possibility is that each was influenced by the two other occurrences of *whiteness* in this passage, both of which are preceded by *the*:

3 Nephi 19:25 (proposed original text)
 and behold **the whiteness** thereof did exceed all whiteness
 yea even there could be nothing upon earth so white as **the whiteness** thereof

The closeness of the first occurrence of “the whiteness” could have easily led both scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 compositor to accidentally add the *the* (but with only scribe 2 catching his error). Perhaps even more significant is the fact that the last occurrence of “the whiteness” would have been right below the instance of “all whiteness” in \mathcal{C} , as it is in \mathcal{P} :

3 Nephi 19:25 (lines 4–6 on page 395 of \mathcal{P})

-ments of Jesus	and behold the whiteness thereof did exceed	all
-eness yea	^ their could be nothing upon Earth so white as the white	<th>^e whit
-ness thereof . . .		even

Since here both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} , contamination from the two nearby occurrences of “the whiteness” could have led to “the whiteness” initially in \mathcal{P} and to “all the whiteness” in the 1830 edition.

The phrase “all the whiteness” (the 1830 reading) is indeed odd unless there is some post-modification of *whiteness*, as in the following example:

1 Nephi 8:11
 yea and I beheld that the fruit thereof was white
 to exceed **all the whiteness** that I had ever seen

In that case, *whiteness* is modified by a relative clause. Similarly, there are two instances later on in 1 Nephi where “the whiteness” occurs, and there the phrase is again postmodified (either by *thereof* or by a prepositional phrase):

1 Nephi 11:8
 and **the whiteness** thereof did exceed **the whiteness** of the driven snow

Otherwise, when *all* is found along with the verb *exceed*, we do not expect the *the* unless the following noun is postmodified; the following example shows the contrast:

1 Nephi 11:8
 and **the beauty** thereof was far beyond
 yea exceeding of **all beauty**

For 3 Nephi 19:25, the best solution would be to accept the corrected reading of \mathcal{P} (“all whiteness”) as the original reading, which was probably the reading of \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 19:25 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “behold the whiteness thereof did exceed **all** whiteness”; the occurrence of “all the whiteness” in the 1830 edition seems to have been

an error based on the two occurrences of “the whiteness” in this passage; in a similar manner, scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} initially wrote “the whiteness” instead of the correct “all whiteness” in this sentence.

■ 3 Nephi 19:26

*and Jesus saith unto them : pray on
nevertheless they did not cease to pray*

Dan Wood suggests (personal communication, 15 November 2003) that the word *nevertheless* seems out of place here. One possible replacement would be the word *therefore* (or perhaps *wherefore*):

3 Nephi 19:26 (possible emendation)
and Jesus saith unto them : pray on
therefore they did not cease to pray

Even so, there are no instances in the text where *nevertheless* has ever been mixed up with either *therefore* or *wherefore*.

Perhaps the meaning here is the disciples didn’t intend to cease praying, so that Jesus didn’t really need to tell them to continue praying, but he still did. One may protest that Jesus wouldn’t ask them to do something that he knew they would continue to do anyway. Yet arguments from God’s omniscience may not be appropriate for the Book of Mormon text. For instance, at the beginning of 3 Nephi 17, Jesus first tells the Nephites that he must leave, but then he changes his mind when he sees their great desire for him to stay longer (3 Nephi 17:1–8). One can reinterpret the text in 3 Nephi 17 to claim that Jesus already knew he would be staying longer even when he said that he had to leave and the Nephites needed to go home to ponder what he had already said. I would prefer to think that through faith we can sometimes change the Lord’s mind. In fact, there is evidence from 3 Nephi 16–17 that Jesus cut off his discourse on Isaiah 52:8–10 right after quoting it because he could tell that his audience’s attention was lagging (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 16:17–18). Thus here in 3 Nephi 19:26, Jesus asked the disciples to continue praying without knowing whether they actually intended to keep on praying.

Another possibility here, one less fraught with theological implications, is that the meaning of the word *nevertheless* may be different than what we expect in today’s English. The Oxford English Dictionary under definition 5b of *never* indicates that in Middle English and Early Modern English phrases like “never the less” acted as a negative emphatic with the meaning ‘not in any way less’ or ‘by no means less’. In other words, the word *nevertheless* here in 3 Nephi 19:26 may mean something like ‘by no means’ or ‘not at all’, so that in context the negative clause could be interpreted as equivalent to “and by no means did they cease to pray”. This interpretation may very well represent what the original sentence intended to convey.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out other possible interpretations that may work here. For instance, Jesus’s counsel for them to continue praying did not nevertheless interrupt their praying. In other words, the word *nevertheless* may be negating only one aspect of the clause “they did not cease to pray” rather than every aspect of the clause. To be sure, the reading here in 3 Nephi 19:26 is a difficult one; but the use of the word *nevertheless* does appear to be intended and will therefore be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 19:26 the use of *nevertheless*; the meaning here seems to be an emphatic negative with the meaning ‘and by no means’, but it is also possible to interpret the word *nevertheless* as negating only some restricted aspect of the clause “they did not cease to pray”.

■ 3 Nephi 19:28

I thank thee that thou hast purified

[*these* 01PS | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *which I have chosen because of their faith*

There is a small extant fragment here of the original manuscript, and it definitely has *these*, not *those*. The printer’s manuscript has the same *these*, but the 1830 typesetter accidentally changed *these* to *those*. In accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} , the 1908 RLDS edition restored *these*, but the LDS text has retained the 1830 *those*.

This kind of error is, as we have seen, very common in the history of the Book of Mormon text. The original *these* should be restored. There are other cases of variation between *these* and *those* in this part of the text where both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} but for which \mathcal{O} is not extant. In those cases, we must rely (where possible) on errors in transmission and internal evidence (usage elsewhere in the text) in order to determine the reading in \mathcal{O} . For some examples of this indeterminacy, where \mathcal{O} is not extant but \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition differ with respect to *these* and *those*, see under 3 Nephi 1:22 and 3 Nephi 10:17.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 19:28 *these* in “thou hast purified these” since this is the reading of the original manuscript (which is extant here on a small fragment).

■ 3 Nephi 19:29

I pray not for the world

but for them which thou hast given

[*unto* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *me out of the world*

Here in 3 Nephi 19:29, it appears that the typesetter for the 1837 edition accidentally dropped the preposition *unto*. This kind of error is natural since in the original text we have 21 occurrences of “give me” but only 8 of “give unto me”. The text itself favors the modern-sounding “give me” rather than the archaic reading with the preposition *unto*. For two other instances in the textual history where *unto* has been lost from “give unto me”, see under Alma 7:4 and Mormon 3:4 (both of these deal with the phrase “give unto me to know”).

Summary: Restore the preposition *unto* in 3 Nephi 19:29 (“which thou hast given **unto** me out of the world”); for each case of “give (unto) me”, we follow the earliest reading.

■ 3 Nephi 19:33

and the multitude did hear and **do** bear record and their hearts were open
and they [*dod* >js *did* 1 | *did* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] understand in their hearts
the words which he prayed

Here scribe 2 wrote *dod* in \mathcal{P} . The 1830 edition reads *did*, which is undoubtedly correct. Later, when Joseph Smith edited \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, he corrected the *dod* to *did*. Scribe 2's *dod* appears to be a scribal slip rather than a misspelling of *doed* (which is what we might expect a child to say for the past-tense form of the verb *do*). There are a few cases in the history of the text where the irregular past-tense form has been replaced by a regular form:

1 Nephi 20:21 (*cleaved* in \mathcal{P} originally and in the 1830 edition)

he [*claved* >+ *clave* 0 | *cleaved* >js *cleav* 1 | *cleaved* A |
clave BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the rock also

Alma 1:11 (*pleaded* introduced into the LDS text in 1879)

he stood before Alma
and [*pled* 1 | *plead* ABCDEFGHKPS | *pleaded* IJLMNOQRT] for himself
with much boldness

Alma 23:14 (perhaps *dwelled* initially in \mathcal{G})

whithersoever they [*dweld* > *dwelt* 0 | *dwel* > *dwelt* 1 |
dwelt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 36:18 (*caught* in \mathcal{G})

now as my mind [*caghed* >% *cached* >% *cacht* 0 |
caught 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] hold upon this thought . . .

Here in 3 Nephi 19:33, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have simply written *dod* because he was used to writing *do* (note the preceding “**do** bear record”), not because he was trying to write a rather improbable past-tense *doed*. It should be noted that scribe 2 made this same scribal slip later on in 3 Nephi:

3 Nephi 22:1 (quoting Isaiah 54:1)

sing O barren
thou that [\S 2 *dodst* >+ \S 1 *didst* 1 | *didst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not bear

In this case, Oliver Cowdery later corrected the impossible *dodst* to *didst* when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{G} .

Summary: Maintain the past-tense form *did* in 3 Nephi 19:33 as well as the past-tense *didst* in 3 Nephi 22:1; scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} sometimes accidentally wrote *did(st)* as *dod(st)*.

■ 3 Nephi 19:35

so great faith [*have* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *hath* E] I never seen among all the Jews

Here the 1849 LDS edition reads *hath* instead of the expected *have*. This change was undoubtedly a typo. Perhaps the 1849 typesetter was influenced by the preceding singular noun phrase “so great faith”, which led him to expect the third person singular *hath* rather than *have*. Of course,

the subject in this sentence is *I*, not “so great faith” (which acts as a fronted direct object in this sentence). The 1852 LDS edition restored the *have*, the correct verb form for the subject *I*. It is true that in the original text there is some evidence for expressions equivalent to “I hath” (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 8:16), but here in 3 Nephi 19:35 this later instance of “I hath” is clearly secondary. Here is one more instance of “I hath” in the original text, although in this case the *hath* occurs in a conjoined predicate:

Helaman 14:10

and now because I am a Lamanite
and [*hath* >*js have* 1 | *hath* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] spoken unto you
the words which the Lord hath commanded me . . .

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 19:35 the original *have*, the earliest reading as well as what we expect with the subject pronoun *I*.

3 Nephi 20

■ 3 Nephi 20:2

*and he commanded them that they should arise
and stand* [§2 NULL > §1 *up* 1 | *up* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOQRT | HKPS] *upon their feet*

Here the adverb *up* has been lost at two different times, in \mathcal{P} by scribe 2 and later in the 1874 RLDS edition. The RLDS text has maintained the shorter reading. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , restored the *up*. The critical text will maintain the *up* after the verb *stand*. For further discussion regarding the loss of *up* before *upon*, see under Alma 2:15.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 20:2 the adverb *up* in the conjoined predicate “and stand **up** upon their feet”, the reading of the earliest textual sources (the 1830 edition and the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}).

■ 3 Nephi 20:2

and they arose [*up* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N]
and stood [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *up* N] *upon their feet*

Here the typesetter for the 1906 LDS edition shifted the adverb *up* to a later position in the sentence, from after *arose* to after *stood*. He seems to have been influenced by the placement of the *up* earlier in the verse: “and he commanded them that they should arise and stand **up** upon their feet”. The 1906 edition never served as a copytext; thus all subsequent LDS editions follow the original placement of the *up* in this sentence. Of course, either reading is theoretically possible here, so the critical text will follow the earliest reading, with *up* after *arose* but not after *stood*. For another variant involving the occurrence of *up* after *stood*, see under Alma 36:8.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 20:2 the earliest extant reading with its use of *up* after *arose* but not after *stood*.

■ 3 Nephi 20:3

*and it came to pass that
he* [§2 *brerke* > §1 *brak* > *broke* 1 | *break* ABCDPS | *brake* EFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *bread again
and blessed it and gave to the disciples to eat*

The original manuscript here in 3 Nephi 20:3 read as either *brake* or *break*, but not *broke*. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote the verb as *brerke*, a rather bizarre scribal error. Oliver Cowdery started to correct the spelling to *brake* but then crossed out what he had written (namely, *brak*) and wrote the more

modern past-tense form, *broke* (his entire correction is written supralinearly). The 1830 edition has *break*, an homophonous spelling for *brake*. The 1849 LDS edition and the 1858 Wright edition replaced the incorrect *break* with *brake*. For some unknown reason, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier *break* to the RLDS text. The critical text will maintain the archaic past-tense form *brake*. For a complete discussion of the use of *brake* versus *broke* in the earliest text, see under Alma 14:26.

Summary: Maintain the simple past-tense form *brake* in 3 Nephi 20:3 (the probable reading here of the original text) rather than the modern form *broke*.

■ 3 Nephi 20:3–5

*and it came to pass that
he brake bread again
and blessed it*

- (1) *and gave to the disciples to eat*

*and when they had eat
he commanded them
that they should break bread*

- (2) *and give [1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | it CGHKPS] unto the multitude*

- (3) *and when they had given unto the multitude
he also gave them wine to drink
and commanded them*

- (4) *that they should give unto the multitude*

The issue here is whether there should be a direct object *it* after the verb *give*. There are four cases here in 3 Nephi 20:3–5 where there is no *it* after *give* in the earliest text, although in one case (listed above as 2) the 1840 edition supplied it, probably accidentally since the *it* was not added in the other cases. As explained under Alma 55:31, the critical text will maintain instances of the verb *give* where the direct object is left unstated. Also see the discussion under 3 Nephi 18:3.

Summary: Continue the use of the verb *give* without any direct object in 3 Nephi 20:3–5 (“and gave to the disciples to eat . . . and give unto the multitude and when they had given unto the multitude . . . that they should give unto the multitude”).

■ 3 Nephi 20:7

*but he truly gave
[unto 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] them bread to eat
and also wine to drink*

In 3 Nephi 19:29, the preposition *unto* was accidentally omitted in the 1837 edition. Here in 3 Nephi 20:7, the 1874 RLDS edition has the same typo. This kind of error is natural since in modern English we typically omit the preposition (usually *to*, but also *unto* in archaic English) in expressions like this one. Even so, the original Book of Mormon text is about equally divided in usage here, with 29 occurrences of “give them” and 31 of “give **unto** them” (there is only one instance where the preposition is *to*, in 2 Nephi 9:26). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the use of *unto* in

this passage, most likely by reference to the printer's manuscript. The LDS text has maintained the original reading with the *unto*, as will the critical text.

Summary: Maintain the original preposition *unto* in 3 Nephi 20:7 (“but he truly gave **unto** them bread to eat”).

■ 3 Nephi 20:8

he that eateth this bread

eateth of my body to [their 1A | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] soul

and **he** that drinketh of this wine

drinketh of my blood to [their 1A | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] soul

and [their 1A | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] soul shall never hunger nor thirst
but shall be filled

Here in the 1837 edition, three instances of the generic third person possessive pronoun *their* were changed to *his*, thus making the number agree with the generic subject pronoun *he* in this passage. Joseph Smith is probably responsible for this editing, although he did not mark it in \mathcal{P} .

The generic plural is sometimes used in the original Book of Mormon text, as explained under 1 Nephi 17:48 (for cases of *whoso* and *whosoever*) and under 2 Nephi 29:11 (for cases of *every man*). For each of these generic cases, the critical text will follow the grammatical number of the earliest textual sources, thus restoring the three original cases of *their* here in 3 Nephi 20:8.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 20:8 the three original instances of the generic plural *their* that were edited to *his* in the 1837 edition.

■ 3 Nephi 20:10

behold [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

I finish the commandment which the Father hath commanded me
concerning this people which are a remnant of the house of Israel

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the *now* when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Oliver Cowdery later supplied it when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . The 1830 edition, set from \mathcal{C} , also has the *now*; thus we can be confident that \mathcal{C} also had the *now*. See under Helaman 7:29 for another instance where the scribe (in that case, Oliver Cowdery) omitted the original *now* after *behold*, at least initially, when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

For this part of the text where both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} , I will usually not discuss those cases where the variation consists solely of a correction by Oliver Cowdery to scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} 's reading (or scribe 2's own correction), providing the corrected reading agrees with the 1830 reading. In volume 3, I list all these cases of manuscript variation between 3 Nephi 19:21 and Mormon 9:37, where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was the main scribe in \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{C} ; unfortunately, \mathcal{C} is extant for only three minor fragments in this part of the text.

Summary: Maintain the *now* in 3 Nephi 20:10 (“behold now I finish the commandment”), the 1830 reading and Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ 3 Nephi 20:12–13

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
 [1 | . ABCDGHKPS | , EFIJLMNOQRT]
 O house of Israel
 [1 | , ABCDGHKPS | . EFIJLMNOQRT]
 [and 1ABDPS | CGHK | And EFIJLMNOQRT] then shall the remnants
 which shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth
 be gathered in . . .

The question in this passage is whether “O house of Israel” should be attached to the preceding *people* (as in the LDS text) or to the following clause (as in the RLDS text). The 1830 typesetter punctuated this passage so that the latter held: he placed a period after *people* and a comma after *Israel*. For the 1849 edition, Orson Pratt reversed the punctuation, placing a comma after *people* and a period after *Israel*.

The reading in the LDS text is very probably the correct reading. Elsewhere in the text, we have 12 occurrences of “O house of Israel” where each is connected to a preceding occurrence of *people*. In nearly all of those cases, the following clause begins with a connective word that does not permit a preceding vocative like “O house of Israel”. In eight cases, the connective is *and*, just as here in 3 Nephi 20:12–13. Other connectives are *that*, *verily*, and *therefore* (each occurring once). In only one case do we get a situation where the following clause doesn’t have a connective, which would then allow “O house of Israel” to be attached to that clause, at least in theory:

1 Nephi 21:1 (the last two lines quote Isaiah 49:1)
 yea all ye that are broken off
 that are scattered abroad
 which are of my people
 O house of Israel
 listen O isles unto me
 and hearken ye people from far

Yet even here “O house of Israel” cannot be attached to the following clause beginning with *listen* since this clause already has a vocative (“O isles”), just as the following clause does (“ye people from far”).

Here in 3 Nephi 20:13, the 1840 edition removed the *and* of the clause following “O house of Israel”. The original 1830 punctuation implied that “O house of Israel” should be attached to “and then shall the remnants . . .”; but the *and* made this rather difficult, so the *and* was probably deleted for that reason. The evidence thus strongly supports the 1849 interpretation that “O house of Israel” is connected to the preceding *people*. There is no reason to follow the 1830 punctuation, nor to delete the *and* at the beginning of verse 13.

Summary: Accept the current punctuation for “O house of Israel” at the end of verse 12 in 3 Nephi 20; this vocative phrase belongs with the preceding *people*; there is therefore no reason to delete the connective *and* that begins the following clause (in verse 13).

■ 3 Nephi 20:13

*and then shall the [remnant >+ remnants 1 | remnants ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth
 be gathered in . . .*

In the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 originally wrote the singular *remnant*, then immediately added the plural *s* with heavier ink flow (he apparently redipped his quill here before writing the plural *s*). The 1830 edition has the plural, so the original manuscript undoubtedly also did.

Normally the text has the singular *remnant* (61 times in the original text), but there is one other firm occurrence of the plural:

1 Nephi 10:14
 or in fine
 that after the Gentiles had received the fullness of the gospel
 the natural branches of the olive tree
 or the **remnants** of the house of Israel
 should be grafted in
 or come to the knowledge of the true Messiah

The use of the plural *branches* confirms the plural *remnants* in this second passage (“the natural **branches** of the olive tree or the **remnants** of the house of Israel”). Thus the plural *remnants* is possible, and in 3 Nephi 20:13 the original manuscript undoubtedly read in the plural.

It should be noted that in this passage the relative pronoun *which* was never grammatically emended to *who*. Other passages in the Book of Mormon show that for the noun *remnant* an original *which* can be edited to *who(m)* or that in the original text the relative pronoun can be *who(m)*:

1 Nephi 13:34
 and this remnant of [*which* 0A | *which* >js *whom* 1 |
whom BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I speak
 is the seed of thy father

3 Nephi 21:22
 and they shall come in unto the covenant
 and be numbered among this the remnant of Jacob
 unto **whom** I have given this land for their inheritance

Here in 3 Nephi 20:13, Joseph Smith left the *which* unchanged in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will follow each original instance of *which*. For further discussion of this issue, see under WHICH in volume 3. For other examples where Joseph apparently neglected to edit *which* to *who(m)*, see under 2 Nephi 18:18. Also see under 2 Nephi 25:22 for a noun (namely, *nation*) for which the editing from *which* to *who(m)* has been optionally applied.

Summary: The plural *remnants* was undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript in 3 Nephi 20:13; this plural usage, although fairly rare in the Book of Mormon, is supported by the reading in 1 Nephi 10:14; original instances of *which* where *who(m)* is expected in modern English will be either restored or maintained, as the case may be.

■ 3 Nephi 20:15

and I say unto you that if the Gentiles do not repent
 after the [blessings >]s blessing 1 | blessing ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which they shall receive . . .

Here the printer’s manuscript originally had the plural *blessings*. The 1830 edition has the singular. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith corrected \mathcal{P} to the reading of the 1830 edition. He crossed out the plural *s* with the same speckled ink that he used elsewhere in this part of \mathcal{P} to make corrections for the 1837 edition. So the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} was not made earlier—that is, not by scribe 2 nor by Oliver Cowdery. We must therefore consider which reading—the singular *blessing* or the plural *blessings*—is most appropriate in this passage.

There are many examples in the history of the text where the grammatical number for nouns has been mixed up. When we compare the error rates for scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 typesetter, we find that their tendency to permanently mix up the singular and plural forms for nouns is about the same. Scribe 2 wrote down only about 15 percent of the text of \mathcal{P} ; but if he had done the entire text, I would estimate he would have made about 94 errors involving adding or omitting the plural *s* (this estimate is based on the 14 errors of this type that he made for his 15 percent of \mathcal{P}). This error rate is a little more than the 1830 compositor’s; as described under 3 Nephi 10:13, John Gilbert made about 85 changes involving the plural *s* for the entire text. So in order to determine which of the two, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} or Gilbert, is responsible for any difference in grammatical number between \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition, we will mostly have to rely on internal evidence (that is, usage elsewhere in the text) unless, of course, we have specific information about mix-ups for the particular noun in question. But for the noun *blessing* there are no other passages where scribe 2 or the 1830 compositor (or Oliver Cowdery, for that matter) mixed up the number.

When we turn to internal evidence, we find that there are three instances in the current text that refer to “receiving blessings” (that is, all three read in the plural), yet in the third case the earliest text read in the singular:

2 Nephi 1:10 (\mathcal{C} is extant)

after that they have received
 so great **blessings** from the hand of the Lord

Alma 9:23 (\mathcal{C} is not extant)

if this people
 who have received so many **blessings** from the hand of the Lord
 should transgress . . .

Mormon 5:19 (1830 and \mathcal{P} agree; \mathcal{C} is not extant)

and behold the Lord hath reserved
 their [blessing 1A | blessings BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which they might have received in the land
 for the Gentiles which shall possess the land

In Mormon 5:19, the 1837 edition replaced the original singular *blessing* with the plural. In that case, \mathcal{C} most probably read in the singular since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read in the singular (from Helaman 13:17 through Mormon, as already noted, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand

copies of \mathcal{O}). The change in the 1837 edition could well be a typo rather than a conscious correction since Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, did not mark that change in \mathcal{P} . Of course, the original manuscript's singular might have been an error.

One could argue that the original use of the singular in Mormon 5:19 was due more to the use of the verb *reserve* than the verb *receive* that occurs in the following relative clause. But there are no other examples in the text of the verb *reserve* taking *blessing(s)*, so it is difficult to make a judgment regarding expectations when the verb is *reserve*. But generally speaking, for other verbs we get examples of both the singular and the plural for *blessing*, as in this contrastive pair involving the verb *bestow*:

Alma 26:2 what great **blessings** hath he bestowed upon us

Alma 26:3 and this is the **blessing** which hath been bestowed upon us

In the case of Mormon 5:19, it is worth noting that Lehi, in his farewell to his children, said that he would either leave his (first) blessing upon Laman and Lemuel and their descendants or he would take it away, depending on them:

2 Nephi 1:28–29 (speaking to his sons and to Ishmael's sons, referring to Nephi)

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**

and it shall rest upon him

2 Nephi 4:5–7 (speaking to Laman's children)

but behold my sons and my daughters

I cannot go down to my grave

save I should leave **a blessing** upon you . . .

wherefore if ye are cursed

behold I leave **my blessing** upon you

that the cursing may be taken from you . . .

wherefore because of **my blessing**

the Lord God will not suffer that ye shall perish

2 Nephi 4:9 (speaking to Lemuel's children)

behold I leave unto you **the same blessing**

which I left unto the sons and daughters of Laman

And in Mormon 5:19 it appears that Mormon is referring to this blessing that Lehi left to the descendants of Laman and Lemuel, namely, that it was being extended to the Gentiles because the Lamanites were not yet worthy of that blessing. Thus the use of the singular is appropriate in Mormon 5:19, and the critical text will maintain the singular *blessing* since it is the reading of the earliest text (in this case, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition).

Generally speaking, unless a specific blessing is being referred to, the Book of Mormon prefers the plural *blessings*, as in the examples in 2 Nephi 1:10 and Alma 9:23 that involve the verb *receive*

(listed earlier in this discussion). When we consider the other passages that refer to the blessing(s) that the Gentiles will receive, we find that in the general case the plural occurs:

Mormon 5:10

and now behold this I speak unto their seed
and also to the Gentiles which hath care for the house of Israel
that realize and know from whence their **blessings** come

On the other hand, when the Lord refers to a specific blessing such as “the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Gentiles”, the text reads in the singular:

3 Nephi 20:27

in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed
unto the pouring out of the Holy Ghost through me upon the Gentiles
which **blessing** upon the Gentiles shall make them mighty above all
unto the scattering of my people / O house of Israel

Contextually, here in 3 Nephi 20:15 there seems to be only a general reference to God’s blessing of the Gentiles. Thus the odds favor the plural *blessings* for this passage, and the critical text will therefore accept the plural reading in \mathcal{P} rather than the singular 1830 reading. Nonetheless, the singular is still possible.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 20:15 the plural reading *blessings* , the reading of the printer’s manuscript, rather than the singular *blessing* , the 1830 reading; also restore in Mormon 5:19 the original singular *blessing* , the reading in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition; the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural when no specific blessing is mentioned, although the singular is also possible in general contexts.

■ 3 Nephi 20:16

*and ye shall be among them
as a lion among the beasts of the [forest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | forests s]*

□ Micah 5:8 (King James Bible)

and the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people
as a lion among the beasts of the **forest**

There has been a tendency in the history of the text to replace the singular *forest* with the plural *forests* . Here in 3 Nephi 20:16, the 1953 RLDS edition made this change; that edition is known for changing singulars to plurals (see the list of examples under 2 Nephi 7:3). The singular is correct since the *as* -clause is a literal quote from Micah 5:8, which reads in the singular in the King James Bible. For the same change to *forests* , but in the 1902 LDS missionary edition, see nearby under 3 Nephi 21:12.

Summary: Maintain the singular *forest* in 3 Nephi 20:16, the earliest reading as well as the reading in the corresponding passage from Micah 5:8.

■ 3 Nephi 20:17

thy hand shall be lifted up

upon [§2 their > §1 thine 1 | thine ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *adversaries*

and all [§2 their > §1 thine 1 | thine ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *enemies shall be cut off*

□ Micah 5:9 (King James Bible)

thine hand shall be lifted up

upon **thine** adversaries

and all **thine** enemies shall be cut off

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} twice miswrote *thine* as *their*. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , made the proper corrections. The *thine* occurs in the corresponding King James reading in Micah 5:9. But one difference between the King James text and the Book of Mormon has to do with the noun *hand*: in the King James reading, we have “thine hand” because of the *h*-less pronunciation of *hand* in Early Modern English, which shows up quite frequently in the King James Bible (which has 147 instances of “thine hand” but only 40 of “thy hand”). Although the overall number of occurrences is less, the Book of Mormon text prefers “thy hand” over “thine hand” (4 to 2), so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources. The Book of Mormon preference for *thy* over *thine* may be due to the fact that the *h* of *hand* is pronounced by the vast majority of modern English speakers.

This same kind of variation between *thy* and *thine* before *h*-initial words is found in other biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon. In all the following cases, the form *thy* consistently occurs in the Book of Mormon text, while the King James text has the archaic use of *thine*:

	BOOK OF MORMON	KING JAMES BIBLE
2 Nephi 24:13 / Isaiah 14:13	thy heart	thine heart
3 Nephi 13:17 / Matthew 6:17	thy head	thine head
3 Nephi 20:17 / Micah 5:9	thy hand	thine hand
3 Nephi 20:19 / Micah 4:13	thy horn	thine horn
3 Nephi 21:16 / Micah 5:12	thy hand	thine hand
3 Nephi 21:17 / Micah 5:13	thy hands	thine hands
3 Nephi 22:2 / Isaiah 54:2	thy habitations	thine habitations
3 Nephi 22:5 / Isaiah 54:5	thy husband	thine husband

Nonetheless, sometimes the King James *thine* before an *h*-initial word is retained in the Book of Mormon text:

1 Nephi 21:21 / Isaiah 49:21	thine heart	thine heart
2 Nephi 8:22 / Isaiah 51:22	thine hand	thine hand

Cases involving variation within the Book of Mormon text itself will always be discussed in this volume. See, for instance, the discussion regarding *thy* versus *thine* under 3 Nephi 12:43. In all of the invariant cases within the Book of Mormon text, the critical text will accept the earliest Book of Mormon reading even if it differs with a corresponding King James reading, thus “thy hand” here in 3 Nephi 20:17. For vowel-initial words like *adversaries* and *enemies*, of course, *thine*

occurs in both the Book of Mormon and King James texts. For a complete discussion, see under POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 20:17 the use of *thy* before *hand* (the consistent Book of Mormon reading for this passage) rather than the King James *thine*; maintain *thine* before the two vowel-initial words *adversaries* and *enemies*.

■ 3 Nephi 20:25

*and ye are of the covenant
which the Father made with your fathers
saying [1BCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | : AL]
unto Abraham
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT]
and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*

□ Acts 3:25 (King James Bible)

ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant
which God made with our fathers
saying unto Abraham
and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed

Ostensibly, the biblical source for this passage, at least the words of the Lord to Abraham, is in the Old Testament:

Genesis 22:17–18 (King James Bible)
and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies
→ and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed

But the actual Book of Mormon quotation follows the King James reading for Acts 3:25, although the specific words of the Lord to Abraham differ by only a single word (*nations* versus *kindreds*) when we compare Acts 3:25 with Genesis 22:18. More significantly, the larger passage in 3 Nephi 20:22–26 paraphrastically follows the overall language of the Acts passage (Acts 3:22–26), as in verse 25 for both sources (with the differences shown in bold):

<i>3 Nephi 20:25</i>	<i>Acts 3:25</i>
and behold ye are	ye are
the children of the prophets	the children of the prophets
and ye are of the house of Israel	
and ye are of the covenant	and of the covenant
which the Father made	which God made
with your fathers	with our fathers
saying unto Abraham	saying unto Abraham
and in thy seed	and in thy seed
shall all the kindreds	shall all the kindreds
of the earth be blessed	of the earth be blessed

In other words, 3 Nephi 20:25 is more of a quote from Acts 3:25 than from Genesis 22:18.

Clearly, the phrase “unto Abraham” belongs with the preceding *saying* in both 3 Nephi 20:25 and Acts 3:25. Even so, the compositors for the 1830 edition and the 1902 LDS edition interpreted “unto Abraham” as part of the Lord’s words to Abraham, thus ending up with the very awkward reading “unto Abraham and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed”.

Summary: Maintain the current punctuation in 3 Nephi 20:25; in Acts 3:25 (and with support from Genesis 22:18), the phrase “unto Abraham” belongs with the preceding *saying*, not the following clause that actually quotes the Lord’s words to Abraham.

■ 3 Nephi 20:30

*and it shall come to pass that the time cometh
when the fullness of my gospel*

[1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be preached unto them*

Here the printer’s manuscript lacks a finite verb form in the subordinate clause “when the fullness of my gospel **be** preached unto them”. One could interpret the *be* as a subjunctive verb form (in distinction to the indicative form “when the fullness of my gospel **is** preached unto them”). On the other hand, the 1830 edition has the modal *shall* for this subordinate clause (“when the fullness of my gospel **shall be** preached unto them”).

The reading of the printer’s manuscript seems to be in error here. The original manuscript probably had the *shall* and scribe 2 accidentally dropped it when copying into the printer’s manuscript. This analysis is consistent with the general tendency for scribes to accidentally omit small words, especially function words. Nonetheless, there is no specific evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ever omitted modal verbs or that the 1830 compositor added them. Usage elsewhere in the text, however, argues that the original text here had the modal. There are over six hundred *when*-clauses in the Book of Mormon text, and not one of them is in the subjunctive; all are in the indicative (excluding, of course, the one case here in \mathcal{P} for 3 Nephi 20:30). More specifically, in the original text there are at least 19 instances of “when X shall be <past participle>” but none of “when X be <past participle>”. Thus internal evidence argues that the original text here in 3 Nephi 20:30 read “when the fullness of my gospel **shall** be preached unto them”. The critical text will assume that the subjunctive reading in \mathcal{P} for 3 Nephi 20:30 is an error.

Summary: In 3 Nephi 20:30 it appears that the *shall* of the 1830 edition was the reading of the original manuscript but was accidentally dropped by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} ; elsewhere in the text there are no examples of subjunctive verb forms in subordinate clauses headed by *when*.

■ 3 Nephi 20:32

*then shall their watchmen lift up **their** [voice 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | voices S]
and with the voice together shall they sing*

□ Isaiah 52:8 (King James Bible)

thy watchmen shall lift up **the voice**
with the voice together shall they sing

As explained under Mosiah 15:29, the 1953 RLDS edition tended to replace the singular *voice* with the plural *voices*. The earliest textual sources here in 3 Nephi 20:32 and the corresponding King James passage in Isaiah 52:8 have the singular *voice*, as will the critical text of the Book of Mormon. Also note that here the Book of Mormon version reads “lift up **their** voice”, unlike the King James version (“lift up **the** voice”). For discussion of this difference, see under Mosiah 15:29.

There is also one other difference here in 3 Nephi 20:32, namely, an extra *and* before the second clause. In comparison, Isaiah 52:8 and the three other Book of Mormon quotations of this passage (in Mosiah 12:22, Mosiah 15:29, and 3 Nephi 16:18) do not have this extra *and*: “thy watchmen shall lift up the(ir) voice / with the voice together shall they sing”. Even so, the *and* here in 3 Nephi 20:32 will be maintained since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have it, which implies that \mathcal{C} did too. And as noted for other biblical passages quoted more than once in the Book of Mormon, the direct quotations may nonetheless vary slightly. See, for instance, the discussion regarding *face(s)* under 2 Nephi 6:7 and 2 Nephi 26:20. For each of these cases of variation in biblical quotes, we follow the earliest Book of Mormon reading, thus maintaining the extra *and* here in 3 Nephi 20:32 (but allowing for the lack of it in the three other quotations of the same Isaiah passage).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 20:32 the earliest reading, the singular *voice* and the conjunction *and* that precedes the second clause (“**and** with the voice together shall they sing”); in the biblical quotations, we follow the earliest Book of Mormon reading unless there is clear evidence of some error in transmission.

■ 3 Nephi 20:37

*shake thyself from the dust
arise
sit down / O Jerusalem
loose thyself from the bands of thy neck / O captive daughter of Zion*

□ Isaiah 52:2 (King James Bible)

shake thyself from the dust
arise
and sit down / O Jerusalem
loose thyself from the bands of thy neck / O captive daughter of Zion

In this passage, we have the opposite situation from the previous case (in 3 Nephi 20:32), namely, an *and* in the King James text (“arise *and* sit down”) but no conjunction in the corresponding

Book of Mormon passage (“arise / sit down”). Note, however, that the King James *and* is in italics, which means that the Hebrew original lacks the *and*. Both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript are missing the *and*, which means that the original manuscript probably didn’t have it either. It is always possible, of course, that the original Book of Mormon text itself had the *and* but that it was dropped as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Yet it is worth noting here in 3 Nephi 20:37 that the Book of Mormon text (as in the Hebrew original) has a series of asyndetic imperatives (that is, there is no *and* between any of the imperatives).

Earlier in 3 Nephi we saw that very often (but not always) words in italics in the King James text are missing in the earliest textual sources for the Book of Mormon. See the discussion regarding *you* under 3 Nephi 12:11, *do* under 3 Nephi 13:7, and *can* under 3 Nephi 14:17–18.

Summary: Maintain the current text in 3 Nephi 20:37 without the *and* before “sit down”; the missing *and* in the Book of Mormon text corresponds with an italicized *and* in the King James text (and no *and* in the Hebrew).

■ 3 Nephi 20:39

verily verily I say unto you
that my people shall know my name
yea in that day they shall know

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> NULL | I A B C E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>my name yea in that day they shall know</i> | D |

that I am he that doth speak

□ Isaiah 52:6 (King James Bible)

therefore my people shall know my name
 therefore *they shall know* in that day
 that I *am* he that doth speak

Here we have a clear case of dittography in the 1841 British edition. The typesetter had just set “yea in that day they shall know”; then searching his copytext for *shall know* in order to continue the typesetting, he accidentally skipped back to the preceding *shall know*, and thus he ended up twice setting “my name yea in that day they shall know”. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) removed this dittography.

Summary: Ignore the dittography in 3 Nephi 20:39 that the 1841 British edition introduced into the LDS textual tradition (but which did not persist).

■ 3 Nephi 20:39

*verily verily I say unto you
that my people shall know my name
yea in that day they shall know
that I am he that doth speak*

□ Isaiah 52:6 (King James Bible)

therefore my people shall know my name
therefore *they shall know* in that day
that I *am* he that doth speak

The location of the phrase “they shall know” is different in the Book of Mormon text: it is placed after the adverbial phrase “in that day”. The King James Bible has the opposite order, which is somewhat awkward. But the phrase “they shall know” is in italics in the King James text (which means that the Hebrew original lacks the phrase); the subject pronoun and verb phrase are recoverable from the preceding “my people shall know my name”. But this Book of Mormon example is different from other cases involving italics in the King James text in that the italicized portion simply appears in a different place in the Book of Mormon text rather than being deleted or altered in place. The different Book of Mormon word order appears to be intentional; since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree here, \mathcal{O} undoubtedly read with the same word order.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 20:39 the different location for “they shall know” in the Book of Mormon text, especially since in the King James text these words are in italics.

■ 3 Nephi 20:42

*for ye shall not go out with haste
nor [go 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | MOQ] by flight*

□ Isaiah 52:12 (King James Bible)

for ye shall not go out with haste
nor **go** by flight

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated *go* in this passage (replacing “nor **go** by flight” with “nor by flight”). Two subsequent LDS editions followed this shorter reading, the 1907 vest-pocket edition (perhaps independently) and the 1911 edition. The copytext for the 1911 LDS edition was a printed copy deriving from the 1905 plates that had been corrected (in 1907) for the third printing of the 1905 edition. In any event, the 1920 LDS edition restored the repeated *go*. The corresponding King James text has the *go*, as will the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 20:42 the repeated *go* in “ye shall not go out with haste nor **go** by flight”, the reading of both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition (as well as the reading of the corresponding passage in Isaiah 52:12).

■ 3 Nephi 20:42

and the God of Israel shall be your [§2 reward > §1 rearward 1 | rereward A | rearward BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

□ Isaiah 52:12 (King James Bible)

and the God of Israel *will be* your **rereward**

The 1830 edition follows the King James Bible’s archaic spelling *rereward* for *rearward*, meaning ‘rear guard’, not only here in 3 Nephi 20:42 but also in the next chapter:

3 Nephi 21:29

and I will be their [*rearward* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *rereward* A]

This spelling suggests that John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, checked his copy of the King James Bible in order to come up with such an archaic spelling. Another possibility, at least worth considering, is that the original manuscript itself had this archaic spelling. If so, this could explain why scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *reward* in 3 Nephi 20:42 when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} (*reward* is directly contained within *rereward*). On the other hand, Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , corrected *reward* to *rearward*, not *rereward*, which argues for the spelling *rearward* in \mathcal{O} . In any event, subsequent Book of Mormon editions have had only the more transparent spelling *rearward*. This modernized spelling should undoubtedly be continued in the standard Book of Mormon text; the critical text will also maintain this spelling. In fact, elsewhere in the critical text the word will be spelled *rearward* whenever Isaiah 52:12 is cited.

Summary: Retain in 3 Nephi 20:42 and 3 Nephi 21:29 the more modern spelling *rearward* in place of the archaic King James spelling *rereward*.

■ 3 Nephi 20:45

*so shall he sprinkle many nations
the kings shall shut their mouths at him
for that which had* [1ABCDEFGHIK | *not* IJLMNOQRST] *been told them*
[*shall they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | *they shall* MOQ] *see*
and that which they had not heard
shall they consider

□ Isaiah 52:15 (King James Bible)

so shall he sprinkle many nations
the kings shall shut their mouths at him
for *that* which had **not** been told them
shall they see
and *that* which they had **not** heard
shall they consider

We have two cases of textual variation in 3 Nephi 20:45. First, the earliest textual sources are missing the negative *not* in the first of two parallel clauses (thus “for that which had been told them”),

which means that either Joseph Smith or the scribe in \mathcal{O} (presumably Oliver Cowdery) omitted the *not* during the dictation of the text. This *not* was supplied in the 1879 LDS edition (and in the 1953 RLDS edition). Most probably, the original manuscript lacked the *not* since both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition are missing the *not*. But the missing *not* in \mathcal{O} would have been an accident since (1) both *not*'s occur in the corresponding King James text (in Isaiah 52:15), and (2) both *not*'s occur in the next chapter of 3 Nephi, which also quotes the King James version of Isaiah 52:15:

3 Nephi 21:8
 and when that day shall come
 it shall come to pass that
 kings shall shut their mouths
 for that which had **not** been told them
 shall they see
 and that which they had **not** heard
 shall they consider

Thus the 1879 and 1953 emendation that supplied the *not* is very likely the original reading of the Book of Mormon text for 3 Nephi 20:45. For another case where Oliver permanently omitted a *not* from the text (in this other case, when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P}), see under 1 Nephi 12:5. There are also a number of cases where Oliver momentarily omitted the *not* in \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 14:2	and if it so be that they harden [NULL > <i>not</i> 1] their hearts
2 Nephi 8:14	and that he should [NULL > <i>not</i> 1] die in the pit
3 Nephi 8:20	the inhabitants thereof which had [NULL >+ <i>not</i> 1] fallen
Ether 6:25	he refused and would [NULL > <i>not</i> 1] be their king
Moroni 10:4	if these things are [NULL > <i>not</i> 1] true

The other textual variant here in 3 Nephi 20:45 is the word order “they shall see” that the 1905 LDS edition introduced into the LDS text. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original (and correct) inverted word order (“shall they see”). Once more, Isaiah 52:15 and 3 Nephi 21:8 each have two parallel occurrences of the inverted word order (just as 3 Nephi 20:45 did originally):

3 Nephi 21:8 (Isaiah 21:15)
 for that which had not been told them **shall they** see
 and that which they had not heard **shall they** consider

Summary: Accept the 1879 LDS emendation of 3 Nephi 20:45 with the inserted *not* because of the otherwise identical quotation of Isaiah 52:15 in 3 Nephi 21:8; similarly, the original inverted word order “shall they see” should be maintained in 3 Nephi 20:45 (as well as in 3 Nephi 21:8).

■ 3 Nephi 20:46

[& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **then** shall this covenant
 which the Father hath covenanted with his people be fulfilled
and then shall Jerusalem be inhabited again with my people

At the beginning of this passage, the printer’s manuscript has “and then”, but the 1830 edition has only the *then*. As already noted, the overwhelming tendency in the history of the Book of Mormon text has been to accidentally drop words rather than to add them (especially when the scribes or the typesetters were only attempting to copy the text rather than edit it). For this reason, the original manuscript here in 3 Nephi 20:46 probably read “and then”, which means that the 1830 compositor accidentally missed the *and* that would have been written as an ampersand in \mathcal{O} since Oliver Cowdery was the scribe for this part of \mathcal{O} (two nearby fragments of \mathcal{O} in 3 Nephi 19–21 are in Oliver’s hand).

Despite this argument from transitional probabilities, it is possible that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote “and then” because of the subsequent instance of “and then” later on in this passage: “**and then** shall Jerusalem be inhabited again with my people”. His eye could have glanced down to the following line in \mathcal{O} , thus prompting him to accidentally insert an extra *and*. Yet elsewhere we have no examples where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ever accidentally added an *and*, even momentarily; there are a number of cases where he omitted an *and*—and usually without him catching his error (six out of nine times). As we might expect, the 1830 compositor sometimes omitted the *and*; in each of the following examples, the omission appears to be accidental:

1 Nephi 9:4	[<i>and</i> 0 & 1 A] upon the other plates
2 Nephi 2:13	[& 1 A] if ye shall say
2 Nephi 28:2	[& 1 A] the things which shall be written
Jacob 2:6	[& 1 A] it grieveth my soul
Omni 1:25	[& 1 A] in all things which is good
Alma 1:32	[& > <i>And</i> 1 A] wearing costly apparel
Alma 43:8	[& 01 A] this he done
Ether 1:7	[& 1 A] Coriantor was the son of Moron

The critical text will therefore accept the reading in \mathcal{P} as the original reading here in 3 Nephi 20:46 (“**and then** shall this covenant . . . be fulfilled”); the chances are much greater that an *and* was lost here than added.

Summary: Restore the *and* in 3 Nephi 20:46 (“**and then** shall this covenant . . . be fulfilled”), the reading of the printer’s manuscript; the 1830 compositor seems to have accidentally skipped an ampersand as he set the type from \mathcal{O} .

3 Nephi 21

■ 3 Nephi 21:2

for verily I say unto you that when these things

which I [§2 deliver > §1 deliver > declare 1 | declare ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto you

*and which I shall [§2 deliver > §1 declare 1 | declare ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto you
hereafter . . .*

Here in the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 wrote the verb *declare* as *deliver* both times. Oliver Cowdery, in proofing against the original manuscript, corrected both to *declare*. The 1830 edition, independently set here from the original manuscript, also has *declare* in both instances. So the original manuscript undoubtedly had *declare*, not *deliver*. The visual similarity and semantic compatibility of the two words led scribe 2 to make this substitution.

Elsewhere in the text there are 20 references to delivering a message but 111 of declaring a message. Either verb is possible here in 3 Nephi 21:2. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *declare* twice here in 3 Nephi 21:2.

There are two other examples in the early text where *deliver* and *declare* were mixed up, a momentary one immediately corrected by scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} and a permanent one by the 1830 typesetter:

Mosiah 27:37

for they did publish peace

they did publish good tidings of good

and they did [*deliver* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] declare

unto the people

that the Lord reigneth

Alma 5:1

now it came to pass that Alma began

to [*declair* 1 | *deliver* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the word of God

unto the people

In the second case, the original *declare* was replaced by *deliver* apparently under the influence of a preceding *deliver* in the text (see under Alma 5:1 for discussion).

Summary: Accept the two occurrences of the verb *declare* in 3 Nephi 21:2, in each case the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} and the reading of the 1830 edition.

■ 3 Nephi 21:4

*that these [1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] might come forth from them
unto a remnant of your seed*

The printer’s manuscript has simply “that these might come forth”, while the 1830 edition has “that these **things** might come forth”. Normally in the Book of Mormon text, the use of a subject *these* alone refers to people rather than writings or words. For instance, whenever the subject *these* is followed by a modal verb (like *might* here in 3 Nephi 21:4), the demonstrative pronoun refers to people but not to objects:

1 Nephi 12:22	behold these shall dwindle in unbelief
1 Nephi 21:12	behold these shall come from far
Jacob 4:16	how is it possible that these . . . can ever build upon it
Mosiah 15:22	these shall come forth in the first resurrection
Alma 12:34	and these shall enter into my rest
Alma 40:13	and these shall be cast out into outer darkness
Moroni 8:13	these must have gone to an endless hell

Of course, it is not impossible for *these* alone to refer to things, as in the following examples where *these* acts as a fronted direct object:

Jacob 5:13	and these will I place in the nithermost parts of my vineyard
Alma 11:22	and all these will I give unto thee if . . .

Here in 3 Nephi 21:4, our expectation is to read *these things* rather than just *these*. Thus one could argue that \mathcal{C} lacked the *things* and that the 1830 typesetter supplied it since he expected it. Even then, perhaps the original text itself had *things* but it was omitted during the dictation of the text.

When we turn to the evidence from the early transmission of the text, we find that there are no cases where the 1830 typesetter ever added (or omitted) the word *thing*, in either the singular or plural. There is one case where Oliver Cowdery may have accidentally added the singular *thing* (see under 2 Nephi 8:4), but there is no example where Oliver accidentally omitted either *thing* or *things*. Interestingly, however, there is one clear case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted *things*:

Alma 12:28
and after God had appointed that
these [*things* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 NULL > §1 *things* 1]
should come unto man . . .

In that instance, unlike here in 3 Nephi 21:4, Oliver Cowdery supplied the missing *things* when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . Moreover, \mathcal{C} is extant in Alma 12:28 and has *things*. Notice also that in Alma 12:28 we have one more instance of *these things*, just like here in 3 Nephi 21:4. Thus the odds are quite high that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} is responsible for the variation in 3 Nephi 21:4. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading here as the reading in \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 21:4 the 1830 reading with its occurrence of *things* (“that these things might come forth”); there is independent evidence (in Alma 12:28) that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} could miswrite *these things* as simply *these*.

■ 3 Nephi 21:5

*therefore when these [work >+ works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
—and the [work 1Ps | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] which shall be wrought
among you hereafter—
shall come forth from the Gentiles unto your seed . . .*

Book of Mormon scribes frequently mixed up the grammatical number for the word *work* (for an extensive list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 30:17). Here in 3 Nephi 21:5, we have two instances of variation involving *work(s)*. Parallelism suggests that in this passage both occurrences of *work(s)* should be in the plural. For the first occurrence, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the singular *work*, an obvious error because of the preceding *these*. But he immediately corrected the singular to the plural by adding the plural *s* inline; he probably redipped his pen before writing the *s* since it was written with heavier ink flow. However, in the second occurrence, he wrote *work*, which in this case was left unchanged. The first example could be interpreted as showing that scribe 2 tended to write the singular *work* instead of the correct plural. (For a list of other cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote *work* instead of the correct *works*, see under Alma 7:24.) Here in 3 Nephi 21:5, one could assume that his second *work* is a mistake based on this same error tendency. The 1830 edition has the plural *works* in both cases. The LDS text has maintained this consistent plural reading, while the more recent RLDS text (following the reading in \mathcal{P} since 1908) has had the singular *work* in the second case.

David Calabro argues (personal communication) that Jesus’s language here in verse 5 parallels what he spoke just before:

3 Nephi 21:2
for verily I say unto you that
when **these things** which I declare unto you
and which I shall declare unto you hereafter of myself
and by the power of the Holy Ghost which shall be given unto you of the Father
shall be made known unto the Gentiles . . .

In verse 2, Jesus refers to the things that he is now declaring and will declare later (either by himself or by the Holy Ghost); in verse 5 Jesus refers to the works he is now doing and the works that will be done later (presumably by himself and by those acting in his name):

3 Nephi 21:2	3 Nephi 21:5 (the 1830 reading)
when these things which I declare unto you	when these works
and which I shall declare	and the works which shall be wrought
unto you hereafter	among you hereafter

The parallelism between the two verses supports having *works* in the plural both times in verse 5.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that the reference to *works* here in 3 Nephi 21:5 could also be referring to the future events discussed more generally in the preceding chapter, in 3 Nephi 20. Under either interpretation, the preceding text implies that the plural *works* is probably correct both times in 3 Nephi 21:5. The critical text will maintain each instance of *works* in “therefore when these **works**—and the **works** which shall be wrought among you hereafter—shall come forth”. Under this interpretation, it appears that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} twice wrote *works* as *work*; he caught the first instance since it was preceded by *these*, which may have distracted him from correcting the second instance.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 21:5 both instances of the plural *works*: “therefore when these **works**— and the **works** which shall be wrought among you hereafter—shall come forth”; the plural reference to *things* earlier in verse 2 supports the use of the plural *works* in referring to what will happen later as Jesus continues to visit among the Nephites.

■ 3 Nephi 21:7

and when these things [come 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | came Q] to pass that thy seed shall begin to know these things . . .

The compositor for the 1911 LDS edition accidentally set *come* as *came*, probably because “came to pass” is much more frequent than “come to pass” in the Book of Mormon text (about 15 times more frequent in the early 20th-century Book of Mormon text). However, this passage is referring to the future, not the past, so *come* is clearly correct. The subsequent LDS edition (1920) restored the correct present-tense form.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *come* in 3 Nephi 21:7 (“and when these things **come** to pass”).

■ 3 Nephi 21:9

for in that day for my sake shall the Father work a work which shall be a great and [a 1ABCDEFGHIKPRST | FIJLMNOQ] marvelous work among them

Here the 1852 LDS edition omitted the repeated indefinite article *a* in the phrase “a great and a marvelous work”. The 1920 LDS edition restored it to the LDS text (although normally other losses of repeated *a*’s have not been restored in the LDS text). For further discussion of the repeated *a* in the phrase “a great and (a) marvelous work”, see under 1 Nephi 14:7. The critical text will, for each case of the repeated *a*, follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 21:9 the repeated *a* in “a great and a marvelous work”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 3 Nephi 21:9

for in that day for my sake shall the Father work a work which shall be a great and a marvelous work among them and there shall be

- among **them which** will not believe it 1*A
- among **them who** will not believe it 1^cEFIJLMNOPQS
- among **who** will not believe it BD
- among **them those who** will not believe it CGHKRT

although a man shall declare it unto them

The earliest textual sources (the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript) read “and there shall be among **them which** will not believe it”, which seems quite awkward and is not improved by the editing of the *which* to *who* for the 1837 edition. The problem here in the earliest extant text

is that the prepositional phrase “among them” is not directly connected to the relative clause “which will not believe it”. If “among them” is placed at the beginning of the clause, the difficulty is immediately apparent: “and among them there shall be which will not believe it”. All other instances in the text of “among them which” (and “among them who”) do work:

1 Nephi 22:22	which kingdom is established among them which are in the flesh
2 Nephi 3:24	and there shall raise up one mighty among them which shall do much good
Alma 1:22	there were many among them who began to be proud
Alma 10:13	there were some among them which thought to question them
Alma 19:25	there was many among them who said that . . .
Alma 19:32	but there was many among them who would not hear his words
Alma 57:25	and neither was there one soul among them which had not received many wounds
Helaman 5:35	now there was one among them who was a Nephite by birth
3 Nephi 15:2	there were some among them which marveled and wondered . . .
3 Nephi 15:24	and ye are numbered among them which the Father hath given me

Not surprisingly, there are no examples elsewhere in the text like the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 21:9.

Besides the expected change of *which* to *who*, two different changes have been made to the text here. The first was the deletion of the pronoun *them* (introduced in the 1837 edition): “and there shall be among **who** will not believe it”. This reading is so difficult that one doubts that the omission of the *them* was due to conscious editing. The 1841 British edition followed this reading, but the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the *them* (“among **them who** will not believe it”); this reading, still awkward, persisted in the LDS text until 1920.

The second change was the insertion of *those* after *them* (introduced in the 1840 edition, probably by Joseph Smith in his editing for that edition): “and there shall be among **them those who** will not believe it”. This reading continued in the RLDS textual tradition until 1908, when the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , the result of Joseph’s editing for the 1837 edition, was restored (“among **them who** will not believe it”). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition, on the other hand, decided to adopt the 1840 reading with the *those* (“among **them those who** will not believe it”).

When we consider usage elsewhere in the text, we find little to support the existential expression “there <*be verb*> among those <relative clause>”. In fact, there are no expressions of this precise form, although there is one with the verb *begin*:

4 Nephi 1:24 (earliest text; <i>which</i> edited to <i>who</i> in the 1837 edition)	
	and now in this two hundred and first year
	there began to be among them those which were lifted up in pride

So the 1840 reading in 3 Nephi 21:9 is possible. On the other hand, there is much more evidence in the text for an existential expression where *among* is preceded by an indefinite quantifier, either *many* or *some*:

Jarom 1:4	and there are many among us which have many revelations
Alma 1:22	there were many among them who began to be proud

3 Nephi 21

Alma 10:13	there were some among them which thought to question them
Alma 19:25	there was many among them who said that . . .
Alma 19:32	but there was many among them who would not hear his words
Alma 32:25	there are some among you which would humble themselves
Helaman 9:40	and now there were some among the people which said that . . .
3 Nephi 15:2	there were some among them which marveled and wondered what he would concerning the law of Moses

These examples suggest that the original text in 3 Nephi 21:9 read as either “there shall be **many** among **them which** will not believe it” or “there shall be **some** among **them which** will not believe it”. The larger passage implies that *many* (rather than the weaker *some*) would be the more appropriate emendation since the opposition to the Lord’s work and to the servant who will bring it forth will be considerable (as explained in the next verse):

3 Nephi 21:10
but behold the life of my servant shall be in my hand
therefore they shall not hurt him
although he shall be marred because of them
yet I will heal him
for I will shew unto them
that my wisdom is greater than the cunning of the devil

Also note that verse 9 here in 3 Nephi 21 parallels Paul’s language to the nonbelieving Jews in Antioch of Pisidia (in Asia Minor):

Acts 13:41
for I work a work in your days
a work which ye shall in no wise believe
though a man declare it unto you

(Here Paul is quoting from the Septuagint version of Habakkuk 1:5.) As described in both 3 Nephi 21:9–10 and Acts 13:41, the opposition to the Lord’s work will be substantial; thus *many* is better than *some* as a possible emendation (all other things being equal).

Since both the 1830 edition and \mathfrak{P} prior to Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition read the same (as “and there shall be among **them which** will not believe it although a man shall declare it unto them”), the original manuscript probably read this way as well. So if *many* (or some other word) was lost from the text, it must have occurred during the dictation of the text. Note that *many* looks like *among*, which suggests that Joseph Smith could have skipped the *many* as he read off the text to Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here in \mathfrak{C}). There is an example of such a visual error elsewhere in the text where Oliver misread *among* as the visually similar *many* when he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} :

Alma 51:7
which caused much rejoicing among the brethren of Parhoron
and also [*among* 0 | *many* >jg *many* of 1 | *many* of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the people of liberty

As explained under Alma 51:7, the word *among* is definitely the correct reading for that passage. The important point here is that if 3 Nephi 21:9 originally read “there shall be **many among** them which will not believe it”, *many* could have been lost because of its visual similarity to the following *among*. It seems less likely that an original *some* would have been lost in this environment (or that an original *those* would have been lost after *them*). Moreover, there are no explicit examples in the history of the text where *some* or *those* have been omitted, but there are two instances in \mathcal{P} where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *many*, although neither of these occurred in the context of the word *among*:

Omni 1:17

they had had [NULL >+ *many* 1 | *many* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wars
and serious contentions

Ether 7:13

and Corihor repented of
the [NULL > *many* 1 | *many* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] evils
which he had done

(There is one case where *many* was added to the text, not in the manuscripts but in the 1837 edition; see under 4 Nephi 1:27 for discussion of that case.) Thus the loss of *many* is possible here in 3 Nephi 21:9. The critical text will accept *many* as the most plausible reading for the original text in this passage.

Summary: Emend 3 Nephi 21:9 to read “and there shall be **many among** them which will not believe it”; this conjectured reading provides the most reasonable reading for this context since it is supported by usage elsewhere in the text and can be explained as the loss of *many* in the context of the visually similar *among* that immediately follows.

■ 3 Nephi 21:11

therefore it shall come to pass
that whosoever will not believe in my words
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *am Jesus Christ*
[*which* >js *whom* 1 | *which* ART | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] *the Father shall cause him*
to bring forth unto the Gentiles
and shall give unto him power
that he shall bring them forth unto the Gentiles . . .

In this passage, Joseph Smith edited both instances of *which* to a form of *who* (the subject *who* in the first case, the object *whom* in the second). In both cases, Joseph interpreted the *which* as referring to a person, in the first case to Jesus Christ, in the second probably to the servant mentioned in verse 10 who will bring these words forth (that is, Joseph Smith). This interpretation is correct in the first case, but not in the second. In the latter case, the *which* actually refers to the earlier *my words*, thus “my words . . . which the Father shall cause him to bring forth unto the Gentiles and shall give unto him power that he shall bring them forth unto the Gentiles”. Of course, in the critical text both instances of *which* will be restored no matter whether they refer to persons or not. But the use of *whom* in the edited text for the second instance of *which* appears to be an error. The editors

for the 1920 LDS edition recognized that *whom* was an error and thus restored the original *which* to the text here.

A similar error occurred later in Joseph Smith's editing of the printer's manuscript for another theoretically ambiguous case of *which*:

3 Nephi 25:4
 remember ye the law of Moses my servant
 [*which* >js *whom* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph emended the *which* to *whom*, thinking that the relative pronoun referred to "Moses my servant"; yet the *which* actually refers to "the law of Moses my servant". In this instance, the change to *whom* was never made in the actual 1837 edition, probably because it was figured out that the *which* referred to *the law*, not *Moses*. Again, of course, the critical text will maintain the original *which* irrespective of whether it refers to persons or not.

Summary: Accept both instances of original *which* in 3 Nephi 21:11, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the first *which* refers to Jesus Christ, the second to the words that the Lord's servant will bring forth; similarly, the *which* in 3 Nephi 25:4 refers to the law of Moses rather than to Moses himself.

■ 3 Nephi 21:12

*and my people which are a remnant of Jacob
 shall be among the Gentiles
 yea in the midst of them
 as a lion among the beasts of the [forest 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | forests L]*

□ Micah 5:8 (King James Bible)

and the remnant of Jacob
 shall be among the Gentiles
 in the midst of many people
 as a lion among the beasts of the **forest**

As explained nearby under 3 Nephi 20:16, there has been an occasional replacement in the text of *forest* with the plural *forests*. Here in 3 Nephi 21:12, the 1902 LDS edition made the change, but that error was never transferred to any subsequent LDS edition (the 1902 edition never served as a copytext). The earliest Book of Mormon textual sources have the singular *forest*, as does the corresponding passage in Micah 5:8; thus the critical text will maintain the singular *forest* here. For a more general discussion regarding the grammatical number for *forest(s)*, see under 1 Nephi 18:25.

Summary: Maintain the singular *forest* in 3 Nephi 21:12, the earliest Book of Mormon reading as well as the reading in Micah 5:8.

■ 3 Nephi 21:15–16

and I will cut off the cities of thy **land**
 and throw down all thy strong holds
 and I will cut off witchcrafts out of thy [*hand* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | *land* CGHKRT]

□ Micah 5:11–12 (King James Bible)

and I will cut off the cities of thy **land**
 and throw down all thy strong holds
 and I will cut off witchcrafts out of thine **hand**

Here in 3 Nephi 21:16, the 1840 edition replaced the original *hand* with *land*. It is possible to interpret this 1840 change as intentional, although not necessarily so. Earlier in verse 15, the nearly parallel clause reads “and I will cut off the cities of thy **land**”, which undoubtedly prompted the change in verse 16 (whether intentional or not) to “and I will cut off witchcrafts out of thy **land**”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *hand*, but surprisingly the 1920 LDS edition consciously adopted the 1840 reading (the change is marked in the 1920 committee copy). The earliest reading, *hand*, is definitely correct since it is not only the earliest reading in the Book of Mormon text but it is also the reading in Micah 5:12. The critical text will restore the original *hand*.

There are two examples in Oliver Cowdery’s copying of the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} where he mixed up *land(s)* with the visually similar *hand(s)*:

2 Nephi 24:25 (Isaiah 14:25 has *land*)
 that I will break the Assyrian
 in my [*land* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *hand* > *land* 1]

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* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *hands* 1].

In both instances, \mathcal{O} is extant and reads *land(s)*. In the first instance, Oliver’s error was only momentary; but in the second, he never caught his error. (In this second case, the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} , so Oliver’s error did not persist.) Also note that in Helaman 16:7 there is a preceding *hands* in the passage (“to lay their **hands** on him”) that led Oliver to misread *lands* as *hands* when he copied the text. We have a similar case here in 3 Nephi 21:16: a preceding *land* in verse 15 led to the 1840 change of *hand* to *land* (whether intentional or not).

Summary: Restore the original *hand* in 3 Nephi 21:16 since this reading occurs in both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript as well as in the corresponding King James text (Micah 5:12).

■ 3 Nephi 21:16–17

and I will cut off witchcrafts out of **thy** hand . . .
and thou shalt no more worship the **works** of **thy** hands

□ Micah 5:12–13 (King James Bible)

and I will cut off witchcrafts out of **thine** hand . . .
and thou shalt no more worship the **work** of **thine** hands

Here the Book of Mormon text varies in two ways from the corresponding King James text. First of all, there are two instances of *thy hand(s)* in 3 Nephi 21:16–17 that correspond with *thine hand(s)* in Micah 5:12–13. Such differences between the two texts is common for words beginning with *h*; see, for instance, the nearby discussion under 3 Nephi 20:17, which also deals with the use of *thy* and *thine* before the noun *hand* and other *h*-initial nouns. As explained there, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest Book of Mormon reading. Moreover, such minor variation between the Book of Mormon and King James texts is common.

The other difference here in 3 Nephi 21:16–17 deals with the grammatical number for the noun *work* in verse 17: the Book of Mormon text has the plural *works* while the King James text has the singular *work*. When we consider the phraseology “work(s) of one’s hand(s)” in the King James Bible, we find that there are examples of all four possibilities; in fact, in Deuteronomy we can find at least one example of each type for the same basic phrase, “all the work(s) of thy/thine hand(s)”:

<i>singular-plural</i>	38 times	“all the work of thine hands” (Deuteronomy 24:19)
<i>plural-plural</i>	16 times	“all the works of thine hands” (Deuteronomy 16:15)
<i>singular-singular</i>	4 times	“all the work of thine hand” (Deuteronomy 14:29)
<i>plural-singular</i>	1 time	“all the works of thy hand” (Deuteronomy 2:7)

The Book of Mormon has three examples of the phraseology “work(s) of one’s hand(s)”, and all are from biblical sources that have the dominant singular-plural reading, “work of one’s hands”. Only here in 3 Nephi 21:17 does the phrase differ in grammatical number. For the two other Book of Mormon cases, there is no difference in number:

2 Nephi 12:8 (Isaiah 2:8 reads identically)
they worship the **work** of their own **hands**

2 Nephi 27:34 (Isaiah 29:23 reads identically except it has “**mine** hands”)
but when he seeth his children
the **work** of my **hands**
in the midst of him
they shall sanctify my name

One could take this systematicity as evidence that *works* in 3 Nephi 21:17 is an error for *work*. Even so, *works* is a possible reading, especially given the variety that is found in the King James Bible itself. The critical text will therefore accept the phraseology “the works of thy hands”, the invariant Book of Mormon reading, in 3 Nephi 21:17.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 21:16–17 the invariant Book of Mormon readings (“out of **thy** hand” and “the **works** of **thy** hands”), even though they disagree in minor ways with the corresponding King James readings in Micah 5:12–13.

■ 3 Nephi 21:19

and it shall come to pass that all lyings and deceivings and envyings
 and [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and [*priestcraft* 1 | *priestcrafts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and whoredoms shall be done away

It appears that all the conjuncts in this passage read in the plural. The 1830 edition gives such a consistent reading. The printer's manuscript, on the other hand, has the singular *priestcraft* instead of the plural *priestcrafts*. In addition, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote *strife*, but then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he corrected the singular *strife* to *strifes*. This change shows that scribe 2 tended to write the singular even though his copytext apparently read in the plural. Here in 3 Nephi 21:19, the plural *strifes* is very likely the correct reading. For further examples of mix-ups between *strife* and *strifes* (including at least one more by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P}), see under Alma 1:32.

The case regarding *priestcraft(s)* is more complicated since \mathcal{P} reads in the singular and the 1830 edition is in the plural. But in all other cases where *priestcraft(s)* is conjoined with other nouns, all the conjuncts, where possible, are in the plural, including *priestcraft(s)*:

2 Nephi 10:4

but because of **priestcrafts** and iniquities
 they at Jerusalem will stiffen their necks against him

3 Nephi 16:10 (*hypocrisy* occurs only in the singular in the Book of Mormon)

and shall be filled with all manner of lyings
 and of deceits and of mischiefs and all manner of hypocrisy
 and murders and **priestcrafts** and whoredoms and of secret abominations

3 Nephi 30:2 (*wickedness* occurs only in the singular form in the Book of Mormon)

turn all ye Gentiles from your wicked ways
 and repent of your evil doings
 of your lyings and deceivings and of your whoredoms
 and of your secret abominations and your idolatries
 and of your murders and your **priestcrafts** and your envyings
 and your [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and from all your wickedness and abominations

Notice that in the last example scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} once more initially wrote *strife* instead of the correct *strifes*. The consistency of the plural *priestcrafts* with all the other plural conjuncts argues that in 3 Nephi 21:19 the original text read in the plural (and probably \mathcal{C} did too). Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have accidentally omitted the plural *s* when he copied *priestcrafts* from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 21:19 the plural uses of *strifes* and *priestcrafts*, especially since in all other cases of conjunctiveness we get plural forms for these nouns and the nouns conjoined with them (as in especially the two other cases of extended conjunctiveness in 3 Nephi 16:10 and 3 Nephi 30:2).

■ 3 Nephi 21:25

*and then shall the [power > powers 1 | power ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of heaven
come down among them
and I also will be in the midst*

Here in the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 initially wrote *powers* in the singular, but virtually immediately he corrected it to the plural (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the plural *s* that was inserted at the end of the line). This correction does not appear to be the result of conscious editing; instead, it seems to represent scribe 2's attempt to copy the text correctly. On the other hand, the 1830 edition reads in the singular, which could be interpreted as evidence that Ø read in the singular and that scribe 2's correction was an attempt at editing. This, however, seems unlikely since either reading will work here, at least in theory. In any event, whether a plural *s* was either added or lost here, it was probably accidental.

Elsewhere in the text, we have two instances of “the powers of heaven” but none of “the power of heaven”; both are found in this part of 3 Nephi:

3 Nephi 20:22

and the [Power >+ Powers 1 | powers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of heaven
shall be in the midst of this people
yea even I will be in the midst of you

3 Nephi 28:7

when I shall come in my glory with the **powers** of heaven

The example from 3 Nephi 20:22 parallels 3 Nephi 21:25. Both, for instance, refer to “the power(s) of heaven” being in the midst of the people—and Jesus also will be in their midst. There is another similarity: as in 3 Nephi 21:25, scribe 2 of Ø initially wrote *Power* in 3 Nephi 20:22 but then corrected it to *Powers* (in this case with slightly heavier ink flow). In 3 Nephi 20:22, however, the 1830 edition has the correct plural *powers*. This evidence argues that 3 Nephi 21:25 should also read in the plural as “the powers of heaven”. The critical text will therefore restore the plural *powers* here in 3 Nephi 21:25. Also note that the phrase occurs three times in the King James Bible, although in variant forms for a different expression:

Matthew 24:29	and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken
Mark 13:25	and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken
Luke 21:26	for the powers of heaven shall be shaken

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that one could interpret scribe 2's correction of *Power* to *Powers* here in 3 Nephi 21:25 as the result of editing on his part, given that he had earlier corrected *Power* to *Powers* in 3 Nephi 20:22. One problem with this proposal is that in this case the two passages are not really that close: there are more than three manuscript pages separating the two instances. Moreover, scribe 2 of Ø does not appear to ever engage in conscious editing of the text, unlike Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 typesetter. Although there is no other evidence of the 1830 typesetter mixing up the number for *power(s)*, there is considerable evidence that he sometimes added or omitted the plural *s*, with about the same frequency as scribe 2 of Ø (as explained under 3 Nephi 20:15).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 21:25 the plural reading *powers* in “the powers of heaven”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; this reading agrees with the same plural use of *powers* for this phrase elsewhere in the text, especially in the parallel passage in 3 Nephi 20:22 (there scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} also initially wrote the correct *powers* in the singular).

■ 3 Nephi 21:26

*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*

For these two instances of the relative pronoun *which* that refer to tribes, Joseph Smith did not edit the *which* to *who(m)* in his editing for the 1837 edition. But for other cases where *which* refers to tribes, Joseph usually made that change (the one other case where he left the *which* unchanged is marked with an asterisk):

* 2 Nephi 29:12

and I shall also speak unto the other **tribes** of the house of Israel
which I have led away
and they shall write it

3 Nephi 7:11

they were not so strong in numbers as the **tribes** of the people
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were united together

3 Nephi 15:15

neither at any time hath the Father given me commandment
that I should tell unto them concerning the other **tribes** of the house of Israel
[*which* >js *whom* 1 | *which* A | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the Father hath led away out of the land

3 Nephi 16:4

that they may receive a knowledge of you by the Holy Ghost
and also of the other **tribes**
[*which* >js *whom* 1 | *which* A | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they know not of

Mormon 3:18

yea behold I write unto all the ends of the earth
yea unto you twelve **tribes** of Israel
[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be judged
according to your works by the twelve
whom Jesus chose to be his disciples in the land of Jerusalem

Notice in particular that the case in 3 Nephi 15:15 has virtually the same phraseology as here in 3 Nephi 21:26 (both refer to the tribes “which the Father hath led away out of X”), yet one *which* was grammatically emended to *whom* while the other was not. Of course, the critical text will maintain or restore, as the case may be, all original instances of *which*, irrespective of whether

they refer to people or not. For a complete discussion of this grammatical issue, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 21:26 the two instances of *which* that refer to tribes; elsewhere in the text, Joseph Smith typically emended such cases of *which* to *who(m)*, but those instances of *which* will be restored in the critical text.

■ 3 Nephi 21:29

and I will be their [rearward 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | rereward A]

□ Isaiah 52:12 (King James Bible)

and the God of Israel *will be* your **rereward**

As discussed under 3 Nephi 20:42, the critical text will adopt the modern spelling *rearward*, meaning ‘rear guard’, instead of the archaic King James spelling, *rereward*.

3 Nephi 22

■ 3 Nephi 22:1

and cry aloud

thou that didst not [travel 1 | travail ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with child

□ Isaiah 54:1 (King James Bible)

and cry aloud

*thou that didst not **travail** with child*

All the manuscript scribes wrote *travel* in place of *travail*. This spelling is based on their pronunciation of *travail*. In most instances, the 1830 typesetter substituted the standard *travail*, as here in this quotation from Isaiah 54:1 (which reads *travail*). And as elsewhere for this word, the 1830 typesetter could have determined that *travail* was correct without consulting his King James Bible. ☹ itself, not extant here, probably read *travel*. For a complete discussion, see under 2 Nephi 29:4.

Summary: Maintain the word *travail* in 3 Nephi 22:1, the 1830 reading as well as the corresponding King James reading.

■ 3 Nephi 22:4

*for thou shalt forget the shame **of thy** youth*

□ NULL

IAPS

□ *and shalt not remember
the reproach **of thy** youth*

BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT

and shalt not remember

*the reproach **of thy** widowhood any more*

□ Isaiah 54:4 (King James Bible)

*for thou shalt forget the shame **of thy** youth*

and shalt not remember

*the reproach **of thy** widowhood any more*

The typesetter for the 1837 edition accidentally repeated part of the text here in 3 Nephi 22:4. After setting “the reproach of thy”, the typesetter, in looking for *of thy*, skipped upwards and found the *of thy* before *youth*. Thus his typeset text ended up repeating the words “and shalt not remember the reproach of thy youth”. This dittography was definitely not intended. The Book of Mormon quotation of Isaiah 54 here in 3 Nephi 22 is quite exact, with only minor variation (the

only significant difference is the omission of the King James phrase “nor rebuke thee” at the end of 3 Nephi 22:9). This 1837 error here in verse 4 changed an original pair of parallel lines (the single most common device in Hebrew poetry) into an excessively redundant triplet of parallelism. The RLDS 1908 edition restored the correct reading to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has retained the 1837 dittography.

Summary: Remove in 3 Nephi 22:4 the extra predicate (“and shalt not remember the reproach of thy youth”) that the 1837 typesetter accidentally added to the text, the result of his eye skipping backwards from the second *of thy* to the first *of thy* in this verse.

■ 3 Nephi 22:9

for this [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the waters of Noah unto me

□ Isaiah 54:9 (King James Bible)

for this *is as* the waters of Noah unto me

The King James Bible has the words *is as* in italics, which means that these words were supplied by the King James translators and are not found in the Hebrew. The Book of Mormon is also missing these two words.

The Book of Mormon text is definitely difficult to process here. Nonetheless, words in italics in the King James Bible are often missing when a passage is quoted in the Book of Mormon. In particular, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:14 regarding the frequent omission of the italicized *is* in the long quotation from Isaiah 2–14. Here in 3 Nephi 22:9 we have the only case where *is as* is lacking in the Book of Mormon text. Even so, the critical text will follow the shorter Book of Mormon reading since it appears to be fully intended. The 1830 typesetter placed a comma between the initial “for this” and the following “the waters of Noah unto me”, which helps facilitate the processing of this difficult reading.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 22:9 the awkward but original “for this / the waters of Noah unto me”; this reading more closely follows the Hebrew in Isaiah 54:9; the King James text has *is as* in italics after “for this”.

■ 3 Nephi 22:10

neither shall the covenant of my [peace 1PST | people ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] be removed

□ Isaiah 54:10 (King James Bible)

neither shall the covenant of my **peace** be removed

The 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *peace* as the visually similar *people*. This kind of error is understandable given the high expectation of *covenant* with *people*. There are 32 passages where the text uses the word *people* to refer to people making covenants or to the Lord making covenants with people, including ten occurrences of the noun phrase “covenant people”. There is an instance

of similar phraseology in another Book of Mormon quotation from the King James Bible (also from Isaiah): “and I will preserve thee and give thee my servant for a covenant of the **people**” (1 Nephi 21:8, quoting Isaiah 49:8). On the other hand, there are only six other instances in the text that refer to “a covenant of peace” or to “a covenant to keep the peace”, yet all of these refer to keeping or making a treaty of peace with opponents in war. So it is not surprising that here in 3 Nephi 22:10 the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the original “the covenant of my **peace**” with “the covenant of my **people**”.

Here the King James text has *peace*, not *people*. In accord with the King James Bible and the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition restored *peace* to the text. The critical text will continue with *peace* in this passage.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 22:10 the noun *peace* in “neither shall the covenant of my **peace** be removed”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript and the corresponding King James reading.

■ 3 Nephi 22:11

O thou afflicted
tossed with [*tempests* 1 | *tempest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

□ Isaiah 54:11 (King James Bible)

O thou afflicted
tossed with **tempest**

The printer’s manuscript has the plural *tempests*, but the 1830 edition has the singular, which is also the reading of the King James Bible. The singular usage is also found as part of a sequence of conjunctive singulars in another quotation from Isaiah:

2 Nephi 27:2
they shall be visited of the Lord of Hosts
with thunder and with earthquake and with a great noise
and with storm and **tempest** and with the flame of devouring fire

Isaiah 29:6 (King James Bible)
thou shalt be visited of the LORD of Hosts
with thunder and with earthquake and great noise
with storm and **tempest** and the flame of devouring fire

The singular *tempest*, the 1830 reading in 3 Nephi 22:11, is undoubtedly correct. For a different instance of variation between *tempest* and *tempests*, see under 3 Nephi 8:12 (there the plural rather than the singular is correct).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 22:11 the singular *tempest*, the 1830 reading as well as the corresponding King James reading.

■ 3 Nephi 22:15, 17

- (1) *behold they shall surely gather together **against thee** / not by me*
- (2) *whosoever shall gather together **against thee** shall fall for thy sake . . .*
- (3) *no weapon that is formed **against thee** shall prosper*
- (4) *and every tongue that shall rise **against thee** in judgment thou shalt condemn*

□ Isaiah 54:15, 17 (King James Bible)

- (1') behold they shall surely gather together *but* not by me
- (2') whosoever shall gather together **against thee** shall fall for thy sake . . .
- (3') no weapon that is formed **against thee** shall prosper
- (4') and every tongue *that* shall rise **against thee** in judgment thou shalt condemn

Here the Book of Mormon passage completes a parallelism that is lacking in the corresponding King James Bible—namely, the use of “against thee” for each pair of sentences in verses 15 and 17. The Book of Mormon text has “against thee” in all four instances, but the King James Bible lacks the first one (identified as 1' in the above citation). The underlying Hebrew for the King James translation also lacks this “against thee”. Interestingly, the Septuagint (the early Greek translation of the Hebrew) for Isaiah 54:15, although its translation is quite different in meaning, uses the Greek pronoun equivalent to *thee* in all four cases. The parallel use of “against thee” in 3 Nephi 22:15 is not unexpected and will be maintained in the critical text since it appears to be intended.

We also note here that the King James Bible has the conjunction *but* (and in italics) before “not by me”. This conjunction is lacking in the Book of Mormon text, which is consistent with other cases of italics in the King James Bible, including here in 3 Nephi. The *but* would definitely help the flow of the text in 3 Nephi 22:15, but the use of a separating comma (supplied originally in the 1830 edition) is probably sufficient to identify “not by me” as an additional statement, thus “behold they shall surely gather together against thee, not by me”. Alternatively, a dash could be used: “behold they shall surely gather together against thee—not by me”.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 22:15 the parallel use of “against thee” in the first clause; also maintain the lack of a conjunction (where the King James text has an italicized *but*) before “not by me”.

■ 3 Nephi 22:16

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

□ Isaiah 54:16 (King James Bible)

behold I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire
and that bringeth forth **an** instrument for his work
and I have created the waster to destroy

Here the 1841 compositor accidentally replaced the indefinite article *an* with the definite article *the*. The compositor was probably influenced by the multiple use of the definite article in the immediately preceding predicate (“**the** smith that bloweth **the** coals in **the** fire”). This error was removed from the subsequent LDS edition (1849). The King James text has the *an*.

Summary: Maintain the indefinite article *an* in 3 Nephi 22:16, the earliest extant reading as well as the reading of the corresponding King James passage in Isaiah 54:16.

■ **3 Nephi 22:17**

and every tongue

that shall [revile 1PST | rise ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] against thee in judgment

thou shalt condemn

□ **Isaiah 54:17** (King James Bible)

and every tongue

that shall **rise** against thee in judgment

thou shalt condemn

The printer's manuscript has *revile*, which definitely seems to make more sense than *rise*, the reading of the 1830 edition. In accord with the assumption that the 1830 edition derives from the printer's manuscript (which is not true from Helaman 13:17 through the end of Mormon), the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition emended the text here in 3 Nephi 22:17 to read *revile*, in agreement with \mathcal{D} .

The King James Bible, however, has *rise*, a reading that seems strange to modern English readers in referring to the tongue as rising against someone in judgment. Of course, the King James reading implies that the difficult 1830 reading is textually correct and that in copying to the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} accidentally replaced *rise* with the visually similar *revile*. Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon shows that "to revile against X" is expected; there are 18 occurrences of this expression in the text, excluding the one here in 3 Nephi 22:17. On the other hand, there are no instances of "to rise/raise against X", but there are 9 of "to rise/raise **up** against X" (usually "in rebellion"). In other words, the unexpectedness of "every tongue that shall **rise** against thee in judgment" led scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} to replace *rise* with *revile*. Alternatively, he could have kept *rise* and added the adverb *up* ("every tongue that shall **rise up** against thee in judgment"). Yet since the reference is to the tongue, even "rise up" would be unexpected. On the other hand, the verb *revile* is naturally expected with the noun *tongue*, although we must note that this passage in 3 Nephi 22:17 / Isaiah 54:17 is the only example in the scriptures where *tongue(s)* occurs with either verb, *rise* or *revile*, nor are there any examples of *tongue(s)* with the related verbs *arise* and *raise*.

One could argue that the original manuscript actually read *revile* and that the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, used his King James Bible to consciously replace *revile* with *rise*. The problem with this hypothesis is that the 1830 typesetter seems to have referred to his King James Bible only when he had some particular difficulty with the text, such as the spelling of names or unusual words or phrases. Consider, for instance, his adoption of the King James spelling *rereward* for *rearward* in 3 Nephi 20:42 and 3 Nephi 21:29. For examples where Gilbert made a substantive emendation based on the King James reading, see under 2 Nephi 17:23 (where he correctly replaced the *that* in \mathcal{D} with *at*, the King James reading) and under 2 Nephi 20:10 (where he inserted the verb phrase *did excel*, also correctly). Here in 3 Nephi 22:17 there was nothing inherently wrong with *revile*; thus there wouldn't have been any motivation at this point for Gilbert to

check his King James Bible. Note that nearby in 3 Nephi 22:10 he accidentally set “the covenant of my **people**” rather than the correct “the covenant of my **peace**”. In this instance, the corresponding King James reading has *peace*; but since *people* made sense, Gilbert neglected to check what he had set against his Bible.

Summary: Restore *rise* in 3 Nephi 22:17 since the King James Bible and the 1830 edition both have *rise*; the reading in \mathcal{P} , *revile*, appears to be an error made by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , who did not expect *rise* in the expression “every tongue that shall **rise** against thee in judgment”.

3 Nephi 23

■ 3 Nephi 23:4

*therefore give heed to my words
write the things which I have told you
and according to the [time 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | times S]
and the will of the Father
they shall go forth unto the Gentiles*

There was a strong tendency in the 1953 RLDS edition to create plural forms. In this passage, the singular *time* was changed to *times*. Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text supports the singular *time*. Consider, for instance, its use in 1 Nephi 10:3, where the passage refers to a specific future event that the prophets have prophesied about: “according to the own due **time** of the Lord”. In 1 Nephi 10:3 the text is referring to the specific time when the Jews will return from their captivity in Babylon. Similarly, here in 3 Nephi 23:4, the text is referring to the specific time when the Lord will reveal the words of the Book of Mormon.

For a list of other cases where the 1953 RLDS edition changed a singular to the plural, see under 2 Nephi 7:3.

Summary: Retain the singular *time* in 3 Nephi 23:4 (“according to the **time** and the will of the Father”), the earliest extant reading and what we expect for a single future event.

■ 3 Nephi 23:7–8

*and it came to pass that he saith unto Nephi
bring forth the [§2 Records > §1 Record 1 | record ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST]
which ye have kept
and when Nephi had brought forth the **records**
and laid **them** before him
and he cast his eyes upon **them** and saith . . .*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *records* in the plural, but Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , corrected it to the singular *record*. The singular agrees with the 1830 reading, which argues that \mathcal{O} itself read in the singular. We note here that the larger passage refers first to bringing forth “the record which ye have kept”, yet Nephi then brings forth “the records”. The subsequent pronouns that refer to the records are also in the plural (“and laid **them** before him and he cast his eyes upon **them**”). As explained under 1 Nephi 5:21, there is evidence for such variation in number

for *record(s)*. Even so, it is possible here in 3 Nephi 23:7–8 that the first instance of *record*, the presumed reading in \mathcal{O} , is an error for *records*. Under 1 Nephi 5:21, I provide a fairly long list of cases involving mix-ups between *record* and *records* in the two manuscripts.

There is also considerable evidence that the grammatical number for *record(s)* can vary within a passage, as in the following example where the singular “a record” is definitely intended (in fact, it occurs twice) yet the following text refers to that record in the plural:

Mosiah 21:27 (original text)
 and they brought **a record** with them
 even **a record** of the people whose bones they had found
 and **they were** engraven on plates of ore

For that passage, the 1920 LDS edition emended the plural “they were” to “it was”. The critical text will restore the original “they were” to Mosiah 21:27. Similarly, here in 3 Nephi 23:7–8, the mixed use of *record* and *records* will be maintained. The original reading will work: Jesus could have asked Nephi to “bring forth the record which ye have kept”, but then Nephi could have still brought forth the physical records that contained that record.

Overall, there are 12 passages in the text that refer to the bringing (forth) of a record or records: five of them are in the singular, seven in the plural (so the plural is more frequent, but the singular still occurs). Similarly, there are 20 passages that refer to the keeping of a record or records; in this case, the singular dominates (13 to 7)—but as before, the other number is possible. In every case of *record(s)*, we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 23:7–8 the singular *record* in verse 7 (“bring forth the **record**”) and the plural *records* in verse 8 (“when Nephi had brought forth the **records**”); for each case, we generally follow the earliest sources; other passages in the text sometimes show even more extreme cases where the grammatical number varies for the word *record(s)*.

■ 3 Nephi 23:8

*and when Nephi had brought forth the records
 and laid them before him*
 [§2 NULL > §1 & 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he cast his eyes upon them and saith . . .

In this instance, the printer’s manuscript originally read just like the 1830 edition, namely, without the Hebraistic *and* between the subordinate *when*-clause and the following main clause. It appears that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the *and*, as did the 1830 compositor, since Oliver Cowdery supplied the *and* (as an ampersand) in \mathcal{P} when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . The *and* is unexpected here, so it is very probable that the original manuscript had the ampersand. For the latter part of the Book of Mormon text, the 1830 compositor consciously removed many of these extra instances of *and*. See under Helaman 16:10 for some discussion of this editing on his part as well as a list of examples where he omitted the *and* in the latter part of the text. The critical text will restore the *and* here in 3 Nephi 23:8. For a list of other cases where the Hebraistic *and* was removed after *when*-clauses, see under 1 Nephi 4:8–9; also see the more general discussion under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 23:8 the Hebrew-like *and* that originally occurred after the *when*-clause and before the main clause; although both scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 compositor omitted the *and* here, Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (undoubtedly because \mathcal{C} had it).

■ 3 Nephi 23:9

verily I say unto you
I commanded my servant Samuel the Lamanite
that he should testify unto this people
that at the day that the Father should glorify his name in me
that there were many saints which should arise from the dead
and should appear unto many and should minister unto them
and he saith unto them
 [were 1BCDEFGIN | Were AHJKLMOPQS | was RT] *it not so*

At the end of this verse, the 1920 LDS edition changed the verb *were* to *was*, presumably because there is no hypothetical or contrary-to-fact implication in this yes-no question. As discussed under 2 Nephi 2:16, the subjunctive *were* was used in earlier English more extensively than it is in modern English. There is still one example of the subjunctive “were it not so” in the Book of Mormon text, but in this example the implication is contrary-to-fact and it occurs as a conditional clause:

Ether 3:9 (original text)
 and never has man come before me
 with such exceeding faith as thou hast
 for **were it not so**
 ye could not have seen my finger

(The textual history of this passage is complicated; for discussion, see under Ether 3:9.) The expression “were it not so” is, to be sure, much more frequent in English as a conditional clause than as a yes-no question. For instance, on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, there are 76 instances of the conditional clause type but only one of the yes-no question type, namely:

John Davidson (1908)
 To purchased advocates were it not so?

It is very possible that the use of *were* in the yes-no question type is the result of the highly frequent conditional clause type. In any event, the occurrence of the *were* here in 3 Nephi 23:9 appears to be fully intended. Thus the critical text will restore the original subjunctive *were*, the reading of both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 23:9 the subjunctive form *were* in the yes-no question “were it not so”; subjunctive usage was considerably more common in Early Modern English and extended to cases where the expression was not hypothetical or contrary-to-fact.

3 Nephi 24

■ 3 Nephi 24:1

and these are the words which he did tell
[unto 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *them saying . . .*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the preposition *unto*. It was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). Either reading is theoretically possible. Note, however, the use of *unto* earlier in the verse (“he commanded them that they should write the words which the Father had given unto Malachi which he should tell **unto** them”). For another case where the 1841 typesetter omitted *unto*, see under Mormon 3:4.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 24:1 the preposition *unto* in the relative clause “which he did tell **unto** them”.

■ 3 Nephi 24:1

behold I will send my messenger
and he shall prepare [the 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | my D] way before me

□ Malachi 3:1 (King James Bible)

behold I will send my messenger
and he shall prepare **the** way before me

Here we have another typo by the typesetter for the 1841 British edition (and once more the correct reading is restored in the subsequent 1849 LDS edition). In fact, the 1841 typesetter made several typos in the quotation of Malachi 3–4, as noted in the analysis for five more variants listed below (here in 3 Nephi 24 and 25). In this instance, the typesetter replaced the determiner *the* before *way* with the possessive pronoun *my*, probably because of the preceding use of *my* in “I will send **my** messenger”. The corresponding King James passage in Malachi has *the* before *way*. The critical text will maintain the original reading, “he shall prepare **the** way before me”. It should be noted, however, that in theory something like “he shall prepare **my** way before me” is possible, as in 2 Nephi 4:33: “but that thou wouldst clear **my** way before me”.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 24:1 the determiner *the*, not *my*, in “he shall prepare **the** way before me”.

■ 3 Nephi 24:2

*for he is like a [refiners 1 | refiner's ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fire
and like [fullers 1 | fullers' A | fuller's BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] soap*

□ Malachi 3:2 (King James Bible)

for he *is* like a refiner's fire
and like **fullers'** soap

The printer's manuscript has no apostrophes for *refiner's* or *fullers'/fuller's*. The 1830 typesetter added the apostrophes, but in accord with the spellings in the King James Bible; that is, as *refiner's* and *fullers'*. For the 1837 edition, *fullers'* was changed to *fuller's*. This spelling has been retained in both the LDS and RLDS texts, even though the King James Bible has the spelling *fullers'*.

In the original 1611 King James Bible, there were no apostrophes; the text in Malachi 3:2 was set as “for he *is* like a refiners fire, and like fullers sope.” When the apostrophes were added, the apostrophe for *fullers* was placed after the *s*, which is in accord with the original Hebrew where the word for *fuller* is in the plural (*refiner* is in the singular). The critical text will therefore restore here in 3 Nephi 24:2 the original plural possessive *fullers'* (and retain the original singular possessive *refiner's*).

Summary: In 3 Nephi 24:2 the Book of Mormon spelling *fuller's soap* is incorrect and should be altered to *fullers' soap*, in accord with the King James reading as well as the original Hebrew; the singular *refiner's* is correct and will be maintained.

■ 3 Nephi 24:4

*as in the days of old
and [as 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | is D] in former years*

□ Malachi 3:4 (King James Bible)

as in the days of old
and **as** in former years

Here the 1841 British edition replaced the second *as* with *is*. This obvious typo was replaced with the correct *as* in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). It definitely appears that the 1841 typesetter was quite tired as he set the text for this quotation from Malachi.

Summary: Maintain the original use of *as* at the end of 3 Nephi 24:4 (“and **as** in former years”).

■ 3 Nephi 24:7

*return unto me and I will return unto you
saith the Lord of Hosts
but ye [said 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | say RT]
wherein shall we return*

□ Malachi 3:7 (King James Bible)

return unto me and I will return unto you
saith the LORD of Hosts
but ye **said**
wherein shall we return

The 1920 LDS edition introduced the present-tense reading *say* in 3 Nephi 24:7, even though Malachi 3:7 in the King James Bible has *said*. The change to *say* was intentional since it is marked in the 1920 committee copy. Perhaps the reason for making this change is that in the next verse the text reads in the present tense for the verb *say*:

3 Nephi 24:8
but ye **say**
wherein have we robbed thee

Malachi 3:8 (King James Bible)
but ye **say**
wherein have we robbed thee

In fact, the Hebrew original reads the same in both verses, as *wa'āmartem*, which is translated in 20th-century conservative translations, such as the Revised Standard Version, as the present-tense *you say*. The parallelism is intended in the original Hebrew, and the 1920 LDS emendation brings out that parallelism in the Book of Mormon quotation.

Nonetheless, this kind of editing of a biblical quote is quite unusual for the Book of Mormon. Normally, Book of Mormon editing corrects an obvious difficulty or ungrammaticality. But here in 3 Nephi 24:7, there is no strong grammatical reason to do so except for the parallelism with verse 8. If such an emendation is accepted, one could probably find many biblical phrases in the Book of Mormon that could be changed. The biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon definitely follow the King James reading, even when the King James translation is not very felicitous. The critical text will restore the original reading *ye said* in 3 Nephi 24:7 (which agrees with the corresponding King James reading).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 24:7 the original reading *ye said* (which agrees with the King James reading in Malachi 3:7); even though *ye said* clashes with *ye say* in the next verse, the Book of Mormon quotations from the King James Bible normally follow the specific language of that translation.

■ 3 Nephi 24:10

*bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse
that there may be meat in **my** house*

□ Malachi 3:10 (King James Bible)

bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse
that there may be meat in **mine** house

As discussed under 2 Nephi 24:13, the initial *h* in words like *house* is pronounced; thus the appropriate form in the Book of Mormon text is *my* rather than *mine* (and *thy* rather than *thine*). In Early Modern English, the *h* of *house* was often silent, thus *mine house* in Malachi 3:10. Nonetheless, there are some instances of the biblical style in the Book of Mormon, including the following that do not involve biblical quotations:

1 Nephi 11:1	as I sat pondering in mine heart
Jacob 5:47	have I slackened mine hand
Jacob 5:47	and I have stretched forth mine hand almost all the day long
Alma 10:11	for behold he hath blessed mine house
Alma 14:11	I must not stretch forth mine hand
Alma 29:1	O that I were an angel and could have the wish of mine heart

Note, in particular, the instance of *mine house* in Alma 10:11. For a complete discussion of this variation, see under POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3. In cases like this one in 3 Nephi 24:10, the critical text will maintain the invariant Book of Mormon reading, *my house*.

Summary: Maintain the invariant *my* before *h*-initial words (such as *my house* in 3 Nephi 24:10) unless there is specific evidence in the Book of Mormon textual sources to support the more archaic use of *mine*.

■ 3 Nephi 24:11

*and I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes
[1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground*

□ Malachi 3:11 (King James Bible)

and I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes
and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground

The printer's manuscript seems to be missing the *and* at the beginning of the second clause in this verse. The 1830 edition has the *and*, as does the King James reading in Malachi. And the King James *and* is not in italics, so there is no identifiable reason for omitting it from the Book of Mormon text. For a list of cases where scribe 2 of *Ø* dropped the *and* from the text, sometimes momentarily, see under Alma 12:8.

Summary: Maintain the *and* that begins the second clause in 3 Nephi 24:11; the 1830 reading as well as the corresponding King James text in Malachi has this *and*.

■ 3 Nephi 24:11

and I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes

and [he 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | ye F] shall not destroy the fruits of your ground

□ Malachi 3:11 (King James Bible)

and I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes

and **he** shall not destroy the fruits of your ground

The typesetter for the 1852 LDS edition accidentally misread the pronoun *he* as *ye*, probably because of the surrounding instances of *your*: “for **your** sakes . . . the fruits of **your** ground”. The correct *he* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1879).

Summary: Maintain the pronoun *he* in 3 Nephi 24:11 (“and **he** shall not destroy the fruits of your ground”), the reading of the earliest Book of Mormon sources as well as the King James text.

■ 3 Nephi 24:11

neither shall your vine cast her [fruit 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | fruits D]

before the time in the [field 1A | fields BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

□ Malachi 3:11 (King James Bible)

neither shall your vine cast her **fruit**

before the time in the **field**

Here we have two textual variants involving grammatical number. In the first case, the 1841 typesetter accidentally replaced the singular *fruit* with the plural *fruits*, probably because of the plural *fruits* earlier in this verse (“and he shall not destroy the **fruits** of your ground”). As noted under 3 Nephi 24:1, that typesetter made quite a few typos in this quotation from the book of Malachi. As with other 1841 typos here in 3 Nephi 24–25, the 1849 edition restored the correct reading to the LDS text. Of course, the singular *fruit* is correct here; it is found in the earliest textual sources and in the corresponding Malachi passage. For further discussion regarding *fruit* versus *fruits*, see under Jacob 5:74.

The second case of variation in this verse involves the following singular *field*, which the 1837 typesetter replaced with the plural *fields*. This variant, although in disagreement with the singular *field* in Malachi 3:11, has been retained in both the LDS and RLDS texts. The critical text, of course, will restore the original *field*.

Summary: In 3 Nephi 24:11 the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources regarding the singular nouns *fruit* and *field*; in both cases, the singular number agrees with the reading in Malachi.

■ 3 Nephi 24:13

your words have been stout against me
 saith [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Lord*

□ Malachi 3:13 (King James Bible)

your words have been stout against me
 saith **the** LORD

Here we have an obvious loss of *the* before *Lord* in \mathcal{P} . Undoubtedly, \mathcal{S} read “saith the Lord” and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted the definite article here. The 1830 edition and the King James text have the expected *the*. There is some evidence that scribe 2 tended to omit *the*. Here are two other cases in this part of the text where it appears that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the definite article:

Mormon 8:17

and if there be faults
 they be [1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] faults of a man

Mormon 8:37

for behold ye do love money . . . more than
 ye love the poor and [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] needy
 the sick and the afflicted

In these two cases, however, the reading in \mathcal{P} is theoretically possible. See under each passage for the evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , not the 1830 typesetter, is responsible for the textual variation (that is, scribe 2 omitted the *the*, just as he obviously did here in 3 Nephi 24:13).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 24:13 the expected *the* in the phrase “saith the Lord”.

■ 3 Nephi 24:14

and what doth it profit
 that we have kept his [ordinances 1CGHKPRST | ordinance ABDEFIJLMNOQ]

□ Malachi 3:14 (King James Bible)

and what profit *is it*
 that we have kept his **ordinance**

The Book of Mormon text here differs from the King James Bible in the form of the question (“what doth it profit” versus “what profit *is it*”). Since *is it* is in italics in the King James Bible, the form of the question is subject to variation, so the difference in question form is undoubtedly intended. Moreover, both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript read “what doth it profit”. The expression “what doth it profit” is found one more time in the Book of Mormon (namely, in Alma 30:34: “what doth it profit us to labor in the church”); there are no examples of “what profit is it” in the Book of Mormon text. The King James Bible, on the other hand, has instances of both types: “what profit is it” occurs not only in Malachi 3:14 but also in Genesis 37:26, while “what doth it profit” is found twice in James 2 (verses 14 and 16).

This verse in 3 Nephi 24 also has a textual variant for the word *ordinance(s)*. The 1830 edition agrees with the King James Bible in having the singular *ordinance*. Modern English speakers feel

uncomfortable with the singular here, so the tendency in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text has been to replace the awkward use of *ordinance* with the expected *ordinances*. The printer’s manuscript and the 1840 edition (and perhaps even the 1920 LDS edition) independently introduced the plural reading. Since the 1830 *ordinance* follows the King James reading, the original manuscript probably read in the singular. Despite its strangeness, the singular *ordinance* will be restored in the critical text.

One could argue that here the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, proofed his copytext against the King James Bible and thus made the change to the singular *ordinance* (that is, \mathcal{O} read in the plural and the 1830 typesetter was the one who made the textual change). There is evidence that Gilbert sometimes referred to the King James Bible—for instance, to get the spelling *fullers’ soap* in 3 Nephi 24:2. But it is doubtful that he actually proofed the whole text. He seems to have referred to the King James Bible only when something difficult showed up. If the original manuscript had read *ordinances*, it would have been so natural that it is very doubtful he would have checked it against his Bible. In this regard, note that in the next verse the Book of Mormon text reads *them that* in both \mathcal{O} and the 1830 edition; here one naturally expects *they that*, the King James reading. Even so, the 1830 typesetter did not adopt that reading; in this case, he simply let the Book of Mormon reading stand without consulting his Bible. (For discussion regarding *them that* versus *they that*, see immediately below, under 3 Nephi 24:15.)

In the expression “keep . . . ordinance(s)”, the King James Bible has four other examples in the singular and five in the plural, including one in Malachi 3:7 (and quoted in the plural in 3 Nephi 24:7):

3 Nephi 24:7
 even from the days of your fathers
 ye are gone away from mine **ordinances**
 and have not kept them

Malachi 3:7 (King James Bible)
 even from the days of your fathers
 ye have gone away from mine **ordinances**
 and have not kept *them*

Although it is possible that this passage could have influenced scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} to substitute the plural later in verse 14, the stronger influence probably came from the fact that speakers of modern English expect the plural *ordinances* with the verb *keep*, as elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (although only once):

2 Nephi 25:30 ye must keep the performances and **ordinances** of God

Despite this plural usage elsewhere in the text, the original text for 3 Nephi 24:14, it would appear, agrees with the singular reading in Malachi 3:14 (“his ordinance”) and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 24:14 the singular *ordinance*, the 1830 reading as well as the King James reading; also maintain the question “what doth it profit”, the invariant Book of Mormon reading.

■ 3 Nephi 24:15

and now we call the proud happy
 yea **they that** work wickedness are set up
 yea [*them* 1ABCGHKPS | *they* DEFIJLMNOQRT] **that** tempt God are even delivered

□ Malachi 3:15 (King James Bible)

and now we call the proud happy
 yea **they that** work wickedness are set up
 yea **they that** tempt God are even delivered

In this example, the earliest textual sources (the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript) have *they that* for the first *yea*-clause but the dialectal *them that* for the second *yea*-clause. To be sure, one could interpret the second one as simply an error in the original manuscript; that is, either Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery allowed the dialectal *them that* to replace the standard *they that* (the King James Bible reading), although this replacement did not occur in the first *yea*-clause.

Another possibility is that since the second *they that* is in italics in the King James text, the Book of Mormon text could be altered for that case, thus ending up with a nonstandard variant. The *them* was grammatically emended to *they* in the 1841 British edition, with the subsequent LDS text (from 1849 on) following this emendation; the RLDS text has, however, retained the earlier *them*.

As explained under 2 Nephi 28:30, the original Book of Mormon text has a number of instances where nonstandard *them* was used in subject position instead of *they*; these nonstandard uses of *them* have all been grammatically emended. But since the nonstandard usage can be found in the earliest text, it will be accepted here in the critical text. Nonetheless, it is possible that these instances of *them* are errors that entered the earliest text because of dialectal influence.

Summary: Restore the earliest use of *them* in 3 Nephi 24:15 (“yea **them** that tempt God”) even though the preceding text reads “yea **they** that work wickedness”; the use of *them* in the second instance may, however, represent an early error in the transmission of the text.

■ 3 Nephi 24:16

then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another
and the Lord hearkened and heard
and a book of remembrance was written before him . . .

□ Malachi 3:16 (King James Bible)

then they that feared the LORD spake often one to another
 and the LORD hearkened and heard *it*
 and a book of remembrance was written before him . . .

The Book of Mormon text lacks the pronoun *it* after *heard*. This pronoun is in italics in the King James Bible and is therefore subject to alteration in the Book of Mormon text. The earliest textual sources indicate that the original manuscript did not have the *it*. And the current text, both LDS and RLDS, continues to follow this reading.

Elsewhere in this quotation from Malachi, there are longer italicized King James phrases that have also been excluded from the Book of Mormon text:

3 Nephi 24:5

and that turn aside the stranger
and fear not me

Malachi 3:5 (King James Bible)

and that turn aside the stranger *from his right*
and fear not me

3 Nephi 24:13

yet ye say
what have we spoken against thee

Malachi 3:13 (King James Bible)

yet ye say
what have we spoken *so much* against thee

In these cases, as with the *it* in Malachi 3:16, the unnecessary italicized phrase has been omitted in the Book of Mormon text. For examples involving a single word, see the discussion regarding *you* under 3 Nephi 12:11 and *do* under 3 Nephi 13:7.

Summary: In 3 Nephi 24:16, a direct object pronoun *it* after *heard* is not supported by any of the Book of Mormon textual sources; it occurs in italics in the King James version of Malachi 3:16 and is therefore subject to deletion; the critical text will therefore maintain the invariant Book of Mormon reading without the *it*.

3 Nephi 25

■ 3 Nephi 25:2

*but unto you that fear my name
shall the **Son** of righteousness arise with healing in his wings*

□ Malachi 4:2 (King James Bible)

but unto you that fear my name
shall the **Sun** of righteousness arise with healing in his wings

As discussed under 2 Nephi 26:9, “the **Son** of righteousness” should be emended to “the **Sun** of righteousness”, the King James reading. In the Book of Mormon, this noun phrase acts as a title or name for Jesus Christ.

■ 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*

□ Malachi 4:2 (King James Bible)

but unto you that fear my name
shall the Sun of righteousness arise
with **healing** in his wings

The 1830 edition has the plural *healings*, while the printer’s manuscript has the singular *healing*, which is also the King James reading. This plural is an error that seems to have been influenced by the visual similarity of the following plural *wings* (both end in *-ing*). This same error independently occurred in the 1892 RLDS edition. In neither case was the error transferred to subsequent editions.

Summary: Maintain the singular *healing* in 3 Nephi 25:2, the reading in \mathcal{D} as well as the corresponding reading in Malachi 4:2.

■ 3 Nephi 25:2

*but unto you that fear my name
shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing
[in 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | on D] his wings*

□ Malachi 4:2 (King James Bible)

but unto you that fear my name
shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing
in his wings

Once more the typesetter for the 1841 British edition misread a small word; in this instance, he replaced the preposition *in* with *on*. The subsequent LDS edition in 1849 restored the correct *in*, which is also the King James reading.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 25:2 the preposition *in* for the phrase “in his wings”; both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition (as well as the King James Bible) support the *in*.

■ 3 Nephi 25:2

*and ye shall go forth and grow up
as calves [of 1PS | in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the stall*

□ Malachi 4:2 (King James Bible)

and ye shall go forth and grow up
as calves **of** the stall

The printer’s manuscript has the preposition *of*, which agrees with the King James reading in Malachi. The 1830 edition has the preposition *in*, but this is undoubtedly an error. The phraseology “calves **of** the stall” sounds unusual, while “calves **in** the stall” seems more expected for modern English speakers. This expectation was the probable source for the change that the 1830 typesetter accidentally introduced. Such an error also shows that the 1830 typesetter was apparently not systematically proofing the typeset text against his copy of the King James Bible. He seems to have used his Bible only when he thought something unusual or difficult needed to be figured out.

Summary: Restore the preposition *of* in 3 Nephi 25:2 (“as calves **of** the stall”); this reading is found in the printer’s manuscript and agrees with the King James reading.

■ 3 Nephi 25:3

for they shall be

[*as* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ashes under the soles of your feet
in [*the* 1ABC EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* D] day that I shall do this

□ Malachi 4:3 (King James Bible)

for they shall be

ashes under the soles of your feet

in **the** day that I shall do *this*

Here we have two more minor variants in the text, including one more by the typesetter for the 1841 British edition, namely, the replacement of the determiner *the* with *that* (thus changing “in **the** day that I shall do this” to “in **that** day that I shall do this”). The *that* was apparently prompted by the subordinate conjunction *that* in the following clause (“**that** I shall do this”). In any event, the correct *the* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). For a more complicated case of “in **the** day” versus “in **that** day”, see under Helaman 14:20.

The second minor variant in this passage involves scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , who initially wrote “they shall be **as** ashes” in \mathcal{P} but virtually immediately corrected the text by crossing out the *as* (there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Scribe 2 was probably influenced by the phraseology “they shall be as . . .” as well as by the word-initial *as* of the following word, *ashes*. In the Book of Mormon text, the *as* is usually lacking in the phrase “they shall be (as) <noun>” (as in 3 Nephi 20:28: “and they shall be a scourge unto the people of this land”), but there are a few examples of “they shall be **as** <noun>”:

2 Nephi 26:4	for they shall be as stubble
2 Nephi 26:6	and they shall be as stubble
3 Nephi 16:15	and they shall be as salt that hath lost his savor

The use of the *as* in the two examples from 2 Nephi 26 follows the language of Isaiah 47:14 (“behold they shall be **as** stubble”). Although the example here in 3 Nephi 16:15 is related to Matthew 5:13, there is no *as* in the biblical version (“but if the salt have lost his savor”), nor when it is quoted in 3 Nephi 12:13 (“but if the salt shall lose its savor”). The critical text will in each of these cases follow the earliest textual sources, thus no *as* here in 3 Nephi 25:3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 25:3 the reading of the earliest textual sources without the *as* (“they shall be ashes”), which is also the corresponding reading in Malachi; also maintain the definite article in the phrase “in **the** day”.

■ 3 Nephi 25:4

*remember ye the law of Moses my servant
[which >js whom 1 | which ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I commanded
unto him in Horeb for all Israel
with the statutes and judgments*

□ Malachi 4:4 (King James Bible)

remember ye the law of Moses my servant
which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel
with the statutes and judgments

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith initially interpreted the *which* in this passage as referring to Moses, and thus he edited the *which* to *whom* in \mathcal{P} . However, this interpretation was apparently rejected by the time the typesetting for that edition took place since the 1837 edition maintains the original *which* (as do all subsequent editions). The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *which* here even if it referred to Moses. For another example where *which* was edited to *whom*, in this case incorrectly, see the nearby discussion under 3 Nephi 21:11.

Summary: Maintain the original *which* in 3 Nephi 25:4, the reading of the earliest textual sources as well as the corresponding King James passage (in Malachi 4:4).

3 Nephi 26

■ 3 Nephi 26:1

*and now it came to pass that when Jesus had told these things
he expounded them [unto 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | to Q] the multitude
and he did expound all things **unto** them both great and small*

Here the 1911 LDS edition accidentally replaced the preposition *unto* with *to*, which is what we expect in modern English. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *unto*. Note that the following sentence also has *unto*, not *to* (“and he did expound all things **unto** them”). For additional discussion regarding *unto* versus *to*, see under 1 Nephi 3:23.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 26:1 both instances of the preposition *unto*, the reading of the earliest sources.

■ 3 Nephi 26:1–2

*and now it came to pass that
when Jesus had told these things
he expounded them unto the multitude
and he did expound all things unto them both great and small
and he [sayeth 1 | saith ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] . . .*

Here we have an example of the historical present-tense *saith* that Joseph Smith missed in his editing for the 1837 edition. As explained under 1 Nephi 2:1, Joseph usually emended the historical present tense to the past tense. Interestingly, here in 3 Nephi 26:2 no subsequent edition has ever made the change. There is a nearby example, in 3 Nephi 27:2, where Joseph marked the change from *saith* to *said* in \mathcal{D} but it was never implemented in the 1837 edition. In that case, 20th-century editions of the Book of Mormon made the change to *said*. For a complete discussion of the historical present tense in the original Book of Mormon text, plus its normal editing to the past tense, see under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *saith* in 3 Nephi 26:2; such usage is common in the original Book of Mormon text, although most cases have been edited to *said*.

■ 3 Nephi 26:3

even until the elements should [melts 1 | melt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with fervent heat

Here \mathcal{P} reads incorrectly as *melts* rather than the obvious *melt* (the 1830 reading). This form appears to be a simple scribal error on the part of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} . He made similar additions of morphemic *s* elsewhere in his copywork:

Mosiah 29:41	to rule over them or to [<i>Judges</i> >% <i>Judge</i> 1] them
Alma 2:16	at the [<i>heads</i> >% <i>head</i> 1] of his armies
Alma 9:20	having been favored above every [<i>others</i> >% <i>other</i> 1] nation
Alma 11:40	and salvation [<i>comeths</i> >% <i>cometh</i> 1] to none else
Alma 12:7	the thoughts and intents of his [\S 2 <i>hearts</i> >+ \S 1 <i>heart</i>]
3 Nephi 19:25	and his [<i>countenances</i> >% <i>countenance</i> 1] did smile upon them
3 Nephi 23:11	ye have not written this [<i>things</i> >% <i>thing</i> 1]
3 Nephi 29:7	for he that doeth this shall become [<i>likes</i> > <i>like</i> 1] unto the son of perdition
Mormon 9:29	ye will in [<i>no wises</i> >% <i>no wise</i> 1] be cast out

In all these other cases but one, scribe 2 immediately caught his error (in Alma 12:7, Oliver Cowdery corrected the error when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}).

Summary: Ignore cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally added a morphemic *s*, such as *melts* for *melt* in 3 Nephi 26:3.

■ 3 Nephi 26:3

*even until the elements should melt with fervent heat
and the earth should be [wrapped 1PS | wrapt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] together as a scroll
and the heavens and the earth should pass away*

This verse uses two different biblical phrases. The first clause states that “the elements should melt with fervent heat”, a precise use of the phraseology found twice in the King James text for 2 Peter:

2 Peter 3:10	and the elements shall melt with fervent heat
2 Peter 3:12	and the elements shall melt with fervent heat

The second clause states that “the earth should be wrapped together as a scroll”; a similar expression can be found in the King James Bible:

Isaiah 34:4	and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll
Revelation 6:14	and the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together

Note, however, that the Book of Mormon passage refers to the earth, not the heaven(s), as being wrapped together as a scroll; also note that the verb form that is used is *wrapped* rather than *rolled*.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are two references to the earth rather than the heaven(s) being rolled together as a scroll, both in Mormon:

Mormon 5:23	and at his great command the earth shall be rolled together as a scroll
-------------	---

Mormon 9:2

yea even that great day when the earth shall be rolled together as a scroll
and the elements shall melt with fervent heat

The consistent use of *the earth* in 3 Nephi 26:3 and the two passages in Mormon clearly shows that *the earth* is intended. Note also that the second passage from Mormon has the same biblical clause found in 2 Peter: “and the elements shall melt with fervent heat”.

A second question that arises here is whether *wrapped* (archaically spelled as *wrapt*) in 3 Nephi 26:3 is an error for *rolled*. Such an error would have been in the original manuscript since both the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition have *wrapped/wrapt*. There is a small possibility that Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote *wrapped* or *wrapt* in \mathcal{O} in place of a correct *rolled* (both words are one syllable long and begin with the same *r* sound, but the similarity ends there). Moreover, this is the only use of the verb *wrap* in the entire Book of Mormon. Even so, *wrapped* is very likely correct. The Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 9 for the verb *wrap*) indicates that one meaning for the verb *wrap* is ‘to wind or fold up or together . . . to roll or gather up’; thus the phrase “wrap together” in 3 Nephi 26:3 can be considered equivalent to “roll together”. In fact, the OED cites the following biblical passage in support of this usage (here given in the King James version):

2 Kings 2:8

and Elijah took his mantle and wrapped *it* together and smote the waters

The OED also provides a citation that refers to both heaven and earth as being wrapped up (here cited with modern accidentals):

William Watreman (1555)

the beginner of things visible wrapped up
both heaven and earth . . . together in one pattern

Thus the reference in the Book of Mormon to the earth being wrapped up as a scroll is fully acceptable. There is no need for any emendation here in 3 Nephi 26:3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 26:3 the reference to the earth being wrapped up as a scroll in the last days; usage from Mormon 5:23 and 9:2 argues that *the earth* is correct and is not an error for *the heaven(s)*; and usage from Early Modern English argues that *wrapped together* here means ‘rolled together’ (the two passages in Mormon use the verb *roll* rather than *wrap*).

■ 3 Nephi 26:3

*even until the elements should melt with fervent heat
and the earth should be wrapped together as a scroll
and the [Heaven 1 | heavens ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the earth should pass away*

Here the printer’s manuscript has the singular *heaven*, while the 1830 edition has the plural *heavens*. Nearby we can find some evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to write the singular *heaven* in place of the correct *heavens*:

3 Nephi 28:36

yea even three which were caught up
 into [*Heaven* >+ *the Heavens* 1 | *the Heavens* A |
the heavens BCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | *the heaven* MOQ]

In this passage, the correct text is clearly “the heavens” since both the 1830 edition and the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} read this way. Of course, the case here in 3 Nephi 26:3 is more complicated since *heaven* was never corrected to *heavens* in \mathcal{P} . And so it is theoretically possible that the singular is correct and that the 1830 typesetter made the change from an original *heaven* to the plural *heavens*.

Elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text, there are numerous instances of “the heavens” (37 of them) but only two of “the heaven”:

Mosiah 12:36 (Exodus 20:4 reads “in heaven above”)

thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image
 or any likeness of any thing
 in [*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heaven above
 or things which is in the earth beneath

Mormon 9:17

that by his word
 the [*Havens* >% *Haven* 1 | *heaven* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and the earth should be

Of the 37 other instances in the text, eight are of the form “the heavens and the earth”, so the plural is definitely favored here in 3 Nephi 26:3. In fact, note that in one of the exceptions (in Mormon 9:17), scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote *heavens* (although as *Havens*), which he immediately corrected to the singular by erasing the plural *s*; the 1830 edition has the singular *heaven*, so \mathcal{O} must have read in the singular. Overall, of course, the plural “the heavens” is definitely favored. To be sure, the expectation of the plural could have prompted the 1830 typesetter here in 3 Nephi 26:3 to replace an original *heaven* with *heavens* (just like scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} almost did in Mormon 9:17).

There are four other occurrences in the Book of Mormon text referring to the earth passing away:

1 Nephi 17:46	he can cause the earth that it shall pass away
Alma 9:2	although he should preach unto us that the earth should pass away
Alma 9:3	for they knew not that the earth should pass away
Ether 13:8	until the end come when the earth shall pass away

But none of these other passages include any reference to the heaven(s) passing away. In fact, it is possible to interpret 3 Nephi 26:3 so that it too does not refer to the heaven(s) passing away. David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that the phrase “and the heaven(s)” could be interpreted as a delayed conjoined subject that belongs to the previous clause:

3 Nephi 26:3

and the earth should be wrapped together as a scroll—and the heavens—
 and the earth should pass away

And there are examples in the text of a noun phrase alone acting as a delayed conjoined subject:

Helaman 16:13 there were great signs given unto the people—and wonders
 Mormon 8:5 my father hath been slain in battle—and all my kinsfolks
 Ether 7:7 Kib dwelt in captivity—and his people

Thus one could argue that here in 3 Nephi 26:3 there is one more reference to only the earth passing away. And one can find biblical support for the heavens being wrapped or rolled together as a scroll:

Isaiah 34:4 (King James Bible)
 and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll

And this example supports the use of the plural *heavens*.

Nonetheless, there are several references to both the heaven(s) and the earth passing away in the King James Bible:

Matthew 24:35
heaven and earth shall pass away
 but my words shall not pass away

Mark 13:31
heaven and earth shall pass away
 but my words shall not pass away

Luke 21:33
heaven and earth shall pass away
 but my words shall not pass away

Revelation 21:1
 and I saw a new heaven and a new earth
 for **the first heaven and the first earth** were passed away

But these examples are not particularly helpful in determining the number for “the heaven(s)” here in 3 Nephi 26:3 since none are of the form “**the** heaven(s) and **the** earth”; when the definite article does occur, as in the last example, there is an intervening *first*. For the other passages we get simply “heaven and earth”—that is, without any article at all.

Interestingly, there is a biblical passage that lacks the reference to the earth passing away but does refer to “the heavens” passing away:

2 Peter 3:10 (King James Bible)
 but the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night
 in the which **the heavens** shall pass away with a great noise
 and the elements shall melt with fervent heat

And as we have seen in the previous discussion, the language of this verse in 2 Peter 3 is earlier referred to in 3 Nephi 26:3 (namely, “even until the elements should melt with fervent heat”). Thus the use of the plural “the heavens” in 2 Peter 3:10 provides some support for the same plural reading in 3 Nephi 26:3:

KING JAMES BIBLE	the heavens	shall	pass away
BOOK OF MORMON	and the heavens and the earth	should	pass away

This parallelism also provides support for interpreting “and the heavens” as belonging with the following clause (“and the earth should pass away”) rather than as a delayed conjoined subject attached to the preceding clause (“and the earth should be wrapped together as a scroll”).

But no matter how we parse “and the heaven(s)”, usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and in the King James Bible argues that the plural *heavens* is correct in 3 Nephi 26:3. The plural *heavens* was most likely the reading in \mathcal{O} ; while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have dropped the plural *s* in *heavens*.

Summary: 3 Nephi 26:3 apparently read “the heavens” (the 1830 reading) in the original manuscript; the evidence for the plural reading is enhanced by the plural *heavens* in 2 Peter 3:10 (“the heavens shall pass away”), a New Testament phrase that is cited earlier in this verse; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text as well as in the King James Bible favors “the heavens” over “the heaven”.

■ 3 Nephi 26:6

*and now there cannot be written in this book
even [an 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hundredth part
of the things which Jesus did truly teach unto the people*

The printer’s manuscript has the archaic Early Modern English style for the phrase “an hundredth part”, while the 1830 edition has the expected *a* form of the indefinite article (since in the standard English of today the *h* is pronounced). The original manuscript is not extant here.

Elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text, there are four occurrences of “a hundredth part” but none of “an hundredth part”. All four of these are in Oliver Cowdery’s hand; none were written by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} . There is only one occurrence originally of “the hundredth part” (in Ether 15:33), although one instance of “a hundredth part” was accidentally changed to “the hundredth part” in the 1837 edition (in the Words of Mormon 1:5). So textual consistency would argue that here in 3 Nephi 26:6 we should accept “a hundredth part”.

Interestingly, there are seven occurrences of “an hundred” in the Book of Mormon text but none of “a hundred”. The only examples of “an hundred” written by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} occur after 3 Nephi 26:6 (namely, three of them in 4 Nephi), which means that if scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} introduced the *an* in the reading “an hundredth part”, it was not due to him being influenced by “an hundred” in the Book of Mormon text. If he is responsible for the change, it must have occurred because of his familiarity with the King James biblical style. In the King James Bible, there are 176 instances of “an hundred” but only one of “a hundred” (in Isaiah 37:36). The King James text has no examples of “a(n) hundredth X”, but there is one example of “the hundredth X”, namely, in Nehemiah 5:11: “also the hundredth *part* of the money” (note here that the word *part* is in italics, which means that it was not in the original Hebrew but was supplied by the translators). In any event, one could argue that in 3 Nephi 26:6 scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was influenced by the biblical use of “an hundred” and thus introduced “an hundredth part” into the Book of Mormon text.

When we consider the tendency to mix up *a* and *an* before *h*-initial words in the Book of Mormon text, there is one case of each type (that is, one of *a* to *an* and one of *an* to *a*):

Alma 8:20 (*a holy* changed to *an holy* in the 1852 LDS edition)
 and I know that thou art
 [a 1ABCDEFGHIKPRST | an FIJLMNOQ] holy prophet of God

Ether 13:5 (*an holy* changed to *a holy* in the 1830 edition but indirectly)
 it should be built up again
 [& 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] holy city unto the Lord

In the first case, the 1852 typesetter is responsible for introducing *an holy* into the text for Alma 8:20. As explained under that passage, he was probably influenced by earlier instances of “he was **an** hungered” and “**an** humble servant of God” in Alma 8:19 (the preceding verse), although he might have also been influenced by the King James style that favors *an holy* over *a holy* (41 to 2). He wouldn’t have been influenced by the possible use of *an holy* in the Book of Mormon itself since Ether 13:5, the second case listed above, appears to be the only instance of *an holy* in the original text (there are 16 cases of *a holy*). And even this single instance of *an holy* was removed from the text. In that particular case, Oliver Cowdery seems to have misheard an original *an holy* as *and holy*, which he then wrote in Ⓒ (one would assume) and copied into Ⓓ as “& holy”, thus creating the impossible “it should be built up again **and** holy city unto the Lord”. The 1830 typesetter recognized this as an error but incorrectly replaced the *and* with *a*, not *an*. But at least the Ether 13:5 example does show that *an holy* is possible in the Book of Mormon text, even though all other instances read *a holy*. In the original Book of Mormon text, if we accept the reading in Ⓓ for 3 Nephi 26:6, we will have a similar kind of predominance for “a hundredth part” over “an hundredth part” (4 to 1). We should note that the example from Ether 13:5 also shows that the 1830 typesetter preferred the *a* before an *h*-initial word, when he was given the choice.

In the Alma 8:20 example, there were two nearby preceding instances of *an* with *h*-initial words that appear to have triggered the change of *a holy* to *an holy* in the 1852 LDS edition (namely, *an hungered* and *an humble*). Here in 3 Nephi 26:6, there are no nearby preceding instances of *an* before *h*-initial words that could have prompted scribe 2 of Ⓓ to change *a hundredth* to *an hundredth*. So if scribe 2 is the source for the variation here in 3 Nephi 26:6, the *an* must have come from his familiarity with the biblical phraseology, namely, *an hundred*, but not from nearby uses of that style in the Book of Mormon text itself. Since modern English speakers generally expect *a hundredth*, the odds are therefore greater that the 1830 typesetter made the change from *an hundredth* to *a hundredth*. The example in Ether 13:5 shows that he was capable of making such a change, although he did leave all the instances of *an* before *h*-initial words unchanged in his typesetting. In this regard, one should note that there are many instances of original *an* before *h*-initial words in biblical citations that are replaced by *a* when quoted in the Book of Mormon. We have the following examples:

	BOOK OF MORMON	KING JAMES BIBLE
2 Nephi 13:7 / Isaiah 3:7	a healer	an healer
2 Nephi 15:10 / Isaiah 5:10	a homer	an homer
2 Nephi 19:17 / Isaiah 9:17	a hypocrite	an hypocrite
2 Nephi 20:6 / Isaiah 10:6	a hypocritical nation	an hypocritical nation
2 Nephi 21:16 / Isaiah 11:16	a highway	an highway
2 Nephi 27:3 / Isaiah 29:8	a hungry man	an hungry <i>man</i>
3 Nephi 12:14 / Matthew 5:14	a hill	an hill

Within the Book of Mormon text itself, “a hundredth part” is the easier reading. Since the transmissional evidence is equally balanced, the critical text will accept the more difficult reading, “an hundredth part”, for 3 Nephi 26:6.

Summary: Restore the unexpected indefinite article *an* in 3 Nephi 26:6 since the odds are greater that the 1830 typesetter changed an original *an* to *a* than scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} replaced an original *a* with *an*.

■ 3 Nephi 26:9–10

*and when they shall have received this which is expedient
that they should have first to try their faith
and if it [should 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] so be
that they shall believe these things
then shall the greater things be made manifest unto them
and if it so be that they will not believe these things
then shall the greater things be withheld from them unto their condemnation*

Here the 1830 edition has the modal verb *shall* in the first *if*-clause, but the printer’s manuscript has *should*. The *shall* could have come from the following clause (“that they **shall** believe these things”) or perhaps from the earlier use of *shall* in “when they **shall** have received this”—or more generally from the numerous instances of the present-tense *shall* (and one *will*) throughout the passage. On the other hand, the *should* could have come from the immediately preceding clause (“that they **should** have first to try their faith”).

The Book of Mormon very often uses *should* in future statements. In fact, under 3 Nephi 1:8 I list four clear cases where the 1830 typesetter replaced the future *should* with *shall*. And to that list the critical text will add 3 Nephi 1:8 (as well as the case here of 3 Nephi 26:9). On the other hand, there is no explicit example where scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} ever mixed up *shall* and *should*, even momentarily. Oliver Cowdery mixed up the two modals fairly often, but usually only momentarily. Thus the odds are quite high here in 3 Nephi 26:9 that the 1830 typesetter is the one responsible for the variation. The critical text will restore the unexpected *should*, the reading in \mathcal{D} .

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 26:9 the modal *should*, the reading in \mathcal{D} , since evidence from textual transmission shows a fairly strong tendency on the part of the 1830 typesetter to replace uses of *should* with the more expected *shall* when referring to future events.

■ 3 Nephi 26:11

*behold I [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | were > was M | was OQRST] about to write them all
which [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | were > was M | was Q] engraven upon the plates of Nephi*

In the third printing of the 1905 Chicago edition (in 1907), the original “I **were** about to write them” in this passage was changed to “I **was** about to write them”, thus eliminating the subjunctive use of the verb *be* in favor of the indicative. In a nearby chapter, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith made the same change for this phraseology:

3 Nephi 28:25

behold I [*were* >*js was* 1 | *were* A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] about
to write the names of those who were never to taste of death

In earlier English, the subjunctive was appropriate because of the implied negative in “I were about to <do something>”. In both of these passages, Mormon did not end up writing down what he had first intended.

For other cases of “I was/were about to <do something>”, the text has instances of only the indicative *was*; in two of the following cases (each marked with an asterisk), the speaker ends up not doing what he was going to do:

1 Nephi 17:17

and when my brethren saw that I **was** about to build a ship
they began to murmur against me

* Alma 8:24

and they would not receive me but they cast me out
and I **was** about to set my back towards this land forever

Alma 12:22

now Alma saith unto him
this is the thing which I **was** about to explain

* Ether 13:13

and I **was** about to write more but I am forbidden

Thus the editing in 3 Nephi 26:11 and 3 Nephi 28:25 is consistent with the other examples in the text. In general, the original text allows for either the indicative or the subjunctive (see, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 2:16). Thus the critical text will restore the subjunctive *were* in these two passages.

We also note here that for the 1907 impression of the 1905 LDS edition the *were* in the following relative clause (“which **were** engraven upon the plates of Nephi”) was changed to *was*. The 1911 LDS edition continued the *was*, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the original *were*.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 26:11 and 3 Nephi 28:25 the two original instances of the subjunctive in “I were about to write something”; maintain in 3 Nephi 26:11 the plural *were* in the relative clause “which **were** engraven upon the plates of Nephi”.

■ 3 Nephi 26:11

behold I were about to write them . . .

but the Lord [*forbid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *forbid* > *forbade* M | *forbade* QRT] *it*

Apparently the original manuscript had *forbid* as the past-tense form for the verb *forbid* here in 3 Nephi 26:11 (since both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript read this way). Such usage is found in commonly spoken English (including my own), as in the example “he forbid me to go”. The Oxford English Dictionary lists this past-tense form as dating from Early Modern English

(beginning in the 1500s) and continuing up to the 1800s. For the third impression (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition, the colloquial *forbid* was replaced with the standard *forbade*.

The parallel passage in 3 Nephi 28:25 has *forbade* in both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript:

3 Nephi 28:25
 behold I were about to write the names of those
 who were never to taste of death
 but the Lord **forbade**

So in this second case the original manuscript apparently had *forbade*. Thus the original manuscript seems to have had some variation between *forbid* and *forbade* as the past-tense form for the verb *forbid*. Of course, it is quite possible that in 3 Nephi 26:11 the use of the colloquial past-tense form *forbid* was an error on the part of the scribe in \mathcal{C} , presumably Oliver Cowdery.

These two examples are the only ones of the simple past-tense form for the verb *forbid* in the whole Book of Mormon text. It is perhaps worth noting that for the related verb *bid*, we have only *bade* as the simple past-tense form (and without variation throughout the entire textual history):

1 Nephi 1:11 and the first came . . . and **bade** him that he should read
 1 Nephi 4:25 and I also **bade** him that he should follow me
 1 Nephi 8:6 he spake unto me and **bade** me follow him
 1 Nephi 8:38 he **bade** them to keep the commandments of the Lord
 3 Nephi 17:19 Jesus spake unto them and **bade** them arise

Like the case of *forbid*, my own English prefers *bid* in all these past-tense instances. We should also point out the one case of past-participial *bid* that occurred originally in Helaman 5:49; this form implies the theoretical existence of the simple past-tense *bid* (see the discussion under that passage). The past-tense form *forbid* is therefore quite possible as the original reading here in 3 Nephi 26:11, although it could also be an error due to dialectal speech. In any event, the critical text will restore *forbid* since that form is possible.

Another possibility worth noting is that the use of “the Lord **forbid** it” in 3 Nephi 26:11 could be an error for “the Lord **forbiddeth** it” (or even “the Lord **forbids** it”)—that is, perhaps the verb *forbid* is in the present tense. Note that later in the text, in Ether 13:13, we have such a present-tense passive construction involving *forbid*: “and I was about to write more but I **am** forbidden”. Nonetheless, 3 Nephi 26:11 is syntactically similar to 3 Nephi 28:25, which definitely has the past-tense form *forbade* (although not the direct object pronoun *it*):

3 Nephi 26:11 but the Lord forbid it
 3 Nephi 28:25 but the Lord forbade

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that 3 Nephi 26:11 could be a mistake for “but the Lord forbidden”. Here Oliver Cowdery could have misheard Joseph Smith's dictated *forbidden* as *forbid it*—that is, the unstressed *-ed* ending was misinterpreted as the direct object pronoun *it*, also unstressed. If this suggested emendation is correct, then the simple past-tense form is a regular past-tense form derived from the base form of the verb *forbid*. And this would mean that there would be no *it* after the verb, just as in 3 Nephi 28:25 where no direct object is stated for *forbade*.

One problem with this proposal, however, is that there is no evidence elsewhere in the text for such a misinterpretation in the dictation of the text. Moreover, the earliest reading, *forbid it*, will work since the dialectal past-tense form *forbid* does exist. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading for the verb form here in 3 Nephi 26:11.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 26:11 the original past-tense form *forbid* for the verb *forbid* in place of the standard past-tense form *forbade*; such usage is supported by usage in Early Modern English as well as in today's colloquial English.

■ 3 Nephi 26:13

*and after that
he did shew himself unto them oft
and did break bread oft
and bless it
and [give 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | gave GHK] it unto them*

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the infinitive form *give* with the past-tense *gave*. The two subsequent RLDS editions followed this reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *give*. The original text here reads as a conjoining of three infinitive phrases: “break bread oft and bless it and give it unto them”. The *did* preceding *break bread* is not repeated since all three actions are performed as one; on the other hand, the preceding predicative conjunct has the *did* (“he did shew himself unto them oft”) since Jesus’s showing himself is a distinct action.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 26:13 the infinitive *give*, which helps to connect the three actions of breaking the bread, blessing it, and giving it out (as distinct from Christ showing himself to the people).

■ 3 Nephi 26:14

- and it came to pass that he did teach and minister
unto the children of the multitude of whom hath been spoken*
- (1) *and he did loose their tongues
and they did speak unto their fathers great and marvelous things
even greater than he had revealed unto the people*
- (2) *and [1ABCDEFGHijklmnopqs | he RT] loosed their tongues that they could utter*

The earliest reading here, under one interpretation, has a conjoined predicate that seems to be lacking its subject. The printer’s manuscript and the 1830 reading read identically, without the expected *he*, which means that very likely the original manuscript itself lacked the *he*. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition supplied the *he* since it seems necessary—providing one assumes that in this passage we have two references to the Lord loosing the tongues of the children. Such an interpretation is possible since there are examples elsewhere in the original text where two identical clauses frame a central body of information:

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

Alma 56:19

(1) **and thus were we favored** 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 favored**

Yet David Calabro points out (personal communication) that here in 3 Nephi 26:14 we may not have two references to loosing the tongues of the children. He argues that the second instance refers to the Lord as loosing the tongues of the people (that is, the adults, in distinction to the children). Calabro notes that support for this interpretation can be found in an earlier reference to the disciples being given the words they should say when they prayed:

3 Nephi 19:24

and it came to pass that
when Jesus had thus prayed unto the Father
he came unto his disciples
and behold they did still continue without ceasing to pray unto him
and they did not multiply many words
for it was given unto them what they should pray

And shortly afterwards the text explains that not only were the disciples praying but also the entire multitude:

3 Nephi 20:1

and it came to pass that
he commanded the multitude that they should cease to pray
and also his disciples

One could argue that the entire multitude, not just the disciples, were being given what they should pray and that this is what Jesus is referring to here at the end of 3 Nephi 26:14. In other words, the final predicate belongs to the comparative clause: “even greater than he had revealed unto **the people** and loosed **their** tongues that **they** could utter”. This means that the antecedent for the pronouns *they* and *their* is *the people*, not *the children* (which is found much earlier in the passage). Given this interpretation, the 1920 emendation was unnecessary—and, in fact, misleading. Since Calabro’s proposed reading will work, the critical text will restore the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 26:14—that is, without any subject pronoun *he* for the last conjoined predicate.

Summary: Restore the earliest text in 3 Nephi 26:14 without the subject pronoun *he* heading the final conjoined predicate; this predicate, it would appear, actually belongs in the immediately preceding

comparative clause, so that the comparison here is between the utterances of the children and the earlier utterances of the adults.

■ 3 Nephi 26:15

*and it came to pass that
after he had ascended into heaven
—the second time that he shewed himself unto them—
and [NULL >]s had 1| A| had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] gone unto the Father
after having healed all their sick and their lame . . .*

The original text here (“and gone unto the Father”) actually works if we realize that the adverbial phrase “the second time that he shewed himself unto them” acts parenthetically; that is, without the parenthetical statement, we have “after he had ascended into heaven . . . and gone unto the Father”, which is perfectly acceptable. Of course, the intervening adverbial phrase tends to cause the reader to incorrectly interpret the *and* as joining “gone unto the Father” with “shewed himself unto them”. For this reason, Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition by inserting a repeated *had* so the connection with the preceding “had ascended into heaven” would be guaranteed. But by placing dashes around the adverbial phrase, such an emendation can be avoided. In this case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Remove in 3 Nephi 26:15 the repeated *had* that Joseph Smith added; the original conjoined predicate does not need the repeated *had*, providing the preceding intervening phrase, “the second time that he shewed himself unto them”, is treated parenthetically by surrounding it with dashes.

■ 3 Nephi 26:15

*after having healed all **their** sick and **their** lame
and opened the eyes of [the 1N| their ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] blind
and unstopped the ears of **the** deaf*

The printer’s manuscript has “of **the** blind” here in 3 Nephi 26:15, but the 1830 edition reads “of **their** blind”. (It should also be noted that the 1906 LDS edition replaced the *their* of the earlier printed editions with *the*, but this change was not passed on to subsequent LDS editions since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext.) The *the* in \mathcal{P} could have come from the following “of **the** deaf”, or the *their* in the 1830 edition could have come from the preceding “all **their** sick and **their** lame”. It is more probable that the latter happened since the *their* would have been already stated twice when the 1830 compositor came to setting “of the(ir) blind”. In addition, in this passage the pairwise syntactic parallelism of the conjuncts argues for the *the*:

3 Nephi 26:15 (the reading in \mathcal{P})
after having healed
all **their** sick and **their** lame
and opened the eyes of **the** blind
and unstopped the ears of **the** deaf

It should also be noted that it is improbable that the original passage had *their* all four times since in the last line (“and unstopped the ears of the deaf”) we have *the* before *deaf* in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition.

Elsewhere in the text, when we get conjoined examples of *sick*, *lame*, *blind*, and *deaf*, we always get complete agreement (either all with *the* or all with *their*):

2 Nephi 9:31–32

and woe unto **the** deaf that will not hear
for they shall perish
woe unto **the** blind that will not see
for they shall perish also

2 Nephi 27:29 (quoting Isaiah 29:18 from the King James Bible)

and in that day shall **the** deaf hear the words of the book
and the eyes of **the** blind shall see out of obscurity and out of darkness

Mosiah 3:5

such as healing **the** sick
raising **the** dead
causing **the** lame to walk
the blind to receive their sight
and **the** deaf to hear

3 Nephi 17:9

all the multitude with one accord did go forth
with **their** sick
and **their** afflicted
and **their** lame
and with **their** blind
and with **their** dumb

4 Nephi 1:5

insomuch that they did heal **the** sick
and raise **the** dead
and cause **the** lame to walk
and **the** blind to receive their sight
and **the** deaf to hear

These examples do not provide direct evidence for determining the original text in the mixed situation of 3 Nephi 26:15, but it is worth noting that syntactic parallelism is always maintained.

Here in 3 Nephi 26:15, evidence from scribal transmission is not too helpful. There are no clear examples where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ever wrote *the* in place of *their*, not even momentarily (although there are three clear cases where he momentarily wrote *their* in place of *the*). Conversely, there are no clear examples where the 1830 compositor accidentally replaced *the* with *their* (although in Alma 27:23 he appears to have consciously replaced an earlier *the* with *their*). On the other hand, there are three cases where he replaced *their* with *the*, but this is the opposite of what we need here in 3 Nephi 26:15. We are therefore required to rely on the strong parallelism of 3 Nephi 26:15 as well as the preceding occurrence of the two *their*'s to argue that the original text first had

a pair of *their's* and then a pair of *the's*. The critical text will therefore adopt the reading in \mathcal{D} , “and opened the eyes of **the** blind”.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 26:15 the determiner *the* of the printer’s manuscript (“and opened the eyes of **the** blind”) since it accommodates itself better to the syntactic parallelism of its conjoined predicate (“and unstopped the ears of **the** deaf”); the *their* in the 1830 reading (“and opened the eyes of **their** blind”) appears to be due to the influence of the two preceding *their's* in “after having healed all **their** sick and **their** lame”.

3 Nephi 27

■ 3 Nephi 27:2

*and Jesus came and stood in the midst of them
and [sayeth >]s said 1 | saith ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | said PRST] unto them*

Here is an example of the historical present-tense *saith* that Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed to the past-tense *said* in \mathfrak{P} yet the change was never made in the 1837 edition. Joseph's editing practice was to remove the historical present tense from the text, although in some instances he failed to make the change (as noted in the discussion regarding 3 Nephi 26:1–2). Here in 3 Nephi 27:2, modern editions have made the change to *said* (namely, the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1920 LDS edition). The RLDS change was likely based on the change that Joseph marked in \mathfrak{P} . The critical text (as explained under 1 Nephi 2:1) will restore all original instances of the historical present tense, thus “and saith unto them” here in 3 Nephi 27:2.

Summary: Restore the historical present-tense *saith* in 3 Nephi 27:2, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 3 Nephi 27:3

*we will that thou [wouldest 1 | wouldst ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] tell us
the name whereby we shall call this church*

The question here is whether the schwa vowel was pronounced in the modal verb *would(e)st*. The printer's manuscript has the two-syllable *wouldest*; the 1830 edition has the one-syllable *wouldst*. This issue is generally discussed under 1 Nephi 20:5 for the two modal verb forms *should(e)st* and *would(e)st*. Basically, we find the following for these two words:

- (1) The Book of Mormon text favors the one-syllable forms, *shouldst* and *wouldst*. In the earliest text, there is only one firm instance ending in *-est*, namely, *shouldest*, the immediately corrected reading in \mathfrak{C} for 1 Nephi 20:5. This was altered to *shouldst* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} .
- (2) In the current LDS text, there are no examples of *shouldest* or *wouldest*, only *shouldst* (11 times) and *wouldst* (6 times).
- (3) In the current RLDS text, there is only one example of *wouldest* (in Alma 30:55), otherwise only *shouldst* (11 times) and *wouldst* (5 times).

- (4) In the King James Bible, on the other hand, there are no examples of *shouldst* and *wouldst*, only *shouldest* (73 times) and *wouldest* (38 times).
- (5) The first two Book of Mormon editions sometimes introduced instances of the biblically styled *shouldest* and *wouldest*:

1830 EDITION	wouldest (1 Nephi 20:8) shouldest (1 Nephi 21:6)
1837 EDITION	wouldest (2 Nephi 4:33) shouldest (2 Nephi 8:12) shouldest (Alma 30:47) wouldest (Alma 30:55)

What we seem to have here under point 5 is a minor tendency to replace original *-st* forms with the biblically styled *-est* forms, at least in the first two editions. In the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery struggled in one case over these two forms, but only in an Isaiah quotation (namely, in 1 Nephi 20:5, listed under point 1). Unfortunately, the only case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} is involved with this variation is here in 3 Nephi 27:3, where he wrote *wouldest*, but the 1830 edition has the expected *wouldst*. So we cannot independently determine what this scribe's error practice might have been with respect to modal verbs ending in *-est* or *-st*. Similarly, we have no evidence regarding what the 1830 typesetter might have done if his copytext had had a modal verb ending in *-est* (the models in his copytext all ended in *-st*). This lack of evidence suggests that we should adopt the general usage here in 3 Nephi 27:3; in other words, the reading in \mathcal{C} was probably *wouldst* and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} made the change to *wouldest*, possibly because of his familiarity with the biblically styled ending *-est* (the same tendency shown by the typesetters for the 1830 and 1837 editions). This means that for this passage the critical text will maintain the expected shorter form ending in *-st*.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 27:3 the form *wouldst*, the 1830 reading, rather than *wouldest*, the reading in \mathcal{P} ; in this instance we adopt the expected usage for the Book of Mormon; this decision implies that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} replaced an original *wouldst* with *wouldest*, perhaps under the influence of the King James biblical style, which has only *wouldest*.

■ 3 Nephi 27:4

why is it [that 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] the people should murmur and dispute because of this thing

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the subordinate conjunction *that*. The 1849 LDS edition restored the *that*. Elsewhere the text consistently uses the subordinate conjunction *that* in introducing finite clauses complementing an expletive *it* in a *wh*-question:

1 Nephi 7:8	and how is it that ye are so hard in your hearts
1 Nephi 7:9	how is it that ye have not hearkened unto the word of the Lord
1 Nephi 7:10	how is it that ye have forgotten that ye have seen an angel of the Lord
1 Nephi 7:11	yea and how is it that ye have forgotten how great things the Lord hath done for us

1 Nephi 7:12	yea and how is it that ye have forgotten that the Lord is able to do all things
1 Nephi 15:10	how is it that ye do not keep the commandments of the Lord
1 Nephi 15:10	how is it that ye will perish because of the hardness of your hearts
1 Nephi 17:46	O then why is it that ye can be so hard in your hearts
1 Nephi 17:51	how is it that he cannot instruct me that I should build a ship
Alma 18:17	what is it that thy marvelings are so great
Mormon 6:19	how is it that ye could have fallen
Moroni 7:40	how is it that ye can attain unto faith save ye shall have hope

The critical text will maintain the occurrence of *that* here in 3 Nephi 27:4.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:4 the expected subordinate conjunction *that* in the *wh*-question “why is it **that** the people should murmur”.

■ 3 Nephi 27:5

ye must take upon you the name of Christ

which is [m >% NULL 0 | 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | in > NULL A] my name

The original manuscript is extant here for part of this verse, and it provides strong evidence that the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} for this part of the text. In \mathcal{O} itself, Oliver Cowdery started to write the word *my* at the end of the line. But only the initial *m* fit, and he decided not to hyphenate this two-letter word; instead he wrote the whole *my* at the beginning of the next line. Accordingly, he erased the line-final *m* that he had initially written in \mathcal{O} , but he did not cross it out. At first glance, his erased *m* looks like *in*, and this is precisely what the 1830 compositor initially set in the 1830 edition: “which is **in** my name”. Later, this typo was caught and an in-press change was made during the 1830 printing: the *in* was removed, giving the correct “which is my name”. The printer’s manuscript, also a direct copy of the original manuscript, has simply “which is my name” and was not the source for the incorrect insertion of the *in* in the initial typesetting of the 1830 edition. This variant does not affect the reading of the text, but it does provide further evidence that from Helaman 13:17 through Mormon the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} .

Summary: The correct text for 3 Nephi 27:5 is “which is my name”, not “which is **in** my name” (the initial reading for the 1830 edition).

■ 3 Nephi 27:8

for if a church be called

in [Meses 1 | Moses’ ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] name

then it be [moses 1 | Moses’ ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] church

As explained under Mosiah 13:5, in the Book of Mormon text the possessive form for the name *Moses* is simply *Moses’*, not *Moses’s*. As expected, the printer’s manuscript omits the apostrophe for both instances of *Moses’* here in 3 Nephi 27:8 (the first instance was miswritten as *Meses*). For

the lack of apostrophes in the manuscripts, see the discussion regarding “three days’ journey” under the 1 Nephi preface.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:8 the form *Moses’* as the possessive form for the name *Moses*.

■ 3 Nephi 27:8

or if it be called in the name of a man

then it be the church of [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | E] man

The typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition accidentally omitted the indefinite article *a* before *man*. Obviously, in this context “the church of **a** man” is correct; note the preceding use of “the name of **a** man”. The 1852 LDS edition restored the indefinite article in this passage. Jesus is not talking here about some generalized “church of man” in distinction to the “church of God”.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:8 the two instances of “a man”, the earliest reading as well as the expected reading.

■ 3 Nephi 27:11

but if it be not built upon my gospel

and is built upon the works of [§2 man >+ §1 men 1 | men ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] . . .

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote “the works of **man**” when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . This reading will work here, but then so will “the works of **men**”, the 1830 reading. When Oliver Cowdery proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , he restored the plural *men*, the undoubted reading in \mathcal{O} . The critical text will maintain the use of the plural *men* in this phrase. (There are no other instances in the Book of Mormon text of either the phrase “works of men” or “works of man”.)

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:11 the plural *men* in “the works of men”, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ 3 Nephi 27:14

and my Father sent me

that I might be lifted up upon the cross

and after that I had been lifted up upon the cross

[1ABCDEFGHIKPS | that FIJLMNOQRT] *I might draw all men unto me*

[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQ | : KPS | , RT]

that as I have been lifted up by men

even so should men be lifted up by the Father . . .

There has been some difficulty in this passage with the subordinate conjunction *that*. First of all, there is a *that* occurring with *after*. The *that* here is not a pronoun, nor has it been interpreted as such; that is, no comma can follow the *that* (see under Alma 5:5 for examples of the prepositional phrase “after that”). Instead, this particular *that* represents an archaic Early Modern English

construction which Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, almost totally removed from the Book of Mormon text. But from 3 Nephi to the end of the Book of Mormon, Joseph left a few examples of “<subordinate conjunction> that <finite clause>” when he edited the text for the 1837 edition, as in the following nearby instances of unedited *after that*:

3 Nephi 28:1 **after that** I am gone to the Father
 3 Nephi 28:3 **after that** ye are seventy and two years old

For a brief discussion of this usage, see under 1 Nephi 1:17; for a complete listing, see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Here in 3 Nephi 27:14, the 1852 LDS edition added an extra subordinate *that* between the *after*-clause and the following clause, thus directly conjoining that clause with the earlier *that*-clause: “and my Father sent me that I might be lifted up upon the cross and . . . that I might draw all men unto me”. What the original text intends here is a parenthetical compound sentence: “and after that I had been lifted up upon the cross / I might draw all men unto me”. This sentence implies something like ‘as a result of having been lifted up upon the cross, I am able to draw all men unto me’. The critical text will remove the secondary *that* introduced in the 1852 edition.

This compound sentence is then followed by another *that*-clause, but this one is an adverbial *that*-clause and the *that* here means ‘so that’. It is supposed to be conjoined with the first adverbial *that*-clause near the beginning of the verse:

3 Nephi 27:14 (with ellipsis)
 and my Father sent me
 that I might be lifted up upon the cross . . .
 that as I have been lifted up by men
 even so should men be lifted up by the Father

More modern editions have attempted to show this coordination by replacing the 1830 edition’s semicolon with either a comma (the LDS text) or a colon (the RLDS text). Perhaps this relationship could be shown even better by using dashes or parentheses:

3 Nephi 27:14
 and my Father sent me
 that I might be lifted up upon the cross
 —and after that I had been lifted up upon the cross
 I might draw all men unto me—
 that as I have been lifted up by men
 even so should men be lifted up by the Father

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 27:14 the earliest text by removing the intrusive *that* before the clause “I might draw all men unto me”; the compound sentence “and after that I had been lifted up upon the cross / I might draw all men unto me” is parenthetical and should be set off from the rest of the sentence by dashes or parentheses; in addition, the archaic use of *that* in the subordinate clause “after **that** <finite clause>” will be maintained in this sentence.

■ 3 Nephi 27:23–25

write the things which ye have seen and heard

save it be those which are forbidden

write the [§2 words >+ §1 works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | words] of this people

which shall be even as hath been written of that which hath been

for behold out of the books

which have been written and which shall be written

shall this people be judged

for by them shall their works be known unto men

Verse 24 in this passage shows two instances of a tendency to replace the original *works* with *words*. First of all, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *words* instead of the correct *works*, but Oliver Cowdery caught the error when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . Here the 1830 compositor set the correct *works*. The original manuscript undoubtedly read *works*. The same error replacing *works* with *words* occurred in the 1888 LDS edition, but that error was not transmitted to subsequent LDS editions since the 1888 edition never served as a copytext. For other examples where *work(s)* and *word(s)* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under Alma 12:12–14.

The reason for this re-occurring error here in 3 Nephi 27:24 is that we expect “write the words”, not “write the works”. The Book of Mormon text has 42 other sentences that refer to writing words, but no other sentences that refer to writing works. But in the larger passage for 3 Nephi 27:24, especially in the following verse, it is clear that Jesus wants the works of the people to be written down, not just their words, given that the people will be judged from the books that will be written, “for by them shall their **works** be known unto men”.

Summary: Maintain the use of *works* in 3 Nephi 27:24; although we normally expect to read “write the words” rather than “write the works”, *works* is supported by the language of the larger passage; it is also the 1830 reading and Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ 3 Nephi 27:25

out of the books which [have 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | hath K] been written

and which shall be written

Here the 1892 RLDS edition replaced the plural *have* with the biblically styled *hath*. As explained under the phrase “Nephi’s brethren rebelleth” in the 1 Nephi preface, plural subjects frequently take the historical third person singular ending *-(e)th* in the original text of the Book of Mormon. This example in the 1892 edition shows the opposite tendency, namely, of replacing the standard *have* with the biblical *hath* for the plural antecedent *books*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *have* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the plural verb form *have* in 3 Nephi 27:25 (“out of the books which **have** been written”); the accidental use of *hath* in the 1892 RLDS edition would have been possible in the original text, although not required.

(For the evidence against revising the second case to the singular, as “according to his **judgment** which is just”, see the discussion under Omni 1:22.) For each case of this phrase, the critical text will follow the earliest text, thus the singular “according to the **judgment** which I shall give unto you” here in 3 Nephi 27:27.

Summary: Maintain the singular *judgment* in 3 Nephi 27:27, the reading of the earliest textual sources (Ø and the 1830 edition).

■ 3 Nephi 27:28

and now I go unto [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | my N] Father

Here we have another typo in the 1906 LDS edition; in this instance, the typesetter replaced “**the** Father” with “**my** Father”. The 1906 reading was not extended to any subsequent edition since that edition never served as a copytext.

Of course, either reading is theoretically possible here, although elsewhere in the book of 3 Nephi Jesus uses “the Father” much more frequently than “my Father” (123 to 10). Also in the book of 3 Nephi, Jesus refers to himself as going to “the Father” six times (including here in 3 Nephi 27:28) but only once as going to “my Father” (marked below with an asterisk):

3 Nephi 17:4	but now I go unto the Father
* 3 Nephi 18:27	and then I must go unto my Father
3 Nephi 18:35	and now I go unto the Father
3 Nephi 18:35	because it is expedient that I should go unto the Father
3 Nephi 27:28	and now I go unto the Father
3 Nephi 28:1	what is it that ye desire of me after that I am gone to the Father
3 Nephi 28:4	what will ye that I should do unto you when I am gone unto the Father

Again, each reading is possible, but *the* is preferred. However, in the text immediately preceding this instance of “the Father” in 3 Nephi 27:28, there is an equal mixture of both types:

3 Nephi 27:13	I came into the world to do the will of my Father
3 Nephi 27:13	because my Father sent me
3 Nephi 27:14	and my Father sent me that I might be lifted up upon the cross
3 Nephi 27:14	even so should men be lifted up by the Father
3 Nephi 27:15	according to the power of the Father I will draw all men unto me
3 Nephi 27:16	him will I hold guiltless before my Father
3 Nephi 27:17	because of the justice of the Father
3 Nephi 27:26	all things are written by the Father

The sudden increased use of “my Father” seems to have led the 1906 typesetter to make the change to “my Father” here in verse 28. The critical text, as expected, will follow the earliest reading for each case of “the/my Father”, thus “the Father” here in 3 Nephi 27:28.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:28 the definite article *the* in the phrase “the Father”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 3 Nephi 27:28

*and verily I say unto you
 whatsoever **things** ye shall ask the Father in my name
 [it ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] shall be given unto you*

Here in 3 Nephi 27:28, the original manuscript undoubtedly read *things* (since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read in the plural), but such a reading in \mathcal{O} could be a mistake since the original text is followed by *it* in the following clause. The contradiction in number between *things* and *it* may have been one reason the editors for the 1920 LDS edition decided to remove the *it*. Another reason for removing the *it* was its redundancy. For discussion of other cases where a redundant *it* has been removed from the text, see under Alma 43:46. Such redundancy is, to be sure, fairly frequent in the original text.

Another possible emendation here in 3 Nephi 27:28 would have been to leave the redundancy of the *it* but change the plural *things* to the singular *thing*. One could argue, in fact, that Oliver Cowdery (the probable scribe here in \mathcal{O}) accidentally added the plural *s* while writing down Joseph Smith's dictation. See under 1 Nephi 15:11 for several examples where the scribes, including Oliver, mixed up the grammatical number for *thing(s)*.

As explained under 1 Nephi 18:6, the Book of Mormon text has plenty of examples of “whatsoever thing(s)”, with 11 instances in the singular and 11 in the plural (in the original text). So either is theoretically possible here in 3 Nephi 27:28. In fact, there are three cases where *it* is used to refer to a preceding singular “whatsoever thing”:

Enos 1:15

whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith
 believing that ye shall receive
 in the name of Christ
 ye shall receive **it**

Moroni 7:17

but **whatsoever thing** persuadeth men to do evil
 and believe not in Christ and deny him and serve not God
 then ye may know with a perfect knowledge **it** is of the devil

Moroni 7:26

whatsoever thing ye shall ask the Father in my name
 which is good
 in faith
 believing that ye shall receive
 behold **it** shall be done unto you

But there is also one instance where *it* refers to a preceding plural “whatsoever things”; this instance of disagreement in number has never been removed from the text:

Jacob 4:1–2

and we know that the things which we write upon plates must remain
 but **whatsoever things** we write upon any thing
 save **it** be upon plates
 must perish and vanish away

This example shows that the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 27:28 is textually acceptable. The critical text will therefore restore the original *it* here even though it refers to a plural “whatsoever things”. More generally, we should note, the original Book of Mormon text allows for the singular *it* to refer to plural subjects. For some additional examples, see the list under Helaman 13:31. And as explained under Alma 43:46, the redundancy of the *it* is also textually acceptable.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 27:28 the pronoun *it* in “it shall be given unto you” even though the *it* is redundant and refers to the earlier plural “whatsoever things”.

■ 3 Nephi 27:29

*therefore ask and ye shall receive
knock and it shall be opened unto you
for he that asketh receiveth
and [§2 to >+ §1 unto 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him that knocketh
it shall be opened*

□ Matthew 7:7–8 (King James Bible)

ask and it shall be given you
seek and ye shall find
knock and it shall be opened **unto** you
for every one that asketh receiveth
and he that seeketh findeth
and **to** him that knocketh
it shall be opened

This biblical quotation is based on Matthew 7:7–8; overall it is paraphrastic in 3 Nephi 27:29, but in many instances the phraseology is exactly the same. The one case of interest here is that in the printer’s manuscript scribe 2 wrote “& **to** him that knocketh it shall be opened”, which follows exactly the King James phraseology in the last part of Matthew 7:8. However, Oliver Cowdery (when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}) corrected the preposition *to* to *unto*. The 1830 edition, set here from the original manuscript, has *unto*, so *unto* was undoubtedly the reading in \mathcal{O} . Both Oliver and the 1830 typesetter probably wouldn’t have independently emended the text to *unto* since there is nothing wrong with *to*. The Book of Mormon text is in this regard more consistent than the King James Bible since in Matthew 7:7 we have *unto* in “knock and it shall be opened **unto** you” but in Matthew 7:8, the next verse, we have *to* in “and **to** him that knocketh it shall be opened”. Scribe 2’s *to* is probably just a simple scribal error on his part, especially since *to* is what we expect in modern English.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:29 the preposition *unto* in “and **unto** him that knocketh it shall be opened”; even though scribe 2 wrote “to you” (the King James reading) in the printer’s manuscript, the original manuscript undoubtedly read “unto you” since Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2’s *to* to *unto* and the 1830 edition independently has *unto*.

KING JAMES BIBLE	where moth and rust doth corrupt
BOOK OF MORMON	which moth doth corrupt
KING JAMES BIBLE	and where thieves break through and steal
BOOK OF MORMON	and which thieves can break through and steal

The critical text will therefore follow the 1830 reading, not Oliver’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} . And to be sure, the meaning supports the 1830 reading. No one would sell anything or anyone, much less the Lord, for “that moth which doth corrupt”. For further discussion of the possibility of omitting *which* after *that*, see under Mosiah 8:13.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 27:32 the 1830 reading, where *which* precedes *moth*; parallelism with the biblical language, as well as the intended meaning, supports the 1830 reading, not the impossible reading in \mathcal{P} (whether corrected or not).

■ 3 Nephi 27:33

*enter ye in at the [strait 1NOQRST | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMP] gate
for [strait 1NOQRST | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMP] is the gate
and narrow is the way that leads to life
and few there be that find it*

□ Matthew 7:13–14 (King James Bible)

enter ye in at the **strait** gate . . .
because **strait** is the gate
and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life
and few there be that find it

As explained under 1 Nephi 8:20, gates are referred to as being “strait” (that is, ‘narrow’) in the Book of Mormon text. The language is taken from the Sermon on the Mount, where the gate is, of course, narrow. In the manuscripts and early editions, the standard spelling distinction between *strait* and *straight* was basically ignored.

3 Nephi 28

■ 3 Nephi 28:2

and they all spake save it were three
[*saying* 1APRST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] . . .

The discourse connective *saying* was here omitted in the 1837 edition, probably accidentally since its deletion was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P} , nor were other instances of *saying* in the same context ever deleted in that edition. Elsewhere in the original text, there were 56 instances of “spake . . . saying”. In one instance, *saying* was permanently lost (in 1 Nephi 2:10, by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P}); in another instance, *saying* was incorrectly added (in 1 Nephi 7:1, again by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P}). Otherwise, each instance of “spake . . . saying” has been maintained, not only in the manuscripts but in every printed edition—except here in 3 Nephi 28:2. In this case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *saying* to the RLDS text (apparently by reference to \mathcal{P}); the 1920 LDS edition restored it to the LDS text (apparently by reference to the 1830 edition). The critical text will, to be sure, maintain the original *saying* here in 3 Nephi 28:2.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:2 the connective *saying* since it is found in the earliest textual sources (\mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition).

■ 3 Nephi 28:3

blessed are ye
because ye [*desire* 1PS | *desired* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *this thing of me*

The printer’s manuscript has the present-tense *desire*, the 1830 edition the past-tense *desired*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading of \mathcal{P} , *desire*, while the LDS text has maintained the past-tense *desired*.

The present-tense works best here in verse 3 since in the preceding verses the Lord has just asked the twelve disciples what their desire is:

3 Nephi 28:1–2

what is it that **ye desire** of me after that I am gone to the Father
and they all spake save it were three saying
we desire that after we have lived unto the age of man
that our ministry wherein thou hast called us may have an end
that we may speedily come unto thee in thy kingdom

The past-tense *desired* in verse 3 would work better if the nine disciples had expressed their desire some time earlier. Of course, one could argue that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} replaced an original *desired* with the present-tense *desire* because of the preceding instances of *ye desire* and *we desire* in verses 1 and 2.

Later in verse 5, the text does use the simple past-tense *desired* to refer to the desire of the three other disciples:

3 Nephi 28:5
and they sorrowed in their hearts
for they durst not speak unto him the thing which they **desired**

But this passage is part of Mormon's past-tense narrative, so the past-tense form is expected. Interestingly, in the following verses Jesus speaks of the desire of the three disciples in the present perfect:

3 Nephi 28:6
and ye **have desired** the thing
which John my beloved
which was with me in my ministry
before that I was lifted up by the Jews
desired of me

3 Nephi 28:9
and all this will I do because of the thing
which ye **have desired** of me
for ye **have desired**
that ye might bring the souls of men unto me
while the world shall stand

The simple past-tense *desired* at the end of verse 6 (“which John my beloved . . . desired of me”) is appropriate since John's request occurred some time earlier.

When we look at transmission errors involving changes in tense, we find that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} never made any errors replacing an original simple past-tense form with a present-tense form. On the other hand, there are quite a few cases where the 1830 compositor changed an original simple present-tense form to a past-tense form. In each of the following cases, there is nothing inappropriate about the present-tense form; and in one case (marked with an asterisk) the past-tense form does not work well for the given context:

1 Nephi 17:22 (*keep* > *kept*)
and we know that the people
which **were** in the land of Jerusalem
were a righteous people
for they [*keep* 01 | *kept* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the statutes
and the judgments of the Lord and all his commandments

* 2 Nephi 25:13 (*delighteth* > *delighted*)
wherefore my soul [*delighteth* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *delighted* A]
to prophesy concerning him
for I have seen his day

Jacob 2:23 (*are* > *were*)

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

Alma 1:18 (*murdereth* > *murdered*)

and they **durst** not steal for fear of the law
for such **were** punished
neither **durst** they rob nor murder
for he that [*Murdereth* >js *Murdered* 1 | *murdered* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
was punished unto death

Alma 11:36 (*speak* > *spake*)

behold thou hast lied
for thou sayest that I [*speak* 0 | §2 *spake* > §1 *speak* 1 |
spake ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
as though I had authority to command God

Moroni 9:10 (*devour* > *devoured*, *do* > *did*)

and after that they **had done** this thing
they **did murder** them in a most cruel manner
torturing their bodies even unto death
and after that they **have done** this
they [*devour* >jg *devoured* 1 | *devour* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their flesh
like unto wild beasts because of the hardness of their hearts
and they [*do* >jg *did* 1 | *do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it for a token of bravery

It should be noted that in two of the above passages, 1 Nephi 17:22 and Alma 1:18, the 1830 compositor was very likely influenced by nearby past-tense verb forms when he decided to change the present tense to the past. For Alma 11:36 we note that not only the 1830 compositor but also scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} made the change to the past-tense *spake*, yet Oliver Cowdery corrected the *spake* to the present-tense *speak* when he proofed \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} (in this instance, \mathcal{C} is extant and reads *speak*). But Oliver's correction in \mathcal{D} did not deter the 1830 compositor from setting *spake* when he set the type for this passage from \mathcal{D} ; for some reason he decided to accept scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} 's *spake*. Finally, we should note that the last case (in Moroni 9:10) is particularly interesting because here the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, directly marked in \mathcal{D} the change to the past-tense form for two verbs but then ended up ignoring those emendations when he set the type itself, probably because the preceding perfect form is in the present tense ("and after that they **have done** this"). It seems that Gilbert originally wanted the past-tense forms here because of the preceding occurrence of the past-tense *had done* and *did murder* earlier in the verse.

These examples provide considerable evidence that the 1830 compositor was the one responsible for changing an original *desire* to *desired* here in 3 Nephi 28:3. One could argue that *desired* is the more difficult reading, which makes one wonder why the compositor would set a difficult reading. But we have already seen in one case (in 2 Nephi 25:13) that the 1830 compositor's change to the past-tense form can create a difficult reading. The critical text will therefore restore here in 3 Nephi 28:3 the present-tense *desire*, the reading in \mathcal{D} ; the difficult *desired*, the 1830 reading, appears to be an error.

We should note here that the use of the present perfect in verses 6 and 9 of 3 Nephi 28 suggests that the verb in verse 3 could have originally been in the present perfect: “blessed are ye because ye **have desired** this thing of me”. If \mathcal{O} read this way, then the 1830 compositor must have accidentally dropped the perfect auxiliary *have*. But then scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} must have made a more complicated change, namely, altering the present perfect to the simple present tense by dropping not only the *have* but also the *d* at the end of the verb *desire*. It seems quite unlikely that both scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 compositor would have omitted the *have* in their transmission of the text. Another possibility, of course, is that the original text had the *have* but that it was omitted as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here for \mathcal{O}). Under that scenario, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} then made the change from *desired* to *desire*, while the 1830 compositor faithfully set the reading of his copytext. But as we have already seen, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was not prone to make this kind of change. Ultimately, the simplest solution is to accept the reading in \mathcal{P} , the present-tense *desire*, as the original reading for 3 Nephi 28:3.

For other examples of *blessed* followed by *because*, the tense in the *because*-initial clause or phrase is always in the present, never in the past; most are in the present perfect, but there is also one in the simple present tense (marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 2:1	blessed art thou Lehi because of the things which thou hast done
* 1 Nephi 11:6	and blessed art thou Nephi because thou believest in the Son of the Most High
Mosiah 26:16	and blessed are they because of their exceeding faith in the words alone which thou hast spoken unto them
Mosiah 26:17	and blessed art thou because thou hast established a church among this people

These examples provide internal support for the present-tense *desire* in 3 Nephi 28:3 (and also for the conjectured present-perfect *have desired*), but not for the past-tense *desired*.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:3 the present-tense *desire*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; the 1830 compositor appears to have replaced the original present-tense form with a past-tense form, a common enough error on his part elsewhere in the transmission of the text.

■ 3 Nephi 28:8

*ye shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye
from mortality to [Immortality 1 | immortality ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | immorality K]*

As discussed under Alma 40:2, there are a few places in the printed editions where *immortality* has been set as *immorality*, an obvious typo that has never persisted. Here the error occurred in the 1892 RLDS edition.

■ 3 Nephi 28:10

*and for this cause ye shall have fullness of joy
and ye shall sit down in the kingdom of my Father
yea your [joy 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | joys G] shall be full
even as the Father hath given me fullness of joy*

Here the typesetter for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the singular *joy* with *joys* in the clause “your joy shall be full”. The error was clearly unintentional. Note that the singular *joy* was correctly set elsewhere in the verse (for two instances of “fullness of joy”). In fact, there are no instances of the plural *joys* in the Book of Mormon text. Once Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *joys* instead of the correct *joy*, an error that he immediately corrected by erasure:

Alma 31:38
save it were swallowed up
in the [joy 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | joys >% joy 1] of Christ

Summary: Maintain the singular *joy* throughout the Book of Mormon text, including 3 Nephi 28:10, where the typesetter for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally set *joys*.

■ 3 Nephi 28:20

*but they did smite the earth
with the [§2 words >+ §1 word 1 | word ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of God*

The printer’s manuscript originally had the plural *words* in the phrase “with the words of God”, but the 1830 edition had the singular *word* (“with the word of God”). The plural *s* of *words* in \mathcal{D} was later crossed out with considerably heavier ink flow. The ink looks dark, but it does not look as black as the ink Joseph Smith used for other corrections on this page. Moreover, Joseph’s corrections have left stains on the following page of \mathcal{D} (the opposing recto), but the crossout of the *s* in *words* has not, which argues that this correction is not Joseph Smith’s. In addition, the crossout follows Oliver Cowdery’s style for crossing out single letters, not scribe 2’s. Thus Oliver probably made this change while proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} , and so \mathcal{C} very likely read in the singular. As explained under Alma 5:11, either *word* or *words* is possible for the phrase “the word(s) of God”, although the singular is normal.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 28:20 the singular *word* in “the word of God”, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} ; the plural *words* (what scribe 2 wrote in \mathcal{D}) is very likely an error.

■ 3 Nephi 28:20

*and therefore they could not dig pits
[sufficiently 1A | sufficient BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
to hold them*

The 1837 edition removed the adverbial ending *-ly* from *sufficiently* in favor of the adjective form *sufficient*. The assumption is that *sufficient(ly)* refers to some attribute of the pits; thus we expect an

adjective after *pits* (as if the sentence read “they could not dig pits big or deep enough to hold them”). Another possibility (theoretical, at least) is that *sufficient(ly)* refers to the digging itself, not the size of the pits; in other words, they could not dig enough pits to hold them. This interpretation would imply that there were so many disciples that they couldn’t dig enough pits. Of course, this is clearly the wrong interpretation.

In fact, the original adverb form *sufficiently* does not actually refer to some particular characteristic of the pits that failed to hold the disciples. Instead, the meaning of *sufficiently* here in 3 Nephi 28:20 is ‘competently enough’. The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that in Early Modern English the adjective *sufficient* also had the meaning ‘competent, capable, able’, now obsolete, with citations listed under definition 3a dating from late Middle English into the early 1800s; examples where *sufficient* is complemented by an infinitival clause headed by *to* (listed under definition 3b) date from late Middle English to Early Modern English and include this example from *Paradise Lost* (book 3, lines 98–102):

John Milton (1667)

. . . I made him just and right,
Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
 Such I created all th’ Ethereal Powers
 And Spirits, both them who stood and them who faild;
 Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell.

Here Milton is referring to the agency of man and is stating that man was made capable of either standing or falling.

Another striking use of *sufficient* with the archaic meaning ‘competent enough’ is found later on in the Book of Mormon text:

Mormon 2:18

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

In other words, Mormon has observed these conditions ever since he was capable or competent enough to do so. The word *sufficient* is not specifically referring to him being ‘old enough’ or ‘big enough’, although the question here is definitely one of maturation.

The critical text will therefore accept the adverbial form *sufficiently* here in 3 Nephi 28:20, with the understanding that it means ‘competently enough’; in other words, no pit was capable of holding Jesus’s disciples.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:20 the adverbial form *sufficiently*; here the use of the word *sufficiently* is an archaic one, dating apparently from Early Modern English, that means ‘competently enough’; in other words, they could not dig pits that were capable of holding the disciples; the adjective form *sufficient* has the same archaic meaning of ‘competent enough’ in Mormon 2:18.

■ 3 Nephi 28:21–22

*and thrice **they were** cast into a furnace and received no harm
and twice [were they 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | they were HKPS] cast into a den of wild beasts*

In this passage we may wonder about the word order after the initial adverbs *thrice* and *twice*. Based on the earliest textual sources (the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript), which agree here, we have the noninverted word order in verse 21 (“and thrice **they were** cast”) but the inverted word order in verse 22 (“and twice **were they** cast”). The RLDS text, beginning with the 1874 edition, switched to the noninverted word order in the second case (“and twice **they were** cast”), thus making the word order agree in both verses.

Undoubtedly, the mixed order occurred in the original manuscript. Still, one wonders if the first case might have been an error in the original manuscript—that is, perhaps the original text read with the inverted order (“and thrice **were they** cast”) and that somehow the word order got mixed up during the dictation of the text. There is some internal evidence favoring the inverted word order when the initial adverbial phrase tells us how many times something happened. We have only four other examples in the Book of Mormon, but each of these has the inverted order:

Jacob 5:69	only this once will I prune my vineyard
Alma 55:29	many times did the Lamanites attempt to encircle them about by night
Alma 55:30	and many times did they attempt to administer of their wine to the Nephites
Mormon 3:13	and thrice have I delivered them out of the hands of their enemies

But usually we get variability in word order for cases where there is an initial adverbial phrase; that is, for any particular adverbial phrase, either word order, inverted or noninverted, is possible. For an example, see the case of the sentence-initial “and then” under 3 Nephi 5:17. Since either word order is generally possible, the critical text will accept the variability of the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 28:21–22, namely, “thrice **they were** cast” in verse 21 but “twice **were they** cast” in verse 22.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:21–22 the noninverted order in verse 21 (“thrice **they were** cast”) and the inverted order in verse 22 (“twice **were they** cast”); these are the readings of the earliest textual sources (Ø and the 1830 edition) for this passage.

■ 3 Nephi 28:25

*behold I [were >js was 1 | were A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] about to write
the names of those who were never to taste of death*

As discussed under 3 Nephi 26:11, the critical text will restore the subjunctive use of *were* here in 3 Nephi 28:25. Such subjunctive usage is characteristic of earlier English as well as the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ 3 Nephi 28:27–28

*and behold they will be among the Gentiles
and the Gentiles [knoweth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | shall know RT] them not
they will also be among the Jews
and the Jews shall know them not*

In this passage, the first verse has the present-tense *knoweth*, which sounds strange given the preceding use of the future modal *will* (“they **will** be among the Gentiles”). In addition, the subject is plural and *knoweth* is supposed to have a third-person singular subject in standard biblical English. Accordingly, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended *knoweth* to *shall know*, as suggested by the language in the following parallel verse: “and the Jews **shall know** them not” (not “and the Jews **knoweth** them not”). This editing therefore eliminated an unusual present-tense verb form and increased the parallelism:

<i>verse 27</i> (1920 revision)	<i>verse 28</i>
and behold	
they will be among	they will also be among
the Gentiles	the Jews
and the Gentiles	and the Jews
shall know them not	shall know them not

The 1920 change was intentional since it is marked in the committee copy.

The phraseology here in 3 Nephi 28:27–28 may be related to John the Baptist’s language in John 1:26, which is quoted (along with other biblical sentences) in 1 Nephi 10:8:

1 Nephi 10:8
for there standeth one among you
whom ye know not

John 1:26 (King James Bible)
but there standeth one among you
whom ye know not

But these statements do not refer to the future, as 3 Nephi 28:27–28 does.

The original manuscript undoubtedly read *knoweth* in verse 27 since both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript agree here. It is doubtful that Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe here in \mathcal{O} , would have accidentally replaced a dictated *shall know* with *knoweth* (or that Joseph Smith would have made this particular change as he dictated the text). The emended reading *shall know* definitely works better, but it very likely does not represent the original text. Obviously, the use of *knoweth* gives an immediacy to the narrative, but then one wonders why the same present-tense construction wasn’t used in verse 28. In any event, the critical text will restore the original use of *knoweth* in verse 27, despite its difficulty.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:27 the original use of *knoweth* (“the Gentiles knoweth them not”), the reading of the earliest textual sources (\mathcal{O} and the 1830 edition).

■ 3 Nephi 28:29

and unto all nations

[*Kindreds* 1 | *kindred* A | *kindreds* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

tongues and people

As explained under 3 Nephi 10:2, the 1830 typesetter tended to replace *kindreds* with *kindred*. Here in 3 Nephi 28:29, he apparently made this mistake. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we always have agreement in number for the conjuncts *nation(s)*, *kindred(s)*, and *tongue(s)*—although the final conjunct, *people*, is always in the singular. Ignoring this singular *people*, we get all plurals nine times and all singulars eight times; thus the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 28:29 is very likely the result of the 1830 typesetter’s preference for the singular *kindred*. The subsequent edition (1837) restored the expected plural, *kindreds*.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:29 the expected agreement in number when *nation(s)*, *kindred(s)*, and *tongue(s)* are conjoined.

■ 3 Nephi 28:29

and it shall come to pass when the Lord seeth fit in his wisdom

that they shall minister unto all the scattered tribes of Israel

and unto all nations kindreds tongues and people

and shall bring out of them unto Jesus many souls

that their [desire 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | desires J] may be fulfilled

Here the earliest text has the singular *desire*, although in theory one’s plural desires can also be fulfilled. The 1888 LDS edition replaced the singular with the plural *desires*; but since that edition never served as a copytext, the plural reading was restricted to that edition. But the singular is definitely correct since these three disciples who are to remain have expressed a single desire, as mentioned earlier by Jesus:

3 Nephi 28:9

and all this will I do because of **the thing**

which ye have desired of me

for ye have desired that ye might bring the souls of men unto me

while the world shall stand

The critical text will retain the singular *desire* here in 3 Nephi 28:29.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:29 the original *desire* (that is, in the singular) since the three disciples had this special desire.

■ 3 Nephi 28:33

*and if ye had all the scriptures
which [gives >js give 1 | gives A | give BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] an account
of all the marvelous works of Christ . . .*

As discussed under Alma 34:30, the word *scriptures* sometimes acts as a single semantic unit. Thus here in 3 Nephi 28:33 the earliest text reads “all the scriptures which **gives** an account”, just as Alma 34:30 originally read “the holy scriptures **testifies**”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the third person singular verb form ending in *-(e)s* by removing it, giving *testify* in Alma 34:30 and *give* in 3 Nephi 28:33. The critical text will restore the original non-standard grammar in both cases since it appears to be fully intended.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:33 the third person singular form *gives*, the reading of the earliest textual sources (D and the 1830 edition); this kind of subject-verb agreement for the plural *scriptures* occurs elsewhere in the earliest text (namely, in Alma 34:30).

■ 3 Nephi 28:34

*and woe be unto him
[that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | that that MQ] will not hearken unto the words of Jesus . . .*

The compositor for the 1905 LDS edition created a dittography here, namely, *that that*. Interestingly, the compositor for the 1911 LDS edition, when he set the text from the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 edition, retained this dittography. The 1920 LDS edition removed the repeated *that*.

Summary: Maintain the nonrepeated *that* in 3 Nephi 28:34.

■ 3 Nephi 28:36

*and now behold as I spake concerning them
whom the [Lord had 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | had Lord F | Lord hath MQRT] chosen*

Here the 1905 Chicago edition replaced the past perfect auxiliary *had* with the present perfect *hath*; the error was very likely a typo on the part of the compositor for that edition. He was probably influenced by the use of the present perfect *hath* two verses earlier:

3 Nephi 28:34
and woe be unto him that will hearken unto the words of Jesus
and also to them which he **hath** chosen and sent among them

Elsewhere in this part of the Book of Mormon text, when referring to these twelve disciples of Christ, we always get *had* for the expression “the disciples whom Jesus **had** chosen” (or its equivalent): there are ten examples (eight in 3 Nephi, plus one in 4 Nephi 1:14 and another in Moroni 2:1). There are four other examples in the present perfect, but these are all in the first person singular, with Jesus himself speaking; here the expression takes the form “the disciples whom I **have** chosen” (or its equivalent).

Here in 3 Nephi 28:36, the secondary reading with *hath* has continued in the LDS text. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *had* here in 3 Nephi 28:36. (We also note here that the compositor for the 1852 LDS edition mixed up the order of *had* and *Lord*, setting the impossible “the had Lord”.)

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:36 the original *had* in “concerning them whom the Lord **had** chosen”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 3 Nephi 28:36

*yea even three which were caught up into [Heaven >+ the Heavens 1 |
the Heavens A | the heavens BCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | the heaven MOQ]*

The correct reading here is the plural noun phrase *the heavens*. In the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 originally wrote simply *Heaven*, but virtually immediately he corrected it to *the Heavens* (the correction is written with slightly heavier ink flow). The 1830 edition also reads *the Heavens*, which argues that \mathcal{O} read this way. Interestingly, the 1905 LDS missionary edition changed the plural *the heavens* to *the heaven*, by accident, it would appear. This secondary reading continued in two subsequent LDS editions (the 1907 vest-pocket edition and the 1911 large-print edition), but the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *the heavens* to the LDS text. For further discussion of the competition between *the heaven* and *the heavens*, see under 3 Nephi 26:3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:36 the plural noun phrase *the heavens*, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{O} .

■ 3 Nephi 28:36

*and now behold as I spake concerning them whom the Lord had chosen
yea even three which were caught up into the heavens
that I knew not whether they were **cleansed** from mortality to immortality*

The verb *cleanse* seems strange here. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, *cleanse* is used to refer to spiritual cleansing (from sin, iniquity, unrighteousness, or corruption). In the Book of Mormon, mortality per se is not explicitly viewed as needing cleansing (consider, for instance, Mormon’s arguments in Moroni 8 for why baptism of innocent children is inappropriate). Thus the verb *cleanse* seems out of place here in 3 Nephi 28:36.

When referring to going from mortality to immortality, there are several possibilities for the verb in the Book of Mormon text:

- to **become** immortal:
2 Nephi 9:13, 2 Nephi 9:15, Alma 11:45
- to **put on** immortality:
Enos 1:27, Mosiah 16:10, Alma 40:2, Mormon 6:21
- to be **raised** from mortality to immortality:
Alma 5:15, Alma 11:45, Alma 12:12, Alma 41:4

- to be **changed** from mortality to immortality:

Alma 12:20, 3 Nephi 28:8, 3 Nephi 28:15

More specifically, the text here in 3 Nephi 28 constantly uses the verb *change* to refer to the resurrection as well as the transfiguration of the three Nephite disciples (in attempting to determine what actually happened to their bodies so they would not die):

3 Nephi 28:8

ye shall be **changed** in the twinkling of an eye from mortality to immortality

[Jesus is here speaking of their eventual resurrection.]

3 Nephi 28:15

for it did seem unto them like a transfiguration of them

that they were **changed** from this body of flesh into an immortal state

3 Nephi 28:37

and he hath made it manifest unto me

that there must needs be a **change** wrought upon their bodies

3 Nephi 28:38

therefore that they might not taste of death

there was a **change** wrought upon their bodies

3 Nephi 28:39

now this **change** was not equal to that which should take place at the last day

but there was a **change** wrought upon them

3 Nephi 28:40

and at that day they were to receive a greater **change**

[Again Jesus is speaking of their eventual resurrection.]

If *cleansed* is an error for *changed* in verse 36, it did not occur when the text was transferred from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} or from \mathcal{O} into the 1830 edition since both those sources read identically here. Nor does the error seem like one that depends upon Oliver Cowdery mishearing Joseph Smith's *changed* as *cleansed*. More probable is the possibility that Joseph himself misread the word. Visually they are quite similar, with *h* lining up with *le* and *s* with *g*:

<i>changed</i>	CHANGED
<i>cleansed</i>	CLEANSSED

Perhaps the misreading was also facilitated by the reference in the previous verse to the judgment of God, which speaks of “an offended God who hath been trampled under feet of men” (3 Nephi 28:35), thus implying filth and dirt and perhaps suggesting *cleanse* for the verb. It's also possible that the visual similarity of *immortality* to *immorality* could have prompted the notion of uncleanness. (As evidence for such lexical interference, see under Alma 40:2 for the occasional change of *immortality* to *immorality* in the text.)

This emendation, replacing *cleansed* with *changed*, has been independently suggested in a number of personal communications, from Ross Geddes (3 November 2004), David Calabro

(17 November 2005), and Grant Hardy (5 November 2007). The critical text will accept *changed* as the original reading for this passage since *cleansed* seems quite inappropriate.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 28:36 the emendation *changed*, which Joseph Smith apparently misread as *cleansed* when he dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here in \mathcal{O}).

■ 3 Nephi 28:37

and he hath made it manifest unto me

that [S2 NULL > S1 there must 1 | there must ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] needs be a change wrought upon their bodies

or else [1 | it ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] needs be that they must taste of death

In this passage we have a couple of textual variants involving *needs be*. First, in the printer’s manuscript scribe 2 skipped *there must*, but Oliver Cowdery (when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}) inserted the *there must*. The 1830 compositor set the correct reading (“there must needs be a change”). For related discussion of this particular omission, see under Alma 28:2–3.

The second textual variant occurs in the next clause, where \mathcal{P} is missing the subject pronoun *it* but the 1830 edition has it. Yet one wonders here in this second case if the text shouldn’t read *must* in front of *needs be*. When we consider all other examples of *needs* in the Book of Mormon text, we find that there is always a preceding *must* except once when *needs* is a nonidiomatic plural noun: “according to their **needs** and their wants” (Mosiah 18:29). This example is not relevant here since in 3 Nephi 28:37 the word *needs* forms part of a modal phrase, where *needs* is an adverb form meaning ‘of necessity’ (see under the adverb *needs* in the Oxford English Dictionary). There are 43 occurrences in the earliest Book of Mormon text of *must needs*, most of which are followed by the verb *be* (29 times). Over half the time the subject is the expletive *it* (23 times), while there are five occurrences with the expletive *there*. In other words, there are no other examples like this case where *needs* is used alone, as if it were a modal verb. Similarly, the King James Bible has no examples of such a modal verb like *needs*, but there are 14 occurrences of *must needs* and two with a different preceding modal verb (*will needs* and *wouldest needs*). The biblical style, then, is to always precede the adverb *needs* with an actual modal verb.

It is obvious in 3 Nephi 28:37 that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} had a problem with *must needs* since there he omitted the phrase *there must* from “there must needs be a change wrought upon their bodies”. He also appears to have missed at least the *it* in the next example. Assuming that \mathcal{O} read “or else it must needs be that . . .”, then scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} must have also dropped the *must*; but such a reading of \mathcal{O} would imply that the 1830 compositor also dropped the *must*. A more reasonable possibility is that \mathcal{O} itself was missing the *must*, and this is why both the 1830 edition and \mathcal{P} do not have it. Of course, one could argue that \mathcal{O} correctly read “it needs be”, a unique expression for the Book of Mormon text. This reading could just be considered an exception to the otherwise consistent use of *must* in front of *needs*.

On the other hand, one might argue that \mathcal{O} actually read like \mathcal{P} (as “or else **needs** be that they must taste of death”) and that the 1830 compositor added the *it* when he set the text. In all other cases where *or else* is followed by a finite verb, the subject is always there:

Mosiah 4:28	or else thou shalt commit sin
Mosiah 7:11	or else I should have caused that . . .
Alma 34:9	or else all mankind must unavoidably perish
3 Nephi 13:24	or else he will hold to the one and despise the other

Of course, in these examples it seems rather inconceivable to delete the subject after *or else*, but actually that same difficulty occurs with the reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 28:37, "or else needs be that they must taste of death".

Given the otherwise systematic use of *must needs* in the Book of Mormon, it seems reasonable to assume that 3 Nephi 28:37 originally read "or else **it must needs be** that they must taste of death", especially since there was some scribal difficulty with both occurrences of *needs be* in this verse; if so, the original manuscript must have been missing the *must* before the second *needs be*. (This emendation supplying *must* was first proposed by Sara Pfister in her term paper for my winter 1995 Book of Mormon textual criticism class.)

One additional argument for why the *must* might be lacking in "or else it needs be" is that the modal in the following *that*-clause is *must* and that the text is consequently trying to avoid the repetition of the *must*. The problem with this argument is that there are three examples of *must needs* followed by a *that*-clause with the modal *must*:

2 Nephi 1:27	and it must needs be that the power of God must be with him
3 Nephi 5:1	for they knew that it must needs be that they must be fulfilled
3 Nephi 23:2	therefore it must needs be that he must speak also to the Gentiles

Don Brugger, however, points out (personal communication) that there are a couple instances where it could be argued that the repetition of *must* has been avoided in the Book of Mormon text:

3 Nephi 5:2 (<i>should</i> instead of <i>must</i>)	they knew it must needs be that all things should come to pass according to that which had been spoken
3 Nephi 26:12 (no modal for <i>be convinced</i>)	it must needs be that the Gentiles be convinced also that Jesus is the Christ

Despite these arguments against "it needs be", we can find evidence for this modal phrase in the history of English. For instance, *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> gives the following citation from the early 1700s:

Anthony Ashley Cooper (died 1713)
 how shall we say of this part of Virtue,
 that **it needs be** *taken upon Terms*?

Most other citations date from the 1800s, as in these examples:

James Fenimore Cooper (1829)	"since it needs be that . . ."
Henry William Herbert (1835)	"and, if it needs be, fire"
Herman Melville (1876)	"it needs be done"

Don Brugger has provided the following example of “it needs be” in the foreign state papers from the reign of Elizabeth I of Britain; this example dates from 13 April 1563:

All that is to be done now, must be with the Queen Mother and the Prince; the rest say they can do nothing, they have enough to do to save themselves. If **it needs be** that there must be war with them, he should send some one to entertain reiters.

(This citation is found at <www.british-history.ac.uk>. The word *reiters* apparently refers to German cavalry soldiers that were employed in the wars of the 16th and 17th centuries, as explained in the Oxford English Dictionary.) Brugger also points out that in this example the following *that*-clause has the modal *must*. In other words, one could argue for omitting the *must* from “it must needs be” when the following *that*-clause has a *must*. But as noted above, there are examples in the Book of Mormon which do not avoid the repetition of the *must*. The important point is that there is historical evidence for “it needs be”, the 1830 reading, here in 3 Nephi 28:37.

David Calabro also points out (personal communication) another possible emendation, the subjunctive “it need be”. And one could also include “it needs to be” as a possible emendation (thus “or else it needs to be that they must taste of death”). It turns out that neither of these two modal alternatives exist elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. So probably the best solution is to choose between the two earliest readings rather than choose between various emendations. Thus the critical text will maintain the 1830 reading, since it is possible. Even so, there is a good chance that “it needs be” is an error for “it must needs be”, the otherwise systematic reading in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 28:37 the 1830 reading, “or else it needs be that they must taste of death”; nonetheless, it is quite possible that this is an error for “or else it **must** needs be that they must taste of death” (given that the text otherwise has instances of only *must needs*); also maintain “there must needs be a change” earlier in the verse.

■ 3 Nephi 28:39

*now this change was not equal to that
which [should 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | shall RT] take place at the last day*

Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the modal *should* with *shall*. In modern English, the past-tense *should* characteristically takes a conditional sense. In order to avoid this interpretation for this sentence, the *should* was replaced by *shall*. There are a number of places in the text where future uses of *should* have been grammatically emended to *shall*, but others have been retained. For some discussion of cases where the 1830 typesetter made this emendation, see under 3 Nephi 1:8. Also see under 1 Nephi 3:19 for discussion regarding Joseph Smith’s editing out of the conditional modal when it referred to the future. The critical text will restore these original instances of past-tense modals such as *should* even when they refer to future time.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 28:39 the past-tense modal *should*, the reading of the earliest textual sources; such uses of past-tense modals to refer to future time were fairly common in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

3 Nephi 29

■ 3 Nephi 29:2

*and ye may know that the words of the Lord
which have been spoken by the holy prophets
shall [all 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] be fulfilled*

Here the word *all* was omitted in the 1840 edition, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the word to the RLDS text; the LDS text, since it derives from the 1837 edition but not the 1840 edition, has maintained the original *all*. The 1840 edition has this same typo in Helaman 14:7. As explained under that passage, the typesetter’s eye seems to have skipped the *all* because the immediately preceding *shall* ends in *all*.

Summary: Maintain the word *all* in 3 Nephi 29:2: “the words of the Lord . . . shall **all** be fulfilled”.

■ 3 Nephi 29:4

*and when ye shall see these sayings coming forth among you
then ye need not any longer spurn at the doings of the Lord
for the sword of his justice is in his right hand
and behold at that day
if ye shall spurn at his doings
he will cause [it 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that it shall soon overtake you*

Here in the 1837 edition the direct object pronoun *it* was removed from before the complementizing *that*-clause. This change may have been intentional, although Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, did not mark this deletion in the printer’s manuscript. The direct object *it* here probably refers to “the sword of his justice” that is mentioned earlier in the verse—that is, the sword of God’s justice “shall overtake you”, as in Old Testament references to the sword overtaking one:

1 Chronicles 21:12	while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh <i>thee</i>
Jeremiah 42:16	the sword which ye feared shall overtake you there in the land of Egypt

But as Don Brugger points out (personal communication), the *it* could also refer to “that day” as overtaking one, as in one of Paul’s epistles:

1 Thessalonians 5:4	but ye brethren are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief
---------------------	--

Under either antecedent, in English we expect such a direct object *it* to be followed by an infinitival complement rather than by a *that*-clause—in other words, something like “he will cause it **to** soon overtake you”. However, examples of a direct object followed by a complementizing *that*-clause for the verb *cause* do occur in the Book of Mormon; and in each case the subject of the *that*-clause is a pronoun which refers to the preceding direct object of the verb *cause*:

1 Nephi 17:46	he can cause the earth that it shall pass away
2 Nephi 5:17	I Nephi did cause my people that they should be industrious
Mosiah 6:7	and king Mosiah did cause his people that they should till the earth
Alma 21:3	they did cause the Lamanites that they should harden their hearts
Alma 58:11	he . . . did cause us that we should hope for our deliverance in him
Alma 60:17	causing them that they should suffer all manner of afflictions
Helaman 16:20	to cause us that we should believe in some great and marvelous thing
3 Nephi 2:3	and causing them that they should do great wickedness in the land
Mormon 3:5	I did cause my people that they should gather themselves together at the land Desolation
Ether 9:33	the Lord did cause the serpents that they should pursue them no more

None of these other examples have *it* as the direct object for *cause*, but note that in four cases the direct object is a pronoun which is then repeated (but in a different form, in accord with standard English) as the subject in the *that*-clause, thus “cause **us** that **we**” and “causing **them** that **they**”. In other words, we have examples that are equivalent to the original text in 3 Nephi 29:4, yet only one of these other examples has been edited (namely, the one in 2 Nephi 5:17). The problem with the 3 Nephi 29:4 example may have been the repetition of the *it*. Another possibility is that the direct object *it* was interpreted as an expletive *it* and thus considered unnecessary. Yet the original text is not difficult to understand. The original construction is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and will be restored here in 3 Nephi 29:4.

Summary: Restore the original text in 3 Nephi 29:4 with its repeated *it*: “he will cause **it** that **it** shall soon overtake you”; this kind of clausal construction for the verb *cause* is found fairly frequently elsewhere in the text, although not in this precise form.

■ 3 Nephi 29:7

yea and woe unto him that shall say at that day
 [1ABCDEFGHIJKPS | to get gain IJLMNOQRT]
that there can be no miracle wrought by Jesus Christ
 [for to get gain 1A | to get gain BCDEFGHKPS | IJLMNOQRT]
for he that doeth this shall become like unto the son of perdition

The 1879 LDS edition placed the infinitive phrase “to get gain” (originally in the archaic or colloquial form “for to get gain”) closer to the verb *say*. With the original placement, there is the possibility of misinterpreting this infinitive phrase as modifying the immediately preceding *that*-clause

(that is, “there can be no miracle wrought by Jesus Christ (for) to get gain”), which is clearly not the meaning of the text. In the early editions, a comma was used to separate off “(for) to get gain”, which helps the reader make the correct interpretation:

3 Nephi 29:7 (1830 accidentals)

yea, and wo unto him that shall say at that day,
 → that there can be no miracle wrought by Jesus Christ, for to get gain;
 for he that doeth this, shall become like unto the son of perdition,
 for whom there was no mercy, according to the word of Christ.

It is worth noting that in the RLDS text this emendation in word order has not been made. The 1830 punctuation, however, has the unusual use of a comma right before the *that*-clause (“say at that day, that . . .”). One possibility is to remove that comma but leave the one at the end of the *that*-clause (or to replace it with a dash):

3 Nephi 29:7 (revised accidentals)

yea, and woe unto him that shall say at that day
 → that there can be no miracle wrought by Jesus Christ—for to get gain;
 for he that doeth this shall become like unto the son of perdition,
 for whom there was no mercy, according to the word of Christ.

There are quite a few instances in the original text where phrases, usually prepositional, are displaced from where they are normally expected in English. For some discussion, see under Mosiah 26:23. For a more extensive list, see under **DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES** in volume 3. Here in 3 Nephi 29:7, the critical text will restore the infinitive phrase to its original position, after the *that*-clause, along with its original *for*. For discussion of the infinitival form “for to do something”, see under Mosiah 20:1 or, more generally, under **FOR TO** in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 29:7 the original infinitive phrase “**for** to get gain”—and in its original, displaced position after the *that*-clause; punctuation can be used to help the reader parse this difficult sentence; other instances of displaced phrases, usually prepositional, are fairly common elsewhere in the text.

■ 3 Nephi 29:7

for he that doeth this

shall become like [unto 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] the son of perdition

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the preposition *unto*. This appears to be a typo since most other instances of “like unto X” were left unchanged in the typesetting for the 1874 edition. Nonetheless, there was some tendency for that typesetter to omit the *unto* in “like unto X”. For two other cases, see under Alma 26:27 and 3 Nephi 20:7. Here in 3 Nephi 29:7, as in the two other cases, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the preposition *unto*.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 29:7 the use of *unto* in the phrase “like unto the son of perdition”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 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*

The printer’s manuscript has the plural “according to the **words** of Christ”, whereas the 1830 edition has the singular “according to the **word** of Christ”. In theory, either is possible. We get a second case of this variation, *words* in \mathcal{P} but *word* in the 1830 edition, later in this part of the text where both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} :

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 and did make a record
according to the **words** of Ammaron

When Joseph Smith edited this later passage for the 1837 edition, he emended the plural *words* in \mathcal{P} to the singular *word*, thus making \mathcal{P} agree with the 1830 reading. But we note that later in that verse, the plural “according to the **words** of Ammaron” occurs in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition, suggesting that the earlier 1830 reading *word* is an error for *words*.

Similarly, we can find support elsewhere for “according to the **words** of Christ” (but not for the singular “according to the **word** of Christ”):

3 Nephi 28:33
ye would—according to the **words** of Christ—
know that these things must surely come

Moroni 7:38
for no man can be saved
—according to the **words** of Christ—
save they shall have faith in his name

Moroni 10:26
and I speak it according to the **words** of Christ

These three examples argue that the correct text in 3 Nephi 29:7 should be the plural reading in \mathcal{P} . More generally, however, the text has examples of both “the word of Christ” (5 times) and “the words of Christ” (11 times); these frequencies exclude the case here in 3 Nephi 29:7. For discussion of one other case of variation, see under Alma 37:45.

Elsewhere in the text, we always get the plural “according to the words of X” whenever X refers to a human (usually X is a personal name):

<i>X</i>	<i>the word of X</i>	<i>the words of X</i>
Alma	—	1
Ammon	—	1
Jeremiah	—	1
Lachoneus	—	1

<i>X</i>	<i>the word of X</i>	<i>the words of X</i>
Nephi	—	2
Neum	—	1
Zenoch	—	1
Zenos	—	1
the prophet Zenos	—	1
the prophet	—	3

These examples support the plural *words* in Mormon 2:17 for both instances of “according to the **words** of Ammaron”. On the other hand, when referring to deity or angels, the singular is not only possible but is sometimes definitely preferred:

<i>X</i>	<i>the word of X</i>	<i>the words of X</i>
Christ	—	3
the angel	2	3
the Lord	4	1
God	6	—
Jesus	1	—

But when the noun is *Christ*, as already noted, the plural “according to the **words** of Christ” is otherwise preferred (here I exclude the case of 3 Nephi 29:7 from the above statistics).

When we turn to evidence from errors in transmission, we find that there is one clear instance where the 1830 typesetter replaced the plural *words* with the singular *word*:

Jacob 3:11
 hearken unto my [*words* 1T | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

On the other hand, there is also one clear instance where scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} accidentally replaced *word* with *words*:

3 Nephi 28:20
 but they did smite the earth
 with the [$\mathcal{S}2$ *words* >+ $\mathcal{S}1$ *word* 1 | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

In this case, Oliver Cowdery corrected this error of scribe 2’s when he proofed \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} ; Oliver’s corrected reading in \mathcal{D} agrees with the 1830 reading, thus arguing that here \mathcal{C} read in the singular as “with the **word** of God”. So transmission errors can be used to support either reading, *word* or *words*, as the original in 3 Nephi 29:7. As explained under 3 Nephi 1:16, the best solution here in 3 Nephi 29:7 is to follow the consistent reading since the evidence from transmission errors is indecisive. Thus the critical text will restore “according to the **words** of Christ” in 3 Nephi 29:7, the reading in \mathcal{D} . The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *words* with *word*, just as he apparently did once more (in Mormon 2:17).

Summary: Restore the plural *words* of the printer’s manuscript in both 3 Nephi 29:7 and Mormon 2:17; textual consistency argues for the plural *words* in the phrases “according to the **words** of Christ” and “according to the **words** of Ammaron”; in each of these cases, the 1830 singular *word* is apparently a typo.

■ 3 Nephi 29:8

yea and ye need not any longer hiss

nor spurn

nor make game of the Jews

*nor [§2 NULL > §1 of 1|of A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] any
of the remnant of the house of Israel*

In the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 wrote the text without the repeated *of* before *any* ("nor make game **of** the Jews nor any of the remnant of the house of Israel"), but later Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , corrected \mathcal{P} by inserting the *of* before the *any* ("nor make game **of** the Jews nor **of** any of the remnant of the house of Israel"). Since the 1830 edition also has the repeated *of* here, the original manuscript probably did too.

In the 1837 edition, the repeated *of* was again omitted, perhaps accidentally since either reading is theoretically possible. Also note that Joseph Smith did not remove the repeated *of* in \mathcal{P} when he edited the text for the 1837 edition. Nonetheless, one could argue that the repeated *of* was omitted for stylistic reasons, namely, in an attempt to reduce the frequency of the *of* in this phrase ("nor **of** any **of** the remnant **of** the house **of** Israel"). There is one other case of a repeated *of* involving the conjunction *nor*, but this one has never been removed from the text:

Jarom 1:2

but I shall not write the things **of** my prophesying nor **of** my revelations

Of course, there is only one instance of *of* in "nor **of** my revelations", so there would have been less of a need to omit the repeated *of*. In any event, the original repeated *of* will be restored in 3 Nephi 29:8 since there is nothing wrong with it and it occurs as the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Restore the repeated *of* in 3 Nephi 29:8 since the earliest textual sources have the *of* (thus "nor make game **of** the Jews nor **of** any of the remnant of the house of Israel").

3 Nephi 30

■ 3 Nephi 30:2

*turn all ye Gentiles from your wicked ways
and repent of your evil doings :
of your lyings
and deceivings
and [1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] your whoredoms
and of your secret abominations
and your idolatries
and of your murders
and [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | of GHK] your priestcrafts
and your envyings
and your strifes*

In this long conjunctive structure, we have some variation with respect to the repeated *of*. It should first be noted that the individual conjuncts vary considerably in the repetition of their elements. Even the *your* is not always repeated (in “of your lyings and deceivings”, perhaps because *lyings* and *deceivings* are virtually synonymous, unlike the other conjuncts). And the *of* is repeated even less. In one case, the 1830 edition has a repeated *of* (“and **of** your whoredoms”) but the printer’s manuscript does not (“and your whoredoms”). In a second case, the 1858 Wright edition added a repeated *of* (“and **of** your priestcrafts”), thus showing that the *of* could have been added in the earlier “and **of** your whoredoms”. For this second variant, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier reading without the *of*. Similarly, the critical text will follow the reading without the *of* in the second variant.

For the first variant, the evidence from textual transmission is fairly equally divided. As explained under 3 Nephi 9:5, the tendency has been about the same in the manuscripts and in the 1830 edition with respect to adding and deleting the preposition *of* in conjunctive structures. As far as this particular variant here in 3 Nephi 30:2 is concerned, we have one example where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the repeated *of* in a conjunctive structure, and that example is found nearby:

3 Nephi 29:8

*yea and ye need not any longer hiss nor spurn nor make game **of** the Jews
nor [§2 NULL > §1 of 1 | of A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] any
of the remnant of the house of Israel*

In this instance, the repeated *of* was also omitted in the 1837 edition (see the discussion under that passage). In contrast, there are two instances in the text where the 1830 typesetter accidentally added the repeated *of* in a conjunctive structure:

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
 and they which shall go with thee
 a great nation

In both of these passages, the critical text will restore the earliest reading without the repeated *of*. It should be noted, however, that we cannot conclude from these numbers that the 1830 typesetter tended to add the *of* more frequently than scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted it since the typesetter set the entire Book of Mormon text while scribe 2 wrote down only 15 percent of \mathcal{P} . We should also keep in mind that overall the more frequent tendency in the history of the text has been to omit rather than add function words. Since the transmission evidence is otherwise fairly equally divided here in 3 Nephi 30:2, the critical text will accept the longer reading with the *of*, the 1830 reading, as the probable reading in \mathcal{O} as well as the reading of the original text.

Nonetheless, there is one parallel passage that provides some support for the reading in \mathcal{P} . This passage has the same noun conjuncts as here in 3 Nephi 30:2 (namely, *whoredoms* and *secret abominations*), yet the *of* is repeated only for the second conjunct:

3 Nephi 16:10

when the Gentiles shall sin against my gospel . . .
 and shall be filled with all manner **of** lyings
 and **of** deceits and **of** mischiefs
 and all manner **of** hypocrisy
 and murders and priestcrafts
 → and whoredoms and **of** secret abominations

Of course, in 3 Nephi 30:2 both noun conjuncts are modified by *your*:

3 Nephi 16:10

and whoredoms
 and **of** secret abominations

3 Nephi 30:2 (the reading in \mathcal{P})

and your whoredoms
 and **of** your secret abominations

Except for the repeated *your*, the parallelism is identical. Even so, 3 Nephi 16:10 shows considerable variation in the repetition of the *of*. Similarly, there is considerable variation in the repetition of the *of* in 3 Nephi 30:2, which makes one unsure of how much to make of the lack of *of* being repeated before *whoredoms* in this particular sequence involving *whoredoms* and *secret abominations*. Note that there are differences in the occurrence of *of* when we line up all the parallel nouns in both these passages (here I follow the order of the noun pairs in 3 Nephi 16:10):

3 Nephi 16:10

of lyings
and **of** deceits

and murders
and priestcrafts

and whoredoms
and **of** secret abominations

3 Nephi 30:2

of your lyings
and deceivings

and **of** your murders
and your priestcrafts

and (**of**) your whoredoms
and **of** your secret abominations

Excluding the case of *whoredoms*, there is agreement in three cases in the occurrence or non-occurrence of the *of*; but in two cases there is disagreement: (1) “and **of** deceits” versus “and deceivings” and (2) “and murders” versus “and **of** your murders”. So the larger context provides no strong support for the occurrence or nonoccurrence of the *of* before *whoredoms*.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 30:2 the 1830 reading with the repeated *of* (thus “and **of** your whoredoms”); this decision is based largely on the stronger tendency in the history of the text to omit function words rather than add them; under this interpretation, the reading in \mathcal{P} , without the *of*, is the result of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitting the *of* when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} ; nonetheless, the possibility remains that the 1830 typesetter added the *of*; in 3 Nephi 30:2 the critical text will also maintain the shorter reading without the *of* before “your priestcrafts”.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

4 Nephi

4 Nephi

■ 4 Nephi 1:2

and there was no contentions

[§2 & >+ §1 *nor* > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *disputations among them*

Oliver Cowdery, when he was proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} , initially thought “no contentions **and** disputations” was an error for “no contentions **nor** disputations”, so he changed scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} ’s ampersand to *nor*. But then in checking \mathcal{C} more closely, he realized that the text indeed read “no contentions **and** disputations”, so he restored the correct reading, *and*. The 1830 edition (set from \mathcal{C} for this part of the text) reads *and*, thus supporting the occurrence of *and* in \mathcal{C} .

There are no other examples in the text of the construction “no X and Y”, where X and Y are nouns. There is, however, one example of “no X and no Y”:

2 Nephi 31:13

acting **no** hypocrisy **and no** deception before God

On the other hand, there are numerous examples of “no X nor Y”, what we expect in English:

2 Nephi 2:13

if there be **no** righteousness **nor** happiness
there be **no** punishment **nor** misery

Mosiah 14:2

he hath **no** form **nor** comeliness

Mosiah 27:4

that they should let **no** pride **nor** haughtiness disturb their peace

Mosiah 29:14

that there should be **no** wars **nor** contentions
no stealing **nor** plundering nor murdering nor . . .

Alma 4:1

there was **no** contentions **nor** wars in the land of Zarahemla

Alma 16:1

there having been **no** wars **nor** contentions
for a certain number of years

Alma 40:13

they have **no** part **nor** portion of the Spirit of the Lord

3 Nephi 4:2

there was **no** wild beasts **nor** game in those lands

3 Nephi 6:22

now there was **no** lawyer **nor** judge nor high priest
that could have power to condemn any one to death

4 Nephi 1:16

and there were **no** envyings **nor** strifes nor tumults nor . . .

Mormon 9:7

there is **no** revelations **nor** prophecies nor gifts nor . . .

Thus it is not surprising that Oliver initially replaced the *and* with *nor* in 4 Nephi 1:2. Clearly, \mathcal{C} itself read *and*; and since that reading is theoretically possible, the critical text will accept it despite its uniqueness in the text.

Summary: Maintain in 4 Nephi 1:2 the occurrence of *and* in the negative conjunctive noun phrase “no contentions and disputations” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ 4 Nephi 1:3

*and they had all things common among them
therefore [there 1ABCGHKPRT | they DEFIJLMNOQS] were not rich and poor / bond and free
but they were all made free and partakers of the heavenly gift*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the existential *there* with the subject pronoun *they*, probably under the influence of the preceding and following instances of *they*: “and **they** had all things common among them . . . but **they** were all made free and partakers of the heavenly gift”. The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *there*. Interestingly, the 1953 RLDS edition made the same change from *there* to *they*, probably independently. For other cases where *there* has been replaced by *they*, see under 3 Nephi 7:2–3.

It is possible that the *there* of the earliest textual sources (the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript) is a mistake for *they* (although the original manuscript itself very probably read *there*). During the dictation of the text, the existential *there* could have entered the text under the influence of the immediately preceding *therefore*. But in support of *there*, there are other examples in the text of the negative existential *there were not*:

Mosiah 25:2

now **there were not** so many of the children of Nephi
or so many of those which were descendants of Nephi
as there were of the people of Zarahemla

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

Alma 51:21

that **there were not** any known by the appellation of kingmen

The second example is particularly relevant since the following *yea*-clause has the pronoun *they* (“yea **they** were not half so numerous”), thus giving an example like 4 Nephi 1:3 where the passage switches from the existential *there* to the pronoun *they*. There is consequently no strong reason to emend the *there* in 4 Nephi 1:3 to *they*.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in 4 Nephi 1:3 with its original existential *there*: “therefore there were not rich and poor / bond and free”.

■ 4 Nephi 1:5

*insomuch that they did heal the sick
and raise the dead
and cause the lame to walk
and the blind to receive [their 1ABCGHKPRST | DEFIJLMNOQ] sight
and the deaf to hear
and all manner of miracles did they work among the children of men*

Here we have another error in the 1841 British edition, the loss of the determiner *their* before *sight*. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *their* to the LDS text. Parallel usage earlier in the text supports the expression “the blind to receive **their** sight”:

Mosiah 3:5

the Lord Omnipotent . . . shall go forth amongst men
working mighty miracles
such as healing the sick
raising the dead
causing the lame to walk
the blind to receive **their** sight
and the deaf to hear
and curing all manner of diseases

Remarkably, except for the verb in the summarizing statement at the end, we have the same sequence of verbs phrases: “heal the sick / raise the dead / cause the lame to walk / the blind to receive their sight / the deaf to hear”. Thus the use of *their* in 4 Nephi 1:5 is firm.

Summary: Maintain the use of *their* before *sight* in 4 Nephi 1:5, the earliest reading; the parallel language in Mosiah 3:5 provides strong support for the expression “the blind to receive **their** sight”.

■ 4 Nephi 1:5

and all manner of miracles did they work among the children of men

[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and in*

□ *nothing did they work miracles save it were in* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

□ NULL D

the name of Jesus

Once more, we have an error by the 1841 typesetter. In this case, his eye skipped from the first to the second *in* in this passage, thus ending up with the abbreviated expression plus an odd use of the semicolon: “and all manner of miracles did they work among the children of men; and in the name of Jesus”. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the missing text, “nothing did they work miracles save it were in”. The copytext for the 1841 British edition was the 1837 edition. For this part of the text, the first *in* occurs at the end of the line, the second just below, one word from the end of the line, thus facilitating the skip:

4 Nephi 1:5–6 (1837 typesetting, original word spacing retained; bolding added)

sight, and the deaf to hear; and all manner of miracles
did they work among the children of men; and **in**
nothing did they work miracles save it were **in** the
name of Jesus. And thus did the thirty and eighth

Summary: Maintain the longer, original text in 4 Nephi 1:5, “and in nothing did they work miracles save it were in the name of Jesus”.

■ 4 Nephi 1:6

*and thus did the thirty and eighth year pass away
and also the thirty and ninth
and [the 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] forty and first
and the forty and second*

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition omitted the definite article *the* before “forty and first”. In this case, the LDS text has maintained the shorter reading up through the present edition. Note that other numbers in this passage have the *the* before the number: “**the** thirty and eighth year . . . **the** thirty and ninth . . . **the** forty and second”. We get the same use of *the* later on in this verse as well as in verse 14:

4 Nephi 1:6

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

4 Nephi 1:14

and it came to pass that
the seventy and first year passed away
and also **the** seventy and second year
yea and in fine until **the** seventy and ninth year had passed away
yea even an hundred years had passed away

The critical text will restore the original *the* before “forty and first”. For a similar loss of *the* before a number (in this case, in the 1892 RLDS edition), see nearby under Mormon 3:8. It is possible that the loss of the *the* was influenced by the fact that the text sometimes refers to the passing of time by specifying a set number of years, in which case the *the* is not used (as in 4 Nephi 1:6: “yea even until forty and nine years had passed away”).

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* before “forty and first” in 4 Nephi 1:6; the current reading without the *the* is quite odd since all the surrounding references to a specific year have the *the*.

■ 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*

Numerous readers have noticed that the text here is missing the expected “and the fortieth” as well as “and the fiftieth”. In both cases the list goes from the first to the ninth year but skips mentioning the decade year. Both cases in 4 Nephi 1:6 could be looked upon as a visual skip, from an original *fortieth* to *forty and first* and from an original *fiftieth* to *fifty and first*. Such an emended text would read:

- 4 Nephi 1:6 (possible emendation)
- and thus did the thirty and eighth year pass away
and also the thirty and ninth*
- *and the **fortieth**
and the forty and first
and the forty and second
yea even until forty and nine years had passed away*
- *and also the **fiftieth**
and the fifty and first
and the fifty and second
yea and even until fifty and nine years had passed away*

Even so, a similar instance of specifying the years, from the first to the ninth, is found later in verse 14:

- 4 Nephi 1:14
- and it came to pass that the seventy and first year passed away
and also the seventy and second year
yea and in fine until the seventy and ninth year had passed away
yea even an hundred years had passed away*

There is no mention there of the decade years, the seventieth or the eightieth. The omission of the decade years in verses 6 and 14 definitely appears to be intentional. The critical text will maintain the reading of all the textual sources in 4 Nephi 1:6, despite the striking lack of the decade years in that passage.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in 4 Nephi 1:6 where the decade years are lacking; there is no reference to the fortieth or the fiftieth years, just as in 4 Nephi 1:14 there is no reference to the seventieth or the eightieth years.

■ 4 Nephi 1:6

yea [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] *even until fifty and nine years had passed away*

In this instance, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the conjunction *and* after *yea*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and*. For other cases where *yea and* has been accidentally reduced to *yea*, see under 3 Nephi 1:17.

Summary: Maintain in 4 Nephi 1:6 the occurrence of *and* after *yea*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ 4 Nephi 1:7–8

yea insomuch that they did [*build* 1PRST | *fill* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ] *cities again*
where there had been cities burned
yea even that great city Zarahemla did they cause to be built again

The printer’s manuscript has *build* rather than the 1830 edition’s *fill*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored *build*, the reading in \mathcal{P} , to the RLDS text. The 1920 LDS edition restored *build* to the LDS text, either by conjecture or by reference to the RLDS text.

Internal evidence argues that the original text (and probably \mathcal{O}) read *build*. The 1830 *fill* is most likely due to the typesetter misreading *build* as *fill* (since the visual contour for both words is similar). The following *yea*-clause uses the verb *build* (“yea even that great city Zarahemla did they cause to be **built** again”). This supports the use of *build* earlier on in the verse since *yea*-clauses typically restate or qualify a preceding statement.

Elsewhere in the text, cities are built (19 more times), as in these five examples referring to the rebuilding of cities (just as in 4 Nephi 1:7–8):

Alma 49:2	and behold the city had been rebuilt
Alma 49:3	the city of Ammonihah had been rebuilt
Alma 49:3	that it was in part rebuilt
3 Nephi 6:7	there were many cities built anew
Ether 13:5	it should be built up again an holy city unto the Lord

In one place (quoting from Isaiah 14:21 in the King James Bible), “the face of the world” can be filled with cities, but cities themselves are not said to be filled:

2 Nephi 24:21	nor fill the face of the world with cities
---------------	--

In other words, there are no examples referring to the filling up of cities.

Summary: The reading of the printer’s manuscript in 4 Nephi 1:7 (“they did build cities again”) makes very good sense and is consistent with other passages in the Book of Mormon that refer to building cities; the 1830 reading, “they did fill cities again”, is probably a visual misreading of the original manuscript’s *build* as *fill*.

■ 4 Nephi 1:14

yea and in fine

[*until* 1PS | *till* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the seventy and ninth year had passed away*

The printer's manuscript has the normal *until*, but the 1830 edition has *till*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored *until*, in accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} . The LDS text has maintained the 1830 *till*. Oliver Cowdery frequently spelled *until* as *untill*, especially in the original manuscript, where there are only a few examples of him spelling it as *until*:

	<i>until</i>	<i>untill</i>
□ extant cases in the original manuscript	6	31
□ in the printer's manuscript	113	53

So it is quite possible that the 1830 *till* was the result of misreading *untill* in \mathcal{O} as *till*. Even so, there are no other examples of any mix-ups between *until* and *till* in the early transmission of the text. The only other case involves the 1840 edition, where *until* was replaced by *till* in Alma 19:16 (see under that passage for discussion).

Elsewhere in the text, in all other clauses referring to *year(s)*, we have only *until* (13 times), never *till*, as in these five examples from 4 Nephi:

4 Nephi 1:6	yea even until forty and nine years had passed away
4 Nephi 1:6	yea and even until fifty and nine years had passed away
4 Nephi 1:18	until an hundred and ten years had passed away
4 Nephi 1:34	even until two hundred and thirty years had passed away
4 Nephi 1:48	even until the three hundred and twentieth year from the coming of Christ

More generally, there are only seven examples in the original text of the conjunction *till*. But none of these refer to the passing of a specific time. For a list of those seven instances, see under Alma 19:16. Internal evidence suggests that the original text probably read *until* here in 4 Nephi 1:14.

Summary: Restore the use of *until* in 4 Nephi 1:14, which is consistent with all other uses in the Book of Mormon of *until* whenever we have the specification of a year.

■ 4 Nephi 1:14

and there were other disciples ordained in their stead

[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and also many of that generation [which 1ABCDEFGHijklmnopqs | RT] had passed away

Here in 4 Nephi 1:14, the 1920 LDS edition removed what appeared to be a sentence fragment by deleting the relative pronoun *which*. This interpretation of the syntax was prompted by the original 1830 punctuation, namely, the semicolon that the 1830 typesetter placed after the word *stead*. Another way to view this passage is to remove the semicolon and interpret it as an existential sentence involving the conjoining of two noun phrases. In fact, if the ellipsis were filled in, we would get “and there were other disciples ordained in their stead and **there were** also many of that

generation which had passed away”. There are other passages in the text where either *there were* or *there was* is ellipted before a conjoined noun phrase:

Alma 42:18

now **there was** a punishment affixed
and a just law given
which brought remorse of conscience unto man

Alma 49:30

yea and **there was** continual peace among them
and exceeding great prosperity in the church

3 Nephi 6:8

and **there were** many highways cast up
and many roads made which led from city to city
and from land to land and from place to place

Ether 15:25

and when the night came
there was thirty and two of the people of Shiz
and twenty and seven of the people of Coriantumr

In addition, an existential *there* can be followed by the noun *generation* modified by a relative clause, although for none of these is there a conjoined noun phrase:

Mosiah 26:1

now it came to pass that
there was many of the rising generation
that could not understand the words of king Benjamin

Helaman 13:10

and **there shall be** those of the fourth generation
which shall live of your enemies
to behold your utter destruction

These examples thus suggest that if the original ellipted conjunctive structure in 4 Nephi 1:14 were to be emended, the more appropriate alternative would be to insert an extra *there were* (“and there were other disciples ordained in their stead and **there were** also many of that generation which had passed away”). There are examples in the text of such repetition, as in 3 Nephi 6:7: “there were many cities built anew and **there were** many old cities repaired”. Here in 4 Nephi 1:14, the critical text will restore the original text with its relative pronoun *which*; the existential *there were* is not repeated, but the 1830 semicolon between the two noun clauses will be removed.

Summary: Restore in 4 Nephi 1:14 the original conjoined noun phrase in the existential sentence: “and there were other disciples ordained in their stead and also many of that generation **which** had passed away” (thus retaining the original relative clause, “which had passed away”).

■ 4 Nephi 1:16

*and there were no envyings
 nor strifes nor tumults nor whoredoms
 nor [lyeings >% lyeing 1 | lyings ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 nor murders nor no manner of lasciviousness*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the plural *lyings* (spelled as *lyeings*), then erased the final *s*. The 1830 edition has the plural *lyings*. One definitely expects the plural *lyings* among all the conjoined plural nouns (*envyings*, *strifes*, *tumults*, *whoredoms*, and *murders*). Since scribe 2 was not inclined to consciously emend the text, the odds are that the original manuscript read in the singular and that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the plural because he expected it. Scribe 2 caught his error immediately and erased the plural *s*, thus choosing, it would appear, to follow his copytext, \mathcal{O} . If this is the case, it means that the 1830 typesetter also made the change to the plural *lyings*, perhaps because the singular *lying* seemed so out of place given the other plural nouns.

This example has already been discussed in some detail under Alma 12:1, 3. In Alma 12:1 we have evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to accidentally write the plural *s* for *lying*; and in Alma 12:3 we have evidence that the 1830 typesetter was willing to emend the number for *lying*, although in that case his change was from the plural to the singular (here in 4 Nephi 1:16 he appears to have changed the singular to the plural). As explained under Alma 12:1, 3, usage elsewhere in the text argues for the plural *lyings* as the reading of the original text here in 4 Nephi 1:16. In other words, during Joseph Smith's dictation of the text, Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O} for 4 Nephi) seems to have neglected to write the plural *s* for *lyings*. Elsewhere in \mathcal{O} , Oliver frequently miswrote a singular for an original plural, as in the following examples of errors where the plural is expected and nearby words are in the plural:

1 Nephi 17:3

wherefore he did provide [*way > ways 0*] and **means** for us
 while we did sojourn in the wilderness

1 Nephi 17:51

and hath wrought so **many** [*miricle > miricles 0*] among the children of men

2 Nephi 23:3 (Isaiah 13:3)

I have commanded my sanctified [*one > ones 0*]
 I have also called my mighty **ones**

Alma 30:28

and hath brought them to believe
 by their **traditions** and their **dreams** and their **whims**
 and their [*vision > visions 0*] and their pretended **mysteries**

Alma 44:5

and by the sacred support which we owe
 to our [*wife > wives 0*] and our **children**

Alma 44:18

but behold their naked **skins** and their bare **heads**
 were exposed to the sharp [*sword > swords 0*] of the Nephites

Alma 45:2

believest thou the words which I spake unto thee
concerning **those** [*Reckord* 0 | *reckords* 1] which have been kept

In all but one of these cases, Oliver caught his error in \mathcal{O} (in Alma 45:2 he corrected *Reckord* to *reckords* only when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P}). In addition, the example in Alma 30:28 shows that such an error can occur in a conjunctive structure containing a whole series of plural nouns (although in this case Oliver caught his error in \mathcal{O}).

The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading, *lyings* (also scribe 2's initial reading), as the correct reading in 4 Nephi 1:16. \mathcal{O} probably read in the singular, as *lying* (perhaps spelled as *lieing* by Oliver Cowdery), but this would have been an error for *lyings*.

Summary: Accept in 4 Nephi 1:16 the plural *lyings* (the reading of the 1830 edition and the initial reading in \mathcal{P}) since all the other conjuncts are in the plural and usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural in such a context.

■ 4 Nephi 1:16–17

and there were no envyings nor strifes nor tumults nor whoredoms nor lyings nor murders

- (1) [*nor no* >js *nor any* 1 | *nor no* A | *nor any* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *manner of lasciviousness . . . there were no robbers*
- (2) [*nor no* 1A | *nor* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *murderers neither were there Lamanites*
- (3) [*nor no* 1A | *or any* BCDEGHK | *nor any* FIJKLMNOPQRST] *manner of ites*

Here in these two verses, we have some variation in the editing of the multiple negative *nor no*. In the first case, Joseph Smith edited *nor no* to *nor any*. In the second case, *nor no* was edited to simply *nor* (in the 1837 edition). The editing for the first two cases has been retained in all subsequent editions. And in the third case, the 1837 edition replaced *nor no* with *or any*, while the 1852 edition restored the *nor*, thus giving *nor any*. There are examples of both *nor any* and *or any* in the original text, as in the following pair of examples involving *any thing*:

Mosiah 13:24 (Exodus 20:17)

thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house . . .
nor any thing that is thy neighbor's

Alma 7:21

neither can filthiness **or any thing** which is unclean
be received into the kingdom of God

In the second instance, the 1953 RLDS edition changed the *or* to *nor*, but in this case either conjunction is possible in English. The critical text will, of course, restore all three original instances of the multiple negative *nor no* in 4 Nephi 1:16–17.

One question that arises here in 4 Nephi 1:16–17 is whether the second example of *nor no* could have been edited to *nor any* instead of simply *nor*, thus “there were no robbers nor any murderers”. However, there is a difference in usage in the Book of Mormon text; namely, *nor any* (whether original or edited) is restricted to the last item in a series of negative conjuncts and that item, it turns out, acts as a kind of *et cetera* (thus covering all remaining possibilities):

Mosiah 2:12 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)
 as I have been suffered to spend my days in your service
 even up to this time
 and have not sought gold nor silver
nor [*no >js any 1 | no A | any BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] **manner** of riches
 of you

Mosiah 3:17 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)
 there shall be no other name given
nor [*no >js any 1 | no A | any BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] **other way nor means**
 whereby salvation can come unto the children of men . . .

Mosiah 13:24 (Exodus 20:17)
 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

Mosiah 29:14 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)
 that there should be no wars nor contentions
 no stealing nor plundering nor murdering
nor [*no >js any 1 | no A | any BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] **manner** of iniquity

Alma 7:21 (1953 RLDS edition)
 neither can filthiness
 [*or 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | nor s*] **any thing** which is unclean
 be received into the kingdom of God

4 Nephi 1:16 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)
 and there were no envyings nor strifes nor tumults
 nor whoredoms nor lyings nor murders
nor [*no >js any 1 | no A | any BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] **manner** of lasciviousness

4 Nephi 1:17 (1852 LDS edition)
 neither were there Lamanites
 [*nor no 1A | or any BCDEGHK | nor any FIJLMNOPQRST*] **manner** of ites

The same restriction applies to *or any*, again whether original or edited:

Mosiah 12:36 (Exodus 20:4)
 thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image
or any likeness of any thing in the heaven above
 or things which is in the earth beneath

Mosiah 13:12 (Exodus 20:4)
 thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image
or any likeness of things which is in heaven above
 or which is in the earth beneath
 or which is in the water under the earth

Alma 7:21

neither can filthiness

[*or* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | *nor* s] **any thing** which is unclean
be received into the kingdom of God

Alma 19:24

and they durst not put forth their hands to touch him

or any of those which had fallen

Alma 31:5

yea it had had more powerful effect upon the minds of the people
than the sword **or any thing else** which had happened unto them

4 Nephi 1:17 (1837 edition)

neither were there Lamanites

[*nor no* 1A | *or any* BCDEGHK | *nor any* FIJKLMNQPQRST] **manner** of ites

For a complete discussion of *nor no* and other negative connectors in the text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the three original instances of *nor no* in 4 Nephi 1:16–17; the original text has numerous instances of multiple negation.

■ 4 Nephi 1:17

there were no robbers

nor no [*murderers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST | *murders* HK]

The 1874 RLDS edition has *murders* in place of *murderers*. This change seems to be a simple visual misreading of the copytext. The 1892 RLDS edition followed this error, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *murderers*. The original manuscript here undoubtedly read *murderers*, but it is theoretically possible that the original text itself could have read *murders*. Yet elsewhere the text always combines *murderers* (not *murders*) with other agents (such as *robbers*, *plunderers*, and *thieves*):

Helaman 2:10	this band of robbers and secret murderers
Helaman 6:18	those murderers and plunderers
Helaman 6:18	Gaddianton's robbers and murderers
Mormon 2:10	the thieves and the robbers and the murderers

Thus *murderers* is undoubtedly correct in 4 Nephi 1:17 because it is conjoined with *robbers*.

Summary: Maintain the use of *murderers* with *robbers* in 4 Nephi 1:17.

■ 4 Nephi 1:19

*and it came to pass that
Nephi
he that kept [the 1PS | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] 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*

The printer’s manuscript has “**the** last record”, but the 1830 edition has “**this** last record”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading of \mathcal{P} . However, it is apparent from the context that the word *last* must mean ‘last mentioned’, not the final record of the Nephites. Moroni, not Nephi, kept the final (or last) record of the Nephites.

Moreover, transmission errors strongly suggest that the more frequent tendency was to accidentally replace *this* with *the* rather than the other way around (see, for instance, under Helaman 14:20 the extensive list of mix-ups between *the* and *this* in the early transmission of the text). In particular, there are four clear instances where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *the* instead of the correct *this*, including one that involves *record*:

Mormon 7:8

therefore repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus
and lay hold upon the gospel of Christ which shall be set before you
not only in [§2 *the* >+ §1 *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] record
but also in the record which shall come unto the Gentiles from the Jews

In this later passage, Oliver Cowdery corrected “in the record” to “in this record” when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . And his correction agrees with the reading of the 1830 edition, which was set from \mathcal{C} . Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} probably wrote “in the record” in Mormon 7:8 because of the phrase “in the record” that follows: “but also in **the** record which shall come unto the Gentiles from the Jews”. Similarly, here in 4 Nephi 1:19 scribe 2 may have written *the record* in place of *this record* because of *the plates* in the immediately following “and he kept it upon **the** plates of Nephi”. For another case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have replaced an original *this* with *the*, see under Mormon 1:16. On the other hand, there are no clear cases where the 1830 typesetter replaced an original *the* with *this*; for discussion of this point, see under Helaman 14:21 (and earlier under Helaman 14:20).

Summary: Maintain “this last record” in 4 Nephi 1:19, the 1830 reading; here “this last record” means ‘this last-mentioned record’, not ‘the final Nephite record’; there is also considerable manuscript evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to replace *this* with *the*, including one other case where he replaced *this record* with *the record*.

■ 4 Nephi 1:20

*and there was still peace in the land
save it were a small part of the people
which had revolted from the church
and [took 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | taken RT] upon them the name of Lamanites*

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced *took* with *taken*. The assumption behind this editing is that the original text conjoined two past-perfect verb phrases, equivalent to “had revolted . . . and had took” but without repeating the *had*. Thus the 1920 editing is basically replacing the nonstandard “had took” with the standard “had taken”. This same change has been made in several other places in the text. For a list, see under Alma 8:26. The critical text will restore the original *took* since “had took” is possible in the original Book of Mormon text. (Theoretically *took* could simply be the simple past-tense form of the verb *take*. For this possibility, see the discussion of the phrase “had read and saw” under 1 Nephi 1:14.)

Summary: Restore in 4 Nephi 1:20 the original use of *took* as either the past-participial form or the simple past-tense form for the verb *take*.

■ 4 Nephi 1:25

*and from that time forth they did have their goods
and their [substance 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | substances K] no more common among them*

Here the compositor for the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally set the singular *substance* as a plural. He may have been influenced by the preceding plural *goods*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct singular. There is one other passage in the history of the text where the plural *substances* has occurred, namely, in Mormon 8:37. In that passage, it appears that Ⓔ itself read *substances*, although this may be an error for *substance*. For discussion, see under that passage.

Summary: Maintain in 4 Nephi 1:25 the singular *substance*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ 4 Nephi 1:27

*yea there were churches which professed to know the Christ
and yet they did deny the more [part 1PS | parts ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] of his gospel*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads in the singular, “the more **part** of his gospel”, while the 1830 edition has the plural, “the more **parts** of his gospel”. As explained under Helaman 6:21, the most likely reading here in 4 Nephi 1:27 is the one with the unexpected plural *parts*.

■ 4 Nephi 1:27–29

*there were **many churches** in the land*
yea there were [1A | many BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] churches
which professed to know the Christ
and yet they did deny the more parts of his gospel
insomuch that they did receive all manner of wickedness
and did administer that which was sacred unto him
to whom it had been forbidden because of unworthiness
*and **this church** did multiply exceedingly because of iniquity*
and because of the power of Satan which did get hold upon their hearts
*and again there was **another church** which denied the Christ*
and they did persecute the true church of Christ
because of their humility and their belief in Christ

There are two problems in this passage. First, in verse 27 the 1837 edition inserted the indefinite quantifier *many* before *churches* in the *yea*-clause, probably because of the immediately preceding “there were **many churches** in the land”. This change could well be accidental. It is definitely not necessary for the sense. Since both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript lack the *many* in the *yea*-clause, most probably the original manuscript also lacked it. It is possible, of course, that the determiner *many* was lost while writing down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Nonetheless, given that the *yea*-clause does not need the *many*, the earliest text (“yea there were churches”) will be restored in the critical text.

The other problem in this passage is the textual switch from the plural *churches* in verse 27 to the singular *church* at the beginning of verse 28 (“and **this church** did multiply exceedingly”). In verse 27 the text quite clearly is referring to more than one church (even if *many* is not included in the *yea*-clause). This shift from plural *churches* to singular *church* appears to have been original to the text. The singular usage in verse 28 (“this church”) is supported by the singular in verse 29 (“and again there was **another church**”). One could possibly emend verse 27 in the *yea*-clause by having “yea there was a church”, but then the use of the *yea*-clause would seem strange since the preceding clause definitely refers to “many churches”.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) another possible way to interpret the difference between *churches* and *church* in this passage. The initial “many churches” in verse 27 could refer to various congregations (or churches, in the plural) that all belonged to the same sect (or church, in the singular), thus “this church” in verse 28. There is definitely evidence in the Book of Mormon text for such usage, as in Mosiah 25:22: “and thus notwithstanding there being many churches they were all one church / yea even the church of God”. (See under Alma 8:23 for a complete discussion of the two distinct meanings in the Book of Mormon text of the word *church*.) In other words, the two instances of *church* in 4 Nephi 1:28–29 may refer to different sects, while *churches* in verse 27 may refer to different congregations of the same sect. Yet even with this interpretation for 4 Nephi 1:27–29, the shift does strike one as odd, especially since there is no explanation as in Mosiah 25:22 for the shift in grammatical number. In any event, the shift here in 4 Nephi 1:27–29 does appear to be intended and the critical text will retain it.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *many* in the *yea*-clause in 4 Nephi 1:27, giving “yea there were churches which professed to know the Christ”; the unexpected shift from plural *churches* in verse 27 to singular *church* in verses 28–29 appears to be original to the text and will be retained.

■ 4 Nephi 1:33

and they also cast them into dens of wild beasts
and they did play with [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | H] wild beasts
even as a child with a lamb

In this verse the typesetter for the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the definite article *the* from before the second occurrence of *wild beasts*, probably because the first occurrence lacks the *the*. The first occurrence, of course, introduces the noun phrase to the passage, so the use of the definite article with the following occurrence of *wild beasts* is what we expect in English. In this instance, the subsequent RLDS text (1892) restored the *the*, which is unusual for that edition; the 1892 edition rarely departs from the 1874 edition, its copytext, and then usually by accident.

Summary: Maintain the definite article *the* before the second occurrence of *wild beasts* in 4 Nephi 1:33; the first occurrence of *wild beasts* lacks the *the* because it introduces this phrase to the passage.

■ 4 Nephi 1:36

in this year there arose a people
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[was 1A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] called the Nephites
and they were true believers in Christ

In this passage, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition treats *people* as a plural; thus he changed “a people which was” to “a people who were”. The plural usage for *people* is characteristic of Joseph’s editing for the 1837 edition (as is his change of *which* to *who* when *which* refers to people); this same editing is found in the following example where Joseph Smith edited an original “this people which is” to “this people who are”:

Alma 9:19
 nay he would rather suffer that the Lamanites might destroy all
 this people [*which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST*]
 [*is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | were J*] called the people of Nephi

But there are still two instances of semantically singular *people* in the text:

Alma 30:24–25
 ye say that this people is a free people . . .
 ye say that this people is a guilty and a fallen people

These expressions are, to be sure, fairly awkward for modern speakers of English, but the use of *this* in each case supports the use of the singular verb *is*.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith typically made the change from *which* to *who* (or *whom*) when the antecedent was *people*, but there are ten instances where he didn’t,

most of which are found at the end of 2 Nephi and at the beginning of the book of Jacob, as in these examples:

2 Nephi 29:1	to recover my people which are of the house of Israel
Jacob 1:2	this people which are called the people of Nephi
Jacob 1:13	the people which were not Lamanites
Jacob 2:32	the cries of the fair daughters of this people which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem

The critical text will, of course, restore all instances of original *which*. For a complete discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 4 Nephi 1:36 the original *which* and the singular *was* in the relative clause that modifies *people*; such usage is characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text.

■ 4 Nephi 1:36

*and it came to pass that in this year there arose a people
which was called [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] Nephites*

The 1892 RLDS edition omitted the definite article *the* before *Nephites*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading with the *the* to the RLDS text. The reading without the *the* is possible. In fact, usage later on in this verse and the two following verses supports the possibility of omitting the definite article before the name of a people:

4 Nephi 1:36–38	and among them there were they which was called by the Lamanites
→	Jacobites and Josephites and Zoramites therefore the true believers in Christ and the true worshippers of Christ . . .
→	were called Nephites and Jacobites and Josephites and Zoramites and it came to pass that they which rejected the gospel
→	were called Lamanites and Lemuelites and Ishmaelites

Note especially the use of “were called Nephites” in verse 37. More generally, however, either reading, with or without the *the*, is possible in verse 36, although for most instances referring to what a people were called, the definite article is lacking:

2 Nephi 5:14	the people which were now called Lamanites
Jacob 1:13	now the people which were not Lamanites were Nephites nevertheless they were called Nephites Jacobites . . .
Mosiah 25:12	and be numbered among those which were called Nephites
Mosiah 29:44	among all the people which was called the Nephites
Alma 2:11	the people of Amlici . . . being called Amlicites and the remainder were called Nephites
Alma 3:11	whosoever would not believe in the tradition of the Lamanites . . . were called the Nephites
Alma 23:17	and they were called by this name and were no more called Lamanites
Alma 30:59	among a people which had . . . called themselves Zoramites

4 Nephi

Alma 46:28	and those which had dissented which were called Amalickiahites
Alma 53:16	and they called themselves Nephites
Helaman 3:16	until they are no more called the Nephites
3 Nephi 2:16	and they were numbered among the Nephites and were called Nephites
3 Nephi 3:24	and there were a great many thousand people which were called Nephites
3 Nephi 10:18	and also they which had been called Lamanites
Mormon 1:9	now the Lamanites and the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites were called Lamanites

Since the definite article is possible, it will be retained before *Nephites* here in 4 Nephi 1:36.

Summary: Maintain in 4 Nephi 1:36 the use of the definite article *the* before *Nephites* (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ 4 Nephi 1:38

*and they did not dwindle in unbelief
but they did willfully rebel against the gospel of Christ
and they did teach their children that they should not believe
even as their fathers from the beginning did dwindle*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 3 November 2004) suggests that the phrase “in unbelief” is missing at the end of this verse. Except for one case, all other occurrences of *dwindle* (25 of them) have “in unbelief” following. The exception is in Helaman 4:23, where the reference to dwindling apparently refers to the church diminishing in size (“because of their iniquity the church had began to dwindle”).

Another way to read the end of 4 Nephi 1:38 is as a case of ellipsis, although there is no ellipsis of this phrase elsewhere in the text. In fact, no other passages show such an ellipsis when two instances of *dwindle* occur close together:

1 Nephi 12:22–23

behold these shall dwindle **in unbelief**
and it came to pass that I beheld that
after they had dwindled **in unbelief** . . .

2 Nephi 26:15

after that my seed and the seed of my brethren shall have dwindled **in unbelief** . . .
and all they which have dwindled **in unbelief** shall not be forgotten

Helaman 15:15

for behold had the mighty works been shewn unto them
which have been shewn unto you
yea unto them which have dwindled **in unbelief**
because of the traditions of their fathers
ye can see of yourselves
that they never would again have dwindled **in unbelief**

The last part of 4 Nephi 1:38 refers to the children of these willfully unbelieving parents, suggesting that the children's unbelief would have been a case of dwindling. In this instance, it seems unlikely that the phrase "in unbelief" was lost as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. The critical text will accept the earliest reading in 4 Nephi 1:38; in other words, we have a case of ellipsis that purposely lacks a final "in unbelief".

Summary: Accept at the end of 4 Nephi 1:38 the earliest reading without the phrase "in unbelief" after the word *dwindling*; here the phrase "in unbelief" appears to be ellipted.

■ 4 Nephi 1:39

and it was because of the wickedness

and [abominations 1ABCEDEGHKPS | abomination FIJLMNOQRT] of their fathers

The 1852 LDS edition replaced the plural *abominations* with the singular. This reading has persisted in the LDS text. As explained under Helaman 13:17, either number for *abomination(s)* is possible when conjoined with *wickedness*, although the plural dominates. In each instance, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus the plural *abominations* here in 4 Nephi 1:39.

Summary: Restore in 4 Nephi 1:39 the plural *abominations*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 4 Nephi 1:43

and also the people which were called the people of Nephi

began to be proud in their hearts because of their exceeding riches

and [became 1KPS | become ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT] vain

like unto their brethren the Lamanites

Here the printer's manuscript reads *became*, while the 1830 edition reads *become*. The question, then, is whether the meaning is 'the people began to be proud and to become vain' (the reading of the 1830 edition and most editions) or 'the people began to be proud and they became vain' (the reading of the printer's manuscript and RLDS editions since 1892).

Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote the letters *a* and *o* similarly, so it is quite possible that scribe 2 in the printer's manuscript misinterpreted *become* in the original manuscript as *became*. But of course the opposite could have happened: the 1830 typesetter could have misread a *became* in the original manuscript as *become*. For other instances where *become* and *became* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under Alma 13:9.

The best evidence for resolving this problem comes from usage elsewhere in the text. First of all, we have four examples in the text where the verb in the conjoined clause is in the past tense and thus agrees with a *began* in the preceding clause:

1 Nephi 4:30

he **began to tremble**

and **was** about to flee from before me and return to the city of Jerusalem

Alma 18:24

and Ammon **began to speak** unto him with boldness

and **said** unto him . . .

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
and **were** led away by some . . .

Ether 6:19

and the brother of Jared **began to be old**
and **saw** that he must soon go down to the grave

In these instances, the first clause refers to a continuous action, but the following conjoined clause refers to a completed specific action.

In contrast, there are 39 cases where the conjoined clause is in the infinitive form (there are examples with and without the repeated infinitival marker *to*), as in Helaman 16:12, where the *to* is not repeated: “the people **began to be** more hardened in iniquity and **do** more and more of that which was contrary to the commandments of God”. (For further discussion of this type, see under Alma 16:2.) Thus either the past-tense *became* or the infinitival *become* is theoretically possible here in 4 Nephi 1:43.

Ultimately, the real issue here in 4 Nephi 1:43 is whether it is textually possible to have the expression “begin to become”. Elsewhere in the text, there are no other examples of “begin to become” (although there are 111 occurrences of “begin to be”, with 105 of them with the past-tense form *began*, including here in 4 Nephi 1:43: “began to be proud”). Thus the use in the current text of “began to . . . become vain” in 4 Nephi 1:43 is unique. Semantically, “begin to become <adjective>” is possible, but nonetheless it seems strange. Instead of this expression, the text relies on “begin to wax <adjective>” (7 times), as in 3 Nephi 2:3: “the people began to wax strong in wickedness and abominations”. Thus here in 4 Nephi 1:43, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“began to be proud . . . and became vain”) is probably the original reading.

Summary: Adopt the reading of the printer’s manuscript in 4 Nephi 1:43 (“began to be proud . . . and became vain”) since otherwise in the text there are no occurrences of “begin to become”.

■ 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*

As explained under Helaman 16:10, here in 4 Nephi 1:47 the original text (and apparently the original manuscript) had an instance of the Hebraistic *and* for the main clause “Amos died” that completes the subordinate *after*-clause and follows the intervening parenthetical clause (“and the people did still remain in wickedness”). For the latter part of the Book of Mormon text, the 1830 compositor generally deleted such non-English uses of *and*. For three nearby examples of this editing on his part, see under 3 Nephi 23:8, Mormon 1:5, and Mormon 3:4. The critical text will restore all these original instances of *and*.

Summary: Restore in 4 Nephi 1:47 the original Hebraistic use of *and* before the main clause “Amos died”.

■ 4 Nephi 1:47

*and his brother [Ammoron/Ammaron 1 | Ammaron ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | Ammoron PS]
did keep the record in his stead*

This is the first occurrence of the name *Ammoron/Ammaron* that refers to the prophet who kept the Nephite record just before Mormon. This name occurs ten times in the text. In the 1830 edition, set from the original manuscript, the name is always spelled *Ammaron*, while in the printer's manuscript (also deriving from the original manuscript), scribe 2 spells this name consistently as *Ammoron*, although here in the first case scribe 2's first *o* almost looks like an *a*. This variability involving scribe 2's *o/a* for the first occurrence of the name in \mathcal{P} suggests that the *a* spelling could be correct.

There is considerable evidence that in the printer's manuscript scribe 2 frequently wrote actual *a*'s as *o*'s. Consider these examples from his copywork in \mathcal{P} :

	MANUSCRIPT SPELLING	STANDARD SPELLING
Mosiah 28:19	ore	are
Mosiah 29:42	offairs	affairs
Alma 2:23	thot	that
Alma 2:28	hond	hand
Alma 3:18	foll	fall
Alma 4:15	come	came
Alma 5:23	monner	manner
Alma 5:37	ofter	after
Alma 12:31	gove	gave
3 Nephi 21:17	standing	standing
3 Nephi 26:19	mon	man
3 Nephi 27:21	olso	also
3 Nephi 28:38	toste	taste
Mormon 2:1	some	same
Mormon 9:13	bond	band

And the opposite occurs, although not as frequently:

	MANUSCRIPT SPELLING	STANDARD SPELLING
Alma 1:3	labar	labor
Alma 5:7	awake	awoke
Alma 9:17	periad	period
3 Nephi 20:43	extalled	extolled

So there is a possibility that scribe 2 intended to write *Ammaron* when he wrote the name as *Ammoron* for the first time (in 4 Nephi 1:47).

Elsewhere in the text, scribes as well as the 1830 typesetter had occasional difficulty spelling *a* and *o* for numerous names and nouns specific to the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 19:1	<i>Jordon</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>Jordan</i> (1830, King James Bible)
2 Nephi 20:26	<i>Mideon</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>Midian</i> (1830, King James Bible)
Jarom 1:14	<i>Joram</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>Jarom</i> (1830)
Alma 10:2	<i>Gidanah</i> (scribe 2 in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>Giddonah</i> (1830)
Alma 11:9	<i>sean</i> (scribe 2 in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>seon</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , as corrected; 1830)
Alma 11:11	<i>omnor</i> (scribe 2 and Oliver Cowdery initially in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>ammor</i> (scribe 2 and Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , as corrected; 1830)
Alma 11:13	<i>anti</i> (scribe 2 in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>an onti</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , as corrected; 1830)
Alma 50:25	<i>Morionton</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C}) versus <i>Morianton</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} ; 1830)
Alma 50:40	<i>Parhoron</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C}) versus <i>Pahoran</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} ; 1830)
Helaman 8:19	<i>Zenos</i> (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P}) versus <i>Zenas</i> (1830)

All these examples show that Oliver Cowdery, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , and the 1830 typesetter mixed up *a* and *o*, especially in unknown names and words. Sometimes an *o* replaces a correct *a*; sometimes the opposite occurs. In fact, examples can be found in both directions for each one of these three individuals.

Related to this problem is the spelling of three other names in the Book of Mormon. The spelling for each of these names is very close to the 1830 spelling *Ammaron* here in 4 Nephi 1:47 (and one is identical to *Ammoron*, the spelling in \mathcal{P}):

- *Amaron* (second record keeper in the book of Omni)
 - 2 occurrences (Omni 1:3–4)
 - spelled consistently as *Amaron* in \mathcal{P} and 1830 (\mathcal{C} not extant)
- *Ammoron* (Amalickiah's brother)
 - 24 occurrences (from Alma 52:3 through Helaman 1:16)
 - spelled consistently with the *o* vowel and with two *m*'s in both manuscripts except for the following two initial errors in \mathcal{C} :
 - 4th occurrence (Alma 54:1)
[*Amamoron* >+ *Amoron* 0 | *Ammoron* 1A]
 - 12th occurrence (Alma 55:1)
[*Amoron* > *Ammoron* 0 | *Ammoron* 1A]
- *Amoron* (Nephite general)
 - 1 occurrence (Moroni 9:7)
 - spelled consistently as *Amoron* in \mathcal{P} and 1830 (\mathcal{C} not extant)

So for each of these three additional names the scribal evidence supports a distinct spelling (*Amaron*, *Ammoron*, and *Amoron*). Thus the question is whether the spelling for the name of the prophet immediately preceding Mormon is the same as the Nephite dissenter *Ammoron* or whether that name takes on a distinct, fourth spelling. In fact, the relationship of *m* versus *mm* between *Amoron* and *Ammoron* argues that *Amaron* might have a parallel name differing by only *m* versus *mm*—that is, *Ammaron*.

One could interpret *Ammoron/Ammaron* as a compound name derived from (or related to) the name *Moron* (also note *Moroni* and *Moronihah*). If so, one could then argue for an *o* vowel in *Ammoron* (as *Am+moron*). But this argument seems somewhat tangential since we also have the distinct names *Amaron* and *Amoron*, yet we would not want to argue that *Amaron* is an error for *Amoron* simply because of the name *Moron*.

Ultimately, it is hard to decide between *Ammoron* and *Ammaron* for the spelling of the name of the prophet in 4 Nephi and Mormon. But since scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have mixed up the *a* and *o* for common words as well as for the first spelling of the name *Ammoron/Ammaron* here in 4 Nephi 1:47, the more probable spelling for this prophet's name is the spelling found in the 1830 edition (namely, *Ammaron*).

Summary: Accept the 1830 spelling *Ammaron* for the name of the prophet that preceded *Mormon*; in this case we end up with four distinct Book of Mormon names: *Amaron*, *Amoron*, *Ammaron*, and *Ammoron*.

■ 4 Nephi 1:48–49

*Ammaron being constrained by the Holy Ghost
did hide up the records which were sacred
—yea even all the sacred records which had been handed down from generation to generation
which were sacred—
even until the three hundred and twentieth year from the coming of Christ
and [1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did hide them up unto the Lord*

The pronoun *he* in 4 Nephi 1:49 seems to have been lost while copying into the printer's manuscript. The long preceding passage hardly tolerates an ellipted pronoun here. Moreover, as discussed under Alma 11:2, there are five other instances in the text where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the subject pronoun *he*, including two after *and* (namely, in Alma 8:22 and Alma 11:2). In all these five other cases, the *he* was supplied by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . It is true that there is a strong motivation to add the pronoun here in 4 Nephi 1:49. It is possible that Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C}) could have omitted the *he* in \mathcal{C} and that the 1830 typesetter decided to supply it. But as has been shown over and over again in this part of the analysis (from Helaman 13:17 through Mormon), the text generally tended to become shorter in its early transmission, with small words being lost here and there, providing the scribe or typesetter was trying to simply copy the text (rather than edit it). The critical text will therefore assume here in 4 Nephi 1:49 that the original text had the *he*.

It is also worth noting the repetition of the relative clause “which were sacred” in this passage: “the records **which were sacred** / yea even all the sacred records which had been handed down

from generation to generation / **which were sacred**". Although one could view this repetition as the result of some sort of textual error, the excessiveness of the references to sacred records in this sentence (including an instance of "all the sacred records") suggests that this emphasis on the sacredness of these records is intended. \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree here, so the original manuscript undoubtedly also read this way.

Summary: Accept in 4 Nephi 1:49 the 1830 reading with the subject pronoun *he* as the reading of the original text (as well as the probable reading of the original manuscript); the printer's manuscript is missing the *he* probably because scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} frequently omitted *he* in his copywork; also accept in 4 Nephi 1:48–49 the repeated references to the sacredness of these records, including the two occurrences of the clause "which were sacred".

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Mormon

Mormon 1

■ Mormon 1:3

*and when ye are of that age
go to the land [of 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] Antum
unto a hill which shall be called Shim*

The preposition *of* was dropped here in the 1837 edition, probably accidentally. As explained under Alma 27:22–24, for each case of “land (of) X” we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the *of* is present. Here in Mormon 1:3, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have the *of*, so we restore the *of* in the critical text. The RLDS text made the restoration in the 1908 edition. This is the only example in the text of the name *Antum*.

Summary: Restore the preposition *of* to give “the land **of** Antum” in Mormon 1:3; both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript have the *of*.

■ Mormon 1:4

*and ye shall engrave
[upon 1APS | on BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the plates of Nephi
all the things that ye have observed concerning this people*

Here the typesetter for the 1837 edition replaced the preposition *upon* with *on*, which is what we expect in modern English. This change was probably not due to editing, especially since it was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P} ; moreover, virtually all instances of “engrave **upon** plates” were retained in the 1837 edition. For further discussion of the phrase “to engrave (up)on plates”, see under Mosiah 28:11; in that instance, the 1837 edition made the same change as here in Mormon 1:4. The critical text will restore the original *upon* in both cases.

Summary: Restore the preposition *upon* in Mormon 1:4, the reading of the earliest textual sources (\mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition).

■ **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*

As explained under Helaman 16:10, the 1830 typesetter removed most instances of the Hebraistic *and* in his typesetting for the latter part of the text. For some other instances of this editing on the part of John Gilbert, see under 3 Nephi 23:8, 4 Nephi 1:47, and Mormon 3:4. Here in Mormon 1:5, the printer’s manuscript has the *and*, and the critical text will restore it. We should also note that in this passage Gilbert could have also deleted the repeated subject pronoun *I*. For an example of that kind of editing on his part (where he removed not only the Hebraistic *and* but also the repeated subject), see under Ether 9:8.

Summary: Restore the original *and* before the main clause in Mormon 1:5; for this part of the text, the 1830 typesetter generally removed these non-English uses of *and*.

■ **Mormon 1:5**

*and I [remembered 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| remember GQ] the things
which Ammaron commanded me*

Here we have an idiosyncratic loss of the past-tense ending *-ed* in the 1858 Wright edition and, independently, in the 1911 LDS edition. In both cases, we have an obvious typo since the base narrative here is in the past tense. Not surprisingly, this error was not followed by any subsequent edition (neither the 1874 RLDS edition nor the 1920 LDS edition). The critical text will maintain the correct *remembered* here in Mormon 1:5.

Summary: Maintain the past-tense form *remembered* in Mormon 1:5, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the present-tense *remember* does not work at all.

■ **Mormon 1:6**

*and it came to pass that
I being eleven years old was carried by my father into the land southward
even to the land [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| H] Zarahemla*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the preposition *of* from the phrase “the land of Zarahemla”. As explained under Alma 2:15, the original text of the Book of Mormon has examples only with the *of* for this phrase. Here in Mormon 1:6, the subsequent RLDS edition (1892) restored the correct phraseology with the *of*.

Summary: Maintain the *of* in the phrase “the land **of** Zarahemla” everywhere in the text, including here in Mormon 1:6.

■ Mormon 1:6–7

and it came to pass that

*I being eleven years old was carried by my father into the land southward
even to the land of Zarahemla*

[1 | : A | ; BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | . RT]

*the whole face of the land [having 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | had RT] become covered
with buildings*

[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and the people were as numerous almost as it were the sand of the sea

There are several ways to deal with the original fragment in this passage. One would be to change the initial participial phrase (in verse 7) into a finite clause by replacing *having* with *had* (the decision that was made for the 1920 LDS edition). But this results in a rather abrupt beginning for a main clause. Another possibility would be to interpret the following *and*-clause as a Hebraism (that is, as a main clause following a present participial phrase). Under Alma 16:21 and 3 Nephi 18:20, I list a few more examples of such Hebraisms involving present participial phrases. So if this interpretation is correct, then the appropriate emendation in the standard text would be to delete the unexpected *and*:

Mormon 1:7 (proposed grammatical emendation)

the whole face of the land having become covered with buildings
the people were as numerous almost as it were the sand of the sea

One problem with this interpretation is that the main clause is not a consequent of the participial phrase, which is what we normally expect from such constructions in English (as in “having done his homework, John was allowed to watch TV”). Presumably a lot of buildings implies a lot of people, but this implication is a logical one, not a resultive one.

Another possibility would be to change the punctuation so that the original participial phrase is attached to the end of the preceding verse:

Mormon 1:6–7

and it came to pass that
I being eleven years old
was carried by my father into the land southward
even to the land of Zarahemla
the whole face of the land having become covered with buildings
and the people were as numerous
almost as it were the sand of the sea

The 1830 printer placed a colon after “even to the land of Zarahemla”; the 1837 edition replaced the colon with a semicolon; and the 1920 LDS edition changed the punctuation to a period. The 1830 colon does allow some connection between verse 6 and the original participial phrase at the beginning of verse 7. David Calabro (personal communication, 17 March 2006) has suggested the participial phrase could be explaining why Mormon’s father brought him into the land southward: namely, the land northward had become overbuilt. But, as Calabro also suggests, the participial phrase could be simply describing what Mormon observed during his move.

Since the Hebraistic construction does not work well here, the most satisfactory decision would be to emend the punctuation by attaching the present participial phrase to the preceding text. Of course, the original *and* should be maintained.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 1:6–7 the original present participial phrase at the beginning of verse 7, but alter the punctuation so that this phrase is linked to the end of verse 6 (giving “I being eleven years old was carried by my father into the land southward, even to the land of Zarahemla, the whole face of the land having become covered with buildings”); also maintain the original *and* at the beginning of the main clause in verse 7: “**and** the people were as numerous almost as it were the sand of the sea”.

■ Mormon 1:7

and the people were as numerous

almost as [it were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K]

the [s2 sands > s1 sand 1 | sand ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the sea

In this passage there is some question about whether *it were* is actually necessary (the 1892 RLDS edition deleted it, although perhaps unintentionally). It is definitely unexpected in normal English; the phraseology we expect is “and the people were as numerous almost as the sand(s) of the sea” (or, more usually, with *almost* right after the verb: “and the people were almost as numerous as the sand(s) of the sea”). Yet the additional *it were* is actually characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, including these examples that deal with the numerousness of peoples:

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

Alma 2:27

the Lamanites and the Amlicites

being as numerous almost as **it were** as the sands of the sea

came upon them to destroy them

We might wonder also about whether the text should read “the **sand** of the sea” (as in 1 Nephi 12:1) or “the **sands** of the sea” (as in Alma 2:27). Here in Mormon 1:7, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the plural *sands*, which Oliver Cowdery later corrected to the singular *sand*, which agrees with the 1830 reading. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (as seen in the discussion under Alma 2:27), we have only one example of the plural *sands* (namely, in Alma 2:27). Otherwise, we have only the singular *sand*—namely, in 1 Nephi 12:1, here in Mormon 1:7, and in three quotes from the King James Bible: 1 Nephi 20:19 (Isaiah 48:19), 2 Nephi 20:22 (Isaiah 10:22), and 3 Nephi 14:26 (Matthew 7:26). The King James Bible uses only the singular *sand*; in particular, it has ten occurrences of “the sand of the sea”. All of this suggests that the plural *sands* in Alma 2:27 could be a mistake for the singular *sand*. See under that passage for discussion. Here in Mormon 1:7 the critical text will maintain the singular *sand*, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 1:7 the use of *it were* in “almost as **it were** the sand of the sea”; the Book of Mormon actually favors the use of *it were* in this construction; the singular *sand* should also be maintained since the text prefers the singular (the only example of the plural *sands* is in Alma 2:27).

■ **Mormon 1:8**

and it came to pass
 [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in this year*
there began to be a war between the Nephites . . .

As discussed under 3 Nephi 8:5, evidence from scribal and typesetting errors argues that the subordinate conjunction *that* was probably accidentally added here in Mormon 1:8 by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The 1830 typesetter seems to have omitted the *that* only when he was setting the text from Isaiah and the King James Isaiah lacked the *that*. For a more general discussion, including the evidence from transmission errors, see under 3 Nephi 1:22.

Elsewhere the text prefers *that* between “it came to pass” and the adverbial phrase “in this year”; there are seven instances with *that* and two without (each of the latter is marked below with an asterisk):

Alma 63:9	and it came to pass that in this year there were . . .
* Alma 63:14	and it came to pass also in this year that there were . . .
Helaman 3:24	and it came to pass that in this same year there was . . .
Helaman 5:1	and it came to pass that in this same year behold . . .
Helaman 11:3	and it came to pass that in this year Nephi . . .
Helaman 13:2	and it came to pass that in this year there was . . .
* 4 Nephi 1:35	and now it came to pass in this year . . . there were . . .
4 Nephi 1:36	and it came to pass that in this year there arose . . .
Mormon 2:20	and it came to pass that in this year the people of Nephi . . .

Here in Mormon 1:8, it would appear that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally added the *that* because he expected it.

Summary: Retain in Mormon 1:8 the 1830 reading without the *that* after “and it came to pass”; it is more likely here that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} supplied the *that* than it was omitted by the 1830 typesetter.

■ **Mormon 1:11**

and it came to pass that
they did have in this same year a number of battles
 [*in the which* 1ABCDGHKPS | *in which* EFIJLMNOQRT] *the Nephites did beat the Lamanites*
and did slay many of them

As explained under 1 Nephi 3:2, Joseph Smith revised nearly half the instances of “in the which” when he edited the text for the 1837 edition, usually by omitting the *the*. Here in Mormon 1:11 is one instance where Joseph left “in the which” unchanged; in this case, the *the* was later removed in the 1849 LDS edition. The LDS text has maintained the expected reading without the *the*, but the critical text will restore the original “in the which”. For a complete discussion, see under IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original instance of “in the which” in Mormon 1:11 and elsewhere in the text where the *the* has been omitted (usually by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition).

■ **Mormon 1:12**

*and there was **peace** settled in the land*

□ NULL 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST

□ *and **peace** settled in the land* D

*and **peace** did remain for the space
of about four years*

Here we have an example of a long dittography in the 1841 British edition (see under 3 Nephi 20:39 for another long dittography in that edition). After setting *and peace*, the compositor’s eye skipped back to the previous occurrence of *peace*, and he ended up setting the extra “and peace settled in the land”. The 1849 LDS edition restored the original text without the dittography.

Summary: Follow the earliest text for Mormon 1:12—that is, without the dittography that the 1841 compositor introduced into that edition.

■ **Mormon 1:12**

*and there was **peace** settled in the land*

*and **peace** did remain*

*for the [*pace* 1 | *space* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] of about four years*

*that there [*was* 1BCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST | *were* A] no bloodshed*

The word *pace* in \mathcal{P} is undoubtedly a scribal slip, perhaps the result of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} having just written the word *peace* (“and **peace** did remain for the **space** of about four years”). Clearly, *pace* is an error and can be ignored. Oliver Cowdery twice made the same slip in \mathcal{P} , but in both cases he caught his error:

2 Nephi 5:7

and after that we had journeyed

for the [*pace* > *space* 1 | *space* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] of many days . . .

Helaman 11:26

yea even in the [*pace* > *space* 1 | *space* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST]

of not many years . . .

A more significant textual issue here in Mormon 1:12 is whether the verb in the original text read *was* or *were* for the clause “there was/were no bloodshed”. \mathcal{P} has the singular *was* while the 1830 edition has the plural *were*. For the 1837 edition, the 1830 *were* was replaced by the expected *was*. The question here is how often did scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} write *was* instead of the correct *were* in comparison to how often the 1830 compositor set *were* instead of the correct *was*. There are a few instances in the early transmission of the text where “there was <singular noun>” was changed to “there were <singular noun>”, but none of these errors involve either scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} or the 1830 compositor. There is one example where Joseph Smith accidentally made the change in his editing for the 1837 edition, but only momentarily (virtually immediately he restored the original *was*):

Alma 4:5

and there [*was* > *js were* > *was* 1 | *was* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST]

continual peace in all that time

Oliver Cowdery made the change much more frequently in his manuscript work (namely, in 3 Nephi 1:29, 3 Nephi 4:2, 3 Nephi 7:4, 3 Nephi 8:11, and 3 Nephi 8:12), although in all five cases his error was only momentary. So one could argue for a general tendency to revise the text towards “there were”, which would suggest that the 1830 compositor was responsible for the variation here in Mormon 1:12. On the other hand, one could argue that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} made the change under the influence of the earlier instance of *was* in this verse (“there **was** peace settled in the land”).

Textually, both “there **was** no <singular noun>” and “there **were** no <singular noun>” occur in the earliest text. The expected singular *was* dominates (with at least 36 instances), but there are two with *were* in the earliest text:

3 Nephi 4:4	there were no chance for the robbers to plunder or to obtain food
3 Nephi 11:3	there were no part of their frame that it did not cause to quake

Here we exclude two instances of subjunctive *were*:

Helaman 14:4	as if it were one day and there were no night
3 Nephi 1:8	as if there were no night

Since *was* is the expected reading, it seems more reasonable to assume that the original manuscript read *were* and that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} made the change to the expected *was*. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading (“there **were** no bloodshed”), a textually possible reading despite its difficulty for modern readers.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possibility here: namely, the singular form *bloodshed* is an error for *bloodsheds*. As explained under 2 Nephi 10:6, there are seven instances of plural *bloodsheds* in the original text, and three of them have been changed to the singular *bloodshed* in the LDS text. Perhaps here in Mormon 1:12 the original text read grammatically as “there were no bloodsheds” but Oliver Cowdery omitted the plural *s* when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation, giving “there were no bloodshed” in \mathcal{C} (and thus leading scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} to change the *were* to *was*). One problem with this proposed emendation is that all original seven instances of the plural *bloodsheds* in the Book of Mormon text are immediately conjoined with another plural noun, such as *visitations*, *earthquakes*, *pestilences*, *wars*, and *contentions*. Elsewhere in the text, there are ten instances of the singular *bloodshed* that are not conjoined with another noun, including one more that uses the existential *there*: “insomuch that there was much bloodshed” (Helaman 4:1). In other words, the plural *bloodsheds* never occurs alone in the text. Thus it seems unlikely that the original text here in Mormon 1:12 had a plural *bloodsheds*.

Summary: Restore the difficult 1830 reading in Mormon 1:12: “there **were** no bloodshed”; there is some evidence for the use of *were* in existential statements like this one in the earliest Book of Mormon text; scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have made the change to the expected *was* when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

■ **Mormon 1:12**

*and peace did remain for the space of about four years
that there were no [blood shed 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | bloodshed RT]*

The question here is whether the subject predicate in the *that*-clause is the full noun *bloodshed* or the noun *blood* postmodified by the past participle *shed* (which would be equivalent to “shedding of blood”). The 1920 LDS edition changed the spelling to *bloodshed* to guarantee the reading as a full noun.

There are 26 occurrences of *bloodshed(s)* in the Book of Mormon. In at least two more of these cases, one could reinterpret the word *bloodshed* as the noun *blood* postmodified by the past participle *shed*:

Omni 1:24 (“much blood shed”?)
and behold I have seen in the days of king Benjamin
a serious war and **much bloodshed** between the Nephites and the Lamanites

Helaman 4:1 (“much blood shed”?)
and there was also a contention among the people
insomuch that there was **much bloodshed**

In both these cases, unlike Mormon 1:12, there has been no spelling variation; we get only *bloodshed*.

The Book of Mormon text has many instances of the gerundive expression “(the) shedding (of) blood” (with 28 occurrences). In other words, there are two nominal forms: the full noun *bloodshed(s)* and the gerundive “(the) shedding (of) blood”. There doesn’t seem to be one clear case of *blood* postmodified by *shed*. For this reason, the 1920 emendation of *blood shed* to *bloodshed* in Mormon 1:12 was probably correct.

Summary: Maintain the noun *bloodshed* in Omni 1:24, Helaman 4:1, and Mormon 1:12; the expression *blood shed* does not seem to occur in the text; instead, the text uses the full noun *bloodshed(s)* or the gerundive expression “(the) shedding (of) blood”.

■ **Mormon 1:16**

*and I did endeavor to preach
unto [the 1 | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
but my mouth was shut*

The printer’s manuscript has “unto **the** people”, but the 1830 edition reads “unto **this** people”. Elsewhere the text has 18 examples of “preach (un)to **the** people” and 6 of “preach (un)to **this** people”. (Here I exclude cases where *people* is postmodified since we expect only *the* in such cases.) So both readings in Mormon 1:16 are theoretically possible.

Under Helaman 14:20, I list four independent cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} replaced *this* with *the*. On the other hand, there are no clear cases where the 1830 compositor set *this* instead of *the* (there is one case, in Mosiah 1:10, where he set *the* instead of *this*). These transmission errors argue that the 1830 reading in Mormon 1:16, “unto **this** people”, is probably the correct one.

Summary: Retain “unto **this** people” in Mormon 1:16 (the 1830 reading) rather than “unto **the** people” (the reading in \mathcal{P}); we have specific evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} sometimes accidentally replaced *this* with *the*.

■ **Mormon 1:16–17**

- (1) *and I [were 1A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | wa~s L] forbidden*
 (1') **that I should** *preach unto them*
for behold they had willfully rebelled against their God
and the beloved disciples were taken away out of the land because of their iniquity
but I did remain among them
 (2) *but I [were >js was 1 | were A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forbidden*
 (2') *[that I should >js to 1 | that I should A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] preach unto them*

In both these verses, the earliest text has *were* instead of *was* in the clause “I were forbidden”. The 1837 edition adopted *was* (“I was forbidden”), which is what we expect in standard English. For two other instances of “I were” in the earliest text, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 26:11. These instances of “I were” represent subjunctive instances of *were*, which was considerably more frequent in Early Modern English. Don Brugger (personal communication) provides this example from the 17th century (original accidentals retained):

Richard Brome (1640)

Was ever harmesle creature so abus'd?
 To be drench'd under water, to learne dumbnesse
 Amongst the fishes, as I **were** forbidden
 To use the naturall members I was borne with,
 And of them all, the chiefe that man takes pleasure in;
 The tongue; Oh me accursed wretch.

The critical text will restore the earliest reading, the nonstandard use of *were*, in both these cases of “I were” in Mormon 1:16–17.

In the second of these two cases here in Mormon 1:16–17, Joseph Smith grammatically emended the *that*-clause “that I should preach unto them” to the infinitival “to preach unto them” (which is what we expect in modern English for the verb *forbid*). But note that Joseph did not make this change in the first case (in verse 16). As explained under 2 Nephi 5:15, 17, the critical text will maintain or restore, as the case may be, original *that*-clauses, such as the two here in Mormon 1:16–17. Elsewhere the text actually prefers the *that*-clause as the complement for the verb *forbid* (along with the modal verb *should*):

1 Nephi 14:28

and behold I Nephi am forbidden
that I should write the remainder of the things which I saw

3 Nephi 26:16

and the things which they did utter were forbidden
that there should not any man write them

3 Nephi 28:14

and it was forbidden them **that they should** utter

There is one occurrence in the original text where *forbidden* is followed by an infinitival complement:

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

In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus the two instances of the *that*-clause here in Mormon 1:16–17.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 1:16–17 the original two instances of the plural *were* in “I **were** forbidden”; also restore the use of the *that*-clause in verse 17 (“but I were forbidden **that I should** preach unto them”), in agreement with the use of the *that*-clause in verse 16 (“and I were forbidden **that I should** preach unto them”).

Mormon 2

■ Mormon 2:1

*and it came to pass [that >]s NULL 1 | that AKPS | BCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT]
in that same year there began to be a war again between the Nephites and the Lamanites*

The original text here had the subordinate conjunction *that* after “it came to pass”, but Joseph Smith deleted it in his editing for the 1837 edition. Interestingly, the 1892 RLDS edition supplied the *that*, probably unintentionally. The RLDS text has continued with the *that*, even though Joseph crossed it out in \mathcal{P} and normally the 1908 RLDS edition follows the reading in \mathcal{P} (including the corrections that Joseph marked in the manuscript). The critical text will, of course, restore the original *that*, following the earliest text for each case of “it came to pass (that)”.

Most instances of “it came to pass” in the text are followed by *that*, but not all. But when “it came to pass” is followed by the prepositional phrase “in that (same) year”, the original text always has an intervening *that*; and in one case (marked below with an asterisk) there is a repeated *that* after the prepositional phrase:

* Alma 50:37	and it came to pass that in that same year that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them
Helaman 11:29	but behold it came to pass that in that same year they were driven back
Mormon 2:1	and it came to pass that in that same year there began to be a war again
Mormon 3:7	and it came to pass that in that year we did beat them
Ether 13:15	and it came to pass that in that same year . . . there began to be a great war among the people

Only here in Mormon 2:1 has the intervening *that* been removed.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after “it came to pass” in Mormon 2:1 and wherever else the earliest textual sources support the *that* in that position.

■ Mormon 2:1

*and notwithstanding I being young
was large in stature
therefore the people of Nephi appointed me
that I should be their leader or the leader of their armies*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 24 July 2006) suggests that the subject pronoun *I* is missing from the text here, that it should read “and notwithstanding I being young **I** was large in stature”. If there is an error here, it would have been in \mathcal{O} since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition

read alike here (and for this part of the text both these sources are firsthand copies of \mathcal{G}). Geddes notes that elsewhere whenever the text reads “notwithstanding <subject> being”, there is always a full clause afterwards and it begins with the appropriate pronoun for the already-stated subject:

1 Nephi 17:30	and notwithstanding they being led . . . they hardened their hearts
2 Nephi 31:7	but notwithstanding he being holy he showeth unto the children of men that . . .
Alma 57:11	and notwithstanding the Lamanites being cut off . . . they were still determined to maintain the city
3 Nephi 11:3	and notwithstanding it being a small voice it did pierce them

But more generally, there are cases where the subject is not repeated after a present participial clause with *being*, as in these examples where the subject is *I*:

Mosiah 9:3	and yet I being overzealous to inherit the land of our fathers collected as many as were desirous . . .
Mosiah 10:22	and now I being old did confer the kingdom upon one of my sons
Mormon 1:6	I being eleven years old was carried by my father into the land southward

Note especially the nearby example in Mormon 1:6. The critical text will therefore accept the reading here in Mormon 2:1 without the repetition of the subject pronoun *I*.

Summary: Maintain the reading in Mormon 2:1 without the repetition of the subject pronoun *I* (“and notwithstanding *I* being young was large in stature”); there is considerable evidence elsewhere in the text for this kind of construction.

■ Mormon 2:2

*therefore three hundred
and twenty [1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] six years
had passed away*

The printer’s manuscript lacks the conjunction *and* between the numbers *twenty* and *six*. Conjoined numbers in the Book of Mormon text almost always have the *and* between every pair in number conjuncts, unlike modern English. The 1830 reading, with the *and*, is very likely correct here in Mormon 2:2 since otherwise this part of the Book of Mormon text consistently has the *and*’s between the numbers; there are, for instance, 19 other examples in Mormon alone, and all of them have the *and*, including these examples involving *years*:

Mormon 1:3	when ye are about twenty and four years old
Mormon 2:15	and thus three hundred and forty and four years had passed away
Mormon 5:5	and thus three hundred and seventy and nine years passed away
Mormon 6:5	and when three hundred and eighty and four years had passed away

The exceptional cases are all earlier in the text:

Mosiah 6:4	making in the whole about four hundred and seventy six years
Mosiah 8:9	they have brought twenty four plates
Mosiah 9:18	we did slay three thousand and forty three

Mosiah 9:19 two hundred and **seventy nine** of our brethren were slain
Alma 37:21 and now I will speak unto you concerning those **twenty four** plates

Finally, we have considerable evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} frequently omitted the conjunction *and*. For a list of his omissions of *and*, see under Alma 12:8. Thus evidence from both usage and scribal practice indicates that the original text here in Mormon 2:2 had the *and* between the numbers *twenty* and *six*. The critical text will therefore maintain the current reading here.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 2:2 the *and* in the phrase “twenty and six years”, the reading of the 1830 edition; it appears that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted the *and* between these two numbers when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

■ Mormon 2:4

and it came to pass that we did come to the city
of [Angolah 1 | Angelah A | Angola BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and we did take possession of the city

There are two textual issues regarding the name of this city. The first question deals with whether the second vowel is an *e* or an *o*. The second question deals with whether the name of this city ends in an *h*. The printer’s manuscript has an *o* as the second vowel, but the 1830 edition has an *e*. Since each of these sources is a firsthand copy of the original manuscript, the problem is to determine which vowel was the spelling in the original manuscript. As far as the final *h* is concerned, it must have been in \mathcal{C} since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have the *h*. Later the *h* was dropped in the 1837 edition; also in that edition the *o* spelling in \mathcal{P} was adopted. The omission of the *h* in the 1837 edition may have been intended, but it did not result from consulting either of the two manuscripts.

There are numerous Book of Mormon names (plus some nouns) that end in *h*, including the following that end in *ah* preceded by a consonant:

Ahah, Ammah, Amnigaddah, Antionah, Antiparah, Cumorah, Gadiomnah,
Gidanah, Giddonah, Gidgiddonah, Gilgah, Lamah, Limhah, limnah,
Onidah, Oneidah, rabbanah, Riplah, Sherrizah, Zerahemnah

To this list we can add Book of Mormon names ending in the morpheme *hah/ihah*:

Ammonihah, Cumenihah, Mathonihah, Moronihah, Nephihah,
Onihah, Orihah, Zemnah

So there is nothing wrong with either *Angolah* or *Angelah* ending in *h*. There is one case in the text where *h* was apparently added to the end of a name: in both manuscripts the biblical name *Judea* was written *Judeah*, probably because of *Judah* (see under Alma 56:9 for discussion of this case). But it seems unlikely that an *h* would have been accidentally added to an original *Angola* or *Angela* since there is no similar name or word that could have prompted such an error. Thus the critical text will maintain the final *h* for the name of this city.

Returning to the second vowel in the name, we note that the variant *angola* of the word *angora* (noted in the Oxford English Dictionary) or the spelling of the African country *Angola* (or

even the prefix *Anglo*, as in *Anglo-Saxon*) could have hypothetically (but not realistically) had some influence on the 1837 reading as well as the reading in \mathcal{P} (*Angolah*). More reasonably, one could argue for the influence of the word *angel* (or the name *Angela*) in producing the *e* in the 1830 reading (*Angelah*). When we look at other Book of Mormon names, we find little phonotactic evidence for determining the vowel since no other name has the *ng* sequence. After *g* alone between vowels, we do have two cases with *o*, *Agosh* and *Hagoth*, which would support the reading *Angolah*. There are also three cases with *a* after *g*: *Jacob-ugath*, *Ogath*, and *Pagag*. (Perhaps *Amnigaddah* is a fourth case, providing that name is not a compound, *Amni+gaddah*.) But there are no other examples with *e* after intervocalic *g*. Thus the name *Angolah* looks somewhat more characteristic of Book of Mormon names than *Angelah*.

Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *e*'s and *o*'s. In fact, there is considerable evidence, especially in \mathcal{O} , that Oliver sometimes miswrote names with an *e* instead of the correct *o* (or the *o* he wrote looked more like an *e*); in some cases (each marked below with an asterisk), he corrected his initially written *e*:

<i>Ammen</i> instead of <i>Ammon</i>	Alma 24:5 (in \mathcal{O})
* <i>Ammen</i> > <i>Ammon</i>	Alma 31:32 (in \mathcal{O})
* <i>Siren</i> > <i>Siron</i>	Alma 39:3 (in \mathcal{P})
<i>Sidon</i> looks like <i>Siden</i>	Alma 43:40 (in \mathcal{O})
* <i>Siden</i> > <i>Sidon</i>	Alma 43:51 (in \mathcal{O})
<i>Cohor</i> looks like <i>Coher</i>	Ether 7:21 (in \mathcal{O})

In all other places in \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} , he wrote the *o* vowel correctly for these names, *Ammon*, *Siron*, *Sidon*, and *Cohor*.

Similarly, we also have a few names where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote an *e* instead of the correct *o*; and in some cases (each marked below with an asterisk), he corrected his initially written *e*:

* <i>Minen</i> > <i>Minon</i>	Alma 2:24
<i>Meses</i> instead of <i>Moses</i>	3 Nephi 27:8
* <i>Beaz</i> > <i>Boaz</i>	Mormon 4:20
* <i>Jeneum</i> > <i>Joneum</i>	Mormon 6:14

Since scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was copying from \mathcal{O} , these errors may have been influenced by what Oliver Cowdery had written (or miswritten) in \mathcal{O} . The three names that were corrected by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} do not occur elsewhere in the text, nor are they extant in \mathcal{O} . This is also the situation here in Mormon 2:4 for the name *Angolah*/*Angelah*.

In contrast to this tendency to miswrite *o*'s as *e*'s in names, neither Oliver Cowdery nor scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to miswrite *e*'s as *o*'s in names (at least, there are no examples). This difference in scribal practice argues that a questionable *e/o* spelling in a name more likely represents an original *o* for which Oliver wrote an *e*-like letter. In other words, the original spelling in \mathcal{O} for Mormon 2:4 was probably *Angolah* and Oliver's *o* looked somewhat like an *e*, which led the 1830 compositor to set *Angelah*. The critical text will therefore adopt the reading *Angolah* in Mormon 2:4 (the reading in \mathcal{P}). But we should remember that there is some guesswork in this conclusion and that *Angelah*, the 1830 reading, remains a possibility.

Summary: Restore the final *h* to the name of the city in Mormon 2:4; also adopt the *o* in \mathfrak{D} for this name (that is, *Angolah*); the 1830 reading *Angelah* is also possible, but *Angolah* is somewhat more probable given Oliver Cowdery’s and scribe 2 of \mathfrak{D} ’s fairly frequent tendency to accidentally write in names an *e*-like letter for an actual *o*.

■ **Mormon 2:4**

and we did take possession of the city
and make [preparations 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | preparation CGHK]
to defend ourselves against the Lamanites

As explained under Alma 24:4, the original text of the Book of Mormon consistently uses the plural *preparations* in the phrase “to make preparation(s)”, but the tendency in the history of the text has been to replace the plural with the singular *preparation*. Here in Mormon 2:4, the 1840 edition made this change; the RLDS text restored the correct plural in the 1908 RLDS edition. See nearby under Mormon 4:6 for another case where this change to the singular occurred.

Summary: Maintain the plural *preparations* in Mormon 2:4, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the Book of Mormon text always uses the plural *preparations* in the phrase “to make preparation(s)”.

■ **Mormon 2:4**

and it came to pass that we did fortify the city
with our [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT]

The original text prefers the plural *mights* over the singular *might* in phrases like this one. As explained under Jacob 1:19, the 1920 LDS edition replaced nearly every example of the unexpected plural with the singular. The critical text will restore the plural *mights* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ **Mormon 2:8**

therefore there was blood and carnage spread
[throughout 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | through CGHK] all the face of the land

The change in the 1840 edition to *through* is probably a typo rather than the result of Joseph Smith’s editing. As explained under Mosiah 29:1, we normally expect *throughout* in the context of “(the face of) the land”. Note, in particular, the use of *throughout* in the very same context later on in Mormon 2:8: “and it was one complete revolution **throughout** all the face of the land”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *throughout* here in Mormon 2:8.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 2:8 the word *throughout*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Mormon 2:10**

for behold no man could keep

[*that which* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *what* GHK] *was his own*

Here the 1858 Wright edition introduced the relative pronoun *what* in place of the original *that which*. The first two RLDS editions followed the Wright reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *that which*. Elsewhere in the text, we have 29 occurrences of *that which was*, while there is only one occurrence of *what was*:

3 Nephi 5:8

yea this book cannot contain even a hundredth part
of **what was** done among so many people

There is no reason to reject the original reading here in Mormon 2:10.

Summary: Maintain the use of *that which* in Mormon 2:10, a very normal construction in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mormon 2:10**

for the thieves and the robbers

and the [murderers 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | murderers > rumderers A]

Here the 1830 compositor originally set the word *murderers* correctly. But as the signature for this part of the text was being printed, the type near the end of several lines started to work loose, so the press was stopped in order to tighten up the type. In the process, the compositor reset some of the type; and while doing that he accidentally switched the order of the *m* and *r* at the beginning of the word *murderers*, thus creating the rather fantastic *rumderers*.

Janet Jenson, in her 1973 analysis of in-press changes in the 1830 edition, identified the typo *rumderers* as an initial state, but in actuality it is a “corrected” state. In-press changes in the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon will be discussed more fully in volume 3, in the section covering the printing of that edition. See there for a list of initial and corrected states in the 1830 edition. For Jenson’s analysis, see her article “Variations Between Copies of the First Edition of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 13/2 (1973): 214–222.

Summary: Maintain the word *murderers* in Mormon 2:10, which is what the 1830 compositor originally set.

■ Mormon 2:12

and it came to pass that when I Mormon saw
 their [*lemantations* 1 | *lamentation* ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *lamentations* HKPS]
 and their mourning
 and their [*sorrowing* 1APS | *sorrow* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] before the Lord
 my heart did begin to rejoice within me

There are two textual problems here in Mormon 2:12. The first deals with whether *lamentation(s)* should be in the singular or plural. The printer's manuscript has the plural (miswritten as *lemantations*), while the 1830 edition has the singular *lamentation*. Interestingly, the 1874 RLDS edition reintroduced the plural form, and all subsequent RLDS editions have followed this reading. (This later change shows that the plural is expected and can be independently introduced into the text; thus one could argue that the plural reading in \mathcal{P} is secondary.) On the other hand, the text of the early editions as well as the LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading, the singular *lamentation*. The question here is whether the word was in the singular or plural in the original manuscript.

Usage elsewhere in the text shows that in conjoined noun phrases, we always get number agreement between *lamentation(s)* and the other conjoined noun(s). First, there are four other cases where the singular *lamentation* is conjoined with the gerund *mourning*:

Mosiah 21:9	a great mourning and lamentation among the people of Limhi
Alma 28:4	a great mourning and lamentation heard throughout all the land
Helaman 7:15	my mourning and lamentation
Mormon 2:11	a mourning and a lamentation in all the land

We get the same singular *lamentation* when it is conjoined with the nouns *sorrow* and *howling*:

Mosiah 9:19	our great sorrow and lamentation
Helaman 6:33	the great sorrow and lamentation of the righteous
Ether 15:16	a howling and a lamentation

The plural *lamentations* occurs only once in a conjoining of nouns, but in that instance the other nouns are also in the plural:

Ether 15:16	their cries / their howlings and lamentations
-------------	---

The plural is found in two other cases. In the first one, the plural *lamentations* occurs alone, without any conjoined noun:

Alma 4:13	a great cause for lamentations among the people
-----------	--

The other case involves the conjoining of clauses (with ellipsis of the verb phrase, "was turned"); in this case the two nouns are not directly conjoined and occur at some distance from one another:

3 Nephi 10:10	and their mourning was turned into joy and their lamentations into the praise and the thanksgiving unto the Lord Jesus Christ their Redeemer
---------------	--

So when nouns are directly conjoined, *lamentation(s)* always agrees with the number of the conjoined noun(s); excluding the example in Mormon 2:12, there are seven instances of conjoined singulars and one of conjoined plurals (Ether 15:16), all listed above.

Here in Mormon 2:12, we have a conjoining of three nouns, each preceded by the determiner *their*: “their lamentation(s) and their mourning and their sorrowing”, which forms a noun phrase that acts as the direct object in the sentence. Thus Mormon 2:12 is most like the seven cases where we have the singular noun *lamentation* directly conjoined with another singular noun, such as *mourning*, *sorrow*, or *howling*. Thus internal evidence argues that Mormon 2:12 should follow the 1830 reading, with the assumption that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally added the plural *s*. To be sure, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} had a tendency to accidentally add the plural *s*. Elsewhere in the text there are at least 28 of these errors on his part: 21 are initial errors corrected by scribe 2 himself; 5 are errors corrected by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} ; and 2 are in King James quotes where \mathcal{P} reads in the plural but the 1830 edition and the King James Bible have the correct singular. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading in Mormon 2:12, the singular *lamentation*. (For another example of a word where its grammatical number always agrees with the nearest noun conjunct, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:11 regarding *tempest*.)

The second problem in this passage involves the word *sorrowing*. The earliest textual sources have the gerund *sorrowing*, which is matched by the preceding gerund *mourning*. The 1837 edition introduced *sorrow* in place of *sorrowing*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *sorrowing* to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has maintained the 1837 *sorrow*. Elsewhere in the text, the Book of Mormon always uses *sorrow* rather than *sorrowing* in conjunction with other nouns, such as *mourning*, *lamentation*, *grief*, *afflictions*, *pangs*, *troubles*, *care*, and *pain*. In particular, there are the two instances of “great sorrow and lamentation” in Mosiah 9:19 and Helaman 6:33 (cited just above in the discussion regarding the number for *lamentation*).

Nonetheless, *sorrowing* does occur in the text—in fact, this gerund form is found twice in the very next verse after Mormon 2:12:

Mormon 2:13

but behold this my joy was vain
for their **sorrowing** was not unto repentance because of the goodness of God
but it was rather the **sorrowing** of the damned because the Lord would not always
suffer them to take happiness in sin

It seems quite clear in verse 13 that the word *sorrowing* is referring to the *sorrowing* just mentioned in verse 12. Thus the gerund *sorrowing* is fully supported in verse 12, both by the earliest textual sources and by nearby usage.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 2:12 the singular *lamentation* (the 1830 reading) since we otherwise get the singular when *lamentation(s)* is directly conjoined with a singular noun (such as *mourning*); also restore the gerund *sorrowing* later on in the verse since the earliest textual sources have the gerund form; in addition, the following verse uses *sorrowing*, not *sorrow*.

■ Mormon 2:15

and I saw that the day of grace

was [*passed* 1EFIJLMNOQRT | *past* ABCDGHKPS] with them

As explained in some detail under Mosiah 8:17, the text distinguishes between *past* and *passed*. When referring to something as being over or finished, the correct form is the adjective *past*; thus here in Mormon 2:15 the word should be *past*: “the day of grace was **past** with them”. Similar instances of *past* in the text support this spelling:

Helaman 13:38	your days of probation is past
3 Nephi 1:5	the time was past for the words to be fulfilled
3 Nephi 1:6	behold the time is past

As shown under Mosiah 8:17, the scribes frequently spelled the adjective *past* as *passed*. Here in Mormon 2:15, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote the word as *passed*, but the 1830 edition has the correct *past*. Yet the 1849 LDS edition reintroduced the spelling *passed* in this passage, with the result that all subsequent LDS editions have retained *passed* rather than the correct *past*. This 1849 change was not implemented for other instances of *past* in the text. The change seems to have been the result of a momentary decision, either by the 1849 typesetter or by Orson Pratt (the editor for that edition). Paul Thomas was the first one who brought to my attention this spelling difficulty in Mormon 2:15.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that these four examples of *past* could be considered instances of *passed* if we interpret the *be* verb as the archaic perfect auxiliary. As explained under 2 Nephi 22:2 and Helaman 13:36, verbs of motion and change in earlier English took the *be* verb rather than *have* as the perfect auxiliary (thus the archaic “he **is** risen” rather than the modern “he **has** risen”). By means of this interpretation, one could argue that all four of these Book of Mormon instances of “to be past” could be read as “to be passed”:

Helaman 13:38	your days of probation is passed (that is, “has passed”)
3 Nephi 1:5	the time was passed for the words to be fulfilled (that is, “had passed”)
3 Nephi 1:6	behold the time is passed (that is, “has passed”)
Mormon 2:15	the day of grace was passed with them (that is, “had passed”)

Of course, historically the original source for “to be past” is the archaic “to be passed”, where *past* is a spelling variant for *passed*. Yet even the King James Bible prefers *past* when the meaning is ‘over’, as in the following examples:

Genesis 50:4	and when the days of his mourning were past . . .
Jeremiah 8:20	the harvest is past / the summer is ended
Matthew 14:15	and the time is now past

Even so, the corresponding synoptic passage in Mark for the Matthew example reads as *passed*:

Mark 6:35	and now the time <i>is</i> far passed
-----------	--

But the original Greek for this Mark example is adjectival and could be literally translated as ‘and now the hour [is] much’. (Interestingly, the Greek equivalent for “is past” in the Matthew passage

is verbal, not adjectival.) In accord with the normal King James usage, the critical text will use *past* for all four of the Book of Mormon instances where the meaning appears to be adjectival rather than verbal.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 2:15 the 1830 spelling *past* since the meaning here is ‘over’.

■ Mormon 2:16

*and they were pursued until they came even to the land of Jashon
before it [were >]s was 1 | were A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] possible to stop them
in their retreat*

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically emended the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was*. Two other instances of subjunctive *were* have been left unchanged in this chapter; in both cases, we expect the indicative *was* in modern English:

Mormon 2:7	we did gather in our people as fast as it were possible
Mormon 2:21	and we did gather in our people as much as it were possible

But later, in Ether 15:14, Joseph made the same change of *were* to *was* in “and that they might receive all the strength which it **were** possible that they could receive”.

The Book of Mormon text strongly favors the subjunctive *were* in the phrase “it was/were possible”. For instance, for the conditional clause “if it was/were possible”, the original Book of Mormon text has ten instances with *were* but none with *was*. And for the ten remaining cases of “it was/were possible”, all but one take *were* in the original text (the one case taking *was* is in Mosiah 21:18: “now the people of Limhi kept together in a body as much as it **was** possible”). In other words, the use of *were* here in Mormon 2:16 is expected from a textual point of view. The critical text will restore the original *were* here.

Summary: Restore the original subjunctive *were* in Mormon 2:16 (“before it **were** possible to stop them in their retreat”); such usage is favored in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ Mormon 2:17

*and behold I had gone
according to the [words >]s word 1 | word ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Ammaron
and taken the plates of Nephi
and did make a record
according to the **words** of Ammaron*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads twice in the plural as “according to the **words** of Ammaron”. But the 1830 edition has for the first instance of this phrase the singular *word*. When Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition, he decided to follow the 1830 reading here, so in Ø he crossed out the plural *s* for the first instance of *words*. But as explained under 3 Nephi 29:7, the text strongly supports the plural *words* in the phrase “according to the word(s) of X” whenever X refers to a human. Moreover, there is independent evidence that the 1830 compositor sometimes

replaced *words* with *word* (for example, in Jacob 3:11). The critical text will therefore adopt the plural *words* for both instances of “according to the word(s) of Ammaron” here in Mormon 2:17.

Summary: Accept in Mormon 2:17 both instances of the plural “according to the **words** of Ammaron”, the consistent reading of the printer’s manuscript; for the first instance of *words* it appears that the 1830 compositor accidentally set *word*.

■ Mormon 2:18

and upon the plates of Nephi

- (1) *I did make a full account of all **the** wickedness and abominations
but upon these plates I did forbear*
- (2) *to make a full account of **their** wickedness and abominations*
- (3) *for behold a continual scene of wickedness and abominations has been before mine eyes
ever since I have been sufficient to behold the ways of man*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 24 July 2006) suggests that the *the* preceding the first instance of “wickedness and abominations” is an error for *their*. Note that later in this verse we have an instance of “their wickedness and abominations” but without a preceding *all* (the second instance of “wickedness and abominations”). Of course, *all their* is possible in this context, as in Alma 37:21: “all their wickedness and abominations”.

With respect to the use of *the* in Mormon 2:18, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read alike, so \mathcal{C} must have also read *the*. Nonetheless, there is considerable evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts for mixing up *the* and *their*; see, for instance, under Alma 27:23 for evidence that Oliver Cowdery frequently replaced *their* with *the* (Oliver is the presumed scribe here in \mathcal{C}).

The use of the definite article *the* normally implies some kind of postmodification, as in 3 Nephi 9:9: “because of their sins and their wickedness which was above all **the** wickedness **of the whole earth**”. One could assume in Mormon 2:18 some kind of ellipsis after “all the wickedness and abominations” (perhaps one with the meaning ‘which I have been describing’). Later in this verse one can find some support for a more general interpretation of “wickedness and abominations”, in the third instance of “wickedness and abominations” (where there is no determiner at all before this phrase):

Mormon 2:18
for behold a continual scene of wickedness and abominations
has been before mine eyes
ever since I have been sufficient to behold the ways of man

Another possible emendation in Mormon 2:18 would be to replace the *the* with *this*: “I did make a full account of all **this** wickedness and abominations”. Support for the use of *this* in this context can also be found elsewhere in the text: “yea for all **this** wickedness they were punished” (Alma 30:10). Nonetheless, one wonders if a *this* in Mormon 2:18 wouldn’t also require *abominations* to be in the singular, as in Jacob 2:16: “this iniquity and abomination”.

In any event, the use of *the* for the first instance of “wickedness and abominations” in Mormon 2:18 is not impossible, although it may very well be an error. Since the interpretation involving

ellipsis will work, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading with *the*. Nonetheless, there is a chance that the *the* is an error for *their* (or perhaps even *this*).

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 2:18 the use of *the* in the phrase “all **the** wickedness and abominations”, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the definite article may be an error for *their* (or maybe *this*), but since this phrase can be interpreted as involving ellipsis, the critical text will leave it as it is.

■ Mormon 2:18

for behold a continual scene of wickedness and abominations

[*has* >*js have* 1 | *has* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *been before mine eyes ever since I have been sufficient to behold the ways of man*

The earliest text here has the third person singular verb form *has*. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, thought to change the *has* to *have*, probably because of the immediately preceding plural *abominations*. But the actual subject is the singular *scene*, so the emendation to the plural *have* was ignored by the time the 1837 edition was typeset. Subsequent editions have continued with the singular *has*, as will the critical text.

Summary: Maintain the singular verb form *has* in Mormon 2:18, the earliest reading; the subject for *has* is the singular noun *scene*.

■ Mormon 2:25

and it came to pass that we did stand before them with such firmness

that they did flee [from 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] before us

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the adverb *from*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct reading. Elsewhere the text has numerous instances of “to flee **from before** someone”, including this one in the previous verse:

Mormon 2:24 insomuch that they did not flee **from before** the Lamanites

There are three possibilities in all; the text has “to flee **before** someone” (26 times), “to flee **from** someone” (11 times), and “to flee **from before** someone” (9 times), as in the following contrastive usage near the beginning of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 3:26	we did flee before the servants of Laban
1 Nephi 4:28	and they fled from before my presence
1 Nephi 4:29	wherefore they did cease to flee from my presence
1 Nephi 4:30	and was about to flee from before me

In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus “they did flee **from before** us” here in Mormon 2:25.

Summary: Maintain the use of both *from* and *before* in Mormon 2:25: “they did flee **from before** us” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ **Mormon 2:27**

because of their wickedness and [their 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] abominations

Here in Mormon 2:27, the 1840 edition dropped the repeated *their* in this conjunctive noun phrase. This loss is very likely a typo and not the result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *their* to the RLDS text. For further discussion of the tendency to omit (or sometimes add) repeated determiners in the text, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. Also see the discussion under 3 Nephi 9:2 for various examples involving *abominations* as a conjunct.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *their* in Mormon 2:27, “because of their wickedness and **their** abominations”; such repetition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text.

Mormon 3

■ 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*

As explained under Helaman 16:10, in the latter part of the text the 1830 typesetter usually removed the Hebraistic *and*, as here in Mormon 3:4 where the *and* preceded the main clause “the king of the Lamanites sent an epistle unto me” and separated it from the preceding subordinate *after*-clause with its associated present participial clause. The critical text will restore this original instance of *and*.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 3:4 the Hebraistic *and* that originally occurred just before the main clause “the king of the Lamanites sent an epistle unto me”.

■ Mormon 3:4

*and the king of the Lamanites sent an epistle unto me
which gave [unto 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| D] me to know
that they were preparing to come again to battle against us*

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition omitted the preposition *unto*. The 1849 LDS edition restored the original *unto*. For another example where the 1841 edition omitted *unto*, see under 3 Nephi 24:1. As explained under Alma 7:4, the Book of Mormon text prefers the *unto* in the verb phrase “to give (unto) someone to know”.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 3:4 the preposition *unto* in the relative clause “which gave unto me to know that . . .” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ Mormon 3:8

*and in [the 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST| K] three hundred and sixty and second year
they did come down again to battle*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the definite article *the* before the compound ordinal number and its accompanying noun *year*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the obviously correct reading with the *the*. In Mormon 4:10, scribe 2 of Ø made the same error initially in his copywork:

Mormon 4:10

and it came to pass that

[NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] three hundred and sixty

and sixth year had passed away

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 3:8 and in Mormon 4:10 the definite article *the* before the ordinal number; in each case the *the* is expected.

■ **Mormon 3:12**

behold I had led them

notwithstanding their wickedness I had led them many times to battle

and [I 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had loved them

according to the love of God which was in me

with all my heart

The printer's manuscript has the subject *I* before "had loved them", but the 1830 edition lacks the *I*. Depending on the interpretation, either reading will work. Textually, the odds favor the loss of the *I* over its addition. Presuming that Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in \mathcal{O} , it would have been easy enough for the 1830 compositor to skip the *I* after the ampersand that Oliver would have written in \mathcal{O} (*I* and $\&$ are visually similar, especially in Oliver's hand). Nonetheless, there are no clear examples where the 1830 compositor omitted an *I* when setting the type. Nor are there any examples where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} permanently added an *I* to the text, although in one instance he initially wrote one but immediately erased it:

Alma 5:17

or do ye imagine to yourselves that ye can lie unto the Lord at that day

and [*I* >% NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] say

Lord / our works have been righteous works upon the face of the earth

Of course, in this context the first-person "I say" is quite unacceptable. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , as has been noted in the discussion throughout this part of the text, never seems to have consciously edited the text; it is quite unlikely that he would have added the *I* here in Mormon 3:12.

Another consideration here deals with the syntax. With *I* at the beginning of the final clause, we are allowed to interpret "I had loved them" as being conjoined to the initial clause in the verse ("behold I had led them . . . and I had loved them"). Such an interpretation is quite difficult if the *I* is missing, for then we readily interpret Mormon as saying that "notwithstanding their wickedness I had led them many times to battle and had loved them". One could argue, to be sure, that Mormon loved them despite their wickedness. Even so, I think Mormon is simply saying here that he had led them and he had loved them with all his heart. In other words, the clause "notwithstanding their wickedness I had led them many times to battle" is the only part that is parenthetical. In fact, by setting dashes around this parenthetical portion, one can get the appropriate interpretation even if we follow the 1830 reading without the *I*:

Mormon 3:12

behold I had led them
 — notwithstanding their wickedness I had led them many times to battle—
 and had loved them according to the love of God which was in me
 with all my heart

This kind of coordination of predicates exists elsewhere in the text, as explained under 3 Nephi 11:18 (there the examples involve the ellipted subject pronoun *he* rather than *I*).

Ultimately, it is difficult to decide the correct reading here in Mormon 3:12. But since the overall tendency in the early transmission of the text was to accidentally omit small words rather than add them, the critical text will accept the reading in \mathcal{P} with the *I*, especially since it readily allows the more reasonable interpretation.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 3:12 the subject pronoun *I* (the reading of the printer’s manuscript) since this makes the final clause less dependent on the preceding *notwithstanding*-clause; the odds are that the original manuscript had the *I* here and that the 1830 compositor accidentally omitted the *I* because of its similarity to the immediately preceding ampersand that would have occurred in \mathcal{C} (under the assumption that Oliver Cowdery was the scribe here).

■ Mormon 3:15

and I will repay
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

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally misread *this* as *his*. The resulting text, “because his people repented not”, makes no sense here. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *this*. For other cases where the 1841 typesetter mixed up *this* and *his*, see under Helaman 8:22.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 3:15 the determiner *this* in “because this people repented not”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Mormon 3:20

and these things [do 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNP | doth OQRT | does S] the Spirit manifest unto me
therefore I write unto you all
and for this cause I write unto you
that ye may know that ye must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ
yea every soul which [belong >js belongs 1 | belong A | belongs BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to the whole human family of Adam

Here we have two instances of subject-verb disagreement. In the first case (“and these things **do** the Spirit manifest unto me”), the plural *do* of the earliest text appears to be based on the preceding plural *these things*, even though in this sentence that noun phrase is the direct object, not the subject; the actual subject is the singular *the Spirit*, which follows. Thus in standard grammar we expect the *-(e)s* ending in modern English and the *-(e)th* ending in the biblical style. The singular

doth was chosen for the 1907 LDS pocket edition and for the 1911 Chicago edition (probably independently), and the subsequent LDS text has maintained the *doth*. On the other hand, for the 1953 RLDS edition the modern form *does* was chosen.

In the other example, for the earliest text we get the plural verb form *belong* even though its associated subject is the singular *every soul*: “every soul which **belong** to the whole human family of Adam”. In this case, we may have a simple error where the third person singular ending *-s* or *-eth* was accidentally omitted from the verb *belong* when the text was originally dictated. (Both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition read *belong*, which argues that \mathcal{C} read the same since those two sources are both firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} for this part of the text.) In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith supplied the *s* (giving “every soul which **belongs** to the whole human family of Adam”). Alternatively, the *-eth* ending could have been supplied (giving “every soul which **belongeth** to the whole human family of Adam”).

Another possibility is that the plural *belong* occurred in the earliest text because *every soul*, although singular in form, is plural in meaning. There are quite a few examples in the text where “every <noun>” is referred to by means of a plural pronoun, as in the original text for Alma 9:28: “**every man** shall reap a reward of **their** works according to that which **they** have been”. More relevant here in Mormon 3:20 are three instances in the earliest text where the subject is “every <noun>” but the associated verb is in the plural; in each case, there is some intervening text that ends in a plural form that could have triggered the plurality for the immediately following verb form:

2 Nephi 9:21 (“every living creature . . . which belong”)

yea the pains of **every living creature**
both men women and children
which **belong** to the family of Adam

Alma 14:28 (“every soul . . . were slain”)

and **every soul** which was within the walls thereof
save it were Alma and Amulek
were slain

Alma 16:9 (“every living soul . . . were destroyed”)

yea **every living soul** of the Ammonihahites **were** destroyed

The first example is very similar to Mormon 3:20 in its reference to belonging to the family of Adam. But here in Mormon 3:20, there is no intervening plural form such as “both men women and children” in 2 Nephi 9:21; we get simply “**every soul** which **belong** to the whole human family of Adam” in both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition.

There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C} , could omit the third person singular *s* in his manuscript work:

2 Nephi 31:18 (initial error in \mathcal{D} , *lead* instead of *leads*)

and then are ye in this straight and narrow path
which [*lead* > *leads* 1 | *leads* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to eternal life

Alma 30:16 (error when copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , *lead* instead of *leads*)

because of the [*traditions* >% *tradition* 0 | *tradition* 1ABDEPS |
traditions CFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] of your fathers
which [*leads* 0 | *lead* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] you away

3 Nephi 18:13 (initial error in \mathcal{P} , *descend* instead of *descends*)

and when the rain [*descend* > *descends* 1 | *descends* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

The example in Alma 30:16 was a permanent change. \mathcal{O} read “the tradition of your fathers which **leads** you away” (after an immediate correction of *traditions* to *tradition*). When Oliver copied the verb into \mathcal{P} , he omitted the third person singular *s* from *leads*, giving “the tradition of your fathers which **lead** you away”. Yet even in this case, one could argue that the intervening plural *your fathers* led to the replacement of *leads* with *lead*. So actually there is not any specific evidence for permanently omitting the third-person singular *s* unless there is an immediately preceding plural noun.

There is also minor evidence that Oliver Cowdery could omit the *-(e)th* ending, although the only instance was momentary:

Mosiah 2:38

if that man [*repent* > *repenteth* 1 | *repenteth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not
and remaineth and dieth an enemy to God . . .

In this case, however, the initial *repent* in the *if*-clause was more likely due to interpreting the clause as taking the subjunctive (that is, *repent* is not a plural indicative form but the subjunctive infinitival form). So this is probably not an example of Oliver simply omitting a present-tense ending per se.

When we consider all other cases of “every <noun>” where there is no intervening noun between the head noun and its associated verb, that verb is always in the singular rather than the plural. In all there are 29 instances, of which 10 are in biblical quotes. Here I list the 19 other examples:

2 Nephi 9:50	every one that thirsteth
Mosiah 15:13	every one that has opened his mouth to prophesy
Mosiah 24:4	every land which was possessed by his people
Alma 3:19	every man that is cursed
Alma 3:27	every man receiveth wages of him who he listeth to obey
Alma 5:48	every man which steadfastly believeth on his name
Alma 5:49	every one that dwelleth in the land
Alma 5:52	every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit
Alma 7:15	every sin which easily doth beset you
Alma 11:1	every man which was a judge of the law
Alma 12:15	every man that believeth on his name
Alma 14:28	every soul which was within the walls thereof
Alma 32:31	every seed bringeth forth unto its own likeness
Alma 46:36	every tower which was in all the land
Mormon 4:11	every heart was hardened
Mormon 6:8	every soul was filled with terror
Moroni 7:13	every thing which inviteth and enticeth to do good
Moroni 7:16	every thing which inviteth to do good
Moroni 10:18	every good gift cometh of Christ

These examples argue that the third person singular ending is missing for the verb *belong* in Mormon 3:20. We should also note that most of the verb forms listed above take the ending *-(e)th*

rather than *-(e)s*. Excluding the cases of the *be* verb (*is* and *was*), there is only one example with the ending *-(e)s*, namely, *has* in Mosiah 15:13.

David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that here in Mormon 3:20 the antecedent for *belong* may not be the singular *every soul* but instead the earlier plural forms in the sentence (“and for this cause I write unto **you** that **ye** may know that **ye** must **all** stand before the judgment seat of Christ”). He also suggests that one could treat “yea every soul” as parenthetical, as it is used in the following example:

Mormon 8:36
and your churches—yea even every one—
have become polluted because of the pride of your hearts

Note that the text in Mormon 8:36 has the plural *have*, in agreement with the earlier *churches*, not the immediately preceding *every one*. The main problem with this suggestion for Mormon 3:20 is that the phrase “yea every soul” does not appear to be at all parenthetical; the following relative clause (“which belong to the whole human family of Adam”) clearly modifies *every soul*, not just the people that Mormon is addressing.

If *belong* in \mathcal{O} was simply due to a scribal slip, then it seems reasonable to assume that the original text read *belongs* and that Oliver Cowdery simply neglected to write the *s*. Another possibility is that Oliver missed hearing the *-eth* ending in *belongeth* because the final *th* sound would have been followed by the acoustically similar voiceless *t* of the word *to* (“every soul which **belongeth to** the whole human family of Adam”). Since most of the verb forms listed above end in *-(e)th*, it seems more plausible to assume that Oliver accidentally lost the *-(e)th* rather than *-(e)s* ending as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation, although we cannot be sure. The critical text will assume that there was some loss in the inflectional ending as Oliver took down Joseph’s dictation, probably the *-eth* of an original *belongeth*, although the *-s* of *belongs* remains a possibility. The earliest reading, *belong*, seems quite unlikely as the original reading.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 3:20 the original plural verb form *do* since it can be explained as the result of the preceding plural noun phrase, *these things*, even though that noun phrase is the direct object in the sentence; on the other hand, the plural verb form *belong* that follows the singular *every soul* will be considered an early error in \mathcal{O} for *belongeth* (although *belongs*, Joseph Smith’s emendation for the 1837 edition, is also possible).

■ Mormon 3:20–21

and for this cause I write unto you
that ye may know that ye must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ . . .
*and also that the Jews the covenant people of the Lord shall have other **witness***
[*besides* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMOPQRST | *beside* N]
[*that which* >js *him whom* 1 | *that which* A | *him whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they saw and heard
that Jesus whom they slew was the very Christ and the very God

There is some question concerning what the word *witness* means here. One possibility is that *witness* refers to another person (or to other persons), besides Jesus himself, who will witness to

the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition of *that which to him whom* supports this interpretation.

Another possibility is that *witness* refers to the testimony itself rather than the person witnessing—for instance, when we refer to someone's witness or to the witness of the scriptures or to some other kind of evidence. Elsewhere in the text, we have examples of *witness(es)* that refer to witnesses as people and others that refer to testimony itself. But when the noun *witness(es)* occurs without the article *a/an* or the number *one*, the word refers to testimony:

eight-witness statement	God bearing witness of it
Mosiah 13:23	thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor
Alma 10:13	that they might find witness against them
Alma 19:9	I have had no witness save thy word
Helaman 7:21	and bear false witness against your neighbor
Ether 12:6	for ye receive no witness not until after the trial of your faith

This usage suggests that *other witness* in Mormon 3:21 refers to testimony rather than to a person, in which case the change from *that which* to *him whom* would not work. Of course, the critical text will maintain the original *that which* even if it does refer to people.

In fact, it is theoretically possible that the word *witness*, no matter whether it refers to persons or testimonies, stands for the plural *witnesses*; thus the text may be saying that “the Jews . . . shall have other **witnesses** . . . that Jesus whom they slew was the very Christ and the very God”. But as Don Brugger points out (personal communication), here in Mormon 3:20–21 it appears that Mormon is referring to his own writing (or the Book of Mormon more generally) as the other witness of Jesus as the Christ. Yet even if the plural is the correct way to interpret *witness*, the critical text would maintain the bare form without the *-es* ending. For a discussion of the possibility that *witness* sometimes stands for *witnesses* in the original text, see under 2 Nephi 31:18.

Another possibility here in Mormon 3:21 is that *other witness* is an error for *another witness*. Of course, all these alternative readings involve some conjectural emendation, whereas the earliest text with *witness* does work (“the Jews . . . shall have other witness besides that which they saw and heard”). Don Brugger (personal communication) has provided the following example of the usage “have other witness” from <www.google.com>:

John Franklin Genung (1884)
 Of this same period, however, we **have other witness**,
such witness as **makes** the poet's own characterization doubly interesting.

Note that in this citation the noun phrases *other witness* and *such witness* are singulars since the associated verb is the third person singular *makes*. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading in Mormon 3:21 and assume that *witness* is in the singular.

There is one other variant here in Mormon 3:21, namely, when the 1906 LDS edition replaced *besides* with *beside*. But that edition never served as a copytext, so the incorrect *beside* was never transmitted to any subsequent edition. As explained under Alma 57:6, the original Book of Mormon text does not use the adverbial form *beside*, only the form ending in *s*, of which there are three instances, all meaning ‘in addition to’.

Here in the 1906 edition for Mormon 3:21, the change was from “besides him whom” to “beside him whom”; that is, the grammatical change from *that which* to *him whom* had already occurred (in the 1837 edition). Interestingly, one of the uses of *besides* in the original text is like the current text in Mormon 3:21:

2 Nephi 27:12
 the eyes of none shall behold it
 —save it be that three witnesses shall behold it by the power of God—
besides him to whom the book shall be delivered

The form *beside*, it turns out, does occur in biblically styled language. Note especially that the expression “beside that which” occurs four times in the King James Bible:

Deuteronomy 18:8
 they shall have like portions to eat
beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony

1 Kings 10:13
 and king Solomon gave unto the queen of Sheba
 all her desire / whatsoever she asked
beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty

2 Chronicles 9:12
 and king Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba
 all her desire / whatsoever she asked
beside that which she had brought unto the king

2 Chronicles 9:13–14
 now the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year
 was six hundred and three score and six talents of gold
beside that which chapmen and merchants brought

Also note that no biblical instance of “beside that which” refers to a human. Thus these biblical examples, except that they read *beside* instead of *besides*, confirm that in Mormon 3:21 the expression “besides that which” is used with *witness* to refer to testimony and not to a person.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 3:21 the singular form *witness*; restore the original *that which* since that is the reading of the earliest text; most likely, the word *witness* is referring to testimony rather than to people, which means that the 1837 change to *him whom* is not possible; also maintain the form *besides* instead of the biblically styled *beside*.

Mormon 4

■ Mormon 4:1–2

the Nephites did go up with their armies to battle against the Lamanites

(1) *out of the land* [of 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *Desolation*

and it came to pass that

the armies of the Nephites were driven back again

(2) *to the land of Desolation*

and while they were yet weary

a fresh army of the Lamanites did come upon them

and they had a sore battle

(3) *insomuch that the Lamanites did take possession of the city Desolation*

In this passage the printer’s manuscript consistently has “the land **of** Desolation”. The 1830 edition lacks the *of* in verse 1, but in verse 2 the *of* is there. So the immediate implication is that the 1830 edition accidentally dropped the *of* in verse 1, especially since the stronger tendency is to drop small words rather than add them. Note, however, that later in verse 2 we have “the city Desolation”, without any *of*, in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition.

Elsewhere the text consistently reads “the land Desolation” (seven times). Nonetheless, there is evidence that with adjectival names the *of* does occur, but considerably less frequently. For instance, here in Mormon there are five occurrences of “the city Desolation” (including the one at the end of Mormon 4:2, cited above) but one occurrence of “the city of Desolation” (Mormon 3:7).

Similarly, we have six occurrences of “the city Bountiful” and two of “the city of Bountiful”. And in the original text, there were 19 occurrences of “the land Bountiful” and 4 of “the land of Bountiful”. Moreover, there have been some changes in the occurrence of the *of* for “the land (of) Bountiful”—and in both directions: the current text has an added *of* in one case (in 1 Nephi 17:7); and in two cases, the *of* has been omitted (in Alma 50:32 and Alma 52:15).

When we consider the early transmission of the text, we find that there are no clear instances where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} either added or omitted *of* in “land (of) X” or “city (of) Y”. On the other hand, we find that the 1830 typesetter made changes in both directions:

1 Nephi 17:7 (*of* added)

the land [01 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Bountiful

Alma 27:23 (*of* omitted)

the land [*of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jershon

Alma 31:3 (*of* added)

the land [01 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jershon

Alma 52:15 (*of* omitted)

the land [*of* 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Bountiful

3 Nephi 9:7 (*of* omitted)

the city [*of* 1EFIJLMNOPQRST | ABCDGHK] Onihah

Thus the chances are greater that here in Mormon 4:1 the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the *of* in “the land **of** Desolation”. The critical text will consequently accept the reading in \mathcal{P} as the reading in \mathcal{C} and thus the original reading.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 4:1 the *of* in “the land of Desolation”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; the typesetter for the 1830 edition apparently dropped the *of*; this change makes verses 1 and 2 both read “the land **of** Desolation”.

■ Mormon 4:3

now the city Teancum lay in the borders

[*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *of* N] *the seashore*

Here the preposition *by* was accidentally replaced with *of* in the 1906 LDS edition. Subsequent LDS editions continued with the original *by* since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext. As explained under Alma 50:25, the critical text will maintain the original *by* here in Mormon 4:3.

■ Mormon 4:6

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did make

[$\mathfrak{S}2$ *peperation* >+ $\mathfrak{S}1$ *preperation* 1 | *preparations* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOQRT | *preparation* HKPS]

to come against the city Teancum

As explained under Alma 24:4, the original text has only the plural *preparations* in the phrase “to make preparation(s)”. Yet there has been a tendency to replace the plural with the singular, as here in \mathcal{P} for Mormon 4:6. In this instance, \mathcal{C} probably read in the plural, which is how the 1830 compositor set the word. But scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} miswrote the word as *peperation*, with the result that when Oliver Cowdery proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , he supplied the missing *r*, giving *preperation*. But the defective spelling seems to have prevented Oliver from noticing that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} had written the word in the singular, so in his correction Oliver did not add the plural *s*. The 1874 RLDS edition also made the change to the singular, and that reading has been retained in the RLDS text (supported by the singular *preperation* in \mathcal{P}). The critical text will maintain the plural *preparations*, the consistent reading of the Book of Mormon text for this phrase. For another example of this change to the singular, see nearby under Mormon 2:4.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 4:6 the plural *preparations*, the 1830 reading; the Book of Mormon consistently prefers the plural phraseology of “to make **preparations**”.

■ **Mormon 4:6**

*and it came to pass that the Lamanites did make preparations
to come against [the 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thy D] city Teancum*

Here we have an unfortunate typo in the 1841 British edition that shows once more the overall sloppiness in the typesetting for that edition. In this instance, “**the** city Teancum” was set as “**thy** city Teancum”. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct determiner, *the*.

Summary: Maintain the definite article *the* in the phrase “the city Teancum”, the expected reading as well as the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Mormon 4:8**

*they did again boast
of their [own 1PST | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] strength
and they went forth in their **own** might*

The printer’s manuscript has the adjectival *own* before *strength*, while the 1830 edition does not. The 1908 RLDS edition as well as the 1981 LDS edition restored the *own* in this passage, under the incorrect assumption that the 1830 edition here derives from the printer’s manuscript, which is not the case from Helaman 13:17 through the end of Mormon. Nonetheless, the reading of the current text with the *own* is probably the reading of the original since the stronger tendency is for the early text to lose small words rather than to add them. But more specifically, as explained under Alma 5:14, the overall tendency in the text has been to accidentally omit *own*; but in at least four cases, *own* has been accidentally added because of a nearby *own*. And one of these errors was made by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} :

Alma 5:2–3
and these are the words . . .
according to his **own** record saying :
I Alma having been consecrated
by my [$\mathcal{S}2$ *own* > $\mathcal{S}1$ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] father Alma . . .

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} did not catch his error there, but Oliver Cowdery did when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . One could argue that here in Mormon 4:8 we have one of those cases: scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally wrote “their **own** strength” because of the following “their **own** might”. Yet in this case, Oliver Cowdery did not add the *own* when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , which makes one wonder whether the *own* was actually there in \mathcal{O} . Moreover, we also have one clear case where the 1830 typesetter omitted the *own*:

Alma 5:14
have ye received his image
in your [*own* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] countenances

Thus it is very difficult here in Mormon 4:8 to determine how \mathcal{O} itself read, with the *own* or without.

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb is *boast*, the modifier *own* occurs in five out of six passages (the one lacking the *own* is marked below with an asterisk):

Mosiah 11:19	they did boast in their own strength
Alma 26:11	I do not boast in my own strength
Alma 38:11	yea see that ye do not boast in your own wisdom
* Alma 39:2	thou didst go on unto boasting in thy strength and thy wisdom
Helaman 4:13	and their boastings in their own strength
Mormon 3:9	they began to boast in their own strength

Thus the odds favor the occurrence of *own* in expressions referring to boasting. Since the transitional probabilities are fairly balanced, it is probably best to accept the longer reading (given the stronger tendency to omit small words than to add them). Thus the critical text will accept the reading in \mathcal{D} , “they did again boast of their **own** strength”, which means that in this instance the 1830 typesetter omitted the *own*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 4:8 the reading in \mathcal{D} with the *own*: “they did again boast of their **own** strength”; the 1830 reading without the *own* is apparently an error introduced by the 1830 typesetter.

■ Mormon 4:10

and yet the Nephites repented not of the evil
 [which >]s NULL 1 | which A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they had done*

As discussed under Helaman 9:13, there are a couple places in the history of the text where the relative pronoun, either *that* or *which*, has been deleted from the relative clause “which/that they had done”. The critical text will restore the relative pronoun here in Mormon 4:10 that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ Mormon 4:12

and there never had been so great wickedness
among all the children of Lehi
nor even among all the house of Israel
—according to the words of the Lord—
 as [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQ | was RST] *among this people*

The original text has *were* here in Mormon 4:12, but the ellipted subject is obviously the singular *wickedness*, not the nearby plural *words* (which probably led to the original text having the plural *were*). The 1920 LDS edition and the 1953 RLDS edition each made the grammatical change to *was*. The critical text will restore the original *were* despite its ungrammaticality in standard English. See under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3 for examples in the earliest text where subject-verb agreement was based on proximity rather than semantics.

Summary: Restore the original *were* in Mormon 4:12; although the subject for the verb is the singular *wickedness* (which occurs considerably earlier in the passage), the nearer plural *words* led to the use of the plural *were* in the original text.

■ Mormon 4:14

*and they did also march forward against the city Teancum
and did drive the inhabitants forth out of her
and did take many prisoners*

- *of women and of children* 1A
- *both women and children* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

and did offer them up as sacrifices unto their idols gods

Here the original text read “and did take many prisoners of women and of children”. This was edited in the 1837 edition in two ways. First, both *of*’s were deleted, so that the conjunct “women and children” was treated as an appositive to the direct object “many prisoners”. Then, perhaps to make the appositive seem less jarring, the word *both* was placed in front of “women and children”. Such editing was clearly intentional. And although it was not marked in the printer’s manuscript, one would think that Joseph Smith was responsible for it.

It is worth noting that the noun phrase “prisoners of X” means that X were prisoners, not X’s prisoners. However, the latter is how English speakers today interpret the phrase “prisoners of X”. Yet the unexpected interpretation is found rather consistently elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 52:8	that he should retain all the prisoners of the Lamanites as a ransom
Alma 53:1	they did set guards over the prisoners of the Lamanites
Alma 53:5	and in this city they did guard the prisoners of the Lamanites
Alma 54:3	to obtain as many prisoners of the Nephites from the Lamanites as it were possible
Alma 55:20	for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites
Alma 62:29	all the prisoners of the Lamanites did join the people of Ammon
Alma 62:29	they were relieved from all the prisoners of the Lamanites

Interestingly, earlier in Alma 54:3, Mormon first wrote: “and there was not a woman nor a child among all the prisoners **of Moroni**”. Lest the reader misinterpret this phrase as meaning that Moroni himself was a prisoner, Mormon added an *or*-clause to explain that these were Moroni’s prisoners: “or the prisoners which Moroni had taken”. In two places, the text refers to “Lamanite prisoners” instead of “prisoners of the Lamanites” (Alma 54:2 and Alma 55:31), but generally the *of*-construction “prisoners of X” is the normal phraseology the Book of Mormon uses to state that X were prisoners. Thus the 1837 editing that revised the original “many prisoners of women and of children” was textually unnecessary.

It is also worth noting that adding *both* to the noun phrase created a textual difficulty. Normally in the text where *women* and *children* are conjoined but *men* is not, the word *both* is lacking (there are 24 examples elsewhere in the text). For each of these instances, *men* is not conjoined with *women* and *children* because the role of the men is different. For instance, in several of these cases, women and children have been left unprotected and thus subject to being captured in large groups (as implied in Alma 58:30, Alma 60:17, Helaman 11:33, and here in Mormon 4:14–15, 21).

Only once in the earliest extant text do we have *both* occurring with *women* and *children* but without *men*; all the extant sources read this way:

Ether 14:17 (the reading in \mathcal{P} , the earliest extant text; \mathcal{G} is not extant here)
 and it came to pass that Shiz pursued after Coriantumr
 and he did overthrow many cities
 and he did slay **both women and children**
 and he did burn the cities thereof

This usage seems somewhat strange since the text implies that Shiz slew only women and children, yet there is nothing in the narrative to suggest why there were no men in these cities. Internal evidence argues that in Ether 14:17 the original text actually read “and he did slay both **men** women and children”. Note, for instance, that in the following clause (“and he did burn the cities thereof”), the *thereof* most reasonably would refer to cities of people (that is, men, women, and children), not cities of just women and children. For a complete discussion of the evidence for emending Ether 14:17 by adding *men*, see under that passage. The important point here is that if this conjecture is correct, then there are no instances of “both women and children” in the original text. This internal evidence provides support for the original reading in Mormon 4:14 (“many prisoners of women and of children”) and against the edited reading (“many prisoners / both women and children”).

Summary: Restore in Mormon 4:14 the reading in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition: “and did take many prisoners of women and of children”; that is, restore both *of*’s and remove the intrusive *both* of the 1837 edition; the original reading here is perfectly consistent with usage elsewhere in the original text, but the edited reading is anomalous.

■ Mormon 4:15

that they did go [1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *up* MQ] *against the Lamanites*
with exceeding great anger

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally added the adverb *up* here in Mormon 4:15. The 1911 LDS edition followed this reading, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the earlier reading to the LDS text. This use of *up* is consistent with the descriptions of battle movement in Mormon. Usually, the text in Mormon uses neither *up* nor *down* in describing the various attacks (18 times); but when it does, the Lamanites always “come down” against the Nephites while the Nephites always “go up” against the Lamanites. There are nine examples:

Mormon 3:7
 the Lamanites did **come down** to the city of Desolation
 to battle against us [the Nephites]

Mormon 3:8
 they [the Lamanites] did **come down** again
 to battle [against the Nephites]

Mormon 3:10
 that they [the Nephites] would **go up** to battle
 against their enemies [the Lamanites]

Mormon 3:14

that they [the Nephites] would **go up**
unto their enemies [the Lamanites] to battle

Mormon 3:16

I [Mormon, a Nephite] utterly refused to **go up**
against mine enemies [the Lamanites]

Mormon 4:1

the Nephites did **go up** with their armies to battle against the Lamanites

Mormon 4:4

the armies of the Nephites **went up** unto the Lamanites

Mormon 4:17

and in this year they [the Lamanites] did **come down**
against the Nephites with all their powers

Mormon 4:19

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did **come down**
against the city Desolation [a Nephite city]

(For six other examples in the text where “come down” is used to refer to Lamanite attacks against the Nephites, see under Alma 46:30.) Still, in the majority of cases here in Mormon no vertical direction is mentioned, as in the example under discussion and the example in the subsequent verse:

Mormon 4:15

that they [the Nephites] did **go** against the Lamanites with exceeding great anger

Mormon 4:16

and the Lamanites did not **come** again against the Nephites
until the three hundred and seventy and fifth year

Although the addition of *up* in the 1905 edition for Mormon 4:15 turns out to be appropriate for the verb *go* (the Nephites are attacking the Lamanites), the critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest text.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text in Mormon 4:15 without the adverb *up*; the insertion of *up* in the 1905 LDS edition appears to be accidental, even if consistent with usage elsewhere in Mormon.

■ Mormon 4:16

and the Lamanites did not [*come again* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMOPQRST | *come* HK | *again come* N]
against the Nephites
until the three hundred and seventy and fifth year

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the word *again*. Note that the following word is *against*, which means that the typesetter’s eye must have skipped across *again* because of its near identity to *against*. For other examples of this error in the history of the text, see under Alma 44:19–20 and 3 Nephi 2:18.

In the 1906 LDS edition, the word order for *come again* was switched to *again come*. This change was not transferred to any subsequent LDS edition since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext. Elsewhere, the text definitely prefers the word order “come again” over “again come” (34 to 2). But either order is possible, so we follow in each case the earliest reading, thus “the Lamanites did not **come again** against the Nephites” here in Mormon 4:16.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 4:16 the original *again* as well as its placement after the verb *come*.

■ Mormon 4:18

and from this time forth
did the Nephites gain no power over the Lamanites
but began to be swept off
 [by 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | before GHK] *them*
*even as a dew **before** the sun*

The 1858 Wright edition replaced the preposition *by* with *before*, probably because of the following *before* (“before the sun”). The first two RLDS editions followed this reading, but in the third RLDS edition (1908) the original *by* was restored. The use of *by them* in Mormon 4:18 is undoubtedly correct since it is the earliest reading.

Of course, either *before* or *by* will work here in Mormon 4:18 (although there is a difference in meaning). In fact, there is an actual case of *before them* for the phrase “to sweep off”:

Ether 14:27
 and they fled to the land of Corihor
 and swept off the inhabitants **before them**
 all they that would not join them

In this case, the agentive preposition *by* is not possible since the second clause is in the active voice (“they . . . swept off the inhabitants”).

Summary: Accept in Mormon 4:18 the prepositional phrase *by them*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Mormon 4:20

and they came to the city
 [Beaz > Boaz/Beaz 1 | Beaz A | Boaz BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The question here is whether the first vowel in this name is an *o* or an *e*. In other words, is the name *Boaz* or *Beaz*? In the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 initially wrote *Beaz*; then he corrected the vowel to what looks like an *o*. The 1830 compositor, on the other hand, set *Beaz*. Quite clearly, the original manuscript reading must have looked something like *Beaz*.

Under Mormon 2:4, in the discussion regarding the name *Angolah/Angelah*, I observed that Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote an *e*-like *o*. This tendency on his part suggests that in the original manuscript for Mormon 4:20, Oliver (the presumed scribe here in Ⓞ) accidentally wrote *Boaz* with an *e*-like *o*, which led both scribe 2 of Ⓞ (at least initially) and the 1830 compositor to

transmit the name as *Beaz*. The 1837 editing to *Boaz* indicates that Joseph Smith or other editors for that edition realized that *Beaz* was a mistake for the biblical name *Boaz* (the second husband of Ruth as well as the name of one of the pillars in Solomon's temple).

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} occasionally had difficulty writing the *e* vowel. Under Mormon 2:4, for instance, I list a number of names where scribe 2 wrote an *e* in place of the correct *o*. In addition, there are several instances here in Mormon where scribe 2 initially wrote the correct *e* vowel but then overwrote it to make it look more *e*-like; in these cases, his overwritten vowel looks more like an *o*, even when the context clearly requires an *e*:

Mormon 6:22

and he [*doeth* > *doeth/dooth* 1 | *doeth* A] with you
according to his justice and mercy

Mormon 8:20

[*neithe* > *neithe/noithe* 1 | *neither* A] shall he judge

Mormon 8:28

[*leaders* > *leaders/loaders* 1 | *leaders* A] of churches and teachers

The apparent motivation for these corrected *e*'s is that scribe 2's original *e*'s often looked more like undotted *i*'s, so by making a more expansive *e*, scribe 2 hoped to ensure the *e* reading, but the result was that his corrected *e*'s often look like *o*'s! This does not cause a problem with *doeth*, *neither*, and *leaders*, but it does lead to possible misinterpretation with names. In other words, it is possible that scribe 2's rewriting of *Beaz* to *Boaz/Beaz* in \mathcal{D} was simply an attempt to make the *e* more clear!

Ultimately, the 1837 decision to interpret the name here in Mormon 4:20 as *Boaz*, a biblical name, was probably correct, although we cannot be fully confident of this decision. In any event, the critical text will accept *Boaz*. For another example of the same difficulty with another name that is probably biblical, see under Mormon 6:14 regarding the name *Shem*.

Summary: The name of the city in Mormon 4:20 is probably the biblical name *Boaz*; Oliver Cowdery apparently wrote the name in the original manuscript so that the *o* looked more like an *e*.

■ Mormon 4:20 – 21

*and there they did stand against the Lamanites with exceeding boldness
insomuch that the Lamanites did not beat them
until they had come **again** the second time
and when they had come [1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *again* HK] the second time
the Nephites were driven and slaughtered with an exceeding great slaughter*

The 1874 RLDS edition added the *again* here, probably accidentally. The probable source for the error was the *again* that is found in the virtually identical clause that ends the previous verse (“until they had come **again** the second time”). Elsewhere in the text, *again* usually occurs in front of the phrase “the nth time” (there are 13 more examples). However, in three cases the *again* is not there (identified below in each instance with an arrow):

3 Nephi 11:5–6

and **again the third time** they did hear the voice . . .

→ and behold **the third time** they did understand the voice which they heard

3 Nephi 26:15

after he had ascended into heaven

→ —**the second time** that he shewed himself unto them—

and gone unto the Father . . .

Ether 14:29

and it came to pass that they came forth

but were driven again

→ and they came **the second time**

and they were driven **again the second time**

Note the variation in usage in the first and third of these three passages, just as in Mormon 4:20–21, although in 3 Nephi 11:6 the *again* is not really possible before the second instance of “the third time” since the crowd understood the voice only after they had heard it three times. In any event, the original text in Mormon 4:20–21 without the *again* for the repeated instance of “the second time” is fully possible (just like in Ether 14:29).

Summary: Accept the use of “the second time” in Mormon 4:21 without the *again* since variation with and without *again* is possible for the phrase “the nth time”, although usually the text has the *again*.

■ Mormon 4:22

*and it came to pass that
the Nephites did again flee from before them
taking all the inhabitants with them
both **in** towns and villages*

We note here that the preposition *in* is not repeated in the phrase “both in towns and villages” (in other words, it does not read “both in towns and **in** villages”). One wonders if a repeated *in* might have been lost when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in ☺ for this part of the text). Elsewhere the text consistently prefers the repetition of the *in* after *both*, thus “both in X and **in** Y”, not “both in X and Y” (where X and Y are noun phrases):

2 Nephi 3:24	both in word and in deed
2 Nephi 29:11	both in the east and in the west
Jacob 7:14	both in heaven and in earth
Mosiah 4:9	both in heaven and in earth (<i>2 times</i>)
Alma 17:5	both in body and in mind
Alma 22:10	both in heaven and in earth
Helaman 6:9	both in the land south and in the land north
Helaman 6:12	both in the north and in the south (<i>2 times</i>)
3 Nephi 1:17	both in the land north and in the land south

Mormon 4

3 Nephi 4:25 both in their front and in their rear
Ether 10:12 both in buildings and in gold and in silver

Similarly, for other prepositions, the preposition is usually repeated for this construction headed by *both* (as “both <preposition> X and <preposition> Y”). But there are two other instances in addition to Mormon 4:22 where the preposition is not repeated:

1 Nephi 19:7 both **to** the body and soul
2 Nephi 23:9 both **with** wrath and fierce anger

(The second of these is in the King James Bible, Isaiah 13:9.) Thus the construction in Mormon 4:22 without the repeated preposition, although infrequent, is possible and will be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Accept in Mormon 4:22 the nonrepetition of the preposition *in* in “both in towns and villages”, just as the preposition *to* is not repeated, for instance, in “both **to** the body and soul” (1 Nephi 19:7).

Mormon 5

■ Mormon 5:2

but behold I was without [hopes 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | hope CGHKRT]

Here the 1840 edition changed the earlier *hopes* to the singular *hope*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural (the reading in \mathcal{P}) to the RLDS text. The 1920 LDS edition made the same change to the singular, perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition or independently. As explained under Alma 52:21, there are six other instances in the Book of Mormon text of the plural *hopes* where the singular is expected in modern English. The critical text will restore the original plural here in Mormon 5:2.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 5:2 the original plural noun *hopes* (“I was without hopes”), the reading of the earliest sources; although the singular *hope* is more frequent in the text, there are six other instances of *hopes*.

■ Mormon 5:2

*for they repented not of their iniquities but did struggle for their lives
without calling [upon 1ABCDEFGFIJLMNOPQRST | on HK] that Being who had created them*

In this passage the preposition *upon* was accidentally replaced by the preposition *on* in the 1874 RLDS edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *upon*. Either reading is theoretically possible for the phrase “to call (up)on God”, or its equivalent; in the earliest text, there are eight instances with *upon* and two with *on*. On the other hand, when the phrase is “to call (up)on **the name of God**”, or its equivalent, there are five instances with *upon* and ten with *on*. In each case, we follow the earliest reading, thus *upon* here in Mormon 5:2.

Summary: Maintain the preposition *upon* in Mormon 5:2 (“without calling **upon** that Being who had created them”).

■ Mormon 5:2

*for they repented not of their iniquities but did struggle for their lives
without calling upon that Being who [had 1A | BCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] created them*

The 1837 edition dropped the *had* from the relative clause “who had created them”. This may have been accidental rather than intentional; in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not

mark this deletion in \mathcal{P} . There are corresponding instances of this relative clause in the simple past and the past perfect, as well as in the present perfect; here is an example of each type:

1 Nephi 2:12	they knew not the dealings of that God who had created them
Mosiah 2:21	if ye should serve him who hath created you from the beginning
Mosiah 2:25	but behold it belongeth to him who created you

For each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *had created* here in Mormon 5:2.

Summary: Restore the past perfect auxiliary *had* in Mormon 5:2 (“who had created them”); the 1837 loss of the *had* may be a typo.

■ Mormon 5:3

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did come against us as we had fled to the city of [$\mathfrak{S}2$ *Jordan* > $\mathfrak{S}1$ *Jordon* 1 | *Jordan* ABCDGHKPRST | *Jordon* EFIJLMNOQ]

Here scribe 2 in the printer’s manuscript wrote the name of the city as *Jordan*, and the 1830 compositor set the name as *Jordan*. Yet when Oliver Cowdery proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , he corrected \mathcal{P} to read *Jordon*, which implies that the original manuscript actually read *Jordon*. Both scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 compositor must have assumed that the biblical spelling was the correct one for the name of this Nephite city.

And Oliver Cowdery’s scribal practice argues that indeed this is the case. We have already discussed a case where Oliver mistakenly spelled the biblical name *Jordan* as *Jordon*, namely, in 2 Nephi 19:1, an Isaiah quote. In that passage the text refers to the river Jordan, so the *a* vowel is correct. And even earlier, Oliver wrote *Jordon* initially in \mathcal{P} for 1 Nephi 17:32, but in that case he virtually immediately corrected the spelling to *Jordan*. (In fact, in \mathcal{C} for 1 Nephi 17:32 he wrote *Jorden* for this name; see under 2 Nephi 19:1 for further discussion.) The important point here is that this second case is another reference to the river Jordan. So these two scribal errors in \mathcal{P} argue that here in Mormon 5:3 Oliver made the same mistake in \mathcal{C} : namely, he wrote *Jordon* instead of the correct *Jordan*. Most likely, the name of this Nephite city was the biblical name. For two other examples of biblical names here in Mormon, see under Mormon 4:20 for *Boaz* (the name of a city) and under Mormon 6:14 for *Shem* (the name of a Nephite military leader). The critical text will retain the spelling *Jordan* here in Mormon 5:3.

Surprisingly, in the 1849 LDS edition, the spelling *Jordon* showed up once more here in Mormon 5:3; this misspelling was retained in the LDS text until the earlier *Jordan* was restored in the 1920 edition. Orson Pratt, the editor for the 1849 edition, had no access to the manuscripts, so the spelling *Jordon* in that edition was probably not the result of his editing; it was very likely a typo introduced by the typesetter. Nonetheless, *Jordon* persisted for some time in subsequent LDS editions.

Summary: The correct spelling for the city mentioned in Mormon 5:3 is probably *Jordan*, the biblical spelling, not Oliver Cowdery’s misspelling *Jordon* (which he twice wrote elsewhere as the name for the biblical river Jordan).

■ Mormon 5:5

and thus [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] three hundred and seventy and nine years passed away

In this passage the earliest text seems to be a conflation of the two ways of referring to the yearly chronology in the Book of Mormon. Normally, the choice is between “the/this Xth year passed away” and “X years had passed away”. Here in Mormon 5:5, the original manuscript apparently had a *the* before the following plural cardinal number (since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree), yet this extra *the* appears to be a mistake. Such usage is impossible in English; not surprisingly, it is found nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text. The 1920 LDS edition removed this intrusive *the*.

Another difference worth noting here in Mormon 5:5 is the lack of the perfect auxiliary *had*. Elsewhere in the text we get the following statistics regarding the occurrence of this auxiliary verb in these two constructions that refer to the passing away of years:

	SIMPLE PAST	PAST PERFECT
<i>singular ordinal usage</i> “this/the Xth year”	18	8
<i>plural cardinal usage</i> “X years”	1	32

We see from these statistics that the text favors the simple past (“passed away” or “did pass away”) with the singular ordinal construction, but the past perfect (“had passed away”) dominates the plural cardinal construction. The statistics show one more case where we have the plural cardinal construction without the perfect auxiliary, namely, in 4 Nephi 1:41: “and thus did two hundred and fifty years pass away”. One could argue that in this other passage the *did* is a mistake for *had*. Note that in this case the preceding clauses show a similar syntax with *did*, and so the use of *did* at the end of verse 41 seems appropriate for the passage:

4 Nephi 1:40–41
 and the more wicked part of the people **did** wax strong
 and became exceeding more numerous than were the people of God
 and they **did** still continue to build up churches unto themselves
 and adorn them with all manner of precious things
 and thus **did** two hundred and fifty years pass away

In this case, the last *did* must have been in \mathcal{O} since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have it (for this passage each of these textual sources is a firsthand copy of \mathcal{O}). Consequently, the lack of *had* in Mormon 5:5 is not conclusive evidence that the original text read as an ordinal construction. Yet we should note here that one could interpret the last *did* in 4 Nephi 1:40–41 as an error resulting from the two previous occurrences of *did* in the passage. And there is evidence for this kind of error, although from scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} rather than from Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O} for 4 Nephi):

4 Nephi 1:46–47 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 and gold and silver **did** they lay up in store in abundance
 and **did** traffic in all manner of traffic
 and it came to pass that after three hundred and five years
 [*did* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had passed away
 —and the people **did** still remain in wickedness—
 and Amos died

Even so, the reading with *did* in 4 Nephi 1:41 is possible and will therefore be retained in the critical text.

Here in Mormon 5:5, in order to get “the three hundred and seventy and nine years” from an original “three hundred and seventy and nine years” (the plural cardinal construction), only the definite article *the* needs to be inserted. On the other hand, if the original text was “the three hundred and seventy and ninth year”, two errors would be involved: the loss of the ordinal *-th* ending for the number and the addition of the plural *s* for the word *year*. (Of course, if the occurrence of *had* is also at issue, then from an original “three hundred and seventy and nine years **had** passed away” the *had* would have to be lost in addition to adding the *the*.)

If a clause begins with *thus* and is followed by a reference to a particular year or a number of years as passing away, we can get either the singular ordinal construction (11 times) or the plural cardinal construction (4 times, excluding the case here in Mormon 5:5). But there is always a crucial systematic difference. With the ordinal construction, the narrative has already indicated that we are in that particular year, either by explicitly stating so or by referring to the previous year. But with the cardinal construction, the use of *thus* indicates a summarizing statement, namely, that the events described over a number of years are now finished. And the narrative here in Mormon 5:5 follows this second pattern. In Mormon 4:16–17, Mormon describes a major Lamanite campaign against the Nephites in the “three hundred and seventy and fifth year”. After describing the resulting devastation from that campaign, Mormon concludes in Mormon 5:5 that “three hundred and seventy and nine years” had passed away. Since there is no indication until then that the narrative is in that specific year, the use of the ordinal construction would be inappropriate.

The most probable reading for the original text in Mormon 5:5 appears to be “and thus three hundred and seventy and nine years passed away”, even though the lack of the *had* makes the reading somewhat unexpected. Nonetheless, the example from 4 Nephi 1:41 shows that the *had* is not necessary. The 1920 emendation will be retained, although the possibility remains that there was a *had* in the original reading and that it was lost during the dictation of the text.

Summary: Accept the 1920 reading in Mormon 5:5 as the most probable reading of the original text (namely, “and thus three hundred and seventy and nine years passed away”); this emendation proposes the least amount of accidental change in the transmission of the text; there is a possibility, however, that the original text was in the past perfect (“and thus three hundred and seventy and nine years **had** passed away”); but in either case, internal evidence strongly argues that the cardinal construction, not the ordinal one, is appropriate for this clause that begins with the summarizing *thus*.

■ Mormon 5:7

and it came to pass that we did again take to flight
and they whose flight were swifter

- (1) *than the* [*Lamanites* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *Lamanites'* FIJLMNOQRT]
did escape
and they whose flight did not exceed
- (2) *the* [*Lamanites* 1ABCDEGHKLPS | *Lamanites'* FIJLMNOQRT]
were swept down and destroyed

The syntax is quite complex for the two relative clauses in this verse. Since 1852 the LDS text has interpreted *Lamanites* as a possessive form (by the addition of the apostrophe in the 1852 edition), while the earlier text and the current RLDS text have the basic noun *Lamanites*. Neither reading works fully.

One problem is the noun *flight*. The possessive usage *Lamanites'* implies that the Lamanites too were fleeing, which is not the case. Elsewhere in the text, the noun *flight* always refers to the act of fleeing (including the first use of *flight* in this verse: “we did again take to flight”). But if we interpret the second and third occurrences of *flight* in Mormon 5:7 as deriving from the verb *fly* rather than *flee*, then we could interpret *flight* in Mormon 5:7 as meaning ‘swift movement in general’ (see definition 2 in the Oxford English Dictionary under the noun *flight* derived from the verb *fly*). Under this interpretation, the ellipted noun after the possessive *Lamanites'* would take the more general meaning of ‘speed’ rather than ‘fleeing’.

The problem with the basic noun *Lamanites* is that the actual meaning seems to be that those that escaped were “swifter than the Lamanites”; that is, the use of *flight* seems unnecessary. In fact, the original subject-verb agreement for this passage provides some support for this interpretation:

Mormon 5:7
and [*they* >js *those* 1 | *they* A | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
whose flight [*were* 1A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] swifter
than the Lamanites
did escape

If we substitute *who* for *whose flight*, we get the perfectly sensible “and **they** who **were** swifter than the Lamanites did escape”; in other words, the plural *were* in the relative clause agrees with the earlier *they*, not *flight*. (The critical text, as expected, will restore the original *they* and *were* as well as maintain, of course, the original noun phrase *whose flight*.)

Similarly, the last occurrence of *flight* (“whose flight did not exceed the Lamanites”) definitely seems to need some qualification in order to state that the speed of the Nephites’ flight did not exceed the speed of the Lamanites. The verb *exceed* usually deals with such situations by using *that of* after *exceed*:

1 Nephi 1:10	and their brightness did exceed that of the stars in the firmament
Helaman 6:1	their righteousness did exceed that of the Nephites
Moroni 9:9	and notwithstanding this great abomination of the Lamanites it doth not exceed that of our people in Moriantum
Moroni 9:20	and their wickedness doth exceed that of the Lamanites

If we apply this interpretation, but without the *that of*, to Mormon 5:7, we end up once more with a reference to “the flight of the Lamanites”, which is a problem since, as already noted, *flight* otherwise refers only to ‘fleeing’ in the Book of Mormon text.

Another question is whether the Book of Mormon text has isolated possessive forms of nouns (that is, without the following modified noun). The answer is, not very often:

2 Nephi 28:3 (two times)

I am the **Lord’s**

Mosiah 13:5 (*Moses’* stands for ‘Moses’s face’)

and his face shone with exceeding luster
even as **Moses’** did while in the mount of Sinai
while speaking with the Lord

Mosiah 13:24 (quoting Exodus 20:17 from the King James Bible)

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**

We note that one of these examples directly quotes the Bible, and the expression “I am the Lord’s” is also biblical (see Isaiah 44:5). So there is only one example (Mosiah 13:5) that could be said to represent the actual Book of Mormon language style. (As explained under Mosiah 13:5, the corresponding passage in Exodus 34 refers to Moses’s face shining; it does not refer to his whole body shining. The possessive form *Moses’* is undoubtedly correct in Mosiah 13:5.)

When we turn to cases of the possessive pronoun without a following noun, we find 19 instances in the text (of which eight are related to quotations from the King James Bible). And there is one case after the subordinate conjunction *than*:

Jacob 3:8

I fear that unless ye shall repent of your sins
that their skins will be whiter than **yours**
when ye shall be brought with them before the throne of God

So we have evidence of the isolated possessive after *than*—in addition to the possible possessive reading here in Mormon 5:7 of “swifter than the Lamanites”.

Alison Coutts (personal communication) suggests another possibility for ellipsis here in Mormon 5:7, namely, the noun *pursuit*, as if the text read as follows:

Mormon 5:7 (revised with ellipted *pursuit*)

and it came to pass that we did again take to flight
and they whose flight were swifter than the Lamanites’ **pursuit** did escape
and they whose flight did not exceed the Lamanites’ **pursuit** were swept down
and destroyed

Under this analysis, the possessive *Lamanites’* would be correct. One problem with this interpretation, however, is that there is no other instance in the text where ellipsis involves the antonym for a preceding word. If the possessive form *Lamanites’* is correct, then the more reasonable ellipsis should be something like a more general meaning for the noun *flight* (as discussed above). Ultimately,

the question comes down to whether *flight* can mean ‘speed’ in Mormon 5:7. My own inclination is to reject such an interpretation since *flight* never has this general meaning elsewhere in the text. This means, then, that the possessive interpretation *Lamanites*’ should also be rejected.

Summary: Restore the original basic noun form *Lamanites* both times in Mormon 5:7 since the text is not referring to “the flight” of the Lamanites; it seems doubtful that the ellipted word *flight* can here be assigned the general meaning ‘speed’ since that meaning appears nowhere else in the Book of Mormon.

■ Mormon 5:9

*and also that a knowledge of these things must come
unto the remnant of [these 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | this GHK] people*

The 1858 Wright edition replaced “these people” with “this people” here in Mormon 5:9. This change could have been influenced by the later occurrence of “this people” three more times in this verse:

Mormon 5:9
and also unto the Gentiles which the Lord hath said should scatter **this people**
and **this people** should be counted as naught among them . . .
and also that ye might not have too great sorrow
because of the wickedness of **this people**

Normally, the Book of Mormon text has the more expected “this people” (221 times in the original text), but there is nonetheless one other occurrence of “these people”:

Mosiah 29:30 if **these people** commit sins and iniquities . . .

Moreover, there are 11 instances in the original text of the parallel demonstrative plural “those people”. So “these people” is definitely possible in Mormon 5:9 and will be continued in the critical text since the earliest textual sources have the plural *these*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 5:9 the infrequent “these people”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Mormon 5:14

*that the Father may bring about through his most Beloved
his great and eternal purpose
in [the >]s NULL 1 | the A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] restoring
the Jews or all the house of Israel to the land of their inheritance*

As explained under 1 Nephi 17:32, the original text (as well as the current text) has a number of examples of the mixed gerundive construction, such as “the restoring the Jews” here in Mormon 5:14 rather than the more nominal “**the** restoring of **the** Jews” or the more verbal “restoring the Jews”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the definite article *the*, thus adopting the more verbal gerundive form. The critical text will restore the original reading with the *the*. For a general discussion of these different gerundive types, see under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 5:14 the original mixed gerundive “the restoring the Jews”; the original text had a number of occurrences of this construction, some of which have been retained in the current text.

■ Mormon 5:17

*yea they were [lead even 1 | led even ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | even led 0]
by God the Father*

The word order in the earliest text for this passage has the adverb *even* following the main verb *led* (spelled as *lead* in \mathcal{P}), thus “they were **led even** by God”. The 1907 LDS edition changed the word order by moving the *even* before *led* (“they were **even led** by God”). That edition never served as a copytext, so no subsequent LDS edition has ever followed this change in word order. Either reading is theoretically possible. There is one example that supports the original reading here in Mormon 5:17, namely, a case where *even* follows a passive verb phrase, in this case *were driven*: “and the Nephites and the armies of Moronihah **were driven even** into the land of Bountiful” (Helaman 4:6).

Summary: Maintain the original word order in Mormon 5:17, with *even* following the main verb, *led*.

■ Mormon 5:19

*and behold the Lord hath reserved their [blessing 1A | blessings BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which they might have received in the land
for the Gentiles which shall possess the land*

Both the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition read *blessing*, in the singular, which means that the original manuscript very likely also read in the singular. The 1837 edition reads in the plural. This change in number may have been unintentional, especially since it was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P} . As explained under 3 Nephi 20:15, in general the text permits either the singular *blessing* or the plural *blessings*. In this particular case, one could argue that the singular is correct because it is referring to the blessing of possessing the promised land. In any event, the critical text will here follow the earliest reading, the singular *blessing*.

Summary: Restore the singular *blessing* in Mormon 5:19 since \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read in the singular (both are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} for this part of the text).

■ Mormon 5:23

*know ye not that ye are
in the [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote “in the hand of God”, but virtually immediately he corrected the singular *hand* to *hands*. The 1830 edition reads *hands*, so undoubtedly \mathcal{C} did too. Elsewhere the text consistently has the plural *hands* for the phrase “in the hand(s) of God” (eight times), never the singular *hand*. For two other instances where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote *hands* as *hand*, see

under Mosiah 27:4 and Mormon 6:15. The critical text will maintain the plural instance here in Mormon 5:23.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 5:23 the plural *hands* in the phrase “in the hands of God”; elsewhere the text has only the plural *hands* for the phrase “in the hand(s) of God”.

■ Mormon 5:24

*therefore repent ye and humble yourself before him
lest he shall come out in **justice** against you
lest a remnant of the seed of Jacob shall go forth among you as a lion
and tear you in pieces and there is none to deliver*

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 12 November 2007) suggests that the word *justice* here could be an error for *judgment*, especially given the two instances elsewhere in the text of “to come out in **judgment** against someone” (but no others of “to come out in **justice** against someone”):

Alma 60:32

behold can you suppose that
the Lord will spare you and **come out in judgment** against the Lamanites

Moroni 9:15

woe unto this people
come out in judgment / O God
and hide their sins and wickedness and abominations from before thy face

It should be noted that both these passages, along with Mormon 5:24, refer to God’s judgment or justice in a negative context.

If *justice* is an error for *judgment* here in Mormon 5:24, it must have occurred during the dictation of the text, either as a misreading by Joseph Smith or as a mishearing by Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C} for this part of the text). Since both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition are first-hand copies of \mathcal{C} for this passage and they both read *justice*, \mathcal{C} itself undoubtedly read as *justice*.

There is scribal evidence for miswriting *justice* in place of *judgment*, namely, once when Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} :

1 Nephi 22:21

wherefore he shall execute
[*judgment* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *justice* > *Judgment* 1]
in righteousness

Despite this evidence from scribal practice and usage elsewhere in the text, there is clear evidence that the Book of Mormon sometimes associates the word *justice* with *judgment*. In one passage, the association is with the more specific *righteous judgment* and is found in a parallel structure:

Alma 41:14

yea ye shall have mercy restored unto you again
ye shall have **justice** restored unto you again
ye shall have a **righteous judgment** restored unto you again
and ye shall have good rewarded unto you again

And in two cases, the single words *justice* and *judgment* are closely associated. One case is in a quote from the King James Bible where both words are used in a positive context:

2 Nephi 19:7 (Isaiah 9:7)
of the increase of government and peace there is no end
upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom
to order it and to establish it **with judgment** and **with justice**
from henceforth even forever

The other case is found in a negative context:

Alma 60:13
for the Lord suffereth the righteous to be slain
that **his justice and judgment** may come upon the wicked

There is also plenty of support for the semantic relatedness of *justice* and *judgment* in the Old Testament, as in the following examples that refer to the people, kings, and the Lord as exercising justice and judgment, sometimes in parallel constructions:

Genesis 18:19	and they shall keep the way of the LORD to do justice and judgment
2 Samuel 8:15	and David executed judgment and justice unto all his people
Job 8:3	doth God pervert judgment / or doth the Almighty pervert justice
Job 36:17	judgment and justice take hold <i>on thee</i>
Psalms 89:14	justice and judgment <i>are</i> the habitation of thy throne
Psalms 119:121	I have done judgment and justice
Proverbs 21:3	to do justice and judgment <i>is</i> more acceptable to the LORD than sacrifice
Isaiah 59:9	therefore is judgment far from us / neither doth justice overtake us
Isaiah 59:14	and judgment is turned away backward and justice standeth afar off

Don Brugger (personal communication) provides the following citation from <www.google.com>, which gives the title for an anonymously written book published in London in 1649:

A Brief Warning Concerning the Just **Judgement** of God:
And His Eternall **Justice, Against** the Unjust and Wicked Designe
of the Souldiers of England, who Have Deprived of Life, and Murthered Their King.

Thus the expression “to come out in justice against someone” is possible and will therefore be maintained in Mormon 5:24. To be sure, *justice* could be an error for *judgment* in this passage, but it is also possible that it is correct.

Summary: Retain the word *justice* in Mormon 5:24; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and the King James Old Testament argues that *justice* and *judgment* are closely associated semantically.

Mormon 6

■ Mormon 6:2

that we might gather together our people unto the land
of [§2 Camorah > §1 Cumorah 1 | Camorah A | Cumorah BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery’s spelling of the first occurrence of the name *Cumorah* apparently looked like *Camorah* (Oliver is the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O} for this part of the text). Both scribe 2 of the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 compositor interpreted the initial vowel as an *a*, but Oliver, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , replaced the initial *a* with a *u*. This correction argues that Oliver himself decided that the intended name in \mathcal{O} (which he himself had written, it would appear) was *Cumorah*, not *Camorah*.

Similarly, the *u* in the name *Cumenihah*, which occurs later in this chapter, was also written so that it looked somewhat like an *a*, thus leading the 1830 compositor to set *Camenihah*. In that case, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *Cumenihah* in \mathcal{P} :

Mormon 6:14
and [*Cumenihah* 1PST | *Camenihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR]
and Moronihah and Antionum and Shiblom and Shem and Josh
had fallen with their ten thousand each

Oliver frequently mixed up his *a*’s and *u*’s in his manuscript work, especially in cases of original *u* that were written like *a*, as in the following names (see the discussion under each of the passages):

	ORIGINAL <i>u</i>	SECONDARY <i>a</i>
Alma 43:5	Antion <u>u</u> m	Antion <u>a</u> m
Alma 56:18	Antip <u>u</u> s	Antip <u>a</u> s
Helaman 1:9	Kish <u>u</u> cumen	Kish <u>a</u> men
3 Nephi 3:1	Lachone <u>u</u> s	Lachone <u>a</u> s
Mormon 6:14	Jone <u>u</u> m	Jone <u>a</u> m
Moroni 9:2	Lur <u>u</u> m	Lar <u>a</u> m

For instance, in two out of 12 extant occurrences of the name *Kishcumen* in the original manuscript, Oliver’s *u* almost looks like an *a*—that is, *cumen* twice looks like *camen* (for discussion of this point, see under Helaman 1:9). Thus it is not surprising that in Mormon 6:14 an original *Cumenihah* could have been miswritten in \mathcal{O} so that it looked like *Camenihah* to the 1830 compositor.

The name *Cumenihah* occurs only once in the text, but *Cumorah* occurs nine times, all in Mormon. We get the following variation in the earliest textual sources for *Cumorah* (\mathcal{O} is not extant for any of these):

Mormon 6

	PRINTER'S MANUSCRIPT	1830	1837
Mormon 6:2	§2 Camorah > §1 Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:2	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:4	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:4	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:5	Comorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:6	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:6	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 6:11	Comorah	Camorah	Cumorah
Mormon 8:2	Cumorah	Camorah	Cumorah

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} has three different spellings for the standard *Cumorah*. Besides *Cumorah* (with six occurrences), there are two of *Comorah* and one of *Camorah*. As already noted, *Camorah* is the spelling in \mathcal{P} for the first occurrence of the name, which Oliver Cowdery corrected to *Cumorah*. The 1830 edition has only the spelling *Camorah*, while the 1837 edition consistently has the standard *Cumorah*. Subsequent editions have consistently followed the 1837 spelling.

The two cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *Comorah* rather than his most frequent spelling *Cumorah* may be the result of *Cumorah* looking like *Camorah* in \mathcal{G} . Indeed, sometimes in the manuscripts *a*'s look like *o*'s and vice versa. For a list of examples involving Book of Mormon names and words, see the discussion regarding the name *Ammaron* under 4 Nephi 1:47. But it is also possible that *Comorah* is an error based on *Cumorah* since there is evidence in the manuscripts for mix-ups of *o* and *u* in Book of Mormon names and words, especially when the vowel was followed by *m*:

	ORIGINAL VOWEL	SECONDARY VOWEL
Alma 10:31	Zeezrom	Zeezrum
Alma 11:6	ezrum	ezrom
Ether 9:19	cumoms	comoms

So the two instances of the misspelling *Comorah* could be used to argue that Oliver wrote either *Camorah* or *Cumorah* in \mathcal{G} , at least for the fifth and eighth occurrences of the name.

Internal evidence from the spelling of other Nephite names and words supports the *u* vowel for the spellings *Cumorah* and *Cumenihah*. We have a number of names preceded by a /k/-like sound (spelled as either *c* or *k*) and followed by an *m*. In each case, the textual evidence argues that the vowel is *u* rather than *a*. *Cumenihah* is specifically supported by other names that contain the morpheme *cumen(i)* or *kumen*:

Cumeni, Kishcumen, Kumen, Kumenonhi, Pacumeni

More generally, there are other Nephite names and words that have the sequence *cum*, but there are none with *cam*:

cumom, Mocum, Moriancumer, Ripliancum, Teancum

Cumorah is indirectly supported by all these examples and more specifically by *cumom* (the word *cumom* occurs twice, both times in the plural, in Ether 9:19).

The 1830 spelling *Camorah* was recognized as incorrect prior to its correction in the 1837 edition. In one of Oliver Cowdery's letters on the early history of the LDS church, published in the July 1835 issue of the *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* (volume 1, number 10), Oliver wrote in reference to the 1830 edition:

By turning to the 529th and 530th pages of the book of Mormon you will read Mormon's account of the last great struggle of his people, as they were encamped round this hill Cumorah. [It is printed Camorah, which is an error.]

The parenthetical statement at the end is a part of the citation. (This quote was brought to my attention by Delbert Curtis and confirmed with the assistance of Scott Faulring.)

Summary: Continue with the *u*-spellings for the first vowel in *Cumorah* and in *Cumenihah* (Mormon 6:14) since for these two names the scribal and internal evidence basically supports the *u* vowel rather than the *a* vowel.

■ Mormon 6:2

*and desired of him that he **would** grant unto us
that we might gather together our people unto the land of Cumorah
by a hill which was called Cumorah
and there we [would 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | could FIJLMNOQRT] give them battle*

In the last clause, the original text had the modal auxiliary *would*, but in the 1852 LDS edition *would* was replaced by *could* (probably accidentally). The use of *would* actually reads better (*could* sounds too conditional, *would* is more decisive). The use of *would* is also consistent with the earlier use of *would* in this verse, "that he **would** grant unto us". Here are two other examples of negotiations where a proposal involves a sequence of *would*'s:

1 Nephi 3:24

and it came to pass that we went in unto Laban
and desired him that he **would** give unto us
the records which were engraven upon the plates of brass
for which we **would** give unto him our gold
and our silver and all our precious things

1 Nephi 4:32

and it came to pass that I spake with him
that if he **would** hearken unto my words
as the Lord liveth and as I live
even so that if he **would** hearken unto our words
we **would** spare his life

The critical text will restore the original use of *would* in Mormon 6:2. For more examples of textual variation between *would* and *could*, see under 3 Nephi 3:15.

Summary: Restore the original *would* in Mormon 6:2, with the result that Mormon's proposal will consistently use the modal *would* ("that he **would** grant unto us . . . and there we **would** give them battle").

■ **Mormon 6:4**

and we did pitch [our 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | out MQ] tents round about the hill Cumorah

The typesetter for the 1905 LDS edition accidentally misread *our* as *out*. And this typo was subsequently copied into the 1911 LDS edition. Ultimately, the typo was removed from the text in the 1920 LDS edition. There is, of course, no such thing here as “pitching out tents”. Elsewhere the text has nine instances of “pitch **our** tents”.

Summary: Maintain the possessive pronoun *our* in Mormon 6:4: “we did pitch **our** tents” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ **Mormon 6:6**

*and having been commanded of the Lord
that I should not [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] the records
which had been handed down by our fathers which were sacred
to fall into the hands of the Lamanites . . .*

The original text here has a mixture of clausal forms. The clausal complement to the verb *suffer* begins as a *that*-clause (“that the records . . .”) but ends as an infinitival clause (“to fall into the hands of the Lamanites”). The two intervening relative clauses make this conflation of clausal types less noticeable. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the *that*, thus substituting a complete infinitival clause for the original mixture. Here is another example of this kind of mixed clausal structure that was removed by editing (in this instance by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition):

1 Nephi 1:3
and I know [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the record which I make
[*to be* >js *is* 1 | *to be* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] true

In this case, the mixed clause was made into a complete *that*-clause by emending *to be* to *is*. Similarly, here in Mormon 6:6 the editors for the 1920 edition could have replaced the infinitival *to* with, say, *should*:

Mormon 6:6 (alternative grammatical emendation)
and having been commanded of the Lord
that I should not suffer that the records
which had been handed down by our fathers which were sacred
should fall into the hands of the Lamanites . . .

For another example where the *that* was removed, see under Moroni 4:1. The critical text will, of course, restore the original mixed construction here in Mormon 6:6 as well as in 1 Nephi 1:3 and Moroni 4:1.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 6:6 the original mixed clausal complement that begins as a *that*-clause but ends as an infinitival clause.

■ Mormon 6:6

*save it were [thse 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] few plates
which I gave unto my son Moroni*

Here scribe 2 wrote *thse* in \mathcal{P} . John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, set *these*; since Gilbert's copy-text was \mathcal{O} for this part of the text, \mathcal{O} probably read *these*. One other possibility is that scribe 2's *thse* was an error for *those*, which would mean that not only did scribe 2 omit the *o* but that Gilbert replaced *those* with *these*. Such a scenario is highly unlikely, but one wonders about the possibility that the original text here read "save it were **those** few plates which I gave unto my son Moroni", as if the plates that Mormon is writing on here are distinct from the ones he gave his son. Ultimately, since Moroni takes over for his father Mormon at the beginning of chapter 8 in this book (at the beginning of chapter IV in the original chapter system), it seems more likely that the plates are the same and therefore *these* is appropriate.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:6 the demonstrative *these*, the 1830 reading and presumably the intended interpretation for *thse* in \mathcal{P} .

■ Mormon 6:7

*my people with their wives and their children
did now behold the armies of the Lamanites
[1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | a A] marching towards them*

Here \mathcal{P} lacks the prepositional *a* before *marching*, while the 1830 edition has the *a*. In the 1837 edition, all remaining instances of this dialectal use of *a* were permanently removed from the text. As explained under Helaman 16:4, there were originally 26 cases of prepositional *a* in the copytext for the 1830 typesetter, who omitted the *a* in 11 of those cases. But there is no independent evidence that he himself ever added the prepositional *a*. We should consider Mormon 6:7 one of those cases where he maintained the prepositional *a* (for a total of 15 times); it is rather unlikely that he would have added the *a* here since he never did elsewhere.

Unfortunately, we have no other examples showing scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} either omitting or adding the prepositional *a*. There are three instances of the prepositional *a* in his hand, all in Alma 10; each of these was written without correction. But when we consider Oliver Cowdery's practice, we find that in four cases he momentarily omitted the *a*; and in only one case (marked below with an asterisk) did he accidentally add the *a*, again momentarily:

Alma 18:9 (initial loss in \mathcal{P})

behold he is [*feeding* > *afeeding* 1 | *feeding* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thy horses

Alma 28:5 (initial loss in \mathcal{O} ; consciously deleted later in \mathcal{O} by Oliver Cowdery)

and also of fathers

[NULL > *a* >+ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] mourning for their sons

Alma 28:5 (initial loss in \mathcal{P})

and thus the cry of mourning was heard among every one of them

[*a* 0 | NULL > *a* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] mourning for their kindred

* Alma 56:31 (addition in \mathcal{O} immediately deleted by erasure)
 as if we were [*a* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] going
 to the city beyond

Alma 57:31 (initial loss in \mathcal{P} ; room in the lacuna of \mathcal{O} for the *a*)
 behold the armies of the Lamanites
 are [NULL > *a* >js NULL 1 | *a* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] marching
 towards the city of Cumeni

There are two cases, both in \mathcal{O} , where Oliver consciously removed the prepositional *a*. One is listed above (in the first instance of the prepositional *a* in Alma 28:5); here is the second one:

Alma 55:8 (consciously deleted later in \mathcal{O} by Oliver Cowdery)
 and behold they saw him [*a* >+ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] coming
 and they hailed him

(See under Alma 28:5 and Alma 55:8 for discussion of these two conscious deletions of the *a*.) All in all, these statistics suggest that sometimes the scribe omitted the prepositional *a*, although not as frequently as did the 1830 typesetter. Here in Mormon 6:7, the critical text will accept the 1830 reading with the prepositional *a* as the probable reading in \mathcal{O} , which means that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted it when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Restore in Mormon 6:7 the prepositional *a* of the 1830 edition: “my people . . . did now behold the armies of the Lamanites **a** marching towards them”; \mathcal{P} lacks the *a* here, but this is likely the result of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitting the *a* since the 1830 typesetter never otherwise added the prepositional *a*.

■ Mormon 6:7

*and with that awful fear of death which fills the breasts of all the wicked
 did they [await 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | wait GHKPS] to receive them*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced the verb *await* with its variant *wait*. This shorter form has been continued in all the RLDS editions. The verb *wait* is the verb normally used in the text for any general kind of waiting. On the other hand, the verb is typically *await* when there is some sense of anxiousness in the waiting, although all the examples except for two (one in 3 Nephi 3:3 and the other here in Mormon 6:7) refer to some sort of deserved punishment that metaphorically “awaits” the sinner:

Alma 5:7	and an everlasting destruction did await them
Alma 54:7	that awful hell that awaits to receive such murderers as thou . . .
Helaman 9:22	because of the great destruction at this time which doth await you
Helaman 13:6	yea heavy destruction awaiteth this people
Helaman 14:11	and know of the judgments of God which doth await you
3 Nephi 3:3	so many brave men . . . do await with great anxiety the word: go down upon the Nephites and destroy them
Mormon 6:7	and with that awful fear of death . . . did they await to receive them

The original use of *await* in Mormon 6:7 is appropriate and will be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Accept in Mormon 6:7 the use of *await*, the reading of the earliest text; the verb *await* is appropriate here since the context implies anxiousness.

■ **Mormon 6:8**

*and it came to pass that
they [came 1AKPQRST | come BCDEFGHIJLMNO] to battle against us
and every soul was filled with terror because of the greatness of their numbers*

Here the typesetter for the 1837 edition introduced *come* into the text, an obvious typo for *came*. The rest of the passage reads in the past tense. Amazingly, this reading was maintained in the printed editions until the 1892 RLDS edition (for the RLDS text) and the 1911 LDS edition (for the LDS text). It appears that earlier editors and typesetters were willing to interpret this case of *come* as an instance of the historical present tense.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:8 the past-tense *came* in “they **came** to battle against us”; as is appropriate, the entire sentence is in the past tense.

■ **Mormon 6:10**

*and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
yea [or 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] even my ten thousand which were with me*

Here the printer’s manuscript has an example of the correcting *or*, while the 1830 edition lacks it. Mormon added the *or*-phrase here because he wanted to differentiate between the entire army, which was under his overall command, and the ten thousand men under his immediate command in the battle. Verse 12 refers to Moroni’s ten thousand, and verses 13–14 list the names of the other Nephite leaders and the information that each has fallen along with “his ten thousand”. So Mormon’s correction helps the reader understand that Mormon is referring only to his own ten thousand here in verse 10.

It is very unlikely that the *or* was added here in Mormon 6:10; instead, it was probably in the original manuscript (and in the original text). There is considerable manuscript evidence for the occasional omission of the conjunction *or*; for three passages where *or* was initially omitted in the early text, see the discussion under Alma 1:30. And Alma 1:30 itself probably represents a fourth case where *or* was accidentally omitted in the early transmission of the text. In general, the tendency in the transmission of the text has been to omit small words rather than to add them.

There is one other example in the text of “yea or even”:

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

There are also a few examples of the corrective *or* immediately followed by *even*:

Mosiah 1:5
and we should have been like unto our brethren the Lamanites
which know nothing concerning these things
or even do not believe them when they are taught them
because of the traditions of their fathers which are not correct

Mosiah 2:13

neither have I suffered that ye should be confined in dungeons
nor that ye should make slaves one of another
or that ye should murder or plunder or steal or commit adultery
or even I have not suffered that ye should commit any manner of wickedness

Mosiah 7:21

and having yielded up into his hands the possessions of a part of the land
or even the city of Lehi-Nephi and the city of Shilom and the land round about

Mosiah 27:10

and to lead astray the people of the Lord contrary to the commandments of God
or even the king

Alma 32:16

yea without being brought to know the word
or even compelled to know
before they will believe

Thus the printer's manuscript's "yea or even" in Mormon 6:10 is acceptable and is probably the reading of the original manuscript.

Summary: Restore the corrective *or* in Mormon 6:10 ("yea **or** even my ten thousand") since the construction "(yea) or even" is found elsewhere in the text; in addition, the tendency in the text is to omit short words such as *or*, which means that the shorter 1830 reading is probably the secondary one here.

■ Mormon 6:11

*and when they had gone through and hewn down all my people
save it [1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] twenty and four of us*

It is quite obvious that the verb *were* was accidentally dropped here when copying from the original manuscript to the printer's manuscript. The 1830 edition, copied here from \mathcal{O} , has the *were*. Clearly, the clause would not make sense without the verb. It is true that in certain cases the linking *be*-verb is missing in the original text of the Book of Mormon, but all these examples seem to be restricted to quotations from Isaiah (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:14).

One theoretical possibility here is that the original text (or \mathcal{O} itself) read *was* rather than *were*. Even so, the subjunctive "save it were" is considerably more frequent in the earliest text than the indicative "save it was" (for some statistics, see under 1 Nephi 17:31 as well as in the addendum for that passage at the end of this part of volume 4). Also note here in Mormon 6 another example of this phraseology:

Mormon 6:15

there were ten more which did fall by the sword with their ten thousand each
yea even all my people save **it were** those twenty and four which were with me

Thus the odds are quite high that the original text read *were* in Mormon 6:11, in agreement with the 1830 reading there.

One other possibility, but quite implausible, is that the original text here read “save twenty and four of us” — that is, it lacked both the *it* and a verb. Usually the function word *save* is followed by a clause, but there are some examples of *save* followed by a noun phrase in the Book of Mormon text. Compare, for instance, the contrastive usage in the following passage where both the noun phrase and clausal types occur:

Alma 49:18

now behold the Lamanites could not get into their forts of security
by any other way **save by the entrance**
because of the highness of the bank which had been thrown up
and the depth of the ditch which had been dug round about
save it were by the entrance

But here in Mormon 6:11 both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have the *it*, which argues that *it* was in \mathcal{O} as well. The original text undoubtedly read “save it were twenty and four of us” in Mormon 6:11.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:11 the subjunctive *were* in the phrase “save it were twenty and four of us”, the 1830 reading.

■ Mormon 6:12

and we also beheld

[*the* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *ten thousand of my people*
which were led by my son Moroni

The 1841 British edition omitted the expected *the* here in Mormon 6:12. Clearly, the text requires the *the* since Mormon referred earlier in verse 10 to his own ten thousand. Also note the use of the *the* in the following verse: “and behold **the** ten thousand of Gidgiddonah had fallen” (Mormon 6:13). The 1849 LDS edition restored the *the* here in Mormon 6:12.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:12 the definite article *the* in “we also beheld **the** ten thousand of my people”, the earliest (and obviously correct) reading.

■ Mormon 6:13

and behold the ten thousand

of [§2 *Sidgiddonah* > §1 *Gidgiddonah* 1 | *Gidgiddonah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
had fallen

In the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 misread the initial capital *G* of *Gidgiddonah* as an *S*, which would have looked somewhat like *G* in Oliver Cowdery’s hand (here Oliver is the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O}). Later, in proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , Oliver corrected scribe 2’s initial *S* to *G*. The 1830 edition has the *G*, so *Gidgiddonah* must be the reading of the original manuscript. In addition, there are ten occurrences of the related name *Gidgiddoni* in the early chapters of 3 Nephi.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:13 the name *Gidgiddonah* (the 1830 reading as well as Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P}), not *Sidgiddonah* (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ’s misreading of the name).

■ **Mormon 6:14**

and [Lamah 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | Lama KPS] *had fallen with his ten thousand . . .*

and [Limhah 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | Limah HK] *had fallen with his ten thousand*

For both these names, the RLDS text accidentally dropped an *h*. In the first instance, the final *h* was lost in the 1892 RLDS edition; this error has continued in the RLDS text. In the second example, the *h* after the *m* in *Limhah* was accidentally dropped in the 1874 RLDS edition (the resulting *Limah* is thus quite similar to the preceding *Lamah*). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *Limhah* to the RLDS text.

The occurrence of final *h*'s in Book of Mormon names is very common (as it is in Hebrew names). And the *h* after the *m* in *Limhah* is found in other Book of Mormon names as well (namely, *Limhi* and *Limher*). So there is no reason to alter the spelling of these two names. For further discussion of *h*-final names in the Book of Mormon, see under Mormon 2:4 for discussion of the name *Angolah*.

Summary: Retain in Mormon 6:14 all the *h*'s in the names *Lamah* and *Limhah*, the earliest spellings for these two names.

■ **Mormon 6:14**

[& 1 | *and* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *Joneum had fallen with his ten thousand*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the conjunction *and*; the 1849 LDS edition restored it. To be sure, the critical text will maintain it. Here in verse 14, all the preceding statements in the list regarding the death of each group of ten thousand with their commander begin with the conjunction *and*:

Mormon 6:14

and Lamah had fallen with his ten thousand

and Gilgal had fallen with his ten thousand

and Limhah had fallen with his ten thousand

and Joneum had fallen with his ten thousand

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:14 the sentence-initial *and* for every sentence of the form “and X had fallen with his ten thousand”.

■ **Mormon 6:14**

and [Jeneum >+ Joneum/Jeneum 1 | Joneam ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR | Jeneum PST] *had fallen with his ten thousand*

It is very difficult to determine how the original manuscript read for this name. The 1830 edition has *Joneam*. In the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 initially wrote *Jeneum*, but later (in somewhat heavier ink flow) he corrected the first and second vowels. The problem is that it is difficult to determine which vowels they were corrected to—or even whether there was a change! The 1908 RLDS edition, following one possible reading of *Ḷ*, changed the name to *Jeneum*. This same

interpretation was adopted for the 1981 LDS edition, perhaps under the assumption that the 1830 reading was derived from the printer's manuscript (which is not the case here in Mormon).

Let us consider in turn each of the three vowels for this name. For the first vowel, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} definitely wrote an *e* initially (there is a loop there), which he later corrected by adding an additional stroke. This corrected vowel could be read as an *e* or as an *o*. In my discussion under Mormon 4:20 regarding the name *Boaz*, I noted that when scribe 2's *e* looked like a dotless *i*, he would often rewrite it as an *e* by adding an additional stroke. Here in Mormon 6:14, however, the first vowel is definitely an *e*, so his altering of the vowel seems to indicate a change to *o*. This change would therefore make the corrected first vowel read the same as the *o* vowel found in the 1830 edition. As noted under Mormon 2:4 regarding the name *Angolah*, Oliver Cowdery frequently produced *o*'s that looked like *e*'s. Apparently, here in Mormon 6:14, his *o* vowel in \mathcal{O} looked somewhat like an *e*, which led scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} to initially write the first vowel as *e* but then reinterpret his decision and correct the *e* to an *o*.

For the second vowel, scribe 2 intended to write an *e* but actually wrote a dotless *i*, which he then corrected to an *e* by adding an additional stroke. As noted already under Mormon 4:20, this kind of correction is found elsewhere in Mormon. Since the 1830 edition also has *e*, we can be fairly confident that the second vowel was an *e* in the original manuscript.

For the third vowel, we have *u* in the printer's manuscript but an *a* in the 1830 edition. This variation reminds us, of course, of the *u*-*a* variation discussed under Mormon 6:2 regarding the name *Cumorah*. Based on the discussion there, the odds are that the original manuscript had a *u* rather than an *a*, although the *u* probably looked like an *a*.

Internal evidence from other names and words in the Book of Mormon provides some support for *Joneum*, although not a lot. First of all, there is a name that begins with *Jon*, namely, *Jonas* (listed twice in 3 Nephi 19:4); but there are no other names that begin with *Jen*. In addition, when we consider Book of Mormon names and words that end in *eum*, there are two examples, *Neum* and *sheum*, but there are none ending in *eam*.

Thus both internal and external evidence, although not overwhelmingly, supports the spelling *Joneum*, the corrected spelling in the printer's manuscript (it would appear). This reading for the name is only one vowel difference away from the 1830 reading, *Joneam*.

Summary: Change in Mormon 6:14 the spelling of *Jeneum* to *Joneum*, the corrected reading (it would appear) in \mathcal{P} for this name; the evidence for this correction is largely supported by patterns of scribal errors and corrections, although there is some minor support from the form of other Book of Mormon names and words.

■ Mormon 6:14

and [Cumenihah 1PST | Camenihah ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]
and Moronihah and Antionum and Shiblom and Shem and Josh
had fallen with their ten thousand each

As discussed under Mormon 6:2, the correct reading for the first name here is *Cumenihah*. One could interpret this name as ending in the suffix *-(i)hah*, with the base morpheme being *cumeni* or

cumen. The first of these base morphemes exists as the name of the city Cumeni (which was probably named after a person by that name). In this particular case, the 1830 reading *Camenihah* was replaced by *Cumenihah*, the reading in \mathfrak{P} , in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1981 LDS edition.

■ Mormon 6:14

*and [Shem > Shem/Shom 1 | Shem ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and Josh had fallen with their ten thousand each*

The question for this passage centers around whether there is an *e* or an *o* vowel in the first name listed here. In the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 initially wrote *Shem*, then rewrote the *e* vowel, but his correction looks like an *o*. The 1830 edition reads *Shem*. Very likely \mathfrak{C} read *Shem*.

It seems quite reasonable that the biblical name *Shem* is intended here in Mormon 6:14. For a similar case of a probable biblical name that involves the rewriting of *e/o*, see the discussion regarding the name *Boaz* under Mormon 4:20. Also see the discussion under Mormon 2:4 regarding the second vowel in the name *Angolah*.

There are quite a few biblical names in this part of the Book of Mormon text, in support of the decision to choose *Shem* here in Mormon 6:14 (and *Boaz* in Mormon 4:20). From 3 Nephi 19 through the end of Mormon, we have these additional names from the Bible: Timothy, Jonas, Jeremiah, Zedekiah, Isaiah, David, Joshua, Aaron, and Gilgal (all of these are used to refer to individuals or places that make their appearance only in this part of the text). In addition, the name *Shem* is used in Mormon 2:20–21 to refer to a land.

Summary: The name of the Nephite leader in Mormon 6:14 is most probably the biblical name *Shem*, not *Shom*.

■ Mormon 6:15

*and a few which had [deserted 1PST | dissented ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR]
over unto the Lamanites*

As discussed under Alma 46:27, the correct reading here in Mormon 6:15 is *dissented*, not *deserted*. The original manuscript very likely read *desented*, which is how Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here in \mathfrak{C}) wrote *dissented*. Scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} appears to have misread *desented* as *deserted*. In the Book of Mormon text, people dissent but lands are deserted.

■ Mormon 6:15

*and their flesh and bones and blood lay upon the face of the earth
being left by the [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of those who slew them*

Here the original manuscript undoubtedly read “by the **hands** of those who slew them”, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} . Scribe 2's correction appears to have been virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted plural *s*.

In fact, the word *hands* is written at the end of the line in \mathcal{P} , and scribe 2 may have simply run out of room trying to squeeze the word inline there. In other words, the singular *hand* may never have been at all intended. The critical text will maintain the plural *hands* in this passage.

Summary: Accept the plural *hands* in Mormon 6:15, the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Mormon 6:19

O ye fair sons and daughters

ye fathers and mothers

ye [husbands 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | hushand D] and wives

ye fair ones

how is it that ye could have fallen

The singular *husband* in the 1841 British edition is a clear typo. Given all the other plural conjuncts here (*sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, and wives*), we definitely expect the plural *husbands*. Note that the word was actually set as *hushand* by the 1841 compositor. This is because a letter *h* had been accidentally placed in the box for the *b* letter during the preceding distribution of the type. Errors in type distribution occurred very frequently in the 1841 edition. Overall, *h* was substituted for *b* 20 times and *b* for *h* 16 times.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 6:19 the original plural *husbands*, which is what we expect given the surrounding plurals.

Mormon 7

■ Mormon 7:1

*and [this 1A | these BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the words which I speak*

The expression “this is <plural noun phrase>” is grammatically nonstandard; thus it is not surprising that Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed the expression to the plural “these are <plural noun phrase>” (although he only marked the change from *is* to *are* in \mathcal{P}). The nonstandard expression is fairly rare in the earliest text. In fact, there is only one other example of its kind in the text; and again, as we might suspect, Joseph eliminated it in his editing for the 1837 edition (and once more he marked only the change from *is* to *are* in \mathcal{P}):

Ether 2:15

*and [this 1A | these BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL > is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my thoughts
upon the land which I shall give you for your inheritance*

The critical text will restore the original nonstandard usage in both of these cases since it appears to have been intended.

Summary: Restore the two examples of the nonstandard “this is <plural noun phrase>” in Mormon 7:1 and Ether 2:15, the original reading in both cases.

■ Mormon 7:7

*and he hath brought to pass the redemption of the world
whereby **he** that is found guiltless before him at the judgment day
hath it given [unto them 1A | unto him BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | untohim D]
to dwell in the presence of God in his kingdom*

Here both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree in having the plural *them*, so very likely \mathcal{O} also had *them*. The plural *them* refers to the generic *he* that occurs earlier in the sentence: “whereby **he** that is found guiltless . . . hath it given unto **them** to dwell in the presence of God”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith decided to grammatically emend this instance of the generic *them* to *him*. Here the original text itself may have read “unto him” since the scribes sometimes mixed up *him* and *them* during the dictation, which is not surprising given that in unstressed contexts both pronoun forms are pronounced as /ə̃m/ (see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19 for two momentary mix-ups

in \mathcal{O} between the two pronoun forms). On the other hand, there are quite a few cases where the original text shifts the grammatical number for generic pronouns within the same passage, as in the following two examples where one could interpret the *them* as a mishearing for *him*:

1 Nephi 10:19

for **he** that diligently seeketh shall find
and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded
to [*them* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *him* >+ *them* 1]

Mormon 9:21

behold I say unto you that whoso believeth in Christ doubting nothing
whatsoever **he** shall ask the Father in the name of Christ
it shall be granted [*them* >js *him* 1 | *them* A | *him* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

There are other cases where the issue is between *their* and *his*, which are phonetically dissimilar, as in the following case:

Alma 12:34

therefore whosoever repenteth and hardeneth not his heart
he shall have claim on mercy through mine Only Begotten Son
unto a remission of [*their* >js *his* 1 | *their* A | *his* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] sins

In other words, there are cases where the switch in number appears to be fully intended and not due to mishearing. (For other examples of such switching in number for generic pronouns, see under 1 Nephi 17:48.) Thus the critical text will accept the switch in number for the generic pronoun here in Mormon 7:7 and restore the earliest reading since it is possible. Of course, the alternative possibility remains that the *them* is a mishearing of *him* (just as it could be in 1 Nephi 10:19 and Mormon 9:21, listed above).

Summary: Restore in Mormon 7:7 the plural generic pronoun form *them* even though the preceding generic pronoun in the sentence is *he*; such switches in grammatical number can be found quite frequently elsewhere in the original text; nonetheless, there is the possibility that the *them* in Mormon 7:7 is a mishearing for *him* that entered the text as Joseph Smith dictated it to Oliver Cowdery (here the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O}).

■ Mormon 7:7

*to sing ceaseless praises with the choirs above
unto the Father and unto the Son and unto the Holy Ghost
which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] one God*

Here Joseph Smith changed the singular *is* to the plural *are* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Interestingly, this is the only instance in his editing where he made this grammatical emendation. In three other instances referring to the trinity, Joseph retained the expression “which is one (Eternal) God”:

three-witness statement
and the honor be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
which **is** one God

2 Nephi 31:21

and now behold this is the doctrine of Christ
and the only and true doctrine of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost
which **is** one God without end

Alma 11:44

and all shall be brought and be rained
before the bar of Christ the Son and God the Father and the Holy Spirit
which [*is* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >jg *is* 1] one Eternal God

Note that in Alma 11:44 scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the *is* (\mathcal{C} is extant here and has the *is*). The 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, prior to setting the type, supralinearly inserted (in light penciling) the *is* in \mathcal{P} .

The inconsistency of the editing here in Mormon 7:7 suggests that one should not read too much theological motivation into the one case where Joseph Smith made the change to *are*. He seems to have just been correcting the grammar at that late point in his editing.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 7:7 the original singular *is* to the trinitarian statement: “unto the Father and unto the Son and unto the Holy Ghost which **is** one God”.

■ Mormon 7:9

*for behold this is written for the intent
that ye **may** believe that
and if ye [1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | may HKPS] believe that
ye will believe this also
and if ye believe this
ye will know concerning your fathers . . .*

The 1874 RLDS edition inserted the modal verb *may* here in Mormon 7:9. This reading has been followed throughout the subsequent RLDS text. This intrusive *may* in the first *if*-clause is undoubtedly an accident and was prompted, it would appear, by the *may* in the immediately preceding “ye **may** believe that”. The following *if*-clause doesn’t have *may* (“and if ye believe this”), which shows that “ye believe” is correct for both *if*-clauses.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 7:9 the original text without the intrusive *may* that unintentionally entered the RLDS text in the first *if*-clause.

Mormon 8

■ Mormon 8:1

*behold I have but few things to write
which things I have been commanded [of 1ABCGHKPS | by DEFIJLMNOQRT] my father*

As explained under 1 Nephi 11:31, in earlier English the preposition *of* was used as the agentive preposition instead of the modern *by*. Here in Mormon 8:1, we have an instance where the original text reads *of* but the typesetter for the 1841 British edition, unintentionally it would appear, replaced the *of* with *by*. The LDS text has maintained the modern use of *by*, but the critical text will restore the *of*.

Elsewhere in the text, given the passive form of the verb *command*, there are ten occurrences with the agentive preposition *of* and three with the *by*, so the original *of* in Mormon 8:1 is perfectly possible. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that all ten of the occurrences with *of* involve a command from the Lord, while all three with *by* involve a command from a person, not the Lord. One of these three specifically refers to the command of an earthly father:

Omni 1:1
Behold it came to pass that I Omni being commanded **by** my father Jarom
that I should write somewhat upon these plates to preserve our genealogy . . .

Nonetheless, here in Mormon 8:1 *of* is clearly possible and quite understandable. For an example where an original agentive *by* was replaced by the archaic *of*, see under 1 Nephi 22:5.

Summary: Restore the original agentive preposition *of* in Mormon 8:1 (“I have been commanded **of** my father”); this archaic usage with *of* occurs quite frequently in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Mormon 8:2

after the great and [tremendious 1 | tremendous ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] battle at Cumorah

As explained under Alma 28:2–3, the earliest text uses the dialectal *tremendious* rather than the standard *tremendous*. The critical text will restore all instances of *tremendious*, even though this usage may be the result of dialectal overlay on the part of Joseph Smith or his scribes.

■ **Mormon 8:3**

*and my father also was killed by them
and I even [I 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] remaineth alone
to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people*

The 1837 edition dropped the repeated pronoun *I* after *even*, but this deletion seems to have been accidental. It was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. Moreover, the resulting phraseology means that *even* now modifies the verb *remaineth*, which really doesn't make sense. The Book of Mormon text has two other instances of "I even I":

Mosiah 2:26

and **I even I** whom ye call your king
am no better than ye yourselves are

Mosiah 10:10

and **I even I** in my old age did go up to battle against the Lamanites

This phraseology is fairly common in the King James Bible (with 19 occurrences there). Thus the repeated *I* will be restored in Mormon 8:3.

Summary: Restore the *I* after *even* in Mormon 8:3; the 1837 printer seems to have accidentally dropped it here.

■ **Mormon 8:3**

*and I even I [remaineth >js remain 1 | remaineth A | remain BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] alone
to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people*

Here Joseph Smith edited *remaineth* to *remain* since the subject is the first person *I*. Technically, the archaic *-(e)th* ending should be restricted to the third person singular, although in the original text it was very often used in the third person plural. Nonetheless, as explained under 2 Nephi 4:15, there were instances of this ending being used with the first person singular. The critical text will restore the original *remaineth* here in Mormon 8:3. For additional examples of this usage, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *remaineth* in Mormon 8:3 since use of the inflectional ending *-(e)th* with the first person singular pronoun *I* does occur in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mormon 8:5**

*my father hath been slain in battle
and all my [kinsfolks 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | kinsfolk RT]*

As discussed under Alma 10:11, the original text had three instances of *kinsfolks*; each of these was emended to the more expected *kinsfolk* in the 1920 LDS edition. The critical text will restore the original *kinsfolks*.

■ Mormon 8:5

*and how long [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 the Lord will suffer that I may live
 I know not*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the subordinate conjunction *that* after *how long*. There are no other examples in the text of this specific usage (“how <adjective> that S”, where S is a clause), but there are seven examples of “how that S” in the original text. In two cases, the *how* has been removed in later editing (see under 1 Nephi 10:2–3 for discussion). For examples of the archaic use of *that* after subordinate connectors (such as *after* and *because*), see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3. Clearly, the *that* was intended here in Mormon 8:5; both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have it. And \mathcal{C} undoubtedly did as well since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} for this part of the text.

Summary: Restore the original *that* after *how long* in Mormon 8:5: “and how long **that** the Lord will suffer that I may live I know not”.

■ Mormon 8:6

*behold four hundred years
 have passed [1PS | away ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]
 since the coming of our Lord and Savior*

Here the printer’s manuscript lacks the word *away*; the 1830 edition has it. In accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} , the 1908 RLDS edition adopted the reading without the *away*. Elsewhere in the text there are 38 other occurrences referring to a number of years having elapsed—and in each case, the phraseology is “passed away”, never simply “passed”. Most likely, \mathcal{C} read “passed away” and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally dropped the word *away* when he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain the use of *away* in Mormon 8:6: “four hundred years have passed **away**”, the 1830 reading; usage elsewhere in the text consistently supports the occurrence of *away* when referring to the passage of years.

■ Mormon 8:9

*and now behold I say no more concerning them
 for there are none save it be
 [1A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites and robbers
 that do exist upon the face of the land*

Here the 1837 edition added *the* before *Lamanites*. This change may have been accidental. Elsewhere in the text we have one other occurrence that supports the 1837 reading: “and there is none save it be **the** Lamanites” (Ether 4:3). In this passage Moroni once more refers to his being alone. Yet in the Ether 4:3 passage, Moroni does not refer to the robbers. Everywhere else in the text where *Lamanites* is conjoined with *robbers*, we find that the conjoined elements always have the same parallel construction; either both have the definite article *the* or neither do:

4 Nephi 1:17 (negatives only, no articles)

there were no robbers nor no murderers neither were there Lamanites

Mormon 2:8 (no articles)

but behold the land was filled with robbers and with Lamanites

Mormon 2:27 (repeated *the*)

but behold we did go forth against **the** Lamanites and **the** robbers of Gaddianton

Mormon 2:28 (repeated *the*)

we made a treaty with **the** Lamanites and **the** robbers of Gaddianton

Thus Mormon 8:9, if it is to read consistently with the rest of the text, should not have the intrusive *the*. The critical text will restore the original reading without the *the*.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *the* in Mormon 8:9, restoring the original phraseology “save it be Lamanites and robbers”.

■ **Mormon 8:10**

and there are none that do know the true God

save it be the disciples of Jesus

which did tarry in the land until the wickedness of the people were so great

that the Lord would not suffer them to remain with the people

and [whither 1 | whether ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they be upon the face of the land

no man knoweth

As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver Cowdery tended to mix up *whether* and *whither* in his manuscript work. Here in Mormon 8:10, \mathcal{P} reads “and **whither** they be upon the face of the land no man knoweth” while the 1830 edition reads “and **whether** they be upon the face of the land no man knoweth”. \mathcal{C} is not extant here, but Oliver (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C} for this part of the text) could have written either *whither* or *whether* in \mathcal{C} . In any event, according to \mathcal{P} no one knows where the three Nephites are, while the 1830 edition states that no one knows whether the Nephites are anywhere in the land. The implication of this second reading is that the three Nephites have been withdrawn from the land and are somewhere else on the earth.

The context implies that the three Nephites are still around but that nobody knows where they are. The following text (in verse 11) indicates that they still make appearances to the righteous (namely, Mormon and Moroni): “but behold my father and I have seen them and they have ministered unto us”. The critical text will accept the reading in \mathcal{P} as being the most reasonable in the larger context. In 1 Nephi 22:4, the text uses *whither* in a similar way:

1 Nephi 22:4

yea the more part of all the tribes have been led away

and they are scattered to and fro upon the isles of the sea

and [*whither* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whether* 1] they are

none of us knoweth

save that we know that they have been led away

Also note from this example that *whither* occurs with the verb *be*, which means that in the Book of Mormon *whither* is not restricted to verbs of motion. Thus here in Mormon 8:10 *whither* can occur with the *be* verb.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out that earlier it is explained that “the beloved disciples were taken away out of the land” (Mormon 1:16) and thus the question cannot be where they were “upon the face of the land”. But that passage also argues that no one can ask whether these disciples were “upon the face of the land” since Mormon 1:16 clearly states that they were “taken away out of the land”. Ultimately, it seems more appropriate to interpret Mormon 1:16 as simply saying that the disciples were removed from among the people, so no one knew where they were. In fact, this is what the text states here in Mormon 8:10: “the Lord would not suffer them to remain with the people”. But Mormon and Moroni were visited by them, thus implying that even they knew they were somewhere but without knowing precisely where.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:10 the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“and **whither** they be upon the face of the land no man knoweth”); the context implies that the three disciples of Jesus are still in the land but that no one knows where; the use of *whither* in 1 Nephi 22:4 also supports this interpretation.

■ Mormon 8:14

and I am the same

which [hide 1 | hideth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up this record unto the Lord

The printer’s manuscript has *hide* (that is, without the *-eth* ending), while the 1830 edition has the third person singular form *hideth*. Perhaps *hide* could be thought of as the first person singular form, in agreement with the first person *I* rather than with the third person *the same*.

Elsewhere in the text, we consistently have the third person singular ending *-eth* for this construction (“I am X <restrictive relative clause>”), where X is a subject complement:

2 Nephi 8:12	yea I am he that comforteth you
3 Nephi 20:19	and behold I am he which doeth it
3 Nephi 20:39	I am he that doth speak
Ether 4:8	for I am he which speaketh
Ether 4:12	I am the same that leadeth men to all good

The last example has *the same*, just as here in Mormon 8:14. Thus internal evidence supports the 1830 reading in Mormon 8:14.

Changes in the early transmission of the text show that the *-(e)th* ending can be either added or omitted. There are no examples involving scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} , but there are five cases for which Oliver Cowdery was the scribe (two involve omission of the ending, each marked below with an asterisk):

- * 2 Nephi 7:2 (Oliver Cowdery consciously edited *dieth* to *die* in \mathfrak{P})
and they [*dieth* 0 | *dieth* >+ *die* 1 | *die* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of thirst

2 Nephi 7:11 (Oliver Cowdery apparently misheard “kindle a fire” as “kindleth fire” when Joseph Smith dictated the text; the King James Bible reads “kindle a fire”)

behold all ye that [*kindleth* >js *kindle* 1 | *kindleth* A |
kindle BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fire

* Mosiah 2:38 (initial loss in \mathcal{P} , virtually immediately corrected)

therefore if that man [*repent* > *repenteth* 1 |
repenteth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not
and **remaineth** and **dieth** an enemy to God . . .

Alma 37:9 (initial addition in \mathcal{C} , immediately corrected)

yea I [*sayeth* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] say unto you . . .

Alma 54:22 (added when copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P})

but behold these things [*matter* ORT | *mattereth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] not

There are also four examples where the 1830 typesetter made the change (of which only one involves the addition of the ending, marked below with an asterisk):

* 1 Nephi 22:1 (added)

what [*mean* 01 | *meaneth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] these things
which ye have read

Jacob 2:23 (omitted)

this people [*begineth* >js *begines* 1 | *begin* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to wax in iniquity

Alma 3:19 (omitted; also *doeth* changed to *doth*)

and even so [*doeth* 1HK | *doth* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST] every man
that is cursed
[*bringeth* 1 | *bring* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon himself
his own condemnation

3 Nephi 11:40 (omitted)

and whoso shall declare more or less than this
and [*establisheth* 1 | *establish* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it for my doctrine
the same cometh of evil

These examples show that the errors can occur in either direction. The following scenario is also possible here in Mormon 8:14: Oliver Cowdery omitted the ending *-eth* when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation (here Oliver is the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C}), scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} copied *hide* since \mathcal{C} read that way, and the 1830 typesetter supplied the expected *-eth*. Since the transmission evidence is mixed, probably the best solution here in Mormon 8:14 is to accept the internal evidence, thus maintaining the 1830 reading.

Summary: Retain the 1830 reading in Mormon 8:14, *hideth*, since we expect the third person singular ending in this construction (“and I am the same which **hideth** up this record unto the Lord”).

■ Mormon 8:14–15

for he truly saith that
 [§2 none > §1 no one 1 | no one ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall have them to get gain
 but the record thereof is of great worth
 and whoso shall bring it to light / him will the Lord bless
 for [no one 1PS | none ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] can have power to bring it to light
 save it be given him of God

As discussed under Alma 1:1, there are four places in the text that show variation between *no one* and *none*. One case involves editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition, where he changed *no one* to *none* (along with the verb form *was* to *were*):

Alma 6:5

now I would that ye should understand
 that the word of God was liberal unto all
 that [no one was >]s none were 1 | no one was A |
 none were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] deprived of the privilege
 of assembling themselves together to hear the word of God

Interestingly, the three other variants involve scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} . Besides the two here in Mormon 8:14–15, there is one at the beginning of Alma:

Alma 1:1

king Mosiah having gone the way of all the earth
 having warred a good warfare
 walking uprightly before God
 leaving [§2 no one >+ §1 none 1 | none ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to reign in his stead

As is argued under Alma 1:1, Oliver Cowdery's correction of scribe 2's *no one* to *none* appears to be an attempt to follow the copytext (namely, \mathcal{C}), not the result of editing on Oliver's part.

Here in Mormon 8:14 we apparently have another case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} mixed up *no one* and *none*. Once more, Oliver Cowdery corrected the reading in \mathcal{P} . Since the 1830 edition reads *no one* and Oliver corrected \mathcal{P} from *none* to *no one*, \mathcal{C} also probably read that way (here both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C}). Note further that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} started a new page at this point, which could easily explain why he was unable to correctly remember *no one*. So we seem to have two fairly clear cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} mixed up *no one* and *none*. On the other hand, we have no explicit evidence for either Oliver Cowdery or the 1830 typesetter mixing up these two words. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} copied only about 15 percent of the Book of Mormon text, yet at least twice he mixed up *no one* and *none*. Oliver twice wrote down the majority of the text (in taking down Joseph Smith's dictation and in copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P}). The 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, set the type for nearly all the text.

These two errors by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} suggest that in the third case, in Mormon 8:15, scribe 2 is also responsible for the variation. In that case, \mathcal{P} reads *no one*, while the 1830 edition reads *none*. Note that in this case, unlike the two others, Oliver Cowdery did not correct \mathcal{P} when he proofed that manuscript against \mathcal{C} . One could argue from this that \mathcal{C} actually read *no one*. But another possibility is that Oliver accepted *no one* in verse 15 because of its earlier occurrence in verse 14

(not only in \mathcal{O} but also in his corrected *no one* in \mathcal{P}). The editors for the 1908 RLDS edition also accepted *no one*, the uncorrected reading in \mathcal{P} for verse 15, perhaps not only because it was the reading in \mathcal{P} but also because of the correction to *no one* in verse 14. All in all, the most probable conclusion is that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was the one that tended to mix up *no one* and *none*, not Oliver or the 1830 compositor. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading in Mormon 8:15 (“for **none** can have power to bring it to light”) rather than the reading in \mathcal{P} (“for **no one** can have power to bring it to light”).

Summary: Accept in Mormon 8:14 *no one*, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“**no one** shall have them to get gain”); in Mormon 8:15 the 1830 reading with *none* will be maintained (“for **none** can have power to bring it to light”) since evidence elsewhere in the text (the cases in Alma 1:1 and Mormon 8:14) argues that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was the one who tended to mix up *no one* and *none*, not Oliver Cowdery or the 1830 compositor.

■ Mormon 8:15

*for God [will 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | wills RT]
that it shall be done with an eye singled to his glory*

Here the original manuscript apparently read “for God will”, which appears to be a subjunctive use of the main verb *will* (both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read this way). Of course, the original text might have been “for God wills” and Oliver Cowdery, in taking down the text as Joseph Smith dictated it, might have accidentally dropped the *s*, with the result that both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript ended up with *will* (here Oliver is the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O}). For the 1920 LDS edition, the text was emended so that the verb reads in the indicative: “for God wills”.

One problem with this emendation is that the third person singular verb form *wills* occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon or in the King James Bible. There are, however, a couple of alternatives for emending *will* in Mormon 8:15. The first would be to use the archaic third person singular ending *-eth* (“for God willeth”), especially since *willeth* does occur in the King James Bible:

Romans 9:16

so then *it is* not of him that **willeth**
nor of him that runneth
but of God that sheweth mercy

This example suggests the emendation *willeth* as being more appropriate to the biblical style of the Book of Mormon text. As further support for this alternative, it appears that in Mormon 8:14 scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally dropped the *-eth* ending for the verb *hide* (see the nearby discussion under that passage). Perhaps in a similar way, Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped this same ending in \mathcal{O} as he was writing down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Note, in particular, that here in Mormon 8:15 the *-eth* ending could have been lost because of the following *th* of *that* (“for God willeth that . . .”); in other words, Oliver could have missed hearing the ending during the dictation process.

A second alternative would be to use *doth will* in Mormon 8:15 (“for God doth will”), which would imply that Oliver Cowdery omitted the helping verb *doth* as he took down Joseph Smith’s

dictation. There is one occurrence of “doth will” in the Book of Mormon text, although with inverted subject-verb word order because of a preceding *neither*:

Ether 8:19

for the Lord worketh not in secret combinations
neither **doth** he **will** that man should shed blood

One could add other alternatives here in Mormon 8:15, for example *does will* (“for God does will”).

Of course, we could leave the form *will* as a subjunctive form. We have one definite case of this usage elsewhere in the text:

Ether 15:34

whether the Lord **will** that I be translated
or that I suffer the will of the Lord in the flesh
it mattereth not

In this example, we have a *whether*-clause, which is one that frequently takes the subjunctive in the Book of Mormon text, as in Alma 2:5 (“whether it **were** for or against Amlici”) and in Alma 18:3 (“whether he **be** the Great Spirit or a man”). But for Mormon 8:15, we expect the indicative after the conjunction *for*.

Interestingly, in older English we can find instances of the subjunctive *will* in sentences like the one here in Mormon 8:15. In the Oxford English Dictionary, under definitions 3 and 4 for the verb, it states that *will* was used to ‘denote expression of a wish or intention’ or to ‘affirm or maintain’. This usage is designated as obsolete; citations do not extend beyond the 1600s except in legal language. The following instances use *will* with third person singular subjects (vocabulary and accidentals regularized):

Thomas Cromwell (1528)

His grace then **will** that the election of a new dean
shall be among them of the college.

William Tyndale (1534)

When he saith that a man is justified by deeds and not of faith only,
he will no more than that faith doth not so justify everywhere,
that nothing justifieth save faith.

William Shakespeare (1597)

Our battle is more full of names than yours,
Our men more perfect in the use of arms,
Our armor all as strong, our cause the best;
Then **reason will** our hearts should be as good.

Literature Online <lion.chadwyck.com> gives the following example from the Elizabethan play *The History of Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham*: “**God will** that sinners live” (this particular citation dates from a 1664 printing of the play). This example virtually parallels the original usage in Mormon 8:15 (“for God will that . . .”). Given such usage from Early Modern English, the critical text will restore the reading of the earliest text in Mormon 8:15: “for **God will** that it shall be done with an eye singled to his glory”.

Summary: Restore the original use of *will* in Mormon 8:15 (“for God will that . . .”) since such usage occurred in Early Modern English.

■ **Mormon 8:15**

for God will that it shall be done

with an eye [singled >js single 1 | singled A | single BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

to his glory

Here the original manuscript appears to have read *singled* rather than *single* since both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript (prior to Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition) had *singled*. The form *singled* could be an error for *single*, especially since in 3 Nephi 13:22, the other place in the text where this same phrase occurs, has *single* in both the 1830 edition and \mathcal{D} (“if therefore thine eye be single”), which is also the King James reading for Matthew 6:22. Nor does the Oxford English Dictionary list the verbal past participle *singled* as a variant for the adjective *single*. One possibility is that *singled* (which ends in a voiced alveolar stop) could be a mishearing resulting from *single* being immediately followed by *to* (which begins with a voiceless alveolar stop): “with an eye **singled** to his glory”.

Despite this evidence against *singled*, there are instances of the phrase “with an eye **singled** to his glory”, at least in recent English, especially in evangelical literature, as in these examples taken from <www.google.com>:

God’s Sovereign Elective Grace <www.prca.org>

and with a view to Himself, to the enhancement of His name,
with an eye **singled** to His glory,
with Himself before His eye as the ultimate goal.

Mission Messenger <www.mun.ca>

Every exercise of life done with an eye **singled** to his glory
is a manifestation of worship.

If You Agree <www.firesofrevival.com>

We’ve talked about the union, what it is, this “agreeing together”
that it is with an eye **singled** to His glory.

For each of these cases, *singled* is used as the past participle for the verb *single*, with the meaning ‘to concentrate’; for this usage, see definition 8a under the verb *single* in the OED, which has the following citation that also uses *singled* (although in the simple past tense):

Walter Landor (1836)

This reproof . . . **singled** his aim.

Thus the use of *singled* is possible in Mormon 8:15. The critical text will restore it, although it could be an error for *single*.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:15 the original form *singled* in the phraseology “with an eye **singled** to his glory”, the reading in \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition (as well as in \mathcal{C} , one would assume); *singled* could be an error for *single*, but it will nonetheless work with the meaning ‘concentrated’.

■ Mormon 8:15

*for none can have power to bring it to light
 save it be given him of God
 for God will that it shall be done with an eye singled
 to his glory **or** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord*

Cody Robertson has suggested (5 April 2006, conveyed by Camille Fronk) that the *or* near the end of this verse may be an error for the preposition *for* (thus “to his glory **for** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord”). If such an error occurred, it probably took place during the dictation of the text since both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition are here firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} and each reads *or*, not *for*.

There is some evidence that *or* and *for* were occasionally mixed up in the transmission of the text, including two examples where Oliver Cowdery was responsible for the mix-up (the second and third cases listed below):

Alma 37:38 (typo in the 1841 British edition)

I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
 which our fathers call a ball or director
 [*or* 01ABCGHKPRST | *for* DEFIJLMNOQ] our fathers called it Liahona

Alma 51:6 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{C} , immediately corrected)

for the freemen had sworn
 [*for* >% *or* 0 | *or* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] covenanted
 to maintain their rights

3 Nephi 13:24 (Oliver Cowdery’s uncorrected error in \mathcal{D})

no man can serve two masters
 [*or* 1 | *for* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] either he will hate the one
 and love the other
or else he will hold to the one
 and despise the other

In the second example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *for* in \mathcal{C} (undoubtedly under the influence of the preceding *for* in “**for** the freemen had sworn”), but then he immediately corrected *for* to *or* by erasure, giving “for the freemen had sworn **or** covenanted to maintain their rights”. In the third example, both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} ; the 1830 edition reads *for* and \mathcal{D} reads *or*. Here the *or* in \mathcal{D} is probably the result of the following *or*: “**or** else he will hold to the one and despise the other”. This passage follows the King James text in Matthew 6:24, which has *for* here. This last example shows that Oliver could have misread an original *for* as *or*. Thus there is scribal evidence to support the possibility that Oliver wrote *or* in Mormon 8:15 rather than *for* when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. However, in Mormon 8:15 there is no nearby *or* that could have triggered the error. In fact, that passage has two preceding instances of *for* (“**for** none can have power . . . **for** God will that . . .”). For a case where *or* may be an error for *for*, see under Ether 8:24.

Internal evidence argues for the preposition *for* typically occurring before noun phrases with *welfare* as the head (14 out of 20 other places in the text):

2 Nephi 6:3 for I am desirous **for** the welfare of your souls
 2 Nephi 32:9 that thy performance may be **for** the welfare of thy soul

Mormon 8

Jacob 1:10	and having labored in all his days for their welfare
Jacob 2:3	but I this day am weighed down with much more desire and anxiety for the welfare of your souls
Enos 1:9	I began to feel a desire for the welfare of my brethren the Nephites
Mosiah 25:11	they were filled with pain and anguish for the welfare of their souls
Alma 34:27	let your hearts be full drawn out in prayer unto him continually for your welfare and also for the welfare of those which are around you
Alma 48:12	a man who did labor exceedingly for the welfare and safety of his people
Alma 60:9	because of their great desires which they had for the welfare of this people
Alma 60:10	yea and ye had ought to have stirred yourselves more diligently for the welfare and freedom of this people
Alma 60:36	but for the glory of my God and the freedom and welfare of my country
Helaman 12:2	doing all things for the welfare and happiness of his people
3 Nephi 3:5	feeling for your welfare

The example in Helaman 12:2 is of the form “to do something **for** the welfare of someone”, like the proposed reading for Mormon 8:15 (“it shall be done . . . **for** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord”).

Another possibility to consider here in Mormon 8:15 is that the original text read *or for* and that the *for* was accidentally lost as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation:

Mormon 8:15 (another possible emendation)
it shall be done with an eye singled to his glory
or for the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord

The loss of *for* following *or* is quite possible, given the similarity of the two words. As we might expect, there is evidence for *or for* elsewhere in the text:

Mormon 4:11
and it is impossible for the tongue to describe
or for man to write a perfect description of the horrible scene
of the blood and carnage which was among the people

Finally, one may consider the earliest text in Mormon 8:15 as a case of ellipsis of the preposition *to*—that is, the passage is equivalent to “with an eye singled **to** his glory or **to** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord”. Correspondingly, it is also possible that an original repeated *to* was accidentally omitted here during the dictation of the text. And there is evidence in the history of the text for the repeated preposition *to* being omitted after the conjunction *or* (including one example, marked below with an asterisk, where Oliver Cowdery made the error):

Mosiah 26:39 (1888 LDS edition)
according to his sins
or [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |] the sins which he had committed

Alma 41:4 (first printing of the 1852 LDS edition)

raised to endless happiness to inherit the kingdom of God

or [to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > to F] endless misery
to inherit the kingdom of the devil

* Alma 41:5 (when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P})

the one restored to happiness according to his desires of happiness

or [to 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] good according to his desires of good

Ultimately, it is difficult to decide between all these possibilities. Probably the best solution here in Mormon 8:15 is to maintain the earliest reading (which is the reading of all the textual sources) since it will work if we interpret the reading as a case of ellipted *to*. Yet the possibility remains that the *or* alone is the result of some sort of primitive error that occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation, with alternative readings for the original text being *for*, *or for*, or *or to*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:15 the earliest text that conjoins two noun phrases by means of *or*, thus "it shall be done with an eye singled to his glory **or** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord"; various alternative emendations suggest themselves, but since the earliest reading will work, it will be kept.

■ Mormon 8:16

and blessed be [him 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | he RT] that shall bring this thing to light

Here the object pronoun form *him* was replaced with the subject form *he* in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition. As discussed under 2 Nephi 1:27, the original text had quite a few cases where the subject complement took the object form. Some of these have been edited, but not all (for some of the exceptions, see under Mosiah 15:18). For a complete discussion, see under SUBJECT COMPLEMENT in volume 3. The critical text will maintain the object forms whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:16 the object pronoun form *him*, the reading of the earliest textual sources (thus "and blessed be **him** that shall bring this thing to light").

■ Mormon 8:17

and if there be faults

they be [1PS | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] faults of a man

The question here is whether the definite article *the* should appear before the second *faults*. The 1830 edition has the *the*, but the printer's manuscript does not. In accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} , the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition removed the *the* before *faults*.

When we compare this passage with the similar passage on the title page of the Book of Mormon, we get the *the* in the corresponding place, in both the original text and the edited one:

□ title page

<i>original text</i>	<i>edited text</i> (from 1837 on)
and now if there be fault	and now if there are faults
it be the mistake of men	they are the mistakes of men

This passage suggests that in Mormon 8:17 the original text had the *the* (“and if there be faults / they be **the** faults of a man”), even if the noun on the title page is *mistake(s)* rather than *faults*. There is also evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} sometimes omitted the definite article; see the discussion under 3 Nephi 24:13 and Mormon 8:37.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:17 the definite article *the* before *faults*, the 1830 reading; the corresponding statement on the title page also has the *the* in the same place (in this case, before *mistake*).

■ **Mormon 8:17**

let him be aware lest he [shall 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | should J] be in danger of hell fire

Here in the 1888 LDS edition, the modal *shall* was replaced by *should*. That edition never served as a copytext, so its reading was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition. As explained under Helaman 15:9, either *shall* or *should* can occur in *lest*-clauses, but *should* is more frequent, thus the tendency to change *shall* to *should*. For each case, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, thus *shall* here in Mormon 8:17.

Summary: Maintain the modal *shall* in Mormon 8:17, the reading of both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition.

■ **Mormon 8:17–18**

*nevertheless God knoweth all things
therefore he that condemneth*

- (1) *let him [be aware 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | beware HKPS]
lest he shall be in danger of hell fire
and he that saith
shew unto me or ye shall be smitten*
- (2) *let him [be aware 1 | beware ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
lest he commandeth that which is forbidden of the Lord*

In these two verses, the text has varied between *be aware* and *beware*. In verse 17, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read *be aware*, which was emended to *beware* in the 1874 RLDS edition. \mathcal{C} , not extant here, probably read *be aware* since for this part of the text \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} . The RLDS text has maintained the secondary *beware*, while the LDS text has maintained the earlier *be aware*. In verse 18, on the other hand, we get variation in the two earliest sources, *be aware* in \mathcal{P} but *beware* in the 1830 edition. The 1830 reading has been maintained in both the LDS and RLDS texts. Thus in the current RLDS text, both instances read *beware*; in the current LDS text, we have a mixture, first *be aware*, then *beware*.

In both verses, the meaning seems to be *beware* rather than *be aware*—that is, the context implies the stronger ‘to be on guard’ rather than the weaker ‘to be cognizant’. In addition, usage

elsewhere in the Book of Mormon supports *beware* when followed by a *lest*-clause (although there is only one example):

Mosiah 2:32 beware lest there shall arise contentions among you

This usage is also supported in the King James Bible:

Deuteronomy 6:12 *then* beware lest thou forget the LORD
 Job 36:18 *beware* lest he take thee away with *his* stroke
 Isaiah 36:18 *beware* lest Hezekiah persuade you
 Acts 13:40 beware therefore lest that come upon you which is spoken of
 in the prophets
 Colossians 2:8 beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy
 2 Peter 3:17 beware lest ye also . . . fall from your own steadfastness

In contrast to this usage, there are two instances of “to be aware” in the Book of Mormon; each has the meaning ‘to be cognizant’:

Alma 2:12 therefore the people of the Nephites **was aware** of the intent
 of the Amlicites
 3 Nephi 4:24 and now Gidgiddoni **being aware** of their design . . .

(The King James Bible itself has five instances of “to be aware” with the meaning ‘to be cognizant’.)

All of this evidence argues that the expected reading for both instances in Mormon 8:17–18 is the stronger *beware*, with the result that the use of *be aware* (both times in \mathcal{P} and once in the 1830 edition) seems inappropriate. But this makes one wonder why the earliest text favors *be aware*. The difficulty of *be aware* seems to suggest that *be aware* is textually correct and that the tendency has been to replace it with the expected *beware* (as in the 1874 RLDS edition for verse 17 and in the 1830 edition for verse 18).

In Early Modern English, the phrase “to be aware” actually had the stronger meaning ‘to be on guard’; in other words, it was basically equivalent to “to beware”. Under the predicate adjective *aware*, the Oxford English Dictionary lists the first (and original) meaning for *aware* as ‘watchful, vigilant, cautious, on one’s guard’, with these two examples from Early Modern English (accidentals regularized):

Nicolas Udall (1542)
 to be well **aware** lest they should . . . araise battle
 Edward Dacres (1636)
 they were always **aware** of taking of towns by long sieges

The OED identifies this first meaning as obsolete (although examples of its usage extend into the first half of the 1800s). Under definition 2 for *aware*, the OED lists the modern meaning, the one that English speakers expect for “to be aware”, namely, ‘informed, cognizant, conscious, sensible’.

What we seem to have here in Mormon 8:17–18 are two archaic uses of “to be aware” with the meaning ‘to be on guard’ (that is, the same meaning as “to beware”). It would appear that in verse 18 the 1830 typesetter unintentionally made the change (from the unexpected *be aware* to the expected *beware*) since the change was not made to the first instance of *be aware* (in verse 17).

Later, the 1874 RLDS edition made the change to *beware* in verse 17, perhaps because verse 18 read *beware*. The critical text will adopt the earlier *be aware* for both cases, but with the understanding that it means ‘beware’.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:17 the earliest extant reading, *be aware* (the reading in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition); restore in Mormon 8:18 the reading in \mathcal{P} , *be aware*, in place of the 1830 reading, *beware*; in both verses, *be aware* has the obsolete meaning ‘to be on guard’, the same as *beware*.

■ Mormon 8:21

*and he that shall breathe out wrath and strifes against the work of the Lord
and against the covenant people of the Lord*
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[is 1A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | in MOQ] *the house of Israel*
and shall say . . .

Here in the 1905 LDS edition, the preposition *in* was accidentally added, giving “the covenant people of the Lord who are **in** the house of Israel”. (The grammatical emendation of the original *which* to *who* and *is* to *are* was made earlier in the editing for the 1837 edition.) The 1907 and 1911 LDS editions followed this bizarre reading with *in*, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct phraseology without the *in*. There are no instances elsewhere in the text of the prepositional phrase “in the house of Israel”, although there is nothing inherently wrong with such phraseology, depending on the context (there is one instance of it in the King James Bible, in Hosea 6:10).

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 15 February 2007) suggests another possibility here—that the original text here may have read “which is **of** the house of Israel”. He notes that elsewhere the text refers to being “**of** the house of Israel” (27 times). There is also one case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially omitted the *of* in this expression:

3 Nephi 20:25
and ye are [NULL > of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the house of Israel
and ye are of the covenant which the Father made with your fathers

On the other hand, here in Mormon 8:21 both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree, so \mathcal{O} itself likely read without the *of* (for this part of the text, \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are both firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} , which is no longer extant for Mormon).

Nonetheless, there appears to be a difference here in Mormon 8:21. Moroni is simply declaring that the house of Israel is the covenant people of the Lord; thus there is no need for the *of*. Consider, for instance, the same idea expressed earlier in this book:

Mormon 3:21
and also that the Jews—the covenant people of the Lord—
shall have other witness

The critical text will therefore refrain from adding an *of* before “the house of Israel” here in Mormon 8:21.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:21 the lack of an *of* before *the house* in the relative clause “which is the house of Israel”; the Book of Mormon text can refer to the house of Israel and the Jews as the covenant people of the Lord.

■ Mormon 8:24

and he knoweth their prayers

that they were in [1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the A] behalf of their brethren

The printer’s manuscript has “in behalf of”, while the 1830 edition has “in **the** behalf of”. The *the* was removed in the 1837 edition, with the result that this passage read like all other instances of this phrase in the Book of Mormon, including one in the very next verse (marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 1:5	in behalf of his people
Mosiah 20:25	in behalf of the people of Limhi
Alma 6:6	in behalf of the welfare of the souls of those who knew not God
3 Nephi 1:11	in behalf of his people
* Mormon 8:25	in behalf of him

We note here that the Book of Mormon has no examples of “**on** behalf of”. Moreover, there is no variation in the phrase “in behalf of” anywhere else in the text. (Incidentally, the Doctrine and Covenants has four examples of “**in** behalf of” and none of “**on** behalf of”, thus supporting the Book of Mormon phraseology with the *in*—and without the *the*.) To be sure, the consistency of the text otherwise supports the occurrence of “in behalf of” throughout the Book of Mormon. On the other hand, loss of *the* is more likely than its addition, especially since “in behalf of” is more expected than “in **the** behalf of”. Moreover, the early text omitted function words more frequently than it added them.

The King James Bible, on the other hand, always has the definite article *the* for “in the behalf of” and “on the behalf of”, although there are only three examples:

Exodus 27:21	on the behalf of the children of Israel
2 Chronicles 16:9	in the behalf of <i>them</i> whose heart <i>is</i> perfect toward him
Philippians 1:29	in the behalf of Christ

It is doubtful that the *the* would have been added by the 1830 typesetter in imitation of the King James style, especially since none of these phrases occur in any particularly well-known biblical passage.

In terms of transmissional probabilities, the specific evidence supports the omission of *the*. There are, for instance, three cases in this part of the text where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the *the*—and without correction by himself or later by Oliver Cowdery when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (see under 3 Nephi 24:13 for these three cases). There is also an example earlier in the text where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted a necessary *the*:

Alma 2:22
 these were they which went out with their men to watch
 [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] camp of the Amlicites

In this case, the 1830 typesetter supplied the *the*. But unlike the example here in Mormon 8:24, the text in Alma 2:22 obviously required the definite article before *camp*. In contrast, there would have been no motivation for the 1830 typesetter to add the definite article before *behalf*, especially since he did it nowhere else in the text. There are cases where the 1830 typesetter added a *the*, but he usually did so when it seemed necessary or expected for the context. Yet there is one case where the insertion seems unnecessary or perhaps inappropriate for the context:

1 Nephi 15:15
 yea at that day will they not receive
 [01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] strength and nourishment
 from the true vine

(For discussion, see under that passage.) So there is some slight possibility that here in Mormon 8:24 the 1830 typesetter accidentally added the *the* in “in the behalf of”. But from a statistical point of view, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was much more prone to omit *the* than the 1830 typesetter was to accidentally add it. Thus the more likely scenario here in Mormon 8:24 is that \mathcal{C} itself had the *the* and that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted it. The critical text will therefore follow the more difficult reading, “in **the** behalf of”, in Mormon 8:24.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:24 the 1830 reading, “in **the** behalf of”, instead of maintaining the reading in \mathcal{P} , “in behalf of”; the reading without the *the* is the expected reading, but the difficult reading with the *the* is found in the King James Bible.

■ Mormon 8:24

yea even the fiery furnace could not harm them
neither wild beasts nor [poison 1 | poisonous ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] serpents

The printer’s manuscript has the noun *poison* instead of the expected adjective *poisonous* as the modifier for the noun *serpents*. The 1830 edition, on the other hand, has the expected *poisonous*. Elsewhere the text has only “poisonous serpents”:

2 Nephi 25:20 after that they had been bitten by the poisonous serpents
 Ether 9:31 and there came forth poisonous serpents also upon the face of the land
 Ether 9:31 their flocks began to flee before the poisonous serpents
 Ether 9:33 whoso should attempt to pass might fall by the poisonous serpents
 Ether 10:19 and in the days of Lib the poisonous serpents were destroyed

There are no examples elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (nor in the King James Bible) where the noun *poison* is used to modify a noun. Of course, one could argue that the 1830 typesetter emended *poison* to *poisonous* when he set the type. Yet even if \mathcal{C} had *poison* rather than *poisonous*, that could have been an error. Note that Oliver could have misheard “poisonous serpents” as “poison serpents” since *poisonous* ends in /əs/ and the immediately following word, *serpents*, begins with an *s*.

We can find evidence in modern English for the phrase “poison serpents”, especially when the subject is biblical, as in these two examples from <www.google.com>:

Ray C. Stedman, *Adventuring through the Bible*
 Then when they murmured about the food,
 he sent **poison serpents** among them.

New American Standard Bible
 And cobras deadly is of **poison serpents**.

But this kind of usage seems particularly modern and inappropriate for the biblical style. Neither the Oxford English Dictionary nor *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> have any examples of “poison serpent(s)”.

Moreover, there isn’t much evidence from textual errors to help us analyze the variation here, although there is one example in \mathcal{O} of a mix-up between *zeal* and *zealous*:

Alma 27:27
 and they were also distinguished
 for their [*zealous* > *zeal* 0 | *zeal* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] towards God

In this case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the adjective *zealous* with its *-ous* ending rather than the noun *zeal*. He may have expected *zealousness* here but cut off writing the longer noun and crossed out the extra *ous* as soon as he realized his error.

Given that we have little evidence from transmissional probabilities in this instance, we will rely on internal evidence, namely, the preference everywhere else in the text for “poisonous serpents”. The critical text will therefore maintain the 1830 reading here in Mormon 8:24.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:24 the expected “poisonous serpents” (the 1830 reading), not the anomalous “poison serpents” (the reading in \mathcal{P}).

■ Mormon 8:26

and **no one need** [*not* >js NULL 1 | *not* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] say
 they shall not come

Here we have another instance of a multiple negative in the original text (“and **no one need not** say . . .”). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *not*. There are no other examples of this particular kind of multiple negative (“no one . . . not”) in the text. But more generally, multiple negatives are fairly common in the original text. See under 2 Nephi 26:32 for other examples that originally had both *not* and *no* within the same clause; for a more general discussion, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:26 the original multiple negative, “**no one need not** say”.

■ Mormon 8:26

and no one need not say
 [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *that* HK] they shall not come

Here the 1874 RLDS edition added the subordinate conjunctive *that*. The 1908 RLDS edition, based on the reading of the printer’s manuscript, removed this intrusive *that*. Elsewhere in the

text, there are two other occurrences of “need(s) say” followed by a finite clause. In both these cases, the *that* is in the text:

Alma 32:30	and then ye must needs say that the seed is good
3 Nephi 29:2	and ye need not say that the Lord delays his coming

More generally, however, the *that* is optional for finite clauses that complement the verb *say* (although in the majority of instances the *that* is there). For some discussion regarding the optionality of *that* after *say*, see under 2 Nephi 30:2; for a general discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:26 the lack of *that* for the finite clause complementing *say*; both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition, firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} , read without the *that*.

■ Mormon 8:26

*and it shall come in a day when it shall be said
that miracles are done [away 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | way H]*

Here the compositor for the 1874 RLDS edition set *way* rather than *away*. Elsewhere the text has ten instances of “to be done **away**”. The expression “to be done **way**” is probably impossible for the Book of Mormon text, although dialectally the reduced *way* does occur as a variant for *away* (see the introductory discussion under *away* in the Oxford English Dictionary). The 1892 RLDS edition restored the obviously correct “to be done **away**” here in Mormon 8:26. For another case of variation between *away* and *way* in the history of the text, one that is more plausible, see under Helaman 7:15–16 for the expression “to give (a)way”.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:26 the use of *away* in “miracles are done away”, the expected expression as well as the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Mormon 8:27

*and it shall come in a day
when the blood of [1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | the HKPS] saints shall cry unto the Lord*

The 1874 RLDS edition added the definite article *the* here before *saints*. This reading has been kept in the subsequent RLDS text. Most probably the original manuscript did not have the *the* here (since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition lack it). Elsewhere in the text, there are nine references to “the blood of **the** saints” and one to “the blood of **his** saints”:

2 Nephi 26:3	wherefore the cry of the blood of the saints shall ascend up to God from the ground against them
2 Nephi 28:10	and the blood of the saints shall cry from the ground against them
3 Nephi 9:5	that the blood of the prophets and of the saints shall not come up any more unto me against them
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
3 Nephi 10:12	and it was they which had not shed the blood of the saints which were spared
Mormon 8:41	he avengeth the blood of the saints upon you for he will not suffer their cries any longer
Ether 8:22	for the Lord will not suffer that the blood of his saints . . . shall always cry unto him from the ground

Moreover, the phraseology in Mormon 8:27 is similar for most of these other examples: five cases refer to the cries of the saints or of their blood, and seven state that the petitions of the saints are directed to the Lord (“to God”, “unto me”, and “unto him”). These similarities argue that “the saints” is expected in Mormon 8:27; Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe here in *Œ*, could have accidentally dropped the definite article when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Oliver’s occasional loss of the definite article, if only momentary, is fairly common in the transmission of the text (see the examples listed under Alma 14:5).

Note, however, that for Mormon 8:27 the definite article *the* is conspicuously lacking in the larger passage when referring to various groups of people, all in opposition to the saints:

Mormon 8:27–28 (proposed original text)

and it shall come in a day when the blood of **saints** shall cry unto the Lord
because of **secret combinations** and the works of darkness
yea it shall come in a day when the power of God shall be denied
and **churches** become defiled and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts
yea even in a day when **leaders of churches** and **teachers** shall be lifted up
in the pride of their hearts

The text does not read “**the** secret combinations”, “**the** churches”, “**the** leaders”, or “**the** teachers”. The use of *saints* without *the* earlier in verse 27 is consistent with this usage and may therefore be intentional. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading in verse 27, without the definite article before *saints*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:27 the earliest reading without *the* before *saints*; the larger passage avoids the definite article for other nouns referring to groups of people that oppose the saints.

■ Mormon 8:28

*yea it shall come in a day
when the power of God shall be denied
and churches become defiled
and [shall 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPS | RT] be lifted up in the pride of their hearts*

The 1920 LDS edition removed the modal auxiliary *shall* before “be lifted up” in this passage. The change was intentional because it was marked in the 1920 committee copy. Note that the preceding

conjoined clause had no auxiliary verb (“and churches become defiled” instead of “and churches **shall** become defiled”). In other words, the deletion of the *shall* before “be lifted up” essentially assumes that *shall* is ellipted from the preceding conjunct and that the text is equivalent to “the power of God **shall** be denied and churches **shall** become defiled and **shall** be lifted up”. This emendation suggests the possibility that the original text actually read “and churches **shall** become defiled”, which would mean that an instance of *shall* was accidentally deleted as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation (both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition read identically here). Of course, another possibility here is that no auxiliary occurred before *become* because this verb form was intended to be the present-tense *become* rather than the infinitival *become*.

In any event, the earliest reading of the text in Mormon 8:28 is not that difficult; the RLDS text continues it. In fact, we still have a similar construction elsewhere in the text, one where the verb cannot be reinterpreted as a present-tense form (marked below with an arrow):

Helaman 15:12
 and notwithstanding they **shall** be driven to and fro
 upon the face of the earth
 → and be hunted
 and **shall** be smitten and scattered abroad . . .

Here the *shall* is ellipted in the intermediate verb phrase conjunct, “and be hunted”, yet it reappears in the following verb phrase conjunct (“and **shall** be smitten and scattered abroad”). The earliest reading in Mormon 8:28 is textually possible and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore the original *shall* before “be lifted up” in Mormon 8:28 since there is evidence elsewhere in the text for the ellipsis of *shall* for intermediate verb phrase conjuncts.

■ Mormon 8:28

*yea it shall come in a day
 when the power of God shall be denied
 and churches become defiled
 and **shall be lifted up**
 in the pride of their hearts
 yea even in a day
 when leaders of churches and teachers
 [I ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | NULL > shall rise M | shall rise OQRT]
 in the pride of their hearts
 even to the envying of them who belong to their churches*

The second part of this verse, based on the earliest textual sources, seems to be missing its verb phrase. Elsewhere in the text, we do not find long *yea*-clauses like this for which the whole verb phrase has been ellipted.

For the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS missionary edition, the verb phrase “shall rise” was inserted, presumably by German Ellsworth (the mission president in charge of publishing that missionary edition of the Book of Mormon). This reading has been followed in all subsequent LDS editions.

The first part of this verse parallels the second part and suggests that the missing verb phrase is “shall be lifted up”. Note that both refer in the beginning to “in a day when . . .” and end with the same phrase “in the pride of their hearts”. In fact, when we look elsewhere in the text, we find numerous examples that refer to people “lifted up in pride”:

2 Nephi 26:20	and the Gentiles are lifted up in the pride of their eyes
Jacob 1:16	and began to be lifted up somewhat in pride
Jacob 2:13	ye are lifted up in the pride of your hearts
Mosiah 11:5	new ones . . . such as were lifted up in the pride of their hearts
Mosiah 11:19	they were lifted up in the pride of their hearts
Alma 1:6	and he began to be lifted up in the pride of his heart
Alma 1:32	being lifted up in the pride of their own eyes
Alma 4:6	and in all these things were they lifted up in the pride of their eyes
Alma 4:8	the people of the church began to be lifted up in the pride of their eyes
Alma 4:12	some lifting themselves up with their pride
Alma 6:3	I mean those which were lifted up in the pride of their hearts
Alma 7:6	I trust that ye are not lifted up in the pride of your hearts
Alma 31:25	their hearts were lifted up unto great boasting in their pride
Alma 38:11	see that ye are not lifted up unto pride
Alma 62:49	they were not lifted up in the pride of their eyes
Helaman 3:34	and they were lifted up in pride
Helaman 12:5	yea how quick to be lifted up in pride
3 Nephi 6:10	and some were lifted up unto pride and boastings
3 Nephi 6:13	some were lifted up in pride
3 Nephi 16:10	and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts
4 Nephi 1:24	there began to be among them those which were lifted up in pride
Mormon 8:28	and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts
Mormon 8:36	a few only which do not lift themselves up in the pride of their hearts

In fact, six of these have precisely the same phraseology: “in the pride of their hearts”. There is also one other passage that refers to churches being lifted up, just like here in Mormon 8:28:

2 Nephi 28:12
and because of false teachers and false doctrines
their churches have become corrupted
and their churches are lifted up

The surrounding passage also refers to pride. (For discussion on how to parse the larger passage, see under 2 Nephi 28:11–12.)

Another possible emendation here in Mormon 8:28 would be to supply “shall be puffed up”, thus “when leaders of churches and teachers **shall be puffed up** in the pride of their hearts”. There are a few cases where the text refers to people being “puffed up in pride”:

Mormon 8

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

And there are a few other examples of “in one’s pride”, each with a different verb:

Alma 31:27	and yet their hearts are swallowed up in their pride
Helaman 11:37	and they did wax stronger and stronger in their pride and in their wickedness
Helaman 16:10	the more part of the people remaining in their pride and wickedness
Mormon 8:36	ye do walk in the pride of your hearts

But nowhere do we find cases of people “rising (or raising) up in pride”. It seems very reasonable here in Mormon 8:28 that some verb phrase is missing and that the best emendation would be “shall be lifted up”, especially given that phraseology earlier in the verse (“and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts”).

Of course, here in Mormon 8:28, by adding the verb phrase “shall be lifted up” to the text, we assume that this rather long verb phrase was accidentally lost when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, here the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O} . (Since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition agree in their reading here and are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} , the lack of a verb phrase in those two sources means that probably \mathcal{O} too was missing it.) Although long phrases were sometimes temporarily skipped when the text was initially written down in \mathcal{O} , the text was soon corrected. There isn’t much evidence in \mathcal{O} for the permanent loss of longer phrases, but that may be because the resulting shorter text in most cases would have been perfectly acceptable. In any event, such permanent losses were probably infrequent. But here in Mormon 8:28 we seem to have one that is noticeable, although one could argue that Mormon himself accidentally omitted the verb phrase here. If we could be sure that this was the case, we would not emend the critical text reading (despite its difficulty).

Summary: Emend Mormon 8:28 to read “when leaders of churches and teachers **shall be lifted up** in the pride of their hearts”; this verb phrase is supported by numerous other occurrences of this phraseology in the text, including the first part of Mormon 8:28 itself.

■ **Mormon 8:28**

*yea even in a day when leaders of **churches** and teachers
shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts
even to the envying of them
who belong to their [church 1 | churches ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The printer’s manuscript has the singular *church*, the 1830 edition the plural *churches*. The plural is very likely correct. Here the text is speaking of leaders of churches (and their teachers) who will compete with each other in trying to get members. A given leader or teacher is envious of those who belong to other churches. Here *churches* acts as a distributed plural and is consistent with the overall plurality in this passage. Normally, however, people belong to “a church”. Elsewhere

the Book of Mormon has 27 references to people belonging to a church, but never to people belonging to churches. It would appear that the expected singular led scribe 2 of Ø to write the singular here in Mormon 8:28 instead of the correct plural. For another case where an unexpected plural *churches* was replaced with the singular *church*, see under Alma 8:23.

Summary: Maintain the plural reading *churches* in Mormon 8:28; the singular *church* in the printer's manuscript is most probably an error made by scribe 2 of Ø.

■ Mormon 8:30

*and there shall [also be 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | be also E] heard of wars
[& 1 | and ABCDEGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] rumors of wars
and earthquakes in divers places*

Here we have a couple mistakes that were made in the 1849 LDS edition. First, the word *also* was accidentally moved to after the *be* verb. Elsewhere in the history of the text there have been a number of cases where *also* was moved to somewhere else in the verb phrase (for a list, see under 2 Nephi 21:13). Here in Mormon 8:30, this error was corrected in the subsequent LDS edition (1852). The text has five other instances of the word order “shall also be”, as well as three of “also shall be”. But there are none with the word order “shall be also”.

The second 1849 error in this verse, the accidental omission of the *and* in “wars **and** rumors of wars”, was not caught; thus the LDS text has maintained a conjunctive structure that we might expect in modern English (“wars, rumors of wars, and earthquakes”). Yet elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we consistently get “wars **and** rumors of wars”, including one (marked below with an asterisk) where there is a third conjunct introduced by *and* (just like originally in Mormon 8:30):

- * 1 Nephi 12:2
and I beheld wars **and** rumors of wars **and** great slaughters with the sword
among my people
- 1 Nephi 12:21
and I saw wars **and** rumors of wars among them
- 1 Nephi 12:21
and in wars **and** rumors of wars I saw many generations pass away
- 1 Nephi 14:15
insomuch that there were wars **and** rumors of wars
among all the nations and kindreds of the earth
- 1 Nephi 14:16
and as there began to be wars **and** rumors of wars
among all the nations which belonged to the mother of abominations . . .
- 2 Nephi 25:12
but behold they shall have wars **and** rumors of wars

The full form with the *and* (“wars and rumors of wars”) is also found in the King James Bible (in Matthew 24:6 and Mark 13:7). The *and* should definitely be restored here in Mormon 8:30.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 8:30 the *and* in the expected phraseology “wars **and** rumors of wars”; also maintain the original word order where *also* occurs between *shall* and *be* (“and there **shall also** be heard of wars”).

■ Mormon 8:31

*there shall be murders and **robbing** and **lying** and deceivings and whoredoms and all manner of abominations*

One wonders here if the original text read in the plural for either *robbing* or *lying* or for even both words. Since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition have the singular forms for these nouns, \mathcal{O} very likely did too. As explained under Alma 12:1, 3, the singular forms *robbing* and *lying* are acceptable here if we interpret them as gerundive nouns. It is possible that *lying* is an error for *lyings*, that *lying* was prompted by the immediately preceding gerundive *robbing*. Nonetheless, the gerundive interpretation for both nouns is possible, as in the following example found earlier in the text:

Alma 1:32

and wearing costly apparel
being lifted up in the pride of their own eyes
persecuting **lying** thieving and **robbing**
committing whoredoms and murdering and all manner of wickedness

Of course, in that passage all the surrounding conjuncts are gerundives. In any event, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading in Mormon 8:31, the singulars *robbing* and *lying*, since such usage is possible.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:31 the singulars *robbing* and *lying*, the reading of both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition; the singular is possible if we interpret these nouns as gerundives.

■ Mormon 8:33

*why have ye transfigured the holy word of God
that ye might bring damnation upon your [souls 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | soul HK]*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *souls* with the singular *soul*, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural. The plural is what we expect here, although the Book of Mormon does occasionally permit the singular *soul* in generically plural contexts, as discussed under Mosiah 2:20–21. Here in Mormon 8:33 the critical text will maintain the expected plural since it is the reading of the earliest text.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:33 the plural *souls* in “that ye might bring damnation upon your **souls**”.

■ Mormon 8:35

and I know your [doing 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | doings K]

One wonders here if the singular *doing* of the earliest textual sources isn’t an error for *doings*. The 1892 RLDS edition has the plural *doings*, perhaps unintentionally (yet out of expectation

of the plural). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the singular. Elsewhere in the text, there are 21 instances of the plural noun *doings* but none of the singular noun (excluding cases where *doing* acts verbally):

1 Nephi 10:20	all thy doings
1 Nephi 19:22	the doings of the Lord
2 Nephi 13:8	their doings
2 Nephi 13:10	their doings
2 Nephi 22:4	his doings
2 Nephi 25:2	their doings were doings of abomination (2 times)
Mosiah 7:29	their doings
Mosiah 11:29	his evil doings
Mosiah 12:1	their evil doings
Alma 37:36	all thy doings
Alma 37:37	all thy doings
3 Nephi 28:7	all the doings of the Father
3 Nephi 29:4	the doings of the Lord
3 Nephi 29:4	his doings
3 Nephi 29:5	the doings of the Lord
3 Nephi 30:2	your evil doings
4 Nephi 1:18	all their doings
Mormon 2:8	their evil doings
Ether 8:5	the doings of Jared their brother
Ether 15:13	all the doings of the people

These examples argue that the singular *doing*, the earliest reading in Mormon 8:35, is an error. If so, the final *s* must have been dropped in \mathcal{O} as Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe here, took down Joseph Smith's dictation. There is considerable evidence that Oliver occasionally omitted the plural *s*, as in these examples that involve the ending *-ing*:

- 1 Nephi 13:23 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
 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 (uncorrected error in \mathcal{P})
 and he was truly chastened
 because of his [*murmurings* 0 | *murmuring* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 against the Lord
- Mosiah 19:3 (error in \mathcal{P} corrected by the 1830 typesetter)
 and the lesser part began
 to breathe out [*threatning* > jg *threatnings* 1 | *threatnings* ABCD |
threatenings EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] against the king
- Alma 22:14 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
 but the [*suffering* > *sufferings* 1 | *sufferings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and death of Christ atoneth for their sins

Alma 30:22 (initial error in \mathcal{P})

to interrupt their [*rejoicing* > *rejoiceings* 1 | *rejoicings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

3 Nephi 8:25 (uncorrected error in \mathcal{P} ; 1830 reading correctly copied from \mathcal{C})

and thus were the [*howling* 1 | *howlings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the people great and terrible

3 Nephi 16:4 (initial error in corrected reading in \mathcal{P})

and I command you that ye shall write
these [*things* >+ *saying* > *sayings* 1 | *sayings* ABCDEFHJKLMNOPQRST | *things* G]

Moroni 9:25 (initial error in \mathcal{P})

and may his [*suffering* > *sufferings* 1 | *sufferings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and death . . . rest in your mind forever

On the other hand, the singular noun *doing* is not particularly offensive here in Mormon 8:35. It has been maintained in both the LDS and RLDS texts. Moreover, there are similar examples of the singular noun *doing* in the King James Bible, although they all refer to the Lord's doing:

Psalm 64:9	for they shall wisely consider of his doing
Psalm 66:5	<i>he is terrible in his doing</i> toward the children of men
Psalm 118:23	this is the LORD's doing
Matthew 21:42	this is the Lord's doing
Mark 12:11	this was the Lord's doing

(There are also a number of examples in the King James Bible of *well doing* and *evil doing*, which are somewhat different.) On the other hand, references to "one's doings" is quite common in the King James text (there are 51 instances, some of which refer to the Lord's doings). Since the singular is possible, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading here in Mormon 8:35, "I know your doing", despite its uniqueness in the Book of Mormon text. The possibility remains that *doing* is a primitive error for *doings*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:35 the singular *doing* in "I know your doing", the reading of the earliest text; there is some possibility that the original text read "I know your **doings**"; although there is no independent support in the Book of Mormon text for the singular, the King James Bible has examples of this usage.

■ Mormon 8:36

unto the wearing of very fine apparel

*unto **envying***

and [*strife* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and malice

and [*persecutions* 1ABCDEFHJKLMNOPQRST | *persecution* N]

and all manner of [*iniquity* 1PS | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here we have considerable variation between the singular and plural in this series of conjuncts. There are two cases where \mathcal{P} reads in the singular while the 1830 edition reads in the plural: *strife*

versus *strifes*, and *iniquity* versus *iniquities*. In the last case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the singular reading *iniquity* but not the singular *strife* (perhaps because the singular *strife* seemed less plausible). These two cases are rather difficult to analyze since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} for this part of the text.

There is also a third case of variation in this passage, namely, *persecutions* versus *persecution*, where the singular occurs only in the 1906 LDS edition. This variant is easily resolved. As explained under Mosiah 27:3, there has been some tendency in the history of the text to accidentally replace the plural *persecutions* with the singular. The critical text will, of course, maintain the plural *persecutions* here in Mormon 8:36 since it is the reading in both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition.

Transmissional evidence suggests that the plural *strifes* is the correct reading here in Mormon 8:36. As explained under Alma 1:32, there are two other cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote *strife* instead of the correct *strifes* (namely, in 3 Nephi 21:19 and 3 Nephi 30:2). On the other hand, there are no examples where the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced a singular *strife* with the plural, but there is one case (in Alma 4:9) where he replaced *strifes* with *strife*. Yet in all these cases the tendency is to replace the plural *strifes* with the singular, undoubtedly because modern English speakers expect the singular (even though the Book of Mormon text itself prefers the plural, nine to three in the original text). Thus the critical text will accept here in Mormon 8:36 the plural *strifes*, the 1830 reading.

For the last case of variation in this passage, \mathcal{P} has “all manner of iniquity” while the 1830 edition has “all manner of iniquities”. This case is quite difficult. There are two cases where the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced a singular *iniquity* with the plural:

2 Nephi 27:5
and the seers hath he covered
because of your [*iniquity* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *iniquities* A]

Jacob 2:35
behold ye have done greater [*iniquity* 1PS | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]
than the Lamanites our brethren

These two examples thus support an analysis for Mormon 8:36 in which the 1830 typesetter accidentally introduced the plural *iniquities*.

As far as scribal corrections go, we have the following examples involving the number for *iniquity*, all in the printer’s manuscript:

2 Nephi 4:17 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error and correction)
my soul grieveth
because of mine [*iniquity* >+ *iniquities* 1 | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 15:9 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error and immediate correction)
having taken upon himself
their [*iniquities* >% *iniquity* 1 | *iniquity* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and their transgressions

Mosiah 29:30 (Hyrum Smith’s initial error and immediate correction)
that if these people commit sins
and [*iniquity* >% *iniquities* 1 | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they shall be answered upon their own heads

Alma 39:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error and correction)

that ye refrain
from [*iniquity* > *your iniquities* 1 | *your iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 2:10 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} 's initial error and immediate correction)

the Nephites began to repent
of their [*iniquities* >% *iniquity* 1 | *iniquity* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In three of these cases, the scribe first wrote the singular, then corrected to the plural. In the two other cases, the opposite occurred. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} is responsible for only one of these momentary errors (in Mormon 2:10), in which he accidentally wrote the plural initially. This error cannot be used as direct evidence that he accidentally wrote the singular in Mormon 8:36, although it does show him mixing up the number.

As far as the phrase "all manner of X" is concerned, errors for this expression show that an expected plural is sometimes replaced by the singular, although there are only two examples:

Alma 60:17 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{C})

causing them that they should suffer all manner of
[*affliction* >+ *afflictions* 0 | *afflictions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Helaman 12:3 (typo in the 1905 LDS edition)

yea except he doth visit them with death and with terror and with famine
and with all manner of [*pestilences* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *pestilence* MQRT]
they will not remember him

Elsewhere in the text, there are 13 instances of "all manner of iniquity/iniquities". None of these exhibit any variation in number. In nine of these cases we get the singular, while four have the plural. Nonetheless, one factor seems to play a major role here. When this phrase is the direct object of the verb *do*, we get only the singular "all manner of iniquity" (eight times). On the other hand, if we have a list, with "all manner of iniquity/iniquities" ending the list, only once do we get the singular:

Alma 62:40

and there had been murders and contentions and dissensions
and all manner of **iniquity** among the people of Nephi

\mathcal{C} is extant here and definitely reads with the singular "all manner of iniquity", so the reading seems firm (although Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in \mathcal{C} for this passage, could have made an error). In the four other cases with lists, we get the plural "all manner of iniquities" at the end of the list:

Mosiah 29:36

yea all his iniquities and abominations
and all the wars and contentions and bloodshed
and the stealing
and the plundering
and the committing of whoredoms
and all manner of **iniquities** which cannot be enumerated

Alma 45:12

and fall into the works of darkness and lasciviousness
and all manner of **iniquities**

Helaman 10:3

being much cast down
because of the wickedness of the people of the Nephites
their secret works of darkness
and their murderings
and their plunderings
and all manner of **iniquities**

Helaman 13:22

but they do swell with great pride
unto boasting
and unto great swelling
envyings strifes malice persecutions and murders
and all manner of **iniquities**

However, the one occurrence in Alma 62:40 of “all manner of iniquity” ending a list argues that such a reading is also possible in Mormon 8:36; four plural examples is not enough to argue for emending Alma 62:40 to the plural.

Given all this information, the most plausible reading for Mormon 8:36 is to follow the error tendency, which argues that the 1830 typesetter made the mistake in Mormon 8:36 and accidentally replaced the singular *iniquity* with the plural. The critical text will therefore accept the singular *iniquity* in \mathcal{D} . This means that the original text has two instances of “all manner of iniquity” at the end of a list, here in Mormon 8:36 and in Alma 62:40.

There is one other case involving grammatical number that needs to be considered here in Mormon 8:36, namely, the occurrence of the singular *envying* (“unto the wearing of very fine apparel / unto **envying** and strifes and malice and persecutions and all manner of iniquity”). As noted under Helaman 13:22, the Book of Mormon text otherwise prefers the plural *envyings* when combined with other noun conjuncts. It is possible that the preceding gerund phrase (“unto the **wearing** of very fine apparel”) influenced the reading here. Moreover, earlier in this chapter, there is a correct gerundive use of *envying* (which is necessarily singular): “even to the **envying** of them who belong to their churches” (Mormon 8:28). One could use these two preceding gerundives to argue that the gerundive *envying* is correct here in verse 36. Alternatively, one could argue that these two gerundives led to the replacement of the later *envyings* with *envying* in the early transmission of the text. It is difficult to determine whether the original text in Mormon 8:36 read *envying* or *envyings*. The original manuscript undoubtedly read in the singular since both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition read in the singular. But since the singular will work, the critical text will maintain it. Unique readings will occur. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that *envying* here in Mormon 8:36 is a primitive error for *envyings*.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:36 the plural *strifes* and the plural *persecutions*, but follow the reading of the printer’s manuscript for the less common but possible “all manner of iniquity” since there is evidence that the 1830 typesetter tended to replace the singular *iniquity* with the plural *iniquities*; the occurrence of the singular *envying*, despite its uniqueness, will be retained since its use here is possible.

■ Mormon 8:37

for behold ye do love money

and your [§2 substances > §1 substance 1 | substances ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | substance PRST]

and your fine apparel

Here both scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 typesetter copied the word from \mathcal{C} as *substances*, in the plural. Later Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , corrected the plural in \mathcal{P} to the singular by crossing out the plural *s*. This was probably editing on his part. He seems to have written down *substances* in \mathcal{C} , then later decided to correct it in \mathcal{P} . The plural *s* was removed from the RLDS text in 1908, from the LDS text in 1920.

Elsewhere in the text, as one might suspect, there are only singular occurrences of *substance* (26 times). The word always acts as a mass noun rather than a count noun, as in these examples involving lists of possessions (like Mormon 8:37):

Mosiah 4:19

do we not all depend upon the same being even God
for all the **substance** which we have
for both food and raiment
and for gold and for silver
and for all the riches which we have of every kind

Helaman 13:28

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

3 Nephi 3:13

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

3 Nephi 3:22

and they had taken their horses and their chariots and their cattle
and all their flocks and their herds and their grain and all their **substance**

3 Nephi 4:3

for the Nephites had left their lands desolate
and had gathered their flocks and their herds and all their **substance**

4 Nephi 1:25

and from that time forth they did have
their goods and their **substance** no more common among them

In the last example, the 1892 RLDS edition has the plural *substances*, thus showing that this error can occur (for a brief discussion, see under 4 Nephi 1:25).

Oliver Cowdery frequently added and deleted plural *s*'s in taking down Joseph Smith's dictation. In the following examples in \mathcal{O} , he initially added the plural *s* to nouns where the context does not permit the plural:

1 Nephi 22:17	even unto the [<i>destructions</i> > <i>destruction</i> 0] of their enemies by fire
Alma 27:23	between the [<i>lands</i> >% <i>land</i> 0] Jershon and the land Nephi
Alma 30:47	it is better that thy [<i>souls</i> > <i>soul</i> 0] should be lost
Alma 31:28	behold O my God their costly [<i>apparrels</i> >% <i>apparel</i> 0]
Alma 32:42	and your patience with the [<i>words</i> >% <i>word</i> 0] in nourishing it
Alma 42:1	the justice of God in the [<i>punishments</i> > <i>punishment</i> 0] of the sinner
Alma 45:20	Helaman went forth among the [<i>Peoples</i> >% <i>People</i> 0]
Alma 46:24	so shall a remnant of the seed of my son be preserved by the [<i>hands</i> >% <i>hand</i> 0] of God
Alma 47:1	to go to [<i>battles</i> >% <i>battle</i> 0] against the Nephites
Alma 50:34	by the narrow pass which led by the [<i>Seas</i> >% <i>Sea</i> 0]
Alma 51:17	to pull down their [<i>prides</i> >% <i>pride</i> 0]
Alma 51:21	and the [<i>prides</i> > <i>pride</i> 0] of those people
Alma 57:6	to the number of six [<i>thousands</i> >% <i>thousand</i> 0] men
Alma 57:27	and they do put their [<i>trusts</i> > <i>trust</i> 0] in God continually
Helaman 16:1	the words of Samuel the [<i>Lamanites</i> >% <i>Lamanite</i> 0]

Note, in particular, the case of the mass noun *apparel* in Alma 31:28, which Oliver initially wrote down as a plural count noun. So it is quite possible that in Mormon 8:37 he accidentally added the plural *s* to the mass noun *substance* as he took down Joseph's dictation. Although the plural *substances* is not totally impossible, it is highly unlikely. The critical text will therefore accept the modern-day LDS and RLDS emendations of the plural to the singular *substance* here in Mormon 8:37.

Summary: Retain the singular *substance* in Mormon 8:37, the reading in both the current LDS and RLDS texts; the Book of Mormon otherwise uses *substance* only as a mass noun (that is, in the singular); the plural usage seems implausible.

■ Mormon 8:37

*for behold ye do love money and your substance and your fine apparel
and the adorning of your churches
more than ye love the poor and [1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] needy
the sick and the afflicted*

Here \mathcal{P} lacks the repeated *the* before *needy* (“the poor and needy”), while the 1830 edition has the *the* (“the poor and **the** needy”). Most probably, the *the* was in the original manuscript and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally dropped it while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Note that the *the* is repeated in the following “the sick and **the** afflicted”. (For discussion of the repeated *the* in the phrase “the sick and (the) afflicted”, see under Alma 34:28.)

As far as conjuncts of *poor* and *needy* are concerned, all other cases have the repeated *the*:

Alma 1:27

and they did impart of their substance
 every man according to that which he had
 to the poor and **the** needy
 and the sick and the afflicted

Alma 4:13

such as imparting their substance
 to the poor and **the** needy

Alma 5:55

yea and will you persist in turning your backs
 upon the poor and **the** needy

In addition, close by in Mormon 8:39 we have another long series of conjuncts involving *needy*; each noun in this conjunctive phrase has the determiner *the*:

Mormon 8:39

why do ye adorn yourselves with that which hath no life
 and yet suffer **the** hungry and **the** needy and **the** naked
 and **the** sick and **the** afflicted to pass by you and notice them not

These examples argue that the original text in Mormon 8:37 probably read “the poor and **the** needy”. The overall tendency in the history of the text has been to omit the repeated *the* in conjunctive noun phrases, as explained in detail under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will assume that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted the repeated *the* here in Mormon 8:37. As explained under 3 Nephi 24:13, there are other examples where he omitted the definite article *the*.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in Mormon 8:37 (“the poor and **the** needy”), the reading of the 1830 edition; scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} seems to have accidentally omitted the repeated *the* in this conjunctive noun phrase.

■ Mormon 8:38

*O ye **pollutions***

ye hypocrites

ye teachers which sell yourselves for that which will canker

why have ye polluted the holy church of God

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004) wonders if the word *pollutions* isn’t an error here for *polluters* or *pollutants*. If there is any error here, it was in \mathcal{C} since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read identically as *pollutions*. The Oxford English Dictionary gives no examples where *pollutions* refers to people per se. The word *polluters* is more possible as an emendation since the word *pollutant* is relatively recent in English (its first citation in the OED dates from 1892 while the first citation for *polluter* dates from 1550). In the Book of Mormon, the word *pollutions* occurs earlier in this chapter and in that case appears to refer to evil acts (it is clear from the context that *pollutions* does not refer to environmental pollution):

Mormon 8:31

yea it shall come in a day
 when there shall be great **pollutions** upon the face of the earth
 there shall be murders and robbing
 and lying and deceivings
 and whoredoms and all manner of abominations

Perhaps the occurrence of *pollutions* in Mormon 8:38 is a mistake influenced by the earlier occurrence of *pollutions* in verse 31. Clearly, *pollutions* in verse 38 refers to the people that have polluted the church (as is stated later in the verse: “why have ye polluted the holy church of God”). On the other hand, the word *polluter* does not appear in the Book of Mormon (or in the King James Bible). In fact, both texts have instances of the verb *pollute* and the noun *pollution*, but only those. It may simply be that the Book of Mormon text considers one who pollutes as a kind of pollution or as one who has been polluted by evil acts. The critical text will retain the difficult reading here in Mormon 8:38, “O ye pollutions”.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 8:38 the noun *pollutions*, the apparent reading in \mathcal{C} ; here the word means ‘polluters’ or ‘those polluted’; earlier in verse 31 *pollutions* takes a more normal meaning when it refers to moral pollutions.

■ Mormon 8:38

O ye pollutions
ye hypocrites
ye teachers
 [1N |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST]
which sell yourselves for that which will canker
why have ye polluted the holy church of God

Here in the standard LDS and RLDS texts, there is a comma after *teachers*, which implies that all teachers sell themselves “for that which will canker”. The relative clause should be restrictive. The 1906 LDS edition removed the comma. The same should be adopted in the current text.

A similar example is found earlier in the text where all the printed editions have a comma after *the rich*:

2 Nephi 28:15 (all printed editions)
 O the wise, and the learned, and the rich,
 that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts . . .

For further discussion of this example, see under 2 Nephi 28:15.

Summary: Remove the comma before the restrictive relative clause in Mormon 8:38; the text is not condemning all teachers, only those that sell themselves “for that which will canker”.

■ Mormon 8:38–39

*why do ye not think that greater is the value of an endless happiness
than that misery which never dies*

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | — RT]

because of the praise of the world

[1 | ? AEFIJLMNOPQRST | . BCDGHK]

why do ye adorn yourselves with that which hath no life . . .

One wonders with respect to the larger context how to parse the *because*-phrase (“because of the praise of the world”). It doesn’t seem to belong at the end of the previous question per se, nor does it seem to belong to the following question. It seems to be stranded, and perhaps for that reason the 1920 LDS edition replaced the 1830 comma preceding the phrase with a dash. Also note that some of the editions from 1837 to 1892 replaced the 1830 question mark at the end of the phrase with a period, as if the purpose of the *because*-phrase is to parenthetically suggest a possible answer, rhetorically asked, for all the surrounding rhetorical questions:

Mormon 8:38–40 (question marks added)

why have ye polluted the holy church of God?

why are ye ashamed to take upon you the name of Christ?

why do ye not think that greater is the value of an endless happiness
than that misery which never dies?

→ because of the praise of the world?

why do ye adorn yourselves with that which hath no life

and yet suffer the hungry and the needy and the naked and the sick

and the afflicted to pass by you and notice them not?

yea why do ye build up your secret abominations to get gain

and cause that widows should mourn before the Lord

and also orphans to mourn before the Lord

and also the blood of their fathers and their husbands

to cry unto the Lord from the ground for vengeance upon your heads?

In any case, the use of the *because*-phrase is unusual and should probably be separated off in some way from the surrounding rhetorical questions, with either commas or dashes.

Summary: In Mormon 8:38, treat the intermediate *because*-phrase as a parenthetical addition to the series of *why* questions throughout the larger passage in verses 38–40.

■ Mormon 8:40

*yea why do ye build up your secret **abominations** to get gain*

Corbin Volluz (personal communication, 15 March 2005) suggests that in this passage the word *abominations* may be an error for *combinations*. Both words are phonetically similar. If such an error occurred, it would have happened when Joseph Smith dictated the text to his scribe (here presumably Oliver Cowdery). For this part of the text both \mathfrak{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathfrak{C} ; and since both these sources read *abominations*, we can safely assume that \mathfrak{C} (not extant here) did as well.

There is evidence in the text for both the phrases “secret combination(s)” and “secret abomination(s)”, although there are considerably more instances of the former (22 to 4, excluding the case here in Mormon 8:40). But when the verb is “to build up”, we otherwise get references to building up combinations, never abominations (although in the first case listed below the word *combination* is not explicitly used to refer to the band of Gaddianton robbers):

Helaman 6:37–38

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 less wicked part of them insomuch that this band of robbers was utterly destroyed from among the Lamanites 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

4 Nephi 1:42

and it came to pass that the wicked part of the people began again to **build up** the secret oaths and combinations of Gaddianton

Ether 8:23–25

wherefore O ye Gentiles
it is wisdom in God that these things should be shewn unto you
that thereby ye may repent of your sins
and suffer not that these murderous combinations shall get above you
which are **built up to get power and gain . . .**
wherefore the Lord commandeth you
when ye shall see these things come among you
that ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation
because of this secret combination which shall be among you
for woe be unto it because of the blood of them which have been slain
for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon it
and also upon those who **build it up**
for it cometh to pass that whoso **buildeth it up**
seeketh to overthrow the freedom of all lands nations and countries
and it bringeth to pass the destruction of all people
for it is **built up** by the devil

Ether 11:15

and it came to pass that there arose a rebellion among the people
because of that secret combination which was **built up to get power and gain**

Further, two of these passages refer to the purpose of the secret combinations—namely, to get power and gain (Ether 8:23 and Ether 11:15). And Mormon 8:40 also refers to getting gain.

Even so, the example in 4 Nephi 1:42 shows that one can build up secret oaths, which seems less organizational than building up secret combinations. Since secret combinations are associated with both oaths and abominations, building up secret abominations may not be that difficult after all. Further, there is at least one passage that directly lists various abominations (“to commit secret murders and to rob and to plunder”) as leading to gain, although the specific word *abomination(s)* does not appear:

Helaman 6:17

therefore they began to set their hearts upon their riches
yea they began to seek to get gain
that they might be lifted up one above another
therefore they began to commit secret murders and to rob and to plunder
that they might get gain

Heather Hardy has proposed this same emendation for Mormon 8:40 (personal communication, 9 May 2005). And Grant Hardy has provided some additional arguments from similarities in phraseology in arguing for this emendation. He notes, for instance, that in references to the blood of victims and their crying out for justice, all other passages (five of them) refer to secret combinations rather than secret abominations:

Alma 37:30

and the **blood** of those which they murdered did cry unto the Lord their God
for vengeance upon those which were their murderers
and thus the judgments of God did come
upon them workers of darkness and **secret combinations**

3 Nephi 9:9

and behold that great city Jacob-Ugath
which was inhabited by the people of the king Jacob
have I caused to be burned with fire
because of their sins and their wickedness
which was above all the wickedness of the whole earth
because of their **secret** murders and **combinations** . . .
therefore I did cause them to be burned
to destroy them from before my face
that the **blood** of the prophets and the saints
should not come up unto me any more against them

Mormon 8:27

and it shall come in a day
when the **blood** of saints shall cry unto the Lord
because of **secret combinations** and the works of darkness

Ether 8:22

and whatsoever nation shall uphold such **secret combinations**
to get power and gain
until they shall spread over the nation
behold they shall be destroyed
for the Lord will not suffer that the **blood** of his saints
which shall be shed by them
shall always cry unto him from the ground for vengeance upon them

Ether 8:24

wherefore the Lord commandeth you
when ye shall see these things come among you
that ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation
because of this **secret combination** which shall be among you
for woe be unto it because of the **blood** of them which have been slain
for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon it

Thus the appropriateness of emending *secret abominations* to *secret combinations* in the sixth case:

Mormon 8:40 (proposed emendation)

yea why do ye build up your **secret combinations** to get gain
and cause that widows should mourn before the Lord
and also orphans to mourn before the Lord
and also the **blood** of their fathers and their husbands
to cry unto the Lord from the ground for vengeance upon your heads

Clearly, there is an obvious connection between secret combinations and secret abominations, and these abominations are committed with the intent to get gain. Thus the use of *abominations* in Mormon 8:40 is not impossible. Furthermore, it should be noted that there is no evidence in the manuscripts (or the printed editions) that the words *abomination(s)* and *combination(s)* have ever been mixed up. The critical text will therefore maintain the occurrence of *secret abominations* in Mormon 8:40.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *secret abominations* in Mormon 8:40, the reading of the earliest textual sources (D and the 1830 edition); the reading here is possible since there is a close connection between secret combinations and their secret abominations; the possibility remains that *secret abominations* here in Mormon 8:40 is an error for *secret combinations*; if so, it would have occurred as the scribe in C, presumably Oliver Cowdery, took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

Mormon 9

■ Mormon 9:2–3

*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
then will ye **longer** deny the Christ*

The problem here is whether the comparative *longer* can occur without *any* or some other marker of negation. Elsewhere in the text, we have 12 occurrences of “no longer” and 5 of “any longer”. For each of the 5 cases with *any*, there is a preceding *not* in the clause. In all 17 cases of nonassertive *longer*, there has been no textual variation involving the loss of *no*, *not*, or *any*. Interestingly, the example of *longer* here in Mormon 9:3 is the only case where the word occurs in a question rather than in a statement or command; the use here without any negative marker is unique for the Book of Mormon text.

However, this usage is found in a revelation to Joseph Smith given in March 1830, less than a year after the completion of the Book of Mormon translation:

Book of Commandments 16:43 (Doctrine and Covenants 19:40)
or canst thou run about **longer** as a blind guide

This example also takes the form of a yes-no question, just like in Mormon 9:3, thus providing support for the use of *longer* without any negative marker (*no*, *not*, or *any*). The phraseology in Mormon 9:3 will therefore not be emended, even though it sounds strange to modern English readers.

Summary: Maintain the reading in Mormon 9:3 where *longer* occurs without a negative marker in a yes-no question; such usage is unexpected but is apparently intended.

■ Mormon 9:3

*do ye suppose that ye could be happy to dwell with that holy Being
when your souls are racked with a consciousness
of [your 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] guilt
that ye have ever abused his laws*

The original text had *your* in the phrase “with a consciousness of **your** guilt”. The 1837 edition accidentally dropped the *your*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it, as will the critical text.

The expression “a consciousness of your guilt” occurs earlier in this verse and is followed by the similar “a consciousness of your filthiness” in the next verse. In both cases, the *your* has not been removed:

Mormon 9:3

do ye suppose that ye shall dwell with him
under a consciousness of **your** guilt

Mormon 9:4

behold I say unto you
that ye would be more miserable
to dwell with a holy and a just God
under a consciousness of **your** filthiness before him

There are also two other occurrences of this phraseology in Alma. In every case, there is a determiner before *guilt*:

Alma 12:1

and seeing that he began to tremble under a consciousness of **his** guilt . . .

Alma 14:6

and his soul began to be harrowed up under a consciousness of **his** own guilt

Summary: Restore in Mormon 9:3 the *your* that the 1837 typesetter accidentally omitted in the second instance of the phrase “a consciousness of **your** guilt”.

■ Mormon 9:4

*behold I say unto you that ye would be more miserable
to dwell with a holy and [a 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] just God
under a consciousness of your filthiness before him . . .*

The printer’s manuscript here has the repeated *a* (“with a holy and **a** just God”), whereas the 1830 edition lacks the repeated *a* (“with a holy and just God”). Elsewhere in the history of the text, there have been numerous examples where a repeated *a* (or *an*) has been dropped in this same context (namely, between conjoined attributive adjectives in a noun phrase):

1 Nephi 11:35 (omitted in the 1830 edition, although added earlier in \mathcal{P} by Oliver Cowdery)
a large and [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a 1] spacious building

1 Nephi 12:18 (omitted in the 1858 Wright edition and in the 1906 LDS edition)
a great and [a 01ABCDEFGHIJLMOPQRST | GHKN] terrible gulf

1 Nephi 12:23 (initially added by scribe 2 of \mathcal{G} ; its ultimate deletion by scribe 2 of \mathcal{G}
may be an error)
a dark [a > & 0| & 1| and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] loathsome
and a filthy people

1 Nephi 14:7 (omitted in the 1840 edition)
a great and [a 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNQRST | CGHK] marvelous work

2 Nephi 30:6 (omitted in the 1849 LDS edition)
a [*white* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRS | *pure* CGHKT]
and [a 1ABCDGHK PST | EFIJLMNOQR] delightsome people

- Omni 1:28 (omitted in the 1852 LDS edition)
a strong and [*a* 1ABCDEGPS | FHIJKLMNOQRT] mighty man
- Mosiah 27:7 (omitted in the 1840 edition and in the 1852 LDS edition)
a large and [*a* 1ABDEPS | CFGHIJKLMNOQRT] wealthy people
- Alma 9:5 (omitted in the 1858 Wright edition)
a hard-hearted and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | GHKPS] stiffnecked people
- Alma 9:30 (omitted in the 1905 LDS edition)
a lost and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] fallen people
- Alma 9:32 (omitted in the 1840 edition)
a lost and [*a* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] fallen people
- Alma 11:26 (omitted in the 1837 edition)
a true and [*a* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRST] living God
- Alma 11:27 (omitted in the 1841 British edition)
a true and [*a* 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] living God
- Alma 12:22 (omitted in the 1852 LDS edition)
a lost and [*a* 01ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] fallen people
- Alma 17:14 (omitted in the 1902 LDS edition)
a wild and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | L] hardened and a ferocious people
- Alma 20:30 (omitted in the 1902 LDS edition)
a more hardened and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | L] more stiffnecked people
- Alma 30:13 (omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition)
a foolish and [*a* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] vain hope
- Alma 34:10 (omitted in the 1837 edition)
an infinite and [*an* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRST] eternal sacrifice
- Alma 43:6 (omitted in the 1841 British edition)
a more wicked and [*a* 01ABCG | DEFHIJKLMNPOQRST] murderous disposition
- Alma 46:3 (omitted in the 1840 edition)
a large and [*a* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRST | C] strong man
- Helaman 1:15 (omitted in the 1858 Wright edition)
a large and [*a* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNPOQRST | GHK] mighty man
- 3 Nephi 5:9 (omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition and in the 1920 LDS edition)
a [*more short* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *shorter* RT]
but [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPS | HKRT] true account
- 3 Nephi 21:9 (omitted in the 1852 LDS edition)
a great and [*a* 1ABCDEGHKPRST | FIJLMNOQ] marvelous work
- Ether 1:34 (omitted in the 1852 LDS edition)
a large and [*a* 1ABCDEGPS | FHIJKLMNOQRT] mighty man

The first and third cases show the scribe adding the repeated *a*, Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} for 1 Nephi 11:35 and scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} for 1 Nephi 12:23 (see under those two passages for discussion). We have no firm cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ever added (or omitted, for that matter) the repeated *a*. As we can see, in the editions the consistent tendency has been to omit the repeated *a*; and 1 Nephi 11:35 shows one case where the 1830 typesetter made this error. Here in Mormon 9:4 we apparently have a second case. The critical text will therefore restore the repeated *a* in this case (thus “with a holy and a just God”).

Summary: Restore the repeated *a* in Mormon 9:4 (“with a holy and a just God”), the reading in \mathcal{P} ; the repeated *a* has been frequently omitted in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text, especially in the printed editions.

■ Mormon 9:5

it will kindle a flame

of [*anguishable* 1 | *unquenchable* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *fire*
upon you

The printer’s manuscript has *anguishable* while the 1830 edition reads *unquenchable*. Both are visually similar, and one of these is most likely a misreading of the other. Presumably Oliver Cowdery was the scribe for this part of \mathcal{O} . Here he probably wrote *unquenchable* in \mathcal{O} , but his initial *u* may have looked like an *a*, thus leading scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} to misread the word as *anguishable*. For discussion of Oliver’s difficulty with these two letters, *a* and *u*, see the discussion regarding the name *Cumorah* under Mormon 6:2.

There are two examples in the text of “an unquenchable fire” (Mosiah 2:38 and Alma 5:52) and two of “whose flames are unquenchable” (Jacob 6:10 and Mosiah 3:27). References to “unquenchable fire” are also found in the King James Bible (two times: Matthew 3:12 and Luke 3:17). On the other hand, there is no use of the word *anguishable* anywhere in the scriptures, although *anguish* does occur (11 times in the Book of Mormon and 17 times in the King James Bible). The Oxford English Dictionary does not recognize *anguishable*. Even if the word did exist, its use as a modifier of *fire* seems quite implausible.

There is a third possibility here, namely, the word *unextinguishable* (or the equivalent *inextinguishable*). The latter part of this word agrees with the last part of *anguishable*. This proposed alternative is, however, longer than either *anguishable* or *unquenchable*, making it less likely as the reading in \mathcal{O} . Although the OED lists *unextinguishable* (and *inextinguishable*), there are no instances of the word *extinguish* (or any words deriving from it) in the Book of Mormon or in the King James Bible. It seems that here in Mormon 9:5 the original text read *unquenchable*.

Summary: Retain in Mormon 9:5 the noun phrase “unquenchable fire”, the reading of the 1830 edition, since this is the expression found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible; the reading “anguishable fire” is highly implausible, nor is there much chance that the original text read “unextinguishable (or inextinguishable) fire”.

■ Mormon 9:8

he that denieth these things knoweth not the gospel of Christ
yea [they >js he 1 | they A | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[have 1A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not read the scriptures
if so / [they >js he 1 | they A | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[do 1A | does BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not understand them

Here in Mormon 9:8 the text has been edited so that the initial *he* is consistently used throughout the passage. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, twice changed *they* to *he*; the associated verbs were also changed in the 1837 edition to the third person singular, from *have* to *has* and *do* to *does*.

As explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, such switching in number for generic pronouns does occur in the original text. For another example like this one involving more than one pronoun, see under Alma 12:10–11. The critical text will restore the original plural usage to the second and third main clauses here in Mormon 9:8.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 9:8 the original reading with the generic plural forms *they have* and *they do*, even though the first main clause uses the generic singular *he*.

■ Mormon 9:9–10

for do we not read that God is the same yesterday today and forever
*and in him there is no variableness neither **shadow of changing***
and now if ye have imagined up unto yourselves a god
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] doth vary
and in [him 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | whom RT]
*there is [a > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **shadow of changing***
then have ye imagined up unto yourselves
a god which is not a God of miracles

In verse 10, the 1920 LDS edition changed *in him* to *in whom*, probably because the editors wanted to make sure that the existential clause “there is shadow of changing” was conjoined with the preceding relative clause (originally “which doth vary” but later edited by Joseph Smith to “who doth vary”)—that is, “a god . . . in whom there is shadow of changing”. Of course, there really isn’t much of a problem understanding the original text here, especially since the beginning of the following main clause is marked by the adverbial connective *then* (“then have ye imagined up unto yourselves a god which is not a God of miracles”).

It is possible that the *him* found in the earliest textual sources is actually an error for *whom*. The original manuscript undoubtedly had the *him* (since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition here read identically), but Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C} for this part of the text, might have misheard Joseph Smith’s *whom* as *him* (which are acoustically similar and differ only in the vowel). There could have also been some influence from the occurrence of *in him* at the end of the previous verse: “and **in him** there is no variableness neither shadow of changing” (Mormon 9:9).

The derived construction “in whom there is . . .” occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon. It is found once in the King James Bible and also once in the Doctrine and Covenants (in a revelation dating from 4 February 1831):

Psalm 146:3

put not your trust in princes
nor in the son of man in whom *there is* no help

Book of Commandments 43:12 (Doctrine and Covenants 41:11)

for he is like unto Nathaniel of old in whom there is no guile

The example from Psalm 146:3 shows that the formal sounding “in whom there is . . .” is allowed in the biblical style. Note that the example from the Doctrine and Covenants is based on the King James language in John 1:47, which reads without the *there*: “behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile”.

Another factor to consider here is the parallel language between Mormon 9:9 and James 1:17 in the King James Bible:

<i>Mormon 9:9</i>	<i>James 1:17</i>
and in him	with whom
there is no variableness	is no variableness
neither shadow of changing	neither shadow of turning

Note that here the Book of Mormon *him* corresponds to the King James *whom*. Also, the existential *there* is left unstated in James 1:17 (just as it is left unstated in John 1:47). The parallel language could lead one to argue that even the *him* in Mormon 9:9 was originally *whom*. Still, it seems rather unlikely that both instances of Book of Mormon *him*, in verses 9 and 10, are errors for *whom*.

One may also wonder whether the lack of the indefinite article before *shadow* is correct in verse 10. Originally, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote “& in him there is a shadow of changeing”, probably because English speakers expect the indefinite article after *there is* in such a construction. The *a* was crossed out, either by scribe 2 or later by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Undoubtedly there was no *a* in \mathcal{O} , which explains why the 1830 edition, an independent copy of \mathcal{O} , reads “and in him there is shadow of changing”. Nonetheless, it is quite possible that the *a* was missing in \mathcal{O} simply because Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe, accidentally omitted it. On the other hand, the lack of the article *a* may be intentional since there is no *a* in the preceding verse (“and in him there is no variableness neither shadow of changing”); theoretically, the preceding verse could have read “and in him there is no variableness neither a shadow of changing”. But note that the parallel language in James 1:17 of the King James Bible lacks the *a* in “and in whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning”.

More importantly, we can find evidence on <www.google.com> for the expression “there is shadow of X”, although all the examples postdate the Book of Mormon:

“The Vindication of Justice”, *New York Times*, 22 April 1865
 Now that these criminals are disarmed,
 there is **shadow** of excuse for compounding or condoning their crimes.

“The Tariff”, *New York Times*, 8 July 1897
 Nobody even pretends that there is **shadow** of excuse for this . . .

Neurosurgery, April 2005

Location aside, they may play a role
whenever there is **shadow** of a doubt about a lesion's surface accessibility . . .

These examples further show that the lack of *a* in Mormon 9:10 is possible. Consequently, the critical text will allow the earliest reading, “and in him there is shadow of changing” (that is, without the *a*) in Mormon 9:10. Similarly, verse 9 will be maintained without an *a* before *shadow* (“and in him there is no variableness neither shadow of changing”).

Summary: Restore in Mormon 9:10 the original *him* in place of the secondary *whom*; also maintain the lack of *a* before *shadow*, the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} (“and in him there is shadow of changing”); the preceding verse also has *him* and lacks a determiner for *shadow* (“and in him there is no variableness neither shadow of changing”).

■ Mormon 9:10–11

and now if ye have imagined up unto yourselves

- (1) *a* [*God* 1L | *god* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which doth vary*
and in him there is shadow of changing
then have ye imagined up unto yourselves
- (2) *a* [*God* 1L | *god* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- (3) *which is not a* [*God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *god* PS] *of miracles*
but behold I will shew unto you
- (4) *a* [*god* > *God* 1 | *God* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of miracles*

The question here in this passage is whether the noun *God/god* should be capitalized. Basically, the LDS text has ended up capitalizing the word when the reference is to the true God (or to what God is like)—in cases 3 and 4—but leaving the word uncapitalized when it refers to a false god (or to what God is not like)—in cases 1 and 2. The 1908 RLDS edition changed *God* to *god* in the third case, while the 1902 LDS missionary edition capitalized all four instances of *God/god*.

Usage elsewhere in the text supports the capitalization of *God* in the third case (the only one where the current LDS and RLDS texts differ). In both of the following cases, there is no textual variation in the capitalization of *God* in the phrase “a God of miracles”:

2 Nephi 27:23

for behold I am God and I am a **God** of miracles

2 Nephi 28:6

if they shall say there is a miracle
wrought by the hand of the Lord
believe it not
for this day he is not a **God** of miracles

In the last example, the phrase “a God of miracles” occurs in a negative sentence. In addition, the pronoun *he* refers to the Lord, and the Lord is, of course, a God of miracles, even if someone thinks he isn't. Obviously, the reference in 2 Nephi 28:6 is to the true God. The problem in Mormon 9:10 is that the reference is to a false god who isn't a God of miracles (and who is definitely not the

God of miracles). However, there is only one God of miracles, so one could argue that the oblique referent in the negative relative clause is to the actual God of miracles. Given this possibility, the critical text will retain the capitalized *God* in Mormon 9:10 (thus the mixture in capitalization for “a **god** which is not a **God** of miracles”). In other words, the critical text will follow the distinction laid out in the LDS text for this passage. Later passages in this chapter of Mormon continue to make this distinction:

Mormon 9:15

and now O all ye that have imagined up unto yourselves
 a [*God* 1L | *god* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which can do no miracles
 I would ask of you
 have all these things passed of which I have spoken
 has the end come yet
 behold I say unto you nay
 and **God** has not ceased to be a **God** of miracles

Mormon 9:19

and if there was miracles wrought
 then why has **God** ceased to be a **God** of miracles
 and yet be an unchangeable being
 and behold I say unto you
 he changeth not
 if so he would cease to be **God**
 and he ceaseth not to be **God**
 and is a **God** of miracles

Note, however, that in Mormon 9:15 the 1902 LDS edition continued to use the capitalized *God* (thus “a God which can do no miracles”). For further discussion of the use of capitalization when referring to deity, see under 3 Nephi 3:2.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 9:10–11, 15, 19 the cases of capitalized *God* and uncapitalized *god* as they are in the current LDS text; whenever the referent is the Lord (whether direct or indirect), *God* should be capitalized; if the referent is to a false god, then *god* should be left uncapitalized.

■ Mormon 9:11

*and it is [that 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | the HK] same God
 which created the heavens and the earth
 and all things that in them is*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed “that same God” to “the same God”, probably unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that*. Usage elsewhere in the text supports either *that* or *the* in clauses of the form “it is that/the same <noun> <restrictive relative clause>”:

Helaman 6:28	and also it is that same being who put it into the hearts of the people to build a tower . . .
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
Moroni 10:8	but it is the same God which worketh all in all

In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus “it is **that** same God” here in Mormon 9:11.

Summary: Maintain the original determiner *that* in Mormon 9:11 (“and it is **that** same God which created the heavens and the earth”).

■ Mormon 9:13

*and all shall stand before his bar
being redeemed and loosed
from this eternal [bond 1 | band ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of death*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads *bond* while the 1830 edition has *band*. There is considerable evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to mix up the letters *a* and *o*, but then so did Oliver Cowdery (here the probable scribe in \mathcal{C}) and the 1830 typesetter. (See the discussion regarding the name *Ammaron* under 4 Nephi 1:47 for evidence that all three of these tended to mix up the letters *a* and *o*.)

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text definitely prefers “band(s) of death” over “bond(s) of death”: there are 13 instances of “the bands of death”—and without any textual variation between *bands* and *bonds*. So *band* is probably correct here in Mormon 9:13. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that there is a difference: in Mormon 9:13 we have the only instance of the singular *band* in referring to “band(s) of death”. Even so, this uniqueness in grammatical number holds also for “this eternal **bond** of death”. In accord with usage elsewhere in the text, the critical text will follow the 1830 reading, “this eternal **band** of death”. For further discussion of the competition between *band(s)* and *bond(s)*, see under Mosiah 23:12–13.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 9:13 the use of *band*, the 1830 reading, instead of *bond*, the reading in \mathcal{P} ; usage elsewhere in the text consistently refers to “the **bands** of death”.

■ Mormon 9:15

*have all these things [past 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | passed RT]
of which I have spoken*

As mentioned under Mosiah 8:17, the correct reading here in Mormon 9:15 is *passed*, the reading in the LDS text since 1920. In this case, we have an instance of the present perfect for the verb *pass*: “have all these things passed”. If *past* (the original spelling) were correct, then we would expect the finite verb form *are* rather than *have* (“are all these things past”). Instances of *past* with the meaning ‘over’ are found elsewhere in the text; for discussion, see under Mormon 2:15. The critical text will maintain the past participle form *passed* here in Mormon 9:15.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *passed* in Mormon 9:15 since the finite verb here is the perfect auxiliary *have* (“have all these things passed”).

■ **Mormon 9:17**

*who shall say that it was not a miracle that by his word
the [Havens >% Haven 1] heaven ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and the earth should be
and by the power of his word
man was created of the dust of the earth*

Here the original text read “the heaven” rather than the more expected “the heavens”. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the word in the plural, although miswritten as *Havens*, which he immediately corrected to the singular by erasing the plural *s*. As explained under 1 Nephi 12:6, there is at least one other instance in the earliest text of “the heaven” (namely, in Mosiah 12:36). For further discussion of the competition between “the heaven” and “the heavens”, see under 3 Nephi 26:3.

Here in Mormon 9:17, the original manuscript undoubtedly read in the singular as “the heaven” since both the 1830 reading and the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{P} read in the singular. Here the text refers to the word of the Lord regarding the creation of “the heaven and the earth”. Such phraseology in the singular is found in the King James Bible when the creation is described:

Genesis 1:1
in the beginning God created **the heaven** and the earth

Jeremiah 32:17
behold thou hast made **the heaven** and the earth
by thy great power and stretched out arm

The critical text will therefore maintain here in Mormon 9:17 the singular “the heaven”. To be sure, the plural “the heavens” is theoretically possible since it is found in other biblical references to the creation, as in Genesis 2:1: “thus **the heavens** and the earth were finished”.

Summary: Accept the singular number for “the heaven and the earth” in Mormon 9:17 since such language is found in biblical accounts of the creation (for instance, in Genesis 1:1).

■ **Mormon 9:19**

*and if there was miracles wrought
[1FIJLMNOQRT |, ABCDEGHKPS]
then
[1ABCDEGHKPS |, FIJLMNOQRT]
why has God ceased to be a God of miracles*

The question here is whether the word *then* should go at the end of the preceding *if*-clause or at the beginning of the following interrogative clause. The 1830 edition attached the *then* to the following *wh*-question that begins with *why*; the RLDS text has continued this punctuation. In this case, the *then* means ‘as a consequence’. The 1852 LDS edition, on the other hand, changed the punctuation by placing the comma after the *then*, which the LDS text has maintained. With this change, the *then* now means ‘in the past’, and the reference is to the last clause in the preceding verse:

Mormon 9:18
and there was many mighty miracles wrought by the hands of the apostles

In other words, verse 19 basically asks: “If there were miracles wrought then [at the time of the apostles], why has God [now] ceased to be a God of miracles?” As pointed out by Don Brugger (personal communication), the 1852 interpretation here in Mormon 9:18 is possible since there is a semantically equivalent example where the adverb of time is represented by the phrase “at that time”:

Alma 12:23

and now behold I say unto you that if it had been possible for Adam
for to have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life **at that time**
that there would have been no death

Yet the adverb *then*, meaning ‘in the past time’, was not chosen in Alma 12:23.

Although either reading will work in Mormon 9:19, internal evidence argues that the earlier 1830 punctuation is correct. First of all, there are eight examples elsewhere in the text of *then why* occurring as a unit at the beginning of a clause. And in two cases, there is a preceding *if*-clause:

Jacob 4:9

wherefore **if** God being able to speak and the world was
and to speak and man was created
O then why not able to command the earth
—or the workmanship of his hands upon the face of it—
according to his will and pleasure

Helaman 8:12

and now behold **if** God gave unto this man such power
[I I J L M N O Q | , A B C D E G H K P R S T | N U L L > , F]
then why should ye dispute among yourselves
and say that he hath given unto me no power whereby I may know
concerning the judgments that shall come upon you except ye repent

In the last case, the comma could have been placed after the *then*, just as it was in the 1852 LDS edition for Mormon 9:19. Yet in Helaman 8:12, the 1852 editors consciously decided (in the second printing) to place a comma before the *then*. For the subsequent LDS edition (in 1879), that comma was omitted, perhaps intentionally, as if to allow for *then* to end the preceding *if*-clause. But the 1920 LDS edition restored the comma to the LDS text, placing it before the *then*.

For the remaining six cases of *then why*, there is no doubt that the *then* belongs with the following *why*-clause, especially in three cases where there is an exclamatory *O* (just like in Jacob 4:9, listed above):

1 Nephi 3:31

yea even he can slay fifty
[0 1 | ; A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T]
then why not us

1 Nephi 4:1

for behold he is mightier than all the earth
[0 1 | , A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T]
then why not mightier than Laban and his fifty

1 Nephi 17:46

O then why is it that ye can be so hard in your hearts

Alma 26:19

O **then why** did he not consign us to an awful destruction

Alma 30:34–35

and now if we do not receive any thing for our labors in the church
 what doth it profit us to labor in the church save it were to declare the truth
 that we may have rejoicings in the joy of our brethren
 [01 | ? ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
then why sayest thou that we preach unto this people to get gain

Helaman 8:20

O **then why** not the Son of God come according to his prophecy

More importantly, except for the two theoretical cases in Helaman 8:12 and Mormon 9:19, the adverb *then* never ends a clause anywhere else in the Book of Mormon text (in other words, in the only places where it theoretically could end a clause, *then* is immediately followed by *why*). In two cases, we get *then* after the subject but before the verb phrase; both of these occur in biblical quotes:

2 Nephi 24:32 (Isaiah 14:32 reads “what shall **one** then answer the messengers
 of the nation”)
 what shall **then** answer the messengers of the nations

3 Nephi 14:11 (identical to Matthew 7:11)
 if ye **then** being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children
 how much more shall your Father which is in heaven
 give good things to them that ask him

In a third case, the *then* comes after the direct object, but before a long adverbial phrase that ends the clause:

1 Nephi 8:37
 and he did exhort them **then** with all the feeling of a tender parent
 that they would hearken to his words

And finally, there is one instance of the phrase “now and then”; in that case, this adverbial phrase comes right after an existential “there was”:

Alma 43:38
 there was **now and then** a man fell among the Nephites

But in 218 other cases, the *then* comes at the beginning of the clause (in 113 of those cases there is a sentential connective or conjunction, such as *and*, *O*, *yea*, and *behold*). The placement in the 1852 LDS edition of the *then* at the end of the *if*-clause in Mormon 9:19 is therefore unique for the Book of Mormon text. And even that edition did not change the punctuation in Helaman 8:12, when in theory it could have. Here in Mormon 9:19, the critical text will adopt the normal placement of the *then*, so that we end up with a ninth instance of *then why* in the text. Similarly, the punctuation for Helaman 8:12 will be maintained.

Summary: Change the punctuation in Mormon 9:19 so that the *then* comes at the beginning of the following interrogative clause (“then why has God ceased to be a God of miracles”); this decision conforms to all other cases in the text where *then* occurs at clausal boundaries, including Helaman 8:12.

■ **Mormon 9:19**

*and if there was miracles wrought
then why has God ceased to be a God of miracles
and yet be an [unchangeable 1ACFGIJLMNOPQRST | unchangable BDE | unchanged HK] Being*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced *unchangeable* with *unchanged*; this appears to be a typo. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *unchangeable*. Elsewhere in the text, we have two other references to God being unchangeable:

Moroni 8:12	if not so / God is a partial God and also a changeable God
Moroni 8:18	for I know that God is not a partial God neither a changeable being but he is unchangeable from all eternity to all eternity

There is no need to make a change to *unchanged* in Mormon 9:19.

Summary: The text in Mormon 9:19 should read “an unchangeable Being” (the earliest reading), not “an unchanged Being” (an error in the 1874 RLDS edition).

■ **Mormon 9:21**

*behold I say unto you
that **whoso** believeth in Christ / doubting nothing
whatsoever **he** shall ask the Father in the name of Christ
it shall be granted [them >js him 1 | them A | him BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:48, the original text allows the grammatical number to switch for generic pronouns in the same passage. Here in Mormon 9:21, the first pronominal reference to *whoso* is the singular *he* (“whatsoever **he** shall ask the Father”), but the second one is *them* (“it shall be granted **them**”). Although it is possible that here *them* could be a mishearing for *him*, the plural *them* is also textually possible. For instance, in the list of examples under 1 Nephi 17:48 there are cases where the pronominal variation involves *he* and *they* and also *his* and *their*; these shifts in pronoun number are not due to mishearing. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the *them* to *him* here in Mormon 9:21, but the critical text will restore the earlier *them*, the reading of \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition (and presumably \mathcal{O}).

Summary: Restore the *them* in “it shall be granted **them**”, the reading of the earliest textual sources; although *them* could be a mishearing for *him*, there is clear evidence elsewhere in the text for shifting in grammatical number for generic pronouns.

■ **Mormon 9:25**

*and whosoever shall believe in my name / doubting nothing
unto him will I confirm all my words
even unto the [ends 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | end HK] of the earth*

The 1874 RLDS edition introduced the singular *end* here in Mormon 9:25. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier plural, *ends*. We get both forms of this phrase in the Book of Mormon:

“the ends of the earth” (14 times) and “the end of the earth” (3 times). Two of the singular cases are in Isaiah quotes, for which the singular *end* is also found in the King James Bible:

1 Nephi 20:20 (Isaiah 48:20 reads “utter **it even** to the end of the earth”)

utter to the **end** of the earth

2 Nephi 15:26 (Isaiah 5:26 reads identically)

and will hiss unto them from the **end** of the earth

(For a third possible case in a biblical quote of “the end of the earth”, see under 1 Nephi 21:6.) The only other case of the singular in the Book of Mormon text is not in a biblical quote:

2 Nephi 27:11

and all things shall be revealed unto the children of men

which ever hath been among the children of men

and which ever will be / even unto the **end** of the earth

In 2 Nephi 27:11 the text appears to be saying that all the events of the earth’s history will be revealed, including those events that will occur right up to the time the earth ceases to physically exist. The Book of Mormon twice uses the related phrase “the end of the world” to refer to this coming event (in 1 Nephi 14:22 and Mosiah 4:7). In both those cases, the text has the singular *end*.

All 14 occurrences of “the ends of the earth” refer to the furthest places in the earth or to the people that live there. Thus Mormon 9:25 appears to mean that the Lord will confirm his words to all those who believe in him, throughout the world (“even unto the ends of the earth”). A similar passage with the same manner of expression is found nearby:

Mormon 9:21

behold I say unto you that whoso believeth in Christ / doubting nothing

whatsoever he shall ask the Father in the name of Christ

it shall be granted them

and this promise is unto all / even unto the **ends** of the earth

In other words, this promise is unto all people. Except for the two Isaiah quotes cited above, the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural *ends* in the expression “the ends of the earth” to refer to all places and people on this earth. On the other hand, the text uses the singular *end* with *earth* or *world* to refer to the physical end of this planet (except in those two Isaiah quotes).

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 9:25 the use of the plural *ends* (thus “the ends of the earth”), especially since elsewhere the text (except for biblical quotations) uses the plural *ends* in “the ends of the earth” to refer to the whole earth and its people.

■ **Mormon 9:26**

*and now behold who can stand
against the [work > works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lord
who can deny his sayings
who will rise up against the almighty power of the Lord
who will despise the **works** of the Lord
who will despise the children of Christ
behold all ye that are despisers of the **works** of the Lord . . .*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004) suggests that the first instance of *works* may be an error for *words*. Note, in particular, the reference in the following clause to “who can deny his sayings”, a clear reference to words. But later in the passage the text twice refers to those who despise the works of the Lord: “who will despise the **works** of the Lord . . . behold all ye that are despisers of the **works** of the Lord”. On the other hand, we can find some support further on (in the next verse) for inferring that one should not despise the words of the Lord:

Mormon 9:27
O then **despise** not and wonder not
but hearken unto the **words** of the Lord

The following example, in a biblical quote, also refers to those who despise the word of the Lord:

2 Nephi 15:24 (Isaiah 5:24)
because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts
and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel

Although *words* is theoretically possible in Mormon 9:26 (to be sure, one can despise the words of the Lord), there is nothing textually wrong with *works*, the earliest reading: one can stand against (that is, oppose) the works of the Lord as well as his words. We have already discussed numerous instances where *word(s)* and *work(s)* have been mixed up in the transmission of the text; for two lists of examples, see under Alma 12:12–14. But since there is no textual variation for *works* here in Mormon 9:26 and one can oppose and despise the works of the Lord, the critical text will follow the reading of all the textual sources, namely, *works* throughout verse 26. Similarly, the invariant *words* will be maintained in verse 27.

Summary: Maintain the consistent use of *works* in Mormon 9:26; people can “stand against” (that is, oppose) the works of the Lord as well as despise the works of the Lord.

■ **Mormon 9:26**

behold all ye that are despisers

□ <i>of the works of the Lord</i>	1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST
□ <i>of the Lord</i>	HK

Here the typesetter for the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the prepositional phrase “of the works”; his eye apparently skipped from the first *of* to the following one, thus ending up with “all ye that are despisers of the Lord”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the full phraseology to the

RLDS text. Although the shorter reading will work, the critical text will maintain the original one since it is the reading of both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition. Elsewhere the text actually refers only to despising the Lord rather than to despising his works:

1 Nephi 19:14	and because they . . . have despised the Holy One of Israel
1 Nephi 21:7	to him whom man despiseth
Mosiah 14:3	he is despised and rejected of men
Mosiah 14:3	he was despised and we esteemed him not

All but the first of these are biblical citations (from Isaiah). In any event, there is nothing textually inappropriate about referring to those who despise the works of the Lord.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in Mormon 9:26: “behold all ye that are despisers **of the works** of the Lord”.

■ Mormon 9:30

*behold I speak unto you as though I spake from the dead
for I know that ye shall [have 1PST | hear ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] my words*

The printer’s manuscript has the verb *have*, but the 1830 edition has *hear*. These two words are visually similar. The original manuscript could have read with either *have* or *hear*. Based on the reading in the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition adopted the reading with *have*, under the assumption that the 1830 reading with *hear* was a misreading of \mathcal{P} . However, we now know that the 1830 edition derives directly from \mathcal{C} for this part of the text. Unfortunately, \mathcal{C} is not extant for any of Mormon. Nor are there any other examples of mix-ups between *have* and *hear* in the text. Yet it is obvious that there was a mix-up here in Mormon 9:30: either *have* was replaced by *hear* (in the 1830 edition) or *hear* was replaced by *have* (in \mathcal{P}). The question, then, is an internal one: Which reading is the more probable as the original reading (and presumably the reading in \mathcal{C})?

Consider first the evidence for *hear*, the 1830 reading. We have a couple of other verses that refer to readers hearing the words written in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 27:29 (Isaiah 29:18)	and in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book
3 Nephi 30:1	hearken O ye Gentiles and hear the words of Jesus Christ the Son of the living God which he hath commanded me that I should speak concerning you for behold he commandeth me that I should write saying . . .

These examples show that people can hear the words in the Book of Mormon, implying that they were spoken. In fact, this seems to be the case: in ancient times, silent reading was uncommon; typically, readers read the text out loud. For this point, see chapter 2 of Alberto Manguel, *A History of Reading* (New York: Viking, 1996), 41–53.

Nonetheless, there is a passage that parallels Mormon 9:30, and that passage refers four times to having someone's words as scripture (rather than hearing them):

2 Nephi 29:13

and it shall come to pass that
 the Jews shall **have** the words of the Nephites
 and the Nephites shall **have** the words of the Jews
 and the Nephites and the Jews shall **have** the words of the lost tribes of Israel
 and the lost tribes of Israel shall **have** the words of the Nephites and the Jews

From a semantic point of view, the use of the verb *have* actually works better in Mormon 9:30 since one may have the words of the Book of Mormon but refuse to listen to the message. Thus having Moroni's words is wholly appropriate here in Mormon 9:30. Although the evidence is not overwhelming in this instance, the critical text will accept the reading in \mathcal{P} ("ye shall **have** my words") since it is more directly supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Accept in Mormon 9:30 the reading in \mathcal{P} : "ye shall **have** my words"; although "ye shall **hear** my words" will work, the reading with *have* is directly supported by the language in 2 Nephi 29:13.

■ Mormon 9:31

condemn me not

because of mine [imperfection 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | imperfections s]

*neither my father because of his **imperfection***

neither them which have written before him

but rather give thanks unto God

*that he hath made manifest unto you our **imperfections***

Here the 1953 RLDS edition changed the first *imperfection* to the plural. That edition has introduced a plural reading in quite a few cases; for a list, see under 2 Nephi 7:3. Here in Mormon 9:31, either reading will theoretically work, given that later in the passage we have one instance of the singular and another of the plural ("his imperfection . . . our imperfections"). Note that in this passage we get the singular when the possessive pronoun is singular (*mine, his*) but the plural when the pronominal form is plural (*our*). Yet there are no other examples of "<possessive pronoun> imperfection(s)" in the text, so this relationship is not statistically significant. For another case of the tendency to replace the singular *imperfection* with the plural, see below under Mormon 9:33. Here in verse 31, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus "mine imperfection . . . his imperfection . . . our imperfections".

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 9:31 the singular *imperfection* when preceded by *mine* and *his*, but the plural *imperfections* when preceded by *our*.

■ **Mormon 9:31**

*that ye may learn to be more wise
than [that which >js NULL 1 | that which A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] we have been*

The original text had instances of the rather awkward “than that which”. Here in Mormon 9:31, Joseph Smith deleted the last two words of the expression, giving “that ye may learn to be more wise **than** we have been”. As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:1, the critical text will restore the original expression, “than that which”, since it is clearly intended (and is also found in the King James Bible).

■ **Mormon 9:33**

*and if our plates had been sufficiently large
we should have written in [the 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Hebrew
but the Hebrew hath been altered by us also
and if we could have written in [the 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Hebrew
behold ye would have had none imperfection in our record*

The 1837 edition dropped the definite article *the* in both examples of the phrase “in the Hebrew”, probably because in current English we usually say “in Hebrew” (and similarly for any other language). Here in Mormon 9:33, the use of the *the* is not that difficult since we would normally interpret “in the Hebrew” as an ellipsis for “in the Hebrew **language**” or “in the Hebrew **tongue**”. Yet as David Calabro points out (personal communication), the ellipsis more reasonably stands for “in the Hebrew **characters**” (that is, “in the Hebrew writing system”). He notes that in the preceding verse Moroni specifically refers to writing in reformed Egyptian characters:

Mormon 9:32

and now behold we have written this record according to our knowledge
in the characters which are called among us the reformed Egyptian
being handed down and altered by us according to our manner of speech

So in verse 33, when Moroni refers to the Hebrew being altered, he could be referring to the Hebrew characters being altered rather than the spoken Hebrew.

In the King James Bible, we have examples of “in the Hebrew tongue” (six times), “in the Syrian tongue” (twice), and “in the Greek tongue” (once). There are also two examples of “in the Syrian language”. Even so, the head noun is sometimes ellipted, namely, in two examples of “in the Hebrew”; in these two cases, the ellipsis appears to refer to the spoken language since the verb is *call*:

John 19:13

he brought Jesus forth and sat down in the judgment seat
in a place that is called the Pavement
→ but in the Hebrew Gabbatha

John 19:17

and he bearing his cross went forth
into a place called *the place* of a skull
→ which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha

It should also be pointed out that in one case in the King James Bible the definite article is lacking:

John 19:19–20

and Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross
 and the writing was Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews
 this title then read many of the Jews
 for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city
 → and it was written in Hebrew *and* Greek *and* Latin

In this case, the ellipsis could be either *characters* or *language*. In any event, from the perspective of the King James style, “in the Hebrew” is acceptable in Mormon 9:33; the critical text will restore this usage.

Summary: Restore in Mormon 9:33 the definite article both times in the phrase “in the Hebrew” since such an expression is fully understandable and is also found twice in the King James Bible.

■ Mormon 9:33

and if we could have written in the Hebrew

behold ye would have had

[*none* 1A | *no* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[§2 *imperfections* > §1 *imperfection* 1 | *imperfection* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

in our record

As explained earlier under Mormon 9:31, there are instances of *imperfection* and *imperfections* in the earliest text. Besides the three cases in verse 31 and the one here in verse 33, there is one other occurrence, and that example is in the plural:

Mormon 8:12

and whoso receiveth this record
 and shall not condemn it
 because of the **imperfections** which **are** in it
 the same shall know of greater things than these

Here in Mormon 9:33, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote the plural *imperfections*, but Oliver Cowdery later corrected \mathcal{P} to the singular when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . His correction agrees with the singular *imperfection* in the 1830 edition.

The 1837 edition replaced the *none* with *no*, the expected negative quantifier in current English. When *none* modifies a following noun, we find that the noun is always in the singular (assuming the noun allows for a choice between singular and plural). For instance, there are 11 occurrences of “none other <noun>” in the Book of Mormon text, and in each case the following noun is in the singular, as in 2 Nephi 2:30: “and I have none other **object**”. In all these cases, however, the plural would sound odd in English. There are also two instances of *none* directly modifying *other*, and in those two cases the noun takes the singular *other* (not the plural *others*):

2 Nephi 27:13 and there is **none other** which shall view it
 Alma 56:12 for **none other** have they spared alive

These two examples therefore support the singular *imperfection* in Mormon 9:33.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard use of *is* in Mormon 9:36 (“these things . . . **is** according to the prayers of all the saints”); in the original text, subject-verb agreement was often determined by proximity rather than semantics.

■ **Mormon 9:37**

*and [may 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | now κ] the Lord Jesus Christ grant
that their prayers may be answered according to their faith
and **may** God the Father remember the covenant
which he hath made with the house of Israel
and **may** he bless them forever
through faith on the name of Jesus Christ*

Here the compositor for the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally set *may* as *now*. Perhaps he expected the clause to begin as “and **now** the Lord Jesus Christ grant that . . .”, an alternative optative expression for “and **may** the Lord Jesus Christ grant that . . .”. Of course, many Book of Mormon clauses begin simply with “and now”. Whatever the source of the error here in Mormon 9:37, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *may*, which is found in two other optative clauses later in the passage.

Summary: Maintain in Mormon 9:37 the use of the modal verb *may* at the beginning of the verse (as well as the two other times that it occurs in this verse).

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Ether

Ether Narrative Structure

■ book title for Ether

- *The Book of Ether* IEFIJLMNOQRT
- *Book of Ether* ABCDGHKPS

The definite article in the title for this book was omitted by the 1830 typesetter. The 1849 LDS edition restored the *the* to the title. Originally, each book in the Book of Mormon used the definite article in its title:

SHORTENED NAME	ORIGINAL TITLE
1 Nephi	The Book of Nephi
2 Nephi	The Book of Nephi
Jacob	The Book of Jacob
Enos	The Book of Enos
Jarom	The Book of Jarom
Omni	The Book of Omni
Words of Mormon	The Words of Mormon
Mosiah	The Book of Mosiah
Alma	The Book of Alma
Helaman	The Book of Helaman
3 Nephi	The Book of Nephi
4 Nephi	The Book of Nephi
Mormon	The Book of Mormon
Ether	The Book of Ether
Moroni	The Book of Moroni

Interestingly, the four books of Nephi were not originally numbered. For discussion of this point, see under “1 Nephi Narrative Structure” in part 1 of this volume of the critical text (that is, volume 4).

It should also be noted here that with the beginning of the book of Ether, the 1830 typesetter used the printer’s manuscript as his copytext. For the preceding one sixth of the text, from Helaman 13:17 through the end of Mormon, his copytext had been the original manuscript (although apparently without him knowing it). At 3 Nephi 19:21, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} took over for Oliver Cowdery as the copyist in producing the printer’s manuscript while Oliver, it would appear, jumped ahead to the book of Ether and there started copying the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . So when the 1830 typesetter got to the book of Ether, the copyists were once more able to bring in \mathcal{P} as the copytext for the 1830

Ether 1

■ Ether 1:6

he that wrote this [account >+ record 1 | record ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was Ether

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *account*. Later, with heavier ink flow, he crossed out *account* and supralinearly inserted *record*. This correction likely occurred when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . Oliver probably wrote *account* originally in \mathcal{P} because of the preceding seven instances of the word *account* in this opening passage of the book of Ether, including one in the immediately preceding text: “and on this wise do I give the **account**”. Elsewhere the text has examples of both “writing an account” (three times) and “writing a record” (four times), so either reading is theoretically possible here. The critical text will follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “he that wrote this **record** was Ether”.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:6 the word *record*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Ether 1:6

*he that wrote this record was Ether
and he was a **descendant** of Coriantor*

In this part of the record, Moroni refers to Ether as a descendant of Coriantor, yet later in Ether 11:23, Moroni states that “Coriantor begat Ether”, making Ether a son of Coriantor. There is one other paired example of this type in the book of Ether:

Ether 1:16	and Aaron was a descendant of Heth
Ether 10:31	and Heth begat Aaron

Here in Ether 1, there is a third instance of *descendant*, but for that example the later reference in Ether also uses the word *descendant*, not *begat*:

Ether 1:23	and Morianton was a descendant of Riplakish
Ether 10:9	Morianton—he being a descendant of Riplakish—gathered together an army of outcasts

Since the word *descendant* includes the meaning ‘son’, as in the first two examples, it is possible that Morianton was a son of Riplakish. This conclusion is further supported by two other paired examples where Ether 1 refers to Y as the son of X but then later in the book we find that Y is referred to as a descendant of X:

Ether 1:9	and Ethem was the son of Ahah
Ether 11:11	and Ethem being a descendant of Ahah
Ether 1:25	and Shez was the son of Heth
Ether 10:1	Shez which was a descendant of Heth

In contrast to all these examples, there is one case in Ether where *descendant* is used in the sense that we expect in modern English:

Ether 11:17	there arose another mighty man and he was a descendant of the brother of Jared
-------------	--

In this case there are many generations between this unidentified mighty man and the brother of Jared.

Here in Ether 1, the text uses the phraseology “Y was the son of X” 26 times in specifying the genealogy. Brian Garner (personal communication, February 1994) has suggested that there might be a textual problem with the use of the word *descendant* in Ether 1; perhaps the three instances of *a descendant* in Ether 1 (or at least the first two) are errors for *the son*, given the language later in Ether 10–11. (And, of course, we could extend Garner’s proposal to the two cases of *a descendant* in Ether 10–11.) Yet there is no evidence elsewhere in the text for mix-ups between the words *descendant* and *son* (or more specifically, between *a descendant* and *the son*), in either the manuscripts or the printed editions, nor would one expect such since both words are so distinct. For whatever reason, the word *descendant* appears to be fully intended whenever it is used in Ether 1 and in Ether 10–11.

Summary: Maintain in the genealogy in Ether 1 the three instances of *descendant* (which, in at least two cases, is equivalent to ‘son’); despite the unusual use of *descendant* in Ether 1, no textual error seems to be involved; the same conclusion holds for two more instances of *descendant* in Ether 10–11 where the meaning is equivalent to ‘son’.

■ Ether 1:6

and he was a descendant of Coriantor

One wonders here if this name shouldn’t be *Corianton*, the same as the name of one of Alma’s sons. The only difference is the final *n/r*, and we have already seen that Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up these two letters, especially at the end of a word (see, for instance, under Mosiah 2:15–16 for a case involving *clean* versus *clear*, also two cases involving *even* versus *ever*).

However, in reviewing all the manuscript examples for *Corianton* and *Coriantor*, we find no confusion. In the book of Alma we have a clear *n* at the end of each instance of *Corianton*, and in the book of Ether there is a clear *r* at the end of each instance of *Coriantor*.

As far as other Book of Mormon names and words are concerned, the text has examples ending in *on* and *or*:

- *-on* Amaron, Ammaron, Ammon, Ammoron, Amoron, Amulon, antion, Comron, Emron, Gaddianton, Heshlon, Jashon, Jershon, Minon, Morianton, Morionton, Mormon, Moron, Parhoron, seon, Shemlon, Shemnon, Shiblon, shiblon, Sidon, Siron
- *-or* Amnor, amnor, Cohor, Corihor, Kimnor, Korihor, Nehor

Although more examples end in *on*, there are names ending in *or*. Thus we apparently have two very similar, but different, names, *Corianton* versus *Coriantor*. One example of a mix-up in the text between *n* and *r* (in this instance, a case of metathesis) is found in the name *Comron*, which the 1830 typesetter changed to *Commor* (twice in Ether 14:28).

This difference between the Nephite name *Corianton* and the Jaredite name *Coriantor* supports the earlier decision to keep distinct the Nephite name *Morionton* from the Jaredite name *Morianton* (see the discussion under Alma 50:25). Also note the systematic distinction between the Jaredite name *Corihor* and the Nephite name *Korihor*.

Summary: Accept the difference in the final letter for the name *Corianton* (found in Alma) and the name *Coriantor* (found in Ether).

■ Ether 1:6–8

he that wrote this record was Ether
and *he was a descendant of Coriantor*
 [& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT| *and* ps] *Coriantor was the son of Moron*
and *Moron was the son of Ethem*

Here near the beginning of the long genealogical listing in Ether 1, the 1830 edition dropped the conjunctive *and* that is consistently found everywhere else in the listing (at the beginning of verses 8 through 32). This *and* at the beginning of verse 7 does not actually begin the listing but is the second one after the initial reference to Ether in verse 6 (“and he was a descendant of Coriantor”). Thus the loss of the *and* at the beginning of verse 7 created a clear inconsistency in the listing. The critical text will restore the original *and*, just as it was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition (by reference to \mathcal{P}).

Summary: Restore the original connective *and* at the beginning of verse 7 in the genealogical listing found in Ether 1; all other examples in the listing have this connective *and*.

■ Ether 1:11–12

and Seth was the son of [Shiblon 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| Shiblom J]
and [Shiblon 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| Shiblom J] was the son of Com

The name here in Ether 1 is *Shiblon* (two times), but later on, in Ether 11, the name is consistently given as *Shiblom* (six times). There is evidence for both names elsewhere in the text:

Shiblon, a son of Alma	Alma 31:7 – Alma 63:17	9 times
Shiblom, a Nephite general	Mormon 6:14	1 time

There is also a measure of value with the name *shiblon*, which occurs four times in Alma 11.

Here in Ether 1:11–12, the 1888 LDS large-print edition made the text in Ether read systematically by choosing the later spelling *Shiblom* for the name of the Jaredite king. This emendation is consistent with the fact that there is no convincing evidence in the Book of Mormon text for two different spellings of the same name for the same person or group of people (as support for this

conclusion, see the discussion under Alma 2:11–12 regarding the name *Amlicite/Amalekite*). Except for *Shiblon/Shiblom*, this identity also holds for every name in the Jaredite genealogy in Ether: the name that appears at the beginning of the book of Ether is the same name that appears later on in the narrative.

Earlier commentary on the discrepancy between *Shiblon* and *Shiblom* has noted the difference between Ether 1 and Ether 11 but without deciding between the two. For instance, Sidney B. Sperry, in a footnote on page 362 of *The Book of Mormon Testifies* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1952), states: “One wonders if, after all, we are not dealing with one original and not two distinct names. The Nephites doubtless adopted the Jaredite original, but we shall remain in doubt as to its correct spelling.” George Reynolds’ *A Dictionary of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Joseph Hyrum Parry, 1891) lists the difference in spelling for the name as “Shiblom or Shiblon”. He does the same in his later *A Complete Concordance to the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: 1900). And in the index for the 1981 LDS edition the variation is listed as “Shiblom [or Shiblon]”.

Stan Larson has argued that in the book of Ether *Shiblom* is to be preferred over *Shiblon*. On pages 566–567 of his article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 (1978), 563–569, Larson argues in favor of the more frequent spelling, namely, *Shiblom*, since there are six instances of *Shiblom* (all in Ether 11) but only two of *Shiblon* (both in Ether 1). Despite this argument from numbers, there is clear evidence that once a scribe started to misspell a Book of Mormon name, he would typically misspell it throughout a passage. For instance, Oliver Cowdery, when he initially copied the name *Helam* from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} (14 times in the book of Mosiah), consistently wrote *Helaman*, even though \mathfrak{C} apparently read *Helam*. Oliver later changed each of these instances of *Helaman* to the correct *Helam* (for discussion, see under Mosiah 18:12, 13, 14). A second example involves scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} : in Alma 8 he wrote the name *Ammonihah* as *Ammonidah* for the first six occurrences of the name. Later Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{C} , made the correction to *Ammonihah* (see the discussion under Alma 8:6). Therefore it is quite possible that in Ether 11 Oliver Cowdery switched to writing *Shiblom* instead of *Shiblon* and ended up writing all six instances of the name that way. This change, if it did occur in Ether 11, would have likely taken place as Oliver took down Joseph Smith’s dictation since one of the six instances of this name in Ether 11 (the third one, in verse 4) is fully extant in \mathfrak{C} and it reads *Shiblom*. Of course, one could argue that it was in Ether 1 that Oliver made the mistake of writing *Shiblon* instead of *Shiblom*. \mathfrak{C} is not extant for any part of Ether 1, so the change there could have occurred in either \mathfrak{C} or \mathfrak{P} .

In the same article, Larson provides a second argument in favor of the final *m* in *Shiblom* by referring to Hugh Nibley’s claim that “the Book of Mormon favors -m endings for Jaredite names” (as discussed on pages 248–249 in Nibley’s *An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, published as a priesthood manual in 1957 by the LDS Church): by implication, then, we have *Shiblom* in the book of Ether but *Shiblon* in the Nephite language. Of course, this does not explain the name of the Nephite general *Shiblom* in Mormon 6:14 (except to vacuously claim that it must be a Jaredite name).

More significant, in my view, is evidence from the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery tended to replace the final *n* of *Shiblon* with the labial *m*, probably as a result of assimilation with the preceding labial *b* in the name. There are two examples of this error on Oliver’s part, both immediately corrected by erasure:

Alma 38:5 (initial error in \mathcal{C})
 and now my son
 [*Shiblom* >% *Shiblon* 0 | *Shiblon* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 I would that ye should remember that . . .

Alma 49:30 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
 the word of God which was declared unto them by Helaman
 and [*Shiblon* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Shiblom* >% *Shiblon* 1]
 and Corianton

(For further discussion of these two initial errors, see under Alma 38:5.) These examples argue that if Oliver made a mistake in the book of Ether, the tendency would have been to misplace *Shiblon* with *Shiblom* rather than the other way around. The critical text will therefore assume that Ether 1 is correct in the name *Shiblon* and that in Ether 11 Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted Joseph Smith's dictation of *Shiblon* as the assimilated form *Shiblom*.

This analysis leaves only a single occurrence of the name *Shiblom* in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon, namely, the Nephite general *Shiblom* mentioned in Mormon 6:14. Presumably, Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in \mathcal{C} for that portion of the text, and there he could have misplaced *Shiblon* with *Shiblom* one more time. Yet names do differ in minimal ways in the Book of Mormon, and they can end in *om* as well as *on*. For 26 examples of Book of Mormon names and words ending in *on*, see the discussion for the name *Coriantor* under Ether 1:6. For comparison, there are 16 Book of Mormon names and words ending in *om*:

- *-om* Abinadom, Ablom, Com, Corom, cumom, curelom, Esrom, Hearthom, Jacom, Jarom, Nahom, Rameumptom, Shilom, Shimnilom, Sidom, Zeezrom

The critical text will therefore leave unchanged the name *Shiblom* in Mormon 6:14. (For an example of four names differing minimally, see the discussion under 4 Nephi 1:47 regarding the names *Amaron*, *Amoron*, *Ammaron*, and *Ammoron*.)

Summary: In accord with the evidence from scribal errors, the name for one of the later Jaredite kings in the book of Ether should be consistently spelled as *Shiblon*, not *Shiblom*; it is doubtful that there are two forms of the name for this king since apparently no other name in the Book of Mormon allows for spelling variation in the original text.

■ Ether 1:19–20

and *Kish* was the son of [*Corom* 1ART | *Corum* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
 and [*Corom* 1ART | *Corum* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] was the son of *Levi*

Here in Ether 1:19–20, the 1837 edition replaced *Corom* with *Corum* (both times). Yet the change was not made later in Ether 10:16–17 (where the name *Corom* appears twice). The original manuscript is not extant for any of the four occurrences, but the printer's manuscript (as well as the 1830 edition) consistently has the spelling *Corom*.

Surprisingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the correct *Corom* here in Ether 1, even though \mathcal{P} reads that way. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct spelling,

yet the correction was not marked in the committee copy. This is because the correction was made near the end of the editing process. The 1837 typo was discovered, it would appear, by James Talmage's secretary, Helga Pedersen Tingey. Jan Foulger Tingey (wife of William H. Tingey Jr., son of Helga Tingey) has provided the following information on this correction (personal communication, 26 February 2007):

My husband's mother, Helga Pedersen Tingey, worked for Elder James E. Talmage for years around 1920. Elder Talmage was fulfilling his assignment made by the First Presidency to arrange the Book of Mormon into chapters and paragraphs with extensive cross-references and footnotes. He hired Helga to help him proofread every page. While she was doing this important work she discovered an error in the Book of Mormon. She told her children it was in Ether where Moroni made a faulty name reference. When she brought this to Elder Talmage's attention he said, "Sister Pedersen, all the money the church has paid you in all the years you have worked couldn't begin to pay you for finding this one error!" It was sent to the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve and the correction was made.

The statement that Talmage's assignment was to arrange the Book of Mormon into chapters and paragraphs (that is, verses) is not accurate; that was done earlier by Orson Pratt for the 1879 LDS edition. In addition, Talmage and the committee revised Pratt's cross references and eliminated footnotes of a more speculative nature, such as those identifying Book of Mormon geography. Although the Tingey family does not remember what name was changed, the restoration of *Corom* here in Ether 1:19–20 is the only one that was changed in the book of Ether for the 1920 edition. Moreover, it was the only 1920 name change that was not marked in the committee copy. The other name changes (including the Book of Mormon word *shiblon*) were, it would appear, determined earlier by Talmage himself and are so marked in the committee copy:

<i>Bethabara</i> in place of <i>Bethabary</i>	1 Nephi 10:9
<i>Zion</i> in place of <i>Sion</i>	2 Nephi 22:6
<i>shiblons</i> in place of <i>shublons</i>	Alma 11:19
<i>Shimnilom</i> in place of <i>Shimnilon</i>	Alma 23:12
<i>Zenock</i> in place of <i>Zenoch</i>	Alma 34:7
<i>Jordan</i> in place of <i>Jordon</i>	Mormon 5:3

(For discussion of the *Zenoch* change, see under 1 Nephi 19:10; the five other changes are discussed in their own places.) In addition, the 1911 LDS edition (which served as the copytext for the 1920 edition) has four obvious typos for names, each of which was corrected in the 1920 edition; the two typos for *Zarahemla* were obvious and were not marked in the 1920 committee copy:

<i>Zarahelma</i> corrected to <i>Zarahemla</i>	Omni 1:19
<i>Lihmi</i> corrected to <i>Limhi</i>	Mosiah 21:32
<i>Amakelites</i> corrected to <i>Amalekites</i>	Alma 24:29
<i>Zararemla</i> corrected to <i>Zarahemla</i>	Alma 58:4

The discovery that *Corum* was an error for *Corom* seems to have occurred as Helga Tingey was proofing against the 1830 edition (the printer's manuscript would not have been available at that time). It is true that the correct *Corom* occurs later in Ether 10, but there would have been no way

to determine which reading, *Corum* (in Ether 1) or *Corom* (in Ether 10), was the correct spelling without consulting either \mathfrak{D} or the 1830 edition.

This event is indirectly referenced in James Harris (editor), *The Essential James E. Talmage* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1997), xxix: “He was customarily meticulous, making sure there were no errors or omissions, and praised his secretary when she found an error he had missed.”

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Corom* in Ether 1:19–20 and Ether 10:16–17 since it is consistently spelled that way in the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript).

■ Ether 1:23–24

and Morianton was a descendant of Riplakish

and Riplakish was [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a HK] son of Shez

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *the* with *a* in the phrase “**the** son of Shez”, a typo probably resulting from the preceding “**a** descendant of Riplakish”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *the*. Although the indefinite article is theoretically possible, similar phraseology elsewhere in the text supports the definite article:

Alma 10:3

and Aminadi was **a** descendant of Nephi
 who was **the** son of Lehi
 who came out of the land of Jerusalem
 who was **a** descendant of Manasseh
 who was **the** son of Joseph

3 Nephi title (extended)

and Helaman was the son of Helaman
 which was the son of Alma
 which was the son of Alma
 being **a** descendant of Nephi
 which was **the** son of Lehi

Ether 1:6–7

he that wrote this record was Ether
 and he was **a** descendant of Coriantor
 and Coriantor was **the** son of Moron

Ether 1:16

and Aaron was **a** descendant of Heth
 who was **the** son of Hearthom

Thus the definite article *the* before *son* is quite correct in Ether 1:24.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:24 the definite article *the* in the phrase “the son of Shez”.

■ Ether 1:33

*at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people
and [swear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | swear > swore M | swore QRT] in his wrath
that they should be scattered upon all the face of the earth*

Here the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads *swear*, but this is an error for the past-tense form *sware* (the result of *swear* and *sware* being homophones of each other). The misspelling probably originated in \mathcal{O} as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation. In the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition, *swear* was replaced by the modern-day past-tense form *swore*. The LDS text has continued with *swore*, but the critical text will restore the original *sware* here. For another example of *swear* as a misspelling for *sware*, see under Ether 8:14; for a general discussion on the competition between *sware* and *swore* in the history of the text, see under Enos 1:14.

Summary: Restore the original past-tense form *sware* in Ether 1:33.

■ Ether 1:34

*and the brother of Jared
being a large and [a 1ABCDEGFS | FHIJKLMNOQRT] mighty man . . .*

Once more we have an example of a repeated *a* being dropped, in this instance in the 1852 LDS edition. The LDS text has maintained the shorter reading without the *a*. The critical text will restore the repeated *a* since \mathcal{P} , the earliest textual source, supports it. For a list of other places in the text where the repeated *a* has been omitted, see under Mormon 9:4.

Summary: Restore the original repeated *a* in Ether 1:34 (“a large and a mighty man”).

■ Ether 1:34

*and the brother of Jared
being a large and a mighty man
and [being 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] a man highly favored of the Lord
[for 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] Jared his brother said unto him
cry unto the Lord that he will not confound us that we may not understand our words*

This sentence originally began with two conjoined present participial clauses, each with an initial *being*. The second *being* was deleted in the 1920 LDS edition. But the conjoining of *being*-clauses is found elsewhere in the text (for an example, see below), nor is there anything especially difficult about repeating the *being* here in Ether 1:34. The real difficulty has to do with the conjunction *for* that preceded the following clause in the earliest extant text: “**for** Jared his brother said unto him”. This use of *for* seems quite foreign here, so it was removed in the editing for the 1920 edition. But instead of an intrusive *for*, what we appear to have here is an error for *therefore*. One possible scenario is that while writing down the text in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery missed the *there* part of *therefore* and ended up writing down only *for*. (It is also possible that Oliver

miscopied a *therefore* in \mathcal{O} as simply *for* in \mathcal{P} , especially if the *there* ended the line and *-fore* began the following line.)

Another possibility to consider here is that the *for* (or *fore*) is an archaic form that means ‘therefore’. The Oxford English Dictionary, however, provides no direct support for such an interpretation. Under definition 21 for the preposition *for*, the OED lists *for this* as having the meaning ‘therefore’ in the 16th century, but there is no example of *for* (or *fore*) as a shortened form of the word *therefore*.

Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon argues that here in Ether 1:34 *for* is probably a manuscript error for *therefore*. In particular, there are a good many examples of a present participial *being*-clause followed by a main clause introduced by *therefore*, including the following:

1 Nephi 7:8

and now I Nephi **being** grieved for the hardness of their hearts
therefore I spake unto them saying . . .

1 Nephi 15:3

and they **being** hard in their hearts
therefore they did not look unto the Lord as they had ought

Mosiah 2:7

for the multitude **being** so great that king Benjamin could not teach them all
within the walls of the temple
therefore he caused a tower to be erected

Mosiah 19:4

and he **being** a strong man and an enemy to the king
therefore he drew his sword and swore in his wrath that . . .

Alma 1:9

now Gideon **being** stricken with many years
therefore he was not able to withstand his blows

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 . . .

Alma 18:16

and it came to pass that Ammon **being** filled with the Spirit of God
therefore he perceived the thoughts of the king

Alma 46:34

now Moroni **being** a man which was appointed
by the chief judges and the voice of the people
therefore he had power to do according to his will

Alma 47:4

for he **being** a very subtle man to do evil
therefore he laid the plan in his heart to dethrone the king of the Lamanites

Alma 50:30

but behold Morionton **being** a man of much passion
therefore he was angry with one of his maidservants

Alma 52:34

Moroni **being** in their course of march
therefore Jacob was determined to slay them

Alma 63:5

Hagoth he **being** an exceeding curious man
therefore he went forth and built him an exceeding large ship

Helaman 11:24

and also a certain number which were real descendants of the Lamanites
being stirred up to anger by them or by those dissenters
therefore they commenced a war with their brethren

Mormon 1:15

and I **being** fifteen years of age
and **being** somewhat of a sober mind
therefore I was visited of the Lord

The last example is especially similar to Ether 1:34 since there is a pair of conjoined *being*-clauses that precede the *therefore*-clause.

Semantically, the text in Ether 1:34 implies that Jared asked his brother to pray on their behalf because his brother was “highly favored of the Lord”. The Book of Mormon text otherwise uses *therefore* rather than *for* to represent such a resultive relationship, which further argues that the *for* of the printer’s manuscript in Ether 1:34 is an error for *therefore*. The critical text will accept this conjectural emendation, although there are no examples elsewhere in the history of the text for this particular error.

Earlier in my analysis, under Mosiah 29:5, I referred to the *for* in the earliest text for Ether 1:34 as supporting the original reading of *for* in Mosiah 29:5. Given the replacement of *for* with *therefore* here in Ether 1:34, that argument there must now be revised. For the resulting revision in the analysis, see under Mosiah 29:5 in the addenda at the end of this last part of volume 4.

Summary: Emend Ether 1:34 to read *therefore* in place of the *for* found in the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript; usage elsewhere in the text supports *therefore* when preceded by present-participial clauses with the verb form *being*.

■ Ether 1:37

and the Lord had compassion upon their friends and their families also
[*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *and* HK] *they were not confounded*

Here in the 1874 RLDS edition the subordinate conjunction *that* was replaced with the coordinating conjunction *and*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *that*. Usage elsewhere supports the use of *that* as a resultive conjunction. For a list of other examples where an original resultive *that* has been replaced by *and*, see under 1 Nephi 11:29.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:37 the original resultive subordinate conjunction *that* (“that they were not confounded”), the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Ether 1:38

go and inquire of the Lord

[*whither* 1 | *whether* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he will drive us out of the land*
and if he will drive us out of the land / cry unto him

[*whither* 1ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whether* DE] *shall we go*

Here we have two instances of the common mix-up between *whither* and *whether* in the text (see the list under 1 Nephi 22:4). In the first instance in this passage, Oliver Cowdery wrote *whither* in \mathcal{P} (and perhaps also in \mathcal{C}). But *whether* is obviously correct here since the text follows with an *if*-clause that assumes a preceding *whether* (namely, “and if he will drive us out of the land”). The 1830 compositor made the correct substitution of *whether* when he set the type.

In the second instance, the typesetter for 1841 British edition replaced the obviously correct *whither* with *whether* (perhaps under the influence of the preceding *whether*). Surprisingly, the subsequent LDS edition (1849) copied the incorrect *whether*, but the next LDS edition (1852) restored the correct *whither*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:38 the first use of *whether* and the second of *whither*; the context easily resolves the choice between *whether* and *whither* in both these cases.

■ 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 printer’s manuscript has the word order “whither shall we go”, which implies that the original text had a direct quote after “cry unto him”. The 1830 edition shifted the placement of the modal verb *shall*, thus changing the text to read as an indirect quote (“whither we shall go”). If we place a colon before *whither*, then the original word order can be restored since the colon will imply a following direct quote. The text has other examples of direct quotes that start out with a question headed by *whither* (given here as they read in the original text but with their current LDS punctuation and capitalization added):

1 Nephi 16:23

And I said unto my father:

Whither shall I go to obtain food?

1 Nephi 17:9

And I saith:

Lord, **whither** shall I go

that I may find ore to molten,

that I may make tools to construct the ship

after the manner which thou hast shewn unto me?

Alma 20:10

And he also saith:

Whither art thou going with this Nephite,

which is one of the children of a liar?

In the Book of Mormon text, the verb *cry* is normally followed by a direct quote (61 times), as in the following example with its current LDS punctuation and capitalization:

Mormon 3:2

Cry unto this people—
Repent ye, and come unto me,
and be ye baptized, and build up again my church,
and ye shall be spared.

But there are 9 instances in the text where the verb *cry* is followed by an indirect quote, as in the following nearby example (again with current LDS punctuation and capitalization):

Ether 1:34

Cry unto the Lord,
that he will not confound us that we may not understand our words.

The original use of the direct quote in Ether 1:38 undoubtedly makes Jared’s plea more vivid. Adding the appropriate punctuation and capitalization, we therefore get the following for the original text:

Ether 1:38 (revised accidentals)

And if he will drive us out of the land,
cry unto him:
Whither shall we go?

Summary: Restore the original direct quote in Ether 1:38; a colon before *whither* and a question mark at the end will make the direct quote clear: “cry unto him: Whither shall we go?”

■ Ether 1:41

*go to and gather together thy flocks both male and female of every kind
and also [of 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] the seed of the earth of every kind*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the preposition *of*, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. Perhaps the lack of the *of* immediately after the verb *gather* (“gather together thy flocks”, not “gather together **of** thy flocks”) led to this deletion of the *of* after *and also*. On the opposite side of the question, one could ask whether the original text had the *of* after *and also*; in other words, perhaps the *of* was accidentally added under the influence of several nearby prepositional phrases headed by *of* (“of every kind” and “of the earth”).

Nonetheless, it makes sense that the Lord would command the Jaredites to gather all their flocks but not all the seed of the earth. They would need to gather only part “of the seed of the earth of every kind”. This same use of the preposition *of* acting as a partitive marker with the verb *gather* is found in the King James Bible (in this case, in reference to the gathering of manna):

Exodus 16:16

gather **of** it every man according to his eating

In other words, no one gathered all the manna. For the same reason, the original partitive reading here in Ether 1:41 is perfectly correct.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:41 the preposition *of* before “the seed of the earth”; the use of the partitive preposition *of* with the verb *gather* is expected when referring to the gathering of seed (thus “gather . . . **of** the seed of the earth of every kind”).

■ **Ether 1:41**

*go to and gather together thy flocks both male and female of every kind
and also of the seed of the earth of every kind
and thy [family 1PS | families ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
and also Jared thy brother and his **family**
and also thy friends and their **families**
and the friends of Jared and their **families***

The printer’s manuscript has the singular *family* whenever the reference is to an individual (the brother of Jared and his family as well as Jared and his family), but the plural *families* occurs when the text refers to the brother of Jared’s friends and to Jared’s friends. In other words, each individual has one family. Unfortunately, the 1830 compositor accidentally set *families* when referring to the family of the brother of Jared, probably because his eye caught the plural *families* in the next line of the printer’s manuscript. There is definitely no intent in the original text to assign more than one family to the brother of Jared; the singular reading of the original text should be restored here, even though the plural reading has caused some controversy. For instance, Orson Pratt, the editor for the 1879 LDS edition, added a footnote here: “From this verse it is seen that the brother of Jared had a plurality of families.” Walter W. Smith, writing in the RLDS publication *The Saints’ Herald* 56/40 (6 October 1909), draws attention on page 943 to Pratt’s footnote, then concludes with this remark (based on the fact that the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct singular): “But another error has been corrected, and with it another defense of polygamy is gone.” Richard P. Howard, formerly the RLDS Church Historian, provides a more neutral evaluation of the RLDS perspective on page 41 of his *Restoration Scriptures: A Study of Their Textual Development*, second edition (Independence, Missouri: Herald Publishing House, 1995):

The acquisition of the P MS [the printer’s manuscript] in 1903 made possible the clarification of a text which in the Reorganization’s historic warfare against polygamy was considered in 1906 to be very important to the cause. Today we would treat such a matter in keeping with its current relative importance, but in the early 1900s few considerations were much more significant.

Here the year 1906 refers to the RLDS committee’s revision of the RLDS text for the third RLDS edition, published in 1908.

Ultimately, this contentious issue in LDS and RLDS church history should play no role in determining the text of the Book of Mormon. Here in Ether 1:41, the critical text will restore the singular *family*, the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript).

Summary: Restore the original singular *family* in reference to the brother of Jared in Ether 1:41; the plural reading “thy families” is a typo that was introduced by the 1830 compositor.

■ Ether 1:42

and there will I meet thee

and [I 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] will go before thee

Here the 1874 RLDS edition dropped the subject *I* in the conjoined sentence “and **I** will go before thee”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the pronoun. Note that the word order is different in the first and second clauses: *will I* in the first clause (because of the preceding *there*) and *I will* in the second clause.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 1:42 the subject pronoun *I* in the conjoined sentence “and **I** will go before thee”.

■ Ether 1:42

and there will I meet thee and I will go before thee into a land

which is choice above all the [land 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | lands RT] of the earth

The printer’s manuscript has the singular *land* here, which the 1920 LDS edition emended to the plural *lands*. Otherwise the text uses the plural *lands* when comparing the promised land with other lands:

1 Nephi 2:20	a land which is choice above all other lands
1 Nephi 13:30	the land which is choice above all other lands
2 Nephi 1:5	a land which is choice above all other lands
2 Nephi 10:19	for it is a choice land . . . above all other lands
Ether 2:7	the land of promise which was choice above all other lands
Ether 2:10	a land which is choice above all other lands
Ether 2:15	a land choice above all other lands
Ether 9:20	this land which was choice above all other lands
Ether 10:28	a land that was choice above all lands
Ether 13:2	a choice land above all other lands

Here in Ether 1:42, Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally omitted a plural *s* when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or later when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . There is some evidence that Oliver tended to omit the plural *s* from *lands* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} ; in fact, in two out of three cases, he did not catch his error:

Alma 28:3 (uncorrected error in \mathcal{P})

and the people of Nephi returned again
to their [*lands* 0 | *land* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 54:13 (uncorrected error in \mathcal{P})

and we will seek our [*lands* 0 | *land* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 58:38 (momentary error in \mathcal{P})

and we are in the possession
of our [*lands/land* 0 | *land* > *lands* 1 | *lands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The example here in Ether 1:42 is different in that the word *land(s)* is postmodified by the prepositional phrase “of the earth”. There is one other example in the text of “all the land(s) of the earth”, and it has the plural *lands*:

2 Nephi 27:1
 and they which shall be upon other lands
 yea even upon all the **lands** of the earth
 behold they will be drunken with iniquity

There is, however, one instance where the promised land is compared to being “above all the earth”:

Ether 1:38
 and who knoweth but the Lord will carry us forth into a land
 which is choice above all the earth

This example is semantically equivalent to saying that the Lord could carry them to “a land which is choice above all **the land of** the earth”. Note that this instance, in Ether 1:38, of “a land which is choice above all the earth” precedes Ether 1:42 by only a few verses. In other words, the use of the singular *land* in the earliest text for “above all the land of the earth” is possible, although we can find no explicit use elsewhere in the text of the fuller expression, “above all the land of the earth”. But since the singular will work, the critical text will restore the earliest reading here in Ether 1:42, “a land which is choice above all the **land** of the earth”, but with the recognition that this could be an error for “a land which is choice above all the **lands** of the earth”.

Summary: Restore in Ether 1:42 the earliest reading with the singular *land* in the relative clause “which is choice above all the **land** of the earth”; this reading will work, although the possibility remains that the singular *land* could be an error for *lands* (which is how the text was emended in the 1920 LDS edition).

■ 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
 and they [which 1A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall go with thee
 a great nation*

Here we have a complex conjoining of noun phrases in a prepositional phrase beginning with *of*. In the printer’s manuscript, the initial *of* was not repeated for any of the subsequent noun phrase conjuncts. But the 1830 typesetter added the repeated *of* to the second noun phrase conjunct (“and **of** the seed of thy brother”) but left the third one unchanged. However, this third noun phrase conjoins with the preceding *thy brother* and not with the earlier noun phrase *the seed* (in other words, the text is equivalent to “and the seed of thy brother and **the seed of** they which shall go with thee”). There is nothing wrong, of course, with the repeated *of*; on the other hand, it is not necessary either, so we follow the earlier reading here in Ether 1:43.

In terms of grammaticality, the subject pronoun form *they* could be replaced in the standard text by *those*, the appropriate object pronoun form when followed by the relative pronoun *who*: “and **those who** shall go with thee” (the current text reads “and **they who** shall go with thee”).

Elsewhere in the text, Joseph Smith frequently edited examples of *they which* (and *them which*) to *those who*. For some discussion, see under 2 Nephi 1:5; for a complete discussion, see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

Summary: Remove in Ether 1:43 the intrusive *of* that the 1830 typesetter added before “the seed of thy brother”; also maintain the subject pronoun form *they* and restore the original *which* in “and they which shall go with thee”.

■ Ether 1:43

*and [this 1PS | thus ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] I will do unto thee
because of this long time which ye have cried unto me*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads *this* in “and **this** I will do unto thee”. The 1830 typesetter misread *this* as *thus*, giving “and **thus** I will do unto thee”. The 1908 RLDS edition, in accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} , restored the *this*, but the LDS text has retained the secondary *thus*. Mix-ups between *this* and *thus* have been quite common in the history of the text, although all of the examples except this one involve the scribes rather than the typesetters. For some examples, see under Alma 11:21.

Theoretically, either *this* or *thus* will work here in Ether 1:43. Yet elsewhere the text has examples of only “(all) **this** will I do”:

1 Nephi 17:53	and this will I do
Jacob 5:53	and this will I do
Mosiah 12:7	and all this will I do
Mosiah 12:8	yea even this will I do
Mosiah 24:14	and this will I do
3 Nephi 28:9	and all this will I do

It is worth noting here that all these other examples have the inverted word order *will I* (that is, with the auxiliary *will* preceding the subject pronoun *I*). In contrast to the six examples listed above, there are no examples in the text of “**thus** will I do” (or with the differing word order of “**this** I will do”). The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading here, “and **this** I will do unto thee” (but maintaining the noninverted word order *I will*).

Summary: Restore in Ether 1:43 the direct object *this* in “and **this** I will do unto thee”.

■ Ether 1:43

*and this I will do unto thee
because [of >]s NULL 1 | of A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
this long time
[which 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye have cried unto me*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the preposition *of* after *because* as well as the following relative pronoun *which*. This kind of original construction using *because of* is found elsewhere in the text:

Ether 12:23

for thou hast made all this people
that they could speak much
because of the Holy Ghost **which** thou hast given them

The difference here in Ether 1:43 is that the noun phrase after *because of* is adverbial rather than a direct (or indirect) object. Joseph Smith replaced the original prepositional construction (“because of <noun phrase>”) with the clausal one (“because <finite clause>”), perhaps because he felt uncomfortable with an adverbial noun phrase as the complement of the preposition *of*. Nonetheless, there is nothing particularly difficult or ungrammatical about the original reading of the text in this passage.

The text has one other strange use of “because of X which . . .”, and the oddity of this instance has never been removed from the text:

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

Here in the standard text, the redundant *sake* along with the genitive *s* at the end of *people’s* could be omitted, giving “because of the **people** who are upon the land” (*which is* was grammatically emended to *who are* in the editing for the 1837 edition). The critical text, of course, will retain the original “because of the **people’s sake** which is upon the land”, despite its difficulty.

Summary: Restore in Ether 1:43 the original nominal construction with *because of* preceding an adverbial noun phrase; the original reading here is neither difficult nor ungrammatical, although it is unusual.

Ether 2

■ Ether 2:1

*Jared and his brother and their families
and also the friends of Jared and his brother*

- *and their families* 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST
- NULL D

went down into the valley which was northward

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the phrase “and their families”. The 1849 LDS edition restored it. The critical text will, of course, follow the earliest reading with this phrase. Note especially the preceding reference to “Jared and his brother **and their families**”.

Summary: Maintain both instances of the conjoined phrase “and their families” in Ether 2:1.

■ Ether 2:2

*and they **did** also lay snares
and [1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST | *did*] catch fowls of the air
and they **did** also prepare a vessel
in the which they **did** carry with them the fish of the waters*

Here the 1888 LDS edition added the auxiliary *did* to the conjoined verb phrase, giving “and they did also lay snares and **did** catch fowls of the air”. The error probably resulted from the multiple occurrence of the auxiliary *did* in the surrounding text. Since this edition never served as a copy-text, no subsequent LDS edition continued this intrusive *did*. Occasionally Oliver Cowdery made the same error in his copywork, but only momentarily, as in this example:

3 Nephi 11:15
and it came to pass that the multitude went forth
and [*did* > *thrust* 1 | *thrust* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] their hands into his side
and **did** feel the prints of the nails in his hands and in his feet

In that example, Oliver may have been prompted to add the *did* because of its occurrence in the following conjoined verb phrase. (See under Alma 53:13 for another instance where Oliver momentarily added the auxiliary *did*.) Here in Ether 2:2, either reading, with or without the *did*, is theoretically possible, so we follow the earliest textual sources, which lack the repeated *did*.

Summary: Maintain the lack of the repeated *did* in Ether 2:2, the reading of the earliest textual sources (“and they did also lay snares and catch fowls of the air”).

■ Ether 2:3

and they did also carry with them

[Deseret >jg deseret 1 | deseret ABCDEGHIKPRST | Deseret FIJLMNOQ]

which by interpretation is [a 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] honey bee

and thus they did carry with them swarms of bees

In the printer's manuscript, the noun *deseret* is capitalized (as *Deseret*), but John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) replaced the uppercase *D* with a lowercase *d* in \mathcal{D} , thus setting it as *deseret* in the 1830 edition. The 1852 LDS edition restored the uppercase *D*, but the 1920 LDS edition returned to the lowercase spelling. The word *deseret* appears to be a common noun, thus justifying the lowercase spelling. There are also Book of Mormon names for species unknown to us, and these are also left uncapitalized in the printed text (thus *cumoms*, *cureloms*, *neas*, and *sheum*), so the lowercase *d* for *deseret* is consistent with that decision. On the other hand, names for unique objects are capitalized (at least in the current LDS text), which suggests that these names are proper nouns:

Alma 31:21

now the place was called by them **Rameumptom**

which being interpreted is the holy stand

[*Rameumptom* is capitalized in all the extant textual sources; however, only the last part of the name is extant in \mathcal{O} .]

Alma 37:38

I have somewhat to say concerning the thing

which our fathers call a ball or director

or our fathers called it [*Liahona* 01FIJLMNOQRT | *liahona* ABCDEGHIKPS]

which is being interpreted a compass

[*Liahona* is capitalized in the manuscripts and in the LDS text since 1852; the early editions and the RLDS text have the lowercase *liahona*.]

For the possibility that *Gazelem* is the name for the stone mentioned in Alma 37:23, see the discussion under that passage.

Here in Ether 2:3, the 1874 RLDS edition deleted the indefinite article *a* before *honey bee*; the 1908 RLDS edition restored it. The original style with the *a* is found in the King James Bible (even though the Greek does not have an indefinite article):

John 1:42

thou shalt be called Cephas

which is by interpretation a stone

Obviously, the phrase “by interpretation” follows the King James style; thus the use of *a* before *honey bee* is appropriate here in Ether 2:3. Similarly, with the verb *interpret* there is one more case in the Book of Mormon text with the indefinite article *a*:

Alma 37:38

or our fathers called it Liahona

which is being interpreted a compass

Summary: Accept in Ether 2:3 the lowercase spelling *deseret* since this is a common noun in the text; also maintain the use of the indefinite article *a* before *honey bee*, the earliest reading, which is consistent with the language style of the King James Bible (in John 1:42) as well as the Book of Mormon (in Alma 37:38).

■ **Ether 2:4–5**

*and it came to pass that when they had come down into the valley of Nimrod
the Lord came down and talked with the brother of Jared
and he was in a cloud and the brother of Jared saw him not
and it came to pass that the Lord commanded them
that they should go forth into the wilderness
yea into that quarter where there never had man been
and it came to pass that the Lord did go before them
and did talk with **them** as he stood in a cloud
and gave directions whither they should travel*

There is a possibility that the last *them* in this passage is an error for *him*. As explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, *them* and *him* were sometimes mixed up during the early transmission of the text, especially when taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation (since in colloquial speech both object pronouns are pronounced identically as /əm/).

At the beginning of verse 4, the text records that the Lord, while in a cloud, talked with the brother of Jared, not with the entire group. But the text immediately following in verse 5 refers to the entire group: “the Lord commanded **them** that **they** should go forth . . . the Lord did go before **them**”. Even here, one could argue that the *them* in “the Lord commanded them” is an error for *him* (in other words, the Lord commanded the brother of Jared). Later in verse 14, the text once more explicitly refers to the Lord as speaking with the brother of Jared while he, the Lord, was in a cloud:

Ether 2:14

and it came to pass at the end of the four years
that the Lord came again unto the brother of Jared
and stood in a cloud and talked with him

Ultimately, however, the plural usage will work throughout verse 5. One could say that the Lord spoke to the entire group through the brother of Jared. In the same way, we have biblical references stating that the Lord spoke to the children of Israel when in actuality he spoke through his prophet:

Leviticus 10:11 (through Moses)

and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes
which the LORD hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses

Joshua 21:45 (through Joshua)

there failed not ought of any good thing
which the LORD had spoken unto the house of Israel

Jeremiah 10:1 (through Jeremiah)

hear ye the word which the LORD speaketh unto you, O house of Israel

As Don Brugger points out (personal communication), there are examples like this in the Book of Mormon as well. For instance, in 1 Nephi 4:34 Nephi tells Zoram that “surely the Lord hath commanded **us** to do this thing”, yet the actual commandment was given to Lehi (as explicitly stated earlier in 1 Nephi):

1 Nephi 3:2, 4
 behold I have dreamed a dream
 in the which the Lord hath commanded **me**
 that thou and thy brethren shall return to Jerusalem . . .
 wherefore the Lord hath commanded **me**
 that thou and thy brothers should go unto the house of Laban
 and seek the records and bring them down hither into the wilderness

We should also note that if the last *them* in Ether 2:5 were changed to *him*, the reader could readily misread the text as stating that it was the brother of Jared who stood in a cloud: “the Lord did go before them and did talk with **him** as **he** stood in a cloud”. It is easier to interpret all of verse 5 as referring to the group, even though the brother of Jared is the one through whom the Lord spoke and commanded the group.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that it is also possible that the latter part of verse 5 refers to a time when the whole group directly heard the Lord’s voice speaking to them from a cloud. The Lord normally spoke through Moses to the children of Israel in the wilderness, but when the Lord first gave the Ten Commandments at mount Sinai, they all heard the voice of the Lord speaking to them directly (Deuteronomy 5:22–27). Similarly, the latter part of verse 5 here in Ether 2 could be referring to such an event. Under that interpretation, the plural pronoun *them* would work without any problem.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 2:5 all the instances of the plural pronoun *them*, according to the reading of the earliest text; the entire verse refers to the whole group, not just the brother of Jared, even if the text in the latter part of verse 5 is describing how the Lord spoke indirectly to them through the brother of Jared.

■ Ether 2:5–6

*and it came to pass that the Lord **did** go before them
 and **did** talk with them as he stood in a cloud
 and gave directions whither they should travel
 and it [came 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | did come HK] to pass that
 they **did** travel in the wilderness and **did** build barges
 in the which they **did** cross many waters*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed *came* to *did come*, probably because of the use of the auxiliary verb *did* in the surrounding text (“did go before them and did talk with them . . . did travel . . . did build barges . . . did cross many waters”). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *came*. For another example of this error in the 1874 edition, see under Mosiah 28:5. As explained there, the Book of Mormon overwhelmingly prefers “it came to pass” over “it did come to pass”.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 2:6 the original instance of “it came to pass”.

■ Ether 2:7

*but he would that they should come forth even unto the land of promise
which was choice above all other lands
which the Lord God had **preserved** for a righteous people*

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 26 May 2006) suggests that the word *preserved* here in Ether 2:7 could be an error for *reserved*. This is possible, as witness two other places in the text that show variation between *reserve* and *preserve*:

Alma 17:31

and thus we will [*reserve* 1ABCDGHKPS | *preserve* EFIJLMNOQRT]
the flocks unto the king

Alma 37:18

for he promised unto them
that he would [*preserve* 0T | *reserve* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] these things
for a wise purpose in him

(See the discussion under each of these passages. In the first case, the critical text will emend *reserve*, the earliest reading, to *restore*.) Here in Ether 2:7, the verb *preserve* will work. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 2c for the verb *preserve*, lists the meaning ‘to keep in one’s possession, to retain’. Although there could be an error here in Ether 2:7, the earliest reading with the verb *preserve* will work and will therefore be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 2:7 the original use of the verb *preserve*: “the land of promise . . . which the Lord God had **preserved** for a righteous people”.

■ Ether 2:9

*and the fullness of his wrath cometh
[upon 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT | on HK] them when they are ripened in iniquity*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *upon* with the more modern *on*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *upon*. Notice that the immediately surrounding text uses the preposition *upon* in the same phraseology:

Ether 2:8

or they should be swept off
when the fullness of his wrath should come **upon** them

Ether 2:9

or they shall be swept off
when the fullness of his wrath shall come **upon** them

Ether 2:11

that ye may not bring down the fullness of the wrath of God **upon** you

Elsewhere in the text, there are 17 more instances that refer to wrath being “**upon** someone”, but none of wrath being “**on** someone”. For this expression, the Book of Mormon text consistently

supports the use of the preposition *upon*. (For other instances where *upon* and *on* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under 1 Nephi 12:4.)

Summary: Maintain the original preposition *upon* in Ether 2:9 (“and the fullness of wrath cometh upon them”); elsewhere the text consistently uses *upon*, not *on*, for this expression.

■ Ether 2:10

*wherefore he that doth possess it shall serve God or shall be swept off
for it is the everlasting [decrees >js decree 1 | decrees A | decree BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God*

Here the earliest text has a singular subject and verb, but the subject complement is in the plural (“**it is** the everlasting **decrees** of God”). Joseph Smith removed the disagreement in number by changing the plural *decrees* to the singular *decree*. One could argue that the plural *decrees* here is an error due to the use of *decrees* in the preceding verse:

Ether 2:9
and now we can behold the **decrees** of God concerning this land

There is also another instance of the plural later in the larger passage:

Ether 2:11
and this cometh unto you O ye Gentiles
that ye may know the **decrees** of God
that ye may repent

Elsewhere the text generally uses the plural when referring to the decrees of God, but there is one instance of the singular (marked below with an asterisk):

* Alma 29:4
I had not ought to harrow up in my desires
the firm **decree** of a just God

Alma 29:4
yea I know that he allotteth unto man
yea decreeth unto them **decrees** which are unalterable

Alma 41:8
now the **decrees** of God are unalterable

Ultimately, the question here in Ether 2:10 is whether the original text permits number disagreement in expressions like “it is the everlasting decree(s) of God”. Given the general tendency that allows for number disagreement in the original text, it is not surprising that there is at least one other clear example in the earliest text of the phraseology “it is <plural noun>”:

Alma 30:16
ye look forward and say that ye see a remission of your sins
but behold **it is** the [effects 01A | effect BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of a frenzied mind

This example shows that the plural *decrees* is possible in Ether 2:10 since the phraseology in Alma 30:16 (“it is the effects of a frenzied mind”) directly parallels the noun phrase form here in Ether 2:10 (“it is the everlasting decrees of God”). Also note that in the larger passage here in Ether 2, the use of the plural *decrees* at the beginning of verse 9 (the second section in the following citation) seems to require the plural at the end of verse 10 (the third section) as a kind of recapitulation:

Ether 2:8–11

- and he had sworn in his wrath unto the brother of Jared
that whoso should possess this land of promise from that time henceforth and forever
- (1) should serve him the true and only God or they should be swept off
when the fullness of his wrath should come upon them
- and now we can behold the **decrees** of God concerning this land
that it is a land of promise and whatsoever nation shall possess it
- (2) shall serve God or they shall be swept off
when the fullness of his wrath shall come upon them
and the fullness of his wrath cometh upon them when they are ripened in iniquity
- for behold this is a land which is choice above all other lands
- (3) wherefore he that doth possess it shall serve God or shall be swept off
for it is the everlasting **decrees** of God
and it is not until the fullness of iniquity among the children of the land
that they are swept off
- and this cometh unto you O ye Gentiles
that ye may know the **decrees** of God
that ye may repent and not continue in your iniquities
until the fullness be come
- (4) that ye may not bring down the fullness of the wrath of God upon you
as the inhabitants of the land hath hitherto done

Semantically, there is only one decree in this long passage, namely, “serve God or be swept off” (explicitly occurring three times, as listed above, and implied a fourth time at the end). The text nonetheless refers to this decree in the plural, not necessarily because there is more than one decree but possibly because it has been decreed more than once (to the Jaredites, to the Nephites, and now to the Gentiles). The critical text will restore the plural *decrees* in “for it is the everlasting **decrees** of God” in verse 10 since it appears to be intended.

Summary: Restore in Ether 2:10 the plural *decrees*, the reading of the earliest textual source (namely, \mathcal{P}); the larger passage uses the plural *decrees* to refer to the Lord’s repeated decree that the people in the promised land must serve him or be swept off.

■ Ether 2:11

*and this cometh unto you O ye Gentiles
that ye may know the decrees of God
that ye may repent
and not continue in your iniquities
until the fullness [be 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come*

The original text in Ether 2:11 had the expression “until the fullness be come”, an expression characteristic of the biblical style (that is, Early Modern English), as in the following examples from the King James Bible:

Matthew 10:23

ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel
till the Son of Man **be** come

Romans 11:25

that blindness in part is happened to Israel
until the fullness of the Gentiles **be** come in

Note that both Ether 2:11 and Romans 11:25 refer to the Gentiles and the fullness of time. (For both of these biblical passages, the usage “be come” actually dates from William Tyndale’s 1526 New Testament.)

In Ether 2:11 the 1837 edition removed the *be*, although it was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript (that is, in his editing for the 1837 edition). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has quite a few examples of the indicative form for “be come”. Besides six instances that are quotes from the King James Bible, there are three more occurrences of “be come” in the text:

Mosiah 3:3	I am come to declare unto thee glad tidings of great joy
Alma 20:13	and now his children also are come amongst us
Helaman 13:32	for your desolation is already come upon you

These examples show the use of the auxiliary verb *be* in earlier English as the perfect auxiliary for verbs of motion (instead of the auxiliary verb *have*). For further discussion of the archaic use of the perfect *be*, see under 2 Nephi 22:2.

The original use of the infinitive form *be* in Ether 2:11 is supported elsewhere in the Book of Mormon by a few other examples of *until*-clauses that clearly have the infinitive form of the main verb (that is, they take the subjunctive rather than the indicative); two are in biblical quotations from the King James Bible, but one is not (marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 15:11 (compare with Isaiah 5:11)

woe unto them that rise up early in the morning
that they may follow strong drink
that continue until night
and wine **inflamm** them

2 Nephi 16:11 (compare with Isaiah 6:11)

then said I : Lord how long
and he said : until the cities **be** wasted without inhabitant
and the houses without man
and the land **be** utterly desolate

* Ether 13:8

and they shall no more be confounded
until the end **come** when the earth shall pass away

There is one other example of *until* that takes the subjunctive in the current text: “until **he know** them in full” (Alma 12:10). In the original text this read as “until **they know** them in full”, which technically can be interpreted as in either the subjunctive or indicative. (For discussion of this rather complex case, see under Alma 12:10–11 as well as under Alma 12:10.) In any event, the subjunctive expression “be come” is clearly possible in Ether 2:11. Nonetheless, it can easily be confused with the single verb *become*, which may be why *be come* was emended to *come* in the 1837 edition (providing the change was actually intended).

Summary: Restore the original *be* in Ether 2:11: “until the fullness **be come**”; this specific usage is found in the King James Bible, and related usage can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon.

■ Ether 2:12

*if they will but serve the God of the land which is Jesus Christ
which [hath >js has 1 | hath ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been manifested by the things
which we have written*

Here in Ether 2:12, Joseph Smith changed *hath* to *has* in the printer’s manuscript (as part of his editing of the text for the 1837 edition), but this change was never implemented in the printed edition itself. In the next chapter, however, Joseph’s emendation of *hath* to *has* showed up in the 1837 edition:

Ether 3:15

for never [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] man believed
in me as thou hast

It may be that here in Ether 2:12 the change to *has* was simply missed in the typesetting. But one could also argue that it was ultimately decided that *hath* was the appropriate form when referring to deity (as originally in Ether 2:12) but *has* when referring to man (as edited in Ether 3:15). One wonders, in other words, if there might be some correlation between the biblical style and references to deity, at least in Joseph Smith’s editing. Nonetheless, there is no consistent evidence for this interpretation of Joseph’s editing since we have examples of all four possibilities:

Mosiah 2:20 (edited to *has*, referring to deity)

to that God who [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
created you

Helaman 12:6 (*hath* left unchanged, referring to deity)

the Lord their God who **hath** created them

Alma 20:17 (edited to *has*, referring to man)

he [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] repented of his sins

Alma 41:6 (*hath* left unchanged, referring to man)

if he **hath** repented of his sins . . .

More generally, there does not appear to be any consistency in Joseph Smith's editing of *hath* to *has*. Nor is the original text itself consistent in its use of *hath* and *has*, as we can see in the following contrastive pair (based on the earliest extant text):

2 Nephi 6:3	and ye yourselves know that it ever has been
Jacob 7:9	but I know that there is no Christ neither hath been

So there doesn't seem to be much reason for the change in Ether 2:12 (which was never implemented), in distinction to the change in Ether 3:15 (which was implemented). For each case of *hath* or *has*, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus *hath* in both Ether 2:12 and Ether 3:15.

Summary: Maintain the original *hath* in Ether 2:12, the reading of the earliest text; in Ether 3:15 the original *hath* will be restored.

■ Ether 2:13

and they called the name of the place

[*Morian cumer* 1 | *Moriancumer* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote this name with a space between *Morian* and *cumer*. The *c*, however, was not capitalized, which argues that Oliver intended to write *Moriancumer* as a single unit. Nor did he later insert a hyphen between the two parts. The 1830 compositor's decision to set *Moriancumer* as one word is probably correct.

Generally speaking, Book of Mormon names (excluding the biblical names in the Isaiah quotations) are spelled as single units (with no hyphens or spaces intervening). The only exceptions appear to be names that refer to places or to peoples: *Ani-Anti*, *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*, *Lehi-Nephi*, and *Jacob-Ugath*, none of which are names of persons, at least originally. (As explained in Alma 24:3, the brother of king Lamoni took on the name of his converted people, *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*, when he became king over all the Lamanites.)

Another factor to consider here is that *Moriancumer* could be a misspelling for *Moriancumr* (that is, without any explicit vowel in the last syllable). When Oliver Cowdery initially spelled the name *Coriantumr* in Helaman 1:15, he spelled it phonetically, as *Coriantummer*. So one wonders here in Ether 2:13 whether the scribe in \mathcal{C} (presumably Oliver) once more made the mistake of adding a vowel for a name ending in *mr* but this time the error was not corrected. The critical text, however, accepts minor differences in names that refer to different individuals. For a good example of this, see the discussion regarding the name *Ammaron* under 4 Nephi 1:47.

The brother of Jared is sometimes referred to by the name *Mahonri Moriancumer*, but this name is extracanonical. George Reynolds, in a footnote on page 282 of his article "The Jaredites" in *The Juvenile Instructor* 27/9 (1 May 1892), discussed the origin of this name (original punctuation retained):

While residing in Kirtland Elder Reynolds Cahoon had a son born to him. One day when President Joseph Smith was passing his door he called the Prophet in and asked him to bless and name the baby. Joseph did so and gave the boy the name of Mahonri Moriancumer. When he had finished the blessing he laid the child on the

bed, and turning to Elder Cahoon he said, the name I have given your son is the name of the brother of Jared; the Lord has just shown [or revealed] it to me. Elder William F. Cahoon, who was standing near heard the Prophet make this statement to his father; and this was the first time the name of the brother of Jared was known in the Church in this dispensation.

(The bracketed *or revealed* is in the original.) The ultimate source for this account is William F. Cahoon, an older son, who was there. Joseph Smith gave the name to the seventh son of Reynolds Cahoon and Thirza Stiles Cahoon; he was born in 1834 in Kirtland, Ohio. (I wish to thank Ken Cahoon for this additional information from the Cahoon family records.) Apparently the family itself determined the spelling for *Mahonri* but followed the Book of Mormon spelling for *Moriancumer*.

Summary: Accept in Ether 2:13 the spelling *Moriancumer* for the place where the Jaredites encamped on the seashore; the name is spelled as two words in \mathfrak{P} , but this appears to be a scribal error; there is a possibility that the actual spelling of the name was *Moriancumr*, but this can be only indirectly deduced from the name *Coriantumr*.

■ Ether 2:13

*and as they came to the sea they pitched their tents
and they called the name of the place Moriancumer
and they dwelt in tents
and dwelt in tents upon the seashore for the space of four years*

In this passage the text appears to unnecessarily repeat “and dwelt in tents”. In seven other places in the text, there are references to dwelling or living in tents. In no instance does the text first refer to dwelling in tents and then repeat this statement about tent dwelling while adding some specification about where the dwelling took place (as here in the current text for Ether 2:13). But there are three places where the text states, all within the same clause, that someone dwelt in a tent in a specific place (namely, Lehi dwelt in a tent in the valley of Lemuel):

1 Nephi 9:1

and all these things did my father see and hear and speak
as he dwelt in a tent in the valley of Lemuel

1 Nephi 10:16

and all these things of which I have spoken was done
as my father dwelt in a tent in the valley of Lemuel

1 Nephi 16:6

now all these thing were said and done
as my father dwelt in a tent in the valley which he called Lemuel

Here in Ether 2:13 Oliver Cowdery seems to have once more created a dittography while copying from the original into the printer’s manuscript. We have already seen evidence for this kind of accidental dittography in the earliest extant text; for each of these dittographies, \mathfrak{O} is not extant but probably read without the dittography:

2 Nephi 28:23

yea they are grasped with death and hell **and death and hell** and the devil

Mosiah 10:5

and I did cause that the women should spin and toil
and work **and work** all manner of fine linen
yea and cloth of every kind that we might clothe our nakedness

Helaman 1:29

and thus he did **and he did** head them

In the last case, spacing between extant fragments of \mathcal{O} argues that \mathcal{O} read without the dittography. (See under each of these passages for the complete argument that a dittography has occurred.) The earliest extant reading here in Ether 2:13 (“and they dwelt in tents **and dwelt in tents** upon the seashore”) is similar to the three other examples of uncorrected dittography; in particular, each repetition begins with a repeated *and*. For all four of these cases of uncorrected dittography in \mathcal{P} , the error probably occurred when Oliver copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Under Mosiah 10:5, I provide a list of cases where Oliver initially repeated an *and*-initial phrase but caught his error and crossed out the dittography.

Summary: Remove the apparent dittography in Ether 2:13 by deleting the extra “and dwelt in tents”, thus giving “and they dwelt in tents upon the seashore”.

■ Ether 2:13–14

and they dwelt in tents upon the seashore for the space of four years
and it came to pass at the end of [the 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] four years
that the Lord came again unto the brother of Jared

Here in Ether 2:14, the 1837 edition dropped the definite article *the* before *four years*. The resulting reading is ambiguous: one can't be sure whether the text is referring to another four years or the original four years. The earliest text has the definite article *the* and thus eliminates any possible confusion over the length of time; the total number of years is four.

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* before *four years* in Ether 2:14 (“at the end of **the** four years”).

■ Ether 2:15

and the brother of Jared repented
[*him* >js NULL 1 | *him* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the evil which he had done*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the archaic use of *him* after the verb *repent*. This kind of reflexive language (namely, “one repents one(self) of something”) is fairly frequent in the Early Modern English of the King James Bible, occurring 13 times in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament. In the Old Testament most of the examples have the regular personal pronominal form after the verb *repent*, as in these examples:

Judges 21:6	and the children of Israel repented them for Benjamin their brother
2 Samuel 24:16	the LORD repented him of the evil
Jeremiah 42:10	for I repent me of the evil that I have done unto you
Jonah 4:2	thou <i>art</i> a gracious God . . . and repentest thee of the evil

Note in particular the examples that refer to repenting oneself of a particular evil, just like originally here in Ether 2:15. But in three of the biblical cases, we get the reflexive pronoun for this expression:

Deuteronomy 32:36	for the LORD shall . . . repent himself for his servants
Psalms 135:14	and he will repent himself concerning his servants
Matthew 27:3	then Judas . . . repented himself

The original usage in Ether 2:15 (“the brother of Jared repented him”) is clearly intended and will therefore be restored in the critical text (even though this archaic usage involving the verb *repent* occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text).

Summary: Restore in Ether 2:15 the original pronoun *him* in “the brother of Jared repented **him** of the evil which he had done”; such usage for the verb *repent* is found in the King James Bible but nowhere else in the Book of Mormon.

■ Ether 2:15

*and [this 1A | these BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL > is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my thoughts
upon the land which I shall give you for your inheritance*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004) suggests the possibility that the plural *thoughts* in this passage could be an error for *thought*. If the earliest text were emended in that way (to “this is my thought”), then the disagreement in number would be eliminated with the least change. On the other hand, Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, eliminated the disagreement by changing the subject and the verb to the plural (to “these are my thoughts”).

Under Mosiah 28:3, I discuss a number of cases where the Book of Mormon text uses the plural *thoughts* instead of the singular *thought*, including cases like “the very thoughts” (where modern readers expect the singular). The plural *thoughts* is probably correct here in Ether 2:15 and will therefore be retained in the critical text. A syntactically similar example is found in the preceding book:

Mormon 7:1
and [*this* 1A | *these* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*is* >js are 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the words which I speak

As explained under that passage, the original text very likely read “this is the words”. In addition, as discussed nearby under Ether 2:10, there are other examples in the original text of disagreement between the subject and its complement, as in Alma 30:16 (“it is the **effects** of a frenzied mind”) and in Ether 2:10 (“it is the everlasting **decrees** of God”).

Summary: Restore the singular subject *this* and the singular verb form *is* in Ether 2:15 while maintaining the plural *thoughts*, thus giving one more case of disagreement between subject and complement in the original text (“this is my **thoughts** upon the land which I shall give you for your inheritance”).

■ Ether 2:15

for it shall be a land

[*of* >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *choice*

above all other lands

The printer’s manuscript reads here with the preposition *of* before *choice*, thus treating *choice* as a noun. The 1830 compositor, sensing that the *of* was in error, crossed out this preposition in \emptyset and set the expected expression “a land choice above all other lands”.

In only one case do we get *choice* as a noun in the Book of Mormon (in 1 Nephi 7:15: “if ye have choice”), yet there it does not occur as the object of a preposition. The use of the preposition *of* here in Ether 2:15 seems strange because we expect the adjective *choice* in expressions involving *land*. In such cases, *choice* occurs either in a following relative clause modifying *land* or in premodifying position (before *land*):

□ “land which is/was choice”

1 Nephi 2:20	a land which is choice above all other lands
1 Nephi 13:30	the land which is choice above all other lands
2 Nephi 1:5	a land which is choice above all other lands
Ether 1:38	a land which is choice above all the earth
Ether 1:42	a land which is choice above all the land of the earth
Ether 2:7	the land of promise which was choice above all other lands
Ether 2:10	a land which is choice above all other lands
Ether 9:20	this land which was choice above all other lands
Ether 10:28	a land that was choice above all lands

□ “a choice land”

2 Nephi 10:19	for it is a choice land . . . above all other lands
Ether 2:12	this is a choice land
Ether 13:2	a choice land above all other lands

Finally, there is one indirect reference to “a good spot of ground” being choice:

Jacob 5:43
 and behold this last
 whose branch hath withered away
 I did plant in a good spot of ground
 → yea even that which was choice unto me
 above all other parts of the land of my vineyard

Interestingly, there are no examples where *choice* occurs immediately after *land* as a postmodifier except here in the current text for Ether 2:15. But the reading “a land choice above all other lands”

closely parallels two examples of “a choice land” listed above except that the adjective *choice* postmodifies *land* rather than premodifies it:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 2 Nephi 10:19 | a choice land . . . above all other lands |
| Ether 13:2 | a choice land above all other lands |
| Ether 2:15 | a land choice above all other lands [emended text] |

It is possible that the use of “land **of** promise” earlier in this chapter led Oliver Cowdery to accidentally insert an *of* to give “land **of** choice”, either in the original manuscript or when copying into the printer’s manuscript:

- Ether 2:7
but he would that they should come forth
even unto the land **of** promise which was choice above all other lands
- Ether 2:8
and he had sworn in his wrath unto the brother of Jared
that whoso should possess this land **of** promise from that time henceforth and forever
should serve him
- Ether 2:9
and now we can behold the decrees of God concerning this land
that it is a land **of** promise

For another case where Oliver Cowdery apparently inserted an extra *of*, see under 3 Nephi 9:9 (there he seems to have changed an original “the king Jacob” to “the king **of** Jacob”). Also see the discussion under Alma 5:48 regarding the intrusive *of* in the phrase “the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father”.

On <www.google.com>, we can find modern-day examples of “a land **of** choice above all other lands” (or its equivalent). Interestingly, all three with this specific language come from Latter-day Saints:

- Marie Osmond (2004)
It’s truly a land **of** choice above all others.
- Walter Curtis Lichfield (2005)
A second branch of the tribe of Ephraim
by migration from Jerusalem 130 years later
was destined to receive a portion of the heritage of Jacob
by being led to the western hemisphere
to a land **of** choice above all other lands God had shaped and created.
- Relief Society Notes* (2007)
America is a land of promise, a land **of** choice above all others,
founded by good and noble men who were inspired of God.

(Note that in the last example, “a land **of** choice” parallels an immediately preceding “a land **of** promise”.) One could argue that these modern-day instances of “a land of choice” are referring to the land as a land of opportunity, a land where people have more choice. Also note that this phraseology, “a land of choice”, could not come from any printed edition of the Book of Mormon

since the *of* was removed by John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, prior to his setting the text for this passage. Instead, these examples suggest a natural tendency to add the *of* to “a land choice above all other lands”, thus changing *choice* from an adjective to a noun.

Ultimately, my sense is that in Ether 2:15 the *of* is intrusive. Usage everywhere else in the text supports *choice* being used adjectivally in expressions like this one. The *of* may have been inserted under the influence of the phrase “land of promise” earlier in the chapter. Related to this may have been a tendency to avoid having *choice* postmodify the noun *land*. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 compositor’s decision to remove the preposition *of* from this unique instance in the text of “a land of choice”.

Summary: Accept the 1830 compositor’s decision to delete the *of* before *choice* in Ether 2:15 (giving “a land choice above all other lands”); usage elsewhere in the text strongly supports this emendation.

■ Ether 2:20

behold thou shalt make a hole

(1) *in the top* [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]

(2) *and also in the bottom* [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]
and when thou shalt suffer for air

(3) *thou shalt unstop the hole* [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] *and receive air*
and if it so be that the water come in upon thee

(4) *behold ye shall stop the hole* [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]
that ye may not perish in the flood

In this passage, four instances of the postmodifier *thereof* were deleted in the 1920 LDS edition. Traditionally, these instances of *thereof* have been interpreted as referring to the Jaredite vessels, which are called barges (in verses 6, 16, and 18). On the other hand, Hugh Nibley has interpreted these four instances of *thereof* as referring to an air chamber, but never explicitly named, that each barge is implied as having had. For Nibley’s arguments, see pages 276–277 of *An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, second edition (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1964). Each air chamber would have had a hole in its top and bottom, thus obviating the difficulty of having a hole in the bottom of the barge itself (as implied by the second instance in verse 20 if *thereof* refers to barges).

On the other hand, we have already seen that the word *thereof* is sometimes used vacuously in the original text of the Book of Mormon. In other words, in some cases it appears that the *thereof* has no particular referent. For discussion of this problem of the unattached *thereof* in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 46:12. As far as the four instances in Ether 2:20 are concerned, the critical text will restore them; they are clearly intended, even though the referent doesn’t seem to be fully determinable (or if the referent is *barge*, then the *thereof* doesn’t quite work).

Besides the four instances here in Ether 2:20 where the 1920 LDS edition deleted the *thereof*, there are three more that have been deleted in the book of Ether (namely, in Ether 6:2, Ether 14:2, and Ether 14:17). See under each of those passages for specific discussion of the *thereof* and why it was deleted in later editing.

Summary: In Ether 2:20 the four instances of the word *thereof* will be restored; these were deleted in the 1920 LDS edition, probably because the referent could not be readily determined.

■ Ether 2:20

and if it [so be 1ABCDGHKPS | be so EFIJLMNOQRT] that the water come in upon thee . . .

Here the 1849 LDS edition changed the word order from “if it **so be**” to “if it **be so**”. As explained under 1 Nephi 22:17–18, the original text has instances of only the order *so be* in conditional clauses. Five cases of *be so* have shown up in the history of the text (as here in Ether 2:20); all are secondary.

■ Ether 2:22

and he cried [again 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | DE | NULL > again F] unto the Lord saying . . .

The 1841 British edition omitted the *again* in this verse. It was restored to the LDS text in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). Earlier, in verse 18, the text refers to the brother of Jared crying unto the Lord, so the use of *again* is fully appropriate here in verse 22.

Summary: Maintain the *again* in Ether 2:22, the reading of the earliest text (“and he cried again unto the Lord saying . . .”).

■ Ether 2:25

*and behold I prepare you against these things
for [how be it 1 | howbeit ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
ye cannot cross this great deep
save I prepare you against the waves of the sea . . .*

The original text had the clausal expression “how be it”, which the typesetter for the 1830 edition interpreted as the adverbial *howbeit*, perhaps with the standard meaning ‘nevertheless’ or ‘however’. Ultimately, the 1920 LDS edition removed *howbeit* since the meaning ‘nevertheless’ or ‘however’ doesn’t make much sense in this passage.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, such use of the adverbial *howbeit* occurs only once, in a quote from the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 20:7 (Isaiah 10:7)
howbeit he meaneth not so

But there are still two clausal uses of “how be it” in the text:

3 Nephi 23:11
and Jesus saith unto them
how be it that ye have not written this thing

3 Nephi 27:8
and **how be it** my church
save it be called in my name

These two examples of “how be it” can be interpreted in modern English in terms of the expanded phrase “how can it be”.

Another possible way to interpret the phrasal “how be it” here in Ether 2:25 is with the meaning ‘however it may be’ (which would be equivalent to “no matter what” in modern English). In other words, the Lord is saying that no matter what the Jaredites might do, they cannot cross the waters without his help. Clearly, the original phrase “for how be it” is intended. We can treat it as equivalent to “for however be it” and place a comma after the phrase to show that it is separate from the following main clause (thus “for how be it, ye cannot cross this great deep save I prepare you against the waves of the sea”). For this more transparent meaning of the phrase “how be it”, see under definition 1 of *howbeit* in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Summary: Restore in Ether 2:25 the original phrase “for how be it”, which is equivalent to “for however be it” and means ‘for however it may be’; a comma should be placed after this phrase to separate it from the following main clause.

Ether 3

■ Ether 3:1

and it came to pass that the brother of Jared
—now the number of the vessels which had been prepared was eight—
[*therefore the brother of Jared* >]g NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
went forth unto the mount . . .

Here in the printer’s manuscript, the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, crossed out the redundant words “therefore the brother of Jared”. Nonetheless, the preceding parenthetical statement (“now the number of the vessels which had been prepared was eight”) is so disruptive of the textual flow that the repetition of the full subject is very helpful to the reader (despite its stylistic unacceptability). Without the repetition, the text that follows the parenthetical statement seems completely disconnected, and the reader is forced to go back to the beginning of the verse in order to recover the subject. Even for the current text, it might therefore be better to have the repeated subject in Ether 3:1. The critical text will, of course, restore the original reading with “therefore the brother of Jared”.

Another case where *therefore* and a repeated subject (although as a pronoun) were deleted can be found in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition:

Alma 50:12
thus Moroni with his armies
which did increase daily because of the assurance of protection
which his works did bring forth unto them
[NULL >+ *therefore they* 0| *therefore they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS| RT]
did seek to cut off the strength and the power of the Lamanites
from off the lands of their possessions

In this case, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the “therefore they” in \mathcal{O} but later supplied it (probably when he read back the text to Joseph Smith). For a case where *wherefore they* was deleted (this time by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition), see under the Words of Mormon 1:17–18.

Summary: Restore in Ether 3:1 the *therefore* and the repeated subject (“therefore the brother of Jared”); in this case, the intervening parenthetical clause is so disruptive to the text that this restoration, despite its stylistic unacceptability, might also be made to the current text.

■ Ether 3:1

*therefore the brother of Jared went forth **unto** the mount
which they called the mount Shelem because of its exceeding heighth*

One wonders here if the original text might have read “the brother of Jared went forth **into** the mount”. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has instances of only “into the mount”:

1 Nephi 18:3	and I Nephi did go into the mount oft
Alma 47:10	he sent a secret embassy into the mount Antipas
Alma 47:12	he went up into the mount
Ether 6:2	the Lord had prepared the stones which the brother of Jared had carried up into the mount

Moreover, the mix-up between *into* and *unto* is very common in the transmission of the text, with 9 cases in the editions. And in the manuscripts there are 13 examples where *unto* was mistakenly written as *into* initially but then corrected. In the opposite direction, there are 14 examples in the manuscripts where *into* was initially written as *unto* but then corrected (see under 2 Nephi 8:23 for a list of cases where Oliver Cowdery made this error). And there are two cases in the manuscripts where an original *into* was replaced by *unto* without correction (in 2 Nephi 8:23 and apparently in 3 Nephi 9:21). So there is plenty of scribal evidence that Ether 3:1 could have originally read “the brother of Jared went forth **into** the mount”.

On the other hand, the larger passage for Ether 3:1 shows that the brother of Jared went “unto the mount”, where he cast the 16 small stones; then he went up “into the mount”:

Ether 3:1
 therefore the brother of Jared went forth **unto** the mount
 which they called the mount Shelem because of its exceeding heighth
 and did molten out of a rock sixteen small stones
 and they were white and clear even as transparent glass
 and he did carry them in his hands **up on** the top of the mount

In other words, the text shows that the brother of Jared prepared the stones while still at the base of the mount Shelem, making *unto* perfectly acceptable. In fact, a later passage in the book of Ether definitely states that the brother of Jared carried the stones “up into the mount”; that is, the stones were produced prior to him going up into the mountain:

Ether 6:2
 after that the Lord had prepared the stones
 which the brother of Jared had carried up into the mount . . .

So the evidence is quite firm that the preposition *unto* is indeed correct here in Ether 3:1.

In the King James Bible, we have more examples of going up “into the mount” than “unto the mount” (11 with *into* and 6 with *unto*), but either is possible. We even have a pair of examples where both *into* and *unto* are used to describe the same ascent into a mountain:

■ Ether 3:1

therefore the brother of Jared . . .

did [*moulton* 1 | *moulten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *molten* ORT] out of a rock sixteen small stones

The lexical verb *molten* is unusual and appears to be archaic; it is not listed in the Oxford English Dictionary. Nonetheless, it is not an error here in Ether 3:1 since the word is used four other places in the Book of Mormon text; in each case, the meaning is ‘to cast (metal)’:

1 Nephi 17:9

whither shall I go that I may find ore
to [*moulton* 01 | *molten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that I may make tools to construct the ship

1 Nephi 17:16

I did make tools of the ore
which I did [*moulton* 01 | *molten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] out of the rock

Ether 3:3

but behold these things
which I have [*moulton* 1 | *moulten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *molten* ORT]
out of the rock

Ether 7:9

and he did [*moulton* 1 | *moulten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *molten* ORT]
out of the hill

The critical text of the Book of Mormon will maintain all five instances of the archaic lexical verb *molten*.

The OED recognizes the word *molten* as a past-participial adjective form that is historically derived from the past participle of the lexical verb *melt*. We can find one instance of this adjectival use of *molten* in the Book of Mormon, namely, in a biblical quote from the King James Bible:

1 Nephi 20:5 (Isaiah 48:5)

and my [*moulton* 01 | *molten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] image
hath commanded them

There is also an instance in the King James Bible of the past-participial form *molten* being used in the perfect for the transitive verb *melt*:

Isaiah 44:10

who hath formed a god or **molten** a graven image
that is profitable for nothing

This is equivalent to “who **hath molten** a graven image”. Modern translations (such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version) translate this passage with the lexical verb *cast*.

Summary: Maintain the archaic lexical verb *molten*, which means ‘to cast (metal)’; this verb occurs five times in the Book of Mormon text (twice in 1 Nephi 17 and three times in Ether).

■ Ether 3:1

*and he did carry them in his hands **upon** the top of the mount*

All of the extant textual sources (☉ is not extant here) have the preposition *upon*. As explained under 2 Nephi 4:24–25, the *upon* here in Ether 3:1 appears to be a mistake for *up on*; that is, the original text read “and he did carry them in his hands **up on** the top of the mount”. Similarly, 2 Nephi 4:25 originally read “and upon the wings of his Spirit hath my body been carried away **up on** exceeding high mountains”, although there all the extant sources (again ☉ is not extant) read *upon* rather than *up on*. A similar case is found in Alma 1:15, which in all the extant textual sources (once more ☉ is not extant) reads “and they carried him **upon** the top of the hill Manti” but should read “and they carried him **up on** the top of the hill Manti”. Note that in all three of these cases, the verb is *carry*.

One other possible emendation should be considered here in Ether 3:1. As explained under Alma 2:15, there is evidence in the textual history for original *up upon* being reduced to simply *upon*. Thus one could argue that here in Ether 3:1 the original text read “and he did carry them in his hands **up upon** the top of the mount”. Although this reading is clearly possible, the critical text will accept the simpler emendation, *up on*, since it involves only the reinterpretation of *upon* rather than adding an additional word, *up*. As noted above, when the verb is *carry*, the prepositional form is *upon* in all the extant textual sources, not *up upon*; in each case, the *upon* is interpreted as an error for *up on*.

Summary: Emend the preposition *upon* in Ether 3:1 to two words, *up on* (“and he did carry them in his hands **up on** the top of the mount”); similar usage involving the verb *carry* can be found in the original text for 2 Nephi 4:25 and Alma 1:15.

■ Ether 3:3

*thou **hast** smitten us because of our iniquity
and [hath 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQS | hast ORT] driven us forth*

Here the original *hath* was grammatically emended to *hast* in the 1907 LDS edition and (independently, it would appear) in the 1920 LDS edition. As explained under Helaman 10:4, the use of *hath* conjoined with a preceding *hast* does occur in the original text. Here in Ether 3:3, the critical text will restore the original *hath*.

■ Ether 3:3

*and for [this 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPS | these RT] many years
we have been in the wilderness*

As explained under Mosiah 10:18, the original text has expressions like “this many years”. Here the 1920 LDS edition changed the singular *this* to the plural *these*, but the critical text will restore the original *this*.

■ Ether 3:9

*and never has man come [1 ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | forth GHK] before me
with such exceeding faith as thou hast*

The 1858 Wright edition added the adverb *forth* here in Ether 3:9. The first two RLDS editions followed this intrusive reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading without the *forth*. The expression “to come before someone” is not too common in the text; there is only one other example, and the meaning there is metaphorical: “good and evil hath come before all men” (Alma 29:5). But there are no examples of the redundant “to come forth before someone”. For the expression “to come (forth) and stand before someone”, there are examples with and without the *forth*:

1 Nephi 1:11	and the first came and stood before my father
1 Nephi 3:29	behold an angel of the Lord came and stood before them
1 Nephi 8:5	and he came and stood before me
Mosiah 26:25	then shall they that never knew me come forth and shall stand before me
Alma 12:15	we must come forth and stand before him in his glory
Alma 14:14	the chief judge of the land came and stood before Alma and Amulek

Note, however, that the two examples with *forth* deal specifically with the coming forth at the time of the resurrection and are therefore not quite the same as the other cases without the *forth*. The expression without the *forth* in Ether 3:9 is definitely correct.

Summary: Retain the earliest reading without the *forth* in Ether 3:9: “and never has man come before me with such exceeding faith”.

■ Ether 3:9

*because of thy faith thou hast seen that I shall take upon me flesh and blood
and never has man come before me with such exceeding faith as thou hast
for [NULL >? were it not so 0 | were it so 1A | were it not so BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ye could not have seen my finger*

Here the reading in the printer’s manuscript and in the 1830 edition seems to be missing the negative word *not* in the dependent clause. The *not* was added in the 1837 edition. Although the original manuscript is not fully extant here, it is clear that there was a supralinear insertion at the end of the line (the first word in the supralinear insertion, *were*, is extant in \mathcal{O}). And if we compare the placement of the supralinear *were* with where the insert mark for the entire insertion would have been (namely, at the end of the line), there is definitely room for a *not* in the supralinear insertion. If this analysis is correct, it means that the *not* was lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Even so, the 1837 change was very likely made independently of \mathcal{O} since there is no evidence that \mathcal{O} was ever consulted in the editing for the 1837 edition.

Thus the 1837 correction that added the expected *not* was probably the original reading of the text. Elsewhere in the text, the positive “if it (should) so be” is quite common (occurring 44 times). There are only a couple of other cases like the one here in Ether 3:9, and in both cases we get the *not*:

Thus the idea of eternal light is possible. In fact, there is one verse that contrasts “endless light” with “endless life”:

Mosiah 16:9
 he is the light and the life of the world
 yea **a light that is endless**
 that can never be darkened
 yea and also **a life which is endless**
 that there can be no more death

So either reading is theoretically possible in Ether 3:14, and we therefore follow the earliest reading, “in me shall all mankind have **life** and that eternally”.

Hardy also points out that the source for the 1830 change to *light* here in Ether 3:14 may have been the six occurrences of *light* in the preceding text:

Ether 2:19	in them there is no light
Ether 2:22	there is no light in them
Ether 2:23	that ye may have light in your vessels
Ether 2:23	for ye shall not go by the light of fire
Ether 2:25	that ye may have light when ye are swallowed up in the depths of the sea
Ether 3:4	that we may have light while we shall cross the sea

Hardy also considers the possibility that the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, consciously emended *life* to *light* here in Ether 3:14, although that seems unlikely since Gilbert made emendations only when something was clearly wrong with the text; there is nothing wrong with *life* here in Ether 3:14. Nor is it reasonable to think that *life* itself (the reading in \mathcal{P}) might be an early error for *light*, mainly because there are no preceding occurrences of *life* that could have triggered such an error (the nearest preceding occurrence of *life* is in Mormon 8:39). For another example where an original *life* was apparently changed to *light* under the influence of numerous preceding instances of *light*, see under Alma 19:6.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 3:14 the earliest reading of *life*; usage elsewhere in the scriptures supports the occurrence of *life* in this passage; the 1830 reading with *light* seems to have been prompted by the preceding instances of *light* in Ether 2–3.

■ Ether 3:18

and he ministered unto him even as he ministered unto the Nephites
and all this that this man [knew IABDEPS | might know CFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
that he was God
because of the many great works which the Lord had shewed unto him

The 1840 edition replaced the past-tense *knew* with *might know*. This change is very likely the result of Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition; such a change does not appear to be accidental. The 1852 LDS edition adopted this reading, and all subsequent LDS editions have followed it. The 1908 RLDS edition, on the other hand, restored the earlier *knew* since that was the reading in \mathcal{P} .

Elsewhere in the text we have several examples of the expression “and (all) this that . . .”; each one takes a conditional modal such as *might* or *should* and assigns a reason or purpose for events that have just been described:

Alma 7:11

and he shall go forth suffering pains and afflictions and temptations of every kind
and this that the word **might** be fulfilled which saith :
he will take upon him the pains and the sicknesses of his people

Alma 13:16

now these ordinances were given after this manner
that thereby the people might look forward on the Son of God
it being a type of his order or it being his order
and this that they **might** look forward to him for a remission of their sins
that they might enter into the rest of the Lord

Alma 26:30

and we have suffered all manner of afflictions
and all this that perhaps we **might** be the means of saving some soul

Alma 56:37

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

Helaman 6:22

and it came to pass that they did have their signs
yea their secret signs and their secret words
and this that they **might** distinguish a brother
who had entered into the covenant

Helaman 8:18

yea and behold I say unto you
that Abraham not only knew of these things
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

The 1840 change in Ether 3:18 to the conditional *might know* thus affects the relationship within the larger sentence, which ends up stating that the Lord showed himself to the brother of Jared (“he ministered unto him”) so that the brother of Jared would know that he was God. Yet the following two verses explain that it was because the brother of Jared already had a “perfect knowledge of God” (he saw his finger) that he was allowed to see his entire person (thus comparable to his appearance to the Nephites after his resurrection):

Ether 3:19–20

and because of the knowledge of this man
 he could not be kept from beholding within the veil
 and he saw the finger of Jesus
 which when he saw he fell with fear
 for he knew that it was the finger of the Lord
 and he had faith no longer
 for he knew / nothing doubting
 wherefore having this perfect knowledge of God
 he could not be kept from within the veil
 therefore he saw Jesus and he did minister unto him

So in verse 18 the meaning of the clause “and all this that this man knew that he was God” is ‘and all this **because** this man knew that he was God’.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that the original text here actually read “and all this **because** that this man knew that he was God”; that is, the word *because* was accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text. (As explained under 1 Nephi 1:14, the subordinate conjunction *because* was often followed by *that* in the original text.) There are, in fact, two instances of this usage in the text, one with the *that* and one without:

Mosiah 10:12–13

they were a wild and ferocious and a bloodthirsty people
 believing in the tradition of their fathers which is this :
 believing that they were driven out of the land of Jerusalem
 because of the iniquities of their fathers
 and that they were wronged in the wilderness by their brethren
 and they were also wronged while crossing the sea
 and again that they were wronged while in the land of their first inheritance
 after they had crossed the sea
 and all this **because that** Nephi was more faithful
 in keeping the commandments of the Lord

Mosiah 20:21

for are not the words of Abinadi fulfilled which he prophesied against us
 and all this **because** we would not hearken unto the word of the Lord
 and turn from our iniquities

In the first case, the text states that all these so-called wrongs against the Lamanites were the consequence of Nephi’s faithfulness in keeping the Lord’s commandments. The text does not say that these things happened so that “Nephi **would be** more faithful in keeping the commandments of the Lord”. Similarly, in the second case the text explains why the words of Abinadi were fulfilled.

Also note that the phraseology in both cases is in the past tense (“Nephi **was** more faithful” and “we **would** not hearken unto the word of the Lord”, where *would* is the past-tense form for the auxiliary verb *will*), just like it is in Ether 3:18 (“and all this that this man **knew** that he was God”). In all three cases (Mosiah 10:13, Mosiah 20:21, and Ether 3:18) the point is to explain why something happened.

Calabro also points out that, given this emendation in Ether 3:18 (“and all this because that this man knew that he was God”), the immediately following statement, “because of the many

great works which the Lord had shewed unto him”, must necessarily refer to works that the Lord had already shown the brother of Jared (that is, prior to showing him his whole person). Some of these works include the Lord not confounding their language (Ether 1:33–37), the Lord speaking to them from a cloud while leading them through the wilderness (Ether 2:5–6), the Lord telling them how to build the barges (Ether 2:16–18), and the Lord causing the 16 stones to “shine forth in darkness” (Ether 3:4–6). Such great works would have been enough to convince the brother of Jared of God’s existence, let alone seeing the finger of God.

So the question remains whether the original text in Ether 3:18 had the subordinate conjunction *because*. There isn’t any evidence that Oliver Cowdery ever omitted *because*, even momentarily, as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or as he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . There is one case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted *because* (and Oliver supplied it when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C}):

Mosiah 29:20

but behold he did deliver them **because** they did humble themselves before
and [§2 NULL > §1 *because* 1 | *because* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they cried mightily unto him
he did deliver them out of bondage

The preceding use of *because* in this passage could have led to the omission of the second one. Similarly, Calabro suggests for Ether 3:18 that the first *because* could have been omitted because of the second one later in the sentence (namely, “**because** of the many great works which the Lord had shewed unto him”). In any event, the conjectured *because* seems necessary in order to get the correct meaning. Thus the critical text will accept the suggested emendation of *because* in Ether 3:18, along with restoring the original past-tense *knew* (thus “and all this **because** that this man **knew** that he was God”).

Summary: Restore in Ether 3:18 the original past-tense *knew*; in order to make sense of the expression “and all this that this man knew that he was God” within the larger passage, the subordinate conjunction *because* will be supplied before the subordinate *that*, thus giving “and all this **because** that this man knew that he was God”; this *because* seems to have been omitted because of the *because* that occurs in the immediately following text (“**because** of the many great works which the Lord had shewed unto him”).

■ Ether 3:22

*and behold when ye shall come unto me
ye shall write them and [shall 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] seal them up
that no man can interpret them*

The 1840 edition dropped the repeated *shall* in this passage, probably accidentally. There are many examples in the text of the repeated *shall* in conjoined predicates, and there has been no systematic tendency to eliminate the repeated *shall*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *shall* here in Ether 3:22. For another example of the loss of a repeated *shall*, see under Helaman 9:33.

Also with respect to this passage, Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004) wonders about the meaning of the initial subordinate clause in this verse, “and behold when ye shall come unto me”; the text, as it stands, doesn’t seem to make much sense. Contextually, the

passage seems to be saying that when the brother of Jared has seen and heard these things, he should write them and seal them up. Geddes suggests emending the clause “when ye shall come unto me” by replacing *ye* with *these* and *me* with *thee* (thus “and behold when **these** shall come unto **thee**”).

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 12 May 2006) also wonders if there isn’t some mistake in the specific phrase “come unto me”. The next chapter seems to imply that what is meant here in Ether 3:22 is that the brother of Jared should write up these things after going down from the mount:

Ether 4:1

and the Lord commanded the brother of Jared
to go down out of the mount from the presence of the Lord
and write the things which he had seen
and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men
until after that he should be lifted up upon the cross

This passage would imply that the text in Ether 3:22 should read something like “and behold when ye shall **go down** from me”, but Hardy recognizes that a change of “go down from me” to “come unto me” seems rather implausible. In any event, the current reading in Ether 3:22 can’t reasonably refer to the brother of Jared’s death, nor figuratively to when he “comes unto Christ” (that is, when he accepts Christ), since he already has.

One wonders whether any other conjectural emendation might work better here, perhaps a change of a single word or a change that we could find evidence for in the history of the text. Until such an emendation is found, it is probably safest to retain the earliest reading here in Ether 3:22. Perhaps there is some other way to interpret the reading as it currently stands.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 3:22 the repeated *shall*, the reading of the earliest text; also retain the difficult subordinate clause “and behold when ye shall come unto me”; thus far no plausible reading or emendation has presented itself that would make sense out of this clause.

■ Ether 3:24

*wherefore I will cause in [mine 1ABCGHKPS | my DEFIJLMNOQRT] own due time
that these stones shall magnify to the eyes of men these things which ye shall write*

As discussed under Omni 1:10, there have been a number of instances in the text where the archaic attributive use of *mine* has been replaced with *my*. Here in Ether 3:24, the 1841 British edition made the change from “in **mine** own due time” to “in **my** own due time”. The critical text will restore the earliest reading with *mine* in this passage.

■ Ether 3:25

*the Lord shewed unto the brother of Jared all the inhabitants of the earth which had been
and also [all 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] that would be*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the word *all* here in Ether 3:25; the resulting reading “and also that would be” sounds rather awkward. The 1892 RLDS edition nonetheless followed

the 1874 reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *all* (apparently by reference to \mathcal{P}). Earlier in the text we get a similar example of the usage here in Ether 3:25:

Mosiah 2:34–35

ye . . . also have been taught concerning the records
which contain the prophecies which hath been spoken by the holy prophets
even down to the time our father Lehi left Jerusalem
and also all that hath been spoken by our fathers until now

The critical text will retain the original reading in Ether 3:25 with the *all*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 3:25 the *all* before the relative clause “that would be” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ Ether 3:25–27

- (1) *and when **the Lord** had said these words*
- (2) [*the Lord* >js he 1 | *the Lord* A | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shewed unto the brother of Jared all the inhabitants of the earth which had been and also all that would be*
- (3) *and* [*the Lord* 1APS | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *withheld them not from his sight even unto the ends of the earth*
- (4) *for* [*the Lord* 1APS | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *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*
- (5) *therefore **the Lord** could not withhold any thing from him*
- (6) *for he knew that **the Lord** could shew him all things*
- (7) *and **the Lord** said unto him*
write these things and seal them up

In this long passage the original text had seven occurrences of the subject noun phrase *the Lord*. Since the second one occurred very close to the first one, Joseph Smith changed it to *he* in his editing for the 1837 edition (he also marked the change in \mathcal{P}). The two next occurrences of *the Lord* were also changed to *he* in the 1837 edition, yet these changes were not marked by Joseph in \mathcal{P} . But the final three cases of *the Lord* in this passage were left alone. In 1908 the RLDS text, in accord with Joseph’s actual editing in \mathcal{P} , restored *the Lord* in the two cases where the change was not marked in \mathcal{P} (namely, cases 3 and 4, as listed above).

Later in this last part of the text, Joseph Smith replaced another instance of *the Lord* with *he*; as before, the change was prompted by an immediately preceding instance of *the Lord*:

Ether 9:35

and it came to pass that
when they had humbled themselves sufficiently before **the Lord**
[*the Lord* 01A | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did send rain
upon the face of the earth

There are no other instances of this kind of editing in the text. In fact, there are numerous examples in the text of close occurrences of *the Lord* where there has been no editing of *the Lord* to *he*, as in the following examples:

2 Nephi 1:32

wherefore if ye shall keep the commandments of **the Lord**
the Lord hath consecrated this land for the security of thy seed
with the seed of my son

Alma 27:11

and it came to pass that Ammon went and inquired of **the Lord**
and **the Lord** said unto him . . .

The critical text will therefore maintain or restore, as the case may be, each original instance of *the Lord* here in Ether 3:25–27; the original *the Lord* will also be restored in Ether 9:35. (See under Alma 62:50 for a case where Oliver Cowdery momentarily replaced *the Lord* with *he* as he copied the text from \mathfrak{G} into \mathfrak{P} .)

We should also note here that in verse 25 of this passage we have another example of a *which* that refers to people but which has not been edited to *who* (namely, in the clause containing the second instance of *the Lord*): “all the inhabitants of the earth **which** had been and also all that would be”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith typically changed such instances of *which* to *who(m)*. For a general discussion of this, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Ether 3:25–27 the three instances of *the Lord* that were changed to *he* in the editing for the 1837 edition; also restore the similar instance in Ether 9:35; close repetition of the phrase *the Lord* can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

Ether 4

■ Ether 4:1

*and the Lord commanded the brother of Jared to go down out of the mount
from [the 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thy D] presence of the Lord*

Once more we have an example of neglect in the typesetting for the 1841 British edition. The phrase “from **thy** presence of the Lord” doesn’t make any sense. The 1849 LDS edition restored the obviously correct *the*. For another example of this same error in the 1841 edition, see under Mormon 4:6.

Summary: Maintain the definite article *the* before *presence* in Ether 4:1.

■ Ether 4:1

*and for this cause did king [Benjamin 1ABCDGHK | Mosiah EFIJLMNOQRT |
Benjamin [Mosiah?] P | Benjamin {Mosiah?} S] keep them*

As discussed under Mosiah 21:28, there are two passages in the text where editors have been inclined to replace the original name *Benjamin* with *Mosiah*. But it turns out that *Benjamin*, the difficult reading, is not only intended but correct. Here in Ether 4:1, Orson Pratt (the editor for the 1849 LDS edition) made the change to *Mosiah*. The 1908 and 1953 RLDS editions have been more cautious, keeping *Benjamin* but parenthetically inserting *Mosiah* along with a question mark. Here the critical text will restore the original *Benjamin*—and without any reference in the text itself to the alternative, *Mosiah*.

■ Ether 4:3

and now after that
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they have all dwindled in unbelief
[1D |, ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |; RT]
and there is none save it be the Lamanites
and they have rejected the gospel of Christ
[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
therefore I am commanded that I should hide them up again in the earth

Here the 1830 typesetter interpreted *after that* as a prepositional phrase (thus he placed a comma after the *that*). Using a semicolon, he also separated off the main clause at the end of the verse (“therefore I am commanded that I should hide them up again in the earth”). The editors for

the 1920 LDS edition further broke up the sentence by placing a semicolon after “they have all dwindled in unbelief”.

Within the larger passage, there are actually four instances of the subordinate conjunction *after*:

Ether 4:1–3

- and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men
- (1) until **after that** he should be lifted up upon the cross
and for this cause did king Benjamin keep them
that they should not come unto the world
 - (2) until **after** Christ should shew himself unto his people
 - (3) and **after** [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Christ truly had shewed himself
unto his people
he commanded that they should be made manifest
 - (4) and now **after that** they have all dwindled in unbelief
and there is none save it be the Lamanites
and they have rejected the gospel of Christ
therefore I am commanded that I should hide them up again in the earth

In this passage there has been some variety in how the *after* has been treated. In the editing for the 1837 edition, the original *that* was removed after the third instance of *after* (in verse 2), but not after the first instance (in verse 1). Interestingly, the second instance of *after* (at the end of verse 1) lacked the *that* in the earliest extant text, so there was no *that* there to be removed in the editing for the 1837 edition. Of course, the *that* after the fourth *after* was not deleted since the 1830 typesetter had placed a comma after the *that*.

Under Alma 5:5, I list four cases in the original text of actual prepositional *after that*. In all those cases, there is a clear notion of a sequence of contemporary events (‘X happens; and after that, Y happens’). But here at the beginning of Ether 4, there is no such attempt to delineate a sequence of contemporary events—in fact, several hundred years elapsed between the time Christ commanded that the record of the brother of Jared “should be made manifest” and the time Moroni hid up that record. Here at the beginning of Ether 4, Moroni is explaining that the words in the brother of Jared’s record were originally kept from the Nephites and Lamanites until the Savior visited them, but now that the descendants of these people have apostatized, Moroni has been commanded to hide up these words once more. This interpretation of the larger passage works much better than the current text with its comma after the *that* in verse 3.

It should also be noted that this interpretation of the fourth *after* as a subordinate conjunction leads to a striking structural parallelism between verses 2 and 3:

- | | |
|----|---|
| A | and after that Christ truly had shewed himself unto his people |
| B | he commanded that they [the words] should be made manifest |
| A' | and now after that they [his people] have all dwindled in unbelief . . . |
| B' | therefore I am commanded that I should hide them [the words] up again
in the earth |

This parallelism even extends to the pronominal references for the third person plural pronoun: in the A/A' parallel, *they* refers to ‘his people’; in the B/B' parallel, *they/them* refers to ‘the words of the brother of Jared’.

In the larger passage, the critical text will restore the original *that* after the third *after* and maintain the two other cases of *after that* (the first and fourth ones) while leaving the second one without any *that*. And in verse 3 the comma after the *that* and the two semicolons will be removed so that the fourth *after*-clause will be completed by the *therefore*-clause:

Ether 4:3 (revised accidentals)

And now after that they have all dwindled in unbelief
and there is none save it be the Lamanites
— and they have rejected the gospel of Christ—
therefore I am commanded that I should hide them up again in the earth.

Note that the independent clause preceding the final *therefore*-clause is treated parenthetically.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 4:3 the *that* that follows *after*, but remove the following comma since what we have here is a subordinate *after*-clause; also remove the two semicolons in this verse so that the *after*-clause will be completed by the *therefore*-clause; also restore the original instance of *after that* in verse 2.

■ Ether 4:3

and now after that they have [all 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] dwindled in unbelief . . .

Here the 1840 edition omitted the universal quantifier *all*, probably accidentally since there is no grammatical reason to delete it. Moreover, there are several other passages where *all* occurs in this same position:

2 Nephi 28:11	yea they have all gone out of the way
2 Nephi 28:14	they have all gone astray save it be a few
Alma 30:53	for they have all gone astray after an unknown God

For two examples in the 1840 edition where *all* was omitted after the helping verb *shall*, see under Helaman 14:7 and 3 Nephi 29:2. Here in Ether 4:3, the early RLDS textual tradition followed the 1840 reading, but in 1908 the original *all* was restored to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the *all* in Ether 4:3: “after that they have **all** dwindled in unbelief”.

■ Ether 4:4–5

*behold I have written upon these plates **the very things** which the brother of Jared saw
and there never [was 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQS | were ORT] **greater things** made manifest
than [that 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQS | those RT]
which [was 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQS | were RT] made manifest unto the brother of Jared
wherefore the Lord hath commanded me to write **them**
and I have wrote **them**
and he commanded me that I should seal **them** up*

This passage uses the plural at the beginning and the end to refer to what was revealed to the brother of Jared, but in the middle the original text uses the singular to refer to “**that** which **was**

made manifest unto the brother of Jared”. The 1920 LDS edition revised this relative clause to read in the plural (“**those** which **were** made manifest unto the brother of Jared”). Undoubtedly the plural works better in modern English, but the singular isn’t that jarring since the use of the plural *them* three times later in verse 5 can still be understood because of the plural *things* that occurs twice at the beginning of verse 4. The original text permitted such shifting in grammatical number within larger passages (see, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:21 regarding the number for the word *record* in the text).

For this passage here in Ether 4, the 1920 LDS edition (as well as the 1907 LDS edition) edited “there never **was** greater things made manifest” to “there never **were** greater things made manifest”, which is consistent with other editing in the text: namely, in standard English *there was* is supposed to be followed by singular noun phrases and *there were* by plural noun phrases. The critical text will, of course, restore the original singular usage in this existential clause as well as in the following relative clause (“**that** which **was** made manifest unto the brother of Jared”).

Summary: Restore in Ether 4:4–5 the shifting from plural to singular and back to plural in referring to what was revealed to the brother of Jared; such variation in grammatical number occurred fairly frequently in the original text.

■ Ether 4:9

*and at my command
the heavens are [opened 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | open HK]
and are shut*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the past participle *opened* with the adjectival *open*, probably accidentally. The correct *opened* was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition. One possible motivation for the error is that the following *shut* is ambiguous and can be interpreted either as a past participle or as an adjective. The correct interpretation is obviously the verbal one—that is, here both *opened* and *shut* are past participle forms occurring in a passive construction. For another case where the past participle *opened* was accidentally replaced by the adjectival *open*, see under 3 Nephi 14:7–8.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 4:9 the original reading that states that at the Lord’s command “the heavens are opened and are shut”, a verbal action.

■ Ether 4:9

*and at my word the earth shall shake
and at my command the inhabitants thereof shall pass away
even [so 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | D] as by fire*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the adverbial *so*, changing “even **so** as by fire” to “even as by fire”. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *so*. Either reading is theoretically possible. There isn’t much evidence for either reading elsewhere in the text. But there is one expanded

form of this phraseology in 1 Nephi 22:17, and it has the *so*: “even if it **so** be as by fire”. The critical text will follow the original reading here in Ether 4:9 (“even **so** as by fire”).

Summary: Maintain the *so* in Ether 4:9 (“even **so** as by fire”), the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 4:11

*but he that believeth these things which I have spoken
him will I visit with the manifestations of my Spirit
[1 |; ABCDEGHKPS |, FIJLMNOQRT]
and [he 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | κ] shall know and bear record*

Here in the 1892 RLDS edition, the subject pronoun *he* was accidentally omitted. In fact, this edition maintained the semicolon preceding the clause; that is, the 1892 text reads “of my Spirit; and shall know and bear record.” The pronoun was restored in the next RLDS edition (in 1908). The critical text will maintain the original *he* here. Without the *he*, the last predicate incorrectly reads as if the Lord himself “shall know and bear record”.

Summary: Maintain the subject pronoun *he* in the last clause of this passage (“and **he** shall know and bear record”).

■ Ether 4:18–19

*for he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved
but he that believeth not shall be damned
and signs shall follow them that believe in my name
and blessed is he that is found faithful unto my name at the last day
for [they >js he 1 | they A | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be lifted up
to dwell in the kingdom prepared for [them >js him 1 | them A | him BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
from the foundation of the world*

The original text in this passage switches several times between the singular and plural. Part of this variation was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. In the last part of the passage, he replaced the plural *they* and *them* with the singular *he* and *him*, in accord with the immediately preceding use of generic *he* (“and blessed is **he** that is found faithful unto my name at the last day”). Joseph probably made this change because the conjunction *for* connects the last part of this passage to that preceding sentence.

On the other hand, the use of the plural *them* at the end of verse 18 (“and signs shall follow **them**”) was not emended to *him*. One could argue that the *them* here is actually a mishearing for *him*, especially since *them* is pronounced /əm/ in casual speech (for discussion of this possibility, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19). Yet the phraseology here in Ether 4:18 paraphrases the language placed at the end of the Gospel of Mark (as well as the identical language in the last chapter of Mormon):

Mark 16:17	and these signs shall follow them that believe
Mormon 9:24	and these signs shall follow them that believe

Thus the *them* near the end of verse 18 is very likely correct.

Similarly, one can argue for the original plural *them* later in Ether 4:19. First of all, we have a corresponding King James passage that occurs in the plural, albeit with the second person plural *ye* and *you* rather than with the third person plural *they* and *them*:

Matthew 25:34

then shall the King say unto them on his right hand :
come **ye** blessed of my Father
inherit the kingdom prepared for **you**
from the foundation of the world

There is a similar passage earlier in the Book of Mormon text, and in that case we have third person plural pronouns:

2 Nephi 9:18

they shall inherit the kingdom of God
which was prepared for **them** from the foundation of the world
and **their** joy shall be full forever

Of course, the earliest textual sources support the use of the plural *they* and *them* in Ether 4:9, yet these parallel uses in Matthew 25 and 2 Nephi 9 provide further evidence that the plural forms are correct. Thus the critical text will restore the plural *they* and *them* in Ether 4:19.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 4:18 the plural *them* in “and signs shall follow **them** that believe in my name”, even though this clause is surrounded by the generic singular *he*; similarly, the original *they* and *them* in Ether 4:19 should be restored; in both verses, parallel language in the King James Bible and elsewhere in the Book of Mormon supports the plural usage.

Ether 5

■ Ether 5:4

*and in the mouth of three witnesses shall these things be established
and the testimony of three and this work
in the which shall be [shewed >% shewn 0 | shewn 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | shown JNOQRT] forth
the power of God and also his word
of which the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost beareth record—
and all this shall stand as a testimony against the world at the last day*

The original manuscript is extant for about half of this passage, and it shows that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *shewed* rather than the correct *shewn* in \mathcal{O} . Oliver erased the ending *-ed* and overwrote it with an *n*; the erasure shows that the correction in \mathcal{O} was immediate. The past-participial form *shewn* has been maintained here except for the expected change to the modern *shown* in LDS editions, beginning with the 1888 large-print edition.

For the verb *shew/show*, there has been some minor competition between the past participle ending in *-ed* and the one ending in *-n*, with the latter dominating. For some discussion, see under Helaman 15:3; also see under 1 Nephi 11:9 for some additional statistics. For a complete discussion and listing of every form of the verb *shew/show*, see under SHEW in volume 3. In choosing the past-participial ending (either *-ed* or *-n*) and the spelling for the vowel in this verb (either *ew* or *ow*), we follow in each case the evidence from the earliest textual sources. Thus here in Ether 5:4, the original manuscript (and apparently the original text) read *shewn*.

Summary: Restore in Ether 5:4 the past-participial verb form *shewn*, the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{O} .

■ Ether 5:4

*of which the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost
[beareth 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | bear RT] record*

Here the original verb form ends in the third person singular ending *-eth*. One could theoretically argue that this archaic inflectional ending shows that the subject noun phrase, “the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost”, is a singular. In other words, one could use the inflectional ending to support the claim that the subject in this relative clause represents a trinitarian unity of the Godhead. Such an argument, however, is not supported by usage elsewhere in the original text of the Book of Mormon. There we find numerous examples of verbs where the archaic third person

singular ending *-(e)th* occurs with plural subjects, as in the 1 Nephi preface: “Nephi’s brethren **rebelleth** against him” (original text). In that case, *rebelleth* was grammatically emended to the standard third person plural form *rebel* in the 1920 LDS edition, just as in that same edition the form *beareth* here in Ether 5:4 was grammatically emended to *bear*. Moreover, as explained under Mormon 7:7, there doesn’t appear to have been any theological motivation in the history of the Book of Mormon text for editing the grammatical number of the verb for the phrase “the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost”. In general, the critical text will restore the earliest instances of the third person singular ending *-(e)th*, even when the subject is plural.

Summary: Restore the third person singular form *beareth* in Ether 5:4 even though the subject is the plural “the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost”.

Ether 6

■ Ether 6:2

*and behold they did give light
unto the vessels [thereof 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]*

As explained under Alma 46:12, there are six instances of *thereof* in the original text that appear to have no referent. All these instances of *thereof* were removed from the LDS text in 1920, but the RLDS text has retained them. The critical text will restore all six of them (including this one in Ether 6:2) since they are clearly intended.

■ Ether 6:3

*and thus the Lord caused stones to shine in darkness
to give light unto men women and children
that they might [not 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > not K] cross
the great waters in darkness*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *not*. Later, either as an in-press change during the first printing or in preparation for a second printing, the *not* was restored to the text. The negative is obviously required here.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 6:3 the *not* that was omitted in the initial printing of the 1892 RLDS edition (at least in some of the copies).

■ Ether 6:4

- (1) *and it came to pass that [when 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | S]
they [had 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | S] prepared all manner of food
that thereby they might subsist upon the water
and also food for their flocks and herds
and whatsoever beast or animal or fowl that they should carry with them*
- (2) *and it came to pass that when they had done all these things
they got aboard of their vessels or barges
and set forth into the sea*

In the second half of this passage, the narrative starts over with a repetition. The earlier *when*-clause, under 1, is very long and is never completed, so basically Moroni starts over at the end of

his first *when*-clause and summarizes what he has just said, under 2 (“and it came to pass that when they had done all these things”). The LDS text has allowed this difficult construction to remain in the text, but the 1953 RLDS edition changed the first subordinate *when*-clause to a main clause by deleting the *when* (the past-perfect auxiliary *had* was also removed).

Elsewhere the original text allows for incomplete subordinate clauses. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the incomplete present-participial clause in Enos 1:1–2 (discussed under Enos 1:3). The critical text will maintain the original reading here in Ether 6:4.

Summary: Maintain the incomplete *when*-clause in Ether 6:4; although unacceptable in the writing style for modern English, such usage does occur in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ Ether 6:4

*they got [a board 1 | aboard ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of their vessels or barges
and set forth into the sea*

In modern English we do not expect the preposition *of* after *aboard*, but here in Ether 6:4 the *of* appears to be intentional. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word *aboard* appears to have been originally borrowed from the French *à bord*, and the *à* was interpreted as the equivalent of the English preposition *a* (which derives from the preposition *on*), thus leading to the expression “on board”. In the printer’s manuscript, the two-word spelling *a board* suggests that the word *board* could be treated as a separate noun, thus implying the need for the preposition *of*.

Again according to the OED (under section B of *aboard*), the prepositional use of *aboard* (referring to being in or on a ship) is equivalent to “on board of”. One could thus interpret the expression here in Ether 6:4 as the same as “they got **on board of** their vessels”, but of course in modern English we expect the *of* to be missing with *on board* as well as *aboard* (thus “they got **on board** their vessels or barges”). Even so, there is some evidence in the last three centuries (at least) for the expression “to get **aboard of** a ship”, as in the following examples from <www.google.com> and from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

George Colman (1783)

and with wit and valour took opportunity and means
to murder some officers, got **aboard of** an English ship,
and came safe to London . . .

James R. Compton (1887)

We then got **aboard of** a ship and sailed for Fortress Monroe, Virginia.

Keys Oral Histories (2007)

Anybody—when they’d say, “Wreck ashore”,
every boy and everybody in town that could get **aboard of** a ship
would go—go out to it—to the wreck.

The possibility remains, of course, that the *of* in the Book of Mormon expression “got aboard **of** their vessels” is an error in the printer’s manuscript (and perhaps even earlier in the original manuscript). Unfortunately, we have no other examples of *aboard* or *on board* in the Book of

Mormon, so it is difficult to decide here if an error has occurred. There is one occurrence of *aboard* in the King James Bible (“we went aboard”, in Acts 21:2), but in that case no noun phrase follows *aboard*. The most reasonable solution here in Ether 6:4 is to accept the unusual usage with the *of* rather than an emendation that cannot be directly supported by either usage or errors elsewhere in the text. The *of* presents an unexpected but possible reading and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 6:4 the difficult reading “they got **aboard of** their vessels”; the use of the *of* is unexpected here but appears to be intended.

■ Ether 6:5

*and it came to pass that the Lord God caused
that there should [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | be MQRT] a furious wind blow
upon the face of the waters towards the promised land*

As explained under Alma 46:13, the original text permits expressions of the form “there should <noun phrase> <infinitive verb>”. Here in Ether 6:5, the 1905 LDS edition added the *be* verb before the noun phrase (giving “there should **be** a furious wind blow”); this reading has persisted in the LDS text. The critical text will remove the intrusive *be*.

■ Ether 6:5

*and thus they were tossed
upon the [waves 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | wave H] of the sea
before the wind*

In the 1874 RLDS edition, the plural *waves* was replaced with the singular *wave*. The resulting phraseology, “upon the wave of the sea before the wind”, uses only singular noun forms and could be considered poetic. Nonetheless, the change was probably unintended; and the subsequent RLDS edition (in 1892) restored the original plural *waves*. Note that the following verse has the plural:

Ether 6:6

and it came to pass that they were many times buried in the depths of the sea
because of the mountain **waves** which broke upon them

In fact, there is no instance of the singular *wave* in the entire Book of Mormon, only *waves* (eight of them in all, including here in Ether 6:5).

Summary: Maintain the plural *waves* in Ether 6:5 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ Ether 6:12

*and they did land upon the **shore** of the promised land
and when they had set their feet upon the **shores** of the promised land
they bowed themselves down upon the face of the land*

Here we have a singular *shore* in the first clause but a plural *shores* in the immediately following subordinate *when*-clause. As explained under 1 Nephi 2:5, there is insufficient evidence to emend either of these instances of *shore(s)* to its opposite number. The critical text will maintain the variation in grammatical number for the phrase “upon the shore(s) of the promised land” here in Ether 6:12.

■ Ether 6:18

*they began **to** spread upon the face of the land
and [to 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | C] multiply
and **to** till the earth*

Here in the earliest text, the infinitival marker *to* is twice repeated (“and **to** multiply and **to** till the earth”). The 1840 edition accidentally omitted the *to* before the verb *multiply* (but left the *to* before the verb *till*). Subsequent editions have correctly ignored this 1840 omission. For additional examples where a repeated *to* has been omitted, see under 3 Nephi 4:23. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *to* before *multiply* here in Ether 6:18.

Summary: Maintain the multiple repetition of the infinitival *to* in Ether 6:18 (“they began to spread upon the face of the land and **to** multiply and **to** till the earth”), the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 6:20

*now the number of **the** sons and **the** daughters of the brother of Jared
were twenty and two souls
and the number of [the 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] sons and daughters of Jared
were twelve*

In the second part of this enumeration, the 1841 British edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* before *sons* (giving “the number of sons and daughters of Jared”), perhaps because there was no *the* before the following *daughters*. This resulting reading has been retained throughout the LDS textual tradition. The critical text, however, will restore the *the* before *sons* in this second part of the passage.

One might wonder if there isn’t some error in this passage, even in its earliest extant form, since in the first part we have “the number of **the** sons and **the** daughters” but in the second part “the number of **the** sons and daughters”. In other words, perhaps the *the* is missing before the second instance of *daughters* in this passage. However, when we consider other examples of this conjunctive expression in the earliest text, we find an unexpected systematic relationship: namely, when “sons and daughters” is followed by the actual name of the person, we get “the sons and daughters” (that is, without the repeated *the*), but when the following specification is a reference to the person but not his name, we get “the sons and **the** daughters” (that is, with the repeated *the*):

2 Nephi 4:3	the sons and the daughters of my first born
2 Nephi 4:9	the sons and the daughters of my second son
Ether 6:20	the sons and the daughters of the brother of Jared
2 Nephi 4:8	the sons and daughters of Laman
2 Nephi 4:8	the sons and daughters of Lemuel
2 Nephi 4:9	the sons and daughters of Laman
Ether 6:20	the sons and daughters of Jared

Although this systematic relationship could be accidental, it makes us pause before emending Ether 6:20 to read “**the** sons and daughters of the brother of Jared” or to read “the sons and **the** daughters of Jared”. The critical text will therefore maintain this systematic distinction, based in each case on the reading of the earliest text. (In 2 Nephi 4:3, the 1953 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated *the* before *daughters*. For all the other cases, the RLDS text has maintained the earliest reading.)

It should be noted that this restriction on usage is narrowly defined. If, for instance, this expression includes the word *fair* before *son*, then the definite article is never repeated before *daughter*, no matter what kind of postmodification follows; in other words, with the word *fair* the expression is always the invariant “the fair sons and daughters”:

3 Nephi 9:2	because of the slain of the fair sons and daughters of my people
Ether 13:17	neither the fair sons and daughters of Cohor
Ether 13:17	neither the fair sons and daughters of Corihor
Ether 13:17	none of the fair sons and daughters upon the face of the whole earth

Summary: Restore in Ether 6:20 the definite article *the* before *sons* (“the number of **the** sons and daughters of Jared”), but no *the* should be placed before the word *daughters* (in accord with the reading of the earliest text as well as usage elsewhere in the text).

■ Ether 6:21

they did [*desire* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *desired* 1] *of them*
the things which they would that they should do before they went down to their graves

The original manuscript is extant for the last part of the verb *desire*, which in \mathcal{O} has no past-tense *d* at the end of the word. This means that \mathcal{O} very likely read *did desire* (spacing between extant fragments of \mathcal{O} has room for the *did*). In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *did desired*. The 1830 compositor correctly guessed that this stood for *did desire* rather than *desired* alone. Interestingly, Oliver made a similar error in 1 Nephi 2:5, but in \mathcal{O} rather than in \mathcal{P} . There he wrote *did travel* in \mathcal{O} ; then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he corrected that to *did traveld* in \mathcal{O} . As explained under that passage, the original text appears to have read *did travel*, not *traveled*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 6:21 the apparent reading of the original manuscript, namely, “they **did** desire of them” (not “they **desired** of them”).

■ Ether 6:22–24

and it came to pass that the people desired of them
 that they should anoint one of their sons to be a king over them
 and now behold this was grievous unto them
 [but 01| But ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| And RT] the brother of Jared said unto them
 surely this thing leadeth into captivity
but Jared said unto his brother
 suffer them that they may have a king

The first *but* in this passage seems inappropriate since we don't expect the reversal in polarity implied by *but*; instead, we expect simply *and* (which is what the 1920 LDS edition emended the text to here in Ether 6:23). This desire of the people for a king was grievous, and therefore the brother of Jared told them that kingship would lead them into captivity. It is possible that the first *but* is an error caused by the following *but* (in verse 24: "but Jared said unto his brother"). Even so, there are examples in the original text of *but* being repeated within the same narrative (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 4:15–16).

Actually, what we have here in Ether 6:22–24 is a parenthetical clause, "and now behold this was grievous unto them"—that is, grievous unto Jared and his brother. (For discussion of the form *grievious* rather than the standard *grievous*, see under 1 Nephi 17:25.) The *but* of the following clause refers to the brother of Jared's reaction to the people's desire, not to his own grievousness. In other words, the text should be read as if it directly said "the people desired of them that they should anoint one of their sons to be a king over them **but** the brother of Jared said unto them". The solution, then, is to separate off the intervening parenthetical clause with dashes or parentheses:

Ether 6:22–24 (revised punctuation)

and it came to pass that the people desired of them
 that they should anoint one of their sons to be a king over them
 —and now behold this was grievous unto them—
 but the brother of Jared said unto them
 surely this thing leadeth into captivity
 but Jared said unto his brother
 suffer them that they may have a king

Under this interpretation, the sequence of two *but*'s is perfectly acceptable. The first one refers to the brother of Jared's attempt to reverse the people's desire, the second one to Jared's attempt to reverse his brother's opposition to the people's desire. Notice in particular that the *them* in the parenthetical clause ("this was grievous unto them") refers to the brother of Jared and to Jared, while the preceding and following instances of *them* refer to the people ("a king over them" and "the brother of Jared said unto them"). By separating off the parenthetical clause, we also avoid any possible confusion over the referents for the various instances of the pronoun *them*. Thus the critical text will restore the original *but* in this passage.

Summary: Restore the original *but* in Ether 6:23 since the purpose of this conjunction refers to the brother of Jared's attempt to reverse the people's desire; this interpretation works if the intervening clause "and now behold this was grievous unto them" is treated parenthetically.

■ Ether 6:25

and he commanded them

*that they should [not > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] constrain no man
to be their king*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote a multiple negative, "that they should **not** constrain **no** man to be their king". Almost immediately, Oliver crossed out the *not* (there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Although the original manuscript is not extant for this part of the clause, spacing between extant portions argues that there was no *not* in \mathcal{O} (unless it was supralinearly inserted).

As explained under Helaman 13:28, there are no clear examples in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery permanently created a multiple negative. In every case where the original text appears to have had a multiple negative, Oliver wrote it down in \mathcal{O} and copied it into \mathcal{P} without correction. Nor is there any sign of him editing out multiple negatives that were in the original text—unlike the 1830 typesetter, who sometimes did (see the examples listed under Helaman 13:28). Thus here in Ether 6:25, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} without the *not* (and in apparent agreement with the reading in \mathcal{O}).

Summary: Maintain in Ether 6:25 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : "that they should constrain no man to be their king"; spacing between extant fragments of \mathcal{O} argues that there was no *not* before *constrain* in \mathcal{O} .

■ Ether 6:27

and it came to pass that neither would the sons of Jared

even all save it were one

*and Orihah [he 0A | he >]s NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was anointed
to be king over the people*

Here the original text first gives the name of the son of Jared who accepted the kingship (namely, *Orihah*), then uses the subject pronoun *he* to state that "Orihah he was anointed to be king over the people". This kind of redundancy is found in earlier English as well as in ballads and in colloquial and dialectal speech today. The Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 3a for *he*, provides this example from Middle English:

Robert of Gloucester (1297)

þe kyng he sende aftur hem, and grauntede al þis.

'**the king he** sent after them and granted all this'

Since the redundancy of *Orihah he* was nonstandard in Joseph Smith's time, he removed the redundant *he* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore the original usage, despite its archaic (or dialectal) nature.

Although there are no other examples in the text precisely like this one, there are other cases where a name is immediately followed by the subject pronoun *he*. In the following examples, the redundant *he* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition; in these cases, the original *he* was the subject of a present participial clause:

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

Alma 2:30

and it came to pass that
Alma he being a man of God
being exercised with much faith
and he cried saying . . .

Helaman 1:16

now Tubaloth supposing that
Coriantumr he being a mighty man
could stand against the Nephites . . .

See under each of these passages for further discussion regarding Joseph Smith's editing out of the redundant *he*; also see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the expression *Orihah he* could also be viewed as a Hebraism, namely, the nominative absolute. Examples of this Hebraism can be found in the King James Bible, for instance in Deuteronomy 31:8: “and **the LORD he** *it is* that doth go before thee”. Calabro gives a more literal translation for the Hebrew as “and **Yahweh he** [is] the one going before thee”. Calabro also notes that this Hebrew construction is very relevant to the passage here in Ether 6:27 where the subject *Orihah* is “singled out and contrasted with other possible or actual alternatives”, which is how Waltke and O'Connor characterize the purpose of the nominative absolute. Or as Calabro puts it, “*Orihah* is singled out from his brothers and cousins as the one who is anointed as king”. For further discussion of this Hebraism, see pages 297–298 (section 16.3.3c) as well as pages 131–132 (section 8.4.1b) in Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990).

Summary: Restore in Ether 6:27 the redundant pronoun *he* after *Orihah*, the reading of the earliest text; such usage was prevalent in earlier English and continues in colloquial and dialectal English to this day; the usage may also be considered an instance of the Hebraistic nominative absolute.

Ether 7

■ Ether 7:5

*and when [he 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | we DEF] had gathered together an army
he came up unto the land of Moron where the king dwelt*

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition set *we* rather than the correct *he*. There is nothing written in the first person for the larger passage that could have prompted this typo. Don Brugger suggests (personal communication) that the *w* of the immediately preceding *when* could have influenced the typo. Of course, the error does represent the general carelessness in the 1841 typesetting. What is even more surprising here is that both the 1849 and 1852 LDS editions continued with this egregious typo. Finally, in 1879 the error was corrected in the LDS text. The 1841 typesetter made the same typo in Jacob 3:1, but there the subsequent 1849 LDS edition did not copy it (see under that passage).

Summary: Maintain the pronoun *he* in Ether 7:5.

■ Ether 7:8

*and Shule waxed strong and became mighty as to the strength of a man
and [he 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] was also mighty in judgment*

The 1840 edition omitted the pronoun *he* here in Ether 7:8. One could argue that this deletion was intentional since in the immediately preceding text there is no explicit subject for the conjoined predicate (“and became mighty as to the strength of a man”). However, the *also* that occurs here in the final clause (“and he was **also** mighty in judgment”) separates that clause from the preceding clause with its pair of conjoined predicates (“and Shule waxed strong and became mighty as to the strength of a man”). Also note how that pair of conjoined predicates refers to Shule’s physical strength, but the final clause refers to his ability to judge.

Similar constructions are found elsewhere in the book of Ether:

Ether 10:16

and he did live to a good old age and begat sons and daughters
and **he also** begat Corom whom he anointed king in his stead

Ether 10:29

and it came to pass that Lib did live many years and begat sons and daughters
and **he also** begat Hearthom

In these two examples, the *also* separates the final clause from the initial clause with its pair of conjoined predicates. Thus the occurrence of “and he also” in Ether 7:8 is perfectly fine. The omission of *he* in the 1840 edition was probably a typo rather than the result of intentional editing.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 7:8 the original subject pronoun *he* in “and **he** was also mighty in judgment”; the *also* separates that final clause from the initial clause with its pair of conjoined predicates.

■ Ether 7:9

and he did molten out of the hill

and [made 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | make HK] swords out of steel

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the past-tense *made* with the infinitive verb form *make*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *made*. Either reading is theoretically possible here, so we follow the earliest reading (“and **made** swords out of steel”).

One wonders here if the direct object for the verb *molten* might be missing. Elsewhere in the text, this verb always takes an explicit direct object:

1 Nephi 17:9	whither shall I go that I may find ore to molten
1 Nephi 17:16	I did make tools of the ore which I did molten out of the rock
Ether 3:1	the brother of Jared . . . did molten out of a rock sixteen small stones
Ether 3:3	but behold these things which I have molten out of the rock

One possibility here in Ether 7:9 is that the original text read “and he did molten **ore** out of the hill”. The visual similarity between *ore* and *out* may have led to the accidental omission of *ore* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The visual similarity between the two words is increased if *ore* was spelled as *oar* in \mathcal{O} in this sentence. Elsewhere in the manuscripts, we get the following statistics for Oliver’s spellings of *ore* (I also list here the statistics for the plural *ores*, which Oliver never misspelled as *oars* in the Book of Mormon manuscripts):

	\mathcal{O}	\mathcal{P}
<i>ore</i>	4	6
<i>ores</i>	1	2
<i>oar</i>	1	5
<i>oars</i>	0	0

In fact, since Oliver Cowdery’s *a*’s often looked like *u*’s (see under Mormon 6:2), an instance of *oar* in \mathcal{O} might look more like *our*, thus almost identical to *out*, thereby allowing for the accidental loss of *oar* (that is, *ore*) before *out*.

Of course, another possibility here in Ether 7:8 is that the direct object has been left unstated since one knows it would have been ore or metal that would have been molten. There are, for instance, a number of other verbs in the Book of Mormon where the direct object is left unspecified, as in the following examples that are discussed under each of their respective passages:

1 Nephi 1:11 (no specified direct object for *read*)
 and the first came and stood before my father
 and gave unto him a book and bade him
 that he should [NULL >+ read it >% read 1 | read ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 8:21 (no specified direct object for transitive *sat*)
 and he brought forth bread and meat
 and [*sat* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *set* RT] before Alma

3 Nephi 18:3 (no specified direct object for *brake*, *gave*, or *eat*)
 he took of the bread and **brake** and blessed it
 and he **gave** unto the disciples and commanded that they should **eat**

To be sure, “he did molten out of the hill” sounds strange, but that may simply be because we are not familiar with the verb *molten* (see the discussion under Ether 3:1). Yet since it is possible for the direct object to be lacking for the verb *molten*, the critical text will retain the earliest text here in Ether 7:8 without any explicit direct object for this verb.

Summary: Retain the lack of a direct object for the transitive verb *molten* in Ether 7:8; the direct object can be left unstated here since the reader would automatically know that it would have been ore or metal.

■ Ether 7:9

*and he did molten out of the hill and made swords out of steel
 for those which he had [drew 1A | drawn BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] away with him*

This is the only place in the text where the past-participial form for the verb *draw* is *drew* (rather than the standard *drawn*). Elsewhere in the text, there are five instances of past-participial *drawn*. (For the verb *withdraw*, there are two instances of the standard *withdrawn* but none of past-participial *withdrew*.)

This nonstandard use of the simple past-tense form *drew* for the past participle was corrected in the editing for the 1837 edition (although not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{D}). The original text has numerous examples of this kind of dialectal usage. For a complete discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. The critical text will restore the original *drew* here in Ether 7:9.

Summary: Restore in Ether 7:9 the instance of *drew* for the past participle of the verb *draw* since this is how the earliest text reads for this passage.

■ Ether 7:13

*and Corihor repented of the [NULL > many 1 | many ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] evils
 which he had done*

Here in Ether 7:13 Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the indefinite quantifier *many* in \mathcal{D} . \mathcal{C} is not extant here, but it seems reasonable that *many* was in \mathcal{C} since either reading, with or without the *many*, is possible. In addition, the ink level for the supralinearly inserted *many* is unchanged, which implies that the correction in \mathcal{D} was virtually immediate. For two other examples where *many* was omitted in the text (one is conjectured), see under 3 Nephi 21:9. Here in Ether 7:13 the critical text will follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} .

Elsewhere the text does not use *many* when referring to people repenting (or not repenting) of their sins, iniquities, or evil doings. There are 40 instances of “repent of one’s sins, iniquities,

or evil doings”; there are also 7 instances of “repent of **all** one’s sins or iniquities” (that is, with the universal quantifier *all*). But only here in Ether 7:13 do we have an instance where this expression has *many*. The unexpectedness of the *many* is probably the reason why Oliver Cowdery omitted it initially here.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 7:13 the occurrence of *many*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have added *many* here unless it was in \mathcal{O} .

■ Ether 7:15

*and it came to pass that
Noah rebelled against Shule the king
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and also his father Corihor
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and drew away Cohor his brother
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and also all his brethren and many of the people*

The text here is ambiguous. We cannot tell if Noah rebelled against his father Corihor or if Corihor joined Noah in his rebellion. The latter interpretation is possible since the Book of Mormon text allows a conjoined subject to be delayed, 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
and also was Lemuel for he hearkened unto the words of Laman

This example from 1 Nephi has caused some difficulty (as explained under 1 Nephi 3:28). The correct reading is that Laman was angry with both Nephi and Lehi, especially since “and also with my father” is conjoined to the preceding “with me”. On the other hand, “and also was Lemuel” is conjoined to the subject noun *Laman* and means that Lemuel too was angry with Nephi and Lehi. (For further discussion of this construction, including a long list of examples, see the topic “delayed conjoined subject” under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.)

The larger passage for Ether 7:15 suggests that Noah rebelled against both Shule and his father Corihor. Although earlier Corihor had been wicked, verse 13 explains that he repented:

Ether 7:13
and Corihor repented of the many evils which he had done
wherefore Shule gave him power in his kingdom

Of course, Corihor could have joined his son Noah in the rebellion, but there is no further mention of Corihor in the narrative, which argues that Corihor remained loyal to Shule. The critical text will assume that Noah rebelled against his father Corihor as well as against king Shule.

The current punctuation, with commas around the phrase “and also his father Corihor”, does not resolve the ambiguity in any way. The critical text will remove these commas in order to facilitate the more probable interpretation. We should note that the last part of this verse also

ends with two conjoined noun phrases that identify others who joined Noah's brother Cohor in the rebellion. Once more there is an unnecessary comma after "Cohor his brother" that will be removed in the critical text. Thus the accidentals for the verse will read as follows:

Ether 7:15

And it came to pass that
Noah rebelled against Shule the king and also his father Corihor
and drew away Cohor his brother
and also all his brethren and many of the people.

Summary: Remove the confusing commas in Ether 7:15 so that the reader can more easily determine that Noah's rebellion was against both Shule and Corihor.

■ Ether 7:22–23

wherefore Shule did bestow great favors upon him
[*inthewhich* o | *in the which* >js and 1 | *in the which* A | and BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he did do in the kingdom of Shule according to his desires
and also in the reign of Shule there came prophets among the people
which were sent from the Lord
prophesying that the wickedness and idolatry of the people
was bringing a curse upon the land
[*inthewhich* o | *inthewhich* >js and 1 | *in the which* A | and BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they should be destroyed if they did not repent

In this passage we have two instances of original "in the which" that Joseph Smith emended to *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Normally, Joseph emended "in the which" by simply omitting the definite article *the*. But sometimes in the book of Ether his changes were a little more substantial. The critical text will, of course, restore the two original instances of "in the which" here in Ether 7:22–23. Joseph edited nearly half the original occurrences of this phrase—and most of the edited ones were in the book of Ether. For a brief discussion of this editing, see under 1 Nephi 3:2; also see the addendum for 1 Nephi 3:2 at the end of this part of volume 4. For a complete listing of all the original instances of this phrase in the text and which ones were edited (and to what), see under IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original two instances of "in the which" in Ether 7:22–23; this phrase was quite common in the original text.

Ether 8

■ Ether 8:2

he did flatter [much >]s many 1 | much A | many BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

As discussed under Enos 1:21, the original text had quite a few examples of “much <plural count noun>” (such as “much afflictions” in 1 Nephi 16:35 and “much horses” in Enos 1:21). Here in Ether 8:2, Joseph Smith changed *much* to *many* in his editing for the 1837 edition; the critical text will restore the original *much*.

Summary: Restore in Ether 8:2 the original use of *much* with the plural *people*; this kind of usage was fairly common in the original text.

■ Ether 8:3

*and when he had gained the half of the kingdom
he gave battle unto his father
and he did carry away his father into captivity
and did make [them 1A | him BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] serve in captivity*

Here we have a good example of where Oliver Cowdery misheard *him* as *them* while taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation (although the original manuscript is not extant here). The 1837 edition corrected the text to the expected singular pronoun *him*. The reason for the misunderstanding is the identical pronunciation of pronouns *him* and *them* in casual speech (both are pronounced as /əɪm/). For other examples of mix-ups between these two pronoun forms, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19.

The use of *him* here in Ether 8:3 is supported by other cases in the book of Ether where the text refers to single individuals as “serving in captivity”:

Ether 10:15	Levi did serve in captivity
Ether 10:30	and he [Hearthom] served many years in captivity

Summary: The correct reading in Ether 8:3, according to the context, is “did make **him** serve in captivity”; *him* was misinterpreted as *them* by Oliver Cowdery when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation, but the 1837 edition corrected the *them* to *him* (which is what the context requires).

■ **Ether 8:8**

*now the daughter of Jared being exceeding expert
and seeing the [sorrow 1PS | sorrows ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of her father
thought to devise a plan whereby she could redeem the kingdom unto her father*

The printer’s manuscript has the singular *sorrow* here in Ether 8:8. The 1830 typesetter accidentally copied it as the plural *sorrows*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the singular (in accord with the reading in \mathcal{P}). Although the text contains examples of both the singular and plural for this word, the singular seems correct here because the following verse again refers to the father’s *sorrow*: “whereby hath my father so much **sorrow**” (Ether 8:9). There are also other instances in the text of “sorrow of NP” (but none of “sorrows of NP”), where NP is a noun phrase:

Helaman 6:33	to the great sorrow and lamentation of the righteous
Helaman 7:14	because of the exceeding sorrow of my heart

The critical text will restore the singular *sorrow* here in verse 8.

Summary: Restore the singular *sorrow* in Ether 8:8 since it is the reading of the earliest extant text; it is also supported by the singular *sorrow* in the next verse.

■ **Ether 8:10**

*wherefore if he shall desire of thee that ye shall give
[unto him me 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | me unto him o] to wife
then shall ye say: I will give her
if ye will bring unto me the head of my father the king*

The word order “ye shall give **unto him me** to wife” in Ether 8:10 is difficult, which is probably why the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition made the change to the normal word order (“ye shall give **me unto him** to wife”). The 1907 change may have been unintentional. We note that the normal order with *unto* immediately following the direct object is found in the next verse: “give **her unto me** to wife” (Ether 8:11). The critical text will maintain the difficult original word order in verse 10 since it is the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript. The 1907 edition never served as a copytext (which is not surprising since it is a vest-pocket edition); no subsequent LDS edition has ever followed the easier reading of that edition for Ether 8:10.

Summary: Maintain the difficult but original word order in Ether 8:10: “ye shall give **unto him me** to wife” (the reading of all the early textual sources).

■ **Ether 8:11**

and now [Omer 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | Homer E] was a friend to Akish

Here the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition accidentally set *Homer* in place of the correct *Omer*. The correct name was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (in 1852). The name *Homer* would have been known to the typesetter, but not *Omer*, which explains the error. Elsewhere in the book of Ether, 14 instances of *Omer* were maintained without change in the 1849 edition.

Summary: Maintain the name *Omer* in Ether 8:11 and elsewhere in the book of Ether.

■ Ether 8:11

the daughter of Jared danced before him
 [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | *and* s] *she pleased him*

The subordinate conjunction *that* here in Ether 8:11 means ‘with the result that’. Even so, its use here seems strange to modern English speakers. This probably explains the change of *that* to *and* in the 1953 RLDS edition. For other cases where the resultive *that* has been replaced with *and* in the text, see the list under 1 Nephi 11:29.

In this context, modern English speakers expect *so that* (which is fairly frequent in the Book of Mormon text). It is possible that *so* was accidentally dropped from the text here in Ether 8:11. For an example where *so* was omitted early in the transmission of the text, see under 1 Nephi 15:20; yet there are no examples where *so that* has been reduced to simply *that*. Ultimately, there is nothing incorrect about the resultive *that* in the Book of Mormon text; wherever it is supported by the earliest text, the critical text will either maintain or restore it (as the case may be).

Summary: Maintain in Ether 8:11 the use of the resultive *that* (which means ‘with the result that’); such usage is found quite frequently in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Ether 8:13

Akish gathered in unto the house of Jared
 all his [*kindsfolks* 1 | *kinsfolks* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *kinsfolk* RT]

As discussed under Alma 10:11, the original text had three instances of *kindsfolks*; each of these was emended to the more expected *kinsfolk* in the 1920 LDS edition. The critical text will restore the original *kindsfolks* in all three cases.

■ Ether 8:14

and it came to pass that they all [*swear* 01DEFHIJKLMNOPS | *sware* ABCGRT] *unto him*

In the *that*-clause for this sentence, both manuscripts have the present-tense *swear*, but the sentence as a whole is clearly in the past tense. Thus the correct reading is the past-tense homophone *sware*. The 1830 compositor correctly set *sware*, but there has been a tendency in the textual history to revert to the incorrect *swear* (in the 1841 British edition and in the 1874 RLDS edition), perhaps because the preceding verse uses *swear*: “will ye **swear** unto me that ye will be faithful unto me in the thing which I shall desire of you” (Ether 8:13). The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *sware* here in verse 14, but the RLDS text has retained the reading in \mathfrak{P} , *swear*. The critical text will, of course, accept the past-tense *sware*. See under Enos 1:14 for further discussion of the competition between *swear* and *sware* (as well as *swore*) in the history of the text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 8:14 the past-tense form *sware* since the context here requires the past tense.

■ Ether 8:17

wherefore Akish administered it
unto his [*kindreds* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *kindred* RT] and friends

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced a nonstandard plural *kindreds* with the standard *kindred*. (We see a similar kind of editing in verse 13, where the 1920 edition changed the plural *kinsfolks* to the standard *kinsfolk*.) For a general discussion of the competition between *kindreds* and *kindred* in the text, see under Alma 10:4. There is also evidence that the 1830 typesetter was prone to change *kindreds* to *kindred*, especially in 3 Nephi (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 10:2). Here in Ether 8:17, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, namely, the plural *kindreds* (the reading in \mathcal{P} as well as in all the early editions).

Summary: Restore the plural form *kindreds* in Ether 8:17, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 8:18

and it came to pass that they formed a secret combination even as they of old
which combination is [*a* >js NULL 1 | *a* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT]
most abominable and wicked above all in the sight of God

The *a* that occurs before *most* in the earliest textual source for Ether 8:18 (the printer's manuscript) was also probably in the original manuscript (there is room for it in the lacuna between extant fragments). This *a* was, however, probably an error; perhaps Oliver Cowdery expected to write a noun as the subject complement for *combination* (something like "which combination is **a** most abominable and wicked one"). Or he may have been influenced by the occurrence of *a* in the preceding "they formed **a** secret combination". Ultimately, what seems to have happened is that Oliver never crossed out the intrusive *a* in \mathcal{O} , even though he might have intended to.

Elsewhere in the text there are no examples of "most wicked", but there are several of "most abominable". Yet this adjective phrase occurs only as a subject complement (that is, in the predicative position), never in the attributive position premodifying a head noun. And in each case of "most abominable", the following text involves a statement saying that something is "(the) most abominable" with respect to all (other) relevant possibilities:

1 Nephi 13:5

behold the formation of a church
which is **most abominable** above all other churches

1 Nephi 13:26

thou seest the formation of that great and abominable church
which is [*the* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT] **most abominable**
of all other churches

Alma 39:5

these things are an abomination in the sight of the Lord
yea **most abominable** above all sins
save it be the shedding of innocent blood or denying the Holy Ghost

The second instance (in 1 Nephi 13:26), with its definite article *the*, involves ellipsis of its noun, as if the text read “which is the most abominable **church** of all other churches”. In any event, the occurrence of the indefinite article *a* in “a most abominable and wicked above all”, the earliest text for Ether 8:18, seems impossible. Thus Joseph Smith’s removal of the intrusive *a* in Ether 8:18 was most likely correct, and the critical text will accept his emendation as the original reading for this passage. (For an example where the indefinite article *an* was incorrectly inserted before the noun *abomination*, see under Jacob 2:28.)

Summary: Accept in Ether 8:18 Joseph Smith’s 1837 emendation that removed the intrusive *a* before *most abominable*; Oliver Cowdery apparently miswrote “a most abominable” in \mathcal{C} , which was then copied into \mathcal{P} and into the 1830 edition.

■ Ether 8:20

*and now I Moroni do not write the manner of their oaths and combinations
for it [hath 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | had N] been made known unto me
that they are had among all people
and they are had among the Lamanites*

Here in the 1906 LDS edition, the present-tense *hath* was replaced by the past-tense *had*, apparently because of the two correct occurrences of *had* in the subsequent text. The 1906 edition never served as a copytext; thus this error was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition. Elsewhere, when the narrator refers to something as having been revealed unto him, we get the present-tense form of the perfect auxiliary:

Alma 11:31	an angel hath made them known unto me
Alma 36:5	but God hath by the mouth of his holy angel made these things known unto me
Alma 40:11	behold it hath been made known unto me by an angel that . . .
Helaman 7:29	because the Lord God hath made them known unto me

Interestingly, in the first case (in Alma 11:31) the original *hath* was replaced by *had* in the 1874 RLDS edition, just like here in Ether 8:20 for the 1906 LDS edition. The critical text will, to be sure, follow the present-tense form of the perfect auxiliary in all these cases.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 8:20 the present-tense *hath* in “it hath been made known unto me”, the earliest reading.

■ Ether 8:22

*for the Lord will not suffer that the blood of his saints which shall be shed by them
shall always cry unto him from the ground for vengeance upon them
and yet he [avengeth 1A | avenge BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them not*

Here the 1837 edition changed *avengeth* to *avenge*, which may very well be due to conscious editing (although the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P}). What we have here is the replacement

of the indicative *avengeth* with the subjunctive *avenge*. Elsewhere in the text, there is another example of the subjunctive in a similar context:

Mormon 9:19
 and if there was miracles wrought
 then why has God ceased to be a God of miracles
 and yet **be** an unchangeable Being

Nonetheless, there are other cases, also in hypothetical contexts, where the original Book of Mormon text has the indicative but later editing by Joseph Smith has replaced the indicative with the subjunctive:

Alma 27:7
 and if he [*sayeth* >js *say* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *said* S]
 unto us . . .

Helaman 12:18
 and behold if a man [*hideth* >js *hide* 1 | *hideth* A |
hide BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up a treasure in the earth . . .

3 Nephi 18:31
 but if he [*repenteth* >js *repent* 1 | *repenteth* A |
repent BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not . . .

(Also see under Helaman 12:13–14, 16–18 for four cases where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, replaced the indicative “if he saith” with the subjunctive “if he say”.) These examples involving *if*-clauses suggest that Joseph was also responsible for the 1837 change here in Ether 8:22.

One semantic consideration with respect to Ether 8:22 is that the indicative *avengeth* sounds like God will never avenge his saints, whereas the subjunctive *avenge* makes sure that the reader realizes that the statement in the *yet*-clause is hypothetical. A similar hypothetical sense is maintained in the other subjunctive example listed above, in Mormon 9:19.

David Calabro (personal communication) notes that the *-eth* could have been accidentally added by Oliver Cowdery during the dictation of the text since it would have been difficult to hear the difference between *avenge* and *avengeth* in the environment of the following *them*. Note that *them* begins with a voiced interdental fricative while the *-eth* inflectional suffix ends in a voiceless interdental fricative. Thus the main perceptual clue to the difference would have been an extra schwa sound in *avengeth them* when compared with *avenge them*.

Ultimately, we have to recognize that the indicative *avengeth* is possible here in Ether 8:22 since we have cases in the Book of Mormon text of both indicative and subjunctive forms in hypothetical clauses. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading, the indicative *avengeth*, here in Ether 8:22.

Summary: Restore in Ether 8:22 the original indicative form *avengeth* in this hypothetical clause, despite the expectation of the subjunctive.

■ Ether 8:24

wherefore the Lord commandeth you

[1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* D] *when ye shall see these things come among you*
that *ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation*

The 1841 British edition added the subordinate conjunction *that* after “the Lord commandeth you”, thus creating a repeated *that* for this sentence: “the Lord commandeth you **that** when ye shall see these things come among you **that** ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation”. This intrusive *that* was removed in the subsequent 1849 LDS edition. As explained under 1 Nephi 10:2–3, the original text had quite a few examples of the repeated *that*, but it had many more examples without it (for a complete discussion of the repeated *that*, see under THAT in volume 3).

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb is *command*, the subordinate conjunction *that* always precedes the finite-clause complement for that verb (127 times in the original text). And in actuality, here in Ether 8:24 we have the *that*, but it occurs after the intervening *when*-clause: “the Lord commandeth you . . . **that** ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation”. Thus there is always a *that*, even if there is an intervening clause that delays the *that*-clause. Also see under Helaman 6:38 for another case (in the 1840 edition), but with a different verb, where an extra subordinate *that* was inserted, leading to another secondary instance of the repeated *that*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 8:24 the single occurrence of the *that* right before the finite clause that complements the verb *command* (namely, after the intervening *when*-clause).

■ Ether 8:24

wherefore the Lord commandeth you

when ye shall see these things come among you

that ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation

because of this secret combination which shall be among you

or *woe be unto it*

because of the blood of them which have been slain

for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon it

and also upon those who build it up

Paul Huntzinger (personal communication, 30 July 2004) suggests that the conjunction *or* in Ether 8:24 is a mistake for *for*. The passage does not state any condition that would prevent the condemnation of this secret combination for its murders. Elsewhere the text has examples of the expected *for woe* but none of *or woe*:

2 Nephi 25:14	for woe unto them that fight against God and the people of his church
3 Nephi 18:33	for woe unto him whom the Father condemneth

Conditional instances of *woe*-statements can be found in the text, but the condition is always explicitly stated:

1 Nephi 14:6	woe be unto the Gentiles if it so be that they harden their hearts
Alma 33:22	if so / woe shall come upon you
Helaman 7:22	and for this cause woe shall come unto you except ye shall repent

Helaman 15:3	yea woe unto this people . . . except they shall repent
3 Nephi 9:2	woe unto the inhabitants of the whole earth except they shall repent
3 Nephi 21:14	yea woe be unto the Gentiles except they repent
Moroni 7:37	if these things have ceased / woe be unto the children of men
Moroni 10:25	and woe be unto the children of men if this be the case

The only conditional aspect here in Ether 8:24 is whether the Gentiles will resist the secret combination in their midst. But the *woe*-statement appears to apply to the secret combination itself (“woe be unto **it**”), not to the Gentiles as a whole unless the *it* refers to the Gentile nation, yet we have to go all the way back to verse 22 to get such a referent—and a generic one at that (“and whatsoever **nation** shall uphold such secret combinations”). Also note that the singular pronoun *it* is twice repeated later on in verse 24, and for those two instances of *it* the referent is definitely the secret combination itself, not the nation that supports it: “woe be unto it because of the blood of them which have been slain / for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon **it** and also upon those who build **it** up”. Further, other passages in the Book of Mormon declare that those who belong to secret combinations must repent or they will be destroyed, as in the following passage where Alma is speaking to Helaman concerning the Jaredite secret combinations (at the end, Alma extends his warning to all who belong to such combinations but allows for their repentance):

Alma 37:30–31

for behold they murdered all the prophets of the Lord
 which came among them to declare unto them concerning their iniquities
 and the blood of those which they murdered did cry unto the Lord their God
 for vengeance upon those which were their murderers
 and thus the judgments of God did come upon them workers of darkness
 and secret combinations
 yea and cursed be the land forever and ever unto those workers of darkness
 and secret combinations
 even unto destruction except they repent before they are fully ripe

In Ether 8:24, Moroni declares a woe upon this future secret combination that will exist among the Gentiles, although there is no condition of repentance mentioned. The real danger, of course, is that the evil of the secret combination will spread to the entire nation and bring down the whole nation, as Mormon himself explains in referring to Alma’s earlier warning:

Helaman 6:25

now behold it is these secret oaths and covenants
 which Alma commanded his son should not go forth unto the world
 lest they should be a means of bringing down the people unto destruction

According to Mormon, this is precisely what happened to the Jaredites, who had allowed these secret combinations, under the influence of Satan, to spread throughout the land:

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

Thus here in Ether 8:24, not only will the secret combination itself be destroyed but the nation that supports it. Moroni rightly warns the Gentiles to “awake to a sense of your awful situation”. The woe is proclaimed against the secret combination, but it is extended to the entire Gentile nation. Yet ultimately the woe is specifically directed against the secret combination; thus *for* works much better as a connector in Ether 8:24 than *or*.

The original manuscript is not extant in Ether 8:24. If an error occurred, it may have been in \mathcal{C} since Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in \mathcal{C} for this part of the text, could have misheard *for* as *or*. Or the *or* could have been an error introduced into the text when Oliver copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . There are three definite cases in the history of the text where *or* and *for* have been mixed up; one occurred in \mathcal{C} and another in \mathcal{P} (the third occurred in the 1841 British edition). For all three examples, see the list under Mormon 8:15. In the discussion there I consider the possibility (but reject it) that in Mormon 8:15 the *or* in the phrase “**or** the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord” is an error for *for*. But here in Ether 8:24, it seems that such an error did occur. The critical text will in this case accept the emendation *for* in place of the *or*.

Summary: Accept in Ether 8:24 the conjectural emendation of *or* to *for*, thus eliminating our expectation that the *woe*-clause should be conditional.

■ Ether 8:24–25

*for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon it
and also upon those who [build 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | built RT] it up
for it cometh to pass that whoso **buildeth** it up
seeketh to overthrow the freedom of all lands nations and countries*

Here the 1920 LDS edition changed the present-tense *build* to *built*. This change, however, was not marked in the 1920 committee copy, which suggests that this secondary *built* is a typo. This whole passage (as a future prediction of Moroni’s) is supposed to be in the present tense. Note, in particular, the present-tense *buildeth* in the very next clause: “for it cometh to pass that whoso **buildeth** it up . . .” (Ether 8:25). Perhaps the secondary past-tense *built* was influenced by the past-participial *built* that occurs later on in verse 25: “for it is **built** up by the devil”, even though that passive clause is in the present tense (“it **is** built up”). In any event, here in Ether 8:24 the critical text will restore the original present-tense *build*, the reading of the earliest text.

Summary: Restore the original present-tense *build* in Ether 8:24 since we expect the present tense throughout this passage, as exemplified by the present-tense *buildeth* in the following verse.

■ Ether 8:26

*that Satan may have no **power upon** the hearts of the children of men*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 22 September 2004) suggests two possible emendations for *power upon* here: either *hold upon* or *power over*. We will consider each of these in turn.

Elsewhere in the text we can find evidence for predicates similar to “have hold (up)on the hearts of X”:

Ether 8

Alma 8:9	now Satan had got great hold upon the hearts of the people
Alma 10:25	why hath Satan got such great hold upon your hearts
Alma 27:12	for Satan hath great hold on the hearts of the Amlicites
Helaman 6:30	according as he can get hold upon the hearts of the children of men
Helaman 6:31	he had got great hold upon the hearts of the Nephites
Helaman 7:15	that the devil hath got so great hold upon your hearts
Helaman 16:23	Satan did get great hold upon the hearts of the people
4 Nephi 1:28	and because of the power of Satan which did get hold upon their hearts

One problem with the proposed emendation of replacing *power* with *hold* is that the mix-up of these two distinct words seems rather unlikely (there are, for instance, no examples of such a mix-up in the history of the text). Another problem is that the other examples listed above show additional differences in word choice, either in the use of the verb *get* rather than *have* or in the occurrence of *great* before *hold*.

The possible mix-up of the prepositions *upon* and *over* seems more reasonable (although admittedly there are no examples of such mix-ups in the history of the Book of Mormon text). Elsewhere we can find examples of the expression “to have power **over** the hearts of X” (where X refers to people), and for these examples the similarity in word choice is closer to the language in Ether 8:26:

1 Nephi 22:15	Satan shall have no more power over the hearts of the children of men
1 Nephi 22:26	for he hath no power over the hearts of the people
2 Nephi 30:18	and Satan shall have power over the hearts of the children of men no more for a long time
Alma 48:17	yea the devil would never have no power over the hearts of the children of men
Ether 15:19	and Satan had full power over the hearts of the people

In addition, there are 43 more instances of “power over”. On the other hand, there are three instances of “power upon” that refer to the power of God coming upon someone, either negatively or positively:

Jacob 7:15	the power of the Lord came upon him insomuch that he fell to the earth
Jacob 7:21	the power of God came down upon them and they were overcome
Alma 14:25	the power of God was upon Alma and Amulek and they arose and stood upon their feet

There are two additional examples of “power upon” in the text, but these are fundamentally different from the case here in Ether 8:26 since they refer to having power in general:

Mosiah 13:34	have they not said that God himself should come down among the children of men and take upon him the form of man and go forth in mighty power upon the face of the earth
--------------	---

Alma 50:12

therefore they did seek to cut off the strength and the power of the Lamanites
from off the lands of their possessions
that they should have no **power upon** the lands of their possessions

The King James Bible has two examples of “power upon”, but they do not refer to having power over someone:

Luke 5:24 (compare with Mosiah 13:34)

but that ye may know
that the Son of Man hath **power upon** earth to forgive sins
he said unto the sick of the palsy
I say unto thee
arise and take up thy couch and go into thine house

2 Corinthians 12:9 (compare with Alma 14:25)

most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities
that the **power** of Christ may rest **upon** me

The King James Bible also has 17 instances that refer to “power over”.

So if an emendation is to be made here in Ether 8:26, the replacement of *upon* with *over* seems to be more reasonable than replacing *power* with *hold*. Ultimately the question is whether *upon* is impossible here in Ether 8:26. Based on internal evidence, *power over* is the expected reading, but the current reading *power upon* will work here in Ether 8:26, despite its uniqueness when compared with the rest of the Book of Mormon text. And as already noted, we have no textual evidence for mix-ups between *upon* and *over*. The critical text will therefore retain the current reading with the preposition *upon* even though there is a distinct possibility that this is an error for *over*.

Summary: Maintain the unexpected use of the preposition *upon* in Ether 8:26 (“that Satan may have no power **upon** the hearts of the children of men”); usage elsewhere in the text argues that *upon* is an error for *over*, but the earliest reading is not impossible.

Ether 9

■ Ether 9:2

*nevertheless the Lord was merciful unto Omer
and also to his sons and to his daughters
[which were not or >js who were not or >js NULL 1 |
which were not or A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which did not seek his destruction*

As noted under Alma 22:22–23, corrective *or*'s are frequently found in the Book of Mormon text. The one here in Ether 9:2 is apparently the only one that corrects an incomplete statement or a syntactic error, presumably one that occurred on the plates themselves (as with other corrective *or*'s in the text). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated the original *or*-correction by deleting “which were not or”, although initially he thought to keep it and simply replace the *which* with *who*. This is also the only corrective *or* that has been edited out of the text, perhaps because it involves a false start that was left incomplete. Otherwise the most difficult cases of corrective *or* have been retained in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following examples involving lexical choice:

Alma 24:19

and thus we see that they buried the weapons **of peace**
or they buried the weapons **of war for peace**

Alma 35:15

and having been **to declare** the word
or **sent to declare** the word among all the people in every city

These corrective *or*'s do not appear to represent corrections of errors introduced by Joseph Smith himself in his dictation, mainly because those kind of errors are directly corrected by the scribe in the manuscript. (For an example of such a direct correction, see the discussion under Alma 36:4.) The critical text will restore the original corrective *or* here in Ether 9:2, especially since all other corrective *or*'s in the text have been maintained.

One could argue that here in Ether 9:2 Joseph Smith initially dictated “which were not”, which was incorrect. In his attempt to correct his mistake, Joseph said *or*, then dictated the correct phraseology, “which did not seek his destruction”. Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in Ⓞ, did not recognize Joseph's extra *or* as an attempt to tell him, Oliver, to cross out the preceding “which were not”; thus Ⓞ ended up reading “which were not or which did not seek his destruction”. Ultimately, however, there is evidence from witnesses of the translation as well as corrections within Ⓞ itself that Oliver would have read the completed text back to Joseph before going on.

If so, this extracanonical *or* and the preceding “which were not” should have been crossed out in \mathcal{O} and never transmitted into \mathcal{P} . This issue of reading the text back will be fully discussed in volume 3 of the critical text. For some preliminary discussion, see pages 82–84 of Royal Skousen, “Translating the Book of Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript”, in *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1997), 61–93.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:2 the phrase “which were not or”; despite the awkwardness of the original text here (“which were not or which did not seek his destruction”), this reading appears to represent what Moroni originally engraved (and corrected) on the plates.

■ Ether 9:7

*therefore he shut him up in prison
and kept him upon [a 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] little or no food
until he had suffered death*

Here the 1837 edition deleted the indefinite article *a* before *little*, perhaps because without the *a* the phrase “little or no food” becomes fully negative. The negative *little* without the *a* means ‘not much’. There is one other example in the text of *a little* that refers to nourishment:

Moroni 9:8 and no water save **a little** do they give unto them

In this case, we expect the indefinite article because of the word *save*. The preceding negative “no water” is reversed by the positive *save*-phrase; thus the positive *a little* rather than the negative *little* is required.

It is possible that here in Ether 9:7 the original text actually represents another corrective *or*—that is, Moroni started to write “and kept him upon a little food” but then corrected *a little* by adding *or no*, thus giving “and kept him upon a little or no food”. In any event, there is nothing particularly difficult about “a little or no food”, although in modern English we expect “little or no food” without the *a* because of the negative context.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:7 the original *a* in the phrase “a little or no food”, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 9:8

*and now the brother of him that suffered death
—and his name was Nimrah—
[& he 0 | & he >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was angry with his father*

Here John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, removed the redundant *and he*. In this case, he first made the correction in \mathcal{P} itself (by crossing out these two words). To be sure, the original repetition of the subject was helpful because of the immediately preceding parenthetical statement, “and his name was Nimrah”. On the other hand, the editing provided a predicate for the original sentence fragment at the beginning of the verse (“and now the brother of him that suffered death”). For

another example where the 1830 compositor crossed out this kind of redundancy in \mathcal{D} itself, see under Ether 3:1 (there he deleted a redundant “therefore the brother of Jared”). For another case where a repetitious *and he* has been removed from the text, see under Alma 30:12.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:8 the redundant *and he* that the 1830 compositor deleted; such repetition occurs fairly often in the original text, especially after parenthetical statements.

■ Ether 9:11

*wherefore the sons of Akish did offer them money
by [the 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which means
they drew away the more part of the people after them*

As explained under 1 Nephi 3:2, Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed nearly half the instances of the phrase “in the which” in the Book of Mormon, usually by omitting the *the*. (Also see the discussion under the addendum for 1 Nephi 3:2 at the end of this part of volume 4.) Here in Ether 9:11 we have an instance where the related phrase “by the which means” was edited to “by which means” in the 1837 edition (and probably by Joseph, although in this case he did not mark the deletion of the *the* in \mathcal{D}). This was the only instance of “by the which” in the original text, although in Ether 10–11 Joseph changed at least four, possibly five, instances of “in the which” to “by which” (for discussion, see under Ether 10:10 and Ether 11:15). Here in Ether 9:11, the original “by the which means” will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:11 the definite article *the* in the phrase “by the which means”, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 9:18

*and also all manner of cattle / of oxen and cows
and of sheep and of swine and of goats
and also many other [kind 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | kinds QRT] of animals
which were useful for the food of man*

In this passage the 1911 LDS edition replaced the singular *kind* with the plural *kinds*, which is what standard English requires, although many speakers (including myself) use the singular *kind* in such phrases. For discussion of this usage, see under Alma 20:29. The critical text will restore the original *kind* here in Ether 9:18.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:18 the original *kind* in the phrase “and also many other **kind** of animals”, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 9:19

*and there were elephants and cureloms and **cumoms**
all of which were useful unto man
and more especially the elephants and cureloms
and [comoms 1 | cumoms ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The printer's manuscript shows some variation here. Oliver Cowdery wrote *cumoms* for the first instance of the word, but later in the verse he wrote *comoms* for the second instance. Based on the assumption that the scribe took care to correctly spell the first occurrence of a Book of Mormon name or word, we can assume that *cumoms* is the correct reading here in Ether 9:19. The 1830 typesetter assumed as much since he set both instances as *cumoms*.

Of course, one could imagine that the *cu* spelling for *cumoms* was an error based on the *cu* in the immediately preceding *cureloms*. But then one could also argue that the *om* in the first syllable of *comoms* was caused by the combined influence of the final *om* in *cureloms* and the immediately following *om* in the second syllable of *cumoms*.

Elsewhere in the text, we get Book of Mormon names beginning with either *cum* or *com*:

Cumeni, Cumenihah, Cumorah
Com, Comron

In fact, there are two cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *Cumorah* as *Comorah* (in Mormon 6:5, 11), which provides support here in Ether 9:19 for the change from *cu* to *co* in the second instance of *cumoms* (although here in the book of Ether the scribe in \mathcal{P} was Oliver Cowdery, not scribe 2).

Either *cumoms* or *comoms* is theoretically possible in Ether 9:19. The critical text will follow the spelling of the first occurrence in \mathcal{P} , *cumoms*.

Summary: Maintain *cumoms* as the correct spelling in Ether 9:19 since it is the spelling of the first instance of the word.

■ Ether 9:20

*for upon such
[NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] saith the Lord
[NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT] I will pour out the fullness of my wrath*

The 1920 LDS edition changed the comma after “saith the Lord” to a colon. This would have been acceptable if the words “saith the Lord” had actually introduced the entire quote rather than interrupt it (as if the text had read, say, “thus saith the Lord : for upon such I will pour out the fullness of my wrath”). It is quite clear that “for upon such” is a part of the quote, as is exemplified by three other examples of this expression in the text:

1 Nephi 14:15	the wrath of God was poured out upon that great and abominable church
1 Nephi 14:17	the wrath of God is poured out upon the mother of harlots
1 Nephi 22:16	the fullness of the wrath of God shall be poured out upon all the children of men

In each instance, there is a prepositional phrase headed by *upon*, just as here in Ether 9:20 (“for upon such”). Thus the earlier comma will be restored in the critical text for this passage.

Summary: Restore the original comma after “saith the Lord” in Ether 9:20 since the preceding “for upon such” is a part of the quote.

■ **Ether 9:22**

*yea and he even saw the [Son 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | son A]
of [Righteousness 1EFIJLMNOQRT | righteousness ABCDGHKPS]
and did rejoice and glory in his day*

As explained under 2 Nephi 26:9, the critical text will emend “the **Son** of righteousness” to “the **Sun** of righteousness”, an alternative name for the Savior. (Malachi’s use of this term is found in 3 Nephi 25:2, when Jesus quoted Malachi 3–4 to the Nephites.)

Ether 9:26

*and the people had spread again
[over all 1A2BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | all over s] the face of the land*

The 1953 RLDS edition reads “all over the face of the land”. This switch in word order appears to be a simple typo since elsewhere in the text we have examples of only “over all the face of the land” (three times, including nearby in Ether 10:4). In none of those other cases did the 1953 edition change the word order.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 9:26 the original word order, with *over* before *all* in the phrase “over all the face of the land”.

■ **Ether 9:26**

*and there began again to be
an exceeding great wickedness upon the face of the land*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 22 September 2004) suggests that the *an* is intrusive here in Ether 9:26; that is, the original text read “there began again to be exceeding great wickedness upon the face of the land”. Elsewhere in the text there are examples of *wickedness* with various determiners (including the case of no determiner), but there are no others that take the indefinite article *a/an*:

wickedness	46 times
the wickedness	46 times
their wickedness	44 times
your wickedness	7 times
his wickedness	5 times
such wickedness	5 times
so <adjective> wickedness	2 times

this wickedness	2 times
this the wickedness	1 time
this their wickedness	1 time
whatsoever wickedness	1 time
any wickedness	1 time

The use of the indefinite article here in Ether 9:26 suggests a particular wickedness rather than wickedness in general. And in fact, this is what the verse appears to be referring to. Note that right after this reference to “an exceeding great wickedness”, the text refers to the rise, once more, of secret combinations among the people: “and Heth began to embrace the secret plans again of old / to destroy his father” (Ether 9:26). Thus the use of the indefinite article *an* earlier in the verse could be fully intended since secret combinations would constitute an especially evil wickedness.

In addition, there is no scribal evidence for accidentally inserting *an* in front of *exceeding*. More generally, there are two cases where *an* seems to have been consciously added to a noun phrase (and in both cases, by the 1830 typesetter):

Jacob 2:28

and whoredoms is [1 | *an* A] abomination before me

Alma 1:29

[1 | *an* A] abundance of flocks and herds and fatlings of every kind

And in one other case, *an* seems to have been accidentally added (in the 1840 edition) because the following word, *ancient*, began with *an*:

3 Nephi 3:9

and they are of [1AB | *an* C] ancient date

But here in Ether 9:26 there seems to have been no motivation for adding the *an* before *exceeding*. The critical text will therefore accept the reading here in Ether 9:26 of “an exceeding great wickedness”; here we apparently have a reference to secret combinations.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 9:26 the use of *an* before *exceeding*, the reading of all the textual sources; here the text seems to be referring to the particular wickedness of secret combinations.

■ 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*

that [they >+ the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people could not pass

The original manuscript is not extant here, but in the printer’s manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *they people*, a scribal slip. He corrected this to *the people* by crossing out the *y* of *they*. The crossout of the *y* is in heavier ink flow, which argues that the correction was made later. In other words, Oliver did not correct the *they* to *the* immediately after writing *they*. But since he did write the word *people* at the same time he wrote the *they* (both are written inline), the original manuscript probably had the word *people*. One could argue that Ø read *they* but that as Oliver

was copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} he suddenly decided to correct the *they* to *the people* since *they* could have been misinterpreted as referring to the serpents. But the use of heavier ink flow for the correction argues otherwise. The critical text will assume that \mathcal{C} read *the people*.

Oliver Cowdery's initial *they* in place of *the* was probably the result of the two preceding occurrences of *they* in the verse ("that **they** should pursue them no more but that **they** should hedge up the way"). There are eight other instances in the manuscripts where Oliver made the same scribal slip, writing *they* instead of *the*; in each instance, there is at least one nearby instance of *they* that could have served as the source for the slip:

- 1 Nephi 17:30 (error in \mathcal{D} immediately corrected by erasure)
and notwithstanding **they** being led
[*the* 0A | *they* >% *the* 1] Lord their God their Redeemer going before them . . .
- Jacob 5:68–69 (error in \mathcal{D} immediately corrected by crossout)
and **they** shall be one
and [*they* > *the* > NULL 1 | A] the bad shall be cast away
- Alma 17:13 (error in \mathcal{D} virtually immediately corrected)
for **they** supposed that great was [*they* > *the* 1 | *the* A] work
which **they** had undertaken
- Alma 46:37–38 (error in \mathcal{C} immediately corrected by erasure)
and **they** began to have peace again in the land
and thus **they** did maintain peace in the land
until nearly the end of the nineteenth year of the reign of the judges
and Helaman and [*they* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1A] high priests did also maintain order
in the church
- Alma 47:2 (error in \mathcal{C} immediately corrected by erasure)
and it came to pass that **they** would not
or [*they* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1A] more part of them
would not obey the commandment of the king
- Alma 57:21 (error in \mathcal{D} immediately corrected by erasure)
and I did remember [*the* 0A | *they* >% *the* 1] words which **they** said unto me
- Helaman 9:13 (error in \mathcal{D} virtually immediately corrected)
and **they** were brought and behold **they** were the five which were sent
and behold [*they* > *the* 1 | *the* A] judges inquired of them to know
concerning the matter
- 3 Nephi 7:5–6 (error in \mathcal{D} corrected immediately by erasure)
and all this iniquity had come upon the people
because **they** did yield themselves unto the power of Satan
and [*they* >% *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] regulations
of the government was destroyed

Thus here in Ether 9:33 the initial *they people* is very likely a scribal slip.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 9:33 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , "that **the people** could not pass"; here Oliver Cowdery seems to have accidentally written *they people* initially in \mathcal{D} but corrected it only later.

■ **Ether 9:33**

*that [whoso 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | whosoever MOQ] should attempt to pass
might fall by the poisonous serpents*

Here the 1905 LDS edition changed *whoso* to *whosoever*. This appears to have been a typo made by the 1905 typesetter. The correct *whoso* was restored in the 1920 LDS edition. The original text of the Book of Mormon has instances of both *whosoever* and *whoso*. From Mosiah up to the last part of Helaman, we have instances of only *whosoever* (including cases of *whomsoever*); then the text makes a gradual transition from *whosoever* to *whoso* from Helaman 13 through Mormon 9. From then on—that is, from Ether to the end of the text and in the small plates of Nephi (at the beginning of the Book of Mormon, but apparently translated last)—we get only *whoso*. Here in the book of Ether, because of the preceding dominance of *whosoever* there has been a tendency to replace *whoso* with *whosoever*. For two other cases of this error tendency (both by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P}), see under Ether 10:6. For each case of *whoso(ever)*, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus *whoso* here in Ether 9:33. In volume 3 of the critical text, I will discuss at some length the possible significance of this transition in word choice from *whosoever* to *whoso*. For some preliminary discussion regarding this change in usage, see pages 140–143 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.

Summary: Maintain the use of *whoso* in Ether 9:33, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Ether 9:34**

*the people did follow the course of the beasts
and [did 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] devour the carcasses of them which fell by the way*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition omitted the repeated auxiliary verb *did* in the conjoined verb phrase “and **did** devour”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *did* to the RLDS text. Either reading is theoretically possible here, so we follow the earliest text with the repeated *did*. See under Ether 2:2 for an example of a conjoined verb phrase where the *did* was not repeated in the original text.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *did* in Ether 9:34: “the people did follow the course of the beasts and **did** devour the carcasses of them which fell by the way” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ **Ether 9:35**

*and it came to pass that when they had humbled themselves sufficiently before the Lord
[the Lord 1A | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] did send rain upon the face of the earth*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced in the book of Ether a few instances of the noun phrase *the Lord* with the pronoun *he* if there was a nearby occurrence of *the Lord*. For three instances of this change, all in one passage, see under Ether 3:25–27. Joseph was very likely responsible for the change here in Ether 9:35, although the change to *he* was not marked in \mathcal{P} . The critical text will restore the original *the Lord* here as well as earlier in Ether 3.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:35 the original subject *the Lord* even though it is immediately preceded by the same noun phrase, *the Lord*.

■ **Ether 9:35**

and there began to be fruit in the north countries

and in all the countries [around >+ round 0 | round 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] about

As explained under 1 Nephi 8:13, Joseph Smith tended to dictate *around about* in place of the correct *round about*. Yet in three places, the earliest textual sources support *around about*, including here in Ether 9:35 where Oliver Cowdery consciously corrected *around* to *round* later on (by supralinear insertion and with heavier ink flow). Since either reading is theoretically possible, the critical text will accept *around about* here in Ether 9:35.

Summary: Restore in Ether 9:35 the original instance of *around about*; this phraseology, here found originally in \mathcal{O} , was later edited in \mathcal{O} to *round about*.

Ether 10

■ Ether 10:5

which was [grievous 01|grievous ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|grievous E] to be borne

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the original text consistently read *grievous* instead of the standard *grievous*.

■ Ether 10:5

yea he did tax them

with [the >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] heavy taxes

*and with **the** taxes he did build many spacious buildings*

The original manuscript has a minor lacuna between *with* and *heavy*, enough for a word of the length *the*. However, the actual text is undoubtedly “with heavy taxes” and not “with **the** heavy taxes”. I would surmise that in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “with **the** heavy taxes” in anticipation of the following “with **the** taxes”, then crossed out the intrusive *the*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:5 the phrase “with heavy taxes”, the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript; although Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially written “with **the** heavy taxes” in the original manuscript, he very likely deleted the extra *the*.

■ Ether 10:6

(1) *and [whoso 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST|whosoever >+ whoso 1]
would not be subject unto taxes*

he did cast into prison

(2) *and [whosoever >+ whoso 1|whoso ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[were 1A|was BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] not able to pay taxes*

he did cast into prison . . .

(3) *and whoso [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] refused to labor
he did cause to be put to death*

Twice here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *whosoever* (listed above under 1 and 2), but later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , he crossed out both instances of the extra *ever* (the level of ink flow for the crossouts is somewhat heavier). \mathcal{C} is sufficiently extant in the first case that we can determine that the word is the shorter *whoso*. For the third case of *whoso* in this verse, \mathcal{C} is fully extant and reads *whoso*, not *whosoever*. In that third case, Oliver wrote *whoso* without error in \mathcal{P} .

We also note here that the second instance of *whoso* originally took the plural verb form *were*. The 1837 edition changed this to the singular *was*, probably as a result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition (although the change was not marked in \mathcal{P}). As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:48, the original text allows for either a singular or plural interpretation for the generic pronoun *whoso(ever)*. Here in Ether 10:6, the critical text will restore the original plural *were*.

As explained under Ether 9:33, the Book of Mormon text prefers *whoso* in the book of Ether. Starting near the end of Helaman and going up to the end of Mormon, there is considerable variation between *whosoever* and *whoso*. In that section of the text, there is one more instance in \mathcal{P} where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *whosoever* instead of the correct *whoso*:

3 Nephi 11:23
 verily I say unto you
 that [*whosoever* > *whoso* 1 | *whoso* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] repenteth
 of his sins through your words
 and desireth to be baptized in my name
 on this wise shall ye baptize them . . .

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:6 the three instances of *whoso*, two of which are extant in \mathcal{G} ; for two of the three cases, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *whosoever* in \mathcal{P} but later corrected these to *whoso* when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{G} ; the plural *were* for the second instance of *whoso* will also be restored.

■ Ether 10:6–7

*and whoso would not be subject unto taxes he did cast into **prison**
 and whoso were not able to pay taxes he did cast into **prison** . . .
 yea even his **fine** gold he did cause to be refined in **prison**
 and all manner of fine workmanship he did cause to be wrought
 in [*prison* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *prisons* CGHK]*

In this passage, the 1840 edition changed the last occurrence of *prison* to the plural *prisons*. This secondary reading continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition. This change to the plural was undoubtedly unintended since the preceding three occurrences of *prison* in this passage were left in the singular. For all other instances of the singular *prison*, the text has maintained the original number. However, there are two cases in the history of the text where an original plural *prisons* has been accidentally changed to the singular, in Alma 36:27 and in Alma 46:23; see under each of those passages for discussion.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:7 the singular *prison* in “to be wrought in prison”, the reading of the earliest extant text; the singular is used throughout the larger passage.

■ Ether 10:7

*wherefore he did obtain all his [*fine* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] work
 yea even his **fine** gold he did cause to be refined in prison
 and all manner of **fine** workmanship he did cause to be wrought in prison*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the adjective *fine* before *work*, probably by accident since the *fine* was not deleted before *gold* or *workmanship* in the subsequent text. The 1908 RLDS

edition restored the missing adjective to the RLDS text. Later on in this chapter, the text once more refers to *fine work*: “and they did work all manner of fine work” (Ether 10:23).

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:7 the use of *fine* before *work* as well as before *gold* and *workmanship*.

■ Ether 10:8

*the people [raised >+ did raise 1 | did raise ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | did rise RT] up
in rebellion against him*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the people **raised** up in rebellion”. Later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , Oliver corrected the verb form from *raised* to *did raise*. The level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *did* is somewhat heavier, as is the crossout of the *d* in *raised*. There are two other instances in the book of Ether where Oliver initially omitted the *do* auxiliary as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} ; in both these cases, \mathcal{C} is extant and has the auxiliary:

Ether 10:3

and his eldest son whose name was Shez
[*did rebell* 0 | *rebelled* >+ *did rebell* 1 |
did rebel ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] against him

Ether 13:28

and it came to pass that Coriantumr beat him
and [*did persue* 0 | *persued* >+ *did persue* 1 |
did persue ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him

Here in Ether 10:8, \mathcal{C} is not extant but very likely read *did raise*, the same as the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

In the 1920 LDS edition, the verb *raise* was replaced with *rise* since in modern English we expect the phraseology “to **rise** up in rebellion”. However, the original text has a number of instances of intransitive *raise*; in fact, as explained under 2 Nephi 3:24, some of these have been retained in the current text. For further discussion of the competition between “to **raise** up in rebellion” and “to **rise** up in rebellion”, see under Alma 57:32. For each case of *raise* versus *rise*, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus *did raise* here in Ether 10:8. (For a complete listing of the variation between *raise* and *rise*, see under RAISE in volume 3. Also see under Ether 10:14 for another example where the same change to *rise* was made in the 1920 edition.)

Summary: Restore in Ether 10:8 the original reading with the intransitive verb *raise* (namely, “the people **did raise** up in rebellion against him”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}).

■ Ether 10:9

*and it came to pass [that >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after the space of many years
Morianton—he being a descendant of Riplakish—
gathered together an army of outcasts*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “& it came to pass **that** after the space of many years”. Later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , he crossed out the *that*

(the crossout was done with somewhat heavier ink flow). Since either reading is possible here, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to make this correction except to make sure that his copy followed the reading in \mathcal{O} (which is not extant here but probably read without the *that*). For further discussion of Oliver's tendency to add *that* after "it came to pass", see under 3 Nephi 8:5. For each case of *that* after "it came to pass", we follow the earliest textual sources, thus the corrected reading here in Ether 10:9.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:9 the phrase "and it came to pass" without the following *that*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Ether 10:10

he did ease the burden of the people

[*in the which* >js *by which* 1 | *in the which* A | *by which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he did gain favor in the eyes of the people

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith not only removed the definite article *the* from this example of "in the which", but he also changed the preposition from *in* to *by*. He may have been influenced by the earlier instance of "by the which means" in Ether 9:11 (the only instance of "by the which" in the original text). Joseph made the same change of "in the which" to "by which" three more times in the book of Ether:

Ether 10:14

and his brother did raise up in rebellion against him

[*in the which* 1A | *by which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he did bring him into captivity

Ether 10:15

and he did make war against the king of the land

[*in the which* >js *by which* 1 | *in the which* A | *by which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he did obtain unto himself the kingdom

Ether 11:10

and he did do all manner of iniquity in his days

[*inthewhich* >js *by which* 1 | *in the which* A | *by which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he did cause the shedding of much blood

(For one more case where Joseph appears to have intended to edit "in the which" to "by which", see under Ether 11:15.)

There is also an instance of "in the which" near the end of this chapter where Joseph Smith changed the preposition to *with*:

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

In another case, he not only changed the preposition, to *during*, but he also added a noun, *time*:

Ether 10:32

and they fought for the space of many years
 [inthewhich 0 | inthewhich >]s during which time 1 | in the which A |
 during which time BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 Com gained power over Amgid

(Interestingly, the word *during* never occurs in the original text of the Book of Mormon; Ether 10:32 is the only place where it has been introduced into the text.) The critical text will restore all these original instances of “in the which”. For an overview of Joseph Smith’s editing of “in the which”, see under 1 Nephi 3:2. For a complete listing, see under IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore each instance of original “in the which” that Joseph Smith edited for the 1837 edition, including those cases where he ended up changing the preposition (namely, to *by* in Ether 10:10, Ether 10:14, Ether 10:15, and Ether 11:10; to *with* in Ether 10:26; and to *during* in Ether 10:32); in the last case, he also added the noun *time*.

■ Ether 10:12

and the people became exceeding rich under his reign
 both in buildings
 and in gold and [in 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] silver
 and in raising grain
 and in flocks and herds
 and such things which had been restored unto them

The 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the repeated *in* before *silver* here in Ether 10:12. Elsewhere the preposition *in* is repeated in conjuncts involving *gold* and *silver*:

Jarom 1:8	exceeding rich in gold and in silver
Helaman 12:2	and in gold and in silver

The critical text will restore the repeated preposition *in* here in Ether 10:12. For other cases where the repeated *in* has been omitted from noun phrase conjuncts, see under Mosiah 24:1.

Summary: Restore the original repeated preposition in Ether 10:12 (“and in gold and **in** silver”).

■ Ether 10:14

and his brother did [raise 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | rise RT] up in rebellion against him

As noted under Alma 57:32 (and also nearby under Ether 10:8), there are instances in the original text of “to **raise** up in rebellion”. Some of these instances of intransitive *raise* have been edited to *rise*, as here in Ether 10:14 for the 1920 LDS edition. The critical text will restore all cases of intransitive *raise* that are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the original intransitive *raise* in Ether 10:14 (“and his brother did raise up in rebellion against him”), the reading of all the earliest textual sources.

■ Ether 10:21

*and they did preserve the land southward for a wilderness
to get [gain > game 1 | game ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here in Ether 10:21, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “to get **gain**”, perhaps because he expected that phrase. His correction to *game* appears to be virtually immediate (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *game*). There are 19 instances of “to get gain” in the text (as well as three of “to get power and gain”), but there are no more of “to get game”. (The text has three more instances of the noun *game* in reference to wildlife, but none occur in the expression “to get game”.) Here in Ether 10:21, \mathcal{C} undoubtedly read “to get game”. Interestingly, one of the actual instances of “to get gain” is found in the very next verse: “that they might get gain” (Ether 10:22). That particular instance is found exactly two lines below in \mathcal{P} (and undoubtedly it was similarly positioned in \mathcal{C} as well, although \mathcal{C} is no longer extant for this part of the text). Perhaps Oliver’s eye caught a glimpse of the following *get gain* as he was copying the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , thus prompting him to initially write “to get gain” here in verse 21.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:21 the unique occurrence of the phrase “to get **game**”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Ether 10:23

*and they **did** dig it out of the earth
wherefore they [did 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] cast up mighty heaps of earth
for to get ore*

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the *do* auxiliary, thus changing *did cast* to *cast*. The subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the correct *did cast*. Either reading is theoretically possible here in Ether 10:23, so we follow the earliest reading: “wherefore they **did** cast up mighty heaps of earth”. (For discussion of the deletion of the *for* from the phrase “for to get ore”, see under Mosiah 20:1.)

Summary: Maintain the use of the auxiliary verb form *did* in Ether 10:23: “wherefore they **did** cast up mighty heaps of earth” (the reading of the earliest text).

■ Ether 10:25

*and they did make all manner of tools to till the earth
both to plow and to sow / to reap and to hoe
and also to [thrash 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thresh J]*

Historically *thrash* and *thresh* are dialectal variants of the same original word. In current English, *thresh* is the expected specialized term when referring to separating grain from the husk, while otherwise *thrash* retains its general meaning, ‘to beat’. This is the only instance of the word *thrash* (or *thresh*) in the Book of Mormon text. (The King James Bible, on the other hand, systematically uses *thresh* in reference to agricultural threshing.) In the 1888 LDS edition, *thrash* was replaced

by the standard *thresh*, but since that edition never served as a copytext, subsequent LDS texts have maintained the dialectal *thrash*. For further discussion, see the etymological information under *thrash* in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Since the use of *thrash* here is potentially confusing to modern readers, it could be replaced with the expected *thresh* in the standard text. The critical text, of course, will maintain the original *thrash*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:25 the original *thrash*, the reading of the earliest text; in standard English, *thresh* is the expected word here.

■ Ether 10:32

*and it came to pass that Com drew away the half of the kingdom
and he reigned over the half of the kingdom forty and two years
and he went to battle against the king Amgid
and [they 1ABCDGHKPRST | EFIJLMNOQ] fought for the space of many years
in the which Com gained power over Amgid
and obtained power over the remainder of the kingdom*

Here the 1849 LDS edition accidentally omitted the plural pronoun *they*, with the result that the passage ends up stating that Com fought for the space of many years, which is true enough. But the original text states that Com and Amgid fought (against each other) for many years. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *they* in this passage, undoubtedly by reference to one of the early editions of the Book of Mormon. Similarly, the critical text will maintain the plural subject pronoun here.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 10:32 the plural subject pronoun *they*, the reading of the earliest text (“and **they** fought for the space of many years”); the 1849 omission of the *they* changed the subject to *he* (that is, Com); although that reading will work, the plural reading is the correct one.

Ether 11

■ Ether 11:5

*and it came to pass that
the brother of Shiblon [did cause 0A | did cause >js caused 1 | caused BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that all the prophets which prophesied of the destruction of the people should be put to death*

Here we see the first of several cases in the book of Ether where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed the *do* auxiliary. Besides this one here in Ether 11:5, there are three more:

Ether 11:10

and he did do all manner of iniquity in his days
in the which he [did cause >js did caused 1 | did cause ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the shedding of much blood

Ether 11:14

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

Ether 13:22

and the wars [did cease >js ceased 1 | did cease A |
ceased BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not

For the example in Ether 11:10, Joseph added the past tense marker *-d* but forgot to delete the *did*, with the result that the 1837 edition missed implementing this change. The change in Ether 11:14, of *did do* to *did*, involves the main verb *do*. Attempts by Joseph to remove instances of *did do* can be found elsewhere in the text (see the discussion nearby under Ether 11:14).

Otherwise, the removal of the *do* auxiliary for other main verbs was fairly rare in Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition. Besides these examples at the end of Ether, there are only four more elsewhere in the entire text (here I exclude the cases of "do/did do" referred to under Ether 11:14):

1 Nephi 12:11

and I looked and beheld three generations
[did 0A | did >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pass away in righteousness

1 Nephi 12:12

and I Nephi also saw many of the fourth generation
which [did pass 0 | did pass >js passed 1 | did pass A |
passed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] away in righteousness

1 Nephi 19:7

they [*do* 0A | *do* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] set him at naught

Alma 32:23

little children doth have words given unto them many times
 which [*doth* 0A | *doth* >js *do* 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] confound
 the wise and the learned

Note that three of these are in 1 Nephi, at the beginning of Joseph's editing for the 1837 edition. Otherwise Joseph did not edit instances of "do/did pass" (10 cases), "do/did set" (3 cases), and "do/did confound" (7 cases). Similarly, with respect to the edited examples here in the book of Ether (again I exclude the case of "do/did do"), other instances in the text of "do/did cause" (48 cases) and "do/did cease" (17 cases) were left unchanged in Joseph's editing for the 1837 edition.

In the critical text, of course, for each case of the *do* auxiliary we will follow the earliest reading. In each of these instances of idiosyncratic editing for the 1837 edition, the original *do* auxiliary will be restored.

Summary: Restore in the book of Ether the original periphrastic past-tense forms involving the *do* auxiliary that Joseph Smith removed in his editing for the 1837 edition; in particular, *did cause* will be restored in Ether 11:5 and *did cease* in Ether 13:22.

■ Ether 11:6

and there was [NULL >? *a* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *great calamity in all the land*

The original manuscript is extant here for "there was great". There is definitely no room between *was* and *great* for the indefinite article *a*. There is considerable noise in the supralinear space above *was great*, and one could imagine that the indefinite article might have been supralinearly inserted, although my reading of the ultraviolet photograph here is that there is no supralinear *a*, only noise. If the *a* were inserted, it was done in very weak ink. And if so, it was nonetheless not copied into the printer's manuscript. We have evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts that such a mistake is possible. For instance, in Alma 42:2 Oliver Cowdery initially omitted in \mathcal{O} the indefinite article *a* in the phrase "cherubims and **a** flaming sword". Although Oliver later added the *a* supralinearly in \mathcal{O} , the ink flow was so weak that he omitted it once more when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} —and that second time he failed to catch his error.

Surrounding phraseology suggests that the *a* is possible here in Ether 11:6. The proposed phrase "a great calamity" is supported by subsequent references in the same verse to "a great curse" and "a great destruction":

Ether 11:6

for they had testified that **a** great curse should come
 upon the land and also upon the people
 and that there should be **a** great destruction among them

Moreover, the two other instances of *calamity* in the text take determiners, although not *a*:

■ Ether 11:6

*and that there should be a great destruction among them
such an one as never had been upon the face of the earth*

■ Ether 11:7

*insomuch that there was a great destruction
such an one as never had been **known** upon the face of the earth*

Here in Ether 11:6, \mathcal{O} is extant for the words “never had been upon the face of the earth”, and it reads without the past participle form *known*, unlike the virtually identical reading in the next verse (which is not extant in \mathcal{O}): “never had been **known** upon the face of the earth” (Ether 11:7). Lyle Fletcher suggests (personal communication, 23 September 2004) that in Ether 11:6 the word *known* was accidentally lost during the dictation of the text. Of course, one could argue, contrariwise, that the *known* in verse 7 is intrusive and could have been added during the early transmission of the text.

There is one example in \mathcal{O} where *known* was initially omitted (but there are no examples in the entire history of the text where *known* has been accidentally added):

Alma 24:14
and the great God has had mercy on us and made these things
[NULL > *known* 0 | *known* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto us
that we might not perish

So there is some possibility that *known* could have been omitted from Ether 11:6.

On the other hand, there is nothing particularly wrong with the earliest reading in Ether 11:6. Note that there are other cases in the text of the verb phrase “never had been”:

Alma 53:19
as they **never had** hitherto **been** a disadvantage to the Nephites . . .

Mormon 4:12
and there **never had been** so great wickedness among all the children of Lehi
nor even among all the house of Israel according to the words of the Lord
as were among this people

Ether 2:5
yea into that quarter where there **never had** man **been**

(This is in contrast to six instances in the text of the verb phrase “never had been known”, including the one in Ether 11:7.) In Mormon 4:12, listed above, the text could have alternatively read as “and there never had been **known** so great wickedness”. Since variation can occur, it is more reasonable to accept the possibility that the past participle *known* is lacking in Ether 11:6 but occurs in Ether 11:7.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 11:6 the phraseology without *known* (“such an one as never had been upon the face of the earth”) even though in the next verse *known* occurs in otherwise identical phraseology (“such an one as never had been **known** upon the face of the earth”).

■ Ether 11:9

and it came to pass that Shiblon was slain

and Seth was brought into captivity

and [he 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did dwell in captivity all his days

Here the 1837 edition omitted the subject pronoun *he*, ending up with a conjoined predicate that works well enough. But since the original reading with the *he* works perfectly well, the critical text will restore it.

In this part of the text, there are a number of other cases where the subject pronoun *he* has been omitted from a conjoined clause:

Ether 14:3 (initial omission in \mathcal{P})

behold there arose the brother of Shared

and [NULL > he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] gave battle unto Coriantumr

Ether 14:17 (initial omission in \mathcal{P})

and he did slay both men women and children

and [NULL >+ he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did burn the cities thereof

Ether 15:2 (omission in the 1841 British edition)

he saw that there had been slain by the sword already nearly two millions of his people

and [he 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] began to sorrow in his heart

In each of these cases, the critical text will maintain the original *he*. Note that the initial reading in Ether 14:3 presents an interesting syntactic construction, namely, an existential *there*-clause immediately followed by a conjoined predicate but without any explicit subject (“behold there arose the brother of Shared and gave battle unto Coriantumr”). This kind of construction actually occurs elsewhere in the text of the Book of Mormon; for some discussion, see under Alma 21:5.

Repetition of the subject *he* in conjoined clauses is quite common in the text, including cases involving the auxiliary verb *do*. In addition to the cases here in Ether 11:9 and Ether 14:17, there are a couple of other examples in this part of the text:

Ether 10:5–6

and with the taxes he did build many spacious buildings

and **he did** erect him an exceeding beautiful throne

and **he did** build many prisons . . .

Ether 11:10

and it came to pass that Ahah his son did obtain the kingdom

and **he did** reign over the people all his days

and **he did** do all manner of iniquity in his days

Summary: Restore in Ether 11:9 the subject pronoun *he* in the conjoined clause (“and **he** did dwell in captivity all his days”); this kind of conjunctive repetition of the subject pronoun is very common in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Ether 11:12

and it came to pass [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *that* RT]
in the days of Ethem there came many prophets

Here we have one more instance of textual variation involving the subordinate conjunction *that* after “it came to pass” and before a prepositional phrase headed by *in*. As explained elsewhere, the *that* is generally optional in this context; see, for instance, under Alma 30:5 for the phrase “it came to pass (that) in the commencement of the Xth year” and under Mormon 1:8 for “it came to pass (that) in this year”. Here in Ether 11:12, the 1920 LDS edition added the *that*. However, this change was not marked in the committee copy for the 1920 edition, which suggests that this extra *that* was a typo. Since in general the *that* is optional after “it came to pass”, the critical text will follow the earliest text and restore the reading without the *that* here in Ether 11:12. Similarly, the *that* is lacking in Omni 1:20: “and it came to pass in the days of Mosiah there was a large stone brought unto him”.

Summary: Remove in Ether 11:12 the intrusive *that* (which was added apparently by mistake in the 1920 LDS edition), thus restoring the earliest reading: “and it came to pass in the days of Ethem there came many prophets”.

■ Ether 11:12–13

and it came to pass in the days of Ethem there came many prophets . . .
and it came to pass that the people hardened their hearts
and would not hearken unto their [words 1ABCDEFGHIHKPRST | word IJLMNOQ]

The original text reads here in the plural (“and would not hearken unto their **words**”). The 1879 LDS edition introduced the singular *word*, probably accidentally. The plural *words* was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition by reference to the 1830 edition or some other early edition. The Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural *words* whenever the verb *hearken* refers to the word(s) of more than one person (eight times, including here in Ether 11:13). Besides the example here in Ether 11:13, there are two more examples that refer to hearkening unto the words of the prophets:

2 Nephi 26:8	the righteous that hearken unto the words of the prophets
Mosiah 15:11	whosoever hath heard the words of the prophets . . . all those who hath hearkened unto their words

The plural *words* here in Ether 11:13 is undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Maintain the plural *words* with the verb *hearken* in Ether 11:13 since this is the earliest reading; moreover, when the text refers to hearkening unto the word(s) of more than one person, we consistently get the plural *words*.

■ Ether 11:14

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

As explained under 1 Nephi 2:14, there has been a minor tendency in the text to replace *did do* with *did*, namely, by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. Here in Ether 11:14 we have one of those examples; another example is found in 2 Nephi 5:18. And there's also an example, in Helaman 13:24, where *do do* was replaced with *do*. There are other verbs for which Joseph removed the auxiliary verb *do*, but those cases seem much more idiosyncratic (see nearby under Ether 11:5 for discussion of this point).

Here in Ether 11:14, the critical text will, of course, restore this instance of original *did do*. Note that nearby in Ether 11:10–11, two instances of original *did do* were not emended (the text reads invariantly in both cases: “and he **did do** all manner of iniquity in his days . . . and he also **did do** that which was wicked in his days”). For a complete discussion of this archaic usage in the original text of the Book of Mormon, see under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Ether 11:14 the original use of the archaic *did do*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 11:15

*and there arose a mighty man among them in iniquity
and gave battle unto Moron
[in the which >js in by which 1 | in the which A | in which BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he did overthrow the half of the kingdom*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Joseph Smith apparently intended to change “in the which” to “by which”. He crossed out the definite article *the* and supralinearly inserted *by*, but he forgot to delete the *in*. The 1837 edition ended up deleting the *the* but left unchanged the preposition *in*. As explained under Ether 10:10, Joseph changed four other cases of “in the which” to “by which” in the book of Ether. In each instance, the critical text will restore the original phraseology, “in the which”.

Summary: Restore in Ether 11:15 the original phrase “in the which”; in this case, Joseph Smith apparently intended to emend this instance to “by which”, but the 1837 edition ended up with “in which”.

■ Ether 11:21

*and that the Lord God would send
or bring forth another people to possess the land
by his power
after the manner [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | by RT]
which he brought their fathers*

Here in Ether 11:21, the relative pronoun *which* originally stood for the whole prepositional phrase “after the manner”. Thus the relative clause, it would appear, is equivalent to stating that “he brought their fathers after this manner”. The 1920 LDS edition inserted the preposition *by*

in front of the *which*, thus making the following relative clause stand for something like “he brought their fathers by this manner”.

Elsewhere in the text, however, there are no examples of *by* used with *manner* (as in a hypothetical example such as “by this manner doth the Lord shew . . .”). But there are five more examples of “after the manner” followed by a relative clause headed by *which*:

1 Nephi 17:8

thou shalt construct a ship
after the manner which I shall shew thee

1 Nephi 17:9

whither shall I go that I may find ore to molten
that I may make tools to construct the ship
after the manner which thou hast shewn unto me

1 Nephi 18:2

now I Nephi did not work the timbers
after the manner which was learned by men

1 Nephi 18:2

but I did build it
after the manner which the Lord had shewn unto me

Ether 2:16

the brother of Jared did go to work and also his brethren
and built barges after the manner which they had built
according to the instructions of the Lord

In the first four examples, the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is the noun *manner*. But in the last example, as in Ether 11:21, the antecedent for the *which* appears to be the whole prepositional phrase, “after the manner”. In neither Ether 2:16 nor Ether 11:21 does the earliest text have a preposition such as *by* before the *which*.

The 1920 editing here in Ether 11:21 created in the LDS text a unique reading, “by the manner”. In the King James Bible, there is one instance of the phrase “by <determiner> manner”, namely, *by any manner* in Leviticus 20:25: “and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast or by fowl or **by any manner** of living thing that creepeth on the ground”. Normally the King James text uses the expression “after <determiner> manner” (such as 16 of “after this manner”). Ultimately, the original reading in Ether 11:21 is not all that difficult to understand. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading in this passage, “after the manner which he brought their fathers”.

It should also be recalled that the Book of Mormon allows for constructions like “by his power . . . which he brought their fathers” (that is, without a repetition of the preposition *by* right before the relative pronoun *which*). As discussed under Helaman 13:22, the preposition *in* is not repeated in similar constructions:

2 Nephi 2:22 (not “in the same state **in** which they were”)
and all things which were created must have remained
in the same state which they were

Ether 11

Helaman 13:22 (not “in the things **in** which he hath blessed you”)
ye do not remember the Lord your God
in the things which he hath blessed you

Ether 13:15 (not “in that same year **in** which he was cast out”)
and it came to pass that
in that same year which he was cast out from among the people
there began to be a great war among the people

For further discussion of this construction, see under Helaman 13:22 as well as in the addenda at the end of this part of volume 4 (there under 2 Nephi 2:22).

Summary: Restore the original text in Ether 11:21 by removing the intrusive *by* added in the 1920 LDS edition; the secondary phraseology “by his power after the manner **by** which he brought their fathers”, although possible, is not textually necessary.

Ether 12

■ Ether 12:2

*wherefore Ether came forth in the days of Coriantumr
and began to prophesy unto the people
for he could not be [constrained 1A | restrained BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of the Spirit of the Lord which was in him*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the verb *constrain* to *restrain* in three places. In 2 Nephi 1:26, he marked the change in Ø, but here in Ether 12:2 (and also in Ether 13:31) the change appears first in the 1837 edition itself. As explained under 2 Nephi 1:26, the critical text will restore the original *constrain* in all three cases.

■ Ether 12:4

*wherefore whoso believeth in God might with surety hope for a better world
yea even a place at the right hand of God
which hope cometh of faith
maketh an anchor to the souls of men*

Greg Wright (personal communication, 26 November 2002) suggests that here either *maketh* is an error for *making* or there is an *and* missing. The second suggestion seems more plausible from the point of view of manuscript errors, especially if the *and* was written as an ampersand. Ø is not extant for this particular part of the sentence, but an original *and* in Ø would have been written with an ampersand since Oliver Cowdery was the scribe. Of course, it is also possible that Oliver omitted the *and* in Ø when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. There is some evidence that Oliver occasionally omitted *and* in Ø and Ø, if only momentarily. We have, for instance, the following three cases where he initially omitted the *and* before a finite verb form:

Alma 29:13 (omission in Ø before *hath*)

yea and that same God hath called me by a holy calling
to preach the word unto this people
[NULL >- & 0 | & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hath given me much success

Alma 30:52 (omission in Ø before *wrote*)

and Korihor put forth his hand
[& 0 | NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wrote saying
I know that I am dumb

Alma 51:33 (omission in \mathcal{D} before *went*)

Teancum and his servant stole forth
 [& 0 | NULL > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] went out by night

Thus Oliver could have omitted the *and* in Ether 12:4, either in \mathcal{C} or in \mathcal{D} .

The basic problem here in Ether 12:4 is that the earliest text has an asyndetic conjoining of predicates within a relative clause. There are no examples of this kind of relative clause construction elsewhere in the text. The reason for this is that without the *and* one expects an asyndetically attached predicate to apply to some noun phrase that precedes the relative pronoun *which* or *who*. Thus it is not surprising that elsewhere in the text, out of 93 instances of conjoined predicates in relative clauses involving *which* or *who*, all but one have the coordinating conjunction *and* between each predicate; for the one other case, the conjunction is *but*:

Helaman 5:35

now there was one among them who was a Nephite by birth
who had once belonged to the church of God
but had dissented from them

In particular, *and* consistently occurs between predicates in relative clauses with multiple conjoined predicates:

1 Nephi 12:17

and the mists of darkness are the temptations of the devil
which blindeth the eyes
and hardeneth the hearts of the children of men
and leadeth them away into broad roads that they perish and are lost

1 Nephi 13:5

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

Mosiah 2:20

I say unto you my brethren
 that if you should render all the thanks and praise
 which your whole souls hath power to possess
 to that God **who** hath created you
and hath kept and preserved you
and hath caused that ye should rejoice
and hath granted that ye should live in peace one with another . . .

If any of the *and*'s were omitted from these passages, we would immediately misread the asyndetically conjoined predicate as referring to some noun phrase that precedes the *which* or *who*. We should also note that this use of connecting *and*'s between conjoined predicates holds for cases of "whose <noun>" and "which <noun>":

1 Nephi 10:12

that they should be compared like unto an olive tree
whose branches should be broken off
and should be scattered upon all the face of the earth

2 Nephi 9:16

and their torment is a lake of fire and brimstone
whose flames ascendeth up forever and ever
and hath no end

Alma 5:24

do ye suppose that such an one can have a place
to sit down in the kingdom of God
with Abraham with Isaac and with Jacob
and also all the holy prophets
whose garments are cleansed
and are spotless pure and white

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

Here in Ether 12:4, since the *and* is missing before *maketh*, we immediately think that “maketh an anchor to the souls of men” refers to some noun phrase preceding “which hope cometh of faith”, which is wrong. The asyndetic “maketh an anchor to the souls of men” refers to the noun *hope*, as is clear from the parallel language in the following New Testament passage:

Hebrews 6:18–19 (King James Bible)

that by two immutable things
in which *it was* impossible for God to lie
we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge
to lay hold upon the **hope** set before us
which *hope* we have as **an anchor of the soul**

In Ether 12:4, the nearby noun *hope* is the subject for the finite verb form *maketh* (thus “which hope . . . maketh an anchor to the souls of men”). Here the critical text will emend Ether 12:4 to read “which hope cometh of faith **and** maketh an anchor to the souls of men”, thus making sure that the relative clause correctly reads with two predicates conjoined by *and*. In this case, it appears that the connecting *and* was lost during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Emend Ether 12:4 by adding the word *and* before *maketh*, thus removing an implausible reading and at the same time making it clear that the subject for *maketh* is the noun *hope*.

■ Ether 12:6

I would shew unto the world that faith is things

which [is >+ are 1 | are ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hoped for and not seen

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "things which **is** hoped for", which he later corrected (with somewhat heavier ink flow) to the fully plural "things which **are** hoped for". Evidence suggests that the plural *are* was the reading in the original manuscript; Oliver probably wrote the singular *is* because of the preceding *is* in "faith **is** things". \mathcal{O} is not extant here, but this change from *is* to *are* in \mathcal{P} does not appear to be the result of editing on Oliver's part since he otherwise wrote down numerous instances of subject-verb disagreement without emendation in this part of the text, as in these examples in relative clauses:

Ether 5:1 (change to *were* made by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)

and now I Moroni have written the **words**

which [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commanded me

Ether 8:15 (change to *were* made in the 1837 edition)

and Akish did administer unto them the **oaths**

which [*was* 01A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] given by them of old

Moroni 8:29 (change to *were* made by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)

they must perish soon unto the fulfilling of the **prophecies**

which [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] spoken
by the prophets

Moroni 10:23 (change to *are* made in the 1907 and 1911 LDS editions)

if ye have faith / ye can do all **things**

which [*is* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | *are* OQRST] expedient unto me

Moroni 10:27 (change to *were* made by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)

did I not declare my words unto you

which [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] written by this man

Thus here in Ether 12:6 it is much more likely that Oliver made the change in \mathcal{P} from *is* to *are* because \mathcal{O} itself read *are*. (For a complete list of cases of subject-verb disagreement in the text, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3; also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4.)

Here Ether 12:6 paraphrases the King James language in Hebrews 11:1:

Ether 12:6

faith is things

which are **hoped for**

and **not seen**

Hebrews 11:1

now **faith is** the substance of **things**

hoped for

the evidence of things **not seen**

Based on the parallelism, the singular *is* after *faith* in Ether 12:6 is probably intended, even though in the Book of Mormon version the following plural *things* is awkward given the preceding *is* (the singular *substance* in the King James text avoids this problem in agreement). A similar *is* followed by *are* is found in another Book of Mormon passage that refers to faith:

Alma 32:21
 therefore if ye have faith
 ye hope for things
 which **is** not seen which **are** true

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically emended the *is* in that passage to *are*, giving “ye hope for things which **are** not seen which are true”.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:6 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : “faith **is** things which **are** hoped for and not seen”; given Oliver Cowdery’s scribal practice, \mathcal{C} probably read “which **are** hoped for” rather than “which **is** hoped for”.

■ Ether 12:6

*wherefore dispute not because ye see not
 for ye receive no witness
 [not 1] ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] until after the trial of your faith*

The 1830 typesetter removed the *not* before *until*, perhaps accidentally. Based on spacing between extant fragments, the original manuscript probably had the *not*. One could interpret the original text here as a case of multiple negation and thus justify the editing out of the *not* in the standard text. (For similar examples of multiple negation that have been removed from the Book of Mormon text, see under 2 Nephi 26:32.) Another possibility would be to place a comma after *witness*, which would then directly attach the *not* to the following *until* phrase; this would imply closure after “ye receive no witness”, which would be premature.

There are no other examples in the text like this one. There are two other instances of *not until*, both in Ether, but they are not the same kind as the one in the original text for Ether 12:6:

Ether 2:10
 and it is **not until** the fullness of iniquity among the children of the land
 that they are swept off

Ether 3:28
 the Lord commanded him that he should seal up the two stones
 which he had received
 and shew them **not until** the Lord should shew them unto the children of men

The 1830 removal of the *not* before *until* in Ether 12:6 is consistent with the rest of the Book of Mormon text (as well as with standard English). This decision also agrees with the text of the following verse, which has a negative clause before *until* but without a *not* in front of the *until*:

Ether 12:7
 and he shewed **not** himself unto them **until** after they had faith in him

It may have been this nearby reading that prompted the removal of the extra *not* earlier in verse 6, even if unintentional. Of course, the critical text will restore the *not* in Ether 12:6 since the original text had numerous examples of multiple negation. For a complete list, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Ether 12:6 the original *not* before the *until*-clause since it is the reading of the earliest text (“for ye receive no witness **not** until after the trial of your faith”); similar instances of multiple negation can be found in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ Ether 12:7

and he shewed [*not* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *not* 1] *himself*
 [*not* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *unto them*
until after they had faith in him

The original manuscript is extant here, and the *not* comes before *himself*, not after it (thus “and he shewed **not himself** unto them”). Oliver Cowdery, when copying into the printer’s manuscript, initially placed the *not* after *himself*, but then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he corrected the placement of the *not* (putting it before *himself*). Oliver’s error may have been influenced by the word order that occurs at the end of the next manuscript line:

Ether 12:7
 for he shewed **himself not** unto the world

Later in verse 12 the text reverts to the word order where *not* precedes *himself*:

Ether 12:12
 wherefore he shewed **not himself** until after their faith

Either word order is possible, so in each case we follow the earliest reading, thus “and he shewed **not himself** unto them” in the middle of verse 7.

Summary: Maintain in the middle of Ether 12:7 the placement of the *not* before *himself* in “and he shewed **not himself** unto them”, the reading in \mathcal{C} and the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Ether 12:8

but because of the faith of men
he has shewn himself unto the world
and glorified the name of the Father
and prepared [*the* >+ *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *way*
 [NULL >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 [*whereby* >%+ *thereby* 1 | *thereby* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
others might be partakers of the heavenly gift

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “& prepared the way whereby”. After writing *whereby*, Oliver erased the *wh* and overwrote it with *th* (the ink flow is somewhat heavier). At the same time, he made two further corrections: he changed the definite article *the* to the indefinite *a* (by crossing out the *the* and supralinearly writing in the *a*), and he supralinearly inserted the connector *that* that he had accidentally omitted (like the overwriting for *thereby*, these two corrections are written with somewhat heavier ink flow). Here Oliver’s error may have been influenced by language earlier in the text:

3 Nephi 21:27 to prepare **the way whereby** they may come unto me
 3 Nephi 21:28 in preparing **the way whereby** his people may be gathered home
 to the land of their inheritance

As far as the article for *way* is concerned, either article is theoretically possible. Elsewhere in the text, there are 6 instances of “prepare **a** way” and 12 of “prepare **the** way”. So there would have been little motivation for Oliver to emend *the* to *a* in this verse; Ⓒ likely read *a way* rather than *the way*. Turning to *thereby*, we note that this word needs a preceding *that* while *whereby* does not: everywhere else in the text when *thereby* begins a subordinate clause (35 times), there is always a preceding *that*; on the other hand, the relative pronoun *whereby* is never preceded by *that* (out of 24 occurrences). Thus it seems reasonable to assume that Ⓒ read *that thereby* in Ether 12:8.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:8 the corrected reading in Ⓓ: “and prepared **a way that thereby** others might be partakers of the heavenly gift”.

■ Ether 12:11

*but in the gift of [his 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | the CGHK] Son
 hath God prepared a more excellent way*

The 1840 edition replaced the determiner *his* with *the*, probably accidentally since either reading will work. Elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text there are eight occurrences of “of his Son” in contrast to eight occurrences of “of the Son” (I count here only instances that refer to the Son of God). There is definitely no reason here in Ether 12:11 for editing the text from “of his Son” to “of the Son”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *his* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:11 the earliest reading with *his Son* rather than *the Son* in the phrase “in the gift of **his** Son”.

■ Ether 12:14

*behold it was the faith of Nephi and Lehi
 that wrought the change upon the Lamanites
 [that 1ABCDEFGFIJLMNOPQRST | and HK] they were baptized
 with fire and with the Holy Ghost*

Here we have another example where the subordinate conjunction *that* has a resultive meaning (‘with the result that’). Such usage is somewhat unexpected for speakers of modern English, so there has been a tendency in the history of the text to replace the *that* with *and*. Here in Ether 12:14, the change was made in the 1874 RLDS edition, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *that*. For a list of additional examples of the tendency to replace resultive *that* with *and*, see under 1 Nephi 11:29.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:14 the original resultive *that* in the clause “**that** they were baptized with fire and with the Holy Ghost”.

■ **Ether 12:15–16**

*behold it was the faith of Ammon and his brethren
which wrought so great a miracle among the Lamanites
yea and [it was >+ even all they 1| even all they ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which wrought miracles
wrought them by faith*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “yea & it was which wrought miracles” in verse 16, which makes no sense. Later, perhaps when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , Oliver crossed out *it was* and supralinearly wrote *even all they* (the ink level is slightly heavier). He probably wrote *it was* because of the preceding occurrence of those words in verse 15 (“behold **it was** the faith of Ammon and his brethren”). \mathcal{O} is not extant here in verse 16, but it probably read as corrected in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:16 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “yea and **even all they** which wrought miracles wrought them by faith”.

■ **Ether 12:20**

*he could not hide it from the sight of the brother of Jared
because of [his 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| the HK] word which he had spoken unto him*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *his* with *the*, perhaps accidentally, although a possible motivation for such a change would be the following relative clause: the *his* is somewhat redundant when followed by “which **he** had spoken unto him”. Nonetheless, the text has several examples of this same kind of redundancy:

1 Nephi 18:11	unto the fulfilling of his word which he hath spoken concerning the wicked
1 Nephi 20:14	yea and he will fulfill his word which he hath declared by them
Alma 12:9	only according to the portion of his word which he doth grant unto the children of men

Nor did the 1874 RLDS edition change any of these other examples, which argues that the change in Ether 12:20 was accidental. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *his* here in Ether 12:20.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:20 the occurrence of *his word* even though it is followed by a somewhat redundant relative clause.

■ **Ether 12:21**

*and after that the brother of Jared had beheld the finger of the Lord
because of the promise which the brother of Jared had obtained by faith
the Lord could not withhold any thing from his sight
wherefore he shewed him all things
for he could no longer be kept **without the veil***

Stephen Skousen has pointed out (personal communication, 14 July 2006) that the usage seems contradictory in this verse when compared with the earlier text (in the preceding verse as well as earlier in Ether 3):

Ether 3:19

and because of the knowledge of this man
he could not be kept **from beholding within the veil**

Ether 3:20

wherefore having this perfect knowledge of God
he could not be kept **from within the veil**

Ether 12:19

and there were many whose faith was so exceeding strong
even before Christ came
which could not be kept **from within the veil**

Notice, however, that in all three of these cases we have the preposition *from*, but here in Ether 12:21 there is no *from* (“for he could no longer be kept without the veil”). This difference suggests that *from* requires *within*. We appear to have a change in perspective: the phraseology “keep from within” is from an external point of view (such as from the brother of Jared’s perspective) while “keep without” is from an internal point of view (from the Lord’s perspective). Notice also that in Ether 3:19 we have the verb *behold* (“he could not be kept from **beholding** within the veil”), which is definitely from the brother of Jared’s perspective. In any event, there appears to be a systematic difference here in Ether 12:21, and this difference is probably not an error. The critical text will therefore maintain the unique reading in Ether 12:21, “for he could no longer be kept without the veil”.

Summary: Retain in Ether 12:21 the original phraseology, “for he could no longer be kept without the veil”; although this phraseology is unique, it appears to represent the situation from the Lord’s point of view.

■ Ether 12:23

thou hast made us mighty in word by faith

[*where unto* >js *but* 1 | *whereunto* A | *but* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

thou hast not made us mighty in writing

Here Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed the difficult *where unto* to *but*. He probably chose *but* because it expresses the implied contrastiveness between the two clauses (with their parallelism offset by the *not*). The 1830 compositor set the expression *where unto* as the single word *whereunto*, although this may not have been necessary. There is no other instance of *where unto* (or *whereunto*) in the text. Here *where unto* seems to mean something like ‘with respect to which’. There doesn’t seem to be much evidence in the Oxford English Dictionary for such a specific use of the word *whereunto*, although under the related *whereto* the OED lists definition 3b, ‘in addition to or besides which’, which suggests a type of conjunctiveness that might work here in Ether 12:23. Despite its difficulty, the earlier *where unto* does appear to be fully intended and will be restored in the critical text.

The 1830 spelling *whereunto* should probably be avoided because its specific uses in the King James Bible do not work here in Ether 12:23. In the King James text, *whereunto* can be used as an

interrogative or as a relative pronoun, with meanings like ‘to where’, ‘to what’, and ‘to which’, as in these examples:

Psalm 71:3	be thou my strong habitation whereunto I may continually resort
Matthew 11:16	but whereunto shall I liken this generation
Acts 13:2	separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them

Perhaps the two-word spelling *where unto* will lead the reader to a more literal interpretation here in Ether 12:23, something like ‘with respect to which’.

Summary: Restore in Ether 12:23 the original use of *where unto*, despite its difficulty; here it seems to mean ‘with respect to which’.

■ Ether 12:28

*behold I will shew unto the Gentiles their weakness
and I will shew unto them
that faith hope and charity bringeth unto me
[01ABCDEFGHIKPS | — FIJLMNOQRT]
the fountain of all righteousness*

The original lack of punctuation in this passage could lead one to interpret “the fountain of all righteousness” as the direct object for the verb *bring*, as if the text read “faith hope and charity bringeth the fountain of all righteousness unto me”. Since these are the words of Christ, such a reading is really quite impossible. Elsewhere in the text, the phrase “the fountain of all righteousness” appears to refer to Christ as the source of righteousness:

Ether 8:26
wherefore I Moroni am commanded to write these things
that evil may be done away
and that the time may come that Satan may have no power
upon the hearts of the children of men
but that they may be persuaded to do good continually
that they may come unto **the fountain of all righteousness** and be saved

Lehi also compares the Red Sea to “the fountain of all righteousness”, which again could be a metaphorical reference to Christ:

1 Nephi 2:9
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**

Here in Ether 12:28, the 1852 LDS edition placed a dash after *me*, thus separating off “the fountain of all righteousness” and making it an appositive, thereby specifically identifying Christ as “the

fountain of all righteousness”. (For further evidence that the phrase “the fountain of all righteousness” can be considered a name for Christ, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 26:9 regarding another name for Christ, “the Sun of righteousness”).

In support of this interpretation of “the fountain of all righteousness” as an appositive, we note that the verb *bring* does not have to have an explicitly stated direct object when followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *unto*, as in the following example where the direct object for the verb *bring* is an unstated *them*, referring to *his people* earlier in the passage (that is, to the people of the Lord):

Helaman 5:10–11

for he said unto him that the Lord surely should come to redeem **his people**
 but that he should not come to redeem **them** in **their** sins
 but to redeem **them** from **their** sins
 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

In other words, Helaman 5:11 should be read as equivalent to saying “which bringeth **them** unto the power of the Redeemer”. (For other examples of the unstated but assumed *them* for the verb *bring*, see under Helaman 5:11.) In the same way, here in Ether 12:28 the equivalent text is “faith hope and charity bringeth **them** unto me”, as one can see in the larger passage where the ellipted *them* is identified as referring to *the Gentiles* earlier in the passage:

Ether 12:28

behold I will shew unto **the Gentiles their** weakness
 and I will shew unto **them**
 → that faith hope and charity bringeth unto me
 the fountain of all righteousness

Thus there is no need to emend Ether 12:28 by inserting something like *them* (or perhaps *one*) as the explicit direct object for the verb *bring*.

Summary: Accept Ether 12:28 as a case where the direct object for the verb *bring* takes an unstated or ellipted direct object *them* that refers generically to the people under discussion; under that interpretation, the final phrase “the fountain of all righteousness” is an appositive that refers to Christ, represented by the pronoun *me*.

■ Ether 12:29

O Lord thy righteous will be done

This construction is somewhat unusual. We expect something more like “thy will be done”, as can be found in the King James version of the New Testament and elsewhere in the Book of Mormon:

Matthew 6:10	thy will be done in earth as <i>it is</i> in heaven
Matthew 26:42	if this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it thy will be done
Luke 11:2	thy will be done as in heaven so in earth
Luke 22:42	nevertheless not my will but thine be done
Acts 21:14	the will of the Lord be done
2 Nephi 1:19	but behold his will be done for his ways are righteousness forever
Jacob 7:14	nevertheless not my will be done
Jacob 7:14	and thy will O Lord be done and not mine
3 Nephi 13:10	thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven

In none of these is the noun *will* modified by an adjective such as *righteous*. Moreover, the adjective *righteous* here in Ether 12:29 is nonrestrictive in meaning. Moroni is saying that “thy will—which is righteous—be done”. He is not implying that there is such a thing as the unrighteous will of the Lord and that only the righteous will of the Lord should be done. In 2 Nephi 4:5, there is a similar nonrestrictive use of an adjective (namely, *right*) in the phrase “the **right** way that ye should go” (for discussion, see under that passage). Don Brugger also points out (personal communication) that there is the phrase “his holy will” in Moroni 7:2, where *holy* is used nonrestrictively.

Another possibility worth noting here in Ether 12:29 is that this expression, “thy **righteous** will be done”, could be an error for “thy **righteousness** will be done”. In this alternative expression, *will* acts as a modal verb rather than as a noun. And we can find some minor variation in the history of the text where *righteous* and *righteousness* have been mixed up, namely, in 2 Nephi 9:41, where an original “his paths are righteousness” was replaced in the 1837 edition by “his paths are righteous”. As explained under that passage, the earlier reading, *righteousness*, is very likely correct. As far as the proposed expression here in Ether 12:29 is concerned (“thy righteousness will be done”), usage elsewhere in the text suggests that the modal verb *shall* would be preferred over *will* in referring to something being done since there are 12 instances with *shall* but none with *will*:

2 Nephi 3:25	and it shall be done unto thee even according to the words which I have spoken
2 Nephi 26:17	they shall write the things which shall be done among them
Enos 1:18	and it shall be done unto them according to their faith
Alma 42:28	behold evil shall be done unto him according to the restoration of God
Helaman 10:5	yea even that all things shall be done unto thee according to thy word
Helaman 10:8	and it shall be done
Helaman 10:9	and it shall be done
Helaman 12:20	and it shall be done
3 Nephi 21:11	it shall be done even as Moses said
Mormon 8:15	it shall be done with an eye singled to his glory
Mormon 8:16	and it shall be done by the power of God
Moroni 7:26	behold it shall be done unto you

In theory either reading (with *righteous* or *righteousness*) will work here in Ether 12:29. The critical text will therefore accept the consistent reading of all the textual sources rather than the proposed emendation. In fact, based on spacing between extant fragments in \mathcal{C} , the text seems to have read *righteous* in \mathcal{C} rather than *righteousness*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:29 the reading of all the textual sources, “thy righteous will be done”; in this phrase the adjective *righteous* modifies the noun *will* nonrestrictively.

■ Ether 12:31

*for thus [did 1ABCDEFGHJKPS | didst IJLMNOQRT] thou manifest thyself
unto thy disciples*

The earliest text here reads “for thus **did** thou manifest thyself unto thy disciples”. In the 1879 LDS edition, the form *did* was replaced with *didst* since the subject for the verb is *thou*, which requires “thou didst” in standard Early Modern English. (The RLDS text has, however, retained the earlier reading with *did*.) As explained under 2 Nephi 24:12, there are cases of *thou* in the original text where the associated past-tense verb form lacks the expected *-(e)st* ending. In such cases, the earlier reading without the ending will be maintained or restored (as the case may be); here in Ether 12:31, the critical text will restore the original *did*.

Summary: Restore in Ether 12:31 the original *did* in “for thus **did** thou manifest thyself”; although *didst* is standard here, usage elsewhere in the original text supports the occasional second person singular past-tense verb form without the *-(e)st* ending.

■ Ether 12:31

thou didst shew thyself [unto them 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNQRST | HK] in great power

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the prepositional phrase *unto them*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the phrase. Nearby instances of “shew unto them” have been maintained in the text:

Ether 9:35	and the Lord did shew forth his power unto them
Ether 12:7	and he shewed not himself unto them until after they had faith in him
Ether 12:27	I will shew unto them their weakness
Ether 12:28	and I will shew unto them that faith hope and charity bringeth unto me

Summary: Maintain the prepositional phrase “unto them” in Ether 12:31, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Ether 12:31–32

*thou **didst** shew thyself unto them in great power
and I also [rememberest >js remember 1 | rememberest A | remember BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that thou **hast** said that thou **hast** prepared a house for man*

Here the earliest text reads anomalously as “and I also rememberest”. The *-est* ending could be an error caused by the use of the second person singular ending *-(e)st* in the surrounding text, “thou **didst** shew thyself unto them in great power . . . that thou **hast** said that thou **hast** prepared a house for man”. We can find evidence elsewhere in the text for similar errors based on the inflectional ending *-(e)st* in the surrounding text:

Alma 30:35–37

and now **believest** thou that we deceive this people
and that causeth such joy in their hearts
and Korihor answered him : yea
then Alma [*sayest >+ saith 0 | saith >js said 1 | saith A |
said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] unto him
believest thou that there is a God

Alma 45:2

Alma came unto his son Helaman
and [*sayest 0 | sayeth >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] unto him
believest thou the words which I spake unto thee

In these two cases, Oliver Cowdery wrote *sayest* in \mathcal{O} instead of the correct *saith*. In the first case, he caught his error in \mathcal{O} ; in the second case, he made the correction when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Similarly, here in Ether 12:32 Oliver, the scribe in \mathcal{O} , could have written *rememberest* in \mathcal{O} instead of *remember*. Of course, it is also possible (since \mathcal{O} is not extant for Ether 12:32) that Oliver could have made the error when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Interestingly, the 1830 compositor set the difficult *rememberest*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith made the change to the standard *remember*.

The two changes in Alma suggest another possible emendation, namely, \mathcal{O} could have read “and I also **remembereth**” rather than the standard “and I also **remember**”. There is, for instance, evidence that the original text permitted the expression “I saith” for the historical present (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:3). In addition, there is evidence that the original text allowed the occasional use of the ending *-eth* for the first person singular *I*:

Jacob 2:28

for **I** the Lord God **delighteth** in the chastity of women

Mormon 8:3

and **I** even **I** **remaineth** alone to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people

Here in Ether 12:32, the intervening *also* comes between the subject *I* and the verb, thus allowing for the verb form *remembereth*, just as in both of the above examples there are some intervening words between the initial *I* and its associated verb.

It seems fairly obvious that *rememberest* is an error in Ether 12:32, but it is not clear whether the original verb form should be *remember* or *remembereth*. It is even possible that the original text itself read *remember* but that \mathcal{O} incorrectly read *remembereth*. Elsewhere, however, the text

consistently prefers “I remember” over “I remembereth” (5 to 0), including one case with an intervening *also* (marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 29:7	and that I remember they which are upon the isles of the sea
2 Nephi 29:8	that I remember one nation like unto another
* Alma 29:11	yea and I also remember the captivity of my fathers
Ether 12:33	and again I remember that thou hast said that thou hast loved the world
Moroni 7:5	for I remember the word of God which saith . . .

Note especially the nearby example of *remember* in Ether 12:33 (“and again I remember that thou **hast** said that thou **hast** loved the world”); in that case we again have two instances of *hast* in the following subordinate clause, yet in that case *remember* was not changed to *rememberest*. This example in verse 33 argues for *remember* rather than *remembereth* as the original reading here in verse 32. The most plausible solution in Ether 12:32 is to assume that the original text read “and I also **remember**” rather than “and I also **remembereth**”. The third possibility, “and I also **rememberest**”, the actual reading of the earliest text, is most probably an error caused by the surrounding instances of *didst*, *hast*, and *hast*.

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith’s emendation of *rememberest* to *remember* in Ether 12:32; the *-est* ending appears to be an error due to the instance of *didst* earlier in the passage and to two instances of *hast* in the immediately following subordinate clause; usage elsewhere in the text argues against *remembereth* as the original reading in this passage.

■ Ether 12:32

*and I also remember that thou hast said
that thou hast prepared a house for man
yea even among the mansions of thy Father
in the which man might have [a more ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | an HK] excellent hope*

The 1874 RLDS edition changed “**a more** excellent hope” to “**an** excellent hope”. This change is not simply the loss of *more* since the indefinite article was also changed from *a* to *an*, in agreement with the following vowel-initial *excellent*. In any event, a similar phrase is found earlier in Ether 12:11 and there the 1874 RLDS edition did not introduce this change: “but in the gift of his Son hath God prepared **a more** excellent way”. In accord with the earlier reading in \mathcal{P} , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *a more* here in verse 32.

Don Brugger suggests (personal communication) that the 1874 change might have been motivated by the prescriptivist rule against modifying an absolute—that is, perhaps the editors for that edition thought there shouldn’t be any comparison for the phrase *excellent hope*. It should be noted that the phrase “a more excellent way”, found in verse 11, also occurs in 1 Corinthians 12:31, which likewise refers to gifts: “but covet earnestly the best gifts / and yet shew I unto you **a more** excellent way”. Perhaps familiarity with the King James Bible prevented the 1874 editors (or the typesetter) from changing the phrase “a more excellent way” to “an excellent way” in Ether 12:11.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:32 the original phrase “a more excellent hope”, which parallels the phrase “a more excellent way” in Ether 12:11 (which also occurs in 1 Corinthians 12:31).

■ 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*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “even unto the **setting** down in the place which I have prepared in the mansions of my father”. Oliver corrected *setting* to *sitting* by overwriting the *e* with an *i*. The level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier, so it is difficult to tell here whether Oliver consciously edited *setting* to *sitting* or whether he was simply trying to copy the word accurately from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . As explained under Helaman 14:4, Oliver normally copied the verbs *sit* and *set* without grammatical correction. Sometimes in the history of the text, the verb *sit* is found in transitive contexts; less frequently, the verb *set* is found in intransitive contexts. Virtually all these nonstandard uses were written without emendation in the manuscripts.

Here in Ether 12:37 we have the only potential example where Oliver Cowdery could have consciously emended the form of the verb for either *sit* or *set*. In contrast, the 1830 typesetter frequently emended the nonstandard instances of *sit* to *set* (see the examples listed under Helaman 14:4). The most reasonable assumption is that in Ether 12:37 Oliver corrected \mathcal{P} to *sitting* because it read that way in \mathcal{O} . Oliver frequently mixed up *e* and *i* in his copywork, and that is what seems to have happened here when he copied the word from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . He probably made the correction when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , thus the somewhat heavier ink flow for the correction. (For another example of Oliver’s tendency to mix up *e* and *i*, see under 1 Nephi 22:4 where I discuss the competition between *whether* and *whither*.)

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:37 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “even unto the **sitting** down in the place which I have prepared in the mansions of my Father”; in this case, Oliver Cowdery appears to have accidentally written *setting*, which he later corrected to *sitting*, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

■ Ether 12:41

*and now I would **commend** you to seek this Jesus
of whom the prophets and apostles have written*

We might wonder here if the word *commend* isn’t a mistake for *command* or *recommend*. But in the Oxford English Dictionary, there is evidence that the verb *commend* (under definition 2d) had the meaning ‘to recommend (a person) to do a thing’, with the following citation from Early Modern English (original spelling retained):

William Lilly (1647)
Some friend shall commend the party inquiring
to accept of some employment very advantagious.

In other words, there is no need here in Ether 12:41 to emend *commend* to *recommend* since *commend* earlier had ‘recommend’ as one of its meanings (this meaning is marked as obsolete in the OED). It is also unlikely here in Ether 12:41 that the original text read *command* rather than *commend*; elsewhere in the history of the text, there are no examples where *command* and *commend* have ever been mixed up, even momentarily in the manuscripts.

There is another instance of *commend* in the Book of Mormon text that has an archaic meaning; in this case the meaning is ‘entrust’:

Ether 6:4

they got aboard of their vessels or barges and set forth into the sea
commending themselves unto the Lord their God

This meaning is listed in the OED under definition 1b for *commend*. The King James Bible has a number of cases where *commend* has this meaning (as in Acts 20:32: “I commend you to God”).

Summary: Maintain both instances of *commend* in the Book of Mormon, in Ether 6:4 and Ether 12:41; in each case, the assigned meaning is either obsolete or no longer common.

■ Ether 12:41

*and now I would commend you to seek this Jesus
of whom the prophets and apostles have written
that the grace of God the Father and also the Lord Jesus Christ
and the Holy Ghost which beareth record of them
may be and abide [in 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | with HK] you forever*

Once more the 1874 RLDS edition introduced a minor change in the text (from “abide **in** you” to “abide **with** you”). This rash of changes suggests tiring on the part of the typesetter for this part of the text. In modern English, we expect the preposition *with* here, which seems to have triggered this error in the 1874 RLDS edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct preposition to the RLDS text.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text allows either *in* or *with* to occur with the verb *abide*:

Alma 17:9

that the Lord would grant unto them a portion of his Spirit
to go with them and abide **with** them

Mormon 2:26

yea we were left to ourselves
that the Spirit of the Lord did not abide **in** us

Moroni 9:26

and may the grace of God the Father whose throne is high in the heavens
and our Lord Jesus Christ who sitteth on the right hand of his power
until all things shall become subject unto him
be and abide **with** you forever

In addition, the use of *in* with *abide* is characteristic of the epistles of John in the King James Bible, as in 1 John 2:14: “and the word of God abideth **in** you”. Thus there is no need to replace the biblically supported *in* with *with* here in Ether 12:41.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 12:41 the use of the preposition *in* with the verb *abide*, which is supported by usage in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible (especially in the epistles of John).

Ether 13

■ Ether 13:2

*for behold they rejected all the words of Ether
for he truly told them of all things from the beginning of man
and [how >js NULL 1 | how A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that
after the waters had receded from off the face of this land
it became a choice land above all other lands*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *how* before *that* here in Ether 13:2. He also made the same change in 1 Nephi 10:3. Such usage occurs elsewhere in the text of the Book of Mormon and has otherwise been retained. The critical text will restore the original instance of “how that” here in Ether 13:2. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 10:2–3.

■ Ether 13:2

*wherefore the Lord would have
[NULL >+ that 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all men should serve him*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the subordinate conjunction *that*. Later he supralinearly added the *that*, perhaps when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (the level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier). The original manuscript is not extant here, and the lacuna between surviving fragments is over five lines long; thus it is hard to tell if the *that* was in \mathcal{O} , but presumably it was.

It turns out that this is the only occurrence in the Book of Mormon of the expression “X would have that S”, where S is a clause. Elsewhere the text has 76 instances of “X would that S”; there are also four instances of “X would **not** that S” as well as one in question form, “would ye that S” (in Alma 30:51). The uniqueness of *would have that* here in Ether 13:2 makes one wonder if this isn’t an error for *would that*. In other words, perhaps \mathcal{O} read “wherefore the Lord **would that** all men should serve him”. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he could have misread the *that* as *have*, thus initially writing in \mathcal{P} “wherefore the Lord **would have** all men should serve him”. When he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , he noticed that he had omitted the *that*, which he then supplied in \mathcal{P} ; but he did not notice that \mathcal{O} lacked the *have* (or perhaps he simply neglected to cross out the extra *have* in \mathcal{P}), so he ended up with “wherefore the Lord **would have that** all men should serve him”, a unique reading.

The King James Bible has eight instances of “X would that S”, all in the New Testament (as in 1 Corinthians 7:7: “for I **would that** all men were even as I myself”). There are also four instances of

“X would not that S”, again all in the New Testament. There’s also one example in *wh*-question form, in Mark 10:36: “what would ye that I should do for you”. But there are no instances of “X would (not) have that S” in the King James Bible. Nonetheless, there is evidence for *would have that* in English, at least in the 19th century, as in these two examples (here cited with accidentals ignored) from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

William Dunlap (1836)

doing to others as we **would have that** they should do to us

Robert Smith Surtees (1854)

he **would have that** I had spoiled him when I did so

The first example is a paraphrase of the Golden Rule (Matthew 7:12), which in the King James version reads *would that* rather than *would have that*: “therefore all things whatsoever ye **would that** men should do to you / do ye even so to them”. In addition, Don Brugger (personal communication) provides this example from the Internet, also dating from the 19th century:

John Nelson Darby (1842)

God **would have that** His whole being should be evidently manifested, and this manifestation is seen in Jesus.

Thus it seems that the unique reading in Ether 13:2 is possible, and it will therefore be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:2 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , “wherefore the Lord **would have that** all men should serve him”; there is evidence for the expression “X would have that S” in 19th century English, although it occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon or in the King James Bible.

■ Ether 13:2–3

*it became a choice land above all other lands / a chosen land of the Lord
wherefore the Lord **would have that** all men **should** serve him
which [dwelt 1 | dwelleth A | dwell BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon the face thereof
and that it **was** the place of the New Jerusalem
which **should** come down out of heaven*

Here the original form for the verb *dwell* is not extant in the original manuscript. The printer’s manuscript has the simple past-tense form *dwelt*, which the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, changed to the present tense. He selected *dwelleth* rather than *dwell*. Perhaps he thought that the final *t* of *dwelt* in \mathcal{D} indicated that the original present-tense verb form had a *t*, in other words, *dwelleth*. This interpretation would then mean that somehow Oliver Cowdery had miswritten in \mathcal{O} or \mathcal{P} the original *dwelleth* as *dwelt*. The original language of the Book of Mormon allows the *-eth* ending in the third person plural (the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is the plural *all men*), so Gilbert’s emendation is possible for the original text. On the other hand, the 1837 edition removed the *-eth* ending but kept the verb in the present tense (“which **dwelt** upon the face thereof”).

Another possibility is that the original past-tense form *dwelt* is actually correct since the larger passage is consistently in the past tense (“it **became** a choice land . . . and that it **was** the place of

the New Jerusalem”). Also note that the conditional modal verbs *would* and *should*, found in the immediately surrounding text, are past-tense forms historically. Such past-tense usage is still found in English today, for instance, in present conditional sentences such as “I **would** tell you if I **wanted** to go” (in comparison to past conditional sentences such as “I **would have** told you if I **had wanted** to go”, where the perfect auxiliary forms *have* and *had* are added to show past time).

There are three other passages in the Book of Mormon that refer to the people dwelling upon the promised land, and each of these is in the present tense:

2 Nephi 1:9

and if it so be that they **shall** keep his commandments
they **shall** be blessed upon the face of this land
and there **shall** be none to molest them
nor to take away the land of their inheritance
and they **shall dwell** safely forever

2 Nephi 1:31

wherefore because thou **hast** been faithful
thy seed **shall** be blessed with his seed
that they **dwell** in prosperity long upon the face of this land

2 Nephi 10:19

for it **is** a choice land . . . above all other lands
wherefore I **will** have all men that **dwell** thereon
that they **shall** worship me

Yet unlike the case in Ether 13:2, the surrounding text in these three cases is in the present tense; moreover, the modal verbs *shall* and *will*, unlike *should* and *would*, are present-tense forms historically.

Earlier, when I did my transcript for \mathcal{O} , I conjectured that in Ether 13:2 the original text (and \mathcal{O} itself) read *dwell* (as in the 1837 edition), largely on the basis of the present-tense passages listed above that have *dwell*. If the original text here in Ether 13:2 had the present-tense *dwell*, then we would have to explain how it ended up being *dwelt* in \mathcal{P} . One possibility is that Oliver Cowdery (in either \mathcal{O} or \mathcal{P}) accidentally crossed the final *l* of *dwell*. This seems more plausible than the possibility that in \mathcal{O} or \mathcal{P} Oliver accidentally wrote *dwelt* in place of a supposed *dwelleth*. There are no examples in his manuscript work of this latter kind of error, but there are quite a few cases in \mathcal{P} where Oliver accidentally crossed an *l*. For instance, in 3 Nephi 18:26 he intended to write the word *disciples* as *desipels* (in the manuscripts Oliver usually spelled *disciple* as *desipel*), but here in \mathcal{P} he ended up crossing the *l*, so the word looks like *desipets*. Nonetheless, there are no specific examples where Oliver accidentally wrote *dwelt* in place of a correct *dwell*, not even momentarily. (The same holds for the verb *spill*, another verb in the text that would have ended in *lt* in the past tense.) In fact, there are no cases where Oliver accidentally crossed any word-final *l*; all his crossed *l*'s (22 of them) occur earlier in the word (such as the *l* that he crossed in *desipels*, mentioned above).

Another possible argument for *dwelt* in Ether 13:2 as an error for *dwell* is the higher frequency of *dwelt* in the book of Ether: prior to Ether 13:2, there are 13 instances of *dwelt* in the original text for Ether, but there are only two of *dwell*. Oliver, either in \mathcal{O} itself or when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , could have been prompted to accidentally write *dwelt* in place of *dwell* in Ether 13:2. Yet it

should be pointed out that none of the two instances of *dwell* earlier in Ether were mistakenly written as *dwelt*. In other words, it is difficult to find explicit evidence for *dwelt* as a mistake for *dwell*.

Ultimately, we have to realize that the past-tense *dwelt* will work here in Ether 13:2 since the entire passage is in the past tense (including the historically past-tense modal verbs *should* and *would*). The critical text will therefore restore the past-tense *dwelt* in this passage.

Summary: Restore in Ether 13:2 the past-tense verb form *dwelt* since this is the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the earliest extant source; the 1830 typesetter changed this to the present-tense form *dwell* since the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* was the plural *all men*.

■ Ether 13:4

*behold Ether saw the **days** of Christ*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 19 May 2008) wonders if the plural *days* here in Ether 13:4 is an error for *day*. In the discussion under Alma 50:23, I note that the Book of Mormon text definitely prefers the plural expression “the days of X”, where X is a personal name. As noted in that discussion, *Christ* could be considered a title rather than a personal name. Nonetheless, the plural *days* is expected in this expression; the only example in the earliest text with *day* is “the day of Nephi” in Alma 50:23, but as explained under that passage the critical text will accept the 1830 emendation to “the days of Nephi”. Here in Ether 13:4, the critical text will maintain the plural *days* in “the days of Christ”, the earliest extant reading (the reading in \mathcal{P} since \mathcal{C} is not extant here).

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:4 the plural *days* in “the days of Christ”, the reading of the earliest textual sources; usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural *days* in the phrase “the days of X”, where X is a name.

■ Ether 13:5

it should be built up again

[& 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *holy city unto the Lord*

As explained under Alma 8:20, this passage in Ether 13:5 appears to be the only place in the original text with the phrase “an holy <noun>”. The original manuscript is not extant, but the printer’s manuscript reads “& Holy City”. Ultimately, this *and* was probably a mishearing of the indefinite article *an*; that is, Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted Joseph Smith’s *an* as the casual speech pronunciation of the word *and* and wrote an ampersand in \mathcal{C} . Later Oliver copied the ampersand of \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Although the 1830 typesetter realized that *and* was wrong, he replaced the ampersand with *a* rather than *an*. We have specific evidence in the manuscripts that *an* can be misheard as *and*; see under 1 Nephi 13:29, where an original “**an** exceeding great many” was replaced by “**and** exceeding great many” in \mathcal{C} .

The choice of *a* rather than the *an* before *holy* is consistent with all other examples of “a(n) holy <noun>” in the Book of Mormon text—that is, elsewhere in the text there are 16 occurrences

of “a holy <noun>”, including two nearby examples of “a holy city” (one later in this verse and another in Ether 13:8). There are, in other words, no other instances in the text of “an holy <noun>”. Thus the 1830 emendation to “a holy city” is consistent with all other usage in the text.

The use of *an* before *h*-initial words is, however, a characteristic of the King James style. And there are occurrences in the Book of Mormon text of *an* before *h*-initial words. See, for instance, the discussion under 3 Nephi 26:6, where I note that “**an** hundred” is the expected Book of Mormon form with the cardinal number, while on the other hand “**a** hundredth” is the expected form with the ordinal number. Moreover, the King James Bible has 41 occurrences of *an holy* but only two of *a holy*, thus implying that “an holy city” is the preferred King James style (although there are no specific examples in the biblical text of “a(n) holy city”). It should also be noted that it is textually possible in the biblical style for *a* to be replaced by *an* before *h*-initial words, although the only Book of Mormon example is in the 1852 LDS edition (see under Alma 8:20 for the change of “a holy prophet” to “an holy prophet”).

David Calabro suggests (personal communication) another possible emendation here in Ether 13:5: the original text could have read with the verb *be* or *become* plus the indefinite article *a* before *holy*. In other words, the text could have read “it should be built up again and **be(come)** a holy city unto the Lord”. There are two advantages to this emendation: (1) the *and* in \mathcal{P} is explained, and (2) there are now no instances in the text of *an holy*. (Of course, there are still examples in the text of *an* before other *h*-initial words, as explained above.)

Further, one can find specific support for the emendation with *become* in the immediately following language in this verse:

Ether 13:5

wherefore it could not be a New Jerusalem
for it had been in a time of old
but it should be built up again **and become** a holy city of the Lord

There is a difference in the preposition after *holy city*: namely, “**unto** the Lord” earlier in the verse, but “**of** the Lord” later. It should be noted that later in Ether 13 there is evidence for the expression “build up a holy city unto the Lord”:

Ether 13:8

and they shall build up a holy city unto the Lord
like unto the Jerusalem of old

Thus there is nothing wrong with the reading “it should be built up again a(n) holy city unto the Lord” in verse 5.

If Calabro’s proposed emendation is correct, then the verb *be* or *become*, as well as the original indefinite article *a*, was somehow lost during the early transmission of the text. In the printer’s manuscript, we can find evidence for the loss of the *be* verb alone, including one example by Oliver Cowdery (marked below with an asterisk):

Mosiah 27:16 (omitted by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} without correction in proofing)
that their prayers may [1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] answered

Alma 5:62 (omitted by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ; corrected by Oliver Cowdery when proofing)
come and [§2 NULL >+ §1 *be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] baptized

* Moroni 7:42 (initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery)

for without faith

there cannot [NULL >+ *be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] any hope

There are, however, no examples of the verb *become* being omitted in the manuscripts (or in the editions for that matter). To be sure, there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally omitted the indefinite article *a* before a noun; for three examples, see under Helaman 14:13. Of course, for this proposed emendation here in Ether 13:5 we have to have the loss of both the verb and the indefinite article. We have no specific evidence for this kind of more extensive loss in the transmission of the text, but it is not impossible since there are examples of multiple word loss in the history of the text.

The question here is which transmission error is the more likely. In the first case, *an* was misheard as *and*, for which we have specific evidence elsewhere in the text (in 1 Nephi 13:29). In the second case, *be a* or *become a* was accidentally omitted (for which we have no specific evidence). Either conjectured reading is possible. Therefore, the critical text will accept the emendation that most readily explains the reading in \mathcal{P} , namely, the earlier replacement of an original *an* with *and* in \mathcal{C} , thus accepting an original “an holy city” here in Ether 13:5 (but for only the first instance of “a(n) holy city” in that verse).

Summary: Accept in Ether 13:5 the interpretation of “& Holy City” in \mathcal{P} as a mishearing of the biblically styled phrase “**an** holy city”; this error can be supported by the same mishearing of *an* as *and* in 1 Nephi 13:29.

■ Ether 13:5

for it had been in [a 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] time of old

Here the 1874 RLDS edition made a slight change in the text by dropping the indefinite article *a*. This appears to have been an accident, but one cannot be sure since there are no other occurrences in the text of “in (a) time of old”. What we do have is “in times of old”—that is, without the *a* but with the plural *times* (five times). The fact that the 1874 RLDS edition did not change *time* to *times* here in Ether 13:5 indicates that this is probably a typo. The critical text, of course, will follow the earliest reading, “in **a** time of old”, despite its uniqueness. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading to the RLDS text. In support of this reading, *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> cites the following example of “a time of old” from Early Modern English (original accidentals retained):

George Daniel (1657)

alas, I know

Our carefull Sires would tell a Time of old,

When all was good;

Summary: Accept the unique reading “in a time of old” in Ether 13:5; although strange, this expression appears to be correct rather than an error for the relatively common “in times of old”.

■ Ether 13:5–6

and the Jerusalem from whence Lehi should come
 after that it should be destroyed
 it should be built **up** again an holy city unto the Lord
 wherefore it could not be a New Jerusalem
 for it had been in a time of old
 but it should be built **up** again
 and become a holy city of the Lord
 and it should be built [up 1ABCPS | DEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] unto the house of Israel
 and that a New Jerusalem should be built **up** upon this land
 unto the remnant of the seed of Joseph

■ Ether 13:8

wherefore the remnant of the house of Joseph
 shall be built [up 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] upon this land
 and it shall be a land of their inheritance
 and they shall build **up** a holy city unto the Lord
 like unto the Jerusalem of old

In these two passages, there were originally six cases of “to build up”, but in two cases the *up* has been accidentally lost (one case was in the 1841 British edition, the other in the 1830 edition). These changes are not due to any kind of systematic editing, but they have nonetheless persisted in the LDS text. In the second case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *up* to the RLDS text. Obviously, the tendency to drop the *up* is quite strong. There are other places in the text where *up* has been omitted; for some examples, see under Alma 2:15.

Summary: Restore the missing *up* in Ether 13:5 (“and it should be built **up** unto the house of Israel”) and in Ether 13:8 (“the remnant of the house of Joseph shall be built **up** upon this land”).

■ Ether 13:12

and when these things come
 bringeth to pass the scripture which saith . . .

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004) suggests that the subject pronoun *it* was accidentally dropped here in Ether 13:12 (thus “and when these things come / **it** bringeth to pass the scripture which saith . . .”). Indeed, for most instances in the active voice of “bring to pass”, a subject is normally specified (ten times), but not in the following case:

Alma 28:10

and from the first year to the fifteenth
 has brought to pass the destruction of many thousand lives
 yea it has brought to pass an awful scene of bloodshed

Note, however, that the following clause does have a subject *it* (“yea **it** has brought to pass an awful scene of bloodshed”). Perhaps the difference is that in the first instance there is an introductory adverbial of time (“from the first year to the fifteenth”), just like in Ether 13:12 (“when

these things come”). The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading here in Ether 13:12 without any explicit subject for the verb phrase “bringeth to pass the scripture”.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in Ether 13:12 without any explicit subject for “bringeth to pass the scripture”; another example of this construction occurs in Alma 28:10.

■ Ether 13:14

*and as he dwelt in the cavity of a rock
he made the remainder of this record
viewing the [destruction >+ destructions 1 | destructions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which came upon the people
by night*

There are nine instances of the plural *destructions* in the Book of Mormon; each has the meaning ‘destructive events’, as here in Ether 13:14, and does not refer to the entire destruction of a people (for discussion of this point, see under 1 Nephi 15:5). In this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *destruction* in the printer’s manuscript, but later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he inserted the plural *s* (probably when he proofed \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{O} , which is not extant here). The plural is undoubtedly correct since the previous verse uses the plural *things* to convey a similar idea:

Ether 13:13
and he hid himself in the cavity of a rock by day
and by night he went forth viewing **the things**
which should come upon the people

The critical text will accept the corrected plural *destructions* in Ether 13:14 as the original reading.

Summary: Maintain the plural *destructions* in Ether 13:14, the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} ; usage elsewhere in the text consistently assigns the meaning ‘destructive events’ to the plural *destructions*.

■ 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 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | come H] upon the people
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS |, RT] by night*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the past-tense *came* with *come*. This is an obvious typo that was removed in the subsequent RLDS edition (in 1892).

Also note here the placement of the prepositional phrase *by night* at the end of the passage. Without the appropriate punctuation, one would tend to read *by night* as stating that the destructions came by night. Yet in the book of Ether, battles (unless otherwise stated) are always fought during the daytime. Consider, for instance, the series of final battles in Ether 15:15–26 where the two armies battle in the daytime but at night rest and prepare for battle on the following day. There is only one battle described as occurring at night (and explicitly mentioned as such in Ether 8:5: “they did give battle unto him by night”). So here in Ether 13:14, Ether goes out by

night, during the lull in the fighting, to observe what has happened. In fact, this is precisely what verse 13 states: “and he hid himself in the cavity of a rock by day / and by night he went forth viewing the things which should come upon the people”. So in verse 14, in order to show that *by night* modifies *viewing* and not *came upon*, the 1920 LDS edition placed a comma before *by night*. The critical text will also adopt this distinguishing use of the comma. For other examples of displaced prepositional phrases in the text, see under Mosiah 26:23 (or, more generally, under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in volume 3).

Summary: Maintain the comma in Ether 13:14 that separates *by night* from the immediately preceding relative clause, “which came upon the people”.

■ Ether 13:15

and it came to pass that in that same year

[1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *in* RT] *which he was cast out from among the people there began to be a great war among the people*

As discussed under Helaman 13:22, in the Book of Mormon text the preposition *in* can be lacking at the head of a relative clause when it is immediately preceded by a prepositional phrase headed by *in*, not only here in Ether 13:15 but also in two other cases:

2 Nephi 2:22

and all things which were created must have remained **in** the same state

[1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *in* RT] which they were

Helaman 13:22

ye do not remember the Lord your God **in** the things

[1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *with* RT] which he hath blessed you

In order to deal with the awkwardness of the earliest reading in each of these three cases, the 1920 LDS edition added a preposition before the relative pronoun *which*, either *in* (in 2 Nephi 2:22 and Ether 13:15) or *with* (in Helaman 13:22). For another case of this kind of grammatical editing, see under Ether 11:21, where the preposition *by* was editorially inserted in a similar situation. Here in Ether 13:15 the critical text will restore the earlier reading without the preposition *in* before *which*.

Summary: Remove *in* in Ether 13:15 the textually intrusive preposition *in* before the relative pronoun *which*; the earliest text lacks the expected preposition here, but this reading, however awkward, appears to be intentional since such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ Ether 13:17

but he repented not

neither his fair sons [nor 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | and D] daughters

*neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Cohor*

*neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Corihor*

The 1841 British edition changed the *nor* before the first *daughters* to *and*, undoubtedly under the influence of the following “neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Cohor / neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Corihor”. The subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the original *nor*.

Another difference between these three conjoinings of *sons* and *daughters* is that the last two give the name of the father, while the first one uses *his* (because Coriantumr has already been mentioned). A stronger cohesiveness is required when the name is given after the conjunct. If *nor* were used in the last two conjuncts, it would be more difficult to associate the following name with both the sons and the daughters.

This question of cohesiveness may be related to the discussion under Ether 6:20. There we saw that the determiner *the* was not repeated in a conjunct followed by the actual name of a person (thus, “the number of the sons and daughters of Jared”). Following names seem to require a closer connection between the conjuncts; for that reason, *and* is chosen over *nor*, and determiners are not repeated.

Summary: Accept in Ether 13:17 “neither his fair sons **nor** daughters” as well as “neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Cohor / neither the fair sons **and** daughters of Corihor”; when followed by a name, the conjuncts *sons* and *daughters* are more closely associated syntactically.

■ Ether 13:17

and in fine

there [was 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQS | were HKRT] none

of the fair sons and daughters

upon the face of the whole earth

which repented of their sins

Here the 1874 RLDS edition and the 1920 LDS edition changed the singular “there **was** none” to the plural “there **were** none”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *was* to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has continued with the secondary *were*.

The Book of Mormon text has examples of the subject *none* taking singular and plural verb forms, as in these examples where either could occur:

2 Nephi 7:2	yea there was none to answer
2 Nephi 20:14	and there was none that moved the wing
2 Nephi 26:28	and none are forbidden
Mosiah 21:33	but there was none in the land that had authority from God
Alma 13:19	but none were greater
Alma 26:21	there is none that knoweth these things save it be the penitent
Alma 42:24	and thus none but the truly penitent are saved
3 Nephi 19:36	there are none of them that have seen so great things
3 Nephi 27:30	for none of them are lost
3 Nephi 27:31	and none of them are lost
Mormon 5:24	and there is none to deliver
Mormon 8:9	for there are none save it be Lamanites and robbers
Ether 4:3	and there is none save it be the Lamanites
Ether 13:31	and there was none to constrain them
Ether 14:22	there was none left to bury the dead
Moroni 7:44	for none is acceptable before God save the meek and lowly of heart

(The first two of these are quotes from Isaiah; the phrase in Mormon 5:24, “there is none to deliver”, is biblically styled, as in Psalm 7:2 and Psalm 71:11.) The grammatical number has not been changed in any of these cases (although in Ether 4:3 Joseph Smith momentarily changed the *is* to *are* in \mathcal{P} in his editing for the 1837 edition, but then he changed his mind and restored the singular *is* in \mathcal{P}). Thus the critical text will in each case of subject *none* follow the number of the verb in the earliest reading. Hence here in Ether 13:17, the original *was* will be restored.

Summary: Restore the original singular *was* in Ether 13:17, “there **was** none of the fair sons and daughters upon the face of the whole earth which repented of their sins”.

■ Ether 13:18

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

As explained under 3 Nephi 1:22, Oliver Cowdery frequently omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* after “it came to pass”, although usually only momentarily. Here in Ether 13:18, he supralinearly inserted the *that* later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (which is not extant here); the level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier. The inserted *that* is much like the supralinearly inserted *all* that occurs later on in this page of \mathcal{P} (see under Ether 13:20–21). Not only is the level of ink flow for both corrections the same, but the insert mark in both cases is smeared in the same direction. Moreover, the *all* in verse 20 is extant in \mathcal{C} , which argues that here in verse 18 the subordinate *that* was in \mathcal{C} and not added in \mathcal{P} as a result of editing on Oliver’s part.

We should also note that here in Ether 13:18 the *that* that occurs after “in the first year” is a relative pronoun and not the subordinate conjunction *that*. Earlier, in Ether 13:13–14, the text mentions that Ether was hiding out in the cave, so in verse 18 the text specifies that this large number of deaths occurred during the first year of his hiding out in the cave.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:18 the *that* that Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted, apparently when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} ; the *that* was probably inserted here because that was the reading in \mathcal{C} .

■ Ether 13:18

there was many people which was slain by the sword

[NULL >jg *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *those secret combinations*

fighting against Coriantumr

that they might obtain the kingdom

Here the printer’s manuscript originally read “by the sword those secret combinations”, which didn’t make sense to the 1830 typesetter; he therefore inserted *of* in pencil after “by the sword”, thus creating a prepositional phrase, “**of** those secret combinations”. This *of* is found throughout all the printed editions of the Book of Mormon, yet the *of* seems quite odd. There is only one example that refers to the sword in a similar way in the singular:

1 Nephi 22:13

for they shall war among themselves
and the sword **of** their own hands shall fall upon their own heads

But there the reference is to “their own hands” and not to the name of a group of people, as here in Ether 13:18. (When referring to swords in the plural, we can get such usage, as in Alma 44:18: “their naked skins and their bare heads were exposed to the sharp swords **of** the Nephites / yea behold they were pierced and smitten yea and did fall exceeding fast before the swords **of** the Nephites”.)

Another way to interpret the preposition *of* in Ether 13:18 is as a complement to the past participle *slain*. In similar cases elsewhere in the text, the verb phrase “slain of X” (where X is a plural noun phrase) means that X were slain, not that X did the slaying:

2 Nephi 26:7

O the pain and the anguish of my soul
for the loss of the slain **of** my people

Omni 1:21

and they gave an account of one Coriantumr and the slain **of** his people

Alma 2:19

insomuch that there was slain **of** the Amlicites
twelve thousand five hundred thirty and two souls
and there was slain **of** the Nephites
six thousand five hundred sixty and two souls

Alma 17:36

nevertheless they were angry because of the slain **of** their brethren

Alma 19:21

for they were angry with Ammon because of the number
which he had slain **of** their brethren at the waters of Sebus

3 Nephi 9:2

for the devil laugheth and his angels rejoice
because of the slain **of** the fair sons and daughters of my people

Mormon 6:16

and my soul was rent with anguish because **of** the slain of my people

Ether 15:16

and after that they had retired to their camps
they took up a howling and a lamentation for the loss of the slain **of** their people

Ether 15:17

and when the night came
again they did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mourning
for the loss of the slain **of** their people

In the example in Alma 19:21, there is a displaced prepositional phrase headed by *of* that refers to the antecedent noun phrase; that is, the equivalent reading is “because of the number **of** their brethren which he had slain at the waters of Sebus”. Here is another example where an *of* prepositional phrase refers to the antecedent noun phrase:

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

In this case there are actually two displaced prepositional phrases; the equivalent reading is “and with them a part of those men **of** Antipus which were not slain”.

So it is theoretically possible that the *of* prepositional phrase in the current text for Ether 13:18 refers to the antecedent noun phrase; that is, the equivalent reading could be “there were many people **of** those secret combinations fighting against Coriantumr which were slain by the sword”. However, this interpretation does not really work since verse 18 ends with the resultive clause “that they might obtain the kingdom”—that is, the intent of the secret combinations was to take over the kingdom. This final *that*-clause would not have been added if the text meant to say that it was those secret combinations that were being destroyed.

The larger passage implies that it is the secret combinations that were slaying many people, or in other words, “the secret combinations” is the agent in the passage. Elsewhere in the text, when referring to people being slain, we have the agentive preposition *by* when identifying those doing the slaying:

Mosiah 25:9	when they thought of their brethren which had been slain by the Lamanites
Alma 18:3	that he cannot be slain by the enemies of the king
Alma 47:32	that the king had been slain by his servants
Alma 47:34	that the king was slain by his own servants
Helaman 15:9	that they be trodden down and slain by their enemies
Mormon 3:9	that they would avenge themselves of the blood of their brethren which had been slain by their enemies
Mormon 7:5	and that he was slain by the Jews

Although none of these agentive examples explicitly mention death by the sword, the original text here in Ether 13:18 probably read “there was many people which was slain by the sword **by** those secret combinations”. Somehow the second *by* was accidentally dropped, most likely when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} since the prepositional phrase “by the sword” ends the line in \mathcal{P} . Probably the preceding *by* in “by the sword” led to the loss of the second *by* as Oliver completed the first prepositional phrase headed by *by*. The 1830 typesetter inserted *of* for the missing *by*, but that emendation doesn’t really work.

Don Brugger (personal communication) wonders if the earliest text here might involve the loss of *because of*, so that it originally read “there was many people which was slain by the sword **because of** those secret combinations fighting against Coriantumr”. Such a reading will work. There is also support for the syntax of this proposed emendation, where the noun phrase for the *because of* is a gerundive, as in the original text for Alma 56:10: “**because of** the enormity of their forces having slain a vast number of our men”. The main problem with accepting *because of* as the correct reading for the original text here in Ether 13:18 is that the loss of *because of* seems quite unlikely. There is, to be sure, one case where the conjunction *because* was omitted (by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P}):

Mosiah 29:20 (*because* supplied by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O})
 but behold he did deliver them
 because they did humble themselves before him
 and [§2 NULL > §1 *because* 1 | *because* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they
 cried mightily unto him
 he did deliver them out of bondage

There is also evidence for the momentary loss of *of* from *because of*, as in these three examples where Oliver Cowdery made the error:

Alma 33:11 (initial loss in \mathcal{P})
 and thou didst hear me
 because [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] mine afflictions

Alma 53:9 (initial loss in \mathcal{O})
 and thus because of iniquity amongst themselves
 yea because [NULL > *of* 0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] dissensions
 and intrigue among themselves . . .

Helaman 12:2 (initial loss in \mathcal{P})
 yea and this because [NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] their ease
 and their exceeding great prosperity

But there are no examples in the transmission of the text where *because of* was ever lost. Thus it seems best to accept here in Ether 13:18 the emendation that assumes the loss of a single short preposition, namely *by*, rather than the longer *because of*.

Summary: Emend Ether 13:18 by replacing the secondary preposition *of* with *by*; the 1830 typesetter's *of* isn't really appropriate, while the preposition *by* not only works but it also helps explain why it could have been lost (namely, the preceding prepositional phrase was also headed by *by*).

■ Ether 13:20

and in the second year

the word of the Lord came [*unto* >+ *to* 1 | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] *Ether*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “unto Ether” in the printer’s manuscript, but later he corrected *unto* to *to* by crossing out the *un* (the level of ink flow for the crossout appears to be somewhat heavier, like the other corrections on this page of \mathcal{P} that were the result of Oliver’s proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}). Elsewhere, when referring to the word(s) of the Lord coming to someone, the text has four examples with the preposition *unto* but three with *to*:

Alma 8:29	and the word came to Alma
Alma 43:24	the word of the Lord came unto Alma
Helaman 13:36	in the day that the word of the Lord came unto us
3 Nephi 1:15	the words which came unto Nephi was fulfilled
3 Nephi 1:25	yea the word came unto them that it must be fulfilled
Ether 14:24	and the word of the Lord which came to Ether that . . .
Moroni 8:7	and the word of the Lord came to me by the power of the Holy Ghost

Since either preposition is possible, it seems unlikely that the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Ether 13:20 is due to conscious editing; rather, the original manuscript probably read “the word of the Lord came **to** Ether”.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:20 the preposition *to* in “the word of the Lord came **to** Ether”, the correction in \mathcal{P} (which very likely reflects the reading in \mathcal{C}).

■ Ether 13:20–21

*that he should go and prophesy unto Coriantumr
that if he would repent
and [all 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ all 1] his household
the Lord would give unto him his kingdom and spare the people
otherwise they should be destroyed and **all** his household
save it were himself*

As explained under 1 Nephi 7:5, the Book of Mormon text consistently refers to a patriarch’s “whole household” or “all his household”, such as twice here in Ether 13:20–21. In the first instance, however, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *all*, but later he supralinearly inserted it, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier, as it is with the supralinearly inserted *that* in verse 18, discussed above). In this particular case, the *all* here in verse 20 is extant in \mathcal{C} , so we can be sure that Oliver was not emending the text when he added the *all*. (The second *all*, in verse 21, is not extant in \mathcal{C} , but it was undoubtedly there.)

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:20–21 both occurrences of *all* in the phrase “all his household”, the reading in each case of the earliest extant text.

■ Ether 13:21

*otherwise they should be destroyed and all his household / save it were himself
and he **should only live** to see the fulfilling of the prophecies
which had been spoken concerning another people receiving the land for their inheritance*

The original manuscript is not extant here; the printer’s manuscript and all the printed editions have *only* between *should* and *live*. But one wonders if the word *only* might be misplaced. If *only* occurred before *he* or *should*, it would emphasize that only Coriantumr would see the coming of the people of Muloch. In the current text, the meaning seems to be that after everyone else is destroyed, Coriantumr will live only long enough to see these new people.

In Omni 1:21, we read of Coriantumr’s short time (nine months) with the people of Muloch. This is probably a time period short enough to fulfill Ether’s prophecy that Coriantumr wouldn’t live long after coming upon these people (at least under this interpretation of the scope for the word *only*). Without any more evidence, it is undoubtedly best to retain the word order found in the earliest textual source for Ether 13:21 (“and he **should only live** to see the fulfilling of the prophecies”).

Interestingly, there are no examples in the entire history of the Book of Mormon text where there has been a mix-up involving the word order for *only*. There are a few cases where Oliver Cowdery momentarily omitted *only* in the manuscripts (these are listed under Alma 43:20), but

in no case did he switch the order for that word. (In one place, in 1 Nephi 14:10, Joseph Smith added the word *only* in his editing for the 1837 edition.)

Summary: Maintain the original placement of *only* in Ether 13:21 (“he **should only live** to see the fulfilling of the prophecies”); there is no direct evidence that *only* is misplaced in this sentence; moreover, the interpretation resulting from having *only* between *should* and *live* will work, although it may be unexpected.

■ Ether 13:22

and the wars [did cease >]s ceased 1 | did cease A | ceased BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not

As explained under Ether 11:5, the critical text will maintain the original wording here in Ether 13:22 with the use of the *do* auxiliary (“and the wars **did cease** not”). It should be pointed out that there are a few more examples in the original text of such a periphrastic use of the *do* auxiliary in negative clauses where the *not* follows the main verb:

1 Nephi 18:13	nevertheless they did loose me not
Alma 49:10	for behold he did care not for the blood of his people
Helaman 5:44	yet it did harm them not

The first of these was edited by Joseph Smith, but the two others have been retained (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 18:13).

Summary: Restore the original *do* auxiliary in Ether 13:22: “and the wars did cease not”.

■ Ether 13:23

*and he did beat him
insomuch that in the third year he did bring him
[into 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | unto KPS] captivity*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally changed *into* to *unto*; although \mathcal{P} reads *into*, the secondary *unto* has continued in the RLDS text. Elsewhere in the text, there are eight occurrences of “bring **into** captivity” but none of “bring **unto** captivity”; thus the original text is fully consistent with respect to *into* versus *unto* after the verb *bring*. The critical text will maintain the preposition *into* here in Ether 13:23, the reading of the earliest text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:23 the original preposition *into* in “he did bring him **into** captivity”.

■ Ether 13:26

*and in fine all manner of wickedness
upon [all 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] the face of the land*

Here the 1905 LDS edition accidentally omitted *all* from the phrase “upon **all** the face of the land”; the 1911 LDS edition also lacks the *all* (its copytext was one of the later printings of the 1905 edition).

The 1920 LDS edition restored the *all* to the LDS text. Either reading, with or without the *all*, is possible. Elsewhere the text has 23 instances of “all the face of the land” and 39 of “the face of the land”. See under Helaman 14:20 for a general discussion regarding the textual variants for the phrase “the face of the land”. For each instance of this phrase, the critical text will follow the earliest reading. For another example of the omission of *all* from this phrase, see nearby under Ether 13:31. In that case, the 1840 edition accidentally omitted the *all*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:26 the *all* in the phrase “upon **all** the face of the land”, the reading of the earliest extant source (in this case, the printer’s manuscript).

■ Ether 13:27

*and it came to pass that Coriantumr was exceeding angry with Shared
and he went against **him** with his armies to battle
and they did meet in great anger
and they did meet [01ABCDGHKPRST | him EFIJLMNOQ] in the valley of Gilgal*

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally introduced the direct object pronoun *him* in the second instance of “they did meet”. Of course, the correct reading is that Coriantumr and Shared met each other in battle in the valley of Gilgal, so *him* is completely wrong. Note that the immediately preceding clause lacks the *him* (“and they did meet in great anger”). The 1849 typesetter was likely influenced by the use of *him* in the earlier clause “and he went against **him** with his armies to battle”. Surprisingly, this intrusive *him* remained in the LDS text until the 1920 LDS edition.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in Ether 13:27 without the direct object pronoun *him* after “they did meet” (in both cases).

■ Ether 13:27

*and they did meet
in the valley of [Gilgall >+ Gilgal 0 | Gilgal 1ABCDEFGH IJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here we have the first of three references to the valley of Gilgal near the end of Ether 13. Technically, the name *Gilgal* is a biblical name (it occurs 41 times in the King James Bible), but it is quite possible that this biblical connection was unrecognized by Oliver Cowdery and Joseph Smith. Initially spelled as *Gilgall* here in \mathcal{O} , the name was later corrected to *Gilgal* (Oliver crossed out the final *l* with a much heavier ink flow). For this first occurrence of “the valley of Gilgal”, it appears that Oliver and Joseph decided to check the spelling. We should note here that this example clearly shows that Joseph must have spelled out the name letter by letter since orally he could not have otherwise distinguished between *Gilgal* and *Gilgall*. (A similar argument is made for the spelling out of the name *Coriantumr* in Helaman 1:15, as discussed under that passage.)

It is worth noting that the name *Gilgal* appears twice earlier in the text, the first time as the name of a city (in 3 Nephi 9:6) and the second time as the name of a general (in Mormon 6:14). In those two cases, \mathcal{O} is not extant, nor does \mathcal{P} show any variation in the spelling for *Gilgal*. The

two subsequent spellings of *Gilgal* in Ether 13, in verses 29 and 30, also show no variation in \mathcal{P} (neither is sufficiently extant in \mathcal{G} to note any variation there).

Summary: Maintain throughout the Book of Mormon text the spelling of the name *Gilgal*, which is identical in spelling to the biblical name.

■ Ether 13:28

and it came to pass that Coriantumr beat him

and [did persue 0 | persued >+ did persue 1 | did pursue ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him

until he [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | had >+ NULL 1] came to the plains of Heshlon

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& **persued** him until he **had** came to the plains of Heshlon". Later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver corrected the reading to "& **did persue** him until he came to the plains of Heshlon"; that is, he added the *do* auxiliary to the verb *pursue* and changed the perfect *had came* to the simple past-tense *came*. Oliver probably made the change when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{G} . In this instance, \mathcal{G} is extant for this part of the verse and reads as corrected in \mathcal{P} .

See under Ether 10:8 for other cases here in the book of Ether where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *do* auxiliary. For Oliver's tendency to add the perfect auxiliary *had* in subordinate clauses, see under Alma 31:8–9.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:28 the reading in \mathcal{G} : "and did pursue him until he came to the plains of Heshlon" (which is also the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}).

■ Ether 13:30

*and Coriantumr gave [Shared 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] battle again
in the valley of Gilgal*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the indirect object *Shared*. Interestingly, the expression "give battle" always has an indirect object, represented below as X, in the Book of Mormon text, but it occurs in three different forms (in the following I provide one example of each type):

- "give battle unto X" (18 times)

Ether 13:16: "he **gave battle unto them** which sought to destroy him"

- "give X battle" (6 times)

Alma 47:8: "it was not Amalickiah's intention to **give them battle**"

- "give unto X battle" (2 times)

Helaman 1:29: "and thus he did head them . . . and **gave unto them battle**"

The original manuscript is not fully extant here in Ether 13:30, but spacing between extant fragments argues that *Shared* was in \mathcal{G} . The critical text will maintain the earliest reading, "and Coriantumr gave **Shared** battle again".

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:30 the indirect object *Shared*, which is found in \mathcal{D} and was presumably in \mathcal{G} .

■ Ether 13:31

and Shared wounded Coriantumr in [the > his 1 | his ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thigh

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in **the** thigh", which is normal English usage, but then virtually immediately Oliver corrected the definite article *the* to *his* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction). Of course, the personal pronoun *his* also works, so there does not appear to be any intent to edit here. Undoubtedly the original manuscript, not extant here, read "in **his** thigh". For a list of three other cases where Oliver Cowdery momentarily wrote *the* instead of *his*, see under Alma 31:9.

Elsewhere the text allows for either *the* or a possessive pronoun in referring to a part of the body, for instance, in references to the hair of the head:

1 Nephi 4:18	and took Laban by the hair of the head
Alma 11:44	and even there shall not so much as a hair of their heads be lost
Alma 40:23	yea even a hair of their heads shall not be lost

It should be noted that in Alma 40:23 the 1830 typesetter changed "their heads" to "the head". There is one other example referring to wounds and a part of the body; in that case, the text uses the possessive pronoun (just like here in Ether 13:31) rather than the definite article *the*:

Alma 49:24	insomuch that their wounds were upon their legs
------------	--

Summary: Maintain in Ether 13:31 the possessive pronoun *his* in the phrase "in his thigh", although in modern English the definite article *the* is normal for this phrase.

■ Ether 13:31

*and Shared wounded Coriantumr in his thigh
that he did not go to battle again for the space of two years
in the which time **all** the people
upon [all 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | CGHKRT] the face of the land
were a shedding blood*

The 1840 edition dropped the *all* here after *upon*, perhaps because of the *all* in the immediately preceding phrase, "all the people". The shorter reading without the *all* was maintained in the RLDS text until 1908. The 1920 LDS edition deleted the *all*, probably because the 1840 edition did. The change in the 1920 edition was intentional since it was marked in the committee copy. (See nearby under Ether 13:26 for another case where *all* was omitted from this same phrase, but in the 1905 LDS edition.)

We note here that there are other passages with a similar repetition of the universal quantifier *all*:

3 Nephi 5:24
and as surely as the Lord liveth
will he gather in from the four quarters of the earth
all the remnant of the seed of Jacob
which are scattered abroad upon **all** the face of the earth

3 Nephi 9:1
there was a voice heard among **all** the inhabitants of the earth
upon **all** the face of this land

4 Nephi 1:2
the people were **all** converted unto the Lord
upon **all** the face of the land

Ether 13:26
and there was robbers and in fine **all** manner of wickedness
upon **all** the face of the land

Ether 15:12
they did gather together **all** the people
upon **all** the face of the land
which had not been slain save it were Ether

This last example has the very same phraseology that Ether 13:31 originally had (“**all** the people upon **all** the face of the land”). The lack of variation in Ether 15:12 suggests that the 1840 change in Ether 13:31 was a typo, yet in this case the editors for the 1920 edition decided to follow the 1840 edition. Clearly, the original *all* in “upon **all** the face of the land” should be restored here in Ether 13:31.

Summary: Restore in Ether 13:31 the *all* that was accidentally dropped in the 1840 edition (and later followed by the editors for the 1920 LDS edition).

■ **Ether 13:31**

and there was none to [constrain 1A | restrain BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

As explained under 2 Nephi 1:26, the original *constrain* will be restored here in Ether 13:31. For another example of the same editing for the 1837 edition, see nearby under Ether 12:2.

Ether 14

■ Ether 14:1

*and now there began to be a great curse
upon [1APS | all BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the land*

Here the earliest textual sources read “upon the land”. The 1837 edition added *all* after *upon*, apparently accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading (presumably by reference to \mathcal{D}). Elsewhere in the text there are no examples of “**upon** all the land”, but there are 17 of “upon the land” without postmodification, of which six refer to a curse or cursing “upon the land”:

Alma 45:16	for this is the cursing and the blessing of God upon the land
Helaman 13:17	and behold a curse shall come upon the land
Helaman 13:23	for this cause hath the Lord God caused that a curse should come upon the land
Ether 7:23	that the wickedness and idolatry of the people was bringing a curse upon the land
Ether 11:6	for they had testified that a great curse should come upon the land
Ether 14:1	so great was the curse upon the land

The last example is in the very same verse that we are considering here. Thus the text as a whole supports the original reading at the beginning of the verse, “a great curse upon the land”. The *all* was probably inserted because there are 15 examples in the original text of the related phrase “upon all the face of the land”. There is also one original example of “upon the face of **all** the land”, but this was changed in the 1837 edition to the expected phraseology, “upon **all** the face of the land” (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 8:20).

Summary: Remove the intrusive *all* in Ether 14:1, giving “a great curse upon the land” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ Ether 14:1

*if a man should lay his tool or his sword
upon [the 1APS | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] shelf
or upon the place whither he would keep it . . .*

In the 1837 edition, it would appear that the typesetter accidentally replaced *the* with *his* in the phrase “upon the shelf”, probably because of the preceding occurrences of *his* in “if a man should lay **his** tool or **his** sword”. The definite article *the* is perfectly fine. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *the*, as will the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Ether 14:1 the definite article *the* in the phrase “upon the shelf”, the reading of the earliest extant text.

■ **Ether 14:1**

if a man should lay his tool or his sword upon the shelf or upon the place
[*which* > *whither* 1 | *whither* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *whether* s] *he would keep it . . .*

Except for the 1953 RLDS edition, all the (extant) textual sources here read *whither*; the 1953 edition reads *whether*, an impossible reading. We undoubtedly have a typo in this instance. The critical text will maintain the original, correct *whither*. For a list of other cases in the history of the text where *whither* and *whether* have been mixed up, see under 1 Nephi 22:4. One should also note here that *whither* is used even though no motion is involved. For further discussion of this usage for *whither*, see under Mormon 8:10.

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *which* instead of *whither* (“or upon the place **which** he would keep it”). Virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the *which* and supralinearly inserted the correct *whither* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). He appears to have simply misread the *whither* in \mathcal{O} as *which*. Oliver didn’t make this kind of mix-up anywhere else in his manuscript work.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 14:1 the use of *whither*, the reading of the earliest text (“or upon the place **whither** he would keep it”).

■ **Ether 14:1**

if a man should lay his tool or his sword upon the shelf
or upon the place whither he would keep it
[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *behold upon the morrow*
he could not find it
so great was the curse upon the land

Here is a case where John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, did not omit the Hebraistic *and* that originally separated the subordinate *if*-clause from its following main clause. Ultimately, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the original *and*, but the RLDS text has retained it. In the last part of the text, Gilbert frequently removed these extra *and*’s, as in two nearby cases in \mathcal{P} where he marked the deletion in pencil prior to setting the type:

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

For further discussion of Gilbert’s deletion of the Hebraistic *and*, see under Helaman 16:10.

Summary: Restore in Ether 14:1 the Hebraistic *and* that originally separated the subordinate *if*-clause from its following main clause; such usage was fairly common in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ Ether 14:2

*and every man kept the hilt of his sword [thereof 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]
 in his right hand*

As explained under Alma 46:12, here we have an example of *thereof* that does not appear to have a referent. We would expect *thereof* to modify *hilt* rather than *sword* (as in 1 Nephi 4:9: “and I beheld his **sword** and I drew it forth from the sheath thereof and the **hilt thereof** was of pure gold”). The 1920 LDS edition removed the *thereof* here in Ether 14:2, but the critical text will restore it since it is the earliest reading and appears to be intended.

Don Brugger (personal communication) suggests the possibility that *thereof* here in Ether 14:2 could be an error for *therefore*. However, as discussed earlier under 3 Nephi 8:9, the word *therefore* is always found at the beginning of the clause in the Book of Mormon (we exclude here quotations from the King James Bible). Thus it seems very unlikely that the *thereof* in Ether 14:2 is an error for *therefore*.

Summary: Restore the original *thereof* in Ether 14:2 (“every man kept the hilt of his sword **thereof** in his right hand”) even though there is no apparent referent for the *thereof* in this sentence.

■ Ether 14:2

*and every man kept the hilt of his sword thereof in his right hand
 in the defense of his property and his own life
 and [they >js NULL 1 | they A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of his **wives**
 and [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | his D] children*

The earliest extant text here reads “and his own life and they of his wives and children”. On the surface, the meaning seems to be ‘and his own life and **the lives** of his wives and children’; that is, the pronoun *they* seems to be a pluralization of the preceding *life*. Such usage is obviously strange, and thus Joseph Smith deleted the *they* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The *they* here is a subject form, but in this passage *his own life* and *they* are objects of the preposition *of* in the preceding phrase “in the defense of”. Elsewhere in the text, *they* in object position has typically been edited to either *those* or *them* (see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3). This kind of editing elsewhere suggests another possibility for emending the standard text, namely, editing *they* to *those* (“and his own life and **those** of his wives and children”), although even this seems odd because it juxtaposes the singular *life* with the plural *those*.

It should also be noted here that the 1841 British edition accidentally inserted the repeated *his* between the conjuncts *wives* and *children*, but the subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the shorter phraseology. Usually the determiner is repeated for conjuncts involving *wives* and *children* (30 times in the earliest text). However, four cases did not have the repeated determiner in the earliest text, including this one. For discussion of this variation, see under Mosiah 23:28.

The most difficult problem here in Ether 14:2 is the plural *wives*. Everywhere else in the Book of Mormon, when the plural *wives* occurs in a neutral context (there are 43 instances), the text can be readily interpreted as assuming that a man has only one wife, as in Mosiah 19:11: “the king commanded them that all the men should leave their wives and their children”. For one of these cases, one could initially misread the passage as implying that a man could have a plurality of wives:

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** . . .

Here the intervening phrase “every one to the army which he would” seems to clash with the following *their*, but of course the *their* refers to the earlier *they*, not the singular *he* (or *every one*) that occurs in the intervening phrase. Moreover, when the text clearly refers to a man having plural wives, the word *wives* is always conjoined with *concubines* and is identified as being illicit (seven times, in Jacob 1–2, Mosiah 11, and Ether 10). Ultimately, the example here in Ether 14:2 is the only explicit case where one could interpret a man as having a plurality of wives without being condemned for it.

Some have argued that there is evidence in the book of Ether that the Jaredites had a plurality of wives—and without the condemnation of the practice that is typically found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. The most notorious example is the mistake that entered Ether 1:41, where the earliest text refers to the brother of Jared and his family but the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *family* with *families*, giving “go to and gather together thy flocks . . . and also of the seed of the earth of every kind and thy **families**”. The correct reading, as explained under Ether 1:41, is the singular, “and thy **family**”. Orson Pratt, in a footnote to the 1879 edition, cross-references Ether 1:41 to Ether 6:20, where the large number of offspring for the brother of Jared supposedly supports a plurality of wives: “now the number of the sons and the daughters of the brother of Jared were twenty and two souls”. (The same cross-reference to Ether 6:20 was continued in the 1920 and 1981 LDS editions.) And one could also refer to Orihah’s 31 children as implying more than one wife (Ether 7:2). This evidence suggesting plurality of wives in the book of Ether is summarized on page 327 of Daniel H. Ludlow’s *A Companion to Your Study of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1976).

It actually turns out that the book of Ether explicitly refers to plural marriage only once—and in that one case the reference is negative:

Ether 10:5

Riplakish did not do that which was right in the sight of the Lord
for he did have many wives and concubines
and did lay that upon men’s shoulders which was grievous to be borne

In contrast to Riplakish, we have Coriantum who had only one wife at a time (which is clearly what was expected among the Jaredites since no special attention is brought to bear on that issue):

Ether 9:23–24

and it came to pass that Coriantum did walk in the steps of his father
and did build many mighty cities
and did administer that which was good unto his people in all his days
and it came to pass that he had no children even until he was exceeding old
and it came to pass that his wife died / being an hundred and two years old
and it came to pass that Coriantum took to wife
in his old age a young maid and begat sons and daughters
wherefore he lived until he was an hundred and forty and two years old

Coriantum's 142 years corresponds with the longevity of the later postdiluvian biblical patriarchs, so that as we approach the time of Abraham the years eventually correspond with Coriantum's: Peleg, 239 years; Reu, 239 years; Serug, 230 years; Nahor, 148 years; Terah, 205 years; Abraham, 175 years; Isaac, 180 years; and Jacob 147 years. It would appear that in general the Jaredite patriarchs lived longer than we do today, so the large number of children may be due to longer periods of fertility. As a result, they could have had many more children than we are used to having but without necessarily resorting to a plurality of wives. And there's always another possibility: like Coriantum, with the death of his first wife, one could always marry a younger woman, thus increasing the prospects of having a large number of offspring. Consequently, the large number of children listed for the brother of Jared and for Orihah does not necessarily mean that they had a plurality of wives, at least at the same time. In fact, the case of Coriantum suggests that there was not even any consideration of taking an additional wife while the first one was alive, while on the other hand Riplakish is specifically referred to as one who violated what was "right in the sight of the Lord", namely, one wife for one man. This expectation of having one wife applies, I would argue, to the brother of Jared and to Orihah. In other words, there are other possible explanations for the large number of children mentioned in the book of Ether.

Another passage in the Book of Mormon that some have argued refers to a plurality of wives is found in Alma 10:11, where Amulek's reference to *women* could be interpreted as meaning 'wives':

Alma 10:11

for behold he hath blessed mine house
he hath blessed me and **my women** and my children
and my father and my kinsfolks
yea even all my kindred hath he blessed

For instance, John Tvedtnes has bluntly concluded that the use of *women* here means that "Amulek . . . was a polygamist". He argues that his interpretation is supported by the use in Hebrew of the word *'iššā* for either 'woman' or 'wife'. In support of this interpretation in the Book of Mormon text, Tvedtnes notes the use of the word *women* to mean 'wives' in 1 Nephi 17:20: "and our women have toiled being big with child and they have borne children in the wilderness". (For Tvedtnes's argument, see page 59 of his article "Hebraisms in the Book of Mormon: A Preliminary Survey", *Brigham Young University Studies* 11/1 (1970): 50–60.) Even so, the

English text in Alma 10:11 does not use the word *wives*, and one could argue that Amulek's extended patriarchal family could have included unmarried sisters as well as Amulek's mother, who could all be considered along with Amulek's wife as "my women" rather than as part of the final catchall phrase, "my kinsfolks". The point here is that there is no explicit reference in Alma 10:11 to a plurality of wives. Whenever there is such an explicit reference to the plurality of wives in the Book of Mormon, it is always negative—except for here in Ether 14:2.

In all other cases that use a singular noun or pronoun to refer to a man in association with his family, the text uses the singular *wife*:

Mosiah 2:5

and it came to pass that
when they came up to the temple
they pitched their tents round about
every man according to **his** family
consisting of **his wife** and his sons and his daughters

Alma 54:11

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

3 Nephi 19:1

and now it came to pass that
when Jesus had ascended into heaven
the multitude did disperse
and **every man** did take **his wife** and his children
and did return to his own home

These examples argue that the plural "his **wives** and children" in Ether 14:2 is an error for "his **wife** and children":

Ether 14:2 (possible emendation)

and every man kept the hilt of his sword thereof
in his right hand in the defense of his property
and his own life and they of his **wife** and children

A second possibility for Ether 14:2 would be to eliminate the difficulty of the original *they* as well as the problem with the plural *wives*; in this case *they* could be emended to *the lives*:

Ether 14:2 (another possible emendation)

and every man kept the hilt of his sword thereof
in his right hand in the defense of his property
and his own life and **the lives** of his **wife** and children

Actually, this second emendation suggests the possibility that the first emendation is correct—namely, Joseph Smith actually dictated "and his own life and they of his wife and children" but Oliver Cowdery thought of the word *lives* because of the preceding *life*, which accidentally led him to write *wives* instead of *wife*. One should also note that in the earliest text, the plural *wives*

is surrounded by plurals, the pronoun *they* and the noun *children*, thus facilitating the proposed change of original *wife* to *wives*.

Given usage throughout the text, there appears to be a primitive error in Ether 14:2. It seems reasonable to at least assume that the original text read *wife* in the singular rather than in the plural. Since the *they* of the earliest reading will work, despite its grammatical difficulty, the critical text will retain the *they* but emend *wives* to *wife* (thus “in the defense of his property and his own life and they of his **wife** and children”).

Summary: Emend Ether 14:2 to read “in the defense of his property and his own life and they of his **wife** and children”; in accord with the earliest text, the *his* should not be repeated before *children*; an additional emendation, not adopted here, would be to replace *they* with *the lives* (“in the defense of his property and his own life and **the lives** of his **wife** and children”).

■ Ether 14:4

*the brother of [Jared > Shared 1 | Shared ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
did give battle unto him in the wilderness of Akish*

Here Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote “the brother of Jared” initially in \emptyset . Virtually immediately he caught his error, crossed out the entire *Jared*, and supralinearly wrote *Shared* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *Shared*). Oliver was obviously used to writing “the brother of Jared”, which occurs 44 times earlier in the book of Ether, including six times nearby in Ether 12. Here in Ether 14:4 we have the second instance of “the brother of Shared”. The first occurs in the previous verse; there Oliver wrote down the name correctly, but here in verse 4 the higher frequency of “the brother of Jared” led him to make this momentary error. In all, there are four instances of “the brother of Shared”, all here in Ether 14. Of course, *Shared* is correct here in verse 4.

Summary: Maintain the four instances of “the brother of Shared” in Ether 14, including the one in verse 4 that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote as “the brother of Jared”.

■ Ether 14:5

*and it came to pass that Coriantumr did lay siege to the **wilderness***

One wonders if there isn’t something wrong here with the expression “to lay siege to the wilderness”. We usually expect sieges to be laid against cities, towns, and encampments, but not against the wilderness. Perhaps the preposition *to* should be emended to *in*, thus “Coriantumr did lay siege **in** the wilderness”. Don Brugger points out that there are examples on <www.google.com> of “laying siege to forests and mountains” (also “besieging forests and mountains”). But we note that in all these cases the area surrounded by the besiegers has to be sufficiently small, otherwise no siege is effectively possible. And actually this is what we apparently have here in Ether 14:5, where the larger passage definitely implies some kind of investiture, a surrounding of the enemy, especially since the rest of the verse indicates how the brother of Shared escaped Coriantumr’s siege of the wilderness:

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 as they were drunken

Generally, the word *wilderness* is used in the Book of Mormon to refer to large expanses of uninhabited land, often filled with wild animals. Occasionally, specific regions of wilderness are assigned names, such as *Hermounts* and *Bountiful*:

Alma 2:37

yea they were met on every hand and slain and driven
until they were scattered on the west and on the north
until they had reached the wilderness which was called **Hermounts**

Alma 22:31

thus the land on the northward was called Desolation
and the land on the southward was called **Bountiful**
it being the wilderness which was filled with all manner
of wild animals of every kind

Even so, the word *wilderness* has a secondary derived meaning in the Book of Mormon—namely, as a private or secret place of retreat, presumably in a wilderness region. Consider first Amulek's reference to private places where one can pray alone:

Alma 34:26

ye must pour out your souls in your **closets** and your **secret places**
and in your **wilderness**

Later on in the Book of Mormon there are numerous references to the places of retreat used by the Gaddianton robbers. The term *wilderness* is used to refer to these specific places:

Helaman 11:25

and then they would retreat back into the **mountains**
and into the **wilderness** and **secret places**
hiding themselves that they could not be discovered

Helaman 11:28

therefore they sent an army of strong men
into the **wilderness** and upon the **mountains**
to search out this band of robbers and to destroy them

Helaman 11:31

and they were obliged to return
out of the **wilderness** and out of the **mountains** unto their own lands
because of the exceeding greatness of the numbers of those robbers
which infested the **mountains** and the **wilderness**

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

3 Nephi 3:17

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

3 Nephi 3:20

and let us go up upon the **mountains** and into the **wilderness** that we may fall upon the robbers and destroy them in their own lands

3 Nephi 4:1

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

In fact, there is a good possibility that these uses of the singular *wilderness* should be interpreted as plurals—that is, as ‘wildernesses’. In early modern English, words ending in *s* in an unstressed syllable were often not inflected with the normal *-es* endings (such as the plural, possessive, or third person singular present). In such cases, the inflected form was identical to the base form. (For further discussion of this possibility in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 34:26.)

The Book of Mormon use of *wilderness* to refer to a specific place of retreat in a wilderness region seems to be the meaning in Ether 14. First of all, the specific wilderness has a name, the wilderness of Akish. And from the larger passage, the wilderness area seems to be restricted in size and thus subject to being surrounded:

Ether 14:3

and he gave battle unto Coriantumr in the which Coriantumr did beat him and did pursue him to the **wilderness** of Akish

Ether 14:4

the brother of Shared did give battle unto him in the **wilderness** of Akish

Ether 14:5

Coriantumr did lay siege to the **wilderness** and the brother of Shared did march forth out of the **wilderness** by night

Ether 14:7

Coriantumr dwelt with his army in the **wilderness** for the space of two years

Ether 14:14

Lib did smite the army of Coriantumr that they fled again to the **wilderness** of Akish

Apparently verses 5 and 7 refer to the wilderness of Akish, given that the adverb *again* is used in verse 14.

Thus the reference to laying siege to the wilderness in Ether 14:5 makes sense given the secondary meaning of *wilderness* as a secret place of retreat and hiding in a wilderness region. We should note that the Oxford English Dictionary lists under definition 1c a meaning of *wilderness* that refers to a small wilderness that can be restricted in access: ‘a piece of ground in a large garden or

park, planted with trees, and laid out in an ornamental or fantastic style, often in the form of a maze or labyrinth.’ Citations with this meaning range from about 1644 up to 1885. Of course, the Book of Mormon meaning of the word here in Ether 14 does not refer to this particular kind of wilderness. But it does show that historically the English language has allowed for the meaning of *wilderness* to be altered to allow for the word to refer to more restricted areas.

Summary: In Ether 14 the word *wilderness* appears to refer to a secret place of retreat and hiding located in a wilderness region; Alma 34:26 similarly refers to such a secret place for prayer; the use of the term *wilderness* as a hideout occurs generally in Helaman and 3 Nephi; in some of these cases, the form *wilderness* appears to have the plural meaning ‘wildernesses’; this usage suggests there is no need to emend the preposition *to* to *in* in the clause “Coriantumr did lay siege **to** the wilderness”.

■ Ether 14:12

*nevertheless the army of Coriantumr did press forward upon Lib
that he fled to the borders **upon** the seashore*

The use of the preposition *upon* in the phrase “to the borders **upon** the seashore” seems odd. Instead, we expect either the preposition *by* or *of*. Elsewhere the text has only these two prepositions in phrases like this one; the preposition is normally *by* (12 out of 14 cases), but there are two instances with *of* (each marked below with an asterisk):

* Alma 22:27	on the borders of the seashore
Alma 22:28	in the borders by the seashore
Alma 50:9	to the borders by the seashore
* Alma 50:15	by the borders of 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 56:31	on the borders by the seashore
Alma 62:25	in the borders by the seashore
Alma 62:32	upon the borders by the seashore
Mormon 2:6	in the borders west by the seashore
Mormon 4:3	in the borders by the seashore
Ether 14:26	to the borders by the seashore

In addition to the case here in Ether 14:12, two of the above cases involve motion “to the borders” (Alma 50:9 and Ether 14:26). In the earliest text, both of these read “to the borders **by** the seashore”, which argues that Ether 14:12 may have also originally read that way instead of “to the borders **upon** the seashore”.

The original manuscript is not extant for Ether 14:12; the printer’s manuscript and the printed editions read “to the borders **upon** the seashore”. Yet the preposition *upon* could well be an error from the following verse, where the phrase “upon the seashore” occurs. In fact, this phrase is found immediately underneath on the following line in \mathcal{P} (and would have been immediately underneath on the following line in \mathcal{C}). In fact, the last part of both lines in \mathcal{P} are virtually identical,

and Oliver Cowdery could have easily let his eye stray down a line when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The first two lines on page 451 of \mathcal{P} originally read as follows (prior to the 1830 typesetter's adding punctuation in pencil to this page of the manuscript):

Ether 14:12–14 (lines 1 and 2, page 451 of \mathcal{P} ; bolding added)

press forward upon Lib that he fled to the borders **upon** the sea shore & it came to pass that
Coriantumr persued him & Lib gave battle unto him **upon** the sea shore & it came to pass

In other words, here in Ether 14:12 the original manuscript could have read “to the borders **by** the sea shore”, just as it did later in verse 26 of this chapter in the earliest extant textual source, the printer's manuscript: “& it came to pass that Shiz did persue Coriantumr eastward even to the borders **by** the sea shore”. But in Ether 14:12–14, the identity of “the sea shore & it came to pass” on two adjacent lines in \mathcal{O} led Oliver, I would propose, to accidentally miscopy the *by* in verse 12 as *upon*.

Summary: Emend in Ether 14:12 the preposition *upon* to the expected *by* (thus “to the borders **by** the seashore”); the preposition *upon* appears to be an error from the phrase “upon the seashore” found in the immediately following line of text in verse 13 (in the printer's manuscript and presumably the same in the original manuscript).

■ Ether 14:15

*and Coriantumr **had** taken all the people with him
as he [1 ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | had E] fled before Lib
in that quarter of the land whither he fled*

Here the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition added the perfect auxiliary *had*. He was probably influenced by the use of *had* in the preceding clause (“and Coriantumr **had** taken all the people with him”). The subsequent LDS edition (in 1852) removed the intrusive *had*. Note that *had* was not inserted at the end of the verse (“whither he fled”).

Summary: Maintain in Ether 14:15 the lack of the perfect *had* before *fled* for both instances of that verb in the verse.

■ Ether 14:17

*and he did overthrow many cities
and he did slay **both women and children**
and he did burn the cities thereof*

As mentioned under Mormon 4:14, here in Ether 14:17 we have the only instance in the earliest extant text of the phrase “both women and children”. Elsewhere we get “both **men** women and children” (four times):

2 Nephi 9:21
for behold he suffereth the pains of all men
yea the pains of every living creature
both men women and children
which belong to the family of Adam

Helaman 1:27

slaying the people with a great slaughter
both men women and children

Ether 14:22

but they did march forth from the shedding of blood to the shedding of blood
 leaving the bodies of **both men women and children**
 strewed upon the face of the land

Ether 15:15

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 . . .

In four instances, we should note, “men women and children” occurs without the *both*:

3 Nephi 17:25	and they did consist of men women and children
Ether 6:3	to give light unto men women and children
Ether 14:31	now the loss of men women and children on both sides were so great . . .
Moroni 9:7	and there were men women and children

As already mentioned under Mormon 4:14, elsewhere in the earliest text when *women* and *children* are conjoined but *men* is not, we never get the *both* (25 times).

We should also note that in the following clause the original text has *thereof* after *cities*: “and he did burn the cities thereof”. This use of *thereof* could be interpreted as referring to the inhabitants of those cities, namely, the men, women, and children in them. It wouldn’t make much sense if the *thereof* referred to just women and children, as explained below in a separate discussion regarding that clause.

The use of *both* with more than two conjuncts (as in “both men women and children”) may seem strange to modern English speakers, but such usage is common in the Book of Mormon:

1 Nephi 18:25 (6 conjuncts, at least)
 there was beasts in the forests of every kind
both the cow **and** the ox **and** the ass **and** the horse **and** the goat **and** the wild goat
 and all manner of wild animals which were for the use of man

1 Nephi 18:25 (3 conjuncts)
 and we did find all manner of ore
both of gold **and** of silver **and** of copper

2 Nephi 6:15 (6 conjuncts)
 and they that believe not in him shall be destroyed
both by fire **and** by tempest **and** by earthquakes **and** by bloodsheds
and by pestilence **and** by famine

2 Nephi 29:11 (4 conjuncts, at least)
 for I command all men
both in the east **and** in the west **and** in the north **and** in the south
 and in the islands of the sea
 that they shall write the words which I speak unto them

Alma 34:21 (3 conjuncts)
 cry unto him in your houses
 yea over all your household
both morning midday **and** evening

Ether 10:12 (5 conjuncts, at least)
 and the people became exceeding rich under his reign
both in buildings **and** in gold **and** in silver
and in raising grain **and** in flocks and herds
 and such things which had been restored unto them

Of course, there are numerous examples where *both* occurs with two conjuncts, as in Alma 11:43, where we have a sequence of four examples: “now this restoration shall come to all : **both** old and young / **both** bond and free / **both** male and female / **both** the wicked and the righteous”. To be sure, “both women and children” is theoretically possible.

What appears to have happened here in Ether 14:17 is that the original manuscript (no longer extant for this verse) read “both men women and children” but that in copying to the printer’s manuscript Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the word *men* when his eye skipped to the end of the following word *women*, which ends in *men*. Such a reading would make better sense of Ether 14:17. In this passage, the narrative does not explicitly state that the men were off fighting elsewhere, nor that only women and children were in the cities. In fact, two verses later Moroni states that after this destruction “the people began to flock together in armies throughout all the face of the land” (Ether 14:19). Since “both women and children” occurs nowhere else in the text, it seems fairly reasonable that Ether 14:17 originally read “both men women and children”.

Summary: Emend Ether 14:17 by adding *men* so that we get the phrase “both men women and children”; this phrase occurs elsewhere in the text, but there are no other examples in the earliest text of “both women and children”.

■ Ether 14:17

and he did slay both men women and children
and [NULL >+ he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did burn the cities thereof

Here Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the subject pronoun *he*. He later supplied the *he* supralinearly, perhaps when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (the change in the level of ink flow is slightly heavier). Nearby, in verse 3 of this chapter, Oliver made the same error. In that case, he corrected his error virtually immediately since there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *he*:

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

Since either reading—with or without the *he*—will work in Ether 14:17, the critical text will follow the corrected reading. Oliver’s only motivation here would have been to make sure that \mathcal{P} read as it did in \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s correction in Ether 14:17 (namely, when he supplied the subject pronoun *he*, presumably when he proofed \wp against \wp).

■ **Ether 14:17**

and he did slay both men women and children

and he did burn the cities [thereof 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT]

As explained under Alma 46:12, there are six examples in the original text (including the example here in Ether 14:17) where the word *thereof* appears to have no referent. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition apparently made that assumption in this passage since they deleted the *thereof*. This may have been motivated by the fact that their copytext here actually read “and he did slay both women and children”, and it may have seemed odd to the editors that the text referred to cities of only women and children. Of course, if the text is emended to read “and he did slay both **men** women and children” (as explained above in an earlier discussion), then the use of the *thereof* at the end of the following clause would make better sense.

Nonetheless, we should note that elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (we exclude the six examples without any apparent referent) the word *thereof* does not refer to people, only to things (154 times). Most of these instances of *thereof* mean ‘of it’, but a number of them mean ‘of them’ — that is, they refer to plural things (but not to people), as in the following sampling:

1 Nephi 18:15

and also **mine ankles** were much swollen
and great was the soreness **thereof**

Mosiah 8:11

and again they have brought **swords**
the hilts **thereof** hath perished
and the blades **thereof** were cankered with rust

3 Nephi 3:14

and he caused that **fortifications** should be built round about them
and the strength **thereof** should be exceeding great

The King James Bible has 908 examples of *thereof*, and every one of those mean ‘of it’, never ‘of them’. The same holds for the examples cited under *thereof* in the Oxford English Dictionary. If we refuse to accept people as a possible referent for the *thereof*, then we would be forced to interpret the original *thereof* in Ether 14:17 as having no referent, like the other examples listed under Alma 46:12. In any case, the *thereof* is fully intended here in Ether 14:17 and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Ether 14:17 the *thereof* that was deleted in the 1920 LDS edition, probably because there appeared to be no appropriate referent for it in the preceding clause (“and he did slay both women and children”); however, if the original *thereof* refers to people (such as “both men women and children”), we would have a unique use of *thereof* in the text.

■ Ether 14:22

*leaving the bodies of both men women and children
strewed upon the face of the land*

One wonders here if we shouldn't expect *strewn* rather than *strewed* as the past participle for the verb *strew*. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, both are possible past participial forms; thus the critical text will accept *strewed*, the reading here of all the extant textual sources (☉ is not extant for this word). In modern English, *strewn* is the overwhelmingly favored form, but *strewed* also occurs. For instance, in Mark Davies' *Corpus of Contemporary American English* <www.americancorpus.org>, there are 1352 instances of the past participle *strewn* but only 6 of the past participle *strewed*. As far as scriptural usage is concerned, there is only one instance of the verb *strew* in the Book of Mormon, namely, here in Ether 14:22; there are none at all in the King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the past participle *strewed* in Ether 14:22, the more difficult reading for modern English readers (who prefer *strewn*).

■ Ether 14:24

*nevertheless Shiz did not cease to pursue Coriantumr
for he had sworn to avenge himself upon Coriantumr
of the blood of his brother which had been slain
and the word of the Lord
[which 0ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOQRT | which >js NULL 1 | PS] came to Ether
that Coriantumr should not fall by the sword*

The 1908 RLDS edition removed the relative pronoun *which* here in Ether 14:24, which made the last clause an independent clause. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, crossed out the *which* in the printer's manuscript, but the 1837 edition itself did not implement this emendation. In accord with the corrected reading in ☉, the 1908 RLDS edition adopted Joseph's editing here in Ether 14:24.

The motivation for dropping the *which* may have been that it didn't seem right to use the verb *avenge* to refer to avenging oneself "upon the word of the Lord". In modern English, we do not expect such usage. In a note at the end of the verb *avenge*, the Oxford English Dictionary points out that *avenge* occasionally has meanings that do not refer to retribution; that is, *avenge* can be used in broader contexts where the corresponding verb *revenge* would not be appropriate. The OED, for instance, cites examples like these under *avenge*:

Edmund Burke (1790)

To avenge even a **look** that threatened her with insult.

John Neale (1866)

Thou shalt avenge Thy **right**.

These more general applications of the verb *avenge* imply that one can also avenge oneself "upon the word of the Lord".

It should be noted here that the independent clause in the current RLDS reading (“and the word of the Lord came to Ether . . .”) implies that this is the first time that Ether has prophesied that Coriantumr would not fall by the sword. This is clearly not the case; this prophecy was declared earlier in Ether 13:20–21. Thus the use of the relative pronoun *which* in Ether 14:24 is definitely correct and will be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 14:24 the relative pronoun *which* in “and the word of the Lord **which** came to Ether that Coriantumr should not fall by the sword”; unlike the verb *revenge*, the verb *avenge* can take a prepositional phrase like “upon the word of the Lord” as its complement.

■ Ether 14:26

*and it came to pass that Shiz did pursue Coriantumr eastward
even to the borders [by 1AT | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] the seashore*

Here the original text read “to the borders **by** the seashore”. In the 1837 edition, the preposition *by* was accidentally replaced with *of*. The 1981 LDS edition correctly restored the earliest reading (as found in the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition). As argued under Ether 14:12, the original text allowed for only the phraseology “to the borders **by** the seashore” (that is, whenever there is motion “to the borders” defined with respect to the seashore, the preposition is *by*). The earliest reading here in Ether 14:26 supports that claim. For three other instances in the history of the text where “the borders **by** the seashore” has been replaced with “the borders **of** the seashore”, see under Alma 50:25.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 14:26 the preposition *by* in the phrase “to the borders **by** the seashore”, the reading of the earliest textual sources (Ø and the 1830 edition).

■ Ether 14:28

*now the valley of Shurr was
near the hill [Comron 1 | Comnor ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
wherefore Coriantumr did gather his armies together
upon the hill [Comron 1 | Comnor ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The printer’s manuscript clearly reads *Comron* both times in Ether 14:28. The 1830 compositor, however, set the name as *Comnor*, which has been retained throughout the textual history.

We have already noted that in both manuscripts Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote his *n*’s as *r*’s and vice versa (see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16). Thus it is possible that the name here in Ether 14:28 could have theoretically been one of four possibilities: *Comron*, *Comnor*, *Common*, and *Comror*. There is only one instance where Oliver mixed up *mr* and *mn*, namely, in the fifth occurrence of the name *Zerahemnah* in the original manuscript (in Alma 43:53). There he initially spelled the name as *Zerahemrah*, but then he immediately overwrote the *r* with an *n* (see line 15 on page 311’ of Ø). For all other (extant) occurrences of *Zerahemnah*, in both manuscripts, this name was correctly spelled the first time. Thus there is not much evidence that the spelling *Comron* in the printer’s manuscript could be an error for *Common*, *Comror*, or *Comnor*.

Comparing the spellings *Comron* and *Commor* with other Nephite names and words in the Book of Mormon, we find examples ending in either *-ron* or *-nor*; in the following list, the names and words that have an internal *mr* or *mn* sequence are set in bold:

- Amaron, Ammaron, Ammoron, Amoron, **Emron**, Moron, Parhoron, Siron
- **Amnor**, **amnor**, **Kimnor**

Thus there are three examples of *-mnor* and one of *-mron*. There is also one name ending in *-mnon*, namely, *Shemnon*, but none ending in *-mror*. Moreover, none of these examples show any textual variation with respect to the *n* and the *r*. All of this argues here in Ether 14:28 that the earlier *Comron* is definitely possible (it matches *Emron*) and should therefore be adopted in the critical text.

Summary: In accord with the reading in the printer's manuscript, restore the spelling *Comron* for the name of the hill in Ether 14:28.

■ Ether 14:30

and it came to pass that Shiz smote upon Coriantumr
[*that* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *and* D] *he gave him many deep wounds*

Here we have another example where the subordinate conjunction *that* has a resultive meaning ('with the result that'). Such usage is somewhat unexpected for speakers of modern English, so there is a tendency to replace the resultive *that* with *and*, as here in Ether 14:30 where the 1841 British edition made the replacement. The subsequent LDS edition restored the original *that*. For other examples of this change, see under 1 Nephi 11:29; for a nearby example that occurred in the 1874 RLDS edition, see under Ether 12:14.

Summary: Maintain the original resultive *that* in Ether 14:30, the reading of the earliest text.

Ether 15

■ Ether 15:1

*and it came to pass that when Coriantumr had recovered **of** his wounds he began to remember the words which Ether had spoken unto him*

This passage uses the preposition *of* after *recovered*, but in modern English we expect the preposition *from*. There are no other examples in the text of the expression “to recover of/from <an illness or injury>”, although there is one example with *astonishment*: “and when we were recovered from our astonishment” (Helaman 9:14). In the King James Bible, the occurrence of “to recover of <an illness>” is fairly common (with instances of both intransitive and transitive *recover*), as in these examples:

2 Kings 1:2	whether I shall recover of this disease
2 Kings 5:7	this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy
2 Kings 8:8	shall I recover of this disease
Isaiah 38:9	when he had been sick and was recovered of his sickness

In fact, there are no examples with *from* for this expression in the King James text. The use of *of* in “recovered **of** his wounds” will be retained here in Ether 15:1.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 15:1 the preposition *of* in the clause “when Coriantumr had recovered **of** his wounds”, the consistent reading of all the textual sources; the King James Bible also has examples with only *of* for this expression rather than the *from* that modern English speakers expect.

■ Ether 15:2

he saw that there had been slain by the sword already nearly two millions of his people and [he 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] began to sorrow in his heart

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the subject pronoun *he* in the conjoined clause. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored it. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *he*. See under Ether 11:9 for a list of other cases here in the latter part of the book of Ether where such a conjoined subject *he* has been omitted.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 15:2 the subject pronoun *he* in the conjoined clause “and **he** began to sorrow in his heart” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ Ether 15:4

*and it came to pass that he wrote an epistle unto Shiz
desiring [him 1ABCDEFGHijklNPRST | MOQ] that he would spare the people*

Here the 1905 LDS edition accidentally dropped the object pronoun *him*, but the 1920 LDS edition restored it. The text has four other instances of “desiring **him** that S”, where S is a finite clause:

Alma 43:23	desiring him that he should inquire of the Lord
Alma 47:33	desiring him that he would spare the people of the city
Alma 52:10	desiring him that he would be faithful
Alma 52:20	desiring him that he would come out with his armies

But there are also six cases that could have the *him* but do not:

Alma 47:12	desiring that he would come down
Alma 51:15	desiring that he should heed it
Alma 54:1	desiring that he would exchange prisoners
Alma 59:3	desiring that he should cause men to be gathered together
Helaman 2:7	desiring that he would conduct him to the judgment seat
Ether 15:18	desiring that he would not come again to battle

Since either reading is theoretically possible here in Ether 15:4, the one based on the earliest textual sources will be retained (namely, “desiring **him** that he would spare the people”).

Summary: Retain the object pronoun *him* after *desiring* in Ether 15:4 and wherever else the earliest textual sources support the reading with the object pronoun in the expression “desiring **him** that S”.

■ Ether 15:6

*and the [people 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | power D] of Coriantumr were stirred up
to anger against the people of Shiz*

Here we have another totally unacceptable typo in the 1841 British edition, one that replaced *people* with the impossible *power*. One would think that the typesetter was falling asleep here since there is no nearby *power* that could have triggered this error. Nor does the error say much for the proofing, if there was any at this stage near the end of the printing of the 1841 edition. The following LDS edition (1849) restored the correct *people*.

Summary: Maintain the word *people* in Ether 15:6, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Ether 15:11

*and it was [that 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | the HK] same hill
where my father Mormon did hide up the records unto the Lord which were sacred*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the determiner *that* with *the* here in Ether 15:11. We have already seen this kind of change numerous times in the history of the text. For some

examples where Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 typesetter mixed up these two determiners, see under Helaman 14:20 and 3 Nephi 1:12. For another case where the 1874 typesetter replaced *that* with *the*, see under Mormon 9:11 (in that case, the replacement occurred in the phrase “that same God”, which also involves the word *same*).

Either reading, of course, is possible here in Ether 15:11. For instance, elsewhere in the text we have two instances of “same place” followed by a *where*-clause. In one case, the determiner is *that*; in the other, it is *the*:

Alma 3:20	in the same place where the first army met the Amlicites
Alma 58:17	in that same place where we had first pitched our tents

In fact, the second passage shows the tendency, once more, to replace *that* with *the* (see under Alma 58:17 for discussion). Thus the critical text will follow the earliest reading here in Ether 15:11, “it was **that** same hill”.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 15:11 the determiner *that* before *same*, the reading of the earliest extant text: “it was **that** same hill where my father Mormon did hide up the records”.

■ Ether 15:12

*and it came to pass that
they did gather together all the people upon all the face of the land
which had not been slain
save it [were 1A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Ether*

■ Ether 15:14

*and that they might receive all the strength
which it [were 01A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] possible that they could receive*

Here we have two passages where an original subjunctive *were* was changed to the indicative *was* in the 1837 edition, probably as a result of editing by Joseph Smith (although neither change was marked by him in \mathcal{P}). In the first case, there is evidence elsewhere in the text for both “save it **were**” and “save it **was**” (for discussion regarding the variation for that phrase, see under Alma 17:38). Similarly, in the second case there is evidence for either *were* or *was* (for that, see under Alma 8:31). In both these cases here in Ether 15, the critical text will restore the original subjunctive *were*.

Summary: Restore the original occurrences of *were* in Ether 15:12 and Ether 15:14; in both cases, either *were* or *was* is theoretically possible, so we follow the earliest reading.

■ Ether 15:15

*and it came to pass that
when they were all [gathered 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | gathereing D] together
every one to the army which he would . . .*

Here we have another typo in the 1841 British edition that shows considerable neglect or sleepiness on the part of the typesetter. He apparently started to set *gathered*, but when he got to setting the final *d*, he set the ending *-ing* instead, thus producing the bizarre *gathereing*, which was never corrected in proofing (if it was even proofed). The typesetter’s error was probably caused by the occurrence of the present-participial form *gathering* in the previous verse: “wherefore they were for the space of four years **gathering** together the people” (Ether 15:14). Not surprisingly, the 1849 LDS edition corrected this typo. Here in verse 15, the critical text will, of course, maintain the correct *gathered*.

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *gathered* in Ether 15:15, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Ether 15:15

*and it came to pass that
[NULL > when 1 | when ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] 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*

Here initially in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery omitted the subordinate conjunction *when*. Virtually immediately, he supralinearly inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Although the original manuscript is not extant here, there is clearly room for the *when* in the lacuna between extant fragments.

The main clause here is separated from the preceding *when*-clause by a long parenthetical present-participial clause (“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”). Just before the main clause, the original text had the characteristic *and* that appears to represent a Hebraistic literalism. In this instance, John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, crossed out the ampersand in \wp and ended up setting what we would expect in English. For further discussion of Gilbert’s tendency to delete such *and*’s in his typesetting for the latter part of the text, see under Helaman 16:10. For a similar example of this kind of editing on his part, see nearby under Ether 15:30. The critical text will restore all these original instances of the Hebraistic *and*.

Summary: Restore in Ether 15:15 the original *and* that separated the *when*-clause (along with its associated present-participial clause) from the following main clause.

■ Ether 15:16–17

*and after that they had retired to their camps
they took up a howling and a lamentation
for the loss of the slain of their people*

(1) *and so great were their cries their howlings and lamentations
that it did rend the air exceedingly . . .*

and when the night came again

(2) *they did rend the air with their cries **and** their howlings and **their** mournings
for the loss of the slain of their people*

Here in verse 16, we have “their cries their howlings and lamentations”, whereas in verse 17 we get “their cries **and** their howlings and **their** mournings”. One wonders here in verse 16 if there isn’t a repeated *their* missing before *lamentations* or perhaps a missing *and* before *their howlings*. In support of repeating both *and* and *their* in such conjunctive structures (as in verse 17), we have this example from Mormon 2:12: “when I Mormon saw **their** lamentation **and** **their** mourning **and** **their** sorrowing before the Lord”.

Even so, we have already noted that the repeated *and* is not always found in long series of conjuncts (see, for instance, the discussion under Alma 43:47). So the phraseology in verse 16 without the *and* after *cries* is quite possible. Variation in the use of the repeated *and* is acceptable here in Ether 15:16–17.

As far as the nonrepeated *their* goes, we note that when *lamentation* is conjoined (as in verse 16 but not in verse 17), there is typically no repetition of the determiner unless it is the indefinite article *a* without an intervening adjective:

□ *with the repeated indefinite article*

Mormon 2:11	a mourning and a lamentation
Ether 15:16	a howling and a lamentation

□ *without the repeated determiner*

Mosiah 9:19	to our great sorrow and lamentation
Mosiah 21:9	a great mourning and lamentation
Alma 28:4	a great mourning and lamentation
Helaman 6:33	to the great sorrow and lamentation of the righteous
Helaman 7:15	my mourning and lamentation

Thus we actually expect “their howlings and lamentations” in Ether 15:16. So there is no reason to emend the text in this passage.

Summary: Accept the reduced repetition in Ether 15:16 (“their cries their howlings and lamentations”), even though the following verse has a fuller form with increased repetition (“their cries and their howlings and their mournings”).

■ Ether 15:16–17

and after that they had retired to their camps
 they took up a howling and a lamentation
 for the loss of the slain of their people
 and so great were their cries their howlings and lamentations

- (1) that [it 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQS | they RT] did rend the air exceedingly
 and it came to pass that
 on the morrow they did go again to battle
 and great and terrible was that day
 nevertheless they conquered not
 and when the night came
 again [NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]

- (2) **they** did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mournings
 for the loss of the slain of their people

In each of these two verses, we have a reference to the people rending the air with their cries and howlings. The phraseology is similar except that in the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript) the subject pronoun in verse 16 is *it*. This singular pronoun *it* would seem to refer to their cries and howlings rather than to the people themselves. Near the end of verse 17, on the other hand, we have the plural pronoun *they*, which clearly refers to the people rather than to their cries and howlings. In the 1920 LDS edition, the *it* in verse 16 was emended to *they*, which made the subject pronoun here in verse 16 agree with its plural antecedent (“their cries their howlings and lamentations”) as well as with the plural *they* in verse 17. Such an emendation suggests that the original text could have read *they* in verse 16.

The 1920 LDS edition further increased the similarity between the two verses by removing the comma after the *again* near the end of verse 17, giving “and when the night came again they did rend the air”. Although that edition did not add a comma after *came*, the removal of the comma after *again* does suggest an ambiguity—namely, *again* may either end the *when*-clause (“and when the night came again”) or begin the following main clause (“again they did rend the air with their cries”). This latter interpretation would clearly support the change of *it* to *they* in verse 16 since now the word *again* would be referring to the second time the people rent the air with their cries and howlings. But by not putting a comma after *came*, the 1920 edition avoided making a firm decision concerning which clause the *again* belongs to.

When we look at the whole description of this last battle of the Jaredites, we find that *again* is never otherwise used to describe the coming of night or of the following day (the one unclear case, here in verse 17, is marked with an arrow):

- *first day and night* (Ether 15:15–16)

and they fought all that day and conquered not
 and it came to pass that when it was night
 they were weary and retired to their camps
 and after that they had retired to their camps
 they took up a howling and a lamentation
 for the loss of the slain of their people
 and so great were their cries their howlings and lamentations
 that it did rend the air exceedingly

- *second day and night* (Ether 15:17)
 - and it came to pass that
 - on the morrow they did go **again** to battle
 - and great and terrible was that day
 - nevertheless they conquered not
 - and when the night came **again** they did rend the air
 - with their cries and their howlings and their mournings
- *third day and night* (Ether 15:19–20)
 - wherefore they went **again** to battle
 - and it came to pass that they fought all that day
 - and when the night came they slept upon their swords
- *fourth day and night* (Ether 15:21–22)
 - and on the morrow they fought even until the night came
 - and when the night came they were drunken with anger
 - even as a man which is drunken with wine
 - and they slept **again** upon their swords
- *fifth day and night* (Ether 15:23–24)
 - and on the morrow they fought **again**
 - and when the night came they had all fallen by the sword
 - save it were fifty and two of the people of Coriantumr
 - and sixty and nine of the people of Shiz
 - and it came to pass that they slept upon their swords that night
- *sixth day and night* (Ether 15:24–26)
 - and on the morrow they fought **again**
 - and they contended in their mights
 - with their swords and with their shields
 - all that day
 - and when the night came
 - there was thirty and two of the people of Shiz
 - and twenty and seven of the people of Coriantumr
 - and it came to pass that they ate and slept
 - and prepared for death on the morrow

The word *again* occurs throughout the larger passage but with respect to the actions of the people, not the coming of day or night. Thus the passage as a whole supports the use of *again* in verse 17 with the following clause rather than with the preceding one, so that we get “again they did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mournings”. And as a consequence, we have additional support for the change to the plural pronoun *they* in verse 16.

On the other hand, the original text has examples where the singular pronoun *it* refers to a plural collective, as in Helaman 13:31: “and behold the time cometh that he curseth your **riches** that **it** becometh slippery”. Under the discussion for that passage, I list five other instances in the original text where *it* refers to a plural collective. Thus the original use of *it* here in Ether 15:16 to refer to the cries and howlings of the people is definitely possible. In fact, *again* can be still used later in verse 17 to refer to the cries and howlings of the people even if now the subject is the people

rather than their cries and howlings. The critical text will therefore restore the original *it* in verse 16, but in verse 17 a comma will be added before the *again*, thus placing the *again* at the head of the main clause: “again they did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mournings”.

It should be noted that normally in the Book of Mormon text the word *again* does not immediately begin a finite clause. What we typically have is a preceding *and* (71 times), but there are a few instances where *again* occurs at the beginning of a finite clause, as in this example where there is a preceding “it came to pass” clause:

3 Nephi 11:4
and it came to pass that
again they heard the voice and they understood it not

This example shows that *again* can begin a finite clause. Thus here in Ether 15:17 the placement of *again* at the beginning of the clause (“**again** they did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mournings”) is quite possible.

Summary: Restore in Ether 15:16 the original *it* that refers to the people’s cries and howlings, a collective plural; such usage occurred fairly often in the original text; in Ether 15:17, the word *again* should be preceded by a comma, with the result that *again* begins the main clause (“again they did rend the air with their cries and their howlings and their mournings”).

■ Ether 15:17

and it came to pass that on the morrow
[*that* >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *they did go again to battle*

Spacing between extant fragments of \mathcal{O} argues that here in Ether 15:17 the subordinate conjunction *that* may have occurred after “on the morrow” (in addition to before it). Yet the repeated *that*, if it were in \mathcal{O} , may have been crossed out since it is not found in \mathcal{P} . This case is discussed under Alma 58:14; from the discussion there, we can determine that the expression “it came to pass **that** on the morrow **that** . . .” is possible (as originally in Jacob 7:17), but the chances are greater that the subordinate *that* was not repeated after the prepositional phrase “on the morrow”. Here in Ether 15:17, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, namely, the reading in \mathcal{P} without the repeated *that*.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 15:17 the earliest extant reading (the reading in \mathcal{P}) without the repeated *that*: “and it came to pass that on the morrow they did go again to battle”.

■ Ether 15:24

and they contended
in their [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS| *might* RT]
with their swords and with their shields all that day

As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the original text had 12 instances of plural *mights* where modern speakers of English expect the singular *might*. All but one of these instances of *mights* were edited to *might* in the 1920 LDS edition, including here in Ether 15:24. This particular one is interesting

in that it is the only one where the preposition is *in* (“in their might”). For the 11 other instances of original *mights*, the preposition is *with*; there are examples of “with their might”, “with our might”, and “with your might”. Normally, when the preposition is *in*, the text has the singular *might*, with three examples of “in their might”:

Alma 19:16	they did call on the name of the Lord in their might
Helaman 9:3	they ran in their might
3 Nephi 3:16	and they did exert themselves in their might

Nonetheless, the critical text will accept the plural *mights* here in Ether 15:24 since it is the reading of the earliest extant text. Moreover, there is considerable evidence for *mights* elsewhere in the original text.

Summary: Restore the original plural *mights* in Ether 15:24, the reading of the earliest extant text (here the printer’s manuscript).

■ Ether 15:29

behold Shiz had fainted

with [1ABCDEFIJLN | the GHKMOPQRST] loss of blood

Here the printer’s manuscript reads without the definite article *the* before “loss of blood”. The 1858 Wright edition and the 1905 LDS missionary edition supplied the *the* (independently, it would appear). In addition, the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition seems to have adopted the secondary *the* for this phrase by reference to the 1905 edition. The original manuscript is not extant here (nor are there any nearby fragments that might provide evidence from spacing considerations).

Elsewhere in the text, we always get *the* before every reference to the loss of blood (five times), of which the last three refer to fainting (just like here in Ether 15:29):

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

Alma 48:13
 and he had sworn with an oath to defend his people
 his rights and his country and his religion
 even to **the** loss of his blood

Alma 57:25
 and it came to pass that there were two hundred
 out of my two thousand and sixty
 which had **fainted** because of **the** loss of blood

Ether 15:9
 and he **fainted** with **the** loss of blood

Ether 15:27
 and they **fainted** with **the** loss of blood

The last two examples, like the one here in Ether 15:29, are from the same chapter of Ether, and they also use the preposition *with*, thus suggesting that *the* belongs in verse 29 as well. It is quite possible that the *the* was in the original manuscript but was lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Such a change is even more probable when we consider that in modern English we expect the expression “with loss of blood” — that is, without the *the*. And as Alison Coutts points out (personal communication), the same holds for the corresponding negative form, “without loss of blood”.

Oliver Cowdery frequently omitted the definite article *the* in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , usually only momentarily. But there are seven instances where he failed to catch his error in \mathcal{P} (and some of these are obvious errors):

1 Nephi 12:5

and behold I saw [*the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] multitudes
which had not fallen

2 Nephi 5:12

and also the ball or [*the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] compass

Alma 23:14

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

Alma 32:2 (here the *the* was also momentarily omitted in \mathcal{O})

they began to have success among the poorer class
of [NULL > *the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] people

Alma 45:8

and [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | 1] Lord shall prosper thee in this land

3 Nephi 3:23

yea to the line which was betwixt the land Bountiful
and [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] land Desolation

3 Nephi 19:15

while [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] angels were ministering
unto the disciples

So it is quite possible that here in Ether 15:29 Oliver omitted the *the*.

On the other hand, there is considerable evidence in Early Modern English for the phrase “with loss of blood”, as in these examples (with accidentals modernized) from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Jonathan Sidnam (1655)

though faint with loss of blood

Samuel Holland (1656)

that his steed should swoon under him
and lie down with loss of blood

Thomas D’Urfey (1676)

they give no kingdoms won with loss of blood

Literature Online also lists examples of “with **the** loss of blood”, such as this one in Early Modern English (again with accidentals modernized):

Samuel Rowlands (1607)

who with **the** loss of blood doth weakly faint

Literature Online shows that “with loss of blood” is more frequent than “with **the** loss of blood” (94 to 33). And in citations from the 1600s, the same preference holds (17 to 7). These statistics argue that the phrase “with loss of blood” could very well be original in Ether 15:29. Since it will work, the critical text will accept it, but with the recognition that this could be an early error for “with **the** loss of blood”.

Summary: Restore in Ether 15:29 the reading in \mathcal{P} , “with loss of blood”, even though similar instances of this phrase (including two more in this chapter of Ether) read “with **the** loss of blood”.

■ 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*

Once more we have an example in the latter part of the text where John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, removed the Hebrew-like *and* between the subordinate *when*-clause and the following main clause (“he smote off the head of Shiz”). Using pencil, Gilbert crossed out the ampersand in \mathcal{P} and then later set the 1830 text without the *and*.

Here the occurrence of the *and* in the original text is probably related to the parenthetical clause (“that he rested a little”) that intervenes right before the main clause. The critical text will, of course, restore these original instances of *and*. For further discussion of Gilbert’s removal of these *and*’s, see under Helaman 16:10. For another example, see nearby under Ether 15:15.

Summary: Restore in Ether 15:30 the original Hebrew-like *and* that occurred before the main clause (thus “**and** he smote off the head of Shiz”); the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript, has the *and* (written as an ampersand), which the 1830 typesetter crossed out in pencil.

■ Ether 15:31

and it came to pass that

after he had smote off the head of Shiz

that Shiz raised [upon 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS| up HK| up on T] his hands and fell

and after that he had struggled for breath / he died

The 1981 LDS edition reinterpreted *upon* as two words, *up on*, although I can detect very little, if any, semantic difference between “raised **upon** his hands” and “raised **up on** his hands”. Elsewhere in the text, there are no other examples referring to “**upon** one’s hands” or “**up on** one’s hands”. But somewhat parallel to this example here in Ether 15:31 are eight examples in the text that refer to someone rising up to stand on their feet:

Alma 14:25	and they arose and stood upon their feet
Alma 15:11	Zeezrom leaped upon his feet
Alma 19:29	she arose and stood upon her feet
Alma 19:30	and behold he arose and stood upon his feet
Alma 22:22	and he stood upon his feet / receiving his strength
Alma 36:23	and I stood upon my feet
3 Nephi 20:2	and he commanded them that they should arise and stand up upon their feet
3 Nephi 20:2	and they arose up and stood upon their feet

All these examples have the single word *upon*, not *up on* (although we should note that there is the one example, in 3 Nephi 20:2, of *up upon*). All this suggests that the spelling *up on* in the 1981 LDS edition for Ether 15:31 is textually doubtful.

In this passage the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *upon* with *up*, giving “Shiz raised **up** his hands”. This reading provides an alternative for Shiz’s last physical motion prior to collapsing and dying. Nonetheless, this textual change was probably unintentional, although it is possible as a reading (which probably explains why it was copied into the 1892 RLDS edition). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *upon* to the RLDS text. Like the phrase “to raise **upon** one’s hands”, the phrase “to raise **up** one’s hands” is unique in the history of the Book of Mormon text. Since either reading will work, at least in theory, the critical text will accept the earliest reading, “Shiz raised **upon** his hands”.

Summary: Restore the single-word spelling *upon* in Ether 15:31 (“Shiz raised **upon** his hands”); the original text here very likely read *upon* rather than *up*, the reading of the 1874 RLDS edition.

■ Ether 15:33

and he went forth
and [beheld 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | behold D]
that the words of the Lord had all been fulfilled

The 1841 British edition replaced *beheld* with *behold*. The resulting text, “and **behold** that the words of the Lord had all been fulfilled”, doesn’t work. It would work if the subordinate conjunction *that* were also removed (“and behold the words of the Lord had all been fulfilled”). The 1841 change to *behold* is clearly a typo, not the result of editing, especially since there appears to have been no conscious editing for that edition. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *beheld* here in Ether 15:33.

Summary: Maintain in Ether 15:33 the past-tense form *beheld*, the reading of the earliest text (“and he went forth and **beheld** that the words of the Lord had all been fulfilled”).

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Moroni

Moroni 1

■ Moroni 1:1

I had supposed

[*to not* 1 | *not to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have written more*

but I have not as yet perished

Here the 1830 typesetter removed the so-called split infinitive by placing the *not* in front of “to have written”. It is unlikely that this change was an instance of conscious editing since all other examples of split infinitives have been retained throughout the history of the text:

Alma 37:34

teach them **to never be** weary of good works

Alma 56:18

they were compelled by the orders of Ammoron

to not come against the city of Judea

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

Note that Alma 56:18 has a *not* splitting an infinitive and it has never been emended. The original split infinitive will be restored here in Moroni 1:1.

The idea that split infinitives are somehow wrong in English is a complete artificiality. For evidence of this, see the discussion under that subject in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

Summary: Restore the split infinitive in Moroni 1:1 (“to not have written”) since such constructions are found in the original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon; there is nothing ungrammatical about them in English.

■ Moroni 1:3

wherefore I wander whithersoever I can

for the safety of [mine 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | my HK] own life

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed the possessive pronoun *mine* to *my*, the form in modern English that we expect in attributive position. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *mine*.

Moroni 1

For further discussion of the tendency in the text to replace attributive uses of *mine* with *my*, see under Omni 1:10. For each case of the possessive pronoun, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, thus “mine own life” here in Moroni 1:3.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 1:3 the archaic use of *mine* in the phrase “mine own life”, the reading of the earliest extant text.

Moroni 2

■ Moroni 2:2

*and after that ye have done this
ye shall have power that [on 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | to RT] him
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | upon RT] whom ye shall lay
your [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
ye shall give the Holy Ghost*

The 1920 LDS edition changed “**on him whom** ye shall lay your hands” to “**to him upon whom** ye shall lay your hands”, although there is nothing particularly difficult about the original text here. A parallel use of the preposition *on*, at least on the surface, is found in the next verse:

Moroni 2:3 and **on** as many as they laid their hands fell the Holy Ghost

Of course, *upon* is also possible:

Moroni 2:1 as he laid his hands **upon** them
Moroni 3:2 they laid their hands **upon** them

Elsewhere in the text, there are two more occurrences involving *on* with the expression “to lay hands” (when referring to blessings or ordinations):

Alma 6:1 by laying **on** his hands according to the order of God
Mormon 9:24 they shall lay hands **on** the sick

Thus either preposition, *on* or *upon*, will work here in Moroni 2:2.

Even so, the pronoun *him* can be interpreted as the indirect object for the final clause in the sentence, as if the text read “to him . . . ye shall give the Holy Ghost”. This may have been the reason why the 1920 committee felt that the preposition before *him* should be *to* rather than *on* (another possibility would have been *unto*).

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that here in verse 2 the original text may have read as “**him on** whom ye shall lay your hands ye shall give the Holy Ghost” (that is, the earliest reading resulted from a switch in the word order, from *him on* to *on him*). But since the earliest reading here in Moroni 2:2 will work, despite its oddity, the critical text will restore that reading (namely, “**on him whom** ye shall lay your hands ye shall give the Holy Ghost”). There is no textual evidence from mix-ups in word order that would support either the 1920 reading or Calabro’s proposed emendation as the original reading.

We also briefly note that here in the printer’s manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *hand* (“on him whom ye shall lay your **hand**”). Virtually immediately, he corrected *hand*

to *hands* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted plural *s*). Elsewhere, the text has five instances of “to lay **hands** (up)on someone” that refer to blessing or ordaining someone. In fact, all five of these are listed above, with two of them occurring here in Moroni 2. The plural *hands* is also used when “to lay hands (up)on someone” refers to physically taking hold of someone (20 times). In the manuscripts, Oliver frequently mixed up the number of the noun *hand* (for some examples, see under Mosiah 16:1 and Alma 5:4). The critical text will maintain the plural *hands* here in Moroni 2:2.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 2:2 the original *on him whom* in “on him whom ye shall lay your hands”; there is nothing particularly difficult about this reading; the critical text will also maintain the plural *hands* in this clause.

Moroni 3

■ Moroni 3:3

*in the name of Jesus Christ
I ordain you to be a priest
— or if he be a teacher—
I ordain you to be a teacher—
to preach repentance
and remission of sins through Jesus Christ
by the endurance of faith on his name to the end
Amen*

It is obvious that the *or*-clause here includes within its scope the main clause “I ordain you to be a teacher”. However, beginning with the 1830 edition, all printed editions have had parentheses placed around only the *if*-clause:

Moroni 3:3 (original parentheses)
in the name of Jesus Christ
I ordain you to be a priest
(or if he be a teacher)
I ordain you to be a teacher
to preach repentance . . .

Quite clearly, the one ordaining does not say “I ordain you to be a priest / I ordain you to be a teacher”.

This punctuation difficulty is apparently mentioned by Paul Cheesman on page 163 of *The Keystone of Mormonism: Little Known Truths about the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1973). Cheesman refers to this verse as having a problem with punctuation. Over the years Daniel Ludlow has advocated emending the punctuation for this passage (personal communication). Finally, the 2004 Doubleday version of the Book of Mormon made the correction (the text for that edition was provided by the LDS Church).

Summary: Extend the scope of the parenthetical insertion in Moroni 3:3 to include “I ordain you to be a teacher”; the complete *or*-clause (“or if he be a teacher / I ordain you to be a teacher”) should be set off by dashes or parentheses.

Moroni 4

■ Moroni 4:1

*The manner of their **elders and priests** administering the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church*

Here one could reinterpret *elders* and *priests* as plural possessive forms: “The manner of their **elders’** and **priests’** administering the flesh and blood of Christ”. (It is also possible that one could treat “elders and priests” as combinatory rather than segregatory, thus adding the apostrophe to only the last conjunct: “The manner of their **elders and priests’** administering the flesh and blood of Christ”.) This possessive interpretation is indirectly supported by the language at the beginning of the following chapter: “The manner of administering the wine” (Moroni 5:1). In other words, in Moroni 4:1 we have the equivalent “The manner of . . . administering the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church”.

The change to the possessive would make the gerundive phrase more nominal than verbal. We can perhaps see the potential difference more clearly if we replaced the phrase “their elders and priests” with a third person plural pronoun, either *them* or *their*: the more nominal form would be “The manner of **their** administering the flesh and blood of Christ” while the more verbal form would be “The manner of **them** administering the flesh and blood of Christ”. For phrases of this type, the Book of Mormon text prefers the nominal forms, as explained under Mosiah 16:3.

Adding apostrophes here in Moroni 4:1 (or perhaps only one apostrophe) would draw unnecessary attention to a distinction that makes little difference since the text here has plural nouns rather than pronouns. The critical text will therefore leave the text as it is, without adding any apostrophe(s) to the phrase “their elders and priests”.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 4:1 the object form of the noun phrase “their elders and priests”; changing this noun phrase to a possessive form by adding one or two apostrophes would create a rather odd-looking gerundive phrase.

■ Moroni 4:1

wherefore we know

[*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the manner to be true*

Here the original text shows a mixture of a finite *that*-clause and an infinitival clause. The subordinate conjunction *that* was dropped in the 1837 edition, probably as a result of Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition (although he did not mark the deletion in Ø). The current text thus has

a full infinitival structure: “wherefore we know the manner to be true”. Another way of dealing with the mixture would have been to change the infinitive phrase *to be* to the indicative *is*: “wherefore we know that the manner is true”.

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb *know* is followed by a clause stating that something is true, we get the *that*-clause 11 times, as in this complicated example:

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

The infinitival clause, on the other hand, does occur, but only twice:

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

3 Nephi 8:1

and we know our record **to be** true

There is one other case in the text that refers to knowing something to be true, and in the original text that example has a mixture of the finite *that*-clause and the infinitival clause:

1 Nephi 1:3

and I know that the record which I make
 [*to be* >js is 1 | *to be* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] true

In this case, Joseph Smith changed the *to be* to *is* rather than deleting the *that*.

Either possibility for editing the text will work. Joseph Smith’s editing in one case changed *to be* to *is* (1 Nephi 1:3) and in another dropped the *that* (Moroni 4:1). The critical text, however, will in both cases restore the earliest reading, the ones with the mixture of clausal forms—thus “wherefore we know **that** the manner **to be** true” here in Moroni 4:1.

There is one other case of this kind of clausal mixture in the original text. In this third case, as in the one in 1 Nephi 1:3, there is some intervening material that seems to permit the switch from the finiteness of the *that*-clause to the use of the infinitival *to*:

Mormon 6:6

and having been commanded of the Lord that I should not suffer
 [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] the records
 which had been handed down by our fathers
 which were sacred
to fall into the hands of the Lamanites . . .

For further discussion of this example, see under Mormon 6:6.

Summary: Restore the original *that* in Moroni 4:1, giving “wherefore we know **that** the manner **to be** true”; even though the result is a mixture of the finite *that*-clause and an infinitival phrase, *to be*, there is evidence elsewhere in the original text for such mixtures in clausal form.

■ Moroni 4:1

and the elder or priest did [minister 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | administer D] it

Here at the end of verse 1 the 1841 British edition replaced the verb *minister* with *administer*, undoubtedly because earlier in this verse there are two instances of *administer*:

Moroni 4:1

The manner of their elders and priests **administering**
the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church
and they **administered** it according to the commandments of Christ

As explained under Alma 15:18, usage in earlier English allowed for either verb here in Moroni 4:1 (also see the discussion under Alma 17:18). For each case of *(ad)minister*, the critical text will follow the earliest reading—thus the verb *minister* for the third instance in Moroni 4:1.

Summary: In Moroni 4:1 both *minister* and *administer* are possible in referring to the sacrament; the earliest textual sources support *administer* for the first two occurrences in Moroni 4:1 but *minister* for the third one.

Moroni 5

■ Moroni 5:2

*that they do always remember **him***

that they may have his Spirit to be with [them 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST | him E]

Here we have a typo in the 1849 LDS edition, the replacement of the correct *them* with *him*. The likely source of the error was the *him* in the preceding clause “that they do always remember **him**”. Obviously, the text does not intend to say that Christ should have his Spirit to be with himself. The subsequent LDS edition (in 1852) restored the correct *them*. Also note that the prayer for the bread (in Moroni 4) also uses *them* in the same clause: “that they may always have his Spirit to be with **them**”.

There are some substantive differences between the two sacramental prayers that involve the nature of the bread and the wine; also the second prayer is shorter at the end. In addition, there is one minor difference with respect to the occurrence of the word *always* in the last clause (noted under 2 and 2' below):

Moroni 4:3

O God the Eternal Father
we ask thee in the name
of thy Son Jesus Christ
to bless and sanctify this **bread**
to the souls of all those
who **partake** of it
that they may **eat** in remembrance
of the **body** of thy Son

and witness unto thee
O God the Eternal Father
that they **are willing**
to take upon them
the name of thy Son

- (1) **and** always remember him
and keep his commandments
which he hath given them
- (2) that they may **always** have his Spirit
to be with them
Amen

Moroni 5:2

O God the Eternal Father
we ask thee in the name
of thy Son Jesus Christ
to bless and sanctify this **wine**
to the souls of all those
who **drink** of it
that they may **do it** in remembrance
of the **blood** of thy Son
which was shed for them

that they may witness unto thee
O God the Eternal Father
that they

- (1') **do** always remember him

- (2') that they may have his Spirit
to be with them
Amen

The word *always* occurs in the last clause of the first prayer but is lacking in the second prayer. This could be a textual error. Yet in the second prayer there is a preceding *always* (“that they do always remember him”), and it is considerably closer to the final clause than the corresponding *always* is in the first prayer (compare 1 and 2 against 1’ and 2’). This proximity to a preceding *always* may explain why the *always* is not repeated in the second prayer, while in the first prayer the considerable distance between the two occurrences of *always* is acceptable. The critical text will therefore maintain this difference with respect to *always* in the two prayers since it appears to be intentional.

Interestingly, the two sacrament prayers in the standard text are precisely as they were originally, without even any grammatical editing. (I exclude here any variation in the accidentals, such as capitalization and punctuation.)

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 4–5 the substantive differences between the two sacrament prayers, including the difference in the use of *always* in the final clause, “that they may (always) have his Spirit to be with them”; maintain the pronoun *them* at the end of both sacrament prayers.

Moroni 6

■ Moroni 6:3

*and none were received unto [1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the > NULL A] baptism
save they took upon them the name of Christ
having a determination to serve him
[unto 1A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the end*

Here in Moroni 6:3, the 1830 compositor initially set “unto **the** baptism”, perhaps because the following manuscript line, just underneath, reads “unto **the** end”. Later, in an in-press change, the compositor removed the extra *the* from “unto the baptism”, giving “and none were received unto baptism save they took upon them the name of Christ”.

In the 1837 edition, the preposition *unto* in the following phrase “unto the end” was accidentally changed to *to*. Elsewhere in the text, there are 18 other occurrences of “**to** the end” but also 4 of “**unto** the end” (here I exclude cases where *end* is postmodified). Thus either preposition is possible. The critical text will restore the original *unto* here in Moroni 6:3. For further examples of the tendency to replace *unto* with *to* in the 1837 edition, see under 3 Nephi 4:18.

Summary: Restore the preposition *unto* in Moroni 6:3 (“unto the end”) since the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript) reads *unto*.

■ Moroni 6:4

*relying alone upon the merits of Christ
who was the author and **the** finisher of their faith*

Moroni 6:4 uses the same basic expression as found in the King James Bible: “looking unto Jesus / the author and finisher of *our* faith” (Hebrews 12:2). We note here that the definite article *the* is repeated in the Book of Mormon version (“the author and **the** finisher”) but not in the King James version (“the author and finisher”), nor is the definite article repeated in the original Greek. However, paraphrastic aspects are involved here since Moroni’s quote is in the third person while the King James version is in the first person (the Greek, however, does not have the *our*). The use of the repeated *the* is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, so it is not surprising that there is this difference in comparison to the King James text. The critical text will maintain the repeated *the* in the phrase “the author and **the** finisher of their faith”.

Summary: Accept the repeated *the* in Moroni 6:4 even though Hebrews 12:2 does not have it; here we follow the reading of the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript.

■ Moroni 6:9

*for as the power of the Holy Ghost led them
whether to preach or [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | to OQRT] exhort
or to pray or to supplicate or to sing
even so it was done*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition inserted the infinitival *to* before the verb *exhort*. The 1911 LDS edition also added this extra *to*, perhaps independently. Subsequent LDS editions have followed this usage since it seems so appropriate given the otherwise systematic use of the infinitival *to* throughout the passage (“to preach . . . or to pray or to supplicate or to sing”).

The repeated *to* is possible but not necessary, as seen in the following pair of nearly identical examples involving *whether*; the first has the repeated *to*, the second does not:

Alma 12:31 whether to do evil or **to** do good
Alma 41:7 whether to do good or do evil

These two examples from Alma involve a choice between two options, good and evil. But in Moroni 6:9, there are five options, each of which has the repeated *to* except for *exhort*. One could argue, however, that the *to* does not occur with *exhort* because it essentially means the same as the preceding *preach*. But this would not explain why the *to* is then repeated for the conjunctive pair “to pray or **to** supplicate”, since both *pray* and *supplicate* are semantically close.

When we look at the history of the text, we find there are seven cases in the printed editions where a repeated infinitival *to* has been lost:

- Jacob 7:2 (omitted in the 1892 RLDS edition)
 - to preach among the people
 - and [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | κ] declare unto them
 - that there should be no Christ
- Alma 12:4 (omitted in the 1840 edition)
 - to revile us
 - and [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] cast us out
- Alma 16:2 (omitted in the 1837 edition)
 - to slay the people
 - and [*to* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] destroy the city
- Helaman 7:5 (omitted in the 1830 edition)
 - to rule
 - and [*to* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] do according to their wills
- 3 Nephi 1:14 (omitted in the 1837 edition)
 - 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 (omitted in the 1892 RLDS edition)
 - to prosper
 - and [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | κ] wax great

Ether 6:18 (omitted in the 1840 edition)

to spread upon the face of the land
and [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | C] multiply
and **to** till the earth

Oliver Cowdery also tended to omit the repeated *to*. Here are three cases in \mathcal{P} where he initially omitted the repeated *to* but corrected his error; in each case, \mathcal{C} is extant and has the repeated *to*:

Alma 52:13

and thus he was endeavoring to harass the Nephites
and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *to* 1] draw away
a part of their forces to that part of the land

Alma 62:45

to repent of their sins
and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *to* 1] be baptized
unto the Lord their God

Alma 62:48

to multiply
and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *to* 1] wax exceeding strong
again in the land

Despite this strong tendency to omit the repeated *to*, there is one firm case in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery persisted in adding an intrusive *to*:

Alma 57:13

to keep them
or [*to* >% *put* 0 | *to put* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] them to death

In this case, Oliver started to write the repeated *to* in \mathcal{C} , but then he immediately erased it and overwrote the abraded *to* with the beginning of the following word, *put*. Yet when he came to copying this infinitival clause into \mathcal{P} , he reinserted the repeated *to*, this time without correcting it, thus writing in \mathcal{P} “to keep them or **to** put them to death”. This example shows that Oliver Cowdery could insert a repeated *to* as well as delete it.

Ultimately, the safest solution here in Moroni 6:9 is to accept the reading of the earliest textual sources—namely, without any repeated *to* (thus “whether to preach or exhort”). The critical text will therefore remove the repeated *to* since it is lacking in the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 6:9 the earliest reading, which lacks the repeated *to* in “whether to preach or exhort”.

Moroni 7

■ Moroni 7:1

*as he taught them in the synagogue
which they had [build 1 | built ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for the place of worship*

Here the printer's manuscript reads *had build*; the 1830 typesetter emended *build* to *built*. Another possibility is that the original text read "had builded". Although *builded* is archaic, it is found in the King James Bible. We have one case in the Book of Mormon text where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *builded*, but then corrected it to *built*:

Alma 53:6
and thus he had also [*built* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *builded* > *built* 1]
a strong hold to retain his prisoners

As explained under that passage, there is no evidence for *builded* in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

There are other cases where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *build*; all of these appear to be instances of *built* that were miswritten:

2 Nephi 5:16
save it were not [*built* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *build* >% *built* 1]
of so many precious things

Alma 31:13
for they had a place [*build* > *built* 0 | *built* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] up
in the center of their synagogue

Alma 49:3
the city of Ammonihah had been [*rebuild* > *rebuilt* 0 | *rebuilt* 1PRST |
re-built ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ]

Ether 8:25
for it is [*build* > *built* 1 | *built* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] up by the devil

For the first example (in 2 Nephi 5:16), \mathcal{O} is extant and reads *built*, thus showing in that case that the initial *build* in \mathcal{D} is a mistake for *built* and not *builded*. Similarly, the *build* here in \mathcal{D} for Moroni 7:1 is very likely a scribal error for *built*.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 7:1 the 1830 reading *had built* as the correct reading for the *had build* that Oliver Cowdery wrote in \mathcal{D} .

■ Moroni 7:8

*for behold if a man being evil giveth a gift
he [doeth 1AIJLMNOPQRST | doth BCDEFGHK] it grudgingly*

The Book of Mormon text systematically uses the two-syllable *doeth* for stressed forms of *do* but *doth* for the corresponding unstressed verb form. Except for one case, this corresponds with using *doeth* as the main verb form and *doth* as the auxiliary verb form (for the one exception, see under Alma 3:19). Here in Moroni 7:8, the 1837 edition changed the original *doeth* to *doth*, an error that was nonetheless copied into both the LDS and RLDS textual traditions. The correct *doeth* was restored to the LDS text in 1879 and to the RLDS text in 1908. For further discussion of the competition between *doeth* and *doth*, see under Mosiah 4:18.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:8 the original two-syllable *doeth* since here *do* occurs as the main verb and is stressed.

■ Moroni 7:11

*wherefore a man being [the 1A | a BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] servant of the devil
cannot follow Christ
and if he follow Christ
he cannot be a servant of the devil*

Here the earliest text reads “wherefore a man being **the** servant of the devil”, but in the 1837 edition the definite article *the* before *servant* was replaced by the indefinite article *a*. This reading agrees with the use of the indefinite article at the end of the verse: “he cannot be **a** servant of the devil”. It is possible that the 1837 change earlier in the verse to “a servant of the devil” was influenced by that following instance, even if unintentionally (the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P}). There is, of course, nothing really wrong with the definiteness of “the servant of the devil” in the earlier sentence. In fact, in both parts of verse 11 either *the* or *a* will work (that is, we could have “the servant of the devil” or “a servant of the devil”). In other words, there are three reasonable possibilities for the original text in verse 11:

- (1) *the* both times; *the* > *a* in the second case
 wherefore a man being **the** servant of the devil . . .
 he cannot be **the** servant of the devil
- (2) *a* both times; *a* > *the* in the first case (the current text)
 wherefore a man being **a** servant of the devil . . .
 he cannot be **a** servant of the devil
- (3) *the* in the first case; *a* in the second case (the earliest attested text, in \mathcal{P})
 wherefore a man being **the** servant of the devil . . .
 he cannot be **a** servant of the devil

The fourth possibility of *a* in the first instance and *the* in the second seems unlikely since it would involve making two changes in the text to get the reading of the earliest attested text (the

case listed under 3). The three other readings are more plausible. It is probably safest to accept the earliest attested text, the reading of the printer's manuscript, for Moroni 7:11.

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* before the first occurrence of *servant* in Moroni 7:11 (“wherefore a man being **the** servant of the devil”), the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Moroni 7:16**

*for behold the Spirit of Christ is given to every man
that [they 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | he OQRT] may know good from evil*

Here in Moroni 7:16 the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition changed the plural *they* to the singular *he*. The 1911 LDS edition made the same change, perhaps independently. The LDS text has continued with this grammatical emendation, but the RLDS text has maintained the original plural *they*. The preceding noun phrase, *every man*, is singular in form but plural in meaning. This kind of editing towards number agreement in generic expressions has occurred fairly often in the text (for another example, see nearby under Ether 4:18–19). The critical text will, in general, restore the original pronoun forms in generic expressions, even if it leads to disagreement in number.

Summary: Restore the plural *they* in Moroni 7:16, the reading of the earliest text, even though this conflicts grammatically with the preceding *every man* (which is singular in form but semantically plural).

■ **Moroni 7:16**

*for every thing which **inviteth to do good**
and **to persuade to believe in Christ**
is sent forth by the power and gift of Christ*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 25 August 2004) suggests here that *to persuade* may be an error for *persuadeth*. What we should have here is a conjoining of “every thing which inviteth to do good” and “every thing which persuadeth to believe in Christ”. It doesn’t make much sense to “invite to persuade to believe”. If the earliest reading here in Moroni 7:16 is in error, the probable source of the error would be the surrounding infinitive phrases, “to do good” and “to believe”. David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the following verse gives the antithesis of the original statement and it refers to persuading men to not believe in Christ: “but whatsoever thing persuadeth men to do evil and believe not in Christ . . .” (Moroni 7:17).

Other cases of conjunctive *invite* parallel the suggested emendation, all here in this part of Moroni 7:

Moroni 7:12 (with repetition of the infinitival *to*)
for the devil is an enemy unto God
and fighteth against him continually
and **inviteth** and **enticeth**
to sin and **to do** that which is evil continually

Moroni 7:13
but behold that which is of God
inviteth and **enticeth to do good** continually

Moroni 7:13 (with repetition of the infinitival *to*)
 wherefore every thing
 which **inviteth** and **enticeth**
to do good and **to** love God and **to** serve him
 is inspired of God

There are six other cases of “persuade to believe” (for the last four there is a conjoining of the infinitival *believe* with at least one more verb):

1 Nephi 19:23

but that I might more fully persuade them
to believe in the Lord their Redeemer

2 Nephi 25:16

until they shall be persuaded
to believe in Christ the Son of God

2 Nephi 25:23 (with repetition of the infinitival *to*)

for we labor diligently **to** write
to persuade our children and also our brethren
to believe in Christ and **to** be reconciled to God

2 Nephi 33:4 (with repetition of the infinitival *to*)

and it speaketh of Jesus and persuadeth men
to believe in him and **to** endure to the end

Jarom 1:11 (without repetition of the infinitival *to*)

persuading them
to look forward unto the Messiah and believe in him **to** come
 as though he already was

Moroni 7:17 (without repetition of the infinitival *to*)

but whatsoever thing persuadeth men
to do evil and believe not in Christ and deny him and serve not God
 then ye may know with a perfect knowledge it is of the devil

Although there are no examples of errors exactly like the one being proposed here in Moroni 7:16, there are similar ones, as in the case where Oliver Cowdery added the infinitive marker *to* in a conjunctive structure:

Alma 57:13

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

(For discussion of this case, see under Alma 57:13 as well as nearby under Moroni 6:9.) Here in Moroni 7:16, if *to* were accidentally repeated because of the preceding *to*, then the *-eth* ending could have been automatically dropped.

There is some minor evidence that \mathcal{O} itself might have read “and persuadeth to believe”. In the following verse, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in \mathcal{P} “but whatsoever thing **persuadeth to** do evil” (Moroni 7:17). Virtually immediately, Oliver supralinearly inserted *men* after *persuadeth* (the level of ink flow for the correction in \mathcal{P} is unchanged). One could argue that Oliver made this

error in \mathcal{D} for verse 17 because in \mathcal{C} the preceding verse actually read “and **persuadeth** to believe”. Of course, one wonders about the force of this argument since that preceding *persuadeth* in \mathcal{C} would have just been changed in \mathcal{D} to *to persuade*. Moreover, *men* could have been lost in verse 17 even if \mathcal{C} read “and to persuade to believe” in verse 16; the key to the momentary omission of *men* would have been the lack of any direct object in the preceding instance of the verb *persuade*. (In any event, the *men* is undoubtedly correct here in verse 17. Note that later on in the verse the text has *man* as the direct object for the verb *persuade*: “for after this manner doth the devil work / for he **persuadeth** no **man** to do good”.)

Ultimately, the earliest reading here in verse 16 does seem to be in error. The critical text will therefore accept the conjectural emendation here, namely, “every thing which inviteth to do good and **persuadeth** to believe in Christ”.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 7:16 the emendation of *to persuade* to *persuadeth*, giving “for every thing which inviteth to do good and **persuadeth** to believe in Christ is sent forth by the power and gift of Christ”; not only does the meaning require this reading but usage elsewhere in the text supports this conjecture.

■ Moroni 7:17

*for he persuadeth no man to do good / no not one
neither [doth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS|do RT] his angels
neither [doth >js do 1|doth A|do BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQRST] they
which subject themselves unto him*

Here the earliest text has two instances of the third person singular present *doth* for plural subjects, *his angels* in the first case and *they* in the second. For another example where an original *doth* is followed by a plural subject, see under Helaman 5:38 (which originally read “what **doth** all these things mean”). Here in Moroni 7:17, Joseph Smith changed the second instance of *doth* to *do* in his editing for the 1837 edition but left the first instance unchanged. The corresponding change to *do* for that instance was made in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition. The critical text, of course, will restore both instances of original *doth* since the third person singular ending *-(e)th* occurred very often with plural subjects in the original text (as explained under the clause “Nephi’s brethren **rebelleth** against him” in the 1 Nephi preface or, more generally, under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3).

Summary: Restore the two instances of *doth* in Moroni 7:17 since verb forms ending in *-(e)th* often occurred with plural subjects in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ Moroni 7:19

*wherefore I beseech of you **brethren***

Ross Geddes suggests (personal communication, 28 November 2004) that this sentence may be missing *my* (and also possibly *beloved*) before *brethren*. In this sermon of Mormon’s, we otherwise have only “my brethren” (four times) and “my beloved brethren” (nine times). However,

with the verb *beseech*, the use of *brethren* alone may be correct given that in Paul's epistles (in the King James Bible) there are ten instances of the verb *beseech* occurring with just *brethren*, as in this sampling:

Romans 12:1	I beseech you therefore brethren
1 Corinthians 16:15	I beseech you brethren
Galatians 4:12	brethren I beseech you
1 Thessalonians 4:1	furthermore then we beseech you brethren
2 Thessalonians 2:1	now we beseech you brethren

There is also one example in Hebrews 13:22: “and I beseech you brethren”. The Book of Mormon has only one other relevant case with the verb *beseech*: “wherefore my beloved brethren / I beseech of you” (Jacob 6:5). Here, of course, the placement of the vocative is initial rather than at the end, and it is the full form, “my beloved brethren”, rather than just the word *brethren*.

There is one case in the printer's manuscript where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *beloved* from the phrase “my beloved brethren”:

Alma 26:26
 but behold
 my [*beloved* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *beloved* 1] brethren

∅ is mostly extant here, reading *beloved Brethren* at the beginning of a manuscript line. But there is no specific evidence for an original *my* being omitted from “my brethren” or, even less probably, *my beloved* from “my beloved brethren”. (There is one case where the 1830 typesetter added *beloved* to “my brethren”, in Alma 34:28.)

The most convincing argument against the suggested emendation here in Moroni 7:19 is that *brethren* alone is twice used as a vocative in the book of Jacob:

Jacob 4:8 wherefore **brethren** despise not the revelations of God
 Jacob 4:10 wherefore **brethren** seek not to counsel the Lord

Thus there is no strong reason to reject the use of *brethren* alone in Moroni 7:19. The critical text will retain the earliest reading in Moroni 7:19: “wherefore I beseech of you **brethren**”.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:19 the use of *brethren* alone as a vocative since there are two other instances of such usage in the text (in Jacob 4:8, 10); in addition, King James usage in the New Testament epistles supports the use of *brethren* alone as a vocative when the verb is *beseech*.

■ Moroni 7:22

for behold God knowing all things
being [*from* 1ABCFGHIJKLMNQRST | *for* DE] *everlasting to everlasting*
behold he sent angels to minister unto the children of men

Here the 1841 British edition set *for* instead of the correct *from*. The typesetter may have been influenced by the *for* in the preceding “for behold God knowing all things”. Surprisingly, the error was not caught in the subsequent LDS edition (in 1849), but it was corrected in the next

LDS edition (in 1852). There are no other examples of this expression in the Book of Mormon, but it does occur four times in Psalms in the King James Bible:

Psalm 41:13	blessed <i>be</i> the LORD God of Israel from everlasting and to everlasting
Psalm 90:2	even from everlasting to everlasting thou <i>art</i> God
Psalm 103:17	but the mercy of the LORD <i>is</i> from everlasting to everlasting
Psalm 106:48	blessed <i>be</i> the LORD God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting

The critical text will, of course, maintain the original phraseology here in Moroni 7:22, “from everlasting to everlasting”.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:22 the preposition *from* in the phrase “from everlasting to everlasting”, the earliest reading as well as the biblical phraseology.

■ **Moroni 7:25**

*wherefore by the ministering of angels and by every word
which [proceeded > proceded 1|proceeded ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQRT|proceedeth JPS]
forth out of the mouth of God
men began to exercise faith in Christ
and thus by faith they did lay hold upon every good thing
and thus it was until the coming of Christ*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition and the 1908 RLDS text independently changed the past-tense *proceeded* to the present-tense *proceedeth*. The 1888 edition never served as a copytext; thus no subsequent LDS edition has the present-tense form. On the other hand, the RLDS text has continued with the present-tense form.

Clearly, the past-tense form is correct. The verse reads in the past tense and refers to events prior to the coming of Christ (“men **began** to exercise faith in Christ and thus by faith they **did lay hold** upon every good thing and thus it **was** until the coming of Christ”). The introduction of the present-tense form *proceedeth* was apparently prompted by the present-tense usage in the well-known King James scripture in the New Testament, which derives from the Old Testament:

Deuteronomy 8:3
man doth not live by bread only
but by every *word* that **proceedeth** out of the mouth of the LORD
doth man live

Matthew 4:4
man shall not live by bread alone
but by every word that **proceedeth** out of the mouth of God

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *proceeded* in Moroni 7:25, the reading of the earliest text; the present-tense *proceedeth* that was introduced into the RLDS text (in 1908) and that also occurred in the 1888 LDS edition apparently derives from the well-known phraseology in Matthew 4:4, “by every word that **proceedeth** out of the mouth of God”.

■ Moroni 7:26

and after that he [come 1 | came ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 men also were saved by faith in his name
 [1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and by faith
 they [become 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | became N] the sons of God

In this passage, as earlier in verse 25, we continue to have problems with respect to the tense. The printer's manuscript (the earliest textual source for this passage) has the present-tense forms *come* and *become*. The 1830 edition changed the *come* to *came*, and this past-tense form has been maintained in the text ever since. On the other hand, the present-tense *become* has been retained except for the 1906 LDS large-print edition.

There is evidence that Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up *come* and *came* in the manuscripts (for an extensive list where he wrote *come* in place of *came*, see under 3 Nephi 4:22). Here in Moroni 7:26, the difficulty with *come* is twofold: (1) the following independent clause is in the past tense ("men also **were** saved"); and (2) if *come* were correct, we would expect the indicative form *cometh* or *comes*, not the subjunctive *come*. It is not surprising that the 1830 typesetter emended *come* to *came*.

On the other hand, the use of the present-tense *become* in the following clause does not seem inappropriate. However, the parallelistic use of *by faith* suggests that the past tense should occur throughout:

Moroni 7:26 (1906 reading and proposed original text)
 men also were saved **by faith** in his name
 and **by faith** they became the sons of God

The 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon between these two independent clauses, thus separating the second clause from the first one, even though both have *by faith*. Yet the two clauses are closely connected, and a comma shows a closer connection than a semicolon.

There is no direct evidence in the manuscripts of mix-ups between *become* and *became* in the simple past tense. In 4 Nephi 1:43 there is some indirect evidence that Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{C}) may have written *became* in \mathcal{C} so that it appeared more like *become* (for discussion, see under that passage). There are, to be sure, some mix-ups between *become* and *became* as the past participial form for the verb *become* (for this, see under 1 Nephi 17:43).

It should also be noted that the New Testament epistles clearly allow for men to become the sons of God while still in this life:

Romans 8:14
 for as many as are led by the Spirit of God
 they **are** the sons of God

Philippians 2:15
 that ye **may be** blameless and harmless / the sons of God
 without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation
 among whom ye shine as lights in the world

1 John 3:1

behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us
that we **should be** called the sons of God

1 John 3:2

beloved now **are** we the sons of God
and it doth not yet appear what we shall be

Thus there is nothing wrong with the text in Moroni 7:26 claiming that by faith men became the sons of God while they were yet alive. The future-like use of *become* in the current text for Moroni 7:26 is not necessary and, based on the past-tense usage in the conjoined preceding clause, is probably an error for *became*. In order to better show the parallelism between the two independent clauses, both of which use the phrase *by faith*, the semicolon between the two clauses will be replaced by a comma in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:26 the past-tense *came* in the *after*-clause (“and after that he **came**”); parallelism between the two following main clauses argues that the past tense should occur in both of those clauses (“men also **were** saved by faith in his name and by faith they **became** the sons of God”); these two main clauses should be separated by a comma rather than by a semicolon.

■ Moroni 7:26

*and [as surely as >js as sure as 1| as surely as A| as sure as BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS |
as surely as T] Christ liveth
he spake these words unto our fathers saying . . .*

Here the earliest text reads “assuredly as”, although *assuredly* was spelled as two words, *as surely*, in \mathcal{P} as well as in the 1830 edition. As explained under Alma 37:45, this two-word spelling for *assuredly* here in Moroni 7:26 may have influenced Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition to replace *as surely* with *as sure*, thus giving the phrase “as sure as”. The 1981 LDS edition emended the grammar here by adding the adverbial ending *-ly* to *sure*, thus “as surely as”. The critical text will, of course, restore the original “assuredly as”, a perfectly fine reading.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 7:26 the original phraseology “assuredly as”.

■ Moroni 7:27

*wherefore my beloved brethren / **hath** miracles ceased
because that Christ [hath 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | had D] ascended into heaven
and **hath** sit down on the right hand of God
to claim of the Father his rights of mercy
which he **hath** upon the children of men*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *hath* with *had* in the clause “Christ **hath** ascended into heaven”, probably because Christ had already ascended. But the following conjoined predicate maintains the present-tense *hath* in “and **hath** sit down on the right

hand of God”, even though that event had also already happened. (As explained below, the copy-text for the 1841 edition read *hath set* instead of *hath sit*.) Also note that *hath* is used throughout the passage. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *hath* in the first part of the *because*-clause.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:27 the present-tense perfect auxiliary *hath* in “because that he **hath** ascended into heaven”, the reading of the earliest text; the larger passage uses *hath* throughout.

■ Moroni 7:27

because that Christ hath ascended into heaven

and hath [sit 1 | set ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | sat RST] down on the right hand of God

Here the printer’s manuscript reads *hath sit*. The 1830 typesetter replaced *hath sit* with *hath set*, which today would be considered dialectal. The 1920 LDS edition and the 1953 RLDS edition replaced this dialectal *hath set* with the standard *hath sat*. For a discussion of the competition in the Book of Mormon text between the intransitive verb *sit* and the transitive verb *set*, see under Helaman 14:4.

The question here is whether the perfect construction *have sit* is possible. Under the list of forms for the verb *sit*, the Oxford English Dictionary gives examples of standard *have sit* in the 16th through 18th centuries, as in these two examples from Early Modern English (with accidentals regularized):

Thomas Elyot (1540–1541)

after he **had sit** a good space

William Watson (1600)

having sit enthronized three days

The OED also cites dialectal *have sit* for the 19th century. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading here in Moroni 7:27, the archaic (or dialectal) *hath sit*.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 7:27 the earliest reading, the nonstandard use of *sit* as the past participle for the verb *sit* in “and hath **sit** down on the right hand of God”; such usage occurred in Early Modern English as well as dialectally in the 19th century.

■ Moroni 7:32

and after this manner bringeth to pass the Father

[1ABCDGHKPS | , EFIJLMNOQRT] *the covenants*

which he hath made unto the children of men

Here in the 1849 LDS edition, a comma was added after *the Father*, apparently in an attempt to help with the reading of the unusual syntax. The noun phrase *the Father* is the subject here, and the following noun phrase *the covenants* heads the direct object; here the equivalent language would be “after this manner the Father bringeth to pass the covenants which he hath made unto the children of men” except that in the Book of Mormon text the initial adverbial phrase “after this manner”

has led to subject-verb inversion. Elsewhere subject-verb inversion is normal whenever a declarative clause begins with the adverbial phrase “after this manner” (22 times), as in this sampling:

1 Nephi 1:15	and after this manner was the language of my father
1 Nephi 3:21	after this manner of language did I persuade my brethren
1 Nephi 5:3	and after this manner of language had my mother complained
1 Nephi 19:24	for after this manner hath the prophet written
2 Nephi 31:3	for after this manner doth the Lord God work
Enos 1:23	and after this manner do I write concerning them
Alma 51:32	and after this manner were they driven
3 Nephi 11:27	and after this manner shall ye baptize in my name

However, for all 22 of these examples the inversion occurs with either an auxiliary verb or the main verb *be* (once, in 1 Nephi 1:15). On the other hand, in a couple of cases inversion is avoided:

Omni 1:9	and after this manner we keep the record
Mosiah 18:16	and after this manner he did baptize every one that went forth

Note that the first of these lacks an auxiliary verb. In any event, the use of inversion is possible in Moroni 7:32; what is unusual is that the inversion occurs with the full verb phrase “bringeth to pass” (which lacks an auxiliary verb). In order to make sure that the inversion is correctly read, the critical text will remove the comma that separates the subject *the Father* from the following direct object (which is headed by the noun phrase *the covenants*).

Summary: Remove the comma after the subject noun phrase *the Father* in Moroni 7:32.

■ **Moroni 7:37**

*and it is by faith that angels appear and minister
unto [men 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | them N]*

Here the typesetter for the 1906 LDS edition accidentally misread *men* as *them*. He may have been influenced by the usage in the previous verse, where *men* is used first and is then followed by the pronominal *them* in reference to “the children of men” (here I cite the 1906 text, which follows the 1837 editing):

Moroni 7:36 (standard edited text)
 or have angels ceased to appear unto the children of **men**
 or has he withheld the power of the Holy Ghost from **them**

The 1906 typo in verse 37 was not, however, transmitted to any subsequent LDS edition since that edition never served as a copytext. The critical text will maintain the original reading with *men* in Moroni 7:37.

Summary: Maintain *men* in Moroni 7:37, in accord with the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Moroni 7:38**

*for no man can be saved
according to the words of Christ
save they shall have faith [in 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | on HK] his name*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *in* with *on*, probably accidentally. Overall in the text, we have examples with either preposition when referring to faith and the name of the Lord, although *on* does predominate, seven to two (here we include the example in Moroni 7:38):

Mosiah 3:9	even through faith on his name
Mosiah 3:21	only through repentance and faith on the name of the Lord God Omnipotent
Mosiah 5:7	through faith on his name
Alma 9:27	through faith on his name
Mormon 9:37	through faith on the name of Jesus Christ
Moroni 3:3	by the endurance of faith on his name to the end
Moroni 7:26	men also were saved by faith in his name
Moroni 7:38	save they shall have faith in his name
Moroni 8:3	through the endurance of faith on his name to the end

We note that the nearby occurrence in Moroni 7:26 reads “by faith **in** his name”. There is also evidence for the preposition *in* in the King James version for Acts 3:16: “and his name through faith **in** his name hath made this man strong”. In addition, there is an early revelation to Joseph Smith that reads “faith **in** his name”:

Book of Commandments 2:6 (Doctrine and Covenants 3:20)
and be glorified through faith **in** his name

This revelation dates from July 1828, during the same general time period as the Book of Mormon translation. See under Helaman 15:7 for further discussion on the variation between *in* and *on* for prepositional phrases associated with the noun *faith*.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 7:38 the use of *in* for the phrase “faith in his name”, the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Moroni 7:39**

*for if ye have not faith in him
then ye are not fit to be numbered among the people
of [his 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | this GHK] church*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced *his* with *this*. This secondary reading continued in the RLDS text until the correct *his* was restored in the 1908 edition. It seems rather odd to refer to “this church” in this passage, although it is not impossible. There is no nearby instance of *this* that seems to have triggered the error; what we apparently have here is a simple misreading of *his* as *this*. About 70 percent of the mix-ups of *this* and *his* show *this* changing to *his* (for three

Summary: Accept in Moroni 7:42 Oliver Cowdery’s correction of “he must needs hope” to “he must needs **have** hope”; here his correction appears to be the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , just as it very likely was in the next clause when Oliver supralinearly inserted *be* in “there cannot **be** any hope”; these two corrections appear to have been made at the same time.

■ **Moroni 7:43–44**

*and again behold I say unto you
that he cannot have faith and hope*

- (1) *save he shall be meek and lowly **of** heart*

*if so his faith and hope is vain
for none is acceptable before God
save the meek and lowly*

- (2) [*of* 1ABCGHKPS | *in* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *heart*

- (3) *and if a man be meek and lowly **in** heart
and confesses by the power of the Holy Ghost
that Jesus is the Christ
he must needs have charity*

Here the question is whether the text should read “lowly **of** heart” or “lowly **in** heart”. In this passage, the earliest extant text has two occurrences of “lowly **of** heart” and one of “lowly **in** heart”, but in the 1841 British edition, the typesetter accidentally replaced the second instance of “lowly **of** heart” with “lowly **in** heart”, probably because it was immediately followed by the example with *in* and was otherwise identical at the end:

Moroni 7:44 (earliest reading)
save the meek and lowly **of** heart
and if a man be meek and lowly **in** heart

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has only “lowly **in** heart”:

Alma 32:8	I behold that ye are lowly in heart
Alma 37:33	teach them . . . to be meek and lowly in heart
Alma 37:34	teach them . . . to be meek and lowly in heart

This usage with *in* also follows the King James language in Matthew 11:29: “for I am meek and lowly **in** heart”. On the other hand, an early revelation given to Joseph Smith, received in October 1830 (about half a year after the printing of the 1830 Book of Mormon was completed), reads “and be meek and lowly **of** heart” (Doctrine and Covenants 32:1), as in verse 43 of Moroni 7. Thus it appears that either *of* or *in* is possible for this phrase. For each case of “lowly of/in heart”, the Book of Mormon critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources; thus here in Moroni 7:43–44 there are two instances of “lowly **of** heart” followed by one of “lowly **in** heart”.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 7:44 the preposition *of* in the first occurrence of “lowly of heart”; although the use of *of* is not as frequent in the text as *in* is for this phrase, it occurs invariantly in the immediately preceding verse (Moroni 7:43).

■ Moroni 7:44

if so / his faith and hope [is 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | are HKS] vain

The question here is whether the compound subject should be treated as singular or plural. The original text has the singular verb *is* for the subject “his faith and hope”. In the 1874 RLDS edition, the singular verb form *is* was changed to *are*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *is*, but in the 1953 RLDS edition the secondary plural *are* was once more adopted. There are several other places where the 1953 RLDS edition emended the grammatical number for compound subjects that can be interpreted as either singular or plural, namely, in Jacob 7:23, Helaman 3:32 (two times), and Helaman 11:15.

For Moroni 7:44 there is definite evidence that “faith and hope” should be considered a unit. First of all, the *his* is not repeated in the conjunctive phrase; we do not have “his faith and his hope”, which would argue that we have two separate conjuncts. Moreover, in the famous King James passage in 1 Corinthians 13:13, the conjoined “faith hope charity” is grammatically treated as a singular: “and now **abideth** faith hope charity / these three”. One could argue that the third person singular *-eth* ending shows that faith, hope, and charity are being considered as a unit. Another possibility, pointed out by Don Brugger (personal communication) is that the singular verb form could show that each of the three nouns in the series is being considered individually, as if *abideth* is ellipted from before each of the last two nouns. In this case, however, the King James translators were probably literalistically following the Greek original, where the verb is the singular *menei* because the three nouns are all abstract. (This use of the singular *abideth* actually dates back to William Tyndale’s 1526 translation of the New Testament.) For discussion of the use in New Testament Greek of singular verb forms with abstract nouns and pronouns in the plural, see section 133 in F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, edited by Robert W. Funk (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 173–174.

This same grammatical singular verb form is used in a similar expression in the Book of Mormon text: “faith hope and charity **bringeth** unto me” (Ether 12:28). In that case, however, one could interpret the *-eth* form as an example of the tendency in the Book of Mormon text to use the *-(e)th* ending with plural subjects as well as singular ones (see the discussion under the 1 Nephi preface for the clause “Nephi’s brethren **rebelleth** against him”).

Interestingly, the original text for a revelation given to Joseph Smith in February 1829 had the third person singular verb form *qualifies* for the subject “faith hope charity and love”:

Book of Commandments 3:1 (earliest published text)
and faith hope charity and love
with an eye single to the glory of God
qualifies him for the work

The first edition of the Doctrine and Covenants (in 1835) also had *qualifies* (found there under section 31). But this form was later edited to *qualify*, so that modern editions read with the plural verb form (now section 4 in the LDS Doctrine and Covenants). For the most part, the *-es* ending is restricted to third person singular usage in the original Book of Mormon text, which suggests

that “faith hope charity and love” in this early revelation, given during the general time period when Joseph Smith was translating the Book of Mormon, is being considered as a unit.

Given that both Ether 12:28 and 1 Corinthians 13:13 (in the King James Bible) treat “faith hope (and) charity” as a unit, the singular *is* in “his faith and hope **is** vain” should also be retained in Moroni 7:44 in the standard text. The critical text will, of course, retain the earliest reading with the singular *is*.

Summary: Retain the singular verb form *is* in Moroni 7:44 as well as the singular *bringeth* in Ether 12:28; the singular verb usage with conjunctive phrases involving faith, hope, and charity appears to be intended, just as it is in 1 Corinthians 13:13.

■ Moroni 7:44

*and if a man **be** meek and lowly in heart
and [confess >+ confesses 1 | confesses ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
by the power of the Holy Ghost
that Jesus is the Christ
he must needs have charity*

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the subjunctive (that is, infinitive) form of the verb *confess*, in agreement with the subjunctive *be* earlier in this *if*-clause (“if a man **be** meek and lowly in heart”). Somewhat later Oliver corrected \wp by supralinearly adding the third person singular ending *-es* to the end of *confess*. The level of ink flow for this correction is heavier and agrees with the two supralinear corrections earlier on this page of \wp (see the above discussion under Moroni 7:42). This agreement in ink flow argues that here in verse 44 Oliver was once more correcting \wp to make it agree with the reading in \mathcal{C} . In addition, there would have been no motivation to remove the joint occurrence of the subjunctive *be* and the subjunctive *confess* from this *if*-clause.

Of course, the resulting text has both subjunctive and indicative verb forms conjoined within the same *if*-clause. Yet we have already noted (see under Mosiah 2:38) that examples of this kind are found in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 26:29

and if he **confess** his sins before thee and me
and **repenteth** in the sincerity of his heart

Helaman 13:26

if a prophet **come** among you
and **declareth** unto you the word of the Lord

3 Nephi 27:11

but if it **be** not built upon my gospel
and **is** built upon the works of men or upon the works of the devil

One difference here in Moroni 7:44 is that the indicative verb form ends in *-es* rather than *-eth*. Yet the *-es* ending is always possible, even in the original Book of Mormon text.

There is another way to interpret the initial form *confess* here in \mathcal{D} , namely, as a third person singular form for which the inflectional ending *-es* is suppressed. Such usage occurred in Early Modern English. (In fact, one could also reinterpret the subjunctive *confess* in Mosiah 26:29, listed above, as a similar instance of this kind from early English usage.) There is, for instance, some evidence that two original instances of third person singular *witness* in the Book of Mormon text stand for *witnesses* (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 31:18). So the original *confess* here in Moroni 7:44 could be interpreted as standing for an Early Modern English equivalent of *confesses*.

Ultimately, it appears that the initial form *confess* in Moroni 7:44 is a scribal error and that Oliver Cowdery's later correction to *confesses* was the result of his proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} , especially since the level of ink flow for the correction in \mathcal{D} is identical to the two earlier corrections in \mathcal{D} for Moroni 7:42. The critical text will therefore accept the form *confesses*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} for Moroni 7:44.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 7:44 Oliver Cowdery's correction of the verb form *confess* to the third person singular present *confesses*; conjoined mixes of the subjunctive and the indicative in the same *if*-clause are found elsewhere in the text (thus there is nothing wrong with the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : "and if a man **be** meek and lowly in heart and **confesses** by the power of the Holy Ghost that Jesus is the Christ").

■ Moroni 7:47

and **whoso** is found possessed of it at the last day
it shall be well with [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *him* RT]

The original text of the Book of Mormon allows for either singular or plural interpretations for the generic pronoun *whoso(ever)*. Here in Moroni 7:47, the earliest text has the plural form *them* in reference to the preceding *whoso*. The 1920 LDS edition emended the plural *them* to *him*. It is worth noting that the *them* here in Moroni 7:47 could be an error for *him*. Such an error could have occurred in \mathcal{C} as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation since in colloquial speech both *them* and *him* are pronounced identically as /əm/. And as explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, there were mix-ups of these two pronouns in \mathcal{C} . Despite this argument, however, there are enough instances in the earliest text of *whoso(ever)* taking plural pronouns to argue that *them*, the earliest reading here in Moroni 7:47, should be restored. For further discussion of this point (plus an extensive listing of examples), see under 1 Nephi 17:48.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 7:47 the *them* in "it shall be well with **them**", the reading of the earliest textual sources; although *them* could be a mishearing for *him*, there is clear evidence elsewhere in the text that the generic pronoun *whoso(ever)* can take either singular or plural pronouns.

■ Moroni 7:48

wherefore my beloved brethren

pray unto the Father

with all [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] energy of heart

that ye may be filled with this love

In this passage, the 1874 RLDS edition dropped the definite article *the* from the phrase “with all **the** energy of heart”. This loss of the *the* was undoubtedly accidental since there is definitely nothing wrong with its use here. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct phraseology here in Moroni 7:48.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 7:48 the definite article *the* in the phrase “with all **the** energy of heart”, the reading of the earliest extant text.

Moroni 8

■ Moroni 8:4

for it grieveth me that there should disputations rise among you

Lester R. Dickey (personal communication, October 2003) suggests that this expression should be emended to read “that there should **be** disputations rise among you”. However, as explained under Alma 46:13, this kind of expression without the *be* is fairly common in the original text. Moreover, there has been a tendency to occasionally add the *be* verb (namely, in the 1953 RLDS edition for Alma 46:13 and in the 1905 LDS edition for Ether 6:5). The critical text will maintain the reading here in Moroni 8:4 without the *be* verb.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 8:4 the original expression “that there should disputations rise among you”, the reading of all the extant textual sources; this kind of expression is common enough in the original text.

■ Moroni 8:5–6

*there has been disputations among you concerning
the [baptizing >+ baptism 1 | baptism ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of your little children
and now my son / I desire that ye should labor
[exceedingly >+ diligently 1 | diligently ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that this gross error should be removed from among you*

Here we have two more examples where Oliver Cowdery corrected what he initially wrote in the printer’s manuscript. These corrections were probably made when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , which is not extant for the book of Moroni. The level of ink flow for these two corrections is somewhat heavier, similar to the corrections made near the top of the same manuscript page of \mathcal{P} (see the discussions under Moroni 7:42 and Moroni 7:44).

For the first correction here in Moroni 8:5–6, we note that the text has 16 examples of *concerning the* followed by the gerund form of a verb; 11 of these have the gerund *coming*, all in reference to the coming of Christ (as in Mosiah 13:33: “did not Moses prophesy unto them concerning the coming of the Messiah”). The five other examples show considerable variety in the choice of the verb:

1 Nephi 10:11	concerning the dwindling of the Jews in unbelief
1 Nephi 15:13	concerning the grafting in of the natural branches
2 Nephi 26:12	concerning the convincing of the Jews
Alma 27:21	concerning the admitting their brethren
Alma 51:3	concerning the altering of the law

We also have one example of the gerund *baptizing* in the text (in addition to five cases where *baptizing* is used as a present participle):

Helaman 3:26

the work of the Lord did prosper
unto the **baptizing** and uniting to the church of God many souls

Thus the initial reading in Moroni 8:5, “concerning the **baptizing** of your little children”, is quite possible. Of course, the noun *baptism* also exists, with 24 occurrences elsewhere in the original text. We also have clear evidence of Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to accidentally replace a noun with the gerund form of the verb that corresponds to the noun, as in the following case when Oliver momentarily replaced *restoration* with *restoring* in \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 15:19

yea I spake unto them
concerning the [*restoration* 0 | *restoring* > *restoration* 1 |
restoration ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *re~storation* F] of the Jews

In that instance, \mathcal{O} is extant and reads *restoration*, not *restoring* (the scribe there in \mathcal{O} is the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{O}). Elsewhere the text has three more instances of “concerning the restoration” (in 1 Nephi 15:20, Alma 41:1, and Helaman 15:11) but none of “concerning the restoring”. Here in Moroni 8:5, both *baptism* and *baptizing* are theoretically possible; thus the change in \mathcal{P} to *baptism* is most likely a correction to the reading of \mathcal{O} rather than due to editing.

As far as the second correction here in Moroni 8:5–6 is concerned, the text has eight other examples of “to labor diligently” and six of “to labor exceedingly”. Again, either reading is theoretically possible, so we follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (namely, *diligently*) since it appears to represent the attempt on Oliver Cowdery’s part to make sure \mathcal{P} followed the reading in \mathcal{O} , no longer extant here.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 8:5–6 Oliver Cowdery’s two corrections in \mathcal{P} since they both represent, it would appear, the result of proofing against \mathcal{O} ; in both cases, either the initial or the corrected reading will work in theory, so there would have been no motivation for editing the text.

■ Moroni 8:11

*and their little children need no repentance neither baptism
behold baptism is unto repentance
to the fulfilling the commandments
unto the remission of sins*

This passage is somewhat difficult to parse. One cannot be sure how “unto the remission of sins” fits in. Is the text saying that “baptism is unto repentance . . . unto the remission of sins”, or is it referring to “the fulfilling the commandments unto the remission of sins”? Mark Williams (personal communication, 17 May 2004) points out that a later verse in the chapter supports the second, more difficult, interpretation here in verse 11:

Moroni 8:25

and the firstfruits of repentance is baptism
 and baptism cometh by faith
 unto the fulfilling the commandments
 → and the fulfilling the commandments bringeth remission of sins

In other words, there is a direct link between “fulfilling the commandments” and “remission of sins”. The critical text will show this connection in Moroni 8:11 by placing “fulfilling the commandments” and “remission of sins” on the same line of text and without any intervening punctuation:

Moroni 8:11 (arranged according to sense-lines, with punctuation and capitalization)

And their little children need no repentance, neither baptism.
 Behold, baptism is unto repentance,
 to the fulfilling the commandments unto the remission of sins.

There is another passage that can be interpreted as using a similar instance of “fulfilling X unto Y”:

3 Nephi 5:25

and as he hath covenanted with all the house of Jacob
 even so shall the covenant wherewith he hath covenanted with the house of Jacob
 be **fulfilled** in his own due time **unto** the restoring all the house of Jacob
 unto the knowledge of the covenant that he hath covenanted with them

Summary: In Moroni 8:11 the phrase “unto the remission of sins” should probably be interpreted as part of the gerundive phrase “to the fulfilling the commandments”; the passage in Moroni 8:25 provides semantic support for this connection.

■ **Moroni 8:12**

if not so

God is a partial God

and also a changeable [being > God 1 | God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a respecter to persons

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “& also a changeable being”, a perfectly acceptable reading. In fact, that expression is used a few verses later in this chapter:

Moroni 8:18

for I know that God is not a partial God
 neither a changeable **being**

Here in verse 12, Oliver’s correction of *being* to *God* was virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). It should be noted, however, that Oliver wrote not only *God* in the supralinear insertion but also the connecting *and* (as an ampersand). Apparently, the initial reading in \mathcal{P} was “and also a changeable being / a respecter to persons”.

Elsewhere the text has eight other instances where the phrase “a being” refers to God:

Jacob 7:7

and ye have led away much of this people
that they pervert the right way of God
and keep not the law of Moses which is the right way
and convert the law of Moses into the worship of **a being**
which ye say shall come many hundred years hence

Alma 11:22

behold here is six onties of silver
and all these will I give unto thee
if thou wilt deny the existence of **a Supreme Being**

Alma 26:35

for he has all power all wisdom and all understanding
he comprehendeth all things
and he is **a merciful Being**
even unto salvation to those
who will repent and believe on his name

Alma 30:28

that they should
if they did not do according to their words
offend some unknown being
which they say is God
a being which never hath been seen nor known
which never was nor never will be

Alma 54:21 (two instances of “a being”)

behold we know not such **a being** neither do ye
but if it so be that there is such **a being**
we know not but that he hath made us as well as you

Helaman 16:18

saying that it is not reasonable
that such **a being** as a Christ shall come

Mormon 9:19

then why has God ceased to be a God of miracles
and yet be **an unchangeable Being**

Although most of these occurrences of “a being” are used in negative contexts, the example in Alma 26:35 is used positively. The initial use of *being* in Moroni 8:12 is perfectly acceptable; thus the correction to *God* is definitely not due to editing but is the result of Oliver trying to make his copy as accurate as possible.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 8:12 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , “a changeable God”, as the original reading; Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *being* to *God* appears to have been virtually immediate; usage elsewhere in the text argues that either *being* or *God* is possible in this passage; thus the change was not the result of editing.

■ **Moroni 8:12**

*if not so / God is a partial God and also a changeable God
and a respecter [to 1ABCEFGIJLMNOPQRST | of DHK] persons*

Here the earliest text reads “a respecter **to** persons”. The 1841 British edition replaced the *to* with the more expected *of*, but the 1849 LDS edition restored the earlier preposition. Similarly, the 1874 RLDS edition has *of* rather than *to*; the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *to*. Under Alma 1:30, I thoroughly discuss the variation between *to* and *of* in this phrase as well as in related phrases using *respect* or *respects*; in particular, Alma 1:30 originally read “having no respects **to** persons”. For each case involving *respect(s)* or *respecter*, the critical text will follow the earliest text in choosing between the prepositions *to* and *of*, thus *to* here in Moroni 8:12.

Summary: Maintain the original preposition *to* in Moroni 8:12 (“a respecter **to** persons”); similar usage is found in Alma 1:30 (“having no respects **to** persons”).

■ **Moroni 8:14**

*he that supposeth that little children needeth baptism
is in the gall of bitterness
and in the [bond > bonds 1 | bonds ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of iniquity*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write “in the **bond** of iniquity”, but he immediately corrected this to end up with “in the **bonds** of iniquity”. The level of ink flow for the inserted plural *s* agrees with the level of ink flow for the immediately following *of*, which is written inline; this change therefore appears to be an immediate correction. Very likely, the original manuscript, no longer extant here, read in the plural.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text always has the plural, either “bonds of iniquity” (four times) or “bands of iniquity” (one time):

Mosiah 23:12

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

Mosiah 23:13

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

Mosiah 27:29

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

Alma 41:11

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

Mormon 8:31

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

On the other hand, the King James Bible has the singular:

Acts 8:23
 for I perceive that
 thou art in the gall of bitterness and *in* the **bond** of iniquity

The language in Moroni 8:14 parallels this biblical passage (note the reference to “the gall of bitterness”), but then so do three of the other examples listed above (in Mosiah 27:29, Alma 41:11, and Mormon 8:31)—and they have the plural *bonds*. Thus the use of the plural *bonds* in Moroni 8:14 is consistent with all other Book of Mormon usage and contrary to the singular *bond* in Acts 8:23. The critical text will therefore accept the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Moroni 8:14, the plural *bonds*. (For discussion of the competition between “**bonds** of iniquity” and “**bands** of iniquity”, see under Mosiah 23:12–13.)

Summary: Accept the plural “bonds of iniquity” in Moroni 8:14 since the plural is consistent with all other Book of Mormon usage (but against the King James Bible’s singular “bond of iniquity”).

■ Moroni 8:16

*woe be unto [him 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | them RT]
 that shall pervert the ways of the Lord after this manner
 for **they** shall perish except **they** repent*

Here we may have an instance of mishearing *them* as *him* since both are colloquially pronounced as /əm/. As explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, there is evidence in \mathcal{C} that these two pronoun forms were occasionally mixed up. Here in Moroni 8:16, the 1920 LDS edition emended the earlier *him* to *them* so that there would be agreement with the two instances of plural *they* later on in the sentence (“for **they** shall perish except **they** repent”). Even so, there is clear evidence in the original text that generic pronouns can occur in either the singular or the plural and that switches in grammatical number for these pronouns can occur within the same sentence. For some examples involving *whoso(ever)*, see under 1 Nephi 17:48. The critical text will therefore allow for such switches in generic pronouns, when supported by the earliest textual sources. Thus here in Moroni 8:16, the earliest reading will be restored, with *him* near the beginning but switching to *they* later on.

Summary: Restore the singular pronoun form *him* in Moroni 8:16, the reading of the earliest text (the printer’s manuscript); although *him* could be an error for *them*, switches from singular to plural in generic pronouns can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ Moroni 8:16

*woe be unto him that shall pervert
 the [way >+ ways 1 | ways ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the Lord*

In this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the **way** of the Lord”; then later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he inserted the plural *s*, giving “the **ways** of the Lord”. This correction appears to have occurred when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} since nearby corrections in \mathcal{P} also involve a

somewhat heavier ink flow (see, for instance, the discussion under Moroni 8:5–6). Thus here in verse 16, the original manuscript probably read in the plural.

In the Book of Mormon, the phrase “the way(s) of the Lord” always takes the singular *way* when the verb is *prepare* (six times, as in 1 Nephi 10:7: “and he spake also concerning a prophet which should come before the Messiah to prepare the **way** of the Lord”). This language can be said to derive from the language in Isaiah 40:3: “prepare ye the way of the LORD”. On the other hand, if the verb is *walk*, then we always get the plural *ways* (four times, as in Mosiah 6:6: “king Mosiah did walk in the **ways** of the Lord”). There are also four unique uses of “the way(s) of the Lord”, each of which takes the plural:

1 Nephi 16:29	a new writing . . . which did give us understanding concerning the ways of the Lord
Jarom 1:7	and they taught the people the ways of the Lord
Alma 10:5	I never have known much of the ways of the Lord
Mormon 6:17	how could ye have departed from the ways of the Lord

It turns out that only one verb shows variation, namely, *pervert*. In all, there are ten more instances of “pervert the way(s) of the Lord”, of which two take the singular *way* (each of these is marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 13:27	that they might pervert the right ways of the Lord
1 Nephi 22:14	and that great whore which hath perverted the right ways of the Lord
* 2 Nephi 28:15	and all they that . . . pervert the right way of the Lord
Mosiah 12:26	woe be unto you for perverting the ways of the Lord
Mosiah 12:26	therefore ye have perverted the ways of the Lord
* Mosiah 29:7	which would be the cause of shedding much blood and perverting the way of the Lord
Alma 30:22	why do ye go about perverting the ways of the Lord
Alma 30:60	and thus we see the end of him who perverteth the ways of the Lord
Alma 31:1	the Zoramites were perverting the ways of the Lord
Alma 31:11	they did pervert the ways of the Lord in very many instances

There is a third instance of singular *way* that we could add to the list (here we have “the right way of **God**” rather than “the right way of **the Lord**”):

Jacob 7:7	that they pervert the right way of God
-----------	---

Interestingly, the first example listed above (in 1 Nephi 13:27) reads *ways* in \mathcal{O} , but in \mathcal{P} Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *way* before correcting it to the plural. The same error seems to have occurred here in Moroni 8:16 for \mathcal{P} : Oliver initially wrote the singular *way* but corrected it to the plural when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

Thus the textual evidence supports the occasional use of the singular *way* when the verb is *pervert*. So for each case of *way* versus *ways*, we follow the earliest reading. Here in Moroni 8:16, the plural *ways* appears to be the original reading.

Summary: Maintain the plural *ways* in Moroni 8:16, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} and the probable reading in \mathcal{O} , no longer extant for this part of the text.

■ Moroni 8:16

behold I speak with boldness / having authority from God
 [*for* > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I fear not what man can do*
for perfect love casteth out all fear

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**for** I fear not what man can do". Virtually immediately Oliver corrected the *for* to *and*, crossing out the *for* and supralinearly inserting an ampersand (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). His initial error was probably the result of his anticipating the *for* that occurs in the next clause ("**for** perfect love casteth out all fear"). The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in \wp with the *and*.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 8:16 the conjunction *and* that Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote in \wp as *for*.

■ Moroni 8:20

and he that saith
that little children needeth [*repentance* > *baptism* 1 | *baptism* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
denieth the mercies of Christ

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *repentance*, which he immediately corrected by crossing out the word and supralinearly inserting *baptism* (as well as the following verb *denieth*). As explained earlier in Mormon's discourse, little children need neither repentance nor baptism:

Moroni 8:11

and their little children need no **repentance** neither **baptism**

Since either word will work here in Moroni 8:20, the immediate correction, *baptism*, undoubtedly follows the reading of the original manuscript. Note also the occurrence of *baptism* alone, also in this chapter:

Moroni 8:14

he that supposeth that little children needeth **baptism**
 is in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity

This reading strongly supports the occurrence of *baptism* later on (namely, here in Moroni 8:20).

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 8:20 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in \wp where *baptism* replaces *repentance*; either word is theoretically possible in this context, so Oliver's correction very likely follows the reading in \wp .

■ Moroni 8:21

*woe unto such
for **they** are in danger of death hell and an endless torment
I speak it boldly
God hath commanded me
listen unto **them** and give heed
or **they** stand against you at the judgment seat of Christ*

As suggested by Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 November 2004), the plural pronouns here at the end of verse 21 refer to Mormon's words, inferred rather than explicitly stated. Notice that earlier in the verse the *they* refers to people, not words ("for **they** are in danger of death hell and an endless torment"), but the later uses of *them* and *they* definitely do not refer to these people. A similar example of this kind of usage, where *they* implicitly refers to words, is found earlier in the text:

2 Nephi 28:1

And now behold my brethren I have spoken unto you
according as the Spirit hath constrained me
wherefore I know that **they** must surely come to pass

As far as Moroni 8:21 is concerned, there is internal evidence that the *them* in a phrase like "listen unto **them**" refers to words:

Jacob 2:16	and O that ye would listen unto the word of his commands
Mosiah 22:4	or if thou hast hitherto listened to my words in any degree
Mosiah 22:4	even so I desire that thou wouldst listen to my words at this time
Moroni 8:8	listen to the words of Christ

Interestingly, there is only one example in the text that refers to listening to a person, and this is in 1 Nephi 21:1, in a quotation from Isaiah 49:1: "listen O isles unto **me**". The Book of Mormon language proper refers only to listening to words; thus the *them* in "listen unto **them**" here in Moroni 8:21 should refer to words, not to people.

Similarly, usage elsewhere in the text argues that here in Moroni 8:21 the *they* in "or **they** stand against you at the judgment seat of Christ" refers to words, not to people; we have examples where words (including testimony), actions (including crimes), and blood that has been shed can stand against a person in judgment or in trial:

2 Nephi 25:28

and the **words** which I have spoken
shall stand as a testimony against you

Mosiah 3:23–24

and now I have spoken the **words**
which the Lord God hath commanded me
and thus saith the Lord
they shall stand as a bright testimony
against this people at the judgment day

Mosiah 17:10

and I will not recall my **words**
and **they** shall stand as a testimony against you
and if ye slay me / ye will shed innocent **blood**
and **this** shall also stand as a testimony against you at the last day

Alma 14:11

and the **blood** of the innocent shall stand as a witness against them
yea and cry mightily against them at the last day

Alma 39:8

but behold ye cannot hide your **crimes** from God
and except ye repent
they will stand as a testimony against you at the last day

Ether 5:4

and in the mouth of three witnesses shall these things be established
and the **testimony** of three and this **work**
—in the which shall be shewn forth the power of God and also his word
of which the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost beareth record—
and **all this** shall stand as a **testimony** against the world at the last day

(The noun *work* in the last example refers to the Book of Mormon.) But there are no passages that refer to a person “standing against someone” at the day of judgment or at trial. To be sure, we get expressions that refer to “standing against someone in battle” (ten times), as in Mormon 4:20: “and there they did stand against the Lamanites with exceeding boldness”. Thus here in Moroni 8:21 it is very likely that the *they* in “or **they** stand against you at the judgment seat of Christ” refers to words and not to people. The critical text will not attempt to emend instances of pronouns that implicitly refer to words, as in 2 Nephi 28:1 and here in Moroni 8:21.

Summary: Maintain the use of *them* and *they* in Moroni 8:21 (as well as *they* in 2 Nephi 28:1) where these pronouns refer to words but without explicitly mentioning *words*.

■ Moroni 8:22

*for behold **that** all little children are alive in Christ*

As explained under Jacob 5:24, there are a few instances of “behold that” in the original text. What we have to remember in these cases, as here in Moroni 8:22, is that *behold* can be a regular verb in the Book of Mormon. Moreover, it can mean ‘note, observe’ as well as ‘see, look’; that is, the meaning often refers more to knowing than to visually perceiving. Here in Moroni 8:22, we have an imperative form of this verb with the meaning ‘note, observe’. On the other hand, modern English speakers tend to interpret the imperative *behold* here as meaning ‘see, look’; and under that interpretation, the use of *that* is odd, even ungrammatical. In other words, we expect a comma after *behold* and no following *that*, thus “for behold, all little children are alive in Christ”. Yet with the meaning ‘note, observe’, the *that* is perfectly acceptable, as if the text read “for observe **that** all little children are alive in Christ”.

Elsewhere we have indicative and infinitival uses of *behold* with the meaning ‘note, observe’, as in these examples:

Helaman 15:5

and I would that ye should behold
that the more part of them are in the path of their duty

3 Nephi 26:13

therefore I would that ye should behold
that the Lord truly did teach the people
 for the space of three days

The second example is particularly interesting in that Mormon is speaking to us as readers of his book—and we are not present to actually see Christ teaching the people. Even in the first example, Samuel the Lamanite is speaking to the Nephites and telling them that the Lamanites (who do not live among them) are living righteously. Thus in these examples, the sense of knowing seems much more pertinent than the sense of visually perceiving. In such cases, the use of the *that* is possible. For the same reason, the use of “behold that” in Moroni 8:22 works (as in a few other passages, listed under Jacob 5:24); in all these cases, *behold* refers to the conveying of information rather than actually seeing.

Summary: Retain the *that* after the imperative *behold* in Moroni 8:22 since the meaning of the verb *behold* here is ‘note, observe’ and refers to knowledge rather than visual perception.

■ Moroni 8:25

and the firstfruits of repentance is baptism
 and baptism cometh by faith unto **the fulfilling the commandments**
 and **the fulfilling the commandments** bringeth remission of sins

Here we have two more examples of the mixed gerundive construction (namely, “the fulfilling the commandments”), mixed in the sense that the gerundive is both verbal and nominal. In today’s English we expect either the first *the* to be lacking (thus the more verbal form, “fulfilling the commandments”) or an *of* to occur after *fulfilling* (thus the more nominal form, “the fulfilling **of** the commandments”). The fact that here in Moroni 8:25 we get two occurrences close together of the same mixed construction strongly argues that this mixed gerundive form is acceptable style for the Book of Mormon. For further discussion, plus a number of examples, see under 1 Nephi 17:32. There is also evidence for this kind of mixed gerundive construction in the English of Benjamin Franklin, as in the following example cited on page 415 of *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, edited by Jared Sparks, volume 10 (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and Company, 1840):

Benjamin Franklin, in a letter to Noah Webster (26 December 1789)

And if we were to endeavour **the facilitating its progress**,
 the study of our tongue might become much more general.

For additional examples from Franklin as well as from others, see under GERUNDIVES in volume 3; also see under Alma 55:19.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 8:25 the two instances of the mixed gerundive construction, “the fulfilling the commandments”, the reading of the earliest text; such usage can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and in earlier English.

■ Moroni 8:26

which Comforter filleth with hope and perfect love

which [NULL > *love* 1 | *love* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *endureth by diligence unto prayer*

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the relative clause as “which endureth by diligence unto prayer”. Virtually immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted *love* after *which*; the correction occurs at the end of the manuscript line, and there is no change in the level of the ink flow. This correction is undoubtedly based on the reading of the original manuscript since in theory either reading is possible. One could say that both hope and love “endureth by diligence unto prayer”. But earlier, in the previous chapter of Moroni, there is specific evidence for love enduring, namely, in Mormon’s discourse on charity (which in some phrases parallels Paul’s discourse in 1 Corinthians 13):

Moroni 7:46–47

wherefore my beloved brethren
if ye have not charity ye are nothing
for charity never faileth
wherefore cleave unto charity
which is the greatest of all
for all things must fail
but charity is the pure love of Christ
→ and it endureth forever
and whoso is found possessed of it at the last day
it shall be well with them

Thus in Moroni 8:26 the restriction to love enduring is entirely appropriate.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 8:26 Oliver Cowdery’s insertion in \mathcal{P} of the word *love* since it appears to have been virtually immediate and the resulting restriction is consistent with Mormon’s discourse earlier in Moroni 7:46–47.

■ Moroni 8:27

behold the pride of this nation

or the [*pride* >+ *people* 1 | *people* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the Nephites*

hath proved their destruction except they should repent

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “or the **pride** of the Nephites”; then later with somewhat heavier ink flow he crossed out *pride* and sublinearly wrote *people* (the correction occurs in the last line of text on the manuscript page). This correction probably occurred when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

From a semantic point of view, either reading works. But the corrected text is characteristic of the Book of Mormon. Elsewhere in the text, we find similar uses of the corrective *or* involving the names of peoples:

Jacob 1:14

and they which are friendly to Nephi
I shall call Nephites **or** the people of Nephi

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

Alma 2:11

and the remainder were called Nephites **or** the people of God

Alma 3:11

whosoever would not believe in the tradition of the Lamanites
but believed those records which were brought out of the land of Jerusalem . . .
were called the Nephites **or** the people of Nephi from that time forth

Alma 4:19

and this he did that he himself might go forth
among his people **or** among the people of Nephi

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 . . .

Alma 17:22

and the king inquired of Ammon
if it were his desires to dwell in the land
among the Lamanites **or** among his people

Alma 19:14

now Ammon seeing the Spirit of the Lord poured out
according to his prayers upon the Lamanites his brethren
which had been the cause of so much mourning
among the Nephites **or** among all the people of God . . .

Alma 21:20

and he caused that his people **or** the people which was under his reign
should assemble themselves together

While none of these other correcting *or*'s use the phrase "the people of the Nephites", this noun phrase occurs fairly often in the text, although not as often as "the people of Nephi" (for some statistics, see under Alma 45:13). The critical text will follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Moroni 8:27, "the pride of this nation **or** the **people** of the Nephites".

Summary: Accept in Moroni 8:27 Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{P} of *pride* to *people* (thus "the pride of this nation **or** the **people** of the Nephites").

■ Moroni 8:27

behold the pride of this nation or the people of the Nephites
[*hath proved* 1A | *hath proven* BCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *have proven* HK]
their destruction except they should repent

There are two changes here. First, in the 1837 edition the original past-participial form *proved* was replaced by the alternative *proven*. As explained under Alma 34:6, either form is possible in the Book of Mormon text.

The second change took place in the 1874 RLDS edition; there the third person singular *hath* was incorrectly replaced by the third person plural *have*. The 1874 typesetter apparently thought that the subject of the verb was “the people of the Nephites”, a plural noun phrase, when in fact the subject was the earlier singular *pride*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *hath* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 8:27 the original past-participial form *proved*; also maintain the singular *hath*, which is perfectly correct since the subject for *hath* is the singular noun *pride*.

Moroni 9

■ Moroni 9:1

but I write somewhat

[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | of RT] *that which is grievous*

The earliest text here in Moroni 9:1 is a rather difficult reading, even when we ignore the dialectal *grievous*: “but I write somewhat that which is grievous”. In modern English we expect either *of* or *concerning* to separate *somewhat* from the following noun phrase, “that which is grievous”. The 1920 LDS edition emended the text here by supplying *of*, giving “but I write somewhat **of** that which is grievous”. (The 1830 typesetter replaced the original *grievous* with the standard *grievous*; for discussion of the nonstandard variant, see under 1 Nephi 17:25.)

There is minor evidence in the transmission of the text for the momentary loss of *concerning*, namely, in \mathcal{P} as Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from \mathcal{G} :

Helaman 11:22

save it were a few contentions

[NULL > *concerning* 1 | *concerning* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the points
of doctrine which had been laid down by the prophets

Note here, however, that *concerning* was probably omitted because the preceding word was visually similar; both are fairly long and begin with the same syllable, *con*, thus leading Oliver to initially skip *concerning*.

In contrast to *concerning*, there is considerably more evidence in the manuscripts for the occasional loss of the preposition *of* between two noun phrases, as in these examples where Oliver Cowdery made the error:

Alma 29:7 (momentary error in \mathcal{G})

why should I desire that I was an angel

that I could speak unto all the ends

[NULL > *of* 0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the earth

Alma 34:16 (momentary error in \mathcal{P})

and thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice

and encircle them in the arms

[*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *of* 1] safety

Alma 43:38 (momentary error in \mathcal{G})

they being shielded from the more vital parts

[*the* >% *of* 0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the body

Alma 52:40 (momentary error in Θ)
 and now the number of prisoners which were taken
 exceeded more than the number
 [*those* >+ *of* 0 | *of* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] those which had been slain

Alma 57:8 (momentary error in Θ)
 yea with our strong force or with a part
 [NULL >- *of* 0 | *of* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our strong force
 we did surround by night the city Cumeni

Moroni 9:25 (momentary error in \wp)
 and his mercy and long-suffering
 and the hope [NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his glory

In all these cases, Oliver caught his error.

As we might expect, the Book of Mormon text does have examples of “somewhat **of** NP” and “somewhat **concerning** NP”, where NP is a noun phrase, as in 1 Nephi 10:1 (“I must speak somewhat **of** the things of my father and also of my brethren”) and in the Words of Mormon 1:3 (“and now I speak somewhat **concerning** that which I have written”). Yet the original text had two more examples of *somewhat* immediately followed by a noun phrase (that is, without any intervening *of* or *concerning*):

The Words of Mormon 1:12
 he had somewhat [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* RT] contentions
 among his own people

Moroni 9:24
 wherefore write somewhat a few things if thou art spared

In the first case, *of* was supplied in the 1920 LDS edition; but in the second case, the original text has been kept. Also note that the second of these is in this same chapter of Moroni, which argues that the first instance in this chapter, here in verse 1, is correct. Thus the expression “somewhat <noun phrase>” appears to be textually possible since it occurs elsewhere in the text. The critical text will therefore maintain the instance of “somewhat a few things” in Moroni 9:24 and restore the two original instances of “somewhat <noun phrase>” (in the Words of Mormon 1:12 and here in Moroni 9:1).

Summary: Restore in Moroni 9:1 the earlier reading without the preposition *of* between *somewhat* and the noun phrase “that which is grievous”.

■ **Moroni 9:2**

and Archeantus has fallen by the sword
and also [Laram > Luram 1 | Luram ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [Emer >+ Emron 1 | Emron ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In this verse, two of the three names were at first written incorrectly in \wp . Initially, Oliver Cowdery’s *u* in *Luram* was sloped so that it could have been interpreted as an *a*, so Oliver overwrote

the *u* to make sure it was open enough to be interpreted as a *u*. In the case of *Emron*, Oliver initially wrote *Emer*, a name that appeared a number of times in the preceding book of Ether (twice in Ether 1 and seven times in Ether 9). Here in Moroni 9:2, with heavier ink flow and using a broader quill, Oliver later crossed out *Emer* and supralinearly inserted the correct *Emron*. This correction probably occurred when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . Neither of these two names, *Luram* and *Emron*, appear elsewhere in the text, so in each case we follow the corrected reading here in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Accept in Moroni 9:2 the names *Luram* and *Emron*, the corrected readings in \mathcal{P} .

■ Moroni 9:4

wherefore I fear lest the Spirit of the Lord

hath [seaced > ceased 1 | ceased ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[NULL > striving 1 | striving ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with them

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery had difficulty spelling the word *ceased*. He first started out with *ce*, crossed that out, and wrote inline the word as *seaced*. Then he crossed out the *seaced* as well as the original *ce* (a second time) and supralinearly inserted the correct *ceased*. In his supralinear correction, he also wrote the gerundive *striving*. The following phrase *with them* is written inline, which suggests the possibility (rather unlikely) that the original manuscript here actually read "lest the spirit of the Lord hath ceased with them"—that is, without the word *striving*. Since there is nothing particularly wrong with that reading, Oliver's decision to supply *striving* does not appear to be an attempt to emend the text; instead, \mathcal{O} very likely had *striving*. Elsewhere the text always has the verb *strive* in expressions that refer to the Spirit of the Lord ceasing to influence people:

1 Nephi 7:14	the Spirit of the Lord ceaseth soon to strive with them
2 Nephi 26:11	when the Spirit ceaseth to strive with man
Mormon 5:16	the Spirit of the Lord hath already ceased to strive with their fathers
Ether 15:19	the Spirit of the Lord had ceased striving with them
Moroni 8:28	I fear lest the Spirit hath ceased striving with them

Of course, one could argue that the two nearby instances of *ceased striving* (in Ether 15:19 and Moroni 8:28) led Oliver Cowdery to add the *striving* here in Moroni 9:4. Ultimately, the safest decision here is to follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} since it appears to be virtually immediate. The original motivation for the correction was the spelling of *ceased*, not the occurrence of *striving*.

Summary: Maintain *striving* in Moroni 9:4 even though it was supralinearly inserted in \mathcal{P} along with *ceased* when Oliver Cowdery corrected the spelling for *ceased*; usage elsewhere supports the expression "to cease striving"; if \mathcal{O} had read without *striving*, there would have been no strong motivation for Oliver to have added it when he copied the text into \mathcal{P} , although there is a small possibility that he was prompted by two nearby instances of *ceased striving*.

■ Moroni 9:5–6

for so exceedingly do they anger
 that it seemeth me that they have no fear of death
 [& 1 | and ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | that G] they have lost
 [1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | all D] their love one towards another . . .
 for if we should cease to labor
 we should be [brought 1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | wrought M] under condemnation
 for we have [a 1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | to D] labor to perform

For these two verses we have a sudden rash of typos. In all, there are four typos occurring in three editions:

- (1) *and* was replaced by *that* in the 1858 Wright edition, perhaps because *that* was used twice in the preceding clause (“**that** it seemeth me **that** they have no fear of death”);
- (2) *all* was inserted in the 1841 British edition, a semantically plausible addition;
- (3) *brought* was replaced by *wrought* in the 1905 LDS edition, a simple misreading;
- (4) *a* was replaced by *to* in the 1841 British edition, probably because of the *to* that follows (“for we have a labor **to** perform”).

Each of the errors was eliminated in the immediately following edition. Of course, none of these errors have any standing in the critical text.

Summary: Follow the earliest reading throughout Moroni 9:5–6; we ignore the various typos in this passage that showed up in different editions.

■ Moroni 9:7

for according to the knowledge
 [NULL > which 1 | which ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] I have received from Amoron
 behold the Lamanites have many prisoners which they took from the tower of Sherrizah

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the relative pronoun (thus he wrote “according to the knowledge I have received from Amoron”), but then virtually immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted *which* (with no change in level of ink flow for the correction). The non-subject relative pronoun *which* is optional here in English, which means that Oliver’s correction probably reflects the reading of the original manuscript since there would have been no motivation for him to insert the *which* except that $\text{\textcircled{S}}$ read that way. Elsewhere in the manuscripts, Oliver frequently omitted the relative pronoun *which*; for a list of examples, see under Alma 5:3.

Elsewhere in the text, there are a few more examples of *knowledge* postmodified in this way by a relative clause. In each case, the nonsubject *which* is there:

The Words of Mormon 1:9

and I make it according to the knowledge and the understanding
which God hath given me

Alma 9:23

if this people who have received so many blessings from the hand of the Lord
 should transgress contrary to the light and knowledge **which** they do have . . .

Alma 36:26

and the knowledge **which** I have is of God

Helaman 7:24

for they have not sinned against that great knowledge **which** ye have received

The critical text will maintain the *which* here in Moroni 9:7.

Summary: Maintain Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *which* in Moroni 9:7, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} and the probable reading in \mathcal{C} ; both readings, either with or without the nonsubject *which*, are theoretically possible.

■ **Moroni 9:7**

behold the Lamanites have many prisoners

which they took from the tower [NULL >+ of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Sherrizah

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the tower Sherrizah”. Later, probably while proofing against the original manuscript, he supralinearly inserted the preposition *of* (the level of ink flow for the correction is heavier).

Sherrizah is apparently the name of a place (probably a city, but also possibly a land—or perhaps both, a characteristic of Nephite naming):

Moroni 9:16–17

there are many widows and their daughters which remain in **Sherrizah**
 and that part of the provisions which the Lamanites did not carry away
 behold the army of Zenephi has carried away
 and left them to wander whithersoever they can for food
 and many old women do faint by the way and die
 and the army which is with me is weak
 and the armies of the Lamanites are betwixt **Sherrizah** and me

In other words, Mormon is referring here in verse 7 to the tower in the city or land of Sherrizah rather than to a tower named Sherrizah. The *of* helps facilitate this reading.

We have already seen numerous cases of “city (of) X” and “land (of) Y”, with some variation regarding the preposition *of* (see, for instance, under 1 Nephi 11:13 for “city (of) Jerusalem” and under 1 Nephi 17:7 for “land (of) Bountiful”). It has become clear that it is best to let the earliest textual sources determine in each case whether the preposition *of* is there or not for the phrases “city (of) X” and “land (of) Y”. A third case that is similar involves the phrase “hill (of) Z”. As explained under Alma 2:15, most instances of this phrase lack the *of*, but once again variation is possible: there is one instance with the *of* (“the hill of Shim” in Ether 9:3) and one without (“the hill Shim” in Mormon 4:23). Thus variation seems to be inherent for these three phrases. But “the tower of Sherrizah” appears to be different in that *Sherrizah* is not the name of the tower, but the place where it is located. The critical text will therefore maintain the *of* here in Moroni 9:7.

Summary: Retain in Moroni 9:7 the *of* in “the tower of Sherrizah”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; in this case, *Sherrizah* is a place-name, not the name of the tower itself.

■ Moroni 9:9–10

for behold many of the daughters of the Lamanites **have** they **taken** prisoners
 and after depriving them of that
 which **was** most dear and precious above all things
 which is chastity and virtue
 and after that they **had done** this thing
 they **did murder** them in a most cruel manner
 torturing their bodies even unto death
 and after that they **have done** this
 they [devour >jg devoured 1 | devour ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their flesh
 like unto wild beasts because of the hardness of their hearts
 and they [do >jg did 1 | do ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it for a token of bravery

This narrative passage begins in the present tense (*have taken*), then switches to the past tense (*was, had done, did murder*), but then returns to the present tense (*have done, devour, do*). The 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, changed the last two present-tense examples to the past tense (*devoured, did*) by penciling in these changes in the printer's manuscript, yet he left unchanged the preceding present perfect form (*have done*) that begins the sentence.

Nonetheless, Gilbert's changes to the past tense were never implemented in the 1830 edition or in any subsequent one. This use of the present tense in the original text provides a more vivid narrative, as if what has happened is happening right now. Such usage is referred to as the historical present and will be maintained in the critical text. For other cases where Gilbert attempted to smooth out shifts between present and past tense in the original text, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 28:3.

Of course, another possible emendation here in Moroni 9:9–10 would have been to change the past-tense portion of the narrative to the present tense:

Moroni 9:9–10 (alternative emendation)
 and after depriving them of that
 which **is** most dear and precious above all things
 which is chastity and virtue
 and after that they **have done** this thing
 they **do murder** them in a most cruel manner
 torturing their bodies even unto death

Of course, the actual switching in tense is not that difficult for the reader to deal with. The fact that no printed edition has ever tried to eliminate this tense switching is fairly good evidence that there is no real need to emend the tenses here in this passage.

Summary: Maintain the shifting between the past tense and the historical present tense in Moroni 9:9–10, thus ignoring the 1830 typesetter's two suggested changes to the past tense in this passage; such tense switching is not that difficult to comprehend and can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ Moroni 9:10

*and after that they have done this
they devour their flesh
like unto [1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | the MOQ] wild beasts*

Here the 1905 LDS edition accidentally added the definite article *the* before *wild beasts*. This reading was followed by the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition (apparently by reference to the 1905 edition) and by the 1911 LDS edition (which used a later printing of the 1905 edition for its copytext). The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct reading without the *the* to the LDS text.

Normally, the Book of Mormon text has simply *wild beasts* without the article *the* (13 times, including this one in Moroni 9:10). But in three passages, we have *the wild beasts*. One of those cases is in a quotation from the King James Bible, which also contains one of the instances of *wild beasts* without the *the*:

2 Nephi 23:21–22 (Isaiah 13:21–22)
but **wild beasts** of the desert shall lie there
and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures
and owls shall dwell there
and satyrs shall dance there
and **the wild beasts** of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses
and dragons in their pleasant palaces

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in the Hebrew original there is no definite article for either case of *wild beasts*; in fact, the Hebrew word translated as *wild beast* differs for these two instances of *wild beasts* (although the two nouns are phonetically similar). Perhaps the King James translators allowed the definite article *the* for the second case because in the English translation there was a preceding instance of the same noun phrase, *wild beasts*.

For another instance of *the wild beasts* in the Book of Mormon (but not in a biblical quotation), there is a preceding *wild beasts*:

4 Nephi 1:33
and they also cast them into dens of **wild beasts**
and they did play with **the wild beasts**
even as a child with a lamb

In this case one could argue that the *the* before the second *wild beasts* is necessary because of the immediately preceding instance of *wild beasts*; in other words, the text has already brought up the topic of wild beasts.

And finally, in one passage we get *the wild beasts* without any preceding reference to the specific phrase *wild beasts*:

Mosiah 12:2
and the vultures of the air and the dogs
— yea and **the wild beasts**—
shall devour their flesh

Even so, the definite article is used with the wild animals listed as scavengers in the preceding text: “**the** vultures of the air and **the** dogs”; thus the text has *the* with the following *wild beasts*.

Textually, we expect Moroni 9:10 to lack the definite article *the* before *wild beasts*. Here the critical text will maintain the earliest reading without the *the*.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 9:10 the use of *wild beasts* without any preceding *the* (the reading of the earliest text).

■ **Moroni 9:12**

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHPS | *And* IJLMNOQRT | κ] *only a few years have passed away and they were a civil and a delightsome people*

The 1892 RLDS edition dropped the conjunction *and* here at the beginning of this verse. This loss appears to have been a typo, although the use of *and* before both clauses in the sentence may have seemed strange (“**and** only a few years have passed away **and** they were a civil and a delightsome people”). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *and* to the RLDS text.

Elsewhere the text has six examples of sentences beginning with *and only*, as nearby in Ether 12:40: “and only a few have I written”. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading here in Moroni 9:12, with *and* preceding the *only*.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 9:12 the occurrence of *and* before *only*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Moroni 9:16**

and that part of the provisions which the Lamanites did [not 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] carry away behold the army of Zenephi has carried away

Here we have another typo in the 1841 British edition that shows sloppiness and maybe even a lack of proofing. The *not* is crucial for making sense of this sentence. The 1849 LDS edition restored the *not*. For another example of the 1841 printer’s failure to produce an accurate text, see under Ether 15:15.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 9:16 the *not* in the relative clause “which the Lamanites did **not** carry away”; the *not* is necessary to the meaning of the larger sentence.

■ **Moroni 9:17**

and the army which is with me is weak and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] armies of the Lamanites are betwixt Sherrizah and me and as many as have fled to the army of Aaron have fallen victims [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | of MQ] their awful brutality

Here we have two minor errors in editions dating from the early 1900s. In the first case, the 1906 LDS edition omitted the definite article *the* before *armies*. Here the *the* was probably lost because at this point a new page in the 1906 edition begins; the previous page ends with *is weak; and* while the following page begins with *armies*. The loss of the *the* occurred as the 1906 compositor

started to set a new page (or at least when he started a new line of type). It seems obvious here that the definite article *the* is missing, although one could, I suppose, interpret *armies* without *the* as referring to some unspecified “armies of the Lamanites”. In any event, this error was not transmitted to subsequent LDS editions because the 1906 edition was never used as a copytext.

The second error in this passage occurred in the 1905 LDS edition; there the preposition *to* was replaced by *of*. In this instance, the resulting error makes sense. The 1911 LDS edition followed this reading (since it was set from a copy of a later printing of the 1905 edition). The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *to* to the LDS text. There is only one other instance of *victim(s)* in the text, and it also uses *to* for its prepositional complement:

Mosiah 1:14

they must have fallen into the hands of the Lamanites
and become **victims** to their hatred

The critical text will maintain the original preposition *to* here in Moroni 9:17.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 9:17 (and in Mosiah 1:14) the use of *to* to head the prepositional complement of the noun *victims*; also maintain the definite article before *armies*.

■ Moroni 9:19

*and the [sufferings 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | suffering RT]
of our women and our children
upon all the face of this land
doth exceed every thing*

It appears that in order to make the subject *sufferings* agree with the third person singular verb form *doth*, the 1920 LDS edition changed the plural *sufferings* to the singular *suffering*. The change was marked in the 1920 committee copy, so we know it was intentional. Of course, another possible emendation would have been to keep the plural *sufferings* and change *doth* to *do*. As explained for the phrase “Nephi’s brethren **rebelleth** against him” (see under the preface for 1 Nephi), the original Book of Mormon text allowed the third person singular ending *-(e)th* to occur with plural subjects. Thus here in Moroni 9:19 there is nothing textually wrong with *doth* occurring with the plural *sufferings*. The critical text will restore the original plural *sufferings* and maintain *doth*.

It is worth noting that the singular noun *suffering* never occurs in the original text of the Book of Mormon; there are examples of only the plural *sufferings* (19 of them, including the one here in Moroni 9:19). For further discussion of the consistent use of the plural *sufferings* throughout the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 16:19. In contrast, the text has only the singular noun *long-suffering* (17 of them), never *long-sufferings*.

Summary: Restore the original plural *sufferings* in Moroni 9:19 even though the associated verb form *doth* is in the singular; the original Book of Mormon text allows such language as “sufferings . . . doth exceed”; moreover, there are no examples in the original text of the singular noun *suffering*.

■ **Moroni 9:20**

and now my son

I dwell no longer upon [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the > this F] horrible scene

Here in the 1852 LDS edition, the demonstrative *this* was accidentally set as *the*. For the second printing of that edition, also in 1852, the correct *this* was restored, probably by reference to the 1840 edition (although any earlier edition would have given the correct reading). Perhaps one could have figured out that *this* was correct without referring to any other edition. The critical text will maintain the demonstrative *this* here in Moroni 9:20.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 9:20 the determiner *this* in the noun phrase “this horrible scene”, the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Moroni 9:22**

and I pray unto God

that he [would 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | will OQRT] spare thy life

to witness the return of his people unto him

or their utter destruction

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition replaced the conditional modal *would* with the future modal *will*. It is possible that *would* sounded too conditional here. The 1911 LDS edition followed the secondary reading, the one with *will*, perhaps by reference to the 1907 edition since the same change of *would* to *will* was made in both the 1907 and 1911 editions in 3 Nephi 3:15 (see the discussion under that passage).

This change away from the conditional is, of course, not really necessary. Such usage involving conditional modals in expressions of the form “I pray that S”, where S is a clause, occurs elsewhere in the text—and without variation:

Mosiah 2:40

I pray that ye **should** awake to a remembrance
of the awful situation of those that have fallen into transgression

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 critical text will restore the original *would* here in Moroni 9:22.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 9:22 the original conditional modal *would* in “I pray unto God that he would spare thy life”.

■ Moroni 9:23–24

*and if they perish it will be like unto the Jaredites
because of the willfulness of their hearts
seeking for blood and revenge
and if it so be [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | then NO] they perish
we know that many of our brethren have dissented over unto the Lamanites
and many more will also dissent over unto them*

Here in verse 24, the earliest text reads oddly. It appears that the *if*-clause, “and if it so be that they perish”, is unrelated to the following main clause. It is as if the subject matter has been changed, with the main clause referring to Nephites who are surviving, not perishing, by dissenting over to the Lamanite side. Note that earlier in verse 23, the main clause following the *if*-clause appropriately completes that sentence: “and if they perish / it will be like unto the Jaredites”.

The 1906 LDS large-print edition attempted to deal with the seemingly unrelated *if*-clause in verse 24 by changing the subordinate conjunction *that* to the conditional conjunction *then*: “and if it so be / **then** they perish”; in other words, we now have an *if*-clause (“and if it so be”) followed by a different main clause (“then they perish”). It may be helpful here to compare the readings in the 1879 and 1906 LDS editions, along with their accidentals, since the 1879 edition served as the copytext for the 1906 edition:

1879 LDS edition for Moroni 9:23–24 (bolding added)

23. And if they perish, it will be like unto the Jaredites,
because of the wilfulness of their hearts, seeking for blood and revenge.
24. And if it so be **that** they perish,
we know that many of our brethren have dissented over unto the Lamanites,
and many more will also dissent over unto them;

1906 LDS edition for Moroni 9:23–24 (bolding added)

23. And if they perish, it will be like unto the Jaredites—
because of the wilfulness of their hearts, seeking for blood and revenge—
24. And if it so be **then** they perish,
we know that many of our brethren have dissented over unto the Lamanites,
and many more will also dissent over unto them;

Note that the editors for the 1906 edition added dashes to the preceding parenthetical information that ends verse 23 (that is, around “because of the willfulness of their hearts / seeking for blood and revenge”) but left unchanged the punctuation for the revised expression in verse 24. In other words, they did not show that the statements about the dissenters were independent of the newly created *if-then* construction. Perhaps a stop, such as a period, could have been placed there:

1906 LDS edition for Moroni 9:24, with emended punctuation

24. And if it so be, then they perish.
We know that many of our brethren have dissented over unto the Lamanites,
and many more will also dissent over unto them.

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition followed the 1906 emendation of *that* to *then*. The copytext for that edition was still the 1879 LDS edition, but in verse 23 the 1907 edition attempted to use

both the dashes of the 1906 edition as well as the commas of its copytext, with some alteration. But in verse 24, like the 1906 edition, the 1907 edition continued with the original punctuation:

1907 LDS edition for Moroni 9:23–24 (bolding added)

23. And if they perish, it will be like unto the Jaredites, —
because of the wilfulness of their hearts, seeking for blood and revenge, —
24. And if it so be **then** they perish,
we know that many of our brethren have dissented over unto the Lamanites,
and many more will also dissent over unto them;

Ultimately, here in Moroni 9:23–24 the LDS text has maintained the earlier text and accidentals of the 1879 edition (the text for the 1981 edition derives from the 1905 edition rather than from the 1906 or 1907 editions).

David Calabro (personal communication) points out that the earliest text here in Moroni 9:24 can be dealt with if we realize that here Mormon is stating that even if all those identified as Nephites perish, there will nonetheless be dissenters from the Nephites, ones who will deny Christ, who will survive but as Lamanites (that is, as nonbelievers). Mormon refers to this situation, after the final great battle at Cumorah, when he mentions a few dissenters who have survived:

Mormon 6:15

yea even all my people
— save it were those twenty and four which were with me
and also a few which had escaped into the south countries
and a few which had dissented over unto the Lamanites—
had fallen

And Moroni specifically refers to the fact that he could survive if he would deny the Christ (thus becoming a dissenter):

Moroni 1:1–3

and I make not myself known to the Lamanites lest they should destroy me
for behold their wars are exceeding fierce among themselves
and because of their hatred they put to death every Nephite
that will not deny the Christ
and I Moroni will not deny the Christ
wherefore I wander whithersoever I can for the safety of mine own life

And earlier in the text, Mormon more generally refers to Nephites who will dissent over to the Lamanites, and in this way a remnant of the Nephites will survive:

Alma 45:13–14

and when that great day cometh
behold the time very soon cometh that those which are now
or the seed of those which are now numbered among the people of Nephi
shall no more be numbered among the people of Nephi
but whosoever remaineth and is not destroyed in that great and dreadful day
shall be numbered among the Lamanites
and shall become like unto them
all save it be a few which shall be called the disciples of the Lord
and them shall the Lamanites pursue even until they shall become extinct

So under this interpretation, Moroni 9:24 makes sense. Even though the Nephites will perish as a nation, some of their people will survive as Lamanites. In other words, there is a contrastive aspect to Mormon's statement here in Moroni 9:24. Since this interpretation will work, the critical text will accept the earliest (and current) reading in Moroni 9:24, where the *if*-clause is actually completed by the main clause that refers to the dissenters.

Summary: Despite its difficulty, the *if*-clause in Moroni 9:24 is completed by the main clause referring to dissenters; here Mormon is stating that not all the Nephites will perish, only the nation of people identified as such; dissenters who join the Lamanites will survive.

■ Moroni 9:24

*we know that many of our brethren
have [desented 1 | dissented ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | deserted T] over unto the Lamanites
and many more will also [desent 1 | dissent ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | desert T] over unto them*

As explained under Alma 46:27, the original text here in Moroni 9:24 had two instances of the verb *dissent*. The 1981 edition interpreted the verb as *desert*, in part because \mathcal{P} had the spelling *desent* for this verb (which looks like *desert*), and also because in Mormon 6:15 \mathcal{P} actually reads *desert*, although that was an error of misinterpretation on the part of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} . The critical text will restore both instances of original *dissent* here in Moroni 9:24.

■ 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*

Here the original text (as recorded in \mathcal{P}) read “if thou art spared and I should perish”. The 1830 typesetter replaced the conditional modal *should* with the future *shall*, perhaps intentionally (for several other cases where he replaced *should* with *shall*, see the list under 3 Nephi 1:8). Here in Moroni 9:24, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *should* by reference to \mathcal{P} . Earlier, the 1906 LDS edition replaced *I shall* with *should I* but without reference to \mathcal{P} . Thus the 1906 edition reads “if thou art spared and **should I** perish”, a mixture of two different ways of expressing conditionality (first, by means of an *if*-clause and then by inverting the subject-verb word order). The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition also followed the 1906 reading with its use of *should* but restored the normal subject-verb word order, thus unintentionally ending up with the original reading (“if thou art spared and **I should** perish”). However, neither the 1906 or 1907 editions served as copytext for any subsequent LDS edition; thus the secondary 1830 reading has been maintained in the LDS text.

Summary: Restore the conditional modal *should* in Moroni 9:24 (“and I should perish”), the reading of \mathcal{P} (the earliest extant textual source).

■ Moroni 9:25

*and may his sufferings and death
 and the shewing his body unto our fathers
 and his mercy and long-suffering
 and the hope of his glory
 and [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] eternal life
 rest in your mind forever*

Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally dropped the preposition *of* before the noun phrase *eternal life*. The result (“the hope of his glory and eternal life”) doesn’t make much sense since the phrase “the hope of Christ’s eternal life” is quite irrelevant for this passage. The repeated *of* makes sure that the correct reading for the second conjunct is equivalent to “the hope of eternal life”. This idea is expressed elsewhere in the text, in Alma 13:29: “having a hope that ye shall receive eternal life”.

This 1906 typo was never transferred into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext. As noted above, for this part of Moroni 9 the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition adopted some of the 1906 readings (namely, the words *then* and *should* in verse 24 and part of the punctuation in verse 23) but not this reading here in Moroni 9:25, probably because the result was unacceptable. The critical text will, of course, retain the original repeated *of* here in “the hope of his glory and **of** eternal life”. For other cases where the repeated *of* has been omitted in the transmission of the text, see under 3 Nephi 9:5.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 9:25 the original text where the *of* is repeated in “the hope of his glory and **of** eternal life”, thus guaranteeing the correct meaning (‘the hope of eternal life’) for this passage.

Moroni 10

■ Moroni 10:2

after that I have spoken a few words by way of exhortation
[NULL >+ unto you 1 | unto you ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the phrase *unto you* at the end of the verse. He later supplied it, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (the level of ink flow is heavier). He made a similar correction in verse 1 (there the increase in level of ink flow is equally heavy):

Moroni 10:1

and I would that they should know that more than four hundred
and twenty [NULL >+ years 1 | years ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
has passed away since the sign was given of the coming of Christ

The word *years* is clearly necessary in this context and was undoubtedly in \mathcal{O} . (For discussion of when *year(s)* can be ellipted in a Book of Mormon sentence, see under Helaman 3:3.) Similarly, *unto you* was very likely in \mathcal{O} for Moroni 10:2. Either reading, with or without this phrase, is possible, so there would have been no motivation for Oliver to add the phrase here except that it was in \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:2 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “after that I have spoken a few words by way of exhortation **unto you**”.

■ Moroni 10:3

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

Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition reads *unto* rather than *until* for the phrase “even down **until** the time that ye shall receive these things”. Either reading is theoretically possible here, so we follow the earliest reading, *until*. The 1906 edition never served as a copytext, so the reading with *unto* was never passed on to any subsequent LDS edition. The use of *until* is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text: there are 14 instances of “**until** the time” in the earliest text but none of “**unto** the time”. For two other cases where the prepositions *unto* and *until* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under Mosiah 17:10.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:3 the preposition *until* in the expression “even down **until** the time that ye shall receive these things” (the reading of the earliest extant text).

■ Moroni 10:4

*I would exhort you that ye would ask God the Eternal Father in the name of Christ
if these things are [NULL > not 1 | not ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] true*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “if these things are true” in the printer’s manuscript; then virtually immediately he corrected the text by supralinearly inserting the *not* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *not*). Theoretically, either reading will work here, although the negative *if*-clause works better since it implies that these things are indeed true. Without the *not*, the *if*-clause is more neutral in its expectation. In all probability the original manuscript had the *not*.

Elsewhere the text has two other examples of “ask if S”, where S is a clause. In those two cases, the clause itself is positively stated but the implication is negative (thus reversing the polarity):

2 Nephi 31:19

and now my beloved brethren
after that ye have got into this straight and narrow path
I would ask if all is done

Alma 33:12–14

and now Alma saith unto them
do ye believe those scriptures which have been written by them of old
behold if ye do / ye must believe what Zenos saith
for behold he saith: thou hast turned away thy judgments because of thy Son
now behold my brethren I would ask if ye have read these scriptures
if ye have / how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God

In the first case, not all is done. And in the second one, Alma wonders whether his audience has really read those scriptures, because if they had they couldn’t have been as ignorant of the Son of God as they appear to be. (Amulek, Alma’s missionary companion, expands on this point in Alma 34:2.) Here in Moroni 10:4, the *if*-clause also reverses the polarity, so that the presumption is that these things are true since the *if*-clause is stated negatively.

Summary: Accept in Moroni 10:4 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} with the *not* (“if these things are **not** true”), which implies that “these things are true”.

■ Moroni 10:4

*and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart
with real intent / having faith in Christ
[& 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he will manifest the truth of it unto you
by the power of the Holy Ghost*

Here we have the final example in the text of an original Hebrew-like *if-and* construction. Such constructions are, of course, ungrammatical in English; thus the *and* was removed in the 1837 edition. We have already noted many examples of this kind of construction elsewhere in the text. For another example involving an *if*-clause, see nearby under Ether 14:1. For a general discussion, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 10:4 the original Hebraistic *and* that separated the *if*-clause from its following main clause; such usage was fairly common in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Moroni 10:8**

and again [NULL >+ I 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **exhort** you my brethren
that ye deny not the gifts of God

Nearly always in this chapter of Moroni, we have “I would exhort you” rather than simply “I exhort you”. One may wonder here in verse 8 if *would* was possibly lost early in the transmission of the text. In particular, we note for this example that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the subject pronoun *I* as he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} . It is possible that he actually dropped *I would* but inserted only the *I* when he corrected his copy. The level of ink flow for the supralinear *I* is slightly heavier, which suggests that he made this correction when he proofed \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} . As noted under 2 Nephi 4:15, sometimes Oliver omitted the subject pronoun *I*, although usually momentarily. Quite clearly, the *I* belongs here in Moroni 10:8. The more difficult question is whether *would* should also be there.

Nearby verses in this chapter consistently read “I would exhort you” rather than “I exhort you”:

Moroni 10:3	behold I would exhort you that when ye shall read these things . . .
Moroni 10:4	I would exhort you that ye would ask God
Moroni 10:7	wherefore I would exhort you that ye deny not the power of God
Moroni 10:18	and I would exhort you my beloved brethren that ye remember that every good gift cometh of Christ
Moroni 10:19	and I would exhort you my beloved brethren that ye remember that he is the same yesterday today and forever

But then near the end of the chapter, we get variability:

Moroni 10:27	and I exhort you to remember these things
Moroni 10:30	and again I would exhort you that ye would come unto Christ

And similarly, elsewhere in the text we get variability:

Alma 34:39	yea and I also exhort you my brethren that ye be watchful unto prayer continually
Alma 34:40	and now my beloved brethren / I would exhort you to have patience

Thus there is no strong reason to emend Moroni 10:8 by adding *would*. The critical text will retain the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , “and again I exhort you”.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:8 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , “and again I exhort you”; there is no need here to emend the text in the verse by adding the modal verb *would* since elsewhere the text allows for variation in using *would* for this phrase.

■ Moroni 10:17

*and all these gifts [comes >js come 1 | comes A | come BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
by the Spirit of Christ
and they **come** unto every man [severly 1 | severally ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
according as he will*

There are two interesting variants in this verse. First of all, the verb form in the initial clause is *comes* rather than either *cometh* or *come*. Since the subject is plural (“all these gifts”), Joseph Smith emended the verb form *comes* to *come* in his editing for the 1837 edition—and in agreement with the *come* in the following clause (“and they **come** unto every man severally”). Although the third person singular ending *-(e)s* for plural subjects is comparatively uncommon in the earliest Book of Mormon text, there are nonetheless some examples, such as these:

Alma 57:36 (“the souls of them . . . **has**”)
yea and I trust that the souls of them
which [*has* 01A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been slain
have entered into the rest of their God

Alma 58:34 (“neither **does** those men . . . know why”)
now we do not know the cause
that the government does not grant us more strength
neither [*does* 0 | *does* >js *do* 1 | *does* > *do* A | *do* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
those men which came up unto us
know why we have not received greater strength

3 Nephi 10:17 (“these things . . . **testifies**”)
and these things which [*testifies* >js *testify* 1 | *testifies* A |
testify BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of us
are they not written upon the plates of brass

Each of these was emended to the appropriate plural verb form in the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore these original instances of the *-(e)s* ending. And since such usage is possible in the original Book of Mormon text, the instance of *comes* will be restored here in Moroni 10:17, despite its ungrammaticality in modern English.

The second variant of interest here in Moroni 10:17 is the form *severly* in the printer’s manuscript. This appears to be a scribal slip for *severally*, which is how the 1830 typesetter interpreted it. The subsequent text has maintained *severally*. This interpretation of *severly* as *severally* is supported by the textual similarity between this passage and the King James language in one of Paul’s epistles:

<i>Moroni 10:17</i>	<i>1 Corinthians 12:11</i>
and all these gifts comes	but all these worketh
by the Spirit of Christ	that one and the selfsame Spirit
and they come	dividing
unto every man severally	to every man severally
according as he will	as he will

Yet there is a possibility, rather slim though, that *severly* is actually correct. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, *severly* is an obsolete Scottish form of *severally*. Unfortunately, there are no

other instances of the word *severally* in the Book of Mormon, so we cannot determine how the scribes might have dealt with other instances of this word. My suspicion, however, is that *severally* is correct here, especially since there are no actual citations for *severly* with the meaning ‘severally’ either in the online version of the OED or on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>. Interestingly, these two online sources have quite a few examples where *severly* is spelled, intentionally it would seem, as *severly*. Of course, here in Moroni 10:17 *severly* is not the word *severely*. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 interpretation of *severly* as *severally*, which is supported by the parallel language in 1 Corinthians 12:11.

Summary: Restore in Moroni 10:17 the original third person singular verb form *comes* (“and all these gifts **comes** by the Spirit of Christ”); such usage sometimes occurred in the original Book of Mormon text; also accept the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation of *severly*, the reading in \mathcal{P} , as a scribal slip for *severally*; this reading is supported by the parallel language in 1 Corinthians 12:11.

■ Moroni 10:19

even [as 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | so HK] long as the world shall stand

The 1874 RLDS edition changed “**as** long as” to “**so** long as”. This change appears to be accidental. Elsewhere in the text, there are three occurrences of “as long as” and seven of “so long as”, so either is possible here in Moroni 10:19. For each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. Here in Moroni 10:19, the reading “as long as” should be kept. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original “as long as” to the RLDS text.

Summary: Accept “as long as” in Moroni 10:19 since this is the earliest extant reading, the reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Moroni 10:21–22

*neither can ye be saved in the kingdom of God if ye have **not** faith
neither can ye if ye have [not >% no 1 | no ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] hope
and if ye have **no** hope / ye must needs be in despair*

Here the text shows some variation between “have not X” and “have no X”, where X is a noun. In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write “if ye have **not** hope”, but then he immediately erased the *t* at the end of *not* to give “if ye have **no** hope”. He probably wrote the *not* because of the *not* in the immediately preceding “if ye have **not** faith”. The immediacy of the correction argues that *no* before *hope* was quite likely the reading of the original manuscript, especially since the very next *if*-clause reads “and if ye have **no** hope”.

Ether 12, Moroni 7, and Moroni 10 all deal with having faith, hope, and charity. From these examples we see that we consistently get *not* before *faith* and *charity* but *no* before *hope*, providing the main verb is *have*:

Ether 12:30	and if he had not had faith
Ether 12:35	that if the Gentiles have not charity
Ether 12:37	if they have not charity
Moroni 7:39	for if ye have not faith in him

Moroni 10

Moroni 7:44	for if he have not charity
Moroni 7:46	if ye have not charity
Moroni 10:21	if ye have not faith
Moroni 10:21	if ye have no hope
Moroni 10:22	and if ye have no hope

Ultimately, there seems to be no grammatical or semantic reason for having *not* before *charity* and *faith* but *no* before *hope*; either should work in theory. Interestingly, in Paul's epistles in the King James Bible we get these same results: *not* before *charity* and *faith* but *no* before *hope*, providing the main verb is *have*:

1 Corinthians 13:1	and have not charity
1 Corinthians 13:2	and have not charity
1 Corinthians 13:3	and have not charity
Ephesians 2:12	having no hope
1 Thessalonians 4:13	even as others which have no hope
2 Thessalonians 3:2	for all <i>men</i> have not faith

There is, however, one case of “have **no** faith” in the New Testament, but not in Paul's epistles (namely, in Mark 4:40: “how is it that ye have **no** faith”).

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:21–22 the two instances of “have **no** hope”, even though we otherwise get “have **not** charity” and “have **not** faith” in the text.

■ **Moroni 10:26**

*and woe unto them which shall do these things away and die
for they die in their sins and they cannot be saved in the kingdom of God*

The phrase “do these things away” seems rather odd to modern readers, and one might suspect a primitive error here. But it turns out that in Early Modern English this phrase meant ‘to put away, dismiss, remove’. This transitive meaning is listed under definition 44a for the verb *do* in the Oxford English Dictionary. The last quotation cited in the OED with this meaning comes from Edmund Spenser in 1596: “Do fear away and tell.” In the preceding text, Moroni uses this phraseology to refer to those who would deny the power and gifts of God, thus preventing the Spirit from working in their lives:

Moroni 10:24–25
and now I speak unto all the ends of the earth that if the day cometh
that the power and gifts of God shall **be done away** among you
it shall be because of unbelief
and woe be unto the children of men if this be the case
for there shall be none that doeth good among you / no not one
for if there be one among you that doeth good
he shall work by the power and gifts of God

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:24, 26 the use of the archaic phraseology “to do away”, which dates from Early Modern English and means ‘to put away, dismiss, remove’.

■ Moroni 10:27

*did I not declare my words unto you
which was written by this man
like as one **crying** from the dead
yea even as one [speaking 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | speaketh MQ] out of the dust*

The 1905 LDS edition replaced the nonfinite present participial form *speaking* with the finite indicative form *speaketh*. This change was probably an accident, especially when we consider that the preceding clause also has a nonfinite present participle after the word *one* (“like as one **crying** from the dead”). The 1911 LDS edition followed the 1905 reading, *speaketh*, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *speaking* to the LDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:27 the use of the present participial *speaking* after *one*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ Moroni 10:28

*I declare these things unto the fulfilling of the prophecies
and behold they shall proceed forth out of the mouth of the everlasting God
and his [word 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | words N] shall hiss forth
from generation to generation*

Here we have the singular *word* in the earliest textual sources, but one wonders if the correct reading might not be the plural *words*. In fact, the 1906 LDS edition substituted the plural here, although that change may have been unintended. Subsequent LDS editions have followed the earlier reading, *word*, since the 1906 edition was never used as a copytext.

There are two other occurrences in the text that refer to God’s word(s) hissing forth, and both of these read in the plural:

2 Nephi 29:2

and my [word > words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST] shall hiss forth
unto the ends of the earth

2 Nephi 29:3

and because my **words** shall hiss forth
many of the Gentiles shall say . . .

The first example shows a tendency on Oliver Cowdery’s part to momentarily write the singular *word* in place of the correct *words*. Perhaps the same error occurred here in Moroni 10:28 as Oliver (the presumed scribe in \mathcal{O} for this part of the text) wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation or later as he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . David Calabro notes (personal communication) that it would have been especially difficult to hear the difference between *word shall* and *words shall* when Joseph dictated the text.

More generally, however, either *word* or *words* can be used to refer to God’s word(s). Although there are quite a few examples in the Book of Mormon of *these things* and other plurals referring to the coming forth of recorded events, there is some minor evidence for using the singular in referring to the word of God, as in the following clear example:

2 Nephi 3:11

and unto him will I give power
 to bring forth **my word** unto the seed of thy loins
 and not to the bringing forth **my word** only / saith the Lord
 but to the convincing them of **my word**
 which shall have already gone forth among them

This example argues that the singular *word* is definitely possible in Moroni 10:28.

A summarizing discussion of the competition between *word* and *words* when referring to God's word(s) can be found under Helaman 6:36. For each case of *word(s)*, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *word* here in Moroni 10:28.

Summary: Maintain the singular *word* in Moroni 10:28 since such a reading is possible; the plural reading, *words*, is also possible, but in this case we follow the reading of the earliest text (thus “and his **word** shall hiss forth from generation to generation”).

■ Moroni 10:31

and awake and arise from the dust

O [*daughter of Zion* >- *Jerusalem* 1 | *Jerusalem* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

yea and put on thy beautiful garments

O *daughter of Zion*

This first part of the verse paraphrases the language in the King James version of Isaiah 52:1–2, but the order of the ideas is considerably different:

Isaiah 52:1–2

awake awake
 put on thy strength
 O Zion
put on thy beautiful garments
 O Jerusalem the holy city . . .
 shake thyself **from the dust**
arise *and* sit down
O Jerusalem
 loose thyself from the bands of thy neck
O captive daughter of Zion

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “O daughter of Zion” instead of the correct “O Jerusalem”. His eye probably glanced down to the next line in the original manuscript, with the result that he replaced *Jerusalem* with *daughter of Zion*. Somewhat later, probably when proofing against the original manuscript, Oliver caught his error, crossed out *daughter of Zion*, and wrote *Jerusalem* supralinearly. The level of ink flow is distinctly weaker for the word *Jerusalem*, which suggests that the correction was not immediate.

Summary: Oliver Cowdery's correction of “O daughter of Zion” to “O Jerusalem” is definitely not due to editing, but instead is the correction of a copy error, probably caught when proofing the printer's manuscript against the original manuscript.

■ **Moroni 10:31**

*that the covenants of the Eternal [God >+ Father 1 | Father ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which he hath made unto thee O house of Israel
may be fulfilled*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the Eternal God” in the printer’s manuscript, then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) corrected *God* to *Father*, probably when he was proofing against the original manuscript. Much earlier in \mathcal{D} , Oliver made the same initial error, but this one he caught immediately and corrected inline:

1 Nephi 11:21
behold the Lamb of God
yea even the Eternal [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | God > NULL 1] Father

The Book of Mormon text has quite a few examples of both “the Eternal God” (six times) and “the Eternal Father” (nine times), so either is theoretically possible here. However, when we consider the statistics for *God* versus *Father* when preceded by “covenant(s) of”, there are only examples of *Father* (six in all, including this one in Moroni 10:31). In other words, there are no examples of “covenant(s) of God”; thus the corrected reading in Moroni 10:31 is what we expect based on other examples in the text.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:31 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , “the covenants of the Eternal Father”; this reading agrees with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Moroni 10:33**

*then [are ye 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | ye are D] sanctified in Christ
by the grace of God*

The inverted word order of the original text (“then are ye sanctified”) was changed in the 1841 British edition, undoubtedly by accident. The subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the original inverted word order here in Moroni 10:33. Elsewhere in the text, we have other examples of this kind of inverted order after *then*:

2 Nephi 31:18 and **then are ye** in this straight and narrow path
Mormon 6:21 **then are ye** blessed with your fathers

Thus there is nothing wrong with the original inverted word order in Moroni 10:33, and the critical text will maintain it. As one might expect, there are examples with the noninverted word order as well:

1 Nephi 10:21 **then ye are** found unclean before the judgment seat of God
Moroni 7:39 **then ye are** not fit to be numbered among the people of his church

For each case we follow the earliest extant reading.

Summary: Maintain in Moroni 10:33 the inverted word order after *then* (namely, “then are ye sanctified in Christ”).

■ Moroni 10:33

*then are ye sanctified in Christ by the grace of God
through the shedding of the blood of Christ
which is in the covenant of the Father
unto the remission of your sins
that ye become holy [1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQS | , RT] without spot*

The printer's manuscript here reads "holy without spot", and all editions have kept the spelling *holy*. But one wonders if Joseph Smith didn't actually dictate *wholly*. This possible emendation was first suggested in 1991 by Kevin Quinn, one of the students in my textual criticism class that year. There would have been no difference in pronunciation between *holy* and *wholly*, nor would there have been much motivation for the scribe to have asked which word was intended. In other words, we have two possible readings here:

- (1) that ye become **holy** / without spot
- (2) that ye become **wholly** without spot

The committee for the 1920 LDS edition, perhaps aware of the potential problem here, decided to place a comma after *holy* ("that ye become holy, without spot"), thus guaranteeing the first reading.

Either of these readings make sense. First of all, there are numerous passages in the Book of Mormon that refer to righteous people as holy (usually prophets, but not always). One interesting general example is in 2 Nephi 9 where Jacob tells the people that he must preach repentance to them because they are not holy:

2 Nephi 9:48
 behold if ye were holy / I would speak unto you of holiness
 but as ye are not holy and ye look upon me as a teacher
 it must needs be expedient that I teach you the consequences of sin

The distinct implication here is that it is possible for ordinary people to be holy. On the other hand, there is nothing semantically wrong either with "wholly without spot", meaning 'completely without spot'.

From a syntactic point of view, there is no other construction exactly like either of these in the Book of Mormon text. There is nonetheless some syntactic evidence for each kind. We first note that we do have a couple examples in the text of a *without* phrase conjoined with an adjective or adjective phrase:

Helaman 3:5	it had not been rendered desolate and without timber
Moroni 9:20	they are without principle and past feeling

We note here that an *and* is used to separate the two conjuncts, but Moroni 10:33 does not have any *and* between *holy* and *without spot*. The 1920 comma, in a sense, serves this purpose. Interestingly, Brent Johnson, a student in my 1994 textual criticism class, made a thorough analysis of this passage and ended up proposing that third possibility for Moroni 10:33, namely, emending the current reading by inserting an *and* instead of a comma between *holy* and *without spot*, thus "that ye become holy **and** without spot". These two other examples of *without*, listed above, provide some support for this emendation.

There are a couple examples of adverbs being conjoined directly to a *without* phrase without the *and*, but here the *without* phrase also acts adverbially rather than adjectivally:

Alma 26:22	yea he that . . . prayeth continually without ceasing . . .
3 Nephi 19:30	and behold they did pray steadfastly without ceasing unto him

There are also some examples of *without* phrases conjoined together:

2 Nephi 9:50	yea come buy wine and milk without money and without price
2 Nephi 26:25	buy milk and honey without money and without price
Alma 1:20	they did impart the word of God . . . without money and without price
Mormon 5:18	without sail or anchor or without any thing wherewith to steer her
Moroni 9:18	they are without order and without mercy

The first three of these follow the language of Isaiah 55:1: “yea come buy wine and milk without money and without price”.

The King James Bible has quite a few examples of adjectives conjoined with a *without* phrase (and sometimes there is no conjunction):

Exodus 21:11	then shall she go out free / without money
Job 33:9	I am clean / without transgression
Jeremiah 4:23	I beheld the earth and lo <i>it was</i> without form and void
Jeremiah 9:11	and I make the cities of Judah desolate / without an inhabitant
Jeremiah 26:9	and this city shall be desolate / without an inhabitant
Jeremiah 32:43	<i>it is</i> desolate / without man or beast
Jeremiah 33:10	that are desolate / without man and without inhabitant and without beast
Jeremiah 33:12	which is desolate / without man and without beast
Jeremiah 46:19	for Noph shall be waste and desolate / without an inhabitant
Jeremiah 48:9	for the cities thereof shall be desolate / without any to dwell therein
Joel 1:6	for a nation is come up upon my land / strong and without number
Ephesians 1:4	that we should be holy and without blame before him in love
Ephesians 5:27	but that it should be holy and without blemish
Philippians 1:10	that ye may be sincere and without offence
1 Timothy 6:14	that thou keep <i>this</i> commandment without spot / unrebukeable
2 Peter 3:14	that ye may be found of him in peace / without spot and blameless

The two examples in Ephesians are semantically identical to the first interpretation for Moroni 10:33 (that is, “holy / without spot”). The basic difference is that they have the conjunction *and*. These examples support the proposal that Moroni 10:33 could be emended to read “holy **and** without spot”. It is possible that the original manuscript had an ampersand between *holy* and *without spot* and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted it while copying the text from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} . (And it’s also possible, of course, that Oliver omitted the *and* in \mathfrak{C} when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation.)

In support of the reading “holy (and) without spot”, there is the phraseology “pure and without spot” in reference to washing the soul in the Church of England’s *The Book of Common*

Prayer (under “The Order for the Visitation of the Sick: A commendatory Prayer for a sick person at the point of departure”):

Wash it, we pray thee, in the blood of that immaculate Lamb,
that was slain to take away the sins of the world;
that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted
in the midst of this miserable and naughty world,
through the lusts of the flesh, or the wiles of Satan,
being purged and done away,
it may be presented **pure and without spot** before thee.

Turning now to the evidence for the second basic interpretation (“wholly without spot”), we find adverbial uses of *wholly* in the Book of Mormon, although none modify a prepositional phrase; instead, all the examples modify a verb:

2 Nephi 31:19

for ye have not come thus far
save it were by the word of Christ
with unshaken faith in him
relying wholly upon the merits of him
who is mighty to save

Alma 4:20

Alma delivered up the judgment seat to Nephiah
and **confined** himself **wholly** to the high priesthood

Alma 7:1

I having been **wholly confined** to the judgment seat

Thus the internal evidence for the second reading “wholly without spot” is weaker than the internal evidence for the first reading, “holy (and) without spot”.

When we consider the spelling of *holy* and *wholly* in the two manuscripts, we find no specific evidence for any scribe, including Oliver Cowdery, ever mixing up these two words. And spelling errors themselves are very few:

□ original manuscript

1 Nephi 3:20	<i>holly</i> ‘holy’	scribe 2 in Ⓞ
Alma 29:13	<i>holly</i> ‘holy’	Oliver Cowdery

□ printer’s manuscript

2 Nephi 31:19	<i>wholely</i> ‘wholly’	Oliver Cowdery
Alma 7:1	<i>wholely</i> ‘wholly’	scribe 2 in Ⓞ
3 Nephi 19:21	<i>Holie</i> ‘holy’	scribe 2 initially in Ⓞ

There is one case of *whole* (not in the current text) that seems to have involved confusion between *whole* and *hole*: in 1 Nephi 7:5, scribe 3 in the original manuscript wrote “and also his hole hole”, which Oliver Cowdery interpreted in the printer’s manuscript as “and also his household”. As discussed under 1 Nephi 7:5, there is evidence that Joseph Smith actually dictated “and

also his **whole** household”. If this is correct, then scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} mixed up *whole* with *hole*. Such confusion could have also occurred here in Moroni 10:33, with *wholly* being misinterpreted as *holy* (although by a different scribe, Oliver Cowdery).

A synonym for the phrase “without spot” is *spotless*. This word occurs 13 times in the Book of Mormon text (if we include the three-witness statement). In no case is *spotless* ever modified by an adverb, which suggests that *without spot* should not be modified either. One could argue that neither *spotless* nor *without spot* admit adverbial modification (or comparison). This argument provides further support, then, for the first reading, “holy / without spot” (and its potential variant “holy and without spot”).

Ultimately, it is very difficult to be sure about which of the readings is correct for Moroni 10:33. Since there is little evidence for mixing up *wholly* and *holy*, nor is there much for modifying “without spot” by *wholly*, I will retain the spelling *holy*. Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text and the close similarity with Ephesians 1:4 and Ephesians 5:27 suggest that Moroni 10:33 should be emended by inserting an *and* between *holy* and *without spot* (“that ye may become holy **and** without spot”), under the assumption that the original text had an *and* between the two parts but that Oliver Cowdery dropped it in his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} (or earlier in \mathcal{C} when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation). Here the critical text will follow the more conservative solution by continuing the current text with its added comma and without any *and* between *holy* and *without spot*; the earliest text also lacks the *and*.

Summary: Maintain the current reading Moroni 10:33: “that ye become holy / without spot”; this reading is found in all the extant sources; *wholly* is somewhat less appropriate than the current *holy*; an *and* between *holy* and *without spot* would be more consistent with other Book of Mormon usage as well as with two quotes in the King James Bible from the epistle to the Ephesians, but it is not necessary, providing that the comma from the 1920 LDS edition is maintained.

■ Moroni 10:34

*and now I bid unto all farewell
I soon go to rest in the paradise of God
until my spirit and body shall again reunite
and I am brought forth triumphant through the air
to meet you before the **pleasing** bar of the great Jehovah*

As explained under Jacob 6:13, it appears that the phrase “the pleasing bar” is an error for “the pleading bar”, although all of the extant textual sources (\mathcal{C} is not extant in either place) have *pleasing*. Oliver Cowdery, it would appear, substituted “the pleasing bar” for “the pleading bar” since he had no idea what a pleading bar was. The critical text will accept the suggested emendation here in Moroni 10:34 of *pleading* for *pleasing* (thus “the pleading bar of the great Jehovah”).

■ Moroni 10:34

*to meet you before the pleading bar of the great Jehovah
the Eternal Judge of both quick and dead*

Amen

[THE END 1APRST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ]

The printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition end the Book of Mormon with the phrase “The End”. Such an addition was, of course, unnecessary. The *Amen* along with the actual end of the text itself indicates as much. This phrase was omitted in the 1837 edition but was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1920 LDS edition. It has always been printed in all caps. In the printer’s manuscript itself, Oliver Cowdery wrote the phrase out cursively in all caps. Interestingly, in both the 1920 and 1981 LDS editions, the phrase was placed below the footnotes on the last page of the text. In the 1981 edition, the phrase is hardly noticeable.

The original text probably did not have the phrase “The End”. It was apparently added by the scribe (and possibly at Joseph Smith’s suggestion), perhaps just like the word *Chapter* was added at the end of each section in the manuscript but was not part of the text itself. For discussion of the status of the word *chapter* in the Book of Mormon text, see pages 85–87 of my article “Translating the Book of Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript” in *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1997), 61–100. Like the word *chapter*, the critical text will treat the ending phrase “The End” as extracanonical, thus excluding it from the original text itself.

A similar kind of “The End” occurs in the standard King James Bible. The Book of Revelation ends with the word *Amen*, as it did in the 1611 printing. But the 1611 version added the Latin *Finis* after the *Amen* to indicate the end of the Bible. Such an indicator, given in Latin, is obviously secondary. In 1762 the Latin word was replaced in the King James Bible with the English *The End*. For the history of the King James ending, see page 355 of David Norton’s *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). It is also worth noting that William Tyndale ended his 1526 New Testament with the extra phrase “The ende of the newe testament.” Prior to this time, in ending a manuscript book, the scribe would typically write the word *explicit*, meaning ‘unrolled’ (referring originally to an unrolled scroll rather than to the last leaf in a codex, the modern-day form of the book). For this, see the explanation under the noun *explicit* in the Oxford English Dictionary. In any event, all of these devices for indicating the end of the book are traditional, but secondary. It could very well be that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were motivated by the way the King James Bible ends when they decided to place the secondary “The End” at the end of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Omit the phrase “The End” that appears to have been added by either Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery at the end of Book of Mormon; this phrase serves no real function and was probably not a part of the original text itself, just like the word *chapter*, which was added to the original manuscript to show where breaks occurred in the original text.

Addenda

In this section I consider additions as well as corrections to what I have already published in parts 1–5 of volume 4. Of course, there are no addenda or corrections for part 6 at the present time, but I will undoubtedly need to refer to additional addenda and corrections at some later time. These will be placed at the end of volume 3 of the critical text, entitled *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon*. That volume is now in preparation and should be published within the next few years. To be sure, the textual analysis of the Book of Mormon is an ongoing process.

In the process of producing the various parts for volume 4, some general changes have been made in the accidentals (that is, in the capitalization and spelling). I list below some of the changes that have been made during the process of printing the six parts. For the most part, I have not listed the specific places where these changes in the accidentals need to be made since they occur too frequently:

□ capitalization

“Only Begotten Son”, not “only begotten Son”
“the Eternal God”, not “the eternal God”
“your heavenly Father”, not “your Heavenly Father”
“garden of Eden”, not “Garden of Eden”
“Most High” and “Most High God” in Book of Mormon quotations
“most High” and “most high God” in quotations from the King James Bible
Internet, not *internet*

□ removal of hyphenation

bloodthirsty, not *blood-thirsty*
copytext, not *copy-text*
stiffnecked, not *stiff-necked*

first born, not *first-born*
last born, not *last-born*

□ removal of spacing

copywork, not *copy work*

And in the Book of Mormon text itself, spaces will be placed between numbers rather than the hyphens that are otherwise used in standard prose:

one half, one fifth, one tenth
twenty four, forty three, seventy six, seventy nine

In the following list of addenda and corrections, whenever a page and a line number are given, line x means the x th line from the top of the page and line $-y$ means the y th line from the bottom of the page. In this schema, fully blank lines are not numbered; and running heads, either at the top or bottom of the page, are also ignored in the count. In manuscript citations, supralinearly inserted words are given their own line number.

Each write-up in the addenda that has not been previously discussed is marked in bold with a square box preceding it in the margin. In addition, each write-up in the addenda where an earlier textual decision ends up being reversed is marked in the same way. For each of these write-ups proposing additional change in the text, the Book of Mormon passage is cited at the beginning, and a summary is provided at the end of the write-up.



Introduction, page 7, line 16

For felicity's sake, replace "For instance" with "For example".

Introduction, page 14, line -10

The Documentary History of the Church (DHC) is now generally referred to as the History of the Church (HC). For discussion, see footnote 2 on page 71 of Kevin Barney's article "Seeking Joseph Smith's Voice", *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 15/1 (2006): 54–59, 71–72. This change from DHC to HC should also be made on page 313 of part 1.

Introduction, page 16, line -6

Gale Anderson, in an email to Chad Folger of the LDS Church Historical Department, dated 13 February 2006, points out that the 1829 typeset version of the title page may have been set by Elihu Marshall of Rochester rather than by E. B. Grandin of Palmyra (email courtesy of Gale Anderson).

1 Nephi preface, page 51, line -15

The third line in the Jacob 1:11 citation should read "were called by the people **second Nephi** and **third Nephi** etc." In other words, an *and* needs to be inserted between *second Nephi* and *third Nephi*; see the discussion under Jacob 1:11.

1 Nephi 1:3, page 54

In discussing Joseph Smith's change of "the record which I make **to be** true" to "the record which I make **is** true", I should have also noted that the 1920 LDS edition emended the similar example from Mormon 6:6, but there the *that* was removed. This change is like the 1837 change in Moroni 4:1 where the *that* was also removed, thus retaining the infinitival clause. For further discussion, see under Mormon 6:6.

1 Nephi 1:9, page 57, line -8

The scriptural specification should note that bolding has been added: "1 Nephi 11:7 (1981 LDS edition, with bolding added)".

1 Nephi 2:6, page 76, line -9

The word *paraphrastic* should read *periphrastic*.

1 Nephi 2:14, page 79

For one other case where the *do* auxiliary verb has been removed from occurring with the main verb *do*, see under 2 Nephi 5:18. There is also one case where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *do* auxiliary when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} (replacing *did do* with simply *did*):

Helaman 3:20

and he did [*do* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST|NULL >+ *do* 1] that
which was right in the sight of God continually

For a complete list of variation involving the addition and loss of the *do* auxiliary, see under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

1 Nephi 2:16, page 80

In the discussion regarding *exceeding* versus *exceedingly*, it should be noted that there are two cases where adverbial *exceeding* has never been changed to *exceedingly*, namely, when it is used with the noun phrase *strong hold*:

Alma 53:5 and this city became an exceeding strong hold ever after
Alma 55:33 until it had become an exceeding strong hold

The reason for this lack of grammatical change to *exceedingly* is that in the later text *strong hold* has been reinterpreted as a compound noun (see the discussion under Alma 50:6), with the result that the original *exceeding* is now interpreted as an adjective and thus not subject to change to *exceedingly*. Of course, in all cases the critical text will retain the original *exceeding*, no matter whether it is acting adjectivally or adverbially.

1 Nephi 3:2, page 84

The statistics and corresponding description in the second paragraph under this item need to be revised. Based on a complete analysis (which will appear in volume 3), this paragraph should read as follows:

The earliest text had 57 occurrences of the phrase “in the which” but only 5 of the phrase “in which”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed 27 occurrences of “in the which” (but left the other 30 unchanged). The majority of these changes (22 of them) are found in the book of Ether. For most cases of this editing, Joseph just deleted the *the*, but in one case he deleted *in the* (Alma 61:8), in two cases he replaced “in the which” with *and* (Ether 7:22 and Ether 7:23), and in seven cases he deleted the *the* and replaced the *in* with a different preposition (*by* in Ether 10:10, Ether 10:14, Ether 10:15, Ether 11:10, and Ether 11:15, although the last one was never implemented in the 1837 edition; *with* in Ether 10:26; and *during* in Ether 10:32). In the last instance, Joseph also added the word *time* after the *which* (thus producing “during which time”).

1 Nephi 3:28, page 96, line 16

The verse number, given here as 27, is wrong, and the quotation would work better if one additional line is added, thus:

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
for he hearkened unto the words of Laman—
wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak many hard words unto us

1 Nephi 4:19, page 111, line -5

According to the more accurate analysis under Alma 26:29, the sentence here should read as follows:

Elsewhere, the original text usually has the standard *smitten* (42 times), but in six cases *smote* occurs as the past-participial form.

1 Nephi 4:21[-22], page 112, line 1

The passage here is from 1 Nephi 4:21–22, not just from 1 Nephi 4:21.

1 Nephi 4:33, page 117, line 7

At the time I wrote this, I thought the original form was *desolates*, but subsequently (as explained under Helaman 3:5–6), I decided to maintain the standard *desolate*; thus this citation of Helaman 3:5 should be revised, as elsewhere in volume 4; in other words, “it had not been rendered **desolate**”.

1 Nephi 7:1, pages 134–135

The statistics in the paragraph at the end of the page (and at the beginning of the next page) are based on examples of a more general phraseology. Restricting the count to the specific phrase mentioned in this paragraph, there are 57 examples of “spake . . . saying” in the earliest text, plus 6 more of the form “speak . . . saying”. For all 63 of these, the following quote is always a direct one. The number 76 on the first line of page 135 should therefore read 63. The number of instances of “spake . . . saying” in the King James Bible is 239, not 240.

1 Nephi 7:2, page 141

In the list of examples on page 141, *Midian* is distinguished from *Middoni*. As explained under Alma 24:5, internal evidence argues that *Midian* is an early error for *Middoni*. Therefore, the two lines referring to *Middoni* and *Midian* on page 141 should be combined into one. In addition, I have redone the statistics and discovered a few omissions in the original count, including one name that was omitted. Besides removing the line for *Midian* and adding one for *Antum*, we end up with these revised counts for the following specific lines:

Addenda: 1 Nephi

	<i>into</i>	<i>unto</i>	<i>to</i>
BOOK OF MORMON (totals)	36	6	85
Antum			1
Middoni	1		8
Moroni	2		1
Nephi	6		27
Zarahemla	11	1	22

It should also be noted that these statistics include cases where the *of* is lacking in the phrase “the land (of) X”. The main conclusion holds as originally stated, that for each instance of *into*, *unto*, or *to* with the phrase “the land (of) X”, we follow the earliest textual sources. And also as before, the Book of Mormon clearly favors *to* for this phrase, while the King James Bible prefers *into*.

1 Nephi 8:7, page 162, line -13

As explained under Helaman 7:10–11, the verb *led* in “the garden gate which led by the highway” is conjectured to be an error for *was*. Thus the quote from Helaman 7:10–11 should read in the third line of the citation as “the garden gate which was by the highway”.

1 Nephi 8:11, page 167, line 5

Here *paraphrastic* should read *periphrastic*.

1 Nephi 8:11, page 169, line -4

The critical text has adopted *desolate* rather than *desolates* in Helaman 3:6 and elsewhere.

1 Nephi 8:21, page 182, line 5

The square brackets in *pres[s]ing* can be removed, giving the more simple *pressing*. The second *s* here is an elongated *s*, but nonetheless an *s*.

1 Nephi 8:34, page 189, line -10

The discussion regarding *thus* in summarizing statements is found under Helaman 16:11, not under Helaman 16:8–11.

1 Nephi 8:37, page 190, line -4

It would be more accurate to say here that “the *in* is expected” rather than “the *in* seems necessary”.

1 Nephi 10:6, page 201

There is one more example where the verb associated with “all mankind” is in the plural rather than in the singular:

Helaman 14:16

for all mankind by the fall of Adam
being cut off from the presence of the Lord
are considered as dead

On the other hand, there is one passage where the associated verbs are, at least originally, in the singular, although one could argue that here the singular usage is actually in agreement with the earlier reference in the passage to “the man that receiveth salvation”:

Mosiah 4:7 (with adjusted sense-lines)

I say that this is **the man** that receiveth salvation through the atonement
which was prepared from the foundation of the world for all mankind
which ever **was** / ever since the fall of Adam
or which **is** or which ever shall be / even unto the end of the world

In any event, the case in 1 Nephi 10:6 shows that in the original text the subject “all mankind” can take a singular verb form.

1 Nephi 10:16, page 207, line 6

See under RELATIVE CLAUSES, not RELATIVE CLAUSE, in volume 3.

1 Nephi 11:2, pages 217–218

In addition to the three cases listed here where a manuscript momentarily read *-est* in place of the expected *-eth*, there are two cases where the original manuscript read *sayest* in place of *saith* (one of which was also momentary):

Alma 30:37

then Alma [*sayest* >+ *saith* 0 | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A |
said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him
believest thou that there is a God

Alma 45:2

Alma came unto his son Helaman
and [*sayest* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A |
said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him
believest thou the words which I spake unto thee
concerning those records which have been kept

In both of these cases, the *sayest* in \mathcal{O} seems to have been influenced by the following *believest*. In the first instance, Oliver Cowdery caught his error in \mathcal{O} , but not in the second. For further discussion, see under those passages.

1 Nephi 11:6, page 220

As listed at the beginning of the addenda, the critical text has the uppercase spelling for the phrase “Most High God” as well as for the phrase “Most High”. The King James Bible has “most high God” and “most High”. The citations of these phrases in the second paragraph in this discussion should be changed to agree with this capitalization. Thus the first part of that paragraph should read as follows:

Outside of this passage, the Book of Mormon text has “Most High God” (five times), but “Most High” occurs once, in 2 Nephi 24:14 (which quotes Isaiah 14:14).

Although the Book of Mormon text strongly favors “Most High God”, both “most High” and “most high God” are found in the King James Bible, with “most High” occurring more frequently (32 times, versus 11 times for “most high God”).

■ **1 Nephi 11:7** (to be inserted on page 223 in part 1)

and him shall ye witness

*and after that [NULL > ye 0|ye 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST|he KP] shall have witnessed him
ye shall bear record that it is the Son of God*

This variant was omitted in part 1 but needs to be mentioned. The typesetter for the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally set *he* instead of *ye* in “ye shall have witnessed him”. The 1908 RLDS edition, which used the 1892 edition as a copytext, maintained this error, but the 1953 RLDS edition restored the correct *ye*. Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially omitted the *ye* here, but virtually immediately he inserted it supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the necessary *ye*).

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 11:7 the correct subject pronoun *ye* in “after that ye shall have witnessed him”.

1 Nephi 11:18, 21, page 231, line 1

As explained under the addendum for 2 Nephi 19:6, the critical text will have no comma between *Wonderful* and *Counselor*.

1 Nephi 11:18, 21, page 232

Stan Thayne (personal communication) points out that the complaints were by “a friend of truth”, not by Alexander Campbell (an unfounded presumption on my part). The LDS reply is in volume 1, number 7 (not number 3), of the *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate*. The text for the last paragraph on page 232 of part 1 should therefore read as follows:

Perhaps the original motivation for adding the first “the Son of” (in 1 Nephi 11:18) resulted from complaints by “a friend of truth” in a Baptist semimonthly publication called *The Pioneer*; there the author points to the use in the Book of Mormon (the 1830 edition) of the seemingly Catholic phraseology “the mother of God”:

The name of Jesus Christ, was declared to Nephi, 545 years before it was announced to Mary, and she, in true Roman phraseology, is called ‘*the mother of God*.’

The Latter-day Saints were aware of this complaint since they quoted this “friend of truth” in an early issue (volume 1, number 7, April 1835) of the *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate* (see page 105 in the article “Trouble in the West”).

1 Nephi 11:29, page 234, line -16

In the critical text, the noun *spirit* should be capitalized when it clearly refers to deity, but not in general phrases referring to someone being “in the spirit” or “carried away in the spirit”. Thus the second line in the citation should read “they were carried away in the spirit from before my face”.

1 Nephi 11:29, page 234, line -8

For yet another example where the resultive *that* has been replaced by *and*, see under Ether 1:37.

1 Nephi 12:4, page 247, line -2

Instead of “maintain the past participle *burnt*”, the summary should read “restore the past participle *burnt*”.

1 Nephi 12:6, page 250, line 11

The phrase being referred to here is “the heaven”, not “in the heaven”.

1 Nephi 12:18, page 259, line -10

The closing parenthesis at the end of the line should be removed, giving “and then eight times in 1 Nephi 10.”

1 Nephi 13:4, 5, page 265, lines 9–11

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication) points out that the use of the word *inert* to refer to the foundation of the church may be inappropriately interpreted as referring to the apostles and prophets. Instead, a word such as *stable* in place of *inert* would probably work better here, thus: “Instead, *foundation* refers to the stable underlying structure of the church rather than its actual founding or forming.”

■ **1 Nephi 13:30** (to be inserted at the bottom of page 289 in part 1)

*wherefore thou seest that the Lord God will not suffer
that the Gentiles will utterly destroy the mixture of thy seed
which is among thy brethren*

Brent Kerby (personal communication) suggests that at the end of this verse the original text could have read “the mixture of thy seed which is among **the seed of thy brethren**”. He points out that elsewhere in Nephi’s vision there are 16 instances of “the seed of my/thy brethren”. From a logical point of view, Nephi’s seed (or the mixture of his seed) would be among Laman and Lemuel’s seed. Nonetheless, outside of Nephi’s vision, there are two other instances like the original text here in 1 Nephi 13:30:

2 Nephi 3:2

and may the Lord consecrate also unto thee this land
— which is a most precious land — for thine inheritance
and the inheritance of **thy seed with thy brethren**

Alma 3:15

and again I will set a mark upon him
that mingleth **his seed with thy brethren**
that they may be cursed also

In both cases, the text does not read “with the seed of thy brethren”, even though semantic or logical consistency would technically require it. Also notice that the instance in Alma 3:15 refers to the mingling of seed, just as here in 1 Nephi 13:30 there is a reference to the mixture of seed. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading in 1 Nephi 13:30; the use of “thy brethren” rather than “the seed of thy brethren” appears to be intentional.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 13:30 the reference to being “among thy brethren”; usage elsewhere in the text shows that this is not necessarily an error for “among the seed of thy brethren”.

■ **1 Nephi 14:7** (to be inserted near the top of page 304 in part 1)

*for the time cometh saith the Lamb of God
that I will work a great and a marvelous work among the children of men
a work which shall be everlasting
either on the one hand or on the other
either to the **convincing** of them unto peace and life eternal
or unto the deliverance of them
to the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds
unto their being brought down into captivity and also unto destruction*

The verb *convincing* is used strangely here in 1 Nephi 14:7, especially with respect to the following prepositional phrase “unto peace and life eternal”. One could convince someone “unto peace”, but convincing someone “unto life eternal” seems unlikely (except indirectly). David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that one can semantically supply some resultive connection between the object pronoun *them*, on the one hand, and *peace* and *life eternal*, on the other hand, as if the sentence read “to the convincing of them **insomuch that they are brought** unto peace and life eternal” (in other words, they would be convinced to accept peace and life eternal). There is no other instance in the text where the verb *convince* is used like it is here in 1 Nephi 14:7. All the other instances of *convince* follow the normal patterns that we expect of this verb. In the following description of the various patterns, X stands for a person, Y for something, and S for a clause; for each pattern I supply one example:

□ *active mood*

to convince X of Y (10 times)

“to the convincing them of my word” (2 Nephi 3:11)

to convince X that S (4 times)

“concerning the convincing of the Jews that Jesus is the very Christ” (2 Nephi 26:12)

to convince X (1 time)

“to the convincing them” (Helaman 5:19)

to convince [used as a present-participial adjective] (1 time)

“and also because of the convincing power of God” (3 Nephi 28:29)

□ *passive mood / past participial adjective*

X to be convinced of Y (8 times)

“for he was convinced more and more of the power of God” (Alma 12:7)

X to be convinced that S (5 times)

“that the Gentiles be convinced also that Jesus is the Christ” (2 Nephi 26:12)

X to be convinced concerning Y (1 time)

“that his people might be convinced concerning the wicked traditions of their fathers” (Alma 23:3)

X to be convinced, agent specified (1 time)

“the more part of the Lamanites were convinced of them” (Helaman 5:50)

X to be convinced, no agent specified (1 time)

“and as many as were convinced did lay down their weapons of war” (Helaman 5:51)

None of these are semantically unusual in any way, nor do they require the reader to provide any kind of extra semantic connection.

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 21 December 2004) suggests that *convincing* here in 1 Nephi 14:7 may be an error for *consigning*, with the meaning ‘to hand over or to deliver’. And the context here can be interpreted as agreeing with definition 7 of the verb *consign* in the Oxford English Dictionary: ‘to deliver formally or commit, to a state or fate’. The OED provides the following example from the early 1700s that refers to the final state after this life (original accidentals retained):

Matthew Prior (1718)

When this vital breath Ceasing,
consigns me o’er to rest and death.

There are also examples from the 1800s where *consign* is used to refer to death:

William Prescott (1846)

Their desponding imaginations had already consigned him to a watery grave.

Elisha Kane (1856)

The last chapter from Job which has consigned so many to their last resting-place.

In the Book of Mormon text, the verb *consign* itself refers only to a negative consignment (or consignation):

Mosiah 3:25	they are consigned to an awful view of their own guilt and abominations
Alma 9:11	we should unavoidably have been cut off . . . and perhaps been consigned to a state of endless misery and woe
Alma 26:19	O then why did he not consign us to an awful destruction
Alma 28:11	they are consigned to a state of endless woe
Alma 40:26	but they are cast out and consigned to partake of the fruits of their labors or their works which have been evil
Alma 42:1	that the sinner should be consigned to a state of misery
Alma 42:14	the justice of God which consigned them forever to be cut off from his presence
Alma 50:22	whilst thousands of their wicked brethren have been consigned to bondage
Helaman 12:26	yea which shall be consigned to a state of endless misery

In two places we get a choice between something positive and negative, although here we have the noun *consignation* rather than the verb *consign*:

Alma 40:15 and their consignation to happiness or misery

Alma 40:17 and their consignation to happiness or misery

But there are no examples in the Book of Mormon text where *consign* or *consignation* is used to refer only to a positive consignment. Another difference worth noting is that the preposition used with *consign* and *consignment* is consistently *to*, not *unto*, although one could argue that *unto* is an archaic alternative to *to* and therefore possible. In any event, the proposed emendation “to the consigning of them unto peace and life eternal” will work, although not perfectly.

The original manuscript is not extant here, but the word *consigning* could have been misread as *convincing* when copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , especially if scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had written the word without the *g*, as *consining*, or (as Ross Geddes points out, personal communication, 4 January 2005) if the word had been spelled with a silent *e*, as *consineing*. There are no extant examples of *consign* being spelled as *consine* in the manuscripts (or printed editions, for that matter). But as one might suspect, *consine* as a misspelling of *consign* is fairly frequent on <www.google.com>, as in “will they be **consined** to a place hotter than this”. Moreover, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} ’s spelling is fairly transparent in its nonstandardness, with examples such as *Pharro* ‘Pharaoh’, *terable* ‘terrible’, *rath* ‘wrath’, *shurely* ‘surely’, *masiah* ‘Messiah’, and *Isauh* ‘Isaiah’. In addition, this scribe tends to write in the silent *e* before a suffix, as in *engraveings*, *believeing*, *restoration*, and *desireable*. Thus a transparent spelling like *consineing* is quite possible, perhaps even likely, for scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} . (All extant instances of the verb *consign* were correctly spelled by Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , who were considerably better spellers than scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} .)

Here in 1 Nephi 14:7, the word form *convincing* could have intruded since that form occurred a little more than a manuscript page earlier in the text:

1 Nephi 13:39

and after it had come forth unto them / I beheld other books
which came forth by the power of the Lamb from the Gentiles unto them
unto the **convincing** of the Gentiles and the remnant of the seed of my brethren . . .
that the records of the prophets and of the twelve apostles of the Lamb are true

The word *convince* is more frequent in the text, so such an error in copying is quite possible.

Despite these arguments for emending *convincing* to *consigning* here in 1 Nephi 14:7, the earliest extant reading with *convincing* will work, even though it is unusual. The either-or choice here in 1 Nephi 14:7 can be interpreted as referring to making up one’s mind, either by being convinced (and thus accepting peace and life eternal) or by refusing to change one’s mind (and thus allowing oneself to be taken captive by the devil). The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading in 1 Nephi 14:7 (“either to the **convincing** of them unto peace and life eternal or unto the deliverance of them to the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds”).

Don Brugger also notes (personal communication) that there is some interesting variation in this passage in the use of the prepositions *to* and *unto*, especially in the second case of *either-or*:

1 Nephi 14:7

either on the one hand or on the second
either **to** the convincing of them unto peace and life eternal
or **unto** the deliverance of them
to the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds

Brugger points out that we expect the same preposition after *either* and *or*. One could argue that the *unto* before “the deliverance of them” is an error based on the nearby *unto* before “unto peace and life eternal”, that an original *to* was accidentally changed to *unto*. In fact, one could increase the parallelism even further by changing the *to* to *unto* before “the hardness of their hearts”, thus ending up with the following emended text:

1 Nephi 14:7 (as emended to increase the parallelism)

either **to** the convincing of them
unto peace and life eternal
or **to** the deliverance of them
unto the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds

Nonetheless, there is evidence that the English language allows expressions of the form “(either) **to** X or **unto** Y” (that is, where prepositional parallelism is not fully maintained in *or*-constructions), as in these examples (courtesy of Don Brugger) found on <www.google.com> (cited here without punctuation and capitalization):

1 Peter 2:13–14 (the 1611 King James Bible)

submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake
whether it be **to** the king as supreme
or **unto** governors as unto them that are sent by him

Henry Vane (1656)

and this without the least cause of jealousy or unsafety
either **to** the standing army or any member thereof
or **unto** the good people adhering to this cause

George Prevost (1851)

I mean that what we may suffer unjustly from any one
it tells either **to** the doing away of our sins
God so putting that wrong to our account
or **unto** the recompense of rewards

Thus the expression “either to X . . . or unto Y” is possible, and the occurrence in 1 Nephi 14:7 of *unto* before “the deliverance of them” can be retained.

Summary: Maintain the earliest extant reading in 1 Nephi 14:7, the reading in \mathcal{P} : “to the **convincing** of them unto peace and life eternal”; it is possible that *convincing* is an error for *consigning*, but *convincing* will work; also maintain the use of the preposition *unto* before “the deliverance of them”.

1 Nephi 14:8, page 305

At the top of this page, I list four examples where the associated verb for *thou* had a zero ending rather than the expected inflectional ending *-(e)st*. To each of the examples listed there, the printed editions have eventually ended up adding *-est* or *-st*. To that list we should add one more example, namely, *thou beheld*, which has never been emended to *thou beheldest*:

1 Nephi 14:23
 and behold they are written in the book
 which **thou beheld** proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew

ℙ reads *thou beheld* (as do all the printed editions), but ℑ is not extant. Yet there is a possibility that the earliest extant reading, *thou beheld*, is an error for either *thou beheldest* or *thou hast beheld*. For discussion of these alternative readings, see the following addendum under 1 Nephi 14:23.

1 Nephi 14:13, page 308

Here I refer the reader to the write-up under 3 Nephi 8:20 for a complete discussion of the occurrences of *all* within the phrase “the face of the earth/land”. That discussion, it turns out, is basically a statistical listing of the possibilities and can be found under Helaman 14:20 (for “the face of the land”) and under Helaman 14:21 (for “the face of the earth”).

■ 1 Nephi 14:23 (to be inserted on page 309 in part 1)

*and behold they are written in the book
 which **thou beheld** proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew*

The earliest reading with *thou beheld* is possible here since, as noted in the original discussion under 1 Nephi 14:8 (on pages 304–305 in part 1), there are several examples in the earliest text where the past-tense form of the verb lacks the second person singular ending, as in “which **thou received** thy first message” (Alma 8:15), “when **thou had** it in thy heart” (Alma 11:25), and “thus **did thou** manifest thyself” (Ether 12:31). Thus “which **thou beheld** proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew” here in 1 Nephi 14:23 is clearly possible.

However, there are two other possibilities. First of all, the original text may have read “which **thou hast beheld** proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew”. ℑ is not extant for this portion of the sentence and could have read that way, in which case the perfect auxiliary *hast* was lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from ℑ into ℙ. Or perhaps scribe 2 of ℑ, the presumed scribe in ℑ, accidentally omitted the *hast* during the dictation of the text. Moreover, there is textual evidence for the occasional omission of the perfect auxiliary. Although there are no clear cases of loss of *hast* elsewhere in the text, there are some cases where Oliver Cowdery omitted the past-tense perfect auxiliary *had* (listed under Helaman 16:1). And there is one case where he momentarily omitted the present-tense perfect auxiliary *have* in ℙ:

Mosiah 2:27
 even so I at this time
 [NULL > *have* 1 | *have* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] caused
 that ye should assemble yourselves together

For another case where Oliver initially omitted the *have*, but correctly, see under Mosiah 16:7. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} also omitted the perfect auxiliary *have* at least once:

Mormon 3:13
 and thrice have I delivered them out of the hands of their enemies
 and they [$\S 2$ NULL $>+$ $\S 1$ *have* 1 | *have* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 repented not of their sins

For one more case where scribe 2 may have made that error in \mathcal{P} (or possibly the scribe in \mathcal{C} had earlier omitted the *have*), see under Mosiah 29:18–19.

Usage throughout Nephi’s vision of the tree of life supports *thou hast beheld* as the original reading in 1 Nephi 14:23:

1 Nephi 11:7 after **thou hast beheld** the tree which bare the fruit . . .
 1 Nephi 13:24 **thou hast beheld** that the book proceeded forth
 from the mouth of a Jew
 1 Nephi 14:5 **thou hast beheld** that if the Gentiles repent / it shall be well with them

Especially note the partial parallelism between 1 Nephi 13:24 and 1 Nephi 14:23, which we can take as additional support for emending 1 Nephi 14:23 to read “which thou **hast** beheld”:

<p>1 Nephi 13:24</p> <p>→ thou hast beheld that the book proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew</p>	<p>1 Nephi 14:23 (earliest text)</p> <p>they are written in the book → which thou beheld proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew</p>
---	--

Further support for *thou hast beheld* can be found in the beginning of 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 2:3 for **thou hast beheld** that in the fullness of time
 he cometh to bring salvation unto men
 2 Nephi 2:4 and **thou hast beheld** in thy youth his glory

In contrast to these cases, there is secondary evidence in favor of *thou beheldest* as the original reading in 1 Nephi 14:23, namely, from three cases in Jacob 5 where there has been textual variation between *thou beholdest* and *thou beheldest*:

Jacob 5:37
 thou [*beholdest* 1 | *beholdest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that it beginneth to perish

Jacob 5:44
 and thou [*beholdest* $>+$ *beheldest* 1 | *beheldest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that I also cut down that which cumbered this spot of ground

Jacob 5:45
 and thou [*beholdest* $>+$ *beheldest* 1 | *beheldest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that a part thereof brought forth good fruit

The original reading for those three cases is apparently the present-tense *thou beholdest* rather than the past-tense *thou beheldest* (for discussion, see under Jacob 5:37 and under Jacob 5:44–45).

Even so, *thou beheldest* is textually possible for these readings in Jacob 5 as well as here in 1 Nephi 14:23.

Thus we can find support for all three possible readings in 1 Nephi 14:23, the earliest *thou beheld* and the two conjectured readings, *thou hast beheld* and *thou beheldest*. Since the earliest reading will work, at least textually, the critical text will maintain it, but with the understanding that it could be an error.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 14:23 *thou beheld*, the earliest reading (and, in fact, the reading of all the extant textual sources), even though this could be an early error for either *thou hast beheld* or *thou beheldest*.

1 Nephi 15:11, page 317, line -6

The correction in \mathcal{P} of *thing* to *things* in Alma 7:17 was made with somewhat heavier ink flow; thus the variant should read as follows:

[*thing* >+ *things* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 15:20, page 322

There are two instances in \mathcal{C} where Oliver Cowdery started to write *so many* as one word, but in each case he immediately caught his error before completing *somany* and ended up writing the correct *so many*; the transcription for \mathcal{C} reads as follows for these two cases:

Alma 34:30 (<s)oma(-)> so many witnesses
Alma 51:27 so<%m(-)%> many(-) Cities

Here in 1 Nephi 15:20 it was Oliver, as he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , who misread scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} 's *somany* as simply *many*.

1 Nephi 15:35, page 332, line -6

The second line in the citation for Alma 28:14 should read as follows:

of [*man* > *men* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] men

Here in \mathcal{C} , Oliver Cowdery initially tried to correct *man* to *men*, then crossed out the word and wrote the correct *men* inline; thus the correction in this case was immediate.

1 Nephi 17:1, page 348, line 8

The word *paraphrastic* should read *periphrastic*.

1 Nephi 17:7, page 352, line -15

The second line for this citation of Alma 50:32 should read as follows:

[*or* > *of* >%? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Bountiful . . .

The discussion under Alma 50:32 explains how this variant in \mathcal{C} should be interpreted.

1 Nephi 17:7, page 352, line -13

The name here in this citation of Alma 52:15 should be *Moroni* rather than *Teancum*, thus “Moroni . . . had began his march”.

1 Nephi 17:31, page 364

More accurately, the second half of the paragraph at the bottom of the page should read as follows:

In the earliest text, there are 78 occurrences of “save it were”. For one of these cases (in Mosiah 6:2), the current text follows the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “except it were”, but initially \mathcal{P} read “save it were”. For that case, the critical text accepts the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} as the original (for discussion, see under Mosiah 6:2).

1 Nephi 17:31, page 365, line 5

According to the emendation accepted for Alma 17:38, the phrase “with the sword” should be inserted immediately after “but he slew none”; that is, the proposed line reads in the original text as “but he slew none with the sword save it were their leader”. See the discussion under that passage.

■ **1 Nephi 17:45** (to be inserted at the bottom of page 371 in part 1)

*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*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 6 June 2006) suggests that there may be a primitive error here (the text is fully extant in \mathcal{C})—namely, the word *about* seems to be missing after *were*; that is, the text should read “as if it were **about** to divide asunder”. Usage elsewhere supports the occurrence of *about* in this expression:

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 walls did tremble again and the earth shook
as if it were **about** to divide asunder

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

Notice that the last two passages use the same basic language as here in 1 Nephi 17:45.

There isn’t much evidence for the omission of *about* in the history of the text. According to my original analysis (and in agreement with Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition), *about* was accidentally omitted in only one place:

Jacob 5:47

and I have digged [0A | NULL >js *about* 1 | *about* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it
and I have pruned it and I have dunged it

However, subsequent information has led me to revise my analysis here and restore the earliest reading, namely, without the *about* (that is, “and I have digged it”). For discussion of this point, see the addendum under Jacob 5:47 (in this last part of volume 4).

Ultimately, there is nothing particularly wrong with the current reading here in 1 Nephi 17:45. Although *about* may be missing here, it is not necessary, and therefore the critical text will maintain the current reading in 1 Nephi 17:45.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 17:45 the reading without *about* (“as if it were to divide asunder”), although there is a possibility that the word was originally there.

■ 1 Nephi 17:46, page 373

*yea and ye know that by his word he can cause
[that 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rough places
[0A | NULL >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be made smooth
and smooth places shall be broken up*

In this write-up, I proposed that the modal verb *shall* was lost early on in the transmission of the text, that an original “he can cause that rough places **shall** be made smooth” was written down in \mathcal{O} as “he can cause that rough places be made smooth” (that is, as a subjunctive *that*-clause). The main evidence for this emendation is the consistency of the text: elsewhere there are 135 instances of the verb *cause* taking a *that*-clause as complement, and in each of those cases the verb in the *that*-clause is a modal, usually *should* (121 times) but *shall* also occurs (11 times). In fact, that modal shows up in the following conjoined clause, “and smooth places **shall** be broken up”.

Despite this argument from consistency in the text, there is evidence in favor of the earlier reading here in 1 Nephi 17:46. Brent Kerby points out (personal communication, 28 April 2009) that a subjunctive *that*-clause for the verb *cause* does occur in the King James Bible:

Colossians 4:16
and when this epistle is read among you
cause that it **be** read also in the church of the Laodiceans
and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea

Kerby also argues that there are other verbs in the Book of Mormon that can take *that*-clauses in the subjunctive, including the possibility of having a conjoined clause that takes a modal verb:

Mosiah 29:32
but I desire that this land **be** a land of liberty
and every man **may** enjoy his rights and privileges alike

More generally, a conjunctive subordinate clause can begin with a subjunctive verb form and then be followed by a verb form in the indicative:

3 Nephi 18:15 (in a *lest*-clause)
ye must watch and pray always
lest ye **be** tempted by the devil
and ye **are** led away captive by him

3 Nephi 27:11 (in an *if*-clause)

but if it **be** not built upon my gospel

and **is** built upon the works of men or upon the works of the devil . . .

(For additional examples of such mixtures of mood in conjunctive subordinate clauses, see under Moroni 7:44.) Examples like these argue that the earliest reading in 1 Nephi 17:46, although unusual, is possible. The critical text will therefore revert to the earliest reading here and accept it as the original reading. (As already discussed, Joseph Smith's emendation for the 1837 edition, "he can cause rough places to be made smooth", is unnecessary.)

Summary: Reverse the decision to emend 1 Nephi 17:46 by adding the modal verb *shall*; the earliest reading ("he can cause that rough places be made smooth") is possible and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

1 Nephi 17:46, page 373, line -8

As explained in the preceding addendum, the *shall* after *rough places* should be removed, giving for this second line in the citation the following:

that [01A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rough places be made smooth

As indicated here, the subordinate conjunction *that* should also be moved down to the beginning of this second line.

[1] Nephi 19:10, page 403, line -10

The chapter and verse heading should, of course, read "1 Nephi 19:10" rather than without the number 1 (as "Nephi 19:10").

[1] Nephi 19:10, page 405, line 6

Change "the first repetition of *God*" to "the first repetition of *the God*".

■ **1 Nephi 19:16** (to be inserted in the middle of page 416 in part 1)

*yea and all the people which are of the house of Israel
will I gather in—saith the Lord—
according to the words of the prophet Zenos
from the four **quarters** of the earth*

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that we should consider the possibility that the word *quarters* in the phrase "the four **quarters** of the earth" (here and elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text) is an error for "the four **corners** of the earth". In nearly every case, the Book of Mormon text has *quarters* for this phrase, here in 1 Nephi 19:16 as well as in the following instances:

1 Nephi 22:25

and he gathereth his children from the four **quarters** of the earth

3 Nephi 5:24

and as surely as the Lord liveth
will he gather in from the four **quarters** of the earth
all the remnant of the seed of Jacob
which are scattered abroad upon all the face of the earth

3 Nephi 5:26

and then shall they be gathered in from the four **quarters** of the earth
unto their own lands from whence they have been dispersed

3 Nephi 16:5

and then will I gather them in from the four **quarters** of the earth

Ether 13:11

and they are they which were scattered
and gathered in from the four **quarters** of the earth

The two instances of *quarters* in 1 Nephi are extant in \mathcal{O} . For the three cases in 3 Nephi, \mathcal{O} is not extant, but for that part of the text both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} and agree; so in those three cases \mathcal{O} undoubtedly read as *quarters*. The instance in Ether is not extant in \mathcal{O} , but probably read *quarters* (the reading in \mathcal{P}) since there is no actual evidence of mix-ups between *quarter(s)* and *corner(s)* in the manuscripts (or in the editions, for that matter). We can assume that if these instances of *quarters* are errors for *corners*, they would have occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

There is, however, one instance of *corners* in the Book of Mormon text, and this is found in the long Isaiah quotation in 2 Nephi 12–24:

2 Nephi 21:12 (Isaiah 11:12 reads *corners*)

and he shall set up an ensign for the nations
and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel
and gather together the dispersed of Judah
from the four **corners** of the earth

One could argue that all the other passages are indirectly referring to Isaiah 11:12 and therefore *quarters* could be an error for *corners*. But one problem we need to solve here is why Oliver Cowdery was able to get *corners* in the one case when Isaiah 11:12 was directly quoted (namely, in 2 Nephi 21:12). There is no evidence that Oliver ever referred to a King James Bible when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation—nor did he refer to one when he copied \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} or when he proofed the text of \mathcal{P} (but there is evidence that John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, did reference a King James Bible when he set the type for the Isaiah quotations). The fact that Isaiah 11:12 was correctly copied as *corners* suggests that Oliver did not otherwise mishear *corners* as *quarters*. Rather, it implies that *quarters* is indeed correct in all the other Book of Mormon passages where Isaiah 11:12 is not directly quoted.

Most important, there is one occurrence of the phrase “the four **quarters** of the earth” in the King James Bible:

Revelation 20:7–8

and when the thousand years are expired
Satan shall be loosed out of his prison
and shall go out to deceive the nations
which are in the four **quarters** of the earth
Gog and Magog
to gather them together to battle

In the Greek, the phrase “the four quarters of the earth” actually reads “the four corners of the earth”. Elsewhere, the King James Bible systematically translated this phrase as “the four corners of the earth/land”; besides Isaiah 11:12, there is Ezekiel 7:2 and one more in Revelation:

Ezekiel 7:2

an end / the end is come upon the four **corners** of the land

Revelation 7:1

and after these things
I saw four angels standing on the four **corners** of the earth
holding the four winds of the earth

In other words, Revelation 20:8 should have been translated more literally as “the four **corners** of the earth” in the King James Bible, but it was not. This difference in translation of the same Greek phrase in Revelation originated with William Tyndale’s 1526 (and 1534) translations of the New Testament. Earlier, John Wycliffe’s 1388 New Testament translated both instances in Revelation as “(the) four corners of the earth”, as do all modern translations. Thus Tyndale is responsible for the biblical variation.

This variation between *corners* and *quarters* is also found in the Book of Mormon, except the distribution is reversed! There is only one occurrence of “the four corners of the earth”, while others read “the four quarters of the earth”. There is no substantive evidence that the predominate use in the Book of Mormon text of “the four quarters of the earth” is an error. The critical text will maintain the general use of *quarters* in this phrase except for the occurrence of *corners* in 2 Nephi 21:12 (which quotes Isaiah 11:12).

There is one more case where the Book of Mormon text does not use *quarters* for this expression; yet this too is a case where the passage refers to the gathering in of the dispersed of Israel:

2 Nephi 10:8

and it shall come to pass that they shall be gathered in from their long dispersion
from the isles of the sea and from the four **parts** of the earth

This example provides further evidence that variation is possible for this expression. Thus we end up with examples of *quarters*, *corners*, and *parts* in referring to the gathering of Israel from all over the world. And as Don Brugger points out (personal communication), there are also examples referring to the gathering that use the phrase “the ends of the earth” (but this phrase occurs without the number *four*).

Summary: Maintain the distinction between “the four **quarters** of the earth” and “the four **corners** of the earth” in the Book of Mormon text; in each case, we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources; there is also one example of “the four **parts** of the earth”.

■ **1 Nephi 20:17** (to be inserted as the first write-up for 1 Nephi 20:17 on page 436 in part 1)

*and thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer / the Holy One of Israel
I have sent him
[01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord thy God
which teacheth thee to profit
which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go
hath done it*

Kendall Hyde (personal communication, 9 February 2008) suggests that there should be a period after “I have sent him”, not a comma, so that the following text forms a complete sentence (that is, “the Lord thy God . . . hath done it”):

1 Nephi 20:17 (with revised accidentals)
I have sent him.
The Lord thy God,
which teacheth thee to profit,
which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go,
hath done it.

This seems to be right. When we compare the corresponding King James passage, we see that the Book of Mormon initial predicate “have sent him” and the final predicate “hath done it” are lacking in the biblical text; instead the King James version adds an italicized *am* in order to make a complete sentence:

<p><i>1 Nephi 20:17</i></p> <p>I have sent him the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go hath done it</p>	<p><i>Isaiah 48:17</i></p> <p>I <i>am</i> the LORD thy God which teacheth thee to profit which leadeth thee by the way <i>that</i> thou shouldst go</p>
---	---

Hyde’s proposed emendation in punctuation was made earlier in Grant Hardy’s *The Book of Mormon: A Reader’s Edition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2003).

Summary: Revise the punctuation in 1 Nephi 20:17 so that there are two complete finite clauses separated by a period or a semicolon.

■ **1 Nephi 22:21** (to be inserted at the top of page 468 in part 1)

*wherefore he shall execute
[judgment 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | justice > Judgment 1]
in righteousness*

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that here the preposition *in* could be an error for *and* (thus “he shall execute judgment **and** righteousness”). ☺ is extant here, which means that such an error, if it is one, would have entered the text as Oliver Cowdery took down

Joseph Smith's dictation, mishearing *and* as *in*. Support for the reading "judgment and righteousness" can be found throughout the King James Bible, with nine occurrences of *judgment* and *righteousness* conjoined by the conjunction *and* (here I mark with an asterisk each case where the verb is *execute*):

Psalm 33:5	he loveth righteousness and judgment
Psalm 97:2	righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne
* Psalm 99:4	thou executest judgment and righteousness in Jacob
* Psalm 103:6	the LORD executeth righteousness and judgment for all that are oppressed
Proverbs 2:9	then shalt thou understand righteousness and judgment and equity
Isaiah 33:5	he hath filled Zion with judgment and righteousness
Jeremiah 9:24	I <i>am</i> the LORD which exercise loving-kindness judgment and righteousness
* Jeremiah 22:3	execute ye judgment and righteousness
* Jeremiah 33:15	and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land

Secondary support for *and* is provided by examples where a preposition is repeated:

Jeremiah 4:2	the LORD liveth in truth in judgment and in righteousness
Hosea 2:19	yea I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment and in loving-kindness and in mercies
John 16:8	he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment

On the other hand, the Book of Mormon supports only "judgment **in** righteousness"; besides the case in 1 Nephi 22:21, we have four instances in the book of Ether, of which all four have the verb *execute*:

Ether 7:1	Orihah did execute judgment upon the land in righteousness all his days
Ether 7:11	he did execute judgment in righteousness
Ether 7:27	he did execute judgment in righteousness all his days
Ether 9:21	and Emer did execute judgment in righteousness all his days

Moreover, there is no independent support in the original manuscript for the scribes ever mixing up *in* and *and*, although there is evidence for *an* being misheard as *and*:

1 Nephi 13:29 (<i>an</i> misheard as <i>and</i>)	and because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb [& 0 & > <i>an</i> 1 <i>an</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] exceeding great many do stumble
Ether 13:5 (<i>an</i> misheard as <i>and</i>)	it should be built up again [& 1 <i>a</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] holy city unto the Lord

The evidence in the Book of Mormon is not strong enough to emend 1 Nephi 22:21 to read "judgment **and** righteousness" in place of "judgment **in** righteousness".

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 22:21 the reading “he shall execute judgment **in** righteousness”, the reading of the original manuscript; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon supports the use of *in*, not *and*, between *judgment* and *righteousness*.

2 Nephi 1:20, page 484

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery changed both instances of *his* to *my* in an attempt to make the second part of the verse agree with the *my* used in the first part. Examination of the ultraviolet photographs of \mathcal{C} shows that the supralinearly inserted *my* is in each case written with somewhat heavier ink flow (and the crossout of the *his* is in each case distinctly heavier). This difference in ink flow supports the original analysis that these two instances of *my* are secondary. Thus the variant specifications will be revised so that the citation will read as follows:

but inasmuch as ye will not
[NULL > *keep his commandments* >+ *keep my commandments* 0 |
keep my commandments 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ye shall be cut off from [*his* >+ *my* 0 | *my* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *presence*

2 Nephi 1:27, page 492, line -12

Here the object form *him* should be restored (rather than maintained) since the current text has *he* rather than *him*.

2 Nephi 2:10, page 493, line 9

Revise the summary to read “Maintain or restore, as the case may be, the extended use of *-eth* in the third person plural”.

■ **2 Nephi 2:10** (to be inserted in the middle of page 493 in part 1)

wherefore the ends of the law
which the Holy One hath given unto the inflicting
of the punishment which is affixed
which punishment that is affixed
is in opposition to that of the happiness which is affixed
to answer the ends of the atonement

Paul Hoskisson (personal communication, 30 June 2004) has suggested a dittography in this passage, marked above in bold. The current reading produces a sentence fragment (discussed separately under 2 Nephi 2:10–11 in part 1); but if “which punishment that is affixed” is removed, Hoskisson points out, we get a completed sentence:

2 Nephi 2:10 (suggested emendation)
wherefore the ends of the law
which the Holy One hath given
unto the inflicting of the punishment which is affixed
is in opposition to that of the happiness which is affixed
to answer the ends of the atonement

The problem with removing this proposed dittography is that it is not a full dittography. Note that there are two differences in the phraseology: *the* versus *which*, and *which* versus *that*. Moreover, the earliest extant text shows similar instances of repetitiveness, as in the following examples where the repetition has been eliminated in varying ways from the standard text:

1 Nephi 8:7

and it came to pass that **as I followed him**
and after I had followed him
I beheld myself that I was in a dark and dreary waste

1 Nephi 13:37

yea whoso shall publish peace
that shall publish tidings of great joy
how beautiful upon the mountains shall they be

1 Nephi 14:1–2

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 in very deed
unto the taking away of their stumbling blocks
if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb
and if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb of God
they shall be numbered among the seed of thy father

All of these instances of repetitiveness were removed by Joseph Smith in his early editing for the 1837 edition; see under each passage for how Joseph specifically removed the repetition. But in most of his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph left similar instances of repetitiveness unchanged, as here in 2 Nephi 2:10 and these two examples from 1 Nephi 13:

1 Nephi 13:24

thou hast beheld that the book **proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew**
and when it **proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew**
it contained the fullness of the gospel of the Lamb

1 Nephi 13:29

and after that these plain and precious things were taken away
it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles
and after **it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles**
yea even across the many waters which thou hast seen . . .

The critical text will accept the original repetitiveness in 2 Nephi 2:10 and elsewhere.

Summary: Maintain or restore, as the case may be, instances of clausal repetitiveness in the original text; such usage is quite common in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **2 Nephi 2:22**, pages 507–509

*and all things which were created
must have remained in the same state
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | in RT] which they were
after that they were created*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition supplied the preposition *in* at the beginning of the relative clause “which they were” (giving “in the same state **in** which they were”). Originally, I proposed that this preposition *in* should have been placed at the end of that relative clause (giving “in the same state which they were **in**”). I argued under 2 Nephi 2:22 that usage elsewhere in the text supported that emendation.

Later I discovered that a relative clause could lack its expected preposition if that preposition occurred in an immediately preceding prepositional phrase (thus “**in** the same state which they were”). Under Helaman 13:22, I have listed two other instances of this kind of construction in the earliest text:

Helaman 13:22	in the things which he hath blessed you
Ether 13:15	in that same year which he was cast out from among the people

The critical text will therefore restore the earliest text here in 2 Nephi 2:22, “**in** the same state which they were”.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 2:22 the earliest reading without any preposition for the relative clause “which they were” since there is an immediately preceding prepositional phrase, “in the same state”, headed by the expected preposition, *in*.

2 Nephi 3:14, page 517, line -4

The critical text has adopted *desolate* rather than *desolates* in 3 Nephi 4:1 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **2 Nephi 3:17** (to be inserted in the middle of page 518 in part 1)

*and the Lord hath said
I will raise up a Moses
and I will give power unto him in a rod*

Nathan Arp has suggested (personal communication, 18 January 2006) that the occurrence in this verse of the indefinite article *a* before *Moses* is an error. It is possible that during the early transmission of the text an intrusive *a* was added before *Moses*, perhaps under the influence of the *a* in the following clause: “and I will give power unto him in **a** rod”. Another possibility is that previous references in this chapter to “a seer” and “a choice seer” (see verses 6, 7, and 11) led the scribe to accidentally write *a Moses*. In the Book of Mormon proper names are not otherwise used generically (as in “he’s an Einstein” or “she was another Shakespeare”, as we might say in modern English).

Here in verse 17, the text is specifically referring to Moses the prophet; *Moses* is not being used as a generic noun. Note that the preceding text has already referred to Moses, so there is no need for *a Moses*:

2 Nephi 3:9–10

and he shall be great like unto **Moses**
whom I have said I would raise up unto you
to deliver my people O house of Israel
and **Moses** will I raise up
to deliver thy people out of the land of Egypt

2 Nephi 3:16

I am sure of this thing
even as I am sure of the promise of **Moses**

Note especially that *a Moses* does not occur in verse 10 (that is, as “and **a Moses** will I raise up”), even though that phrase says the same thing as “I will raise up (a) Moses” here in verse 17:

2 Nephi 3:17 (with *a Moses* emended to *Moses*)

and the Lord hath said
I will raise up **Moses**
and I will give power unto him in a rod
and I will give judgment unto him in writing
yet I will not loose his tongue that he shall speak much
for I will not make him mighty in speaking
but I will write unto him my law by the finger of mine own hand
and I will make one a spokesman for him

But after verse 17, the text refers to the other seer that the Lord will raise up:

2 Nephi 3:18

and the Lord said unto me also
I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins
and I will make for him a spokesman
and I behold I will give unto him
that he shall write the writing of the fruit of thy loins
unto the fruit of thy loins
and the spokesman of thy loins shall declare it

(This last passage has been emended in the second line to read “I will raise up **one**”; see the discussion under 2 Nephi 3:18 in part 1.) The phraseology *a Moses* could be used to refer to this other seer, but in verse 17 the text is still referring to Moses proper.

There is one case in \mathcal{P} where Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the indefinite article, namely, before *God* in the book of Alma:

Alma 30:51

art thou convinced of the power
of [*gd* >% NULL 0 | *a* 1ABDE | CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God

In this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *God* as *gd* in \mathcal{C} ; the lowercase *g* was in error, plus the *o* vowel was missing. So Oliver erased the *gd* and then wrote the correct *God* inline. But when he came to copying the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} (some six months later), Oliver misread his erased *gd* as the indefinite article *a*. Consequently, \mathcal{P} and most of the early editions (1830, 1837, 1841, and 1849) had the incorrect reading *a God*. The 1840 edition (and the 1852 LDS edition) removed the

intrusive *a* here. So *a* can intrude, although there are no instances where *a* was added before a personal name except possibly here in 2 Nephi 3:17.

The critical text will accept the emendation *Moses* here since it works so much better, although there is not much evidence for the accidental insertion of *a* before names in the history of the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 3:17 to read *Moses* rather than *a Moses*; *Moses* has already been identified by name, and the text here is referring to *Moses* himself, not to someone else that could be considered another *Moses*.

2 Nephi 3:18, page 520

To the list of ambiguous cases regarding the placement of *also*, a third case should be added here, namely, Alma 42:15–16. As with these other cases, the evidence argues that the *also* ends the preceding clause. For discussion, see under that passage in Alma.

2 Nephi 3:18, pages 521–527

As discussed in the nearby addendum under 2 Nephi 3:17, the indefinite article *a* before *Moses* in 2 Nephi 3:17 will be removed. This means that throughout this long write-up for 2 Nephi 3:18, the *a* should be removed from before *Moses* in every citation of 2 Nephi 3:17 that has this extra *a*; in addition, the discussion regarding *a Moses* in the first full paragraph on page 524 has been superseded by the discussion in the addendum discussed above.

■ **2 Nephi 3:18** (to be inserted on page 527 in part 1)

and the Lord said unto me also

I will raise up unto [the 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | thee GHK] fruit of thy loins

and I will make for him a spokesman

In my discussion of this passage on pages 521–527, I argued that the original text had the indefinite pronoun *one*, so that the second line cited here actually read “I will raise up **one** unto the fruit of thy loins”. As part of that discussion, I should have noted one particular textual variant that entered the 1858 Wright edition and was repeated in the first two RLDS editions (in 1874 and 1892), namely, the replacement of the indefinite article *the* with the object pronoun *thee*. Although this change was very likely a typo introduced into the text by the 1858 typesetter, it is interesting that this reading provided a direct object for the clause, namely, the nonspecific “fruit of thy loins”—as if the text read “I will raise up fruit of thy loins unto thee”. Of course, the 1858 reading is rather bizarre, and the 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier reading to the RLDS text (but without the conjectured *one*, of course). Elsewhere in 2 Nephi 3 there are 18 instances of “fruit of one’s loins”, and all 18 are preceded by *the*; there is also one example in Jacob 2:25, and it too is preceded by *the* (“the fruit of the loins of Joseph”). The 1858 introduction of *thee* here in 2 Nephi 3:18 is clearly secondary and quite impossible textually.

Summary: Maintain the original definite article *the* in the phrase “**the** fruit of thy loins” in 2 Nephi 3:18 and elsewhere.

■ 2 Nephi 3:18 (to be inserted on page 527 in part 1)

*and I behold I will give unto him
that he shall write the writing of the fruit of thy loins
unto the fruit of thy loins*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 11 November 2004) suggests that in this verse the phrase *a commandment* may be missing after “I will give unto him”. In accord with usage elsewhere in the text, Geddes notes that we expect some direct object complement in addition to the *that*-clause. Such an emendation, either *a commandment* or perhaps *commandment* alone, could be supported by the following passages in this same chapter:

2 Nephi 3:7
and unto him will I give **commandment**
that he shall do a work for the fruit of thy loins his brethren

2 Nephi 3:8
and I will give unto him **a commandment**
that he shall do none other work
save the work which I shall command him

Elsewhere the text has 14 more instances of “to give (a) commandment” followed by a *that*-clause that describes what that commandment is:

1 Nephi 6:6	I shall give commandment unto my seed that they shall not occupy these plates with things which are not of worth . . .
2 Nephi 2:21	for he gave commandment that all men must repent
2 Nephi 26:30	the Lord God hath given a commandment that all men should have charity
Jacob 1:2	and he gave me Jacob a commandment that I should write upon these plates a few of the things . . .
Jacob 3:5	for they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord which was given unto our father that they should have save it were one wife
Jacob 3:9	a commandment I give unto you . . . that ye revile no more against them
3 Nephi 4:6	Giddianhi gave commandment unto his armies that in this year they should go up to battle against the Nephites
3 Nephi 12:29	I give unto you a commandment that ye suffer none of these things to enter into your heart
3 Nephi 15:14	and not at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell it . . .
3 Nephi 15:15	neither at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell unto them . . .
3 Nephi 18:12	and I give unto you a commandment that ye shall do these things
3 Nephi 18:28	this is the commandment which I give unto you that ye shall not suffer any one knowingly to partake . . .
3 Nephi 23:1	a commandment I give unto you that ye search these things diligently
Ether 3:2	thou hast given us a commandment that we must call upon thee

On the other hand, there are a few examples in the text of “to give unto someone” followed by a *that*-clause but without any specific direct object. In three of these cases, the expression means ‘to allow or empower someone to do something’:

2 Nephi 2:16	the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself
Helaman 14:31	he hath given unto you that ye might know good from evil
Helaman 14:31	and he hath given unto you that ye might choose life or death

And it is this interpretation that works quite appropriately in 2 Nephi 3:18: the Lord gave Joseph Smith the power to obtain the words of the text. The word *commandment* is not necessary here in 2 Nephi 3:18, and the critical text will retain the current reading.

Geddes also suggests that the repetitive “I behold I” is possibly a dittography. There are no other examples of this kind of repetition in the Book of Mormon text. And, in fact, there are two momentary errors in \mathcal{P} that suggest Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally added an extra *I* before *behold I*, either as a misreading of a preceding *and* (which would have been written as an ampersand in the original manuscript) or as the result of a momentary omission of the word *behold*:

Mosiah 15:18	
	[I > & 1 And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold
	I say unto you . . .
Alma 38:8	
	but [I > % NULL 0 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] behold
	I did cry unto him

On the other hand, there is evidence for this usage “I behold I” in the biblical text; we have these five examples in the King James Bible:

Genesis 9:9	and I behold I establish my covenant with you
Exodus 14:17	and I behold I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians
Exodus 31:6	and I behold I have given with him Aholiab
Numbers 3:12	and I behold I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel
Numbers 18:6	and I behold I have taken your brethren the Levites from among the children of Israel

Note that all of these biblical examples have a preceding *and*, as does the example here in 2 Nephi 3:18, which argues that “and I behold I” is correct. The critical text will therefore retain this instance of “I behold I” here in 2 Nephi 3:18, despite its uniqueness in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text in 2 Nephi 3:18 with its initial phraseology “and I behold I” but without the noun *commandment* (or the phrase *a commandment*) after the predicate “will give unto him”.

2 Nephi 3:20, pages 528–529

For one more example where *forth* was initially lost in \mathcal{P} , see under Alma 8:21. In that instance, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the word, but Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

2 Nephi 3:20–21, page 529, between lines 16 and 17

Remove the line of space that divides the citation into two parts.

2 Nephi 3:24, page 530

See under Alma 57:32 for additional examples in the original text of intransitive *raise* in the expression “to raise up in rebellion”.

■ **2 Nephi 4:3** (to be inserted at the top of page 531 in part 1)

*wherefore after my father had made an end of speaking
concerning the prophecies of Joseph
he called the children of Laman
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
his sons and his daughters
and saith unto them . . .*

Grant Hardy, in his 2004 article “Of Punctuation and Parentage” (on pages 2–3 of the FARMS newsletter *Insights* 24/2), argues that here in 2 Nephi 4:3 the verb *called* should be interpreted as meaning ‘named’ and that the comma between “the children of Laman” and “his sons and his daughters” should be removed. In accord with this interpretation, Hardy earlier removed the comma for this verse in *The Book of Mormon: A Reader’s Edition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2003). Hardy argues that Lehi is here adopting Laman’s children as his own children, to replace their rebellious father, Laman. My objection to this interpretation, referred to in a footnote to Hardy’s article, is that the parallel passage in verses 8–9 clearly refers to the children of Lemuel being brought before Lehi rather than being adopted as Lehi’s own (the expression used there is “caused . . . to be brought” rather than one with the potentially ambiguous verb *call*):

2 Nephi 4:8–9

it came to pass that after my father had made an end of speaking
to the sons and daughters of Laman
he caused the sons and daughters of Lemuel to be brought before him
and he spake unto them saying . . .

Note especially that here in 2 Nephi 1–4 Lehi never directly addresses any of his other grandchildren. Lehi hopes that Laman and Lemuel’s children will be righteous and wants to speak to them directly since he has little hope that their fathers will ever teach them the ways of the Lord. He even refers to these children, both Laman’s and Lemuel’s, as “my sons and my daughters” (in verses 3 and 9). Yet even if one considers Lehi as having adopted these grandchildren as his own, the text should avoid interpreting the verb *called* as meaning ‘named’ in 2 Nephi 4:3. The critical text will treat the phrase “his sons and his daughters” as an appositive to the preceding noun phrase, “the children of Laman”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:3 the commas around the appositive noun phrase, “his sons and his daughters”; in accord with the parallel passage in verses 8–9 (where Lemuel’s children are “brought before him”), Lehi is having Laman’s children brought before him in verse 3, not naming them as his adopted children.

2 Nephi 4:5, pages 531–534

The textual variation discussed in these two separate write-ups should be combined, perhaps in a single lemmatized form (where the correction in \mathcal{P} was made by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition):

for behold I know that if ye are brought up
 □ *in the **right** way **that** ye should go* 1*A
 □ *he also being a descendant of Nephi* 1^c BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
ye will not depart from it

As pointed out in my original discussion, the phrase “the right way(s) of the Lord (or God)” occurs four times in the Book of Mormon text. Grant Hardy (personal communication, 27 May 2005) points out that there is a biblical passage that could be referred to in support of the specific phrase “the right ways of the Lord”:

Acts 13:10
 wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord

Hardy has elsewhere argued that here in 2 Nephi 4:5 Joseph Smith removed the word *right* in his editing for the 1837 edition because of the biblical usage without the *right* before *way* in the corresponding famous passage in Proverbs:

<i>Proverbs 22:6</i>	<i>2 Nephi 4:5 (original text)</i>
train up a child	if ye are brought up
in the way he should go	in the right way that ye should go
and when he is old	
he will not depart from it	ye will not depart from it

It is likely that Joseph was influenced by the language in Proverbs when he edited *right* from 2 Nephi 4:5. Notice, in particular, that he not only omitted the adjective *right* but he also deleted the *that*, both of which are lacking in the Proverbs version. Nonetheless, the critical text will restore the earliest extant reading, with the *right* and the *that*. For Hardy’s published comments on this reading, see pages 48–49 of his article on the critical text project, “Scholarship for the Ages”, *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 15/1 (2006): 43–53, 71.

2 Nephi 4:26, page 546

One wonders here if there is any independent manuscript evidence for mix-ups between *men* and *me*. It turns out that there is one example:

2 Nephi 2:21
 and the days of the children
 of [*me* >+ *men* 1 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were prolonged

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *me* instead of the correct *men*. In this instance, *me* is quite impossible. Later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , Oliver corrected his initial *me* to *men* (the ink flow for the inserted *n* is heavier and written somewhat wobbly).

■ 2 Nephi 4:33 (to be inserted at the top of page 547 in part 1)

*wilt thou encircle me **around** in the robe of thy righteousness*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 13 July 2004) suggests that “wilt thou encircle me **around**” should be “wilt thou encircle me **about**”, in accord with usage elsewhere in the text. To be sure, the normal phrase in the Book of Mormon is “encircle about”, with 22 instances (as in 2 Nephi 1:15: “and I am **encircled about** eternally in the arms of his love”). But there is variation. There are, for instance, examples of the phrase “encircle (a)round about”:

Alma 17:33

encircle the flocks round about

Alma 53:4

and thus they did cause the Lamanites to labor

until they had encircled the city of Bountiful

[*around* >% *round* 0 | *round* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] about

with a strong wall of timbers and earth to an exceeding height

There is also one instance of *encircle* without *about* or *(a)round*:

Alma 34:16

and thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice

and encircle them in the arms of safety

These instances of minor variation suggest that there is nothing wrong with there being one instance of “encircle around” in the text, especially since there are instances of “encircle round about”. Moreover, there is no evidence in the manuscripts (or in the printed editions) where *about* and *around* have been mixed up. Another possibility is that this one instance of “encircle around” could be an error for “encircle (a)round about”, although as explained under the nearby addendum for 1 Nephi 17:45, there is no firm evidence in the history of the text for the accidental loss of the word *about* (also see the addendum under Jacob 5:47).

There is historical evidence under *about* and *around* in the Oxford English Dictionary that these two words have the same original meaning and have sometimes been used interchangeably. In fact, *about* comes from *on-bútan*, which originally meant (according to the OED) “*on or by the outside of, hence around, wholly or partially*”. The OED also provides evidence that the adverb *around* is used in American English as an equivalent to British *about* for certain phrases, at least since the late 1700s (for some examples, see under definition 5 in the OED for the adverb *around*).

Ultimately, there is really nothing inappropriate about the expression “wilt thou encircle me around” in 2 Nephi 4:33, only that it is a unique reading in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will therefore accept it since it is the earliest reading in this passage and it will work.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 4:33 the use of *around* in the clause “wilt thou encircle me around in the robe of thy righteousness”, the earliest reading, even though in most instances the phraseology in the text is “encircle about”.

2 Nephi 5:9, page 552, line 18

The actual discussion of this possible emendation is under Alma 39:9–10, not Alma 39:9.

2 Nephi 5:21, page 561

The citation of the Words of Mormon 1:18, in the middle of the page, should have dashes around “and also the prophets”, not around “by laboring with all the mights of his body and the faculty of his whole soul”.

■ **2 Nephi 6:14** (to be inserted before the last write-up on page 573 in part 1)

and behold according to the words of the prophet

*the Messiah will set **himself** again the second time to recover them*

Heather Hardy suggests (personal communication, 9 February 2009) that the language here should read “the Messiah will set **his hand** again the second time to recover them”, not “the Messiah will set **himself** the second time to recover them”. The prophet being referred to here in 2 Nephi 6:14 is Isaiah, and the language is a paraphrase of Isaiah 11:11, which is directly quoted in 2 Nephi 21:11 and paraphrased three more times in the Book of Mormon. And in each of the other instances, the phraseology is “set his hand” (or “set my hand”), not “set himself” (or “set myself”):

2 Nephi 21:11 (Isaiah 11:11)

and it shall come to pass in that day
that the Lord shall **set his hand** again the second time
to recover the remnant of his people

2 Nephi 25:17

the Lord will **set his hand** again the second time
to restore his people from their lost and fallen state

2 Nephi 29:1

that I may **set my hand** again the second time
to recover my people which are of the house of Israel

Jacob 6:2

and in the day that he shall **set his hand** again the second time
to recover his people . . .

Hardy argues that *his hand* is visually similar to *himself*, especially if *his hand* was separated at the end of a manuscript line in \mathcal{O} (that is, with *his* ending the line and *hand* beginning the next line). \mathcal{O} is not extant here. If *himself* is an error, it looks like a visual misreading, which also allows for the possibility that Joseph Smith himself misread *his hand* as *himself* when he dictated the text.

Yet there are no examples of visual misreading quite like this one. The *his* and *him* are, of course, very similar, but *hand* and *self* are less so. Moreover, the current reading will work, although there are no other instances in the Book of Mormon of the phraseology “to set one’s self to do something”. As noted by Hardy, it should be kept in mind that the citation here in 2 Nephi 6:14 is paraphrastic, thus permitting *himself* rather than the expected *his hand*. And there are examples of the phrase “to set oneself to do something” in the King James Bible:

2 Chronicles 20:3

and Jehoshaphat feared and **set himself** to seek the LORD
and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah

The Oxford English Dictionary, to be sure, recognizes the phrase “to set oneself to do something” (listed under definition 113b for the verb *set*). The critical text will therefore retain the reading here in 2 Nephi 6:14, but with the understanding that *himself* could be an error for *his hand*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 6:14 the word *himself* in “the Messiah will set **himself** again the second time to recover them”, the reading of the earliest text; nonetheless, this reading could be an error for “the Messiah will set **his hand** again the second time to recover them”, the reading in Isaiah 11:11 and the four times when it is cited or paraphrased in the Book of Mormon.

2 Nephi 8:16, page 601

In comparing the Book of Mormon text against the King James text, one sometimes finds evidence that the Book of Mormon agrees more closely with the original 1611 version of the King James Bible than with the current King James version. For instance, here in 2 Nephi 8:16, the original Book of Mormon version reads without a repeated *I*:

2 Nephi 8:16

and I have put my words in thy mouth
and **hath** covered thee in the shadow of mine hand

For the second line, the current King James version (in Isaiah 51:16) reads “and **I have** covered thee in the shadow of mine hand”, but the original 1611 version read “and **have** covered thee in the shadow of mine hand”. Although the finite verb form in the original Book of Mormon text differs (reading *hath* rather than *have*), the Book of Mormon agrees with the 1611 version by lacking the subject pronoun *I*. Here in volume 4, I will not take up this important question of whether the original Book of Mormon text is closer to the actual 1611 King James text or to the current King James version. But it will be considered in detail in volume 3 in the section that deals with the differences between the Book of Mormon and the King James texts. In certain instances, this comparative analysis will result in some minor revision in the textual analyses I have made of biblical quotations here in volume 4 (but without revising the original reading of the Book of Mormon text).

2 Nephi 9:2, page 609, line -6

At the end of this write-up (near the bottom of page 609), in referring to 3 Nephi 20:33 and 3 Nephi 20:46, I note that the reference to the Jews returning to their land of inheritance (in the singular) is appropriate. The reason for this is because *Jerusalem* occurs in the same clause as *land*. In 2 Nephi 25:11, cited at the bottom of the previous page, *Jerusalem* occurs with the singular *land* in the first part of the citation (“possess the land of Jerusalem”), but then later, in a separate clause, the text refers to the Jews as being “restored to the **lands** of their inheritance”.

■ 2 Nephi 9:8–9 (to be inserted near the top of page 613 in part 1)

*our spirits must become **subject** to that angel
 which fell from before the presence of the Eternal God . . .
 and we become devils / **angels** to a devil
 —to be shut out from the presence of our God
 and to remain with the fathers of lies
 in misery like unto himself—
 yea to that being which beguiled our first parents*

For this passage, Robert Baer (personal communication, 14 June 1989) suggests that the last line here should be revised by supplying the word *subject*: “yea **subject** to that being which beguiled our first parents”. One could also consider this as an emendation, assuming that the word was actually lost in the early transmission of the text (☪ is not extant here). Ellipsis of the word *subject* is also, of course, a possibility.

I would, however, suggest another ellipsis here, namely, the word *angels*, which occurs closer in the passage. In other words, the text is referring to our spirits becoming angels “to that being which beguiled our first parents”. To be sure, either *subject* or *angels* is possible as an ellipsis, so it is probably best to leave the ellipsis as it is and not emend the text by adding either of these words. The text can be facilitated by placing dashes around the intervening parenthetical text (“to be shut out from the presence of our God and to remain with the father of lies / in misery like unto himself”).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:9 the earliest reading “yea to that being which beguiled our first parents”—that is, without adding either *angels* or *subject* after the initial *yea*; placing dashes around the preceding parenthetical text can help the reader recover the ellipsis here.

2 Nephi 9:11–12, page 613

This passage is discussed in part 1, but I need to add here a reference to Robert Baer (personal communication, 14 June 1989) as the one who first suggested the instances of ellipsis mentioned in my original write-up. He proposed the following two ellipses in verse 11, *death* after *temporal* (in the second line) and *temporal* before *death* (in the fourth line):

<p>2 Nephi 9:11 (proposed emendation)</p> <p>this death of which I have spoken which is the temporal death shall deliver up its dead which temporal death is the grave</p>	<p>2 Nephi 9:12</p> <p>and this death of which I have spoken which is the spiritual death shall deliver up its dead which spiritual death is hell</p>
---	--

The critical text will, as originally explained, maintain the earliest reading in verse 11 where the parallelism is not complete.

■ **2 Nephi 10:19** (to be inserted at the top of page 647 in part 1)

for it is a choice land

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *saith God unto me*

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *above all other lands*

Usage in the larger passage and elsewhere in the Book of Mormon suggests that here in 2 Nephi 10:19 only “saith God” should be surrounded by commas. Nearby we have references to “saith God” but not to “saith God unto me” (that is, throughout this chapter Jacob refers to God’s saying in general, not God’s specific saying to Jacob):

2 Nephi 10:7

but behold **thus saith the Lord God** :
when the day cometh that they shall believe in me / that I am Christ
then have I covenanted with their fathers
that they shall be restored in the flesh upon the earth
unto the lands of their inheritance

2 Nephi 10:8

and the nations of the Gentiles shall be great in the eyes of me / **saith God** /
in carrying them forth to the lands of their inheritance

2 Nephi 10:10

but behold this land / **saith God** /
shall be a land of thine inheritance

2 Nephi 10:13–14

and he that fighteth against Zion shall perish / **saith God** /
for he that raiseth up a king against me shall perish

2 Nephi 10:16–17

for they which are not for me are against me / **saith our God** /
for I will fulfill my promises which I have made unto the children of men

2 Nephi 10:18

wherefore my beloved brethren **thus saith our God** :
I will afflict thy seed by the hand of the Gentiles

2 Nephi 10:19–20

wherefore I will have all men that dwell thereon
that they shall worship me / **saith God** /
and now my beloved brethren . . .

Later in his own book, Jacob quotes from Zenos’s parable that refers to the promised land as being choice unto the Lord:

Jacob 5:43

and behold this last whose branch hath withered away
I did plant in a good spot of ground
yea even that which was **choice unto me**
above all other parts of the land of my vineyard

Thus the more reasonable interpretation here in 2 Nephi 10:19 is to punctuate the sentence to read “it is a choice land, saith God, unto me”.

Summary: Change the punctuation in 2 Nephi 10:19 so that only “saith God” is set apart by commas; the prepositional phrase “unto me” belongs to the preceding text (thus “it is a choice land . . . unto me”).

■ **2 Nephi 10:22** (to be inserted near the bottom of page 647 in part 1)

*for behold the Lord God hath led away
from time to time from the house of Israel
according to his will and pleasure*

Robert Baer (personal communication, 5 July 1989) suggests that there is a missing direct object here, namely, *the righteous* after *led away* (thus “the Lord God hath led away **the righteous** from time to time from the house of Israel”). This appears to be a rather long noun phrase to have been accidentally omitted. To be sure, other passages do refer to the righteous as being led away:

1 Nephi 17:38	and he leadeth away the righteous into precious lands
Jacob 3:4	and the Lord God will lead away the righteous out from among you

In fact, for the 39 instances in the Book of Mormon of the expression “to lead away”, the direct object is expressly stated every time except here in 2 Nephi 10:22. On the other hand, one could argue that *people* is simply understood in 2 Nephi 10:22 and does not need to be stated. There are, for instance, other cases in the Book of Mormon where the direct object is left unexpressed; see, in particular, the discussion under Ether 12:28 regarding the ellipsis of *people* in the phrase “to bring unto me”. Since the reading of all the (extant) textual sources will work here in 2 Nephi 10:22, the critical text will maintain it.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 10:22 the reading of all the (extant) textual sources: “the Lord God hath led away from time to time from the house of Israel”; here the direct object is left unstated since the notion of people being led away is semantically recoverable.

■ **2 Nephi 11:8** (to be inserted at the bottom of page 654 in part 2)

*and now I write some of the words of Isaiah
that whoso of my people which shall see these words
may lift up their **hearts** and rejoice for all men*

Heather Hardy suggests (personal communication, 25 November 2008) that the word *hearts* here may be a mistake for *heads* since elsewhere in the Book of Mormon there are four instances of “lift up one’s head and rejoice” but no others of “lift up one’s heart and rejoice”:

2 Nephi 9:3	that ye may rejoice and lift up your heads forever
Mosiah 7:19	lift up your heads and rejoice and put your trust in God
Alma 1:4	that they might lift up their heads and rejoice
Alma 8:15	lift up thy head and rejoice

Further, here in 2 Nephi 11:8 the word *hearts* is hyphenated at the end of the line in \mathcal{P} , with *he* at the end of the line and *-arts* at the beginning of the next line. This split suggests that Oliver could have meant to write *heads* in \mathcal{P} but ended up writing *hearts*. He may have also been influenced by the familiarity of “lift up one’s heart and rejoice”, especially in the chorus from the hymn “Rejoice, the Lord Is King”: namely, “Lift up your heart! Lift up your voice! Rejoice, again I say, rejoice!” This popular hymn, written by Charles Wesley (1707–1788), was first published in 1744 (thus predating the translation of the Book of Mormon).

On the other hand, there is no evidence of *heart(s)* and *head(s)* ever being mixed up in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text. Moreover, the phrase “lift up one’s heart and rejoice” is quite common in the Doctrine and Covenants; in fact, it occurs in five revelations given in 1830 and early 1831:

March 1830: Book of Commandments 16:43 (Doctrine and Covenants 19:39)
behold canst thou read this without rejoicing
and lifting up thy **heart** for gladness

July 1830: Book of Commandments 26:14 (Doctrine and Covenants 25:13)
wherefore lift up thy **heart** and rejoice
and cleave unto the covenants which thou hast made

September 1830: Book of Commandments 28:7 (Doctrine and Covenants 27:15)
wherefore lift up your **hearts** and rejoice
and gird up your loins and be faithful until I come

September 1830: Book of Commandments 34:4 (Doctrine and Covenants 31:3)
lift up your **heart** and rejoice
for the hour of your mission is come

February 1831: Book of Commandments 44:53 (Doctrine and Covenants 42:69)
lift up your **hearts** and rejoice
for unto you the kingdom has been given

There is also a later revelation that takes *head* for this expression, dating from April 1836: “therefore lift up your **heads** and rejoice” (Doctrine and Covenants 110:5). Either reading—with *hearts* or *heads*—is possible. Thus the critical text will follow the invariant reading with *hearts* for this passage in 2 Nephi 11:8, even though it is unique for the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 11:8 the reading with *hearts* in “lift up their **hearts** and rejoice”; although elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has *head(s)* in this expression, revelations given to Joseph Smith in 1830 and 1831 support the use of *heart(s)*.

2 Nephi 13:23, page 674, line -14

For the citation of 3 Nephi 3:23, internal evidence argues that *betwixt* (the reading in \mathcal{P}) rather than *between* (the 1830 reading) is the correct preposition here, thus “yea to the line which was betwixt the land Bountiful and the land Desolation”. See under 3 Nephi 3:23 for discussion.

2 Nephi 16:5, page 694

In lemmatized citations, accidentals can be ignored; thus for this citation there is no need to distinguish between & and *and*, the misspelling of *midst* as *mids*, or the capitalization of *people*. Thus the reading for \mathcal{P} (represented as 1) can be combined with the other editions (represented as ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST), excluding of course the 1892 RLDS edition (represented as κ).

2 Nephi 17:1, page 706, lines 21–24

In order to help the reader deal with this difficult reading, I have decided to put dashes around the prepositional phrase “in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah”. When set in sense-lines and with punctuation added, the text will read as follows:

2 Nephi 17:1

And it came to pass
— in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah, king of Judah—
Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up
towards Jerusalem to war against it but could not prevail against it.

2 Nephi 18:22, page 727, line 4

As explained under 2 Nephi 27:6, the insertion in \mathcal{P} of the subject pronoun *they* in heavier ink was probably done by John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter. Thus at the top of page 727, the citation should read as follows:

2 Nephi 27:6

and it shall come to pass that
the Lord God shall bring forth unto you the words of a book
and [NULL >jg *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be
the words of them which have slumbered

2 Nephi 18:22, page 727

On this page, I list other examples where Oliver Cowdery omitted the subject pronoun *they*. Yet in one of these cases, the scribe (in \mathcal{C}) was actually Joseph Smith, who had momentarily taken over for Oliver (and ended up writing 28 words in his own hand, including more than the first half of the following sentence):

Alma 45:22

and it came to pass that
[NULL > *they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] did appoint
priests and teachers throughout all the land over all the churches

This example of inserted *they* should therefore be removed from the list of cases where Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the subject pronoun *they*.

2 Nephi 19:1, page 728, line 13

Here the original reading, “at the first”, should be restored (rather than maintained).

2 Nephi 31:19, page 918

In the list of examples of original *got* and *gat*, preference should be given to *gat* over *got* for the example in Alma 47:5; thus the citation here should read as follows:

Alma 47:5 (the original manuscript may be read as either *gat* or *got*;
in the 1911 LDS edition, *got* was changed to *gotten*)
and now he had [*gat/got* 0 | *got* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *gotten* Q]
the command of those parts of the Lamanites
which were in favor of the king

For the choice of *gat* over *got*, see the discussion under Alma 47:5.

2 Nephi 32:3, page 923, line 7

As explained under Mosiah 6:2, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for this passage; thus the second line in this citation should read “except it were little children”, not “save it were little children”.

Jacob 1:1, page 935

In the list of momentary errors where *these* was replaced by *the*, it appears that the example under Mosiah 28:16 was the result of editing on the part of Oliver Cowdery; the original text here appears to have read *the things*. Thus Mosiah 28:16 should be removed from this list on page 935. For a complete discussion, see under Mosiah 28:16.

Jacob 1:11, page 942, line -1

The critical text has adopted *desolate* rather than *desolates* in Helaman 3:5 and elsewhere in the text.

Jacob 2:10, page 954

There is one other case where Jacob uses *commands* rather than *commandments*; this additional instance may be a reference to Nephi’s commands (as originally given to Jacob and now being given to Enos), or Jacob may be using *commands* here to refer to the commandments of God:

Jacob 7:27
and I Jacob saw that I must soon go down to my grave
wherefore I said unto my son Enos : take these plates
and I told him the things which my brother Nephi had commanded me
and he promised obedience unto the **commands**

Jacob 2:15 [2:16], page 961, line 9

The scriptural header for this citation is incorrect; it should read Jacob 2:16 rather than Jacob 2:15. This error persists throughout this particular write-up on page 961, including the summary, and should be corrected everywhere within the write-up.

Jacob 2:17, page 963, line 9

The scriptural specification Alma 19:11 is incorrect; it should read Alma 14:11.

■ **Jacob 2:33** (to be inserted in the middle of page 972 in part 2)

for they shall not commit whoredoms

like unto [they >js them 1 | they A | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of old

Here in the earliest text, we have the subject pronominal form *they* rather than the expected object form *them*. Even so, the earliest text has cases of subject pronouns being used instead of object forms, as in these examples:

1 Nephi 7:6 (“against I Nephi”)

behold Laman and Lemuel and two of the daughters of Ishmael
and the two sons of Ishmael and their families did rebel against us
yea against [*i* 0 | *I* 1ABCDEFGHIJLNP | *me* > *I* F | *me* HKOQRST | *I* > *me* M] Nephi
and Sam and their father Ishmael and his wife and his three other daughters

1 Nephi 17:44 (“unto they”)

and ye are like unto [*they* 0A | *they* >js *them* 1 | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 14:19 (“to deliver ye”)

know ye not that I have power to deliver
[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *you* RT] up unto the flames

The critical text will restore the *they* here in Jacob 2:33 (and will similarly restore the subject pronoun forms in the examples listed here).

Summary: Restore the subject pronoun *they* in Jacob 2:33 (“like unto **they** of old”); such usage is occasionally found elsewhere in the earliest text.

Jacob 5:13, page 1001, line -2

The original modal *may* will be maintained, not restored.

■ **Jacob 5:21** (to be inserted as the first write-up for this verse on page 1007 of part 2)

and it came to pass that the servant saith unto his master

how comest thou hither to plant this tree or this branch of the tree

for behold it was the poorest spot in all the land of thy vineyard

Brent Kerby suggests (personal communication, 24 April 2009) that the present-tense *comest* is an error for *camest*. This branch of the tree was planted earlier (in verse 14), so the servant’s comment should be in the past tense, equivalent in modern English to “how did you come here to plant this tree or this branch of the tree”. The archaic nature of *comest* and *camest* makes it difficult for modern readers to notice the problem in tense. Later the servant once more refers to an event in the past, and there the verb is in the past tense:

Jacob 5:34

and the servant saith unto his master
behold because thou **didst graft** in the branches of the wild olive tree
they have nourished the roots
that they are alive and they have not perished

Moreover, there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery mixed up *a* and *o* in the manuscripts, especially with the verb *come*. For 11 instances where Oliver accidentally wrote *come* instead of the correct *came*, see under 3 Nephi 4:22; in fact, in seven of those instances Oliver left the *come* uncorrected in the manuscript. The chances are quite high that here in Jacob 5:21 *comest* is an error for *camest*. The past-tense form is expected, and the critical text will therefore accept this emendation.

There aren't any other instances of *comest* or *camest* in the Book of Mormon text. The King James Bible has one example that is quite similar in language to the proposed emendation here in Jacob 5:21: "how camest thou in hither / not having a wedding garment" (Matthew 22:12).

Summary: Emend Jacob 5:21 so that the verb reads in the past tense: "how **camest** thou hither to plant this tree or this branch of the tree"; the past tense is expected here, and Oliver Cowdery was prone to write *come* in place of *came*.

Jacob 5:23, page 1007, line -3

As explained just above, the critical text will emend *comest* to *camest* in Jacob 5:21; thus this line in the citation should read "how camest thou hither to plant this tree or **this branch of the tree**".

Jacob 5:24, pages 1008–9

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 2 September 2008) argues that there is evidence elsewhere in the text for the earliest reading here in Jacob 5:24 ("behold that I have nourished also", the reading in \mathcal{D}). In other words, there are cases where *behold* is immediately followed by the direct object (set below in bold), then by the subject and the finite verb form but in noninverted word order:

Alma 11:25

behold **these six onties which are of great worth** I will give unto thee

Alma 26:12

yea behold **many mighty miracles** we have wrought in this land

In both these cases, the direct object is fairly long, unlike the single word of the proposed direct object *that* in the earliest reading for Jacob 5:24.

David Calabro (personal communication, 15 September 2008) responds to Kerby's argument by noting that all the other deictic uses in Jacob 5 are near rather than far:

I agree that in Jacob 5:24, *that* is a subordinate conjunction and not a direct object; therefore the conjectured *it* is necessary. An additional argument in favor of the emended reading is that in this passage (verses 22–25, the Lord's response to the

Addenda: Jacob

servant's question in verse 21), the Lord refers to the tree and spots of ground as *it*, *this*, and *this tree*, with near demonstratives rather than far ones. This corresponds to the use of *hither* (and not *thither*) in verses 23 and 24. So it would be unusual for the Lord to refer to the tree as *that*; we expect *this* instead.

Ultimately, the interpretation of *that* in Jacob 5:24 as a direct object pronoun is highly improbable. The critical text will continue to maintain the 1830 emendation.

Jacob 5:24, page 1009, line -18

As explained under the addendum for Jacob 5:47 (see below), the word *about* should be removed from this line of citation, so that it reads "I have nourished **it** and I have digged it and I have pruned it".

■ **Jacob 5:47**, pages 1020–21

*but what could I have done more in my vineyard
have I slackened mine hand that I have not nourished it
nay I have nourished it
and I have digged [0A|NULL >js about 1|about BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it
and I have pruned it
and I have dinged it*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 31 August 2008) notes that there is an Isaiah passage where the expression "digged it" occurs without the preposition *about*. In fact, this passage starts out with virtually the same language as here in Jacob 5:47 (asking what the Lord could have done more to his vineyard), although it refers negatively rather than positively to what the Lord ends up doing to his vineyard:

Isaiah 5:4–6
what could have been done more to my vineyard
that I have not done in it . . .
I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard
I will take away the hedge thereof
and it shall be eaten up
and break down the wall thereof
and it shall be trodden down
and I will lay it waste
it shall not be pruned nor **digged**
but there shall come up briars and thorns

Thus the use of *digged* without *about* in Jacob 5:47 is probably intended. In addition, under the verb *dig*, the Oxford English Dictionary lists examples of this usage without *about* (meaning 'to till with a spade'), with citations from 1526 through 1626 under definition 4b, including one that refers to digging and dinging of young plants of a year old (here the accidentals are regularized):

Barnaby Googe (1577)
the plants of a year . . . must be discreetly digged and dinged

Thus the original decision (in part 2) to accept Joseph Smith's emendation in Jacob 5:47 will be reversed.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 5:47 the earliest reading without *about* for the verb *dig*: "and I have digged it".

Jacob 5:74, page 1032, lines 6, 10, 15, and 25

As explained in the following addendum, the verb form *become* in the subordinate clause "that the trees had **become** again the natural fruit" should be replaced by *brought*.

■ **Jacob 5:74** (to be inserted at the top of page 1034 in part 2)

*even until the bad had been cast away out of the vineyard
and the good the Lord had preserved unto himself
that the trees had **become** again the natural fruit
and they became like unto one body and the fruit were equal
and the Lord of the vineyard had preserved unto himself the natural fruit*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 5 January 2009) suggests that *become* in "that the trees had **become** again the natural fruit" is an error for *brought*, thus "that the trees had **brought** again the natural fruit". The source for the *become* would be the correct occurrence of *became* in the following clause: "and they **became** like unto one body". To be sure, there is no other instance in Jacob 5 that refers to trees becoming fruit. We have to interpret the earliest reading here in Jacob 5:74 as something like 'the trees had become again of the natural fruit **type**' (but without assuming that the word *type* or *kind* was in the original text).

Elsewhere in Jacob 5, the text has 28 instances of trees and branches "bringing forth fruit" and one, in Jacob 5:61, of the Lord "bringing forth fruit". In other words, what we expect here in Jacob 5:74 is "the trees had brought forth again the natural fruit" (that is, with the adverb *forth*). But Kerby points out that there is one instance of "bringing fruit" without *forth*, namely in the immediately following verse:

Jacob 5:75 (the subject pronoun *it* is conjectured)
and it hath **brought** unto me again the natural fruit

Thus the suggested emendation of *brought* for *become* in Jacob 5:74 seems quite reasonable, especially since *become* does not really work. The critical text will therefore accept this emendation.

Summary: Emend Jacob 5:74 so that *had become* is replaced by *had brought*, thus "that the trees had brought again the natural fruit"; the replacement of the original *brought* with *become* was probably the result of the *became* in the following clause ("and they became like unto one body").

Jacob 5:74, page 1034, line 6

As explained in the preceding addendum, this line should be emended so that it reads "that the trees had brought again the natural fruit" (that is, *brought* instead of *become*).

Jacob 6:13, page 1047, line -6

The original manuscript is not actually extant here for the word *pleasing* in Jacob 6:13, but there is not enough room in the lacuna for *pleasing* except by supralinear insertion. It seems very unlikely that the unexpected *pleasing* would have been added as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , so it was probably inserted in \mathcal{O} . But since we can't be sure, it is probably best to add a question mark to the variant specification:

before the [NULL >? *pleasing* 0 | *pleasing* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *bar of God*

It should also be noted that \mathcal{O} probably did not read *pleading*, the proposed conjectural emendation for the original text here in Jacob 6:13. For discussion of this point, see the write-up under Jacob 6:13 in part 2.

Jacob 6:13, page 1049, line 4

According to the analyses under Alma 11:44 in part 3, this line in the citation should be revised to read with a conjectured *all* and the archaic verb form *raigned*:

and all shall be brought and be **raigned before the bar of Christ**

Jacob 6:13, page 1050

In the list of examples showing the tendency in the text to replace an uncommon word with a common one, one could add the example of *wrecked* in place of *racked*:

Mosiah 27:29
my soul was [*wrecked* 1ABCDEFGHJKPS | *racked* IJLMNOQRT]
with eternal torment

This example is especially interesting in that it took until 1879 for the correction to be made in the LDS text (and it has never been made in the RLDS text). Seven other examples in the text of the verb *rack* are, however, correct in the earliest text. For discussion, see under Mosiah 27:29.

Jacob 7:9, page 1060, line 13

In the list of examples showing the occurrence of either *shall* or *should*, the one identified as Helaman 11:15 is actually found in 3 Nephi 11:15; when corrected, this citation will go at the end of the list.

Jacob 7:9, page 1060, line -4

The discussion of double negatives is found in volume 3 under NEGATION, not MULTIPLE NEGATION.

Jacob 7:17-18, page 1063

At the end of the first paragraph in this write-up, we should note that in his editing for the 1837 edition Joseph Smith corrected the second *speak* to *spake* in \mathcal{P} , to make it agree with the 1830 reading.

Jacob 7:18, page 1064, line 2

We cannot be sure that the crossed-out word in \mathcal{O} for Jacob 7:18 was *eternity*, so the variant specification should have a question mark added to the proposed correction in \mathcal{O} :

and he spake of [eternity >? Hell 0 | hell 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

However, the supralinearly inserted *Hell* is basically extant in \mathcal{O} .

Enos 1:3, page 1073, line -19

Since the word *behold* is the first word in an original section of the text, the convention in the critical text is to capitalize the first letter of that word. Thus the first line in the citation of Enos 1:1–3 will read as follows (here the bolding will, of course, be maintained):

Behold it came to pass that **I Enos**

Enos 1:14, page 1082, lines 11–12

More accurately, I should state here that “the earliest textual readings could be used to support a consistent use of *bare* in the original text”.

Enos 1:14, page 1082, line 14

One should look under BEAR in volume 3, not BARE.

Enos 1:23, page 1096, line -18

The word order should be altered here to read “nowhere in the Book of Mormon text do we get constructions like the following”.

■ **Jarom 1:14** (to be inserted between the two analyses of Jarom 1:14 on page 1104 in part 2)

*and I Jarom do not write more
for **the** plates are small*

Ross Geddes (personal communication) suggests that the *the* here before *plates* might be a mistake for *these*. He refers to the language earlier in verse 2 where Jarom uses *these*:

Jarom 1:2
and as **these** plates are small
and as these things are written for the intent of the benefit of our brethren . . .

Obviously, one could have an error in verse 14 where *the* replaced an original *these* in the early transmission of the text (\mathcal{O} is not extant here). For a list of this rather frequent error in the text, see under Jacob 1:1. Nonetheless, the speaker here in verse 14 is the same as in verse 2; and Jarom has already referred to the plates as *these plates* (in verse 2), so the definite reference to *the plates* is acceptable. The critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading here in verse 14 (“for **the** plates are small”).

Summary: Maintain in Jarom 1:14 the definite article *the* before *plates*, the earliest reading; the earlier reference to *these plates* in verse 2 allows for this later usage.

Omni 1:22, page 1116, line 5

The second reference here should be *Omni 1:25*, not *Omni 2:25*.

Omni 1:30, page 1120, line -3

Besides the complete discussion under *LAY* in volume 3, the reader should also see the discussion under *Alma 22:19* in part 4.

The Words of Mormon 1:12, page 1127, line -14

The sentence here needs the existential *there* after the initial *Thus* (“Thus there are no examples . . .”).

The Words of Mormon 1:14, page 1128, lines 1–2

I should say that the singular *many thousand* occurs only when it is immediately followed by a noun (rather than by a noun phrase).

The Words of Mormon 1:15, page 1129, line -4

The ellipted text in 3 Nephi 7:19 is *had*, not *had been*.

- **The Words of Mormon 1:16** (to be inserted between the two analyses of the Words of Mormon 1:16 on page 1130 in part 2)

*and after that there had been false prophets
and false **preachers** and teachers among the people . . .*

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 11 March 2009) suggests that the word *preachers* here is an error for *priests*. The text has 22 instances of conjoined *priest(s)* and *teacher(s)*. In fact, the word *preacher* occurs in only one other place in the text, but interestingly in a parallel conjunctive expression involving the word *teacher*:

Alma 1:26

and the priest not esteeming himself above his hearers
for the **preacher** was no better than the hearer
neither was the **teacher** any better than the learner

Hardy argues that *preacher* is not a specialized title here in its only other occurrence in the text; thus *preachers* could be an error for *priests* in the Words of Mormon 1:16. It is worth noticing that the passage in Alma 1:26 suggests that the priest was at least a preacher.

It is clear, however, that the adjective *false* works well with *preachers* and *teachers* since what they preach and teach can be false. The expression *false priests* is, of course, possible since one can falsely claim to be a priest of God. And as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there is the phrase *false Christs* in the Words of Mormon 1:15, so one can falsely claim to be the Christ. Yet it is worth noting that there are no references to false priests in the Book of Mormon text. Furthermore, in 4 Nephi 1:24 we have *many priests* conjoined with *false prophets* (implying that the prophets prophesy falsely), but note that the adjective *false* is not applied to *many priests*:

4 Nephi 1:34

nevertheless the people did harden their hearts
for they were led by **many priests** and **false prophets**
to build up many churches and to do all manner of iniquity

The critical text will retain the word *preachers* here in the Words of Mormon 1:16 since it definitely works.

Summary: Maintain in the Words of Mormon 1:16 the word *preachers*; it is probably not an error for *priests*.

The Words of Mormon 1:17–18, page 1131, line -10

The word should be *stiffneckedness*, not *stiffneckness*.

- **Mosiah 1:10** (to be inserted as the second write-up for this verse on page 1140 of part 2)

*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
which the Lord our God hath given us*

Here we have another idiosyncratic error in the 1841 British edition, the replacement of *this* with *his*. This typo, a visual error, was corrected in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). Clearly, *this* works better. For other examples where the 1841 typesetter mixed up *this* and *his*, see under Helaman 8:22.

Summary: Retain the determiner *this* in Mosiah 1:10: “thou art a king and a ruler over **this** people”.

- **Mosiah 2:15** (to be inserted at the top of page 1148 in part 2)

neither do I tell these things that thereby I might accuse you

Greg Wright suggests (personal communication, 4 March 2009) that the word *you* is missing here, that the original text read “neither do I tell **you** these things that thereby I might accuse you”. Nearby, there are two instances of the same expression but with the *you* (later in this same verse and in verse 17):

Mosiah 2:15

but I tell **you** these things that ye may know
that I can answer a clear conscience before God this day

Mosiah 2:17

and behold I tell **you** these things that ye may learn wisdom
that ye may learn that when ye are in the service of your fellow beings
ye are only in the service of your God

More generally, the verb *tell* typically takes an indirect object (such as *you*) or an equivalent prepositional phrase with the preposition *unto*. In all, there are 102 such cases. But there are also 8 cases (including the one here in Mosiah 2:15) where there is no indirect object or equivalent prepositional phrase, including one that is similar to the case here in Mosiah 2:15:

3 Nephi 26:1
and now it came to pass that
→ when Jesus had told these things
he expounded them unto the multitude
and he did expound all things unto them

The critical text will therefore maintain the current reading here in Mosiah 2:15—without any *you*—since it is possible.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 2:15 the lack of the indirect object *you* after the verb *tell* in the clause “neither do I tell these things that thereby I might accuse you”; 3 Nephi 26:1 provides some support for the ellipted *you* in expressions like this.

Mosiah 2:24, page 1155

The first part of the last paragraph in this write-up should be slightly revised to read as follows:

In two other places, Oliver Cowdery may have intended to write *are* but ended up accidentally crossing the *e* to write *art*, just as in Mosiah 2:24. In these two instances, the *art* was transmitted into the 1830 edition (and subsequently removed from the text in the editing for the 1837 edition):

The remainder of the paragraph, with its two citations, follows as originally written.

Mosiah 2:34, page 1158, line 4

The dashes in the third line in the Mosiah 2:34 citation should be revised so that only the *except*-clause is set off parenthetically; thus the whole citation should read as follows:

*I say unto you that
there are not [one >js any 1|one A|any BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] among you
—except it be your little children—
that have not been taught concerning these things
but what knoweth that ye are eternally indebted to your heavenly Father*

The *except*-clause could be set off by dashes or commas. Also note that in the critical text the word *heavenly* in the phrase “your heavenly Father” (at the end of the citation) is not capitalized.

Mosiah 3:1, page 1163

Actually, a better interpretation for the expression “I would call your attention” (here in Mosiah 3:1 and also in Mosiah 4:4) derives from the archaic meaning ‘to ask, invite’ for the verb *call* (mentioned under definition 4a in the Oxford English Dictionary). Thus “I would call your attention” could be interpreted as meaning ‘I would invite your attention’. Or as Alison Coutts points out (personal communication), one could paraphrase the expression as “I would call for your attention”.

Mosiah 4:5–6, page 1178, line 12

Remove the hyphen from *less-prescriptive*, giving “There is less prescriptive motivation for deleting the *that*”.

Mosiah 4:30, pages 1192–93

After listing all the cases of “observe to keep the commandments” in the text, I wrote that only here in Mosiah 4:30 was the phrase *to keep* omitted, but I should clarify that this is the only example of the omission persisting in the text. In one case, there is some indirect evidence that *to keep* was initially omitted in \mathcal{O} ; in Helaman 15:5 there is insufficient room for *to keep* in the lacuna between surviving fragments of \mathcal{O} , so it was probably supralinearly inserted. See the discussion under Helaman 15:5 in part 5 as well as lines 33–34 of the transcript for page 399' of \mathcal{O} (on page 506 in volume 1 of the critical text).

Mosiah 6:2, page 1204, lines 13–14

The dashes in the Mosiah 2:34 citation should be placed so that they set off only the *except*-clause:

Mosiah 2:34

I say unto you that there are not one among you
—except it be your little children—
that have not been taught concerning these things
but what knoweth that ye are eternally indebted to your heavenly Father

The same change is referred to in the addendum listed above under Mosiah 2:34.

Mosiah 7:18, page 1212

The adjective *effectual* is also used in the King James Bible, as in this well-known example from the New Testament: “the **effectual** fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (James 5:16).

■ **Mosiah 7:27** (to be inserted at the top of page 1219 in part 2)

*and because he saith unto them
that Christ was the God*

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Father of all things . . .*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 28 July 2005) notes that the expression “Christ was the God the Father of all things” seems strange. He suggests that the original text here may have read “Christ was the God **and** the Father of all things” (with an additional *and*) or “Christ was God the Father of all things” (without the definite article *the* before *God*).

Geddes notes that Mosiah 3:8 and Helaman 14:12 have a similar kind of multiple asyndetic conjoining of noun phrases that refer to Christ:

Mosiah 3:8

and he shall be called Jesus Christ
the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth
the Creator of all things from the beginning

Helaman 14:12

and also that ye might know of the coming of Jesus Christ
the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth
the Creator of all things from the beginning

These two readings would suggest that there is no need to add an *and* in Mosiah 7:27.

Alternatively, Geddes suggests that there may be a missing prepositional phrase after *the God*, such as *of Israel* (thus “Christ was the God **of Israel** / the Father of all things”). Another possibility, following the two passages listed above, would be to insert *Son of* in Mosiah 7:27, giving “Christ was the **Son of** God / the Father of all things”. Two other verses support this possibility:

Helaman 16:18

that it is not reasonable
that such a being as a Christ shall come
→ if so and he be the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth
as it hath been spoken
why will he not shew himself unto us
as well as unto they which shall be at Jerusalem

Ether 4:7

then will I manifest unto them
the things which the brother of Jared saw
even to the unfolding unto them all my revelations
saith Jesus Christ
→ the Son of God
the Father of the heavens and of the earth
and all things that in them is

Further, here in Mosiah 7:27 Limhi is referring to the preaching of Abinadi, and we have clear evidence that Abinadi used the specific phrase “the Son of God” along with “the Father” to refer to Christ:

Mosiah 15:1–2

and now Abinadi saith unto them
I would that ye should understand
that God himself shall come down among the children of men
and shall redeem his people
and because he dwelleth in flesh
he shall be called the Son of God
and having subjected the flesh to the will of the Father
→ being the Father and the Son . . .

And Abinadi continued to refer to Christ as the Father and the Son (from verse 3 through 9 of Mosiah 15). So if the text is to be emended here in Mosiah 7:27, the most probable reading would be “Christ was the **Son of** God / the Father of all things”. Thus far, however, I have been unable to find any independent examples in the manuscripts where *Son of* has been accidentally lost. To be

sure, Joseph Smith added a few instances of *the Son of* in his editing for the 1837 edition, but these additions were textually unnecessary (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:18, 21).

Ultimately, it is probably safest here in Mosiah 7:27 to maintain the earliest reading, despite its difficulty: “Christ was the God the Father of all things”.

Summary: Although in Mosiah 7:27 the noun phrase “the God the Father of all things”, the earliest extant reading, may be an error (it is both awkward and unique to the text), the critical text will maintain it since it is understandable.

Mosiah 8:13, pages 1227–28

David Calabro points out (personal communication) a few other examples in the King James Bible of *that* as an equivalent for *that which*:

1 Kings 8:24	who hast kept with thy servant David my father that thou promisedst him
1 Kings 8:25	keep with thy servant David my father that thou promisedst him
Matthew 25:25	lo <i>there</i> thou hast that is thine

Mosiah 9:7, page 1242

Here in the citation for Alma 57:29, the initial error in \mathcal{P} was “the land of Zarahemla”, not just “the land”. Oliver Cowdery crossed out *of Zarahemla* in \mathcal{P} and overwrote the *the* as *that*, yet the 1830 typesetter ended up setting “the land” instead of the correct “that land”. The variant on line 15 of page 1242 should read as follows:

to [*that land* 0 | *the land of Zarahemla* > *that land* 1 |
the land ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

(This variant is correctly specified in the write-up for Alma 57:29 in part 5.) Thus on lines 16–17 of page 1242, the text should read as follows:

Oliver Cowdery himself initially wrote “to **the land of Zarahemla**” in \mathcal{P} , but then he caught his error and corrected the text to read “to **that land**”.

Mosiah 10:14, pages 1258–59

The description at the top of page 1259 regarding the ink flow for the correction in \mathcal{O} for Alma 46:33 (given on line -1 on page 1258) is not correct. Like the correction in \mathcal{O} for Alma 43:47 (also listed on page 1258), the ink flow for the correction in Alma 46:33 is slightly heavier (and it is also unevenly applied). Thus one could argue that in both Alma 43:47 and 46:33, Oliver Cowdery simply redipped his pen when making the correction in \mathcal{O} (that is, the correction was virtually immediate); or, contrary to this, one could argue that Oliver corrected \mathcal{O} at the time he made the correction in \mathcal{P} . In any event, the citation for Alma 46:33 at the bottom of page 1258 should read as follows:

the remainder [*was* >+ *were* 0 | *was* > *were* 1] delivered up

■ **Mosiah 11:3** (to be inserted near the bottom of page 1267 in part 2)

*and he laid a tax of one fifth part of all they possessed:
 a fifth part **of** their gold and **of** their silver
 and a fifth part **of** their ziff and **of** their copper and **of** their brass and their iron
 and a fifth part **of** their fatlings
 and also a fifth part **of** all their grain*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 7 February 2006) suggests that there might have been an original *of* before *their iron* that was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text (either as the scribe took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from O into P). All other passages with conjuncts involving specific metals besides gold and silver consistently repeat the preposition *of*:

1 Nephi 18:25	both of gold and of silver and of copper
2 Nephi 5:15	and of iron and of copper and of brass and of steel and of gold and of silver
Mosiah 8:10	and they are of brass and of copper
Mosiah 11:8	of gold and of silver and of iron and of brass and of ziff and of copper
Mosiah 11:10	and of copper and of brass
Ether 10:23	of gold and of silver and of iron and of copper

Obviously, there could have been an *of* before *their iron* originally in Mosiah 11:3, thus “and a fifth part of their ziff and of their copper and of their brass and **of** their iron”.

More generally, however, there is evidence that a preposition is not always repeated for conjuncts of metals. For instance, the *of* is not always repeated for conjuncts of *gold* and *silver*, as explained under Helaman 6:31. Moreover, when the preposition is *in*, for instance, there is no repetition of the preposition for the industrial metals listed in Jarom 1:8: “and also **in** iron and copper and brass and steel”. Thus the conjunctive “and of their brass and their iron” is possible. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading in Mosiah 11:3—that is, without a repeated *of* before *their iron*, even though it is quite possible that the original text had the *of* there.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 11:3 the lack of the repeated *of* before *their iron*, the reading of the earliest text (“and of their brass and their iron”); usage elsewhere in the text allows for the occasional nonrepetition of prepositions in conjuncts involving metals.

Mosiah 11:10, page 1269, line -5

The words *kingman* and *kingmen* are spelled without a hyphen in the critical text. Here the spelling *king-men* is an error and should be replaced by *kingmen*.

Mosiah 12:22, page 1296

It is also worth noting the unusual RLDS variation for the word *watchmen* in this verse. The 1892 RLDS edition changed the plural form to the singular *watchman*, probably accidentally; the 1908

RLDS edition seems to have inadvertently followed the 1892 reading (given that the copytext for the 1908 edition was the 1892 edition). Finally, in the 1953 RLDS edition the correct *watchmen* (also the reading in Isaiah 52:8) was restored to the RLDS text.

■ **Mosiah 13:34** (to be inserted at the end of page 1315 in part 2)

*have they not said
that God himself should come down among the children of men
and take upon him **the form of man**
and go forth in mighty power upon the face of the earth*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 19 May 2008) wonders here if the indefinite article *a* isn't missing before the noun *man*. Usage elsewhere in the text supports the reading with the *a* (or *an*) for the noun following "the form of":

1 Nephi 11:11	for I beheld that he was in the form of a man
1 Nephi 11:27	and abode upon him in the form of a dove
2 Nephi 31:8	the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the form of a dove
Alma 30:53	for he appeared unto me in the form of an angel

(Note, in particular, the similarity between 1 Nephi 11:11 and Mosiah 13:34: both have *man* after "the form of".) There is one difference, however, between these four examples and the one in Mosiah 13:34. For the four with the indefinite article, *the form* is preceded by the preposition *in*, while here in Mosiah 13:34 "the form of man" acts as the direct object for the verb phrase "to take upon oneself". In this case, if *a* were added to *man*, there would be a tendency to interpret the sentence as saying that God would take upon himself the form of a particular man. Here in Mosiah 13:34 the meaning is that God will take upon himself the form of mankind. Here is another passage that supports the generic usage, where *man* occurs without *a*:

Mosiah 7:27	that he should take upon him the image of man
-------------	--

Note that Mosiah 7:27 does not say "that he should take upon him the image of **a man**". In other words, we have a generic use of *man* in both Mosiah 7:27 and Mosiah 13:34, not a specific use; thus *man* without *a* is actually appropriate in Mosiah 13:34. The critical text will therefore continue with the earliest reading here in Mosiah 13:34 ("and take upon him the form of man").

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 13:34 the generic use of *man* without the indefinite article *a* before the noun.

Mosiah 16:1, pages 1342–43

Near the middle of page 1343, I mentioned that each of the cases of variation listed on pages 1342–43 is individually discussed. And except for 3 Nephi 4:8, they are. The analysis for this one missing analysis is covered in the addendum for 3 Nephi 4:8 here at the end of part 6 of volume 4.

Mosiah 16:1, page 1344, line -19

As explained under the addendum for Jacob 5:47, the word *about* should be removed from this line, so that it reads “I have nourished it and I have digged it”.

Mosiah 16:3, page 1348, line 5

The citation here for Moroni 4:1 begins an original section of the text, so by convention the initial letter of the first word is capitalized (thus “The manner of their elders and priests administering the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church”).

Mosiah 18:8, page 1368

In the summary for this write-up, I should add that “also the original singular *is* will be restored”.

Mosiah 18:34–35, page 1378, line -5

In the last sentence before the summary, *had* should be changed to *have*, thus “Oliver would never have added such specific information to the text”.

Mosiah 20:18, page 1403, lines 7–8

The emendation in \mathcal{D} for the first variant listed in this citation was by Joseph Smith, so the symbol *js* should be added, giving the following:

and [is it not they >js are not they the ones 1 | is it not they A |
are not they the ones BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 20:26, page 1408, lines 8–10

The reference to Mosiah 22:2 at the end of this discussion regarding Mosiah 20:26 is a mistake and should be deleted. The particular problem in Mosiah 22:2 is not even discussed in this write-up; the *that* in Mosiah 22:2 is a resultive *that* (see the discussion under that passage). Thus the last sentence before the summary should read as follows:

The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading with the nonsubordinate
that here in Mosiah 20:26.

Mosiah 23:13–14, pages 1442–43

To the list here on these two pages, we can add one more example where a present participial verb form was momentarily added to the text (in this case, in \mathcal{O}) but was immediately corrected:

Alma 51:22
and making [regulating >% regulations 0 | regulations 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to prepare for war against the Lamanites

The form *regulating* was very likely prompted by the immediately preceding *making*.

■ **Mosiah 24:8** (to be inserted on page 1457 in part 3)

*Amulon began to exercise authority over Alma and his brethren
and began to persecute **him**
and cause that his children should persecute their children*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 17 September 2008) wonders whether the *him* here might be a mishearing for *them*, so that the original text would have had reference to persecuting Alma and his brethren rather than persecuting Alma alone.

Nonetheless, there are places in the text where a pronominal reference to a leader can stand for the whole group, as in Alma 43:53, where the text refers to Zerahemnah but means him and his whole army. Other examples of this kind of usage are also listed under that passage. Here in Mosiah 24:8, by referring to Amulon as persecuting Alma, the reader can also assume that Alma's brethren are included. To be sure, the *him* here could be an error for *them*, but *him* will work. Also note that in this passage Amulon is a leader, as is Alma. Undoubtedly not only Amulon but also his fellow priests would have been persecuting Alma and his brethren, but the other priests are not mentioned here.

Interestingly, in the next verse the text returns to focusing its attention on Alma alone by referring to the anger Amulon had against Alma. But then the text suddenly switches the focus of attention from Alma back to Alma and his followers, yet the reference is only to the pronominal *them*:

Mosiah 24:9

for Amulon knew Alma
that he had been one of the king's priests
and that it was he that believed the words of Abinadi
and was driven out before the king
and therefore he was wroth with **him**

for he was subject to king Laman
yet he exercised authority over **them**
and put tasks upon **them**
and put taskmasters over **them**

Thus earlier in verse 8, the text can refer to Amulon as individually persecuting Alma, just as it states in verse 9 that Amulon was individually angry with Alma.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 24:8 the reference to Amulon persecuting Alma, but apparently meaning Alma and his brethren; nonetheless, the *him* that refers to Alma could be an early transmission error for *them*, thus specifically referring to Alma and his brethren.

Mosiah 24:11, page 1459, line -17

In the last paragraph before the summary for Mosiah 24:11, for accuracy's sake the text should read that "there are two similar examples in the earliest text" (that is, *two* rather than *a few*).

Mosiah 25:5–6, page 1472

Robert Baer (personal communication, 14 June 1989) suggests that the difficulty in this passage could be dealt with by emending *Zarahemla* to *Lehi-Nephi*, thus:

Mosiah 25:6 (suggested emendation)

and he also read the account of Alma and his brethren and all their afflictions
from the time they left the land of **Lehi-Nephi** until the time they returned again

The error of writing *Zarahemla* instead of *Lehi-Nephi* could have come from the occurrence of “the land of Zarahemla” in the preceding verse:

Mosiah 25:5

yea he read the records of the people of Zeniff
from the time they left the land of **Zarahemla** until the time they returned again

The main problem with this proposed emendation is that Alma and his brethren never did return to the land of Lehi-Nephi.

Mosiah 25:5–6, page 1474

Before the beginning of the last paragraph on this page, the following paragraph should be added:

As further support for referring to the return of Ammon and his men as well as the return of the people of Zeniff, we have the following statement earlier in the book of Mosiah where Limhi has Ammon tell the people what had been happening in the land of Zarahemla from the time that Zeniff “went up out of the land” until Ammon “himself came up out of the land”:

Mosiah 8:2

and he caused that Ammon should stand up before the multitude
and rehearse unto them all that had happened unto their brethren
from the time that **Zeniff went up out of the land**
even until the time that **he himself came up out of the land**

Thus the proposed parallelism in referring to Zeniff and his people and to Ammon and his men (here in Mosiah 25:5–6) is found elsewhere in the text.

Mosiah 26:15, page 1485, line 2

The word *alone* is missing in the scriptural citation; the original text here reads as follows: “thou art blessed because of thy exceeding faith in the words alone of my servant Abinadi”.

Mosiah 26:20 [26:20–21], page 1486, line 1

The passage cited here is from Mosiah 26:20–21, not just Mosiah 26:20.

Mosiah 26:33, page 1494, line 20

The third line in the citation of Mosiah 26:33 should have an *and* at the beginning, thus “and that he might judge the people of **that** church”.

■ **Mosiah 27:11** (to be inserted on page 1504 in part 3)

*behold the angel of the Lord appeared unto them
and he descended as it were in a cloud
and he spake as it were with a voice of thunder*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 11 October 2005) notes that the indefinite article *a* in Mosiah 27:11 (“with **a** voice of thunder”) could be an error for *the* (thus “with **the** voice of thunder”) since in three other passages the phrase takes the definite article (and the third one specifically refers to the same event, the conversion of Alma and the sons of king Mosiah):

1 Nephi 17:45	he hath spoken unto you like unto the voice of thunder
Alma 29:2	I would declare unto every soul as with the voice of thunder . . .
Alma 36:7	he spake unto us as it were the voice of thunder

Geddes also points out that either *the* or *a* following *with* would be hard to distinguish because of the final *th*-sound in *with*. Notice, however, that one could infer from this observation that the *the* in Alma 29:2 could be a mistake for *a* since there is a preceding *with*, giving as the original reading “I would declare unto every soul as with **a** voice of thunder”. Ultimately, either reading—with *a* or *the*—is possible for this expression. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading here in Mosiah 27:11: “he spake as it were with **a** voice of thunder”.

Summary: Follow in Mosiah 27:11 the earliest reading, “with **a** voice of thunder”, even though “with **the** voice of thunder” is also possible.

Mosiah 27:30–32, page 1519

At the end of this long write-up, one additional question needs to be dealt with. Brent Kerby points out (personal communication, 20 October 2008) a potential difficulty for the proposed emendation “but now I know that they may foresee that he will come”, namely, the modal verb *may* appears to be inappropriate. Kerby notes that the modal here seems to have the meaning ‘to be able’, as if the sentence read “but now I know that they **can** foresee that he will come”. Yet it turns out that *may* can take on this meaning. Under definition 2, the Oxford English Dictionary states that the original meaning for the auxiliary verb *may* refers to having ability or power. And cited there in the OED are some examples with this meaning from Early Modern English:

Thomas Bentley (1582)
No man may separate me from thee.

Michael Drayton (1627)
Thy mighty strokes who may withstand?

In these instances, *may* is equivalent to our modern-day *can*. Thus Mosiah 27:30, as emended, could be interpreted to mean ‘but now I know that they **can** foresee that he will come’. There are, in fact, other instances of *may* in the Book of Mormon where we, as modern English speakers, expect *can*:

1 Nephi 3:7

save he shall prepare a way for them
that they **may** accomplish the thing which he commandeth them

2 Nephi 25:26

that our children may know to what source they **may** look
for a remission of their sins

Moroni 7:18

seeing that ye know the light by which ye **may** judge . . .
see that ye do not judge wrongfully

Given this archaic sense of ‘to be able’ for *may*, there is no problem with its occurrence here in Mosiah 27:30.

Mosiah 28:1, page 1522, lines 13–14

The comma should be removed after the parenthetical phrase “the scribe in \mathcal{P} ”, giving “either the 1830 typesetter or Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in \mathcal{P}) is the one responsible”.

Mosiah 28:3, page 1524, line 9

The name is John Bunyan, not John Bunyon.

Mosiah 28:6, page 1526, line -2

To be fully accurate, the summary should read that what is being restored is “it came to pass that”. In other words, the subordinate *that* needs to be included but the *and* excluded; the *and* was maintained in the text even though Joseph Smith crossed it out in \mathcal{P} .

Mosiah 29:5, pages 1536–37

As explained under Ether 1:34, the *for* in that verse appears to be an error for *therefore*. This means that Ether 1:34 cannot be used to support restoring *for* in Mosiah 29:5, even though the same editorial change in the 1920 LDS edition (namely, the deletion of the *for*) was made in both Ether 1:34 and Mosiah 29:5.

The example of repeated *for* in Moroni 7:5–8 probably provides sufficient evidence for restoring the repeated *for* here in Mosiah 29:5. There is no repeated *for* in the original text for Ether 1:34, and thus the reasons for emending the earliest *for* to *therefore* in that passage are quite different. Excluding this example from Ether 1:34 in support of Mosiah 29:5 means that the last statement in the summary on page 1537 should be deleted.

Mosiah 29:13, page 1543, line -11

It might be more accurate here to say that “there is considerable manuscript evidence” than “the manuscript evidence is substantial”.

■ **Mosiah 29:33** (to be inserted on page 1564 in part 3 as the last write-up for Mosiah 29:33)

*and many more things did king Mosiah write unto them
unfolding unto them all the trials and troubles of a righteous king
yea all the travails of soul for **their** people
and also all the murmurings of the people to their king*

Greg Wright (personal communication, 28 November 2007) suggests that the *their* in “for their people” could be an error for *the* (thus “for the people”). Note that later in this verse we have *the people* in “all the murmurings of the people to their king”. In fact, the *their* could have come as a result of the following occurrence of *their* in “to their king”. Wright also points out the continuing use of *the people* in verse 34 (“that the burden should come upon all the people”).

On the other hand, there is evidence that generic singulars can take plural pronouns. In this passage “a righteous king” refers to any righteous king, so the *their* in “for their people” could refer to righteous kings. For other examples of this kind of usage in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 17:48 and 2 Nephi 29:11.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 29:33 the use of *their* in “all the travails of soul for **their** people”; here *their* can be considered a generic reference to the earlier “a righteous king”.

Alma 1:30, page 1594, line 3

In the citation at the top of the page, from Alma 58:18, the *or* is conjectured and may have been deleted, so the variant should read as follows:

[*or* >? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

For discussion, see under Alma 58:18.

■ **Alma 1:32** (to be inserted on page 1597 in part 3 as the first write-up for Alma 1:32)

*for those who did not belong to their church did indulge themselves
in sorceries and in idolatry or **idleness**
and in babblings and in envyings and strife*

It seems odd that *idleness* is used here, especially since it seems to be conjoined (perhaps contrastively) with *idolatry*: “and in idolatry **or** idleness”. In the Book of Mormon, the adjective *idle* and its related nominalization *idleness* sometimes appear to take on older meanings that are now obsolete in English (see under *idle* and *idleness* in the Oxford English Dictionary), especially in cases where the root morpheme *idle* has the meaning of ‘worthless’ or ‘lacking in usefulness’ rather than referring to inactivity:

1 Nephi 12:23

and it came to pass that I beheld that after they had dwindled in unbelief
they became a dark and loathsome and a filthy people
full of idleness and all manner of abominations

2 Nephi 5:24

and because of their cursing which was upon them
they did become **an idle people**
full of mischief and subtlety
and did seek in the wilderness for beasts of prey

Alma 22:28

now **the more idle part of the Lamanites** lived in the wilderness
and lived in tents

Alma 38:10–13

and now as ye have begun to teach the word
even so I would that ye should continue to teach
and I would that ye should be diligent and temperate in all things
see that ye are not lifted up unto pride
yea see that ye do not boast in your own wisdom
nor of your much strength
use boldness but not overbearance
and also see that ye bridle all your passions
that ye may be filled with love
see that ye refrain from idleness
do not pray as the Zoramites do
for ye have seen that they pray to be heard of men
and to be praised for their wisdom

In context, none of these passages seem to be referring to inactivity per se; instead, they seem to be referring to irresponsible or purposeless living—and doing it very actively. In the case of the first three passages, the text seems to be referring to the uncivilized life of the Lamanites. In the last example, Alma is warning Shiblon to avoid irresponsible expressions of passion or meaningless prayers whose only purpose is to show off. There is no indication that Alma thought his son Shiblon was lazy, as indicated elsewhere in Alma’s discourse to Shiblon:

Alma 38:3

I have had great joy in thee already
because of thy faithfulness and thy diligence and thy patience
and thy long-suffering among the people of the Zoramites

There are cases in the Book of Mormon where *idle* and *idleness* seem to have a more general yet rather neutral sense of being ‘inactive, unoccupied, not moving’:

Alma 24:18

and rather than to spend their days **in idleness**
they would labor abundantly with their hands

Alma 60:22

yea will ye sit **in idleness**
while ye are surrounded with thousands of those
yea and tens of thousands which do also sit **in idleness**
while there are thousands round about in the borders of the land
which are falling by the sword

Mormon 3:16

and it came to pass that I utterly refused to go up against mine enemies
and I did even as the Lord had commanded me
and I did stand as **an idle witness**
to manifest unto the world the things which I saw and heard

This meaning is quite clear in the last example, where Mormon is referring to his decision to cease acting as the general of the Nephite armies; he is not claiming that he is a lazy witness!

Here in Alma 1:32, the word *idleness* could be interpreted as referring to foolish acts, perhaps even states of delirium (which would agree with the following conjoined phrase “and in babblings”). Definition 3 under *idleness* in the OED gives the meanings ‘light-headedness, imbecility; delirium; also folly, foolishness, silliness’, with examples like the following:

William Tyndale (about 1536)

Interpreted . . . as spoken of **idleness** of the head,
by the reason of sickness.

Joseph Hall (1623)

What an **idleness** it is for foolish hypocrites to hope
they can dance in a net, unseen of heaven!

Gerard Boate (1645)

This Fever . . . accompanied with . . . **idleness** or raving, and restlessness.

Thus it is possible to give an interpretation to *idleness* in Alma 1:32 that will work better in that context than the modern-day meaning of indolence and laziness. Note, however, that the OED refers to these definitions of *idleness* as obsolete and in some cases rare for their time.

In contrast to these attempts to interpret *idleness* as such in Alma 1:32, there is another possibility, a highly theoretical one, that should at least be mentioned: namely, the word *idleness* could be a misspelling of the rare word, *idolness*. One could argue that the purpose of the unusual occurrence of the conjunction *or* in the phrase “idolatry or idleness” is to provide a synonym for *idolatry*. Although one might think that there is no such word as *idolness*, examples of this word can be found on the Internet (<www.google.com>, accessed on 30 August 2005). One interesting use of the word *idolness* is in reference to teenage idols, as found on <www.amazon.com>:

editorial review of *The Horse in the Gray Flannel Suit*

Look for a young Kurt Russell, who has little to do
but grace the film (and Helen) with a **little teen idolness**.

review by S. Whear of *The Nasty Rabbit*

In terms of **teen idolness**, I would probably list him quite a few rungs
below that of a Bobby Sherman or an Edd ‘Kookie’ Burns.

One of the more striking examples is an observation that one could interpret the word *idleness* as *idolness* in a line from Geoffrey Chaucer's *Second Nun's Tale*: "Lest that the feend thurgh **ydelnesse** us hente" ('lest the fiend through idleness seize us'). This observation, found at <www.luc.edu>, reads as follows:

Frank N. Schleicher (1986)

While it would be convenient to conjecture that "ydelnesse" here puns on "idolness" or idolatry and thus connects the *Second Nun's Tale* to the *Canon's Yeoman's Tale* by way of man's idolatrous love of gold, the *Tale* forges another, more fundamental connection.

However, if it is the case that the hypothesized *idolness* is an explanation for the word *idolatry*, one wonders why the Book of Mormon text would offer such an explanation by using a virtually unknown word to explain a readily understood word, *idolatry*. The noun *idolatry*, its plural *idolatries*, and the adjective *idolatrous* are found ten other times in the Book of Mormon text, and nowhere else is there any attempt to explain the meaning of *idolatry*. Thus it would be very problematic to emend *idleness* in Alma 1:32 to read as *idolness*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 1:32 the word *idleness*; in this instance, it seems to be referring to foolish acts, perhaps even delirium, thus in agreement with the following use of the word *babblings*; it is very doubtful that *idleness* is an error for the unusual word *idolness*.

Alma 1:32, page 1599, line -19

In the summary, the scriptural reference should be Alma 1:32, not Mosiah 1:32.

Alma 1:32, page 1599, line -18

There shouldn't be a comma after *elsewhere*, thus "elsewhere the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural *strifes*".

Alma 2:11–12, page 1609, line 5

Lyle Fletcher's paper on interpreting *Amalekites* as an error for *Amlicites* was written in 1989 rather than in the early 1990s.

Alma 3:16, page 1641, line 3

Technically, the 1830 printer was E. B. Grandin, the owner of the press. The change would have been made by the 1830 typesetter (that is, compositor), John Gilbert. So to be fully accurate, I should refer here to "the 1830 typesetter's emendation of the word order".

Alma 4:20, page 1664

Near the end of this write-up (in the next-to-last paragraph), I mention a momentary loss in Helaman 16:12 of the longer phrase "of the reign of the judges" and refer the reader to the discussion under that passage. Actually there is no discussion of this loss under Helaman 16:12 simply

because its momentary loss in \mathcal{O} is purely conjectured. There is a large lacuna in \mathcal{O} for this part of the text (about six manuscript lines). In order for the text to fit, I proposed in my transcription for \mathcal{O} that Oliver Cowdery had initially omitted the long phrase “in the eighty & ninth year of the reign of the judges” (see the transcript for lines 26–31 on page 401’ of \mathcal{O} , in volume 1 of the critical text). Obviously, Oliver could have momentarily omitted some other material. For that reason, I ignored discussing this hypothetical omission when I came to Helaman 16:12 in part 5. Such a speculative loss in phraseology cannot be used as evidence in the analysis of Alma 4:20.

Alma 5:34, page 1691, line 2

A closing quotation mark is missing for the second expression listed in this line; it should read as follows:

“eat flesh and drink blood” (5 times)

■ **Alma 5:45** (to be inserted on page 1696 in part 3 as the first full write-up on that page)

do ye suppose that I know not of these things myself

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 5 January 2008) suggests that this sentence should read “do ye suppose that I know **of** these things **of** myself”—in other words, with two *of*’s. Although awkward sounding, such multiple use of *of* in this kind of expression can be found elsewhere in the text:

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

There are quite a few additional cases where the reflexive pronoun is preceded by *of*, but in all these cases there is no *of* before the direct object (if it occurs):

2 Nephi 9:28	supposing they know of themselves
Alma 5:46	that I might know these things of myself
Alma 5:46	and now I do know of myself that they are true
Alma 5:48	I know of myself that whatsoever I shall say unto you . . . is true
Alma 30:35	when thou of thyself knowest that we receive no gain
Alma 38:6	that I know these things of myself
Helaman 7:29	because it is not of myself that I know these things
Helaman 15:7	and behold ye do know of yourselves
Helaman 15:8	ye know of yourselves

In fact, the example in Alma 38:6 suggests that Alma 5:45 could have originally read with no *of* before *these things* but with an *of* before *myself* (thus “do ye suppose that I know not these things **of** myself”).

Of course, there are also cases where reflexive pronouns occur as intensifiers with the verb *know*, and in these cases there is no *of* (and, of course, the meaning is different):

Addenda: Alma

2 Nephi 6:3	and ye yourselves know that it ever has been
Jacob 2:3	and ye yourselves know that I have hitherto been diligent in the office of my calling
Jacob 4:10	for behold ye yourselves know that he counseleth in wisdom
Alma 60:2	for behold ye yourselves know that ye have been appointed to . . .

Note that in Alma 5:45 the reflexive *myself* can be interpreted as a normal intensifier, as if the text read “do ye suppose that I myself know not of these things”. Since this intensifier interpretation will work, the critical text will retain the earliest reading here in Alma 5:45, without *of* before *myself*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 5:45 the reflexive pronoun *myself* without any immediately preceding *of*; here *myself* can be interpreted as an intensifier.

Alma 7:11 [7:12], page 1719, line -9

Throughout this write-up for Alma 7:12, the verse is consistently but incorrectly referred to as Alma 7:11 (including twice on the next page). For each case in this write-up, Alma 7:11 should be specified as Alma 7:12.

Alma 8:6, page 1735, line -5

Here the text should read that scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} accidentally misread the first *h* in *Ammonihah* as a *d*, not the other way around.

■ **Alma 9:22** (to be inserted in the middle of page 1764 in part 3)

*yea and after having been delivered of God
out of the land of Jerusalem by the hand of the Lord*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 23 August 2006) wonders if perhaps the *of* before *God* here might be an error for *by*, what we expect in modern English (“after having been delivered by God”). We note that the agentive preposition *by* is used later in the sentence (“by the hand of the Lord”); perhaps the intervening “out of the land of Jerusalem”, with its two *of*’s, caused an original *by* before *God* to be replaced with *of*. In fact, there is an example in the early history of the text where *by* was momentarily replaced with *of* in a very similar phrase, “delivered by the power of God”:

1 Nephi 13:19	and I Nephi beheld that the Gentiles which had gone out of captivity were delivered [<i>of</i> > <i>by</i> 0 <i>by</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the power of God out of the hands of all other nations
---------------	---

Here scribe 2 of \mathfrak{C} made the error, but his correction was immediate. Also note that the multiple occurrences of *of* in the following text probably led to the error (“the power of God out of the hands of all other nations”). Elsewhere in the text, there is one instance of someone being delivered by someone else (that is, where the preposition is *by*):

Alma 20:30

and there they were taken and cast into prison and bound with strong cords
and kept in prison for many days and were delivered **by** Lamoni and Ammon

Nonetheless, we have to recognize that the original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes uses the archaic agentive preposition *of* instead of the modern *by*. For some general discussion regarding this choice, see under 1 Nephi 11:31. For a second case where agentive *by* has been replaced with *of*, see under 1 Nephi 22:5. For a case in the opposite direction, where an original agentive *of* has been replaced with *by*, see under Mormon 8:1. For each case of agentive *by* versus *of*, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *of* here in Alma 9:22 since one can be “delivered of God”, although in today’s English we expect “delivered by God”.

Summary: Maintain the agentive preposition *of* in Alma 9:22 (“after having been delivered of God”), the reading of the earliest text; other examples of the archaic agentive *of* are found elsewhere in the text, although here in Alma 9:22 we could have an early error for an original *by*.

Alma 10:19, page 1784, line 9

The line here in the citation for Alma 10:29 should read *this people* instead of *the people* (giving “that the **voice** of this people should”, not “that the **voice** of the people should”).

Alma 11:6, page 1807, line 13

The *an* before *onti* in this sentence should be in italics, giving “scribe 2 miswrote *an onti* as *anti*”.

Alma 11:19 [11:18], pages 1812–13

In the LDS text from 1879 on, the verse number for this sentence has been 19, as it is listed here. In the critical text, as explained just before under Alma 11:17–19, this verse will switch places with the preceding verse 18, so ultimately this sentence will be identified as Alma 11:18.

Alma 11:21, page 1815, line -12

Here I refer to three passages where one can read more about the variation between *this* and *thus* in the history of the text. For the second of these passages, Alma 52:24–25, I neglected to include that discussion in part 4, but it can be found here at the end of part 6 under its own addendum.

■ **Alma 11:23** (to be inserted on page 1821 in part 3 as the second write-up for Alma 11:23)

[§2 *knoweth* > §1 *knowest* 1 | *Kowest* A | *Knowest* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou*
that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations

Brent Kerby suggests (personal communication, 17 September 2008) two possible emendations for this sentence:

- (1) the original text was an imperative, thus “**know** thou that . . .”
- (2) there was an original *not* in the question, thus “knowest thou **not** that . . .”

Arguing in favor of the first suggestion, Kerby notes that the initial error *knoweth thou* could have resulted if the original text had read *know thou*. Replacing *know thou* with *knoweth thou* could have occurred because the *-eth* ending was similar to the beginning *th* of the following *thou*, and thus there could have been some difficulty in hearing the difference between *know thou* and *knoweth thou*. Presumably, such an error could have occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation. In support of this emendation, there are similar instances of the imperative *know thou* in the King James Bible, as in these two examples:

Genesis 20:7	know thou that thou shalt surely die
1 Samuel 28:1	know thou assuredly that thou shalt go out with me to battle

There are no actual instances of imperative *know thou* in the Book of Mormon text, but there are several instances of the corresponding plural imperative, *know ye*:

3 Nephi 27:27	and know ye that ye shall be judges of this people
Mormon 7:2	know ye that ye are of the house of Israel
Mormon 7:3	know ye that ye must come unto repentance or ye cannot be saved
Mormon 7:4	know ye that ye must lay down your weapons of war
Mormon 7:5	know ye that ye must come to the knowledge of your fathers

Despite these occurrences of imperative *know* in the Book of Mormon text, it seems unlikely that Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{P} of *knoweth* to *knowest* (here in Alma 11:23) would have been the result of editing on his part. He tended to leave such "errors" as *knoweth thou* in the text (for a couple examples of this kind of error being left uncorrected in the manuscripts by Oliver, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:2). Here in Alma 11:23, Oliver's correction in \mathcal{P} was more likely the result of his proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

The question that Kerby's other emendation brings up is whether there needs to be a *not* in the yes-no question "knowest thou (not) that the righteousness yieldeth to no such temptations". There are quite a few examples that support the use of *not* in yes-no questions involving the verb *know*:

1 Nephi 3:29	know ye not that the Lord hath chosen him to be a ruler over you
2 Nephi 29:7	know ye not that there are more nations than one
2 Nephi 29:7	know ye not that I the Lord your God have created all men
2 Nephi 29:8	know ye not that the testimony of two nations is a witness . . .
2 Nephi 31:7	know ye not that he was holy
Jacob 6:9	know ye not that if ye will do these things that . . .
Mosiah 12:30	knowest thou not that I speak the truth
Alma 14:19	know ye not that I have power to deliver ye up unto the flames
Alma 39:5	know ye not . . . that these things are an abomination
Mormon 5:23	know ye not that ye are in the hands of God
Mormon 5:23	know ye not that he hath all power

The example in Mosiah 12:30 argues for emending Alma 11:23 to read "knowest thou **not** that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations". Even so, there are examples of *knowest thou* in yes-no questions that lack the *not*:

Addenda: Alma

1 Nephi 11:16	knowest thou the condescension of God
1 Nephi 11:21	knowest thou the meaning of the tree which thy father saw
1 Nephi 13:21	knowest thou the meaning of the book
Mosiah 8:12	knowest thou of any one that can translate

Of course, in all these cases the expected response to the question depends on whether the *not* is stated. But ultimately, there is nothing wrong with the corrected reading in Alma 11:23 (“knowest thou that . . .”), even if the *not* is lacking; both types of yes-no questions, with or without the *not*, occur in the text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 11:23 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “knowest thou that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations”; similar yes-no questions, either with or without *not*, occur in the Book of Mormon text (and generally in English); the initial reading in \mathcal{P} for Alma 11:23, *knoweth thou*, is probably an error for *knowest thou* rather than *know thou*.

Alma 11:36, page 1827, line 2

The earliest text for Alma 11:36 reads *said* rather than *saith*. In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *saith*, but then he immediately corrected (by erasure) this present-tense form to the simple past-tense form, *said*. Thus the first line for Alma 11:36 should read as “now Amulek said again unto him”.

■ **Alma 11:37** (to be inserted on page 1827 in part 3)

*and I say unto you again that he cannot save them in their sins
for [I 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] cannot deny his word
and he hath said that no unclean thing can inherit the kingdom of heaven*

Lyle Fletcher has proposed (personal communication, 23 August 2006) that the statement “I cannot deny his word” may be an error for “**he** cannot deny his word”, which certainly seems to fit the immediate context better. Amulek is speaking here, yet earlier in this narrative Amulek answered Zeezrom by referring to the impossibility of God denying his own word:

Alma 11:34
and Zeezrom saith again :
shall he save his people in their sins
and Amulek answered and said unto him :
I say unto you : he shall not
→ for it is impossible for him to deny his word

Here the passage does not read “for me to deny his word”. In Alma 11:37, if “I cannot deny his word” is an error for “**he** cannot deny his word”, then the *I* could have been prompted by the *I* in the immediately preceding sentence (which begins verse 37): “and I say unto you again that he cannot save them in their sins”.

In a revelation dating from January 1831, the Lord himself refers to the impossibility of him denying his own word:

Book of Commandments 41:16 (Doctrine and Covenants 39:16)

behold verily verily I say unto you
that the people in Ohio call upon me in much faith
thinking I will stay my hand in judgment upon the nations
→ but I cannot deny my word

To be sure, a person can deny the word of God; but except for here in Alma 11:37 the Book of Mormon text refers only to nonbelievers denying the word of God or, by extension, the words of his prophets:

Jacob 6:8 (Jacob speaking to the people of Nephi)

behold will ye reject these words
will ye reject the words of the prophets
and will ye reject all the words which have been spoken concerning Christ
after that so many have spoken concerning him
→ and deny the good word of Christ
and the power of God and the gift of the Holy Ghost . . .

Helaman 8:13 (Nephi speaking to the wicked Nephites)

→ but behold ye not only deny my words
→ but ye also deny all the words which hath been spoken by our fathers
and also the words which was spoken by this man Moses

Thus the use of *I* is somewhat unexpected in “I cannot deny his word”. Nevertheless, it is not impossible: if God cannot deny his word, then neither can his prophet.

If *I* is an error here in Alma 11:37, it would have occurred during the dictation of the text since \mathcal{O} is extant here and reads *I*, not *he*. Yet elsewhere there isn’t much independent evidence in the history of the text for mix-ups between the subject pronouns *I* and *he*. The only instance of such a mix-up occurred when scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} wrote *he* instead of the correct *I* in 3 Nephi 27:14; later, Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , corrected the *he* to *I*:

3 Nephi 27:14

and after that [$\S 2$ *he* > $\S 1$ *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *I* D]
had been lifted up upon the cross
I might draw all men unto me

In that case, \mathcal{O} undoubtedly read *I* since the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} , not \mathcal{P} , for this part of the text and it reads *I*. So the chances of *he* being replaced with *I* in Alma 11:37 seem fairly remote. The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 11:37 the earliest reading (“for I cannot deny his word”), the reading in \mathcal{O} , since it will work. Nonetheless, the *I* here could be an error for *he*.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that the use of *I* is no doubt correct given Amulek’s response to Zeezrom in the preceding verse: “for thou sayest that I speak as though I had authority to command God because I said he shall not save his people in their sins”. Brugger notes that in verse 36 Amulek says that he is accused of falsely speaking for God, so he then quite naturally and appropriately emphasizes in verse 37 that he cannot deny God’s word.

Summary: Maintain the pronoun *I* in Alma 11:37 (“for I cannot deny his word”), even though other examples of this phraseology support the reading “for **he** cannot deny his word” (as nearby in Alma 11:34).

Alma 11:41, page 1832

Near the end of this discussion regarding Alma 11:41, I cite Alma 41:4 as another instance of the usage under discussion. In addition, I could have also cited a passage that occurs right before Alma 41:4:

Alma 41:2

for it is requisite that **all things** should be restored
to [*its* >% *their* 0 | NULL > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] proper order

For further discussion of both instances of initial *its* in Alma 41:2–4, see under Alma 41:4 in part 4.

Alma 11:44, page 1835, line -2

The reference to the end of line 16 on page 228' of \mathcal{C} is an error; instead, the line number should be 15; on the following page, the line number is correctly given.

Alma 11:44, page 1837, line -2

In this sentence, the participial verb form should be *shortened*, not *shorten* (thus the phrase should read as “the shortened form *raign*”).

Alma 12:27, page 1868, line -10

Here the sentence should start out as “And in a few cases the dittography was missed”—that is, *in a few cases*, not *in few cases*.

Alma 13:1, pages 1877–78

Grant Hardy (personal communication, 15 December 2006), in response to the question raised by Douglas Stringer, writes:

You note the unexpected adverb *forward*. One of your correspondents wondered if the phrase should read “I would cite your minds **back** to the time which the Lord God gave these commandments unto his children”. You suggest that “the use of the word *forward* may be related to the idea of ‘inciting’ (or ‘citing’) one’s mind to go forward in confronting a new thought.” There is an easier, more integrated solution. It does seem strange that Alma, speaking in about 82 B.C.E., wants to direct his listeners’ minds forward to a past event—Moses’s establishment of the Mosaic law and ordination of priests—but this is a result of the extraneous 1879 chapter break. If we follow the flow of Alma’s argument in Alma 12, he starts with the fall of Adam (verses 22–27), refers to the first revelation of the plan of redemption to mankind (verses 28–30), and then moves on to God’s giving of commandments (verses 31–37), explicitly a commandment to repent, but also perhaps with an implication of the law of Moses. At that point, in Alma 13:1, Alma wants to draw his readers’ attention forward to the first ordaining of priests—not forward from the listeners’ own circumstances, but chronologically forward from the last time period he has been talking about. He wants us to think forward to the next major event on a historical time line he is showing us.

Hardy's comments help to clear up a difficult reading, allowing us to interpret "cite your minds forward" as carrying the subject matter forward in time.

Another possibility, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), is that here the word *forward* may be a Hebraism that actually refers to past time. He notes that the Hebrew word *qedem* has the meaning 'in front of' as well as 'in former time'. Actually, we can see something of this same notion in the diverging semantic development of the English word *before*, as in "he stood before her" (meaning 'in front of her') versus "he came before her" (as her forefather). Note that in archaic English we can refer to an event in the past as occurring "aforesaid". Consequently, the phrase "forward to the time" (in the expression "I would cite your minds forward to the time when the Lord God gave these commandments unto his children") could actually mean 'back to the time'.

Thus there are a couple of alternative ways to view the use of the word *forward* in Alma 13:1. In any event, there appears to be no need to appeal to a more general meaning of 'urge you to consider' for the phrase "cite your minds forward". The earliest (and current) reading will be maintained here in Alma 13:1.

Alma 13:3, page 1879, line -12

In the summary here, although the 1830 semicolon is accepted, a comma or a dash will also work; the basic point is that the punctuation should place "in the first place" with the following present participial clause.

■ **Alma 13:7** (to be inserted on page 1884 of part 3)

*being without beginning of days or end of years
being prepared from [the >% eternity 1| eternity ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to all eternity
according to his foreknowledge of all things*

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 9 July 2008) suggests that the original text here read "from **all** eternity to **all** eternity", just as it does elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 3:5

the Lord Omnipotent who reigneth
which was and is from **all** eternity to **all** eternity
shall come down from heaven among the children of men

Moroni 8:18

but he is unchangeable from **all** eternity to **all** eternity

We get the similar phraseology in a revelation to Joseph Smith in January 1831:

Book of Commandments 41:1 (Doctrine and Covenants 39:1)

Hearken and listen to the voice of him
who is from **all** eternity to **all** eternity

There is a later revelation, dating from February 1832, where *all* is lacking for both instances of *eternity*:

Doctrine and Covenants 76:4
from eternity to eternity he is the same
and his years never fail

This example suggests an alternative emendation here in Alma 13:7, namely, “from eternity to eternity”, which means that an extra *all* was inserted before the second *eternity*, perhaps prompted by the *all* in the immediately following phrase “according to his foreknowledge of **all** things”. In any event, there is no other example where one *eternity* has the *all* and the other lacks it.

There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted *all* in the manuscripts, although usually only momentarily:

¹ Nephi 22:16 (initially in \mathcal{P})

the fullness of the wrath of God shall be poured out
upon [*all* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >- *all* 1] the children of men

Mosiah 4:10 (initially in \mathcal{P})

and now if you believe [NULL > *all* 1 | *all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] these things
see that ye do them

Alma 37:36 (in copying from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P})

let [*all* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRS] thy thoughts be directed unto the Lord

Alma 47:35 (initially in \mathcal{G})

and [NULL >+ *all* 0 | *all* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the dissenters of the Nephites
from the reign of Nephi down to the present time

Alma 58:13 (initially in \mathcal{P})

and thus we did go forth
with [NULL > *all* 1 | *all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] our might

Helaman 4:16 (initially in \mathcal{P})

and the one half of [NULL > *all* 1 | *all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] their lands

³ Nephi 4:31 (initially in \mathcal{P})

they did break forth [*as* > *all* 1 | *all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] as one
in singing and praising their God

Ether 13:20 (initially in \mathcal{P})

if he would repent
and [*all* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *all* 1] his household
the Lord would give unto him his kingdom

There is also one case where *all* is conjectured to have been lost early on in the transmission of the text; for that example, see under Alma 11:44. On the other hand, there is no explicit evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery ever added *all*, which makes us doubt the possibility that the original text here in Alma 13:7 read “from eternity to eternity”. (For one case where *all* may have been accidentally added but the evidence is only indirect, see under 2 Nephi 13:24.)

\mathcal{G} is not extant for this specific phrase in Alma 13:7. However, the lacuna surrounding a fragment of \mathcal{G} argues that *all* was not in \mathcal{G} unless it was supralinearly inserted. This supports the earliest extant reading, in \mathcal{P} , without the *all* before the first *eternity*. Nonetheless, it is quite possible that *all* was lost before the first *eternity* during the dictation of the text by Joseph Smith to Oliver

Cowdery. Yet since the earliest reading, “from eternity to all eternity” is possible, despite its uniqueness in the text, the critical text will follow it. There are just not enough examples of the phraseology “from all eternity to all eternity” to argue convincingly that the reading without one of the *all*’s is in error.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 13:7 the earliest reading, in \mathcal{P} , which lacks *all* before the first *eternity* (“from eternity to all eternity”); even so, internal evidence as well as scribal errors suggests that this reading could be an error for “from all eternity to all eternity”.

Alma 13:9, page 1887, line -5

The word *as* was accidentally set as *a s*; the extra space should be removed.

Alma 13:10, page 1889, line -4

Although the transcript in volume 1 conjectures that for Alma 13:10 the original manuscript read *their* (only *the* is extant at the end of a line), we cannot really be sure whether the word in \mathcal{C} was *their* or *the*. Consequently, \mathcal{C} should be removed as evidence here in Alma 13:10 for the reading “their exceeding faith and repentance”. The scriptural citation should read as follows:

and it was on account of
[*the* 1A | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *exceeding faith and repentance*
and their righteousness before God

Alma 13:10, page 1889, line -2

Contrary to what I wrote at the bottom of page 1889, the scribe here in \mathcal{P} was not Oliver Cowdery but scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} . Oliver, however, was the scribe in \mathcal{C} for this part of the text.

Alma 14:5, page 1906, line -2

In the citation for 3 Nephi 3:23, the word *between* should read *betwixt*; for the evidence that supports *betwixt* rather than *between*, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 3:23.

Alma 14:26, page 1918, line -19

For the variation listed under 3 Nephi 20:3, Oliver Cowdery initially corrected *brerke* to just *brak*, not *brake*. Thus the variant here should read as follows:

[§2 *brerke* > §1 *brak* > *broke* 1 | *break* ABCDPS | *brake* EFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]

This is how the variant is written under 3 Nephi 20:3 (here in part 6).

Alma 14:28, page 1921

The scriptural citation for the second write-up on this page is so complicated that the relationships between the textual sources can be perceived more readily by using an abbreviated lemmatized version of the variation, with bolding added to show the actual differences:

Addenda: Alma

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| □ <i>and every soul which was within the walls thereof . . . were slain</i> | 1*A |
| □ <i>and every soul who was within the walls thereof . . . were slain</i> | 1 ^c BCDEGHKPS |
| □ <i>and every soul who were in the walls thereof . . . were slain</i> | FIJLM* |
| □ <i>and every soul within the walls thereof . . . were slain</i> | NO |
| □ <i>and every soul within the walls thereof . . . was slain</i> | M ^c QRT |

The ellipsis contains the words “save it were Alma and Amulek”, which is invariant in all the sources (excluding variation in the accidentals).

Alma 15:3, pages 1926–27

In one place in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery may have started to write “by the cause of” instead of *because of*:

Alma 49:6

now the leaders of the Lamanites had supposed
[*by the* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] because of the greatness
of their numbers . . .

In this case, of course, the original *because of* in Alma 49:6 will be maintained in the critical text. The original “by the cause of” will be maintained in Alma 7:5 and restored in Alma 15:3.

Alma 16:8, pages 1938–39

Ultimately, I have decided that restoring the 1830 comma between the two restrictive relative clauses doesn’t really help the reader parse this sentence. The reader can figure out what the meaning is here without having an unexpected comma before a restrictive relative clause.

Alma 16:19, pages 1944–45

The argument against *suffering* can be made stronger: there is no evidence at all in the original Book of Mormon text for the singular noun *suffering*. For that point, see the discussion under Moroni 9:19.

Alma 16:21, page 1946, line 9

Actually the initial subordinate clause here in Alma 16:21 is a present participial *after*-clause.

Alma 17:27, page 1965, line 18

It is Ammon, not Alma, who is working with the other shepherds in herding the king’s sheep.

Alma 17:38, page 1976, line 6

In the earliest text, there were 78, not 77, instances of “save it were”. For the correct statement of this number, see the addendum here in part 6 under 1 Nephi 17:31.

Alma 18:3, pages 1978–79

There are three separate write-ups for Alma 18:3. The last two are in the wrong order and should be switched so that the citations follow their order within the text itself.

Alma 19:1, page 1997

Grant Hardy (personal communication, 15 December 2006) points out that on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> there are examples of “being laid **into** one’s tomb”, thus providing additional support for the original use of *into* here in Alma 19:1 (“to take his body and lay it **into** a sepulchre”):

William Shakespeare (1595)

How if, when I am laid **into** the tomb,
I wake before the time that Romeo
Come to redeem me?

Walter Scot (1688)

Then he was dead, and **laid** into his Tomb, . . .

Alma 19:6, page 2004, line 1

For clarity’s sake, in the summary to Alma 19:6 we should note that Joseph Smith’s emendation of *light* to *life* was made in \mathcal{D} when he edited the text for the 1837 edition; the same change of *light* to *life* was independently made in the 1852 LDS edition.

Alma 19:7, page 2004

The intrusive *of* in the 1874 RLDS edition was very likely prompted by the phrase *desired of him* in the previous sentence in the verse: “therefore what the queen desired **of** him was his only desire”.

Alma 19:16, page 2009, line 3

Here in the citation for Alma 19:16, there should be a question mark in the description of the variant in \mathcal{C} , so that the second line in the citation reads as follows:

[NULL >? *the name of* 0 | *the name of* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lord*

There is no room in the lacuna of \mathcal{C} for this phrase except by supralinear insertion. But one could always argue instead that some other phrase in the lacuna (such as *they did call*) was supralinearly inserted in \mathcal{C} .

Alma 22:28, page 2062, line -13

The repeated earlier phrase needs the definite article *the* before *land*, thus “on the west in the land of Nephi”.

Alma 22:32, page 2068, lines 3–6

The statement that *betwixt* is never used for geography in the Book of Mormon text needs to be revised, in accord with the analysis of *betwixt* versus *between* under 3 Nephi 3:23 in part 5. For a complete discussion of the variation for these two prepositional forms, see under that passage. As far as the emendation here in Alma 22:32 is concerned, *between* is more probable than *betwixt* simply because *between* is much more common elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (32 to 6); the argument from geography alone cannot be used to prefer *between* over *betwixt*.

Alma 22:32, page 2069, line -10

This line in the Helaman 4:7 citation should have the indefinite article *a* before *day's*, thus “it being a day’s journey for a Nephite”.

■ **Alma 23:1** (to be inserted near the top of page 2076 in part 4)

that they should not lay their hands

on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni

nor neither of their brethren

Grant Hardy (personal communication, 4 June 2007) suggests that the *of* after *neither* could be an error for *on*—in other words, they should not lay their hands on the sons of king Mosiah “nor neither **on** their brethren” (that is, on their fellow missionaries).

There is little evidence from scribal errors to support the replacement of an original *on* with *of* here in Alma 23:1. There are a couple of cases where *on* has been replaced by *of* with respect to the phrase “on the Yth month”:

Alma 56:1 (initial error in \mathfrak{P})

[*in* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *on* RT] the second day

[*on* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *of* > *on* 1 | *in* RT] the first month

Alma 56:42 (editing for the 1920 LDS edition)

and it was in the morning of the third day

[*on* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *of* RT] the seventh month

In modern English we expect “the Xth day **of** the Yth month”, not “the Xth day **on** the Yth month”; thus the motivation for the replacement of *on* with *of* in these two cases is totally different than here in Alma 23:1 (if such a change actually occurred in the early transmission of the text).

If the original text in Alma 23:1 read “on their brethren”, I would expect it to read with only a single conjoined negative: *or*, *nor*, or *neither*:

Alma 23:1 (suggested emendations with *on*)

that they should not lay their hands

on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni

(1) **or** on their brethren

(2) **nor** on their brethren

(3) **neither** on their brethren

Addenda: Alma

In fact, Alma 23:1 is the only instance of *nor neither* in the text (or of *nor either*, the current reading in this passage), which implies a uniqueness of expression.

Ultimately, there is no problem here in Alma 23:1 since *neither* is acting as an equivalent to the word *none* (or *any* in standard English), for which the *of* is expected, as if the original text read “nor none of their brethren”. For the use of *neither* as a pronoun with the meaning ‘not any one (of more than two)’, see definition 2c under section B for the word *neither* in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:1 the preposition *of* before *their brethren* (“nor neither of their brethren”), the reading of the earliest text; the expression works here since *neither* is acting as equivalent to *none*, and there is nothing wrong with the phrase “nor none of their brethren” (except, of course, for the double negative in standard English).

Alma 24:15, page 2108, line 18

The 1905 LDS edition replaced the singular “his word” with the plural “his words”; in other words, an *s* needs to be added to the second “his word” in this sentence.

Alma 26:5, page 2137, line 22

The definite article *the* needs to be placed before the word *passage*, thus “the rest of the passage refers to the missionary harvest in the past tense”.

Alma 27:3, page 2157, line -9

The word *war* at the end of the line should be in the singular, not the plural (thus “weapons of war” rather than “weapons of wars”).

Alma 27:20, page 2168, line 9

The name *Alma* at the end of the line (since it is conjectured to have occurred there in ☉) needs to be set in all caps, thus ALMA.

Alma 27:22–24, page 2171, line 17

As explained under 3 Nephi 3:23 in part 5, the original text for the third line apparently had *betwixt* rather than *between*; thus the line here should be changed to read as “yea to the line which was betwixt the land Bountiful and the land Desolation”.

■ **Alma 28:1** (to be inserted at the beginning of page 2181 in part 4)

*and now it came to pass that
after the people of Ammon were established in the land of Jershon
and a church also established in the land
and the armies of the Nephites were set round about the land of Jershon . . .*

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication) wonders if the third clause here isn’t missing its finite verb form, namely, *was*:

Alma 28:1 (proposed emendation)

and now it came to pass that
after the people of Ammon were established in the land of Jershon
and a church **was** also established in the land
and the armies of the Nephites were set round about the land of Jershon . . .

Both the preceding and the following clauses have the plural *were* (“were established” and “were set”). In fact, one could argue that there was a tendency to omit the finite verb in this part of the text, namely, in verse 2 where *there was* seems to have been omitted in the early transmission of the text (see the discussion under Alma 28:2–3 in part 4). For a list of cases where *was* alone was initially omitted in the manuscripts, see under Alma 19:6; in other words, there is evidence that *was* could have been lost here in Alma 28:1. On the other hand, there is nothing especially wrong with the ellipted nature of the clause “and a church also established in the land”, despite its apparent uniqueness in the text. The critical text will therefore maintain the current reading without the finite verb form *was*, even though there is a possibility that it was there in the original text but was lost early in the transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 28:1 the reduced clause “and a church also established in the land”, the earliest reading; the ellipsis of the verb form *was* will work here, although there is a possibility that an original *was* was lost during the early transmission of the text.

Alma 29:5, page 2204, lines 2–3

The dash at the end of the first line of the citation from Alma 29:5 should be put at the beginning of the second line, thus:

yea, and I know that good and evil hath come before all men
—or he that knoweth not good from evil is blameless—

Alma 30:1–2, page 2210, line -8

There is little or no word spacing between *1920* and *LDS* in this line; consequently, “the 1920LDS edition” needs to be corrected to “the 1920 LDS edition”.

Alma 30:39, page 2234

For the Hebraistic *if*-clause in this passage, I originally suggested using three dots of ellipsis as a mark of incompleteness. However, a reader might think that these dots represent some unstated words that have been inexplicably omitted from the text. One alternative would be to use a dash rather than the three dots. Another possibility would be to place an exclamation mark at the end of the incomplete clause, to show its imperative nature.

Alma 30:45, page 2237

In the last paragraph of this write-up, I suggest other possible readings for the lacuna in \mathfrak{C} . Another possibility worth mentioning is that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *save* in \mathfrak{C} ; then he immediately crossed it out and wrote *except* inline. For one case where Oliver initially wrote *save* in \mathfrak{D} instead of *except*, see under Mosiah 6:2.

Alma 31:8–9, page 2250, lines 1–4

The correction in Ether 13:28 (namely, the crossout of the perfect auxiliary *had*) was not virtually immediate but instead was done later, apparently when Oliver Cowdery proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (the level of ink flow for the crossout is somewhat heavier). For discussion, see under Ether 13:28. Thus the variant in line 3 here on page 2250 should have a plus added to the correction in \mathcal{P} :

until he [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *had* >+ NULL 1] came

Alma 31:9, page 2251, line 11

The citation is from Alma 31:8–9, not Alma 21:8–9.

Alma 31:29 [31:30], page 2256

For both write-ups under Alma 31:29, the passage is actually Alma 31:30, not Alma 31:29; thus 29 should be replaced with 30 in the header and in the summary for these two write-ups.

■ **Alma 32:19–20** (to be inserted on page 2270 in part 4)

*and now how much more cursed is he that knoweth the will of God and doeth it not
than he that only believeth or only hath cause to believe and falleth into transgression
now of this thing ye must judge
behold I say unto you that it is on the one hand even as it is on the other
and it shall be unto every man according to his **work***

One wonders here if the singular *work* at the end of verse 20 might not be an error for the plural *works*. \mathcal{C} is extant here and reads in the singular. Yet elsewhere in the text we get only the plural phrase “according to one’s works” (20 times), never “according to one’s work” (most of these specifically refer to being judged “according to one’s works”):

2 Nephi 28:23	and be judged according to their works
2 Nephi 29:11	I will judge the world / every man according to their works
Mosiah 3:24	they shall be judged every man according to his works
Mosiah 16:10	to be judged of him according to their works
Alma 3:26	that they might reap their rewards according to their works
Alma 7:27	and now may the peace of God rest upon you . . . according to your faith and good works
Alma 11:41	and be judged according to his works
Alma 11:44	to be judged according to their works
Alma 12:8	to be judged according to their works
Alma 12:12	to be judged according to our works
Alma 12:30	and this he made known unto them according to their faith and repentance and their holy works
Alma 33:22	to be judged at the last and judgment day according to their works
Alma 40:21	and be judged according to their works
Alma 41:3	that men should be judged according to their works

Addenda: Alma

Alma 42:23	to be judged according to their works
Helaman 12:24	that they might be restored unto grace for grace according to their works
3 Nephi 27:15	that they may be judged according to their works
Mormon 3:18	yea unto you twelve tribes of Israel which shall be judged according to your works by the twelve
Mormon 6:21	to be judged according to your works
Mormon 8:19	for according to his works shall his wages be

In each of these, the text is referring to one's acts or deeds in this life. The expression "it shall be unto every man according to his work(s)" appears to be dealing with the judgment of mankind by the Lord, especially given the earlier references in verse 19 to being cursed if one knowingly refuses to do the will of God. This same expression "it shall be unto X" is used in two other passages to refer to the Lord's judgment:

Alma 30:55
if this curse should be taken from thee
thou wouldst again lead away the hearts of this people
→ therefore it shall be unto thee even as the Lord will

Helaman 12:21–22
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 woe unto whom he shall say this
→ for it shall be unto him that will do iniquity
and he cannot be saved

Besides the possible case of error here in Alma 32:20, there are a couple of other cases where the earliest text has the singular *work* but apparently as an error for *works*. In the first case, it appears that scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} accidentally wrote an original *works* as *work*, which Oliver Cowdery copied as such into \mathcal{D} , but then the 1830 typesetter emended the singular to the plural:

1 Nephi 15:33
wherefore they must be brought to stand before God
to be judged of their [*work* 01 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

For that case, the critical text has accepted the 1830 emendation since elsewhere the text consistently refers to people being judged "of their works", not "of their work". In addition, there is specific evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} frequently omitted the plural *s* (as discussed under 1 Nephi 13:23).

A second case, more complicated, involves a mix-up between *works* and *words*:

Alma 12:14
for our [*works* >% *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us
yea all our [*work* 1A | *works* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us

As argued under Alma 12:12–14, the original text here actually read *works* in both instances: "for our **works** will condemn us / yea all our **works** will condemn us".

There is independent evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to write *work* in place of *works*, including the following examples of momentary errors:

- Alma 37:41 (initial error in Θ)
 nevertheless it did shew unto them
 marvelous [*work* > *worke* >+ *works* 0 | *works* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 40:13 (initial error in \wp)
 they chose evil [*works* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *work* > *works* 1]
 rather than good
- Alma 50:2 (initial error in Θ)
 he caused that there should be timbers
 yea [*work* > *works* 0 | *works* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of timbers
 built up to the height of a man

For some general discussion regarding mix-ups of *work* and *works* in the text, see under 2 Nephi 30:17. For a third case where *work* could be an error for *works* (but probably is not), see under Helaman 6:29.

The consistency elsewhere in the text of the expression “according to one’s works” argues that here in Alma 32:20 the one exceptional case of “according to his work” is an error for “according to his works”, especially since the context can be interpreted as dealing with the judgment of the Lord. Nevertheless, as Don Brugger points out (personal communication), the singular *work* is possible in Alma 32:20. Note that *work* is frequently used as a mass noun rather than as a count noun in the text, as in Alma 8:6: “when he had finished his **work** at Melek / he departed thence”. But more significantly, Brugger notes that in a revelation given to Joseph Smith dating from November 1831 the phrase “according to one’s work(s)” occurs in the singular:

- Book of Commandments 1:2 (Doctrine and Covenants 1:9–10)
 yea verily to seal them up
 unto the day when the wrath of God shall be poured out
 upon the wicked without measure
 unto the day when the Lord shall come to recompense
 unto every man **according to his work**
 and measure to every man according to the measure
 which he has measured to his fellow man

Here the text is referring to the day of judgment, thus showing that in such a context the singular *work* is possible for the expression “according to one’s work(s)”. We also note the parallelism between the singular *work* and the singular *measure* in this sentence: “unto every man according to his **work** . . . to every man according to the **measure** which he has measured”. Brugger also notes that this same kind of expression occurs in the singular in the King James Bible:

- Psalm 62:12 for thou renderest to every man **according to his work**
 Proverbs 24:29 I will render to the man **according to his work**
 Revelation 22:12 and my reward *is* with me to give every man
 according as his work shall be

Thus the occurrence of “according to his work” here in Alma 32:20 is possible, despite its uniqueness in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will therefore retain the singular *work* in this

passage since it is possible. Moreover, it is the reading of all the textual sources, including \mathcal{O} ; nor has there ever been any attempt to emend *work* here to *works*.

Summary: Maintain the singular *work* in Alma 32:20; usage from the Doctrine and Covenants and the King James Bible support the singular *work* in the expression “according to one’s work(s)”; the possibility remains that *work* is an error for *works* here in Alma 32:20, but the critical text will follow the unique use of *work* in this passage, especially since it is the reading of all the textual sources, including \mathcal{O} .

Alma 32:37, page 2281, line -12

The *ye* in this line is an error for *he*; the line should read “**that** he may not overpower you”. Note that the surrounding lines in this citation from Alma 34:39 begin with “that ye”, but this one does not.

■ **Alma 37:47** (to be inserted on page 2379 in part 4)

*go unto this people
and declare the word
and be sober*
[01 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | – A]
my son
[01CG | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
farewell

Here at the end of Alma’s discourse to his son Helaman, the question arises whether the noun phrase “my son” should be attached to the preceding imperative (“and be sober”) or to the following word of valediction, *farewell*. From the 1830 edition on, “my son” has been attached to the *farewell* (“my son, farewell”). But the phraseology can be parsed so that the text reads “and be sober, my son”.

The same issue comes up at the end of Alma’s letter to his son Shiblon:

Alma 38:15
now go / my son
and teach the word unto this people
be sober
[01 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
my son
[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
farewell

In this case, one could argue that since “my son” already occurs near the beginning of the sentence (“now go, my son”), there is no need to have it at the end (as “be sober, my son”). On the other hand, one could argue that there is a difference here in Alma 38:15: “be sober” has no *and* separating it from the preceding imperatives, so we end up with two sentences and each one has the phrase “my son”. Thus when there is an *and* (as in Alma 37:47), there is only one instance of “my son” for the sentence, at the end; but when there is no *and* (as in Alma 38:15), there are effectively two sentences, and each one has an instance of “my son” at the end of the sentence.

Generally speaking, there is evidence for “my son”, as a term of address, coming at either the very beginning or ending of a finite clause, as in these two examples:

Mosiah 1:10 (at the beginning of the clause)

and these are the words which he spake unto him saying :

→ my son / I would that ye should make a proclamation
throughout all this land among all this people

1 Nephi 3:6 (at the end of the clause)

→ therefore go / my son
and thou shalt be favored of the Lord
because thou hast not murmured

In the second of these examples, we note that the main clause is an imperative, “therefore go / my son”, just as with the clause “(and) be sober / my son”.

More specifically, however, usage elsewhere in the text argues for attaching noun phrases of direct address to the word of valediction:

Jacob 7:27

and to the reader I bid farewell
hoping that many of my brethren may read my words
brethren / adieu

Moroni 8:30

farewell / my son
until I shall write unto you
or shall meet you again
Amen

The first example (Jacob 7:27) is supported by usage in the King James Bible: “finally, brethren, farewell” (2 Corinthians 13:11). In the second example (Moroni 8:30), the word order is the opposite (that is, “my son” follows the word of valediction). Interestingly, in the printer’s manuscript for Moroni 8:30 Oliver Cowdery started to write the expression with “my son” coming before *farewell*, but he then corrected the reading so that “my son” follows *farewell*. Yet with either order, in Moroni 8:30 the phrase “my son” belongs with *farewell*. Thus usage argues that we should maintain the current phraseology at the end of Alma’s discourses to Helaman and Shiblon. Even so, the placement of “my son” with “(and) be sober” seems to read more fluently.

Summary: Maintain the current punctuation at the end of Alma 37:47 and Alma 38:15, where the phrase “my son” is attached to the word *farewell*.

Alma 38:11, page 2386, lines 15–16

Here, in two places, the phrase should read “in your **own** wisdom”, not “in my **own** wisdom”; that is, the *my* is an error for *your*.

Alma 39:2–3, page 2389

For discussion of the nonstandard use of *grievious* in Alma 39:3, see under 1 Nephi 17:25.

Alma 40:19, page 2414

In the citation of Alma 40:2, the first dash should occur earlier, as follows:

Alma 40:2
behold I say unto you
that there is no resurrection
—or I would say in other words
that this mortal does not put on immortality /
this corruption does not put on incorruption—
until after the coming of Christ

Alma 41:13, page 2426, line 10

A more complete discussion covering this issue can be found under 2 Nephi 13:14 rather than under 2 Nephi 15:25.

Alma 42:7, page 2434, line 4

Remove the slash in this line of the citation, as follows:

*and thus **we** see they became subjects to follow after their own will*

Alma 42:19, page 2441, line -12

Remove the dashes and slash from this line of the citation and combine it with the previous line, thus:

*now if there was no law given if a man murdered he **should** die*

Alma 43:25, page 2475, line -8

When I refer here to legal language “contemporary with the Book of Mormon translation”, I mean legal language in the 1830s.

Alma 43:35, page 2477, line 4

Since the 1920 LDS edition restored the original *came* here in Alma 43:35, the past-tense form *came* should be maintained rather than restored.

■ **Alma 43:50**, pages 2491–92

*and they began to stand against the Lamanites with power
and in [the 1PS|that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] selfsame hour
that they cried unto the Lord for their freedom
the Lamanites began to flee before them*

Under Alma 43:50 in part 4, I noted that the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, may have corrected an original *the* to *that* after Oliver Cowdery proofed the 22nd signature of the 1830 edition against \mathcal{C} , not \mathcal{D} . In the discussion under Helaman 14:20 (on pages 3120–23 in part 5), I observed that this is the only case in Gilbert’s typesetting when he replaced a *the* in \mathcal{D} with a *that*. On the other hand,

Oliver Cowdery was prone to replace the determiner *that* with *the* (see the examples listed under Helaman 14:20), so in Alma 43:50 the odds are that \mathcal{C} read *that*. For the evidence that Oliver proofed this particular 1830 signature against \mathcal{C} , see pages 2448–50 in part 4 (under Alma 42:31). For Alma 43:50, then, the critical text will reverse the decision made under that passage in part 4, thus accepting the 1830 reading as the reading in \mathcal{C} and the original reading in the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Contrary to my earlier decision, the 1830 reading will be maintained in Alma 43:50 (“and in **that** selfsame hour”) since in no other instance did the 1830 compositor replace *the* with *that*; on the other hand, Oliver Cowdery frequently replaced an original *that* with *the* in his copywork.

Alma 45:13, page 2520, line 18

The variant for \mathcal{P} listed in this line cited from Helaman 7:1 should read as follows:

[*Neph >+ the Nepites 1 | the Nephtes ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*]

See under that passage, Helaman 7:1, for how Oliver Cowdery wrote this in \mathcal{P} .

Alma 46:23, page 2548, line 5

The plural *prisons* occurs only in \mathcal{C} , so the summarizing statement should state that *prisons* should be restored in accord with “the reading of the original manuscript” (not “the two manuscripts”).

Alma 46:24, page 2549, line 16

The edition here should read 1953^c, not 1853^c.

Alma 48:21, page 2597, line -11

Here I state that *year* is ellipted in only one passage in the original text (namely, in the first part of 4 Nephi 1:6). This is not correct. For an accurate description, including a list of other examples of ellipted *year*, see the discussion under Helaman 3:3. As described there, the same restriction holds for every case where *year* is properly ellipted in a clause (namely, the word *year* actually occurs elsewhere in the clause). The missing *year* in \mathcal{P} for Alma 48:21 (and in \mathcal{C} for Helaman 3:3) violates that restriction.

Alma 50:2, page 2612, line -8

The second dash in this line in the citation should be removed, thus:

he caused that there should be timbers—yea works of timbers built up to the heighth of a man

Alma 50:19–20, page 2622, lines 2–3

The punctuation for these two lines from Alma 50:20 should be revised so that they read as follows:

Blessed art thou and thy children.
And they shall be blessed!

Alma 50:27–28, page 2629, line 2

Originally I thought that the earliest reading with the word *took* in “they took a large body of men of the Lamanites” was an error for *overtook*, so I cited this line from Alma 62:15–16 as “they overtook a large body of men of the Lamanites”. Subsequent analysis, described under Alma 62:15–16 in part 5, led me to decide that *took* was an acceptable reading here. The line here should therefore read as follows:

they took a large body of men of the Lamanites and slew many of them

Alma 51:14, page 2643, lines 7–8

The instances of the preposition *of* at the head of a relative clause, mentioned under 2 Nephi 3:14, sometimes have the meaning ‘regarding’, just as the original *of* apparently had here in Alma 51:14.

■ **Alma 51:23** (to be inserted at the bottom of page 2645 in part 4)

*the Nephites were not sufficiently strong in the city of Moroni
therefore Amalickiah did drive them / slaying many*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 9 May 2009) suggests the possibility that the adverb *out* could be missing from the second line here, that the original text may have read “Amalickiah did drive them **out** / slaying many”. He notes that a specific city is being referred to, “the city of Moroni”, and the Nephite defenders would have been driven out of the city. After examining more of the evidence, however, Kerby recognizes that the original reading is probably correct here. For instance, there is another passage that refers to Nephite defenders being driven out of a city, yet as here in Alma 51:23 there is no *out*:

Mormon 4:20–21

and they fled again from before them and they came to the city Boaz
and there they did stand against the Lamanites with exceeding boldness
insomuch that the Lamanites did not beat them
until they had come again the second time
and when they had come the second time
the Nephites were **driven** and slaughtered with an exceeding great slaughter

To be sure, there are a couple cases in the text where the text specifically refers to driving defenders out of a city:

Mormon 2:4

but notwithstanding all our fortifications
the Lamanites did come upon us and did drive us **out** of the city

Mormon 4:14

and they did also march forward against the city Teancum
and did drive the inhabitants forth **out** of her and did take many prisoners

Addenda: Alma

And there is evidence that in the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery occasionally omitted *out*, but only momentarily (for one example, see under Alma 58:15). But defenders can be driven from a city without specifically stating that they have been driven "out of the city".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 51:23 the original language without the adverb *out*: "Amalickiah did drive them / slaying many".

Alma 51:25–26, pages 2647–49

The conjecture that *Nephihah* is an error for *Moroni* was earlier proposed by W. Cleon Skousen on page 145 of volume 3 of *Hidden Treasures from the Book of Mormon* (Provo, Utah: Dana Press, 1972):

As Mormon commenced listing the cities as they fell, he made a slight error. . . . He meant to say that the first city to fall was Moroni, having just explained in verse 24 that Amalickiah had kept his army down along the seashore. But he wrote down "Nephihah," the inland city to which the survivors had fled. He then went on to list the other cities along the eastern coast. We know this was a technical mistake because in Alma 59:5 we learn that Nephihah had NOT been conquered by the Lamanites but had become a city of refuge for the Nephites who had escaped from several of the seacoast cities. This present verse should therefore say that Amalickiah and the Lamanites had first conquered Moroni (rather than Nephihah) . . .

Alma 51:31, page 2652, line -16

The indefinite article *a* should be in bold in this citation line since the possibility that it is an error for *the* is discussed in the write-up. The line should therefore read as follows:

*but behold he met with **a** disappointment*

■ **Alma 52:24–25** (to be inserted on page 2667 in part 4)

*and while Teancum was thus leading away the Lamanites
which were pursuing them in vain
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*

Here the text could theoretically read as either "and **thus** they did" or "and **this** they did". Under Alma 24:17–18, I provided evidence that in cases of *this* versus *thus* the critical text will normally follow the earliest textual reading unless there is specific evidence to make us think there might be a textual error. Here in Alma 52:24–25, the earliest *thus* (the reading in \mathfrak{G}) will be maintained. It should be noted that under Alma 11:21 I had indicated I would discuss this item in part 4, but I neglected to do so; thus I have added this brief discussion as an addendum.

Summary: Maintain *thus* in Alma 52:25, the reading of all the textual sources (including \mathfrak{G}).

■ **Alma 55:16–17** (to be inserted at the top of page 2706 in part 4)

*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
insomuch that they were all armed*

[0|NULL >jg ; 1|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*yea even to their women and all those of their children
as many as were able to use a weapon of war*

[NULL >jg ; 1|; ABCDGHKPS|, EFIJLMNOQRT]

→ *when Moroni had armed all those prisoners*

[0|NULL >jg , >jg . 1|. ABCDGHKPS|; EFIJLMNOQRT]

and all those things were done in a profound silence

[0|NULL >jg . 1|. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

This passage and the following four verses need to be repunctuated. The subordinate clause “when Moroni had armed all those prisoners” (identified by the arrow in the above citation) actually belongs with the following text. Only in verse 20 does Mormon return to the subject of Moroni arming the prisoners (“for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites”); and then in verse 21 Mormon finally says what Moroni did after arming the prisoners: “and then he caused his men which were with him to withdraw a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites”. In the middle of verse 17, the critical text will have a new sentence begin with the *when*-clause, while all the intervening text through verse 20 will be treated as parenthetical, thus stating in a Hebrew-like fashion, with an *and* before the main clause, that “when Moroni had armed all those prisoners . . . **and** then he caused his men which were with him to withdraw a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites”.

The structural problem here in Alma 55:16–21 was first brought to my attention by Robert Baer (personal communication, 20 July 1989). Baer refers to an article by Larry Childs, in a FARMS Preliminary Report dating from 1986, “Epanalepsis in the Book of Mormon”, that more generally discusses this kind of repetition (sometimes called “resumptive repetition”) in the Book of Mormon text. (A summary of Larry Childs’ work in this area is found in the summer 1986 issue of *Insights*, the FARMS newsletter.) Here in Alma 55:16–21, we thus end up with two references to the arming of the prisoners, the initial one in verse 17 and the resumptive one in verse 20.

Summary: Restructure Alma 55:16–21 so that the subordinate clause “when Moroni had armed all those prisoners” in verse 17 is completed by the main clause in verse 21 (“and then he caused his men which were with him to withdraw a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites”).

■ Alma 56:23–24 (to be inserted on page 2734 in part 5)

*therefore we were desirous
if they should pass by us
to fall upon them in their rear
and thus **bring** them up in the rear
at the same time they were met in the front
[01 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
we supposed that we could overpower them
but behold we were disappointed in this our desire
they durst not pass by us with their whole army
neither durst they with a part
lest they should not be sufficiently strong and they should fall*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 11 May 2009) proposes that the base verb form *bring* here is an error for the present-participial form *bringing*. ☹ is not extant here, nor is there enough room in the lacuna between extant fragments for the longer *bringing* (except by supralinear correction). Yet an original *bringing* could have been misheard by the scribe (Oliver Cowdery) when taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation since *bring* ends with the same sound sequence *ing* as the inflectional ending *-ing*.

Kerby’s argument for the emendation here is that the text is trying to explain why Helaman and his men supposed they could overpower the Lamanite army, namely, by means of a simultaneous attack from the rear and the front. And their disappointment is not that they were unable to overpower the Lamanites. As explained here in verses 24–26, the Nephites weren’t even given that opportunity: the Lamanites would not come out of the cities that they had already taken. The Nephites’ disappointment, then, was that the Lamanites were not tricked into leaving their places of security so they could be attacked. In the current text, the statement explaining why the Nephites thought they could overpower the Lamanites seems completely unrelated to what has just been said. But by emending *bring* to *bringing*, everything suddenly makes sense and is logically connected:

Alma 56:23–24 (as emended, along with altered accidentals)

Therefore we were desirous,
if they should pass by us,
to fall upon them in their rear;
and thus **bringing** them up in the rear
at the same time they were met in the front,
we supposed that we could overpower them.
But behold, we were disappointed in this our desire.
They durst not pass by us with their whole army,
neither durst they with a part,
lest they should not be sufficiently strong and they should fall.

Although there are no examples of base verbs ending in *ing* losing the inflectional ending *-ing*, there is some minor evidence that the present-participial *-ing* can be lost from a verb under the influence of a preceding finite verb form:

1 Nephi 1:1

therefore I **was** taught somewhat in all the learning of my father
and [*haveing* 1 | *having* ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *have* > *having* B] seen
many afflictions in the course of my days . . .

Here the preceding finite verb form *was* seems to have led the 1837 compositor to initially set *having* as *have*.

As we would expect, there is syntactic evidence for the use of “and . . . thus” at the beginning of a subjectless present-participial clause followed by its main clause:

1 Nephi 1:8

and being thus overcome with the Spirit
he was carried away in a vision

Alma 43:33

and thus having placed his army according to his desire
he was prepared to meet them

Alma 49:7

and being thus prepared
they supposed that they should easily overpower and subject their brethren
to the yoke of bondage

Alma 59:7

and thus being exceeding numerous
yea and **receiving** strength from day to day by the command of Ammoron
they came forth against the people of Nephihah

Note that in the example in Alma 49:7, the verb in the main clause is *suppose* and the verb in the following subordinate *that*-clause is *overpower* (just as it is here in Alma 56:23).

It seems rather difficult here in Alma 56:23 to correct the earliest reading by punctuation alone in order to get the correct logical connection between the various clauses. The critical text will therefore accept the emendation here, replacing *bring* with *bringing*.

Summary: Emend *bring* to *bringing* in Alma 56:23 so that we now get a direct explanation for the conditions under which Helaman and his men supposed they could overpower the Lamanites: “and thus **bringing** them up in the rear at the same time they were met in the front / we supposed that we could overpower them”.

Alma 56:31, pages 2734–35

There are two separate write-ups under Alma 56:31, but they were placed in the wrong order in part 5. The one dealing with “the city (of) Antiparah” should come first.

Alma 56:37, page 2737, line -15

The word *original* should be removed here. Here in Alma 56:37, there is no variation in the accidentals for the 1830 edition. The header for this citation should therefore read: “Alma 56:37 (the 1830 text with its accidentals)”.

■ **Alma 58:7** (to be inserted on page 2776 in part 5)

*we did **wait** in these difficult circumstances for the space of many months
even until we were about to perish for the want of food*

Lyle Fletcher suggests (personal communication, 18 February 2009) that the word *wait* here may be an error for *wade*. There is an earlier passage in this part of the text that has *wade* along with a prepositional phrase that describes the circumstances (as here in Alma 58:7):

Alma 53:15

therefore all those which had entered into this covenant
were compelled to behold their brethren **wade** through their afflictions
in their dangerous circumstances at this time

Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ for Alma 58:7, could have mistakenly heard *wait* instead of *wade* since they are both phonetically similar (although there are no examples in the text of mix-ups between these two words). One could also argue that preceding uses of the verb *wait* here in Alma 58 could have prompted Oliver to write *wait* in verse 7:

Alma 58:3 that we should **wait** that we might receive more strength
from the land of Zarahemla

Alma 58:4 we did **wait** to receive provisions and strength
from the land of Zarahemla

There's also a relevant instance of *wait* later on, in Alma 60:30: "I wait for assistance from you".

The main problem with emending the text here is that elsewhere in the text all instances of *wade* are followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *through*, including the one in Alma 53:15 (also noted above):

1 Nephi 17:1	and wade through much afflictions
Mosiah 27:28	after wading through much tribulation
Alma 7:5	after wading through much afflictions and sorrow
Alma 8:14	wading through much tribulation and anguish of soul
Alma 53:15	to behold their brethren wade through their afflictions
Helaman 3:34	and to wade through much affliction

The corresponding expression in Alma 58:7 lacks such a prepositional phrase.

Finally, we have to recognize that the current reading in Alma 58:7 is acceptable. Helaman's army is waiting for provisions; without those provisions, they are on the point of perishing. Thus the critical text will retain the verb *wait* in Alma 58:7 since it works perfectly well.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 58:7 the earliest reading with the verb *wait* in "we did **wait** in these difficult circumstances for the space of many months"; here it is doubtful that *wait* is an error for *wade*.

Alma 59:8, page 2799, lines 14 and 16

In line 16 the citation is from Alma 59:6, not Alma 58:6, which means that the language in line 14 should be revised to read "nearby in this chapter" instead of "nearby in the previous chapter".

Alma 60:12, page 2807, line 15

Actually, the current RLDS text no longer follows the 1840 emendation. In 1908, for the third RLDS edition, the earlier reading that lacks *it is* was restored to the RLDS text.

Alma 61:8, page 2823, line -17

As explained under the addendum for 1 Nephi 3:2, Joseph Smith himself emended 27 out of 57 instances of “in the which” in the earliest text. Thus the sentence here under Alma 61:8 should state more accurately that Joseph Smith edited “nearly half” of those instances.

■ **Alma 62:20** (to be inserted at the top of page 2845 in part 5)

*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 what part of the city the Lamanites did camp with their army*

Although all the extant textual sources here read *upon* (☉ is not extant), the critical text will reinterpret this as the more literal *up on*. Compare this with the original use of *up upon* two verses later:

Alma 62:22

Moroni caused that his men should march forth
and come [*up* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **upon** the top of the wall

We also have the following example of *up upon* in the next book:

Helaman 14:11

for for this intent I have come **up upon** the walls of this city

These two examples suggest that we could alternatively emend Alma 62:20 to read *up upon* rather than *up on*. Here we accept the simpler emendation, *up on*. For further discussion of cases where *upon* should be reinterpreted as either *up on* or *up upon*, see under 2 Nephi 4:24–25 and Ether 3:1.

Summary: Emend *upon* in Alma 62:20 to read more literally as *up on*.

Alma 62:20, page 2845, line 4

As explained just above, the line here in the citation of Alma 62:20 should read as *up on* rather than as *upon*: “and came up on the top of the wall to spy out”.

Alma 62:22, page 2845

In this passage, the probable reason the 1830 typesetter omitted the adverb *up* from the predicate “and come **up upon** the top of the wall” is that two verses earlier the text read “and came **upon** the top of the wall”—that is, without the *up*. But as explained above in the addendum for Alma 62:20, the preposition *upon* in verse 20 should actually be interpreted more literally as *up on*.

■ **Helaman 3:17–18** (to be inserted on page 2917 in part 5)

*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*
[0|NULL >jg . 1|. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the forty and sixth year of the reign of the judges ended

There is a problem here with the punctuation. There should be some kind of stop after “what I have spoken had passed”, such as a semicolon or a period. The following *after*-clause belongs with the statement that “the forty and sixth year of the reign of the judges ended”. The things Mormon is speaking about (“what I have spoken had passed”) are represented by these contentions, disturbances, wars, and dissensions. These events did not occur after these contentions, disturbances, wars, and dissensions; they were a part of them (as stated earlier in verse 3: “and it came to pass in the forty and sixth year there were much contentions and many dissensions”).

Moreover, in verse 18 the current punctuation means that there is no connector for the clause “the forty and sixth year of the reign of the judges ended”. But for all other instances of this kind of clause (ones that declare the end of a year) there is always some kind of link to the preceding text (48 times), such as in these different types:

Alma 3:27	and thus ended the fifth year of the reign of the judges
Alma 28:9	and the fifteenth year of the reign of the judges is ended
Alma 50:24	and it came to pass that the twenty and second year of the reign of the judges also ended in peace
Helaman 1:13	and all this was done in the fortieth year of the reign of the judges and it had an end
Helaman 6:41	and it came to pass that thus ended the sixty and eighth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Among these examples is one that follows the same general syntactic structure that I am proposing here in Helaman 3:17–18, namely, an *after*-clause followed by the main clause referring to the end of the year:

Alma 16:21 (with a Hebrew-like *and* before the main clause)
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
and thus ended the fourteenth year of the reign of the judges
over the people of Nephi

The critical text will therefore revise the syntactic structure here in Helaman 3:17–18 so that the preceding *after*-clause is connected to the following main clause referring to the end of the year.

Summary: Restructure the phraseology in Helaman 3:17–18 so that there is a semicolon or period after the clause “therefore what I have spoken had passed”; the current stop between verses 17 and 18 should be removed, thus allowing a comma to separate the *after*-clause from its following main clause, “the forty and sixth year of the reign of the judges ended”.

Helaman 5:30, page 2952, line -1

At the end of the summary, I should also note that the indefinite article *a* needs to be maintained before “great tumultuous noise”.

Helaman 6:39, page 2988, line -1

At the end of the summary, I should add that the definite article *the* rather than *their* needs to be maintained before the word *poor*, with the result that the entire prepositional phrase reads “upon the poor and the meek and humble followers of God”.

Helaman 7:15, page 3001, line 13

The verb *sound* should not be set in bold; the second line of the citation for Ether 14:28 should read “**and did** sound a trumpet unto the armies of Shiz”.

Helaman 8:16, page 3019, lines 16–17

The summary misquotes the phrases and should therefore be revised as follows:

Restore in Helaman 8:16 the singular *day* in the phrase “from his day”; the singular is possible even though the text generally prefers the plural noun phrase *his days* over the singular *his day*.

Helaman 14:3, page 3112, line 13

The word *edition* is missing after 1830 in the summary; the correct phraseology is “both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition”.

■ **Helaman 14:5** (to be inserted in the middle of page 3115 in part 5)

and behold there shall [*be* 1CGHKPS | ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] *a new star* **arise**

In part 5, I discussed the question of whether this expression originally had the verb form *be* or not. For this part of the text, the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} , so the question becomes whether the reading in \mathcal{P} (with the *be*) or the 1830 reading (without the *be*) is correct. As noted there in part 5, the original reading in 2 Nephi 1:6 (“there shall **be** none come into this land”) supports the occurrence of the *be* here in Helaman 14:5.

In both of these cases, we naturally interpret the expression to be of the form “there shall be <noun phrase> <infinitive>”. Brent Kerby, on the other hand, has suggested (personal communication, 10 August 2008) that the original reading in 2 Nephi 1:6 can be interpreted as being of the form “there shall be <noun phrase> <past participle>” since the form *come* can stand for either the infinitive form or the past-participial form. Applying that interpretation here in Helaman 14:5, we should have “and behold there shall **be** a new star **arisen**”. Kerby then wonders if the *arise* in Helaman 14:5 might be an error for *arisen*. In this case, the word-final *n* would have been accidentally omitted in \mathcal{O} (as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery) since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} for this part of the text and they both read *arise*, not *arisen* (\mathcal{O} is not extant here).

Addenda: Helaman

We can find evidence for this kind of existential construction elsewhere in the text, that is, sentences of the form “there shall be <noun phrase> <past participle>”:

2 Nephi 26:3	there shall be signs given unto my people
Mosiah 3:17	there shall be no other name given
Helaman 14:23	there shall be many mountains laid low
3 Nephi 18:5	there shall one be ordained among you
Mormon 8:32	there shall be churches built up that shall say . . .

Note, however, that for each of these five cases the past-participial form is a transitive verb and is used in the passive. This is not the case in 2 Nephi 1:6 and Helaman 14:5. The verbs *come* and *arise* are intransitive and should not take the passive. Moreover, there is no evidence in the textual history of a final past-participial *n* being omitted unless the resulting form is a simple past-tense form (as, for instance, in 1 Nephi 17:20 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *have bore* for *have borne* in \mathcal{O}). In other words, there is very little chance that *arise* is an error for *arisen* here in Helaman 14:5. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading, “there shall be a new star arise”; it appears that this reading was the reading in \mathcal{O} , no longer extant. Correspondingly, in 2 Nephi 1:6 (“there shall be none come into this land”) the verb form *come* is the infinitive form, not the past-participial form.

Summary: Maintain the infinitive verb form *arise* in “there shall be a new star arise”, the reading of the earliest textual sources; this reading is supported by the reading in 2 Nephi 1:6 (“there shall be none come into this land”).

Helaman 14:20, page 3124, line -13

The lack of daylight occurred at the time of Christ’s death, not at the time of his birth. Here the word *birth* should be replaced with *death*.

■ **Helaman 16:12** (to be inserted on page 3167 in part 5)

*and there were but little alteration in the affairs of the people
save it were the people began to be more hardened in iniquity
and do more and more of that which was contrary to the commandments of God
→ in the eighty and ninth year of the reign of the judges*

In the transcript for \mathcal{O} , in order to fit the text into a rather long lacuna in the manuscript (of about six manuscript lines), I proposed that the last sense-line here in Helaman 16:12 was initially omitted in \mathcal{O} . I have no specific evidence that it was this part of the text that was initially skipped in \mathcal{O} , contrary to the claim stated in the original discussion under Alma 4:20 in part 3. For a full explanation, see under the addendum for Alma 4:20 here in part 6 of volume 4. The critical text will, to be sure, maintain this long phrase at the end of Helaman 16:12.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 16:12 the final phrase “in the eighty and ninth year of the reign of the judges” as part of the original text; there is a possibility that it was initially omitted in \mathcal{O} , but there is no specific evidence that this is the phrase that was actually omitted initially in \mathcal{O} for this part of the text.

3 Nephi 1:8, page 3183, line -4

Since the *should* was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition, the critical text will maintain, not restore, the *should* in 3 Nephi 1:8.

3 Nephi 3:2, page 3215, lines 4–5

The discussion of the spelling *god* without capitalization is actually found under Mormon 9:10–11, not under Mormon 9:10.

3 Nephi 3:14, page 3224, lines 9–11

The phrase “both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites” should directly postmodify the noun *armies*; thus the sentence should read as “there should be armies both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites . . . should be placed as guards”. The dashes should occur around only the parenthetical phrase “or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites”. Thus the third and fourth lines in the citation should read as follows:

both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites
— or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites —

■ **3 Nephi 4:8** (to be inserted at the bottom of page 3243 in part 5)

and deliver them

out of the [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of their enemies

Under Mosiah 16:1 in part 2, I stated that I would separately discuss in volume 4 each instance in a long list of cases where *hand* and *hands* had been mixed up, even if only momentarily, in the history of the text. Except for one case, all are discussed under their appropriate places in volume 4; the missing case is the one here in 3 Nephi 4:8.

In this instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *hand* at the end of a manuscript line in \mathcal{P} , then virtually immediately added the plural *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correcting *s*). Here the 1830 edition also reads in the plural. For this part of the text, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} ; thus \mathcal{O} undoubtedly read in the plural, as will the critical text. As explained under Alma 5:4, the original text strongly prefers plural instances of “delivering someone out of the **hand(s)** of X”; the expression virtually always takes the plural *hands* (32 times, including here in 3 Nephi 4:8), but there is apparently one instance of the singular *hand* (in Alma 5:4).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:8 the plural *hands*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} as well as the 1830 reading.

■ 3 Nephi 7:7–8 (to be inserted on page 3296 in part 5)

*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—
and thus six years had not passed away
since the more part of the people had turned from their righteousness*

Brent Kerby (personal communication, 15 December 2008) wonders if the word *since* isn't a mistake in this passage. The context implies that the meaning here is 'six years had not passed away **before** the more part of the people had turned from their righteousness'. Kerby suggests a number of emendations, including the possibility that *since* is an error for *and*. One other possibility is that in this passage *since* has the meaning of 'before' or 'until', although no direct evidence for this meaning can be found in the Oxford English Dictionary. (Under definition 4 for the adverb *since*, the OED lists the meaning 'ago, before now', but none of the citations listed there are appropriate for the expression in 3 Nephi 7:8, where *since* is a subordinate conjunction.) Despite the difficulty of the use of *since* here, the critical text will maintain it; the context here makes the *since*-clause readily understandable.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:8 the subordinate conjunction *since*, in spite of its unusual use here; in modern English, we expect *before* or *until* rather than *since*.

3 Nephi 8:17, page 3316, line -17

The definite article *the* before *small words* should be omitted, giving "the loss of small words like *thus* is more likely".

3 Nephi 10:4, page 3336, between lines 8 and 9

The line of space between the second and third instances of "yea O ye people of the house of Israel" should be removed since these two instances belong to the same verse (3 Nephi 10:5). The two other lines of space in this citation will be maintained since they separate off the two other verses (4 and 6) from verse 5.

3 Nephi 12:34, page 3374, lines 19–20

The word *edition* should follow 1830, thus "since both \mathcal{D} and the 1830 edition, the earliest textual sources, read that way".

3 Nephi 17:17, page 3418, lines 10–11 and 18

The citation from Moroni 9:19 at the bottom of page 3417 unfortunately prompted me to twice write "tongue cannot tell" rather than the correct "tongue cannot speak" on the following page. On lines 10–11, the phrase should read "and no tongue cannot speak"; and at the end of line 18, the phrase should read "and tongue cannot speak".

A NOTE ON THE TYPE

The text for this book was set in Adobe Minion, a contemporary typeface designed in 1990 by Robert Slimbach (b. 1956). He has created many typefaces for Adobe Systems and the International Typeface Corporation, including Adobe Garamond, Utopia, Myriad, and ITC Slimbach. In 1991 he received the Charles Peignot Award for excellence in type design. Slimbach modeled his new typeface after classical old-style types from the late Renaissance period, and called his typeface Minion after one of the names denoting a typeface size in early printing; the word means “a beloved servant.”

The symbols O and P used in the text representing the original and printer’s manuscripts were adapted from letters created by Laurie Szujewska, an art director at Adobe Systems.

TYPOGRAPHY BY JONATHAN SALTZMAN