

2 Nephi 11

■ 2 Nephi 11:3

and my brother Jacob

[*also hath* 1A | *also has* BCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *has also* J] *seen him*
as I have seen him

Here the 1888 LDS large-print edition shifted the placement of the word *also*, from immediately after the subject “my brother Jacob” to after the perfect auxiliary verb that immediately follows. The variation here also involves an 1837 change of *hath* to *has*, but that is irrelevant to the word order issue. (For further discussion of *hath* versus *has*, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.)

Elsewhere the text has 11 examples of *also* between the subject and the perfect auxiliary verb *have*:

1 Nephi 1:16	and he also hath written many things
1 Nephi 4:11	and he also had taken away our property
1 Nephi 5:2	and she also had complained against my father
1 Nephi 14:5	and thou also hast heard that . . .
1 Nephi 17:44	yea and ye also have sought to take away his life
1 Nephi 20:19	thy seed also had been as the sand
2 Nephi 6:9	and he also hath shewn unto me that . . .
Jacob 5:55	the natural trees which also had become wild
Jacob 7:12	and it also hath been made manifest unto me
Alma 20:29	and they also had suffered hunger
Ether 4:5	and he also hath commanded that . . .

None of these other examples of *also* were shifted in the 1888 LDS edition, which implies that the shift here in 2 Nephi 11:3 was accidental. The 1888 edition was never used as a copy-text for subsequent LDS editions; therefore this error was never perpetuated. For another example of such an accidental shift, see Jacob 7:12; there the 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally placed the *also* after the perfect auxiliary.

Of course, *also* can come after the auxiliary verb *have*. There are, for instance, 20 examples where the subject is immediately followed by the perfect auxiliary *have* and then *also* (as in 2 Nephi 5:12: “and I Nephi had **also** brought the records”). For an example where *also* was accidentally (but only momentarily) moved in front of the perfect auxiliary, see Alma 33:10. In all these cases, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining the placement of *also*.

Summary: In 2 Nephi 11:3, the word *also* immediately follows the subject “my brother Jacob” rather than following the perfect auxiliary verb form *hath*.

■ 2 Nephi 11:4

*behold my soul delighteth in proving unto my people the truth of the coming of Christ
for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this end hath the law of Moses been given*

Although this double occurrence of *for* (as “for for”) seems awkward to modern English readers, it is nonetheless fairly common in the Book of Mormon text, occurring six times elsewhere:

2 Nephi 25:25

for [NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this end
was the law given

2 Nephi 26:10

for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for the reward of their pride
and their foolishness
they shall reap destruction

2 Nephi 31:17

for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this cause
have they been shewn unto me

Jacob 4:4

for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this intent
have we written these things

Helaman 14:11

for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this intent
I have come up upon the walls of this city

Moroni 8:6

for [1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for this intent
I have written this epistle

In each instance, the first *for* is a subordinate conjunction and the second *for* is a preposition (typically in phrases such as “for this intent”, “for this cause”, and “for this end”). One could shift the word order around to show that the use of the double *for* is indeed intended, as here in 2 Nephi 11:4: “**for** the law of Moses hath been given **for** this end”. In each of these examples, the 1830 typesetter placed a comma between the two *for*’s, in order to help the reader parse the sentence. None of these double *for*’s have ever been elided to a single *for*, either by accident or by editing.

This same use of “for for” is found in the King James Bible, but unlike the Book of Mormon editions, the printed King James text does not have a comma between the two *for*’s:

Romans 13:6

For for this cause pay ye tribute also:

1 Peter 4:6

For for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead,

(For these examples, the King James accidentals are provided.)

Summary: All instances of double *for* (that is, “for for”) in the Book of Mormon are intentional and have never been edited, despite their unusualness for modern English readers.

■ 2 Nephi 11:5

*yea my soul delighteth in his grace
and [1ABCGHKPS | in DEFIJLMNOQRT] his justice and power and mercy
in the great and eternal plan of deliverance from death*

There is no substantial evidence that the 1841 printer ever tried to edit the Book of Mormon text, so the introduction of *in* here in 2 Nephi 11:5 seems to be a typo, undoubtedly influenced by the occurrence of *his* before both *grace* and *justice*, which thus triggered the repetition of the preceding *in*. The RLDS text derives from the 1840 Cincinnati (Nauvoo) edition, not from the 1841 British edition; thus the original reading without the extra *in* has been maintained in the RLDS editions.

The introduction of the second *in* suggests the possibility that “the great and eternal plan of deliverance from death” might depend on only God’s justice, power, and mercy, not his grace. By removing the intrusive second *in*, the possibility of such a misreading is reduced.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the original text by removing the 1841 typo that inserted the preposition *in* before *his justice*.

■ 2 Nephi 11:8

*and now I write some of the words of Isaiah
that whoso of my people
[which >]s NULL 1 | which A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall see these words
may lift up their hearts and rejoice for all men*

The original construction here in 2 Nephi 11:8 reads perfectly well even if it is technically ungrammatical. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the relative pronoun *which*, but the resulting text is actually more difficult to comprehend. Normally in the text, when the relative pronoun *whoso(ever)* is the subject of a *wh*-noun clause, the predicate in that noun clause immediately follows, as in 2 Nephi 26:32: “for **whoso doeth them** shall perish”. There is no difficulty, of course, in understanding such *wh*-noun clauses. But here in 2 Nephi 11:8, there is an intervening prepositional phrase (“of my people”) between *whoso* and the noun-clause predicate (“shall see these words”). If the prepositional phrase had been missing, then “whoso shall see these words” would be the expected phraseology, definitely not “whoso **which** shall see these words” (or “whoso **that** shall see these words”). But given the intervening “of my people”, the reader is helped by having the relative pronoun *which* there.

Elsewhere there are only three cases where *whoso(ever)* is not immediately followed by its predicate:

Mosiah 4:28

and I would that ye should remember that
whosoever **among you**
[that 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPS | RT] borroweth of his neighbor
should return the thing that he borroweth

Helaman 6:24

and whosoever **of those**[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] belonged

to their band

should reveal unto the world of their wickedness and their abominations

should be tried

not according to the laws of their country

but according to the laws of their wickedness

3 Nephi 18:13

but whoso **among you** shall do more or less than these

are not built upon my rock

but are built upon a sandy foundation

In each of these cases, *whoso(ever)* is postmodified by a prepositional phrase. The first of these (Mosiah 4:28) was originally like 2 Nephi 11:8 in that its prepositional phrase was followed by a relative clause (“whosoever among you **that** borroweth of his neighbor”). The relative pronoun *that* was deleted in the 1920 LDS edition, but the RLDS text has retained it. Unlike 2 Nephi 11:8, this example in Mosiah 4:28 was not edited by Joseph Smith. In contrast to the cases in 2 Nephi 11:8 and Mosiah 4:28, the last example (3 Nephi 18:13) is one that has always conformed to the grammatically preferred style: there is no relative pronoun such as *that* after “among you”, although it would read more easily if there were: “whoso among you **that** shall do more or less than these are not built upon my rock”. Finally, the example from Helaman 6:24 is more complicated than any of the others and appears to have one clause with the relative pronoun *which* and one without any relative pronoun. Even this example would read more easily if there were two relative pronouns: “whosoever of those **which** belonged to their band **which** should reveal unto the world of their wickedness and their abominations should be tried . . . according to the laws of their wickedness”.

Obviously, the original text allows both possibilities for this kind of complex *whoso(ever)* clause (either with or without the relative pronoun after the postmodifying prepositional phrase). The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources. In 2 Nephi 11:8 and Mosiah 4:28, the relative pronouns (*which* in the first instance, *that* in the second) will be restored.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 11:8 the relative pronoun after the postmodifying prepositional phrase in the *whoso* clause (“whoso of my people **which** shall see these words may lift up their hearts”); similarly, the *whosoever* clause in Mosiah 4:28 should read “whosoever among you **that** borroweth of his neighbor should return the thing”.

2 Nephi 12

■ 2 Nephi 12:1

Isaiah the son of [*Amos* > *Amoz* 1T | *Amoz* ABCGHKPS | *Amos* DEFIJLMNOQR]

□ **Isaiah 2:1** (King James Bible)

Isaiah the son of **Amoz**

There has been a strong tendency in the text to misspell the name *Amoz* (the father of Isaiah) as the name *Amos* (the biblical prophet). Here in 2 Nephi 12:1, Oliver Cowdery first wrote the name as *Amos* in the printer's manuscript but then corrected it (after several tries) to *Amoz*. The 1841 British edition introduced the incorrect spelling *Amos*, which persisted in the LDS text in all editions up through the early printings of the 1981 edition, finally being corrected to *Amoz* in 1983.

The very same variation is found later on near the end of Nephi's long quotation from Isaiah:

2 Nephi 23:1

Isaiah the son of [*Amoz* 0ABCGHKPS | *Amos* > *Amoz* 1T | *Amos* DEFIJLMNOQR]

Isaiah 13:1 (King James Bible)

Isaiah the son of **Amoz**

In this instance, the original manuscript is extant and has the correct spelling *Amoz*. *Ⓞ* is not extant for 2 Nephi 12:1 but probably also read correctly as *Amoz*.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Amoz* in 2 Nephi 12:1 and 2 Nephi 23:1.

■ 2 Nephi 12:2

*and it shall come to pass in the last days
when the mountain of the Lord's house
shall be established in the top of the mountains
and shall be exalted above the* [*hills* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRT | *hill* S]
and all nations shall flow unto it

□ **Isaiah 2:2** (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass in the last days
that the mountain of the LORD's house
shall be established in the top of the mountains
and shall be exalted above the **hills**
and all nations shall flow unto it

The 1953 RLDS edition accidentally, it would seem, replaced the plural *hills* with the singular *hill*, perhaps under the influence of the *it* at the end of the following clause (“and all nations shall

flow unto it”), although the *it*, of course, refers to the mountain of the Lord’s house. The King James Bible (as well as the original Hebrew) has the plural *hills*.

Summary: Maintain the plural *hills* in 2 Nephi 12:2, the reading of the earliest textual sources and the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 12:8

their land [also is 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | is also FIJLMNOQRT] full of idols

□ Isaiah 2:8 (King James Bible)

their land **also is** full of idols

Ever since the 1852 edition, the LDS text has had the order “is also”, which is more natural for English. The 1852 change, however, was most probably a typo rather than due to conscious editing since the very same original word order (“also is”) was left unchanged at the beginning of verse 7 (“their land **also is** full of silver and gold”). In the middle of verse 7, however, we have a legitimate example of the expected word order (“their land **is also** full of horses”). It is possible that this instance of “is also” prompted the 1852 compositor to set “is also” in the following verse, 2 Nephi 12:8.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 12:8 the word order “also is” in “their land **also is** full of idols”, which is in agreement with the earliest textual sources and the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 12:9

- (1) *and the mean [men 1 | man ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
boweth [NULL >js not 1 | A | not BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] down*
(2) *and the great man humbleth himself **not***
(3) *therefore forgive **him** not*

□ Isaiah 2:9 (King James Bible)

- (1') and the mean **man** boweth down
(2') and the great man humbleth himself
(3') therefore forgive **them** not

This verse shows three difficulties, each one involving a word difference between the King James text and the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. Ⓞ is not extant, but Ⓟ originally read as follows:

2 Nephi 12:9 (earliest extant reading)
and the mean **men** boweth down
and the great man humbleth himself **not**
therefore forgive **him** not

This reading could be interpreted as meaning something like ‘the low men bow down / but the great man does not humble himself / therefore do not forgive him’. The original parallelism of the King James text obviously contradicts this interpretation.

The Book of Mormon passage has undergone two textual changes. First, the 1830 compositor changed the plural *men* to *man*, perhaps by reference to a copy of the King James Bible. Second, Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, negated the first clause in the verse. Thus the current text reads as follows:

2 Nephi 12:9 (current text, dating from the 1837 edition)
 and the mean **man** boweth **not** down
 and the great man humbleth himself **not**
 therefore forgive **him** not

In the current text, the first two clauses now manifest parallelism (albeit negatively rather than positively), but the third clause uses the singular *him*, it would seem, to refer to only the great man rather than both the mean man and the great man.

Thus there are three textual difficulties here: (1) the plural *men* in the first clause, (2) the *not* at the end of the second clause, and (3) the *him* in the third clause. In the following, I consider whether each of these words might be the result of error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text.

First, the plural *men* (the reading of the printer's manuscript) may be an error for the singular *man*. The original manuscript is not extant here, but we do know that the Book of Mormon text has sometimes undergone a switch between *man* and *men*. For examples, see the list under 1 Nephi 15:35. Here in 2 Nephi 12:9 the preceding word is *mean* /min/, which may have influenced /mæn/ to be misheard as /mɛn/. Another possibility is that the *e* in the spelling of *mean* may have led Oliver Cowdery to write *men* since he had just written an *e* after the word-initial *m* in *mean*.

We should note here that in \mathcal{P} the occurrence of *boweth* with the plural subject *men* is not an argument against *men* since the original text of the Book of Mormon freely allows the *-(e)th* ending to occur with plural subjects. (See the discussion regarding *rebelleth* in the 1 Nephi preface or, more generally, under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.) Nor can we argue from parallelism that the plural *men* in one line cannot be allowed to occur with the singular *man* in the other line. In verses 11 and 17, we have two examples of such a mixture of *man* and *men* in parallel lines:

2 Nephi 12:11 (Isaiah 2:11)
 the lofty looks of **man** shall be humbled
 and the haughtiness of **men** shall be bowed down

2 Nephi 12:17 (Isaiah 2:17)
 and the loftiness of **man** shall be bowed down
 and the haughtiness of **men** shall be made low

In fact, in all three passages the original Hebrew text avoids lexical parallelism: the first occurrence of *man* is always *'adam* while the second occurrence (either *man* or *men*) is either the singular or plural of *'iš*. We should note, however, that in verses 11 and 17, there has never been any removal of the mixture by replacing *man* with *men* or vice versa.

The two examples in 2 Nephi 12:11, 17 show semantic parallelism whenever *'adam* and *'iš* occur together, which brings us to the second difficulty in 2 Nephi 12:9: the occurrence of *not* in the second clause but its omission in the first clause. Such a reading obviously violates the

semantic parallelism that seems to be required in this passage. Thus in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith inserted *not* in the printer's manuscript so that the first clause would agree with the second clause, which has a *not* in the earliest Book of Mormon text (but not in the corresponding Isaiah passage). We note that the third clause does end with *not* in both the Book of Mormon and Isaiah texts.

From the point of view of parallelism and consistency, there are two possible emendations for the earliest Book of Mormon text: (1) there were three *not*'s, one in each clause (as in the current text); or (2) there was only one *not*, in the last clause (as in the King James Bible). The first reading works if the reader interprets the first two clauses as a refusal to bow down and humble oneself before God, while the second reading works if the reader interprets the first two clauses as bowing and humbling oneself before idols instead of God. The immediately preceding verse (2 Nephi 12:8) suggests that in the language of the King James Bible the second interpretation is the intended one since it refers to the worshipping of idols ("their land also is full of idols / they worship the work of their own hands / that which their own fingers have made").

This interpretation suggests that the *not* in the second clause is an error, possibly in anticipation of the *not* at the end of the third clause. This error could have occurred in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text, perhaps while copying the text to the printer's manuscript or even while taking down Joseph Smith's dictation. Of course, it is also possible that the original manuscript (which is not extant here) had three *not*'s, one for each clause, so that the original reading of the printer's manuscript represents a simple loss of the *not* in the first clause and Joseph Smith's 1837 emendation represents a restoration of the original Book of Mormon text.

Elsewhere in the manuscripts, we have examples of *not* being added and deleted. The more common change is to drop the *not*, but there are also a few examples of *not* being incorrectly added in the manuscripts:

Mosiah 26:9 (Oliver Cowdery incorrectly edited \mathcal{P} by adding *not*)

and it came to pass that

Alma did [$\mathcal{S}2$ NULL $>+$ $\mathcal{S}1$ *not* 1 | *not* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] know

concerning them

for there were many witnesses against them

3 Nephi 7:11 (Oliver Cowdery initially inserted *not* in \mathcal{P} , then deleted it)

nevertheless they were enemies

notwithstanding they were not a righteous people

yet they were united in the hatred of those

who had [*not* $>$ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] entered

into a covenant to destroy the government

Thus Oliver Cowdery could have inserted the *not* in the second clause in 2 Nephi 12:9 while copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , perhaps in anticipation of the *not* in the following (third) clause. According to this analysis, the text here for 2 Nephi 12:9 was originally in agreement with the King James text, with only one *not* (at the end of the third clause). And the King James reading also makes sense, given the reference in the previous verse to worshipping idols.

Finally, let us consider the third difficulty. All of the Book of Mormon sources have *him* in the third clause, while the King James Bible (as well as the Hebrew) has *them*. In the literal

Hebrew, “the mean man” is simply *man*; similarly, “the great man” is also simply *man*. But as noted above, different words are used for *man* in the Hebrew: namely, *ʾadam* for the first *man* and *ʾiš* for the second *man*. The King James translation shows this lexical difference by representing the first *man* (*ʾadam*) by “the mean man” and the second *man* (*ʾiš*) by the opposite, “the great man”. Here the word *mean* means ‘low’, with perhaps some perceived connection between *ʾadam* and *ʾadama* ‘ground, soil’. David Calabro (personal communication) points out that a similar contrast involving *ʾadam* and *ʾiš* is found in the Psalms:

Psalm 49:1–2 (King James Bible)
 hear this all *ye* people
 give ear all *ye* inhabitants of the world
 both **low** and **high**
 rich and poor together

The phrase “both low and high” literally reads in the Hebrew as “both sons of **man** [*ʾadam*] and sons of **man** [*ʾiš*]”.

The Hebrew for Isaiah 2:9 uses the third person plural pronoun *them*, thus supporting the interpretation that the text is referring to two different (symbolic) individuals, not a single individual. We definitely expect semantic parallelism in 2 Nephi 12:9, especially since other pairs of *ʾadam* and *ʾiš* are used this way (as in Isaiah 2:11, 17 and Psalm 49:2).

It is quite possible that the Book of Mormon *him* is actually an error for *them*. Even the original manuscript (which is not extant here) could have read *him*, but such a reading in \mathcal{O} could still represent *them* since Joseph Smith in his dictation often pronounced unstressed *him* and *them* indistinguishably as /əm/. Here are two examples in the original manuscript showing Oliver Cowdery struggling to decide whether /əm/ should be *him* or *them*:

Alma 55:8 (lines 21–22 of page 341' of \mathcal{O})
 & they hailed him but he sayeth unto <him> them

Ether 8:17 (line 23' on page 462' of \mathcal{O})
 leading {<%him%>|them} away by fair promises

Also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18–19.

As noted above, the probable source (in the printer’s manuscript) for the intrusive *not* at the end of the second clause was the *not* at the end of the third clause. Similarly, the semantic source (in the printer’s manuscript) for the *him* in the third clause may be the *himself* that is found near the end of the second clause. Hearing /əm/ in Joseph Smith’s dictation, Oliver Cowdery may have assumed that the word was *him* because of the preceding *himself*.

The earliest text for 2 Nephi 12:9 can therefore be understood as the result of three early errors in transmission of the Book of Mormon text: *mean men* instead of *mean man*, an extra *not* at the end of the second clause, and *him* instead of *them*. The earliest extant reading (in \mathcal{P}) is not impossible; nonetheless, it does not make sense within the larger context of idol worshipping. Ultimately, the nonparallelism of the first two clauses as given in \mathcal{P} seems implausible. Since each of the three difficulties in this verse can be explained as the result of scribal error, the critical text will accept the King James text as the original text for 2 Nephi 12:9.

Summary: Emend the earliest extant text in 2 Nephi 12:9 (the reading of the printer’s manuscript) so that it reads identically with the King James text: namely, we accept the 1830 compositor’s emendation of *men* to *man*, remove the *not* at the end of the second clause, and replace the *him* of the third clause with *them*.

■ **2 Nephi 12:16**

- (1) **and upon all the ships of the sea**
- (2) *and upon all the ships of Tarshish*
- (3) *and upon all [the 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pleasant pictures*

□ **Isaiah 2:16** (King James Bible)

- (2') and upon all the ships of Tarshish
- (3') and upon all pleasant pictures

This famous Book of Mormon passage combines two different readings, the Greek Septuagint translation (literally, “and upon every ship of the sea”) and the Masoretic Hebrew reading (literally, “and upon all ships of Tarshish”). This link with the Septuagint was noted by Sidney B. Sperry on pages 172–173 of *Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Stevens and Wallis, 1948). Andrew Stewart, a student in my 1991 course on textual criticism, discovered that the first phrase in the Book of Mormon text can also be found in Coverdale’s 1535 Bible: “upon all ships of the sea” (spelling regularized), which may derive from the Greek translation. In the Septuagint and the Coverdale translation, the phrase “ships of the sea” replaces “ships of Tarshish”, implying that “ships of the sea” is an attempt to interpret the enigmatic Hebrew “ships of Tarshish”. The Book of Mormon has both readings, which suggests that in some earlier transmission of the Hebrew text the phrase “upon all ships of the sea” was originally a marginal note explaining the phrase “upon all ships of Tarshish” but that eventually this explanatory note was inserted directly into the text itself.

One other difference between the Book of Mormon text and the King James reading is the use of the definite article *the*. The Book of Mormon text originally had *the* after *all* in each of the three cases: “and upon all **the** ships of the sea and upon all **the** ships of Tarshish and upon all **the** pleasant pictures”. On the other hand, the King James Bible is missing the *the* in the last case (“all pleasant pictures”). Similarly, the 1830 edition is missing the *the* in this last case. The 1830 compositor may have referred once more to his King James Bible to eliminate what appeared to be an extra *the* in the printer’s manuscript. The original manuscript is not extant here, so it is possible that the original text actually lacked the extra *the* in the last line; under this interpretation, Oliver Cowdery could have introduced the *the* under the influence of the two preceding occurrences of *all the*.

The Hebrew text has no definite article with *all* (nor does the Greek text), so at least the reading of the printer’s manuscript (with *all the* before all three noun phrases) reflects the consistency of the original Hebrew. Frequently the Book of Mormon shows more parallelism than the King James version of Isaiah, especially with respect to function words such as *the*. For other examples of increased parallelism for function words, see 1 Nephi 20:12–13 (*and*), 1 Nephi 21:10 (*the*), and

2 Nephi 6:17–18 (*them*). Because of the extended parallelism of *all the* in the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript), the critical text will accept the third instance of *all the* in 2 Nephi 12:16.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 12:16 the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“and upon all **the** pleasant pictures”); this reading reflects the parallelism of the original Hebrew more accurately than the King James translation does.

■ 2 Nephi 12:21

*to go into the clefts of the rocks
and into the tops of the ragged rocks
for the fear of the Lord shall come upon them
and **the majesty of his glory** shall smite them*

□ Isaiah 2:21 (King James Bible)

to go into the clefts of the rocks
and into the tops of the ragged rocks
for fear of the LORD
and for **the glory of his majesty**

Here in 2 Nephi 12:21, the Book of Mormon text has a change in word order: namely, “the majesty of his glory” instead of “the glory of his majesty”, the reading for Isaiah in the King James Bible. One wonders here if perhaps there hasn’t been an accidental shift in the word order, especially when we compare the differences here in verse 21 with two previous occurrences of the same language in verses 10 and 19:

BOOK OF MORMON TEXT	KING JAMES TEXT
2 Nephi 12:10 for the fear of the Lord and the glory of his majesty shall smite thee	Isaiah 2:10 for fear of the LORD and for the glory of his majesty
2 Nephi 12:19 for the fear of the Lord shall come upon them and the glory of his majesty shall smite them	Isaiah 2:19 for fear of the LORD and for the glory of his majesty
2 Nephi 12:21 for the fear of the Lord shall come upon them and the majesty of his glory shall smite them	Isaiah 2:21 for fear of the LORD and for the glory of his majesty

In each case, there are three specific differences between all three versions: (1) the definite article *the* precedes *fear* in the Book of Mormon version, (2) the repeated preposition *for* is omitted in the

Book of Mormon version, and (3) the predicate “shall smite someone” occurs at the end of the Book of Mormon version. But some differences are not systematic: besides the problem with the word order switch in verse 21, the additional predicate “shall come upon them”, found in verses 19 and 21, does not occur in verse 10. Of course, verse 10 is further away, while verses 19 and 21 are very close to each other, which may explain why verse 10 is less similar.

Finally, we have evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally switched the order of associated nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and verbs in his transmission of the text (including two which may have been influenced by biblical language):

1 Nephi 17:41 (see Isaiah 14:29, “fiery flying serpent”)

“flying fiery” (Ⓒ) > “fiery flying” (Ⓓ)

he sent [*flying firey* 0 | *firey flying* 1 | *firy-flying* A |
fiery-flying BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *fiery flying* RT] serpents among them

1 Nephi 20:6

“heard and seen” (Ⓒ) > “seen and heard” (Ⓓ)

thou hast [*heard & seen* 0 | *seen & heard* 1 |
seen and heard ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all this

Mosiah 2:31

“unto you by him” (original text) > “unto him by you” (initial error in Ⓓ)

even so if ye shall keep the commandments of my son
or the commandments of God which shall be delivered
unto [*him* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
by [*you* > *him* 1 | *him* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ye shall prosper in the land

Mosiah 3:13 (see Revelation 14:6, “to every nation and kindred and tongue and people”)

“to every kindred nation and tongue” (original text) >
“to every nation and kindred . . .” (initial error in Ⓓ)

and the Lord God hath sent his holy prophets among all the children of men
to declare these things to every
[NULL > *Kindred* 1 | *kindred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
nation [*& Kindred* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL > *&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] tongue

3 Nephi 18:32

“return and repent” (original text) > “repent and return” (initial error in Ⓓ)

for ye know not but what they will
[*repent* >+ *return* 1 | *return* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [*return* >+ *repent* 1 | *repent* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Thus it is quite plausible that Oliver Cowdery could have mixed up the order of *glory* and *majesty* in 2 Nephi 12:21, although there is no particular motivation for the switch in word order in 2 Nephi 12:21.

On the other hand, it needs to be recognized that the earliest extant word order in 2 Nephi 12:21 will work—that is, one can be smitten by “the majesty of his glory” as well as by “the glory of his majesty”. Here in the Isaiah quotations, we will allow textual variants that work (providing, of course, that they are supported by the earliest textual sources). On this basis, the critical text will here in verse 21 retain the earliest extant reading even though there is evidence to suggest that the exceptional phraseology “the majesty of his glory” is the result of an early transmission error in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Accept the exceptional word order in 2 Nephi 12:21 (“and the **majesty** of his **glory** shall smite them”) since it will work; nonetheless, this word order may be a scribal error given that it disagrees with the word order in 2 Nephi 12:10 and 2 Nephi 12:19 as well as with the three corresponding occurrences of this phraseology in the King James text (Isaiah 2:10, 19, 21).

2 Nephi 13

■ 2 Nephi 13:1

*for behold the Lord the Lord of Hosts doth take away
from Jerusalem and from Judah the stay and the staff
the whole **staff** of bread and the whole stay of water*

□ Isaiah 3:1 (King James Bible)

for behold the Lord the LORD of Hosts doth take away
from Jerusalem and from Judah the stay and the staff
the whole **stay** of bread and the whole stay of water

Here the Book of Mormon text has “the whole **staff** of bread”, whereas the King James Bible has “the whole **stay** of bread”. It is possible that the Book of Mormon *staff* is simply a copying error based on the immediately preceding *staff*, especially since both *staff* and *stay* begin with the same initial letters *sta*. Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant here, so we cannot determine if *stay* was accidentally copied as *staff* when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

The Hebrew text underlying “the stay and the staff” is the masculine nominalized form of the Hebrew verb $\text{š-}^{\text{c}}\text{-}n$ conjoined with the feminine nominalized form of the same verb, the idea being that every form of support has been taken away. Then two examples are given: the entire support of bread and the entire support of water. For these last two examples of the word *support*, the Masoretic Hebrew text repeats only the masculine nominalized form.

The King James translators attempted to make a distinction between the masculine and feminine forms in the Hebrew by translating the masculine form as *stay* and the feminine as *staff*. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, one figurative meaning of *staff* (now generally obsolete) is something that serves as a stay or support (see definition 4 for the noun *staff*). We can see a derivative of this meaning when *staff* is used to refer to the bureaucratic system that supports an organization. Another example is in the phrase “the staff of life”, referring to ‘bread or similar staple food’ (see definition 4c under *staff* in the OED).

One possibility is that the Book of Mormon reading of *stay-staff-staff-stay* represents a Hebraistic chiasmus of the form a-b-b'-a':

- (a) the **stay**
- (b) and the **staff**
- (b') the whole **staff** of bread
- (a') and the whole **stay** of water

Such an interpretation would imply that there was an alternative Hebrew text where the nominalized form of the Hebrew verb $\text{š-}^{\text{c}}\text{-n}$ took the sequence *masculine-feminine-feminine-masculine* (equivalent to *stay-staff-staff-stay*).

As far as meaning goes, the choice between *stay* and *staff* doesn't make much difference. Since it is difficult to determine whether the second occurrence of *staff* is intentional or accidental, the safest solution would be to follow the earliest textual sources (namely, the printer's manuscript) and accept *staff*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 13:1 the earliest reading ("the whole staff of bread"); although the use of *staff* rather than *stay* when referring to bread may be an error, it is also possible that the choice of *staff* is intentional.

■ 2 Nephi 13:6

thou hast clothing
be thou our ruler
 and let **not** *this ruin come under thy hand*

□ Isaiah 3:6 (King James Bible)

thou hast clothing
 be thou our ruler
 and *let* this ruin *be* under thy hand

The additional *not* in the Book of Mormon text reverses the polarity of the original Isaiah text. John A. Tvedtnes (page 29, "The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon", FARMS preliminary report, 1984) has suggested that the *not* is intrusive here in 2 Nephi 13:6. One possible source for the *not* could be the frequent use of negative words in the next verse:

2 Nephi 13:7 (with only minor differences from Isaiah 3:7)
 in that day shall he swear saying
 I will **not** be a healer
 for in my house there is **neither** bread **nor** clothing
 make me **not** a ruler of the people

We have already seen one case where *not* seems to have intruded into the text from a following *not*: namely, in 2 Nephi 12:9, where it appears that early in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text an extra *not* was inserted at the end of one line because the immediately following line ended in a *not*. The text for Isaiah 2:9 reads as "and the great man humbleth himself / therefore forgive them **not**", but in the corresponding part of the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant for this verse) the passage reads as "and the great man humbleth himself **not** / therefore forgive him **not**".

From a semantic perspective, the original King James reading of Isaiah 3:6—that is, without the *not*—makes sense because of the prophetic inevitability of the ruin of Jerusalem, as noted in verses 7–8: "make me not a ruler of the people / for Jerusalem is ruined"; the man wants his brother, not himself, to be in charge when the ruin comes, so in essence he says to his brother, "let this ruin be under thy hand, not mine".

Nonetheless, one can see some textual motivation for reversing the polarity. Perhaps the man is trying to avoid being so blunt with his brother; thus one could interpret the earliest Book of Mormon text as the man wishing his brother good luck: ‘and may this ruin not come under thy hand’. In other words, one could intentionally add the *not* to avoid stating the inevitable. We should also note that (unlike the case in 2 Nephi 12:9) the immediately following clause in 2 Nephi 13:7 does not contain a negative (“in that day shall he swear saying”), which reduces (but does not eliminate) the chances of accidental contamination in 2 Nephi 13:6. The safest solution is to follow the earliest textual source and retain the *not* in 2 Nephi 13:6 since there is a distinct possibility that the additional *not* in the Book of Mormon text is intentional.

Summary: Retain the *not* in 2 Nephi 13:6 (“and let **not** this ruin come under thy hand”), the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript); the larger context for this passage permits a coherent interpretation for the extra *not*.

■ **2 Nephi 13:7**

I will not be a healer

□ **Isaiah 3:7** (King James Bible)

I will not be **an** healer

In the King James text for Isaiah 2–14, there are five examples of *an* before *h*-initial words, whereas the Book of Mormon text has *a* for all five cases. Besides this example in 2 Nephi 13:7, we have the following examples:

2 Nephi 15:10	a homer
Isaiah 5:10	an homer
2 Nephi 19:17	a hypocrite
Isaiah 9:17	an hypocrite
2 Nephi 20:6	a hypocritical nation
Isaiah 10:6	an hypocritical nation
2 Nephi 21:16	a highway
Isaiah 11:16	an highway

These *h*-initial words were pronounced *h*-less by many speakers in Early Modern English, which led to the King James use of *an* rather than *a* since *an* is used before vowel-initial words. Of course, the initial *h*’s of these words are all pronounced in current standard English; therefore, speakers today expect to have *a* rather than *an* for these words. The Book of Mormon text appears to have always had the *a* in these examples in the long Isaiah quotation (2 Nephi 12–24). In other cases, however, the Book of Mormon has sometimes maintained the *an* before words spelled with an initial *h*:

Alma 8:19

and it came to pass that as he entered the city
 he was **an hungered** and he saith to a man
 will ye give to **an humble servant** of God something to eat

Because of this variation within the text, we refer in each case to the earliest textual sources to determine whether the article should be *a* or *an*. In these five cases in the long Isaiah quotation, we maintain the *a* that is consistently found in the Book of Mormon text. For these cases, the original manuscript is not extant, but the printer's manuscript consistently has *a* rather than *an*. For a complete discussion of *an* before *h*-initial words, see under INDEFINITE ARTICLE in volume 3.

Summary: Retain the *a* form of the indefinite article before words beginning with *h* in 2 Nephi 12–24, including this one in 2 Nephi 13:7.

■ **2 Nephi 13:7**

*I will not be a [healer 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | ruler s]
 for in my house there is neither bread nor clothing
 make me not a ruler of the people*

□ **Isaiah 3:7** (King James Bible)

I will not be an **healer**
 for in my house *is* neither bread nor clothing
 make me not a ruler of the people

The 1953 RLDS edition replaced *healer* with *ruler*, a typo based on the occurrence of *ruler* later on in the verse (“a ruler of the people”). The original *healer* agrees with the King James reading.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 13:7 the word *healer* rather than *ruler*, which was accidentally introduced into the RLDS text, probably in anticipation of its legitimate occurrence later on in the verse.

■ **2 Nephi 13:7**

*for in my house
 [is > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] there is neither bread nor clothing*

□ **Isaiah 3:7** (King James Bible)

for in my house
is neither bread nor clothing

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “for in my house *is*”, then immediately crossed out the *is* and wrote inline “there is neither bread nor clothing”. In other words, Oliver initially omitted the *there* and almost ended up writing down the precise reading of the King James text (“for in my house *is* neither bread nor clothing”). Undoubtedly, the original manuscript had the *there* since there is nothing particularly odd about the King James reading that would have motivated Oliver to add *there* in \mathcal{P} .

What this error does show is that sometimes the scribe could accidentally create a King James reading. Yet this error occurs in \mathcal{P} rather than \mathcal{O} , thus demonstrating that manuscript corrections towards the King James text do not necessarily mean that the biblical quotation was being consciously edited during the process of transmission. This issue came up in the discussion regarding 1 Nephi 20:11, where it was noted that there are three Isaiah examples in \mathcal{O} that could be interpreted as involving editing away from the King James reading: namely, a syntactic simplification in 1 Nephi 20:11, the replacement of *had* with *have* in 1 Nephi 21:21, and the addition of *for* in 1 Nephi 21:24. This example in 2 Nephi 13:7 shows that the scribe can accidentally, if only momentarily, write down the precise King James expression, even when copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 13:7 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“for in my house **there** is neither bread nor clothing”); initially Oliver Cowdery omitted the *there*, which would have permitted the precise King James expression for this clause if he had not corrected it.

■ 2 Nephi 13:8–9

*for Jerusalem is ruined and Judah is fallen
because their **tongues** and their doings have been against the Lord
to provoke the eyes of his glory
the shew of their [countenance 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | countenances HK]
doth witness against them
and doth declare their sin to be even as Sodom
and they cannot hide it
woe unto their **souls**
for they have rewarded evil unto themselves*

□ Isaiah 3:8–9 (King James Bible)

for Jerusalem is ruined and Judah is fallen
because their **tongue** and their doings *are* against the LORD
to provoke the eyes of his glory
the shew of their **countenance**
doth witness against them
and they declare their sin as Sodom
they hide *it* not
woe unto their **soul**
for they have rewarded evil unto themselves

Generally speaking, the Book of Mormon text prefers plurals when referring to the eyes, tongues, and hearts of people—or to their souls and minds. Thus here in 2 Nephi 13:8–9, we have *tongues* and *souls* rather than the King James (and original Hebrew) singulars. Another example of this difference in number is found near the end of this long Isaiah quotation:

2 Nephi 23:18
their **eyes** shall not spare children

Isaiah 13:18 (King James Bible)
their **eye** shall not spare children

Similarly, each person has one mind, but in plural contexts the Book of Mormon text always uses the plural *minds* when referring to a group of people, even when these people are “of one mind”:

Alma 17:6 (original text)
 now these were their journeyings
 having taken leave of their father Mosiah
 in the first year of the reign of the judges
 having refused the kingdom
 which their father was desirous to confer upon them
 and also this was the **minds** of the people

This particular plural was edited by Joseph Smith to the singular *mind*, but the change was not implemented in the 1837 edition. For further discussion, see Alma 17:6.

Thus in Book of Mormon biblical quotations, the use of plurals instead of singulars for individual parts of the body and for the spirit or mind seems fully intended. Yet not every instance of an individual characteristic has been changed to the plural in the original Book of Mormon text. For instance, here in 2 Nephi 13:9 the original text has “the shew of their countenance”, although the 1874 RLDS edition changed the singular *countenance* to the plural *countenances* (perhaps under the influence of the preceding “their tongues and their doings”). The 1908 RLDS edition (which generally follows the reading of the printer’s manuscript) restored the original singular *countenance*, the reading of the King James text.

Summary: Retain the plural *tongues* and *souls* in 2 Nephi 13:8–9 and the singular *countenance* in 2 Nephi 13:9.

■ **2 Nephi 13:10**

*say unto the righteous that
 it is well with **them**
 for they shall eat the fruit of their doings*

□ **Isaiah 3:10** (King James Bible)

*say ye to the righteous that
 it shall be well with **him**
 for they shall eat the fruit of their doings*

Theoretically, the *them* here in 2 Nephi 13:10 might be an error for *him*, especially since Joseph Smith typically pronounced both unstressed *them* and *him* identically as /əɪm/. But when we consider the following verse, we note that once more the Book of Mormon text uses the plural in contrast to the singular of the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 13:11
 woe unto the wicked
 for **they** shall perish
 for the reward of **their** hands shall be upon **them**

Isaiah 3:11 (King James Bible)

woe unto the wicked

*it shall be ill with **him***

for the reward of **his** hands shall be given **him**

Thus the use of *them* in 2 Nephi 13:10 rather than the King James *him* seems fully intended.

Summary: Maintain the plural use of *them* in 2 Nephi 13:10, which is consistent with the Book of Mormon's use of the plural in the following verse.

■ **2 Nephi 13:14**

for ye have eaten up the vineyard

and the spoil of the poor in your houses

□ **Isaiah 3:14** (King James Bible)

for ye have eaten up the vineyard

the spoil of the poor **is** in your houses

In this verse, the Book of Mormon text lacks the italicized *is* of the King James text. The original Hebrew also lacks a *be* verb, which is why the King James translators italicized the *is* that they supplied here. There are similar examples involving the omission of an italicized form of the *be* verb elsewhere in this long Book of Mormon quotation from Isaiah 2–14 (covering 2 Nephi 12–24). In later editing of the Book of Mormon text, the King James form of the *be* verb has usually been supplied, as in these examples:

2 Nephi 15:25 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 5:25)

but his hand [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is* RT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 16:5 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 6:5)

woe [NULL >js *is* unto 1 | A | *is* unto BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me

2 Nephi 16:5 (*am* in italics in Isaiah 6:5)

because I [NULL >js *am* 1 | A | *am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a man
of unclean lips

2 Nephi 16:8 (*am* in italics in Isaiah 6:8)

here [NULL >js *am* 1 | A | *am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I

2 Nephi 19:5 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 9:5)

for every battle of the warrior [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is* RT]
with confused noise

2 Nephi 19:12 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 9:12)

but his hand [1 APS | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 19:17 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 9:17)

but his hand [*stretched* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEGHKNPS | *stretcheth* FIJLMOQ |
is stretched RT] out still

2 Nephi 19:21 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 9:21)

but his hand [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 20:4 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 10:4)

but his hand [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 24:27 (*is* in italics in Isaiah 14:27)

and his hand [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out

In each of these examples, the original reading without the *be* verb will, of course, be retained in the critical text. Even though the result is strikingly ungrammatical for English, the fact that the omission is quite consistent implies that these cases in the original Book of Mormon text without the *be* verb are definitely intended despite their unacceptability for English speakers.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 13:14 the earliest text without the *be* verb; it would appear that the King James italicized *is* before “in your houses” was intentionally omitted in the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 13:18

in that day the Lord will take away

the bravery of

[1A | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *tinkling ornaments*

and cauls

and round tires like the moon

□ Isaiah 3:18 (King James Bible)

in that day the Lord will take away

the bravery of

their tinkling ornaments *about their feet*

and ***their*** cauls

and ***their*** round tires like the moon

Here in 2 Nephi 13:18, the original Book of Mormon text is the same as the King James text except that every King James word set in italics is missing in the original Book of Mormon text (three instances of *their* as well as the phrase “about their feet”). The 1837 edition restored the first *their* (“the bravery of their tinkling ornaments”), perhaps by reference to a King James Bible. Nonetheless, the two other *their*’s were not supplied. It is possible that Joseph Smith himself inserted the single *their*, but we cannot be sure since the word was not added in the printer’s manuscript. The entire verse in the original Book of Mormon text does sound somewhat awkward, which may have motivated the insertion of the *their* in front of the noun phrase *tinkling ornaments*.

The original Book of Mormon text was consistent in that there was no determiner at all for *tinkling ornaments*, *cauls*, or *round tires*. The Hebrew original has the definite article *the* for each of these noun phrases, just as it also has a *the* for every noun phrase (18 of them) listed in the following five verses (2 Nephi 13:19–23). This list includes the one case of *nose jewels* (in verse 21), for which the King James translators neglected to supply the *the*.

The most consistent translation of the Hebrew would be to place *the* in front of each noun phrase in the whole list (all 21 examples, from verse 18 through 23). Of course, this solution does not reproduce how the Book of Mormon text originally read in verse 18; there the three *the*'s are purposely missing. The critical text will restore the original reading that ignored all the italicized words in Isaiah 3:18.

Summary: Restore the original text in 2 Nephi 13:18 by deleting the *their* in the conjunctive phrase “tinkling ornaments and cauls and round tires”.

■ 2 Nephi 13:18

*in that day the Lord will take away
the bravery of tinkling ornaments
and cauls and round [tires 1ABCDGHKLPQRST | tiers EFIJMNOQ] like the moon*

□ Isaiah 3:18 (King James Bible)

in that day the Lord will take away
the bravery of *their* tinkling ornaments *about their feet*
and *their* cauls and *their* round **tires** like the moon

The misspelling *tiers* entered the LDS text in the 1849 British edition and remained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition (excluding the 1902 missionary edition, which was never used as a copy-text). The problem for the modern English reader is that many of the nouns listed in verses 18–23 are either obsolete or have a different meaning in modern English. Here the original King James *tire* refers to a head ornament and derives from the word *attire* (see definition 3 under the noun *tire* in the Oxford English Dictionary). The misspelling *tiers* remained in the LDS text for over seventy years simply because neither *tires* nor *tiers* made much sense to readers of the Book of Mormon; without checking either earlier editions or the King James Bible, readers would have had no clue that *tiers* was actually a misspelling. It is even possible that *tier* could have been interpreted as a form of *tiar*, a shortened form of *tiara*, especially since the original King James *tires* refers to a head ornament (see the discussion regarding *tiar* in the OED).

Summary: Maintain the correct spelling *tires* in 2 Nephi 13:18.

■ 2 Nephi 13:20

*the bonnets and the ornaments of [the 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | their CGHK] legs
and the headbands and the tablets and the earrings*

□ Isaiah 3:20 (King James Bible)

the bonnets and the ornaments of **the** legs
and the headbands and the tablets and the earrings

The 1840 edition introduced *their* in place of *the* as the determiner for *legs*. This change may represent editing on the part of Joseph Smith or possibly a typo. The *their* is different from the *their* that appears in the editing of verse 18 (“the bravery of **their** tinkling ornaments”). Its motivation

here in verse 20 seems to be consistent with the *their* used earlier in verses 16–17, where *their* is used to assign attribution to body parts:

2 Nephi 13:16 (Isaiah 3:16)
and making a tinkling with **their** feet

2 Nephi 13:17 (Isaiah 3:17)
and the Lord will discover **their** secret parts

Here in verse 20, the Hebrew original has only a single word for the phrase “and the ornaments of the legs”. In modern English the word would be translated as “ankle bracelets”. If the *their* had occurred in the Hebrew, it could have been attributed only to the ornaments themselves (perhaps as “and their ankle bracelets”).

The reading with *their* continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition removed it, most probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript. The critical text will maintain the earliest text here, which agrees with the King James reading.

Summary: Maintain the original phrase “and the ornaments of the legs” in 2 Nephi 13:20.

■ 2 Nephi 13:21

the rings and [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *the N*] *nose jewels*

□ Isaiah 3:21 (King James Bible)

the rings and nose jewels

The 1906 LDS large-print edition added the *the* here in verse 21, but not in verse 23 in front of *hoods* (“and the fine linen and hoods”), which suggests that the addition of the *the* in verse 21 in the 1906 edition was a typo. As noted in the discussion of 2 Nephi 13:18, the original Hebrew had *the* for all 21 noun phrases listed in verses 18–23 of this chapter, but the King James Bible used *their* instead of *the* for the three cases in verse 18 and omitted the *the* for *nose jewels* in verse 21. The critical text of the Book of Mormon will continue to follow the reading without the *the* for *nose jewels*, especially since it agrees with the King James reading.

Summary: Maintain the phraseology “the rings and nose jewels” in 2 Nephi 13:21 (that is, without any *the* before *nose jewels*), which agrees with the King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 13:23

the glasses and the fine linen and hoods and the veils

□ Isaiah 3:23 (King James Bible)

the glasses and the fine linen and **the** hoods and the veils

As noted in the discussion for verses 18 and 21, each noun phrase listed in 2 Nephi 13:18–23 takes the definite article *the* in the original Hebrew. The King James translators neglected to put in the *the* for *nose jewels* in verse 21. Here in verse 23, the Book of Mormon text is missing the *the* before

hoods. The Masoretic Hebrew and the King James Bible have the *the* before *hoods*. But the situation here is somewhat complicated by the fact that for the Codex Vaticanus of the Greek Septuagint (and some related versions) the *the* is also missing before *hoods*, just as in the earliest extant text for the Book of Mormon. However, the two other major manuscripts of the Septuagint (the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus) have the *the* before *hoods*, so it may simply be that the Codex Vaticanus accidentally dropped the *the* before *hoods*, with the result that it just happens to agree with the earliest extant reading in the Book of Mormon. This interpretation reverses an earlier opinion of mine on the significance of the missing *the* before *hoods* in 2 Nephi 13:23; see pages 53–54 of Royal Skousen, “Towards a Critical Edition of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 30/1 (1990): 41–69.

In fact, the Book of Mormon reading itself may very well be the result of accidentally dropping the *the* in the early transmission of the text (Θ is not extant here). There is considerable manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes dropped the definite article *the*, including repeated *the*'s in conjuncts:

Mosiah 3:7 (initial loss of *the* in ϖ)
 for behold blood cometh from every pore
 so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness
 and [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
 of his people

Alma 49:22 (initial loss of *the* in Θ)
 but behold in these attempts
 they were swept off by the stones
 and [NULL > *the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] arrows
 which were thrown at them

3 Nephi 3:23 (loss of *the* while copying from Θ into ϖ)
 yea to the line which was between the land Bountiful
 and [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land Desolation

Although there are no explicit examples of Oliver dropping the *the* in the biblical quotations, there are examples of such losses in the printed history of the text:

2 Nephi 8:24 (error in the 1888 LDS large-print edition)
 the uncircumcised and [*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | J] unclean

2 Nephi 19:9 (error in the 1837 edition)
 in the pride and [*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] stoutness of heart

2 Nephi 21:6 (error in the 1852 LDS edition)
 the young lion and [*the* 1ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] fatling together

Thus the chances are good that the missing *the* before *hoods* in 2 Nephi 13:23 is an error in transmission, especially since there is no motivation for dropping the *the* before *hoods*. Just like the loss of the *the* before *hoods* in the Greek Septuagint manuscript Codex Vaticanus, the omission in the Book of Mormon text appears to be accidental.

The question, of course, is: When did the error occur in the Book of Mormon text? Given Oliver Cowdery's tendency to drop repeated *the*'s, the earliest text for 2 Nephi 13:23 is possibly one more case where the *the* dropped out during the early transmission of the text (perhaps as Oliver Cowdery copied from the original to the printer's manuscript or when Joseph Smith originally dictated the text). Even so, there remains the distinct possibility that the small plates of Nephi themselves or even the plates of brass could have had the error. The loss of the *the* in the Greek Septuagint manuscript Codex Vaticanus shows that such errors could enter the ancient text, although it is doubtful that there is a direct connection between the error in the Greek manuscript and the one in the printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon. Since the current text will work in 2 Nephi 13:23 (that is, *the* is not necessary before *hoods*), the critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading, even though it is possible that the original text here had a *the* before *hoods*.

Summary: Maintain 2 Nephi 13:23 without the definite article before *hoods*, even though the lack of the *the* in the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript) may represent an early error in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 13:24

*and it shall [all 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come to pass
instead of sweet smell there shall be stink*

□ Isaiah 3:24 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass *that*
instead of sweet smell there shall be stink

The occurrence of *all* in this common phrase seemed out of place to the 1830 typesetter, so he dropped it (perhaps after referring to his King James Bible). In the Book of Mormon text the universal quantifier *all* occasionally appears at the beginning of a subject noun phrase followed by the verb phrase "come to pass":

Helaman 16:16	all these great and marvelous works cannot come to pass
3 Nephi 5:2	all things should come to pass
Ether 11:7	and all this came to pass

But there are no other occurrences of the verb phrase "come to pass" with *all* following its grammatical subject (namely, *it*), as in "it shall all come to pass" or "it all came to pass".

The original manuscript is not extant for 2 Nephi 13:24, but it is possible that the *all* was inserted during copying because of the preceding word *shall*, which ends in *all*. The chances of such a partial repetition occurring are improved if in the original manuscript the word *shall* was hyphenated at the end of the line, with *sh* ending one line and *-all* beginning the next line. If after writing *shall*, Oliver Cowdery looked briefly away from the line, he might have then rewritten the *all*. We actually have quite a few examples of the scribes hyphenating *shall* in this way (namely,

sh at the end of one line and *-all* at the beginning of the next line), as in these examples from the original manuscript:

page 3	lines 47–48	1 Nephi 2:20
page 60	lines 22–23	2 Nephi 8:11
page 290'	lines 3–4	Alma 34:13
page 304'	lines 5–6	Alma 41:4
page 312'	lines 25–26	Alma 44:11

In addition, there are 34 examples of the same hyphenation in the printer's manuscript.

Although we don't have any specific examples in the manuscripts of *shall all* as an error for *shall*, we do have evidence that partial repetition of a word can occur:

3 Nephi 12:27 (line 36 on page 383 of \mathcal{P})

it
Behold <h^old> is written by them of old time

Here Oliver Cowdery initially rewrote the end of *behold* as the separate word *hold* (just as *all* is a separate word found at the end of *shall*). The original manuscript is not extant here, but this error in \mathcal{P} would have been facilitated if in \mathcal{O} the word *behold* had been hyphenated at the end of a line (that is, *be* at the end of the line and *-hold* at the beginning of the next line).

Nonetheless, this argument is highly conjectural, and there is no explicit manuscript evidence that any *shall all* was ever an error for *shall*. Further, one can argue for the reading in \mathcal{P} . Despite the fact that there are no other occurrences of *all* with “come to pass”, there are 15 examples elsewhere of *shall all*, of which one has the subject pronoun *it*:

Alma 34:13 (original text)

then shall the law of Moses be fulfilled
yea **it shall all** be fulfilled
every jot and tittle
and none shall have passed away

Also note that in 2 Nephi 13:24 there is one additional difference between the earliest Book of Mormon text and the King James text: namely, the *that* at the end of the first line in the King James version. The *that* is not found in the Hebrew original and is supplied in italics in the King James Bible. The insertion of the *all* in the Book of Mormon text may be connected with the omission of the King James italicized *that*, with the result that “and it shall all come to pass” can be interpreted as declaring that everything that follows in verse 24 will happen. In the standard text, a colon could be placed after “and it shall all come to pass” in order to make the implication more explicit. Another possible interpretation, pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication), is that the *all* of “it shall all come to pass” could also refer back to the preceding list of deprivations that Isaiah prophesied would come upon the daughters of Zion (verses 17–23 of 2 Nephi 13).

Ultimately, the earliest text (the reading of \mathcal{P}) will work here in 2 Nephi 13:24, and evidence for a scribal error is meager. For this reason, the critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest textual source (“it shall **all** come to pass”).

Summary: Restore the earliest reading with *all* in 2 Nephi 3:24 (“it shall all come to pass”), thus rejecting the 1830 typesetter’s emendation that removed the extra *all*; the inclusion of *all* seems to be connected with the omission of the King James *that* at the end of the clause; although the *all* may be a repetition of the end of *shall*, there is no manuscript evidence for this specific scribal error.

■ **2 Nephi 13:24**

and instead of a stomacher

a [girding 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | girdling κ] of sackcloth

□ **Isaiah 3:24** (King James Bible)

and instead of a stomacher

a girding of sackcloth

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the unfamiliar *girding* with *girdling*, which is based on the more familiar word *girdle*. The preceding use of *stomacher* (obviously related to stomach) may have prompted the typesetter to think of *girdle*, and thus he accidentally set *girdling* instead of *girding*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading of the original text, *girding* (which, of course, is the reading of the King James text).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 13:24 the original *girding* rather than *girdling*, which was accidentally introduced into the 1892 RLDS edition.

2 Nephi 14

■ 2 Nephi 14:2

*in that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious
the fruit of the earth [& 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] excellent and comely
to them that are escaped of Israel*

□ Isaiah 4:2 (King James Bible)

in that day shall the branch of the LORD be beautiful and glorious
and the fruit of the earth *shall be* excellent and comely
for them that are escaped of Israel

The earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript) reads "the fruit of the earth and excellent and comely". This reading appears to be fragmented and almost impossible to understand. In order to deal with this difficult reading, the 1830 compositor intentionally omitted the *and* before "excellent and comely". The result of this conscious decision can be seen in his typesetting for the 1830 edition where there is unusually extra spacing between each of the words on this line of type, precisely enough space for an extra *and* that the compositor first set but later decided to remove. He spread out the extra spacing between the words already on that line rather than shifting any words from the following line to fill in the line.

Even so, the difficulty is not fully alleviated by omitting the *and* that originally preceded "excellent and comely". One could interpret the 1830 compositor's decision as equivalent to omitting the italicized *shall be* of the King James text. Elsewhere, there is one place where an italicized *shall be* of the King James text is omitted when that passage is quoted in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 15:28

and their horses' hoofs shall be counted like flint
and their wheels like a whirlwind
their roaring like a lion

Isaiah 5:28–29

their horses' hoofs shall be counted like flint
and their wheels like a whirlwind
their roaring *shall be* like a lion

On the other hand, there is no other place where any King James *shall be* (whether italicized or not) has been replaced by *and*, a change that in any event would have been quite odd.

It is possible that an extra *and* might have been inserted before *excellent* as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} . The nearby *and* before the following adjective *comely* (as well as perhaps

the more distant *and* before the preceding adjective *glorious*) may have led Oliver to insert an extra *and* before the conjoined adjective *excellent*. The fact that the verb for this clause was lacking may have also motivated Oliver to put something between the noun phrase and the following conjoined adjectives “excellent and comely”.

There is evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally inserted extra *and*'s under the influence of nearby *and*'s. In the following two examples, a following *and* seems to have been the source of the extra *and*. In both these cases, Oliver caught his error and corrected it:

1 Nephi 22:24

and the Holy One of Israel must reign
 [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | & >% NULL 1] in dominion
and might **and** power **and** great glory

Mosiah 11:3

and he laid a tax of one fifth part of all they possessed
 [& >% a 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] 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

In the first example, \mathcal{O} is extant and reads correctly as “must reign in dominion”. The use of the ampersand is not due to mishearing *in* as *and* since the error in \mathcal{P} is the result of visually copying the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Instead, it appears that the following sequence of *and*'s led Oliver to place an *and* before *dominion*. In the second example, Oliver initially started to write “and a fifth part” in \mathcal{P} , undoubtedly because of the repeated occurrence of “and a fifth part” in the rest of this passage. Oliver initially wrote an ampersand after *possessed*, then erased it and overwrote it with the indefinite article *a*.

It seems that the most reasonable solution here in 2 Nephi 24:2 is to accept the 1830 compositor's emendation. The *and* before “excellent and comely” seems just too difficult to justify, and we do have evidence that Oliver Cowdery did occasionally add *and* in anticipation of a following *and*. Accepting this emendation as the original text means that the King James italicized *shall be* was intentionally omitted in the Book of Mormon text, a much more reasonable conclusion than accepting the replacement of *shall be* with *and*.

We should also note here that in the corresponding King James text for 2 Nephi 14:2, the clause begins with a nonitalicized *and* (“and the fruit of the earth *shall be* excellent and comely”), but this initial *and* is missing in the Book of Mormon text. It is doubtful that the *and* in \mathcal{P} that follows “the fruit of the earth” is simply the misplaced *and* from the beginning of the clause. Such accidental transpositions of *and* are not found in the Isaiah quotations of the Book of Mormon.

The omission of the initial *and* results in a somewhat awkward type of coordination (referred to as asyndetic coordination) in which the conjunction is left unexpressed. There are three other examples in the King James quotations from Isaiah where an omitted *and* has led to such an asyndetic construction in the Book of Mormon text:

(1) 1 Nephi 20:19

thy seed also had been as the sand
the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof

Isaiah 48:19

thy seed also had been as the sand
and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof

(2) 2 Nephi 13:24

and instead of a stomacher a girding of sackcloth
burning instead of beauty

Isaiah 3:24

and instead of a stomacher a girding of sackcloth
and burning instead of beauty

(3) 2 Nephi 24:5

the Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked
the scepters of the rulers

Isaiah 14:5

the LORD hath broken the staff of the wicked
and the scepter of the rulers

Thus we have some independent evidence that the omission of the initial *and* in 2 Nephi 14:2 is intended.

Summary: Maintain the 1830 compositor’s emendation of 2 Nephi 14:2, which implies that the *and* before “excellent and comely” in \mathcal{D} is a scribal error; on the other hand, the omission of the King James *and* at the beginning of this verbless clause appears to be intentional.

■ 2 Nephi 14:3

and it shall come to pass

[*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *they* RT] **that are** left in Zion
and [*remaineth* 1A | *remain* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in Jerusalem
shall be called holy

□ Isaiah 4:3 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass *that*
he that is left in Zion
and **he that remaineth** in Jerusalem
shall be called holy

In this passage, a sequence of four italicized words in the King James text (“that he that is”) has been altered to “them that are” in the Book of Mormon text; that is, the subordinate conjunction

that is omitted and the singulars *he* and *is* are replaced with *them* and *are*. The 1920 LDS edition edited the object pronoun *them* to the subject form *they*. Such dialectal usage as “them that” is found in another biblical quote in the Book of Mormon:

3 Nephi 24:15

yea [*them* 1ABCGHKPS | *they* DEFIJLMNOQRT] that tempt God
are even delivered

Malachi 3:15 (King James Bible)

yea **they** *that* tempt God
are even delivered

This nonstandard usage appears to be intended. For related examples of nonstandard usage, see PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

The passage in 2 Nephi 14:3 has a plural subject for *remaineth*. As already noted (in the discussion of *rebelleth* in the 1 Nephi preface), the original Book of Mormon text permits plural subjects for verbs ending in *-(e)th*. In this instance, the 1837 edition omitted this ending, thus ending up with two plural verb forms, *are* and *remain* (“them that **are** left in Zion and **remain** in Jerusalem”).

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 14:3 the original nonstandard language of the Book of Mormon text (“**them** that are left in Zion and **remaineth** in Jerusalem”).

■ 2 Nephi 14:5

and upon her assemblies

a cloud [of > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] smoke by day

□ Isaiah 4:5 (King James Bible)

and upon her assemblies

a cloud **and** smoke by day

The original manuscript is not extant here. Oliver Cowdery, as he was copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , initially wrote “a cloud of smoke” since this expression is what we expect in English. Almost immediately Oliver caught his error and crossed out the *of* and supralinearly inserted the ampersand. The level of ink flow is unchanged for both the crossout and the ampersand. The insert mark itself may have been inserted later (perhaps after redipping the quill) since its ink flow is distinctly heavier. In any event, it seems clear that the original text here read identically to the King James text (“a cloud and smoke”).

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for 2 Nephi 14:5 (“a cloud and smoke by day”); the correction appears to be nearly immediate and agrees with the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 14:6

*and for a place of refuge
and a covert from storm and from rain*

□ **Isaiah 4:6** (King James Bible)

and for a place of refuge
and **for** a covert from storm and from rain

Here the Book of Mormon text does not repeat the preposition *for*. Although it is possible that the repeated *for* was accidentally deleted in the early transmission of the text, two other passages in this long Isaiah quotation (2 Nephi 12–24) show that the Book of Mormon text sometimes omits the repeated preposition *for*:

2 Nephi 17:25	for the sending forth of oxen and the treading of lesser cattle
Isaiah 7:25	for the sending forth of oxen and for the treading of lesser cattle
2 Nephi 18:14	for a gin and a snare
Isaiah 8:14	for a gin and for a snare

Summary: Maintain the lack of the repeated preposition *for* in 2 Nephi 14:6 as well as in 2 Nephi 17:25 and 2 Nephi 18:14.

2 Nephi 15

■ 2 Nephi 15:1

*and then will I sing
to my [beloved > well beloved 1 | well beloved ABCGHKPS | well-beloved DEFIJLMNOQRT]
a song of my beloved touching his vineyard
my [well beloved 1BCDEGHKPS | well-beloved AFIJLMNOQRT] hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill*

□ Isaiah 5:1 (King James Bible)

now will I sing
to my **well beloved**
a song of my beloved touching his vineyard
my **well beloved** hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill

In the printer’s manuscript for 2 Nephi 15:1, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the first *well beloved* as *beloved*, perhaps under the influence of the immediately following “a song of my **beloved**”. In the Book of Mormon text, “my beloved” is much more frequent than “my well beloved” (note especially the highly frequent “my beloved brethren”); “my well beloved” occurs twice here in 2 Nephi 15:1 and once in Helaman 5:47 (“because of your faith in my Well Beloved”). Interestingly, Oliver also initially skipped the *well* in the Helaman passage (see the discussion for Helaman 5:47).

Thus Oliver Cowdery’s error is very natural; even so, he quickly caught his error here in 2 Nephi 15:1 and supralinearly inserted the *well* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Of course, *well beloved* agrees with the reading of the King James Bible, and undoubtedly it agreed with the reading of \mathfrak{O} (which is not extant here).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 15:1 the two occurrences of *well beloved*, the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 15:5

*I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard
I will take away the [hedge 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST | edge F] thereof
and it shall be eaten up*

□ Isaiah 5:5 (King James Bible)

I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard
I will take away the **hedge** thereof
and it shall be eaten up

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally set *edge* rather than the correct *hedge*. Perhaps there was some expectation of “take away the edge thereof”, meaning ‘take away the sharpness thereof’

(see definitions 1 and 2 for *edge* in the Oxford English Dictionary). Ultimately, *edge* doesn't make much sense in this context, and the error was corrected in the next LDS edition (1879).

Summary: Maintain the use of *hedge* in 2 Nephi 15:5, the reading of the earliest Book of Mormon text as well as the King James reading.

■ **2 Nephi 15:7**

and he looked for judgment

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold oppression*
for righteousness

[& > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold a cry*

□ **Isaiah 5:7** (King James Bible)

and he looked for judgment

but behold oppression

for righteousness

but behold a cry

The corresponding Hebrew text literally has “and behold” both times. Depending on the context, the original Hebrew *and* can be translated as *but* (which is the word the King James translators selected here in Isaiah 5:7). For the Book of Mormon, we do not have the original manuscript for this passage; the printer’s manuscript initially read “and behold” in both cases (with *and* written as an ampersand), but the second ampersand was crossed out and *but* supralinearly inserted without any change in the level of ink flow. Thus the Book of Mormon text ends up with the nonparallel “and behold . . . but behold”. The original Hebrew text and the corresponding King James text argue for parallelism: we should have either two occurrences of “and behold” or two of “but behold”.

So the question is: What is the source of the inserted *but* in \mathcal{D} ? We have no conclusive evidence that Oliver Cowdery (when acting as scribe) referred to a King James Bible in his copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{D} (or, for that matter, as he wrote down the original manuscript from Joseph Smith’s dictation). The most probable explanation for the correction in the printer’s manuscript is that the original manuscript read “and behold . . . but behold”. The first occurrence of “and behold” apparently led Oliver to accidentally repeat this phrase when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , but Oliver caught his error and then corrected the second “and behold” to “but behold”.

One wonders, then, if Joseph Smith had perhaps originally dictated “but behold . . . but behold” (namely, the King James text) but that the scribe in \mathcal{C} (probably Oliver Cowdery) had accidentally written down “and behold . . . but behold”. Note that the use of *and* at the very beginning of this verse (“and he looked for judgment”) could have prompted the scribe to write down “and behold oppression”. Thus it is possible that the original text for 2 Nephi 15:7 read identically to the King James reading. And there is considerable evidence within the manuscripts that the conjunctions *and* and *but* were occasionally mixed up. For a list of such mixtures, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:20 regarding the use of *but* in 2 Nephi 9:41.

Ultimately, however, this whole discussion here in 2 Nephi 15:7 involves considerable speculation. The problem is that we have so little evidence to make a firm decision. The most reasonable solution here is to follow the corrected text in \mathcal{P} , under the assumption that it reflects the reading in \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 15:7 the corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript (“and behold . . . but behold”), despite the resulting nonparallelism in an otherwise parallel construction.

■ 2 Nephi 15:9

in mine ears [saith 1JPS | said ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQRT] the Lord of Hosts

□ Isaiah 5:9 (King James Bible)

in mine ears **said** the LORD of Hosts

In the Hebrew text of this passage there is no word *said*; thus it appears in italics in the King James Bible. In theory, either *saith* or *said* can work in this context. The 1830 compositor replaced *saith* with *said*, probably by reference to his King James Bible.

When we look at other places in Isaiah 2–14 (in the King James Bible), we note that the past-tense form *said* is used only in discourse between two individuals, one of which may be the Lord. But when we have an isolated quote (nearly always from the Lord), the King James Bible uses *saith* rather than *said*, except for here in Isaiah 5:9. Such present-tense usage suggests that the Lord’s word is everlasting. (For additional examples of this present-tense usage, see under 2 Nephi 10:10.) Thus it seems more reasonable to have *saith* here in 2 Nephi 15:9 rather than the King James *said*. The 1888 LDS edition of the Book of Mormon independently introduced *saith* here in 2 Nephi 15:9, while the 1908 RLDS edition restored *saith* in accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 15:9 the present-tense reading of the printer’s manuscript, “in mine ears **saith** the Lord of Hosts”; such usage is consistent with other instances of “saith the Lord” in Isaiah 2–14.

■ 2 Nephi 15:10

*and the seed of a [homer 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | horner A]
shall yield an ephah*

□ Isaiah 5:10 (King James Bible)

and the seed of **an homer**
shall yield an ephah

As discussed under 2 Nephi 13:7, the Book of Mormon quotation of Isaiah 2–14 prefers *a* rather than *an* before *h*-initial words, thus *a homer* instead of the King James *an homer*.

Here in 2 Nephi 15:10, the 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *homer* as *horner*. This error was corrected in the subsequent edition (1837). Just like the word *ephah*, the word *homer* is directly

taken from the Hebrew and was otherwise unknown to the compositor. Since he did not recognize the word, he simply set what he thought it looked like. Apparently, he did not consult his King James Bible here.

Summary: Maintain the *a* before *homer* in 2 Nephi 15:10; the 1830 *horner* is simply a misreading of the printer's manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 15:12

*but they regard not the [work 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | works s] of the Lord
neither consider the [operation 1 | operation ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | operations HK]
of his [hand >+ hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT]*

□ Isaiah 5:12 (King James Bible)

but they regard not the **work** of the LORD
neither consider the **operation** of his **hands**

There has been a sporadic tendency to change the number of the nouns in this verse. For instance, the 1953 RLDS edition has *works* rather than *work*. This particular change may be intentional since this edition has a footnote for this verse referring the reader to Psalm 28:5, which has the plural *works* instead of the singular *work*: “because they regard not the **works** of the LORD nor the operation of his hands”. It seems rather strange to let a minor difference in a parallel biblical passage dictate a change in an Isaiah quotation in the Book of Mormon. One other possibility is that the plural *works* was accidentally created in the copy-text for the 1953 edition, which then led the RLDS editors to subsequently find the Psalms passage that agreed with this mistaken plural. In any event, the correct Book of Mormon reading is the singular *work*.

The second change, which replaced the singular *operation* with the plural *operations*, appeared first in the 1874 RLDS edition. This change appears to be a typo and was removed in the third RLDS edition (1908).

Finally, we have an example from the printer's manuscript. While copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery first wrote *hand* at the end of the line in the printer's manuscript. He then inserted the *s* with slightly heavier ink flow after *hand*. (Oliver probably redipped his quill before inserting the plural *s*.) There is a natural tendency to write the singular *hand* in this context since in the Book of Mormon there are 25 occurrences of “the hand of the Lord” but only one of “the hands of the Lord” (in Alma 26:7, “they are in the hands of the Lord of the harvest”). In 2 Nephi 15:12, it seems reasonable to assume that the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here) read *hands*, identically to the King James reading.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 15:12 the original singular nouns *work* and *operation* as well as Oliver Cowdery's corrected plural *hands* in \mathcal{P} ; all three of these agree in number with the reading of the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 15:24

their root shall be rottenness

and their [*blossom* 1 | *blossoms* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shall go up as dust*

□ Isaiah 5:24 (King James Bible)

so their root shall be **as** rottenness

and their **blossom** shall go up as dust

The 1830 typesetter accidentally changed the singular *blossom* to the plural *blossoms*. He did not make this change by reference to his King James Bible, since the King James Bible has the singular *blossom*. But the singular is expected since the parallel clause also has a singular subject (“their root”) in the King James translation as well as in the original Hebrew.

The Book of Mormon text, however, removes one aspect of the parallelism between these two clauses—namely, the *as* in the first clause (“their root shall be rottenness”). The King James translation here reflects the parallelism of the Hebrew original (both words for *rottenness* and *dust* take the prefix *k-*, which means ‘as’). In 2 Nephi 15:24, the *as* in the second clause is kept, probably because it seems necessary; the reading “and their blossom shall go up dust” is awkward, if not impossible. Of course, an *as* in the first clause could have been accidentally dropped in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. (See 2 Nephi 9:16 for a list of instances where Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped *as* as he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} .) On the other hand, since here in 2 Nephi 15:24 the reading without the first *as* is possible, it is perhaps best to follow the earliest textual sources and retain the Book of Mormon reading without the *as*. It is also worth noting here that the original 1611 King James Bible did not have the *as* either.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 15:24 the singular *blossom*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript as well as the King James text (and the original Hebrew); maintain the first clause without the *as* (“their root shall be rottenness”), in accord with the earliest textual sources for this passage in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 15:25

but his hand [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] *stretched out still*

□ Isaiah 5:25 (King James Bible)

but his hand **is** stretched out still

As discussed under 2 Nephi 13:14, in quoting Isaiah passages the original Book of Mormon text frequently does not have the italicized linking verb *be* of the corresponding King James text. One particular clause where the *be* is consistently missing in the original Book of Mormon text is “his hand stretched out”. We have four examples precisely like this one in 2 Nephi 15:25, plus a fifth one (in 2 Nephi 24:17) that is very similar. In all instances, the current LDS text has the *is* of the King James text, while the current RLDS text has maintained the reading of the original text (without the *is*):

2 Nephi 19:12

but his hand [1APS | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 19:17

but his hand [*streached* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEGHKNPS | *stretcheth* FIJLMOQ |
is stretched RT] out still

2 Nephi 19:21

but his hand [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 20:4

but his hand [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out still

2 Nephi 24:27

and his hand [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *is* RT] stretched out

For all six cases of “his hand (is) stretched out”, the critical text will follow the earliest Book of Mormon reading—namely, without the *is*.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 15:25 (and elsewhere) the usage of the original text with respect to the clause “his hand is stretched out” by omitting the *is* (italicized in the King James text).

■ 2 Nephi 15:26–27

[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | 97 PS]
none shall be weary nor stumble among them
 [1ABCDEFGHIJKPS | 27 IJLMNOQRT]
none shall slumber nor sleep
neither shall the girdle of their loins be loosed
nor the latchet of their shoes be broken

□ Isaiah 5:27 (King James Bible)

none shall be weary nor stumble among them
 none shall slumber nor sleep
 neither shall the girdle of their loins be loosed
 nor the latchet of their shoes be broken

Except for two verse divisions (the other is discussed below), Orson Pratt made his 1879 Book of Mormon verse divisions agree with the Isaiah verse divisions found in the King James Bible. In the LDS Church’s Historical Department, there are three pre-1879 copies of the Book of Mormon marked up with Pratt’s versification (apparently all three are in his own hand). All three copies are later printings from the corrected stereotyped plates of the 1852 LDS edition (these plates were corrected for the second 1852 printing of that edition). Two of these copies (1854 #2 and 1874 #2) show the verse break in the right place (namely, before the first “none shall” and in agreement with the King James Bible), but the third copy (1876 #2) has verse 27 begin with the second “none shall”. This is an obvious error, resulting from the fact that both clauses begin with the same words (“none shall”). Apparently, Orson Pratt’s eye skipped down as he marked the verse number here, and thus he ended up accidentally marking the wrong verse division in his third copy. Because this 1876 #2 copy was the copy-text used by the 1879 printer (it is full of printer’s ink, including fingerprints, and is cut in various places), an incorrect verse division entered the 1879 edition and has been followed by every subsequent LDS edition.

The only other difference in versification for the Isaiah passages is for verse 29 in this chapter, but in this instance the difference can be justified. In fact, the 1892 and 1908 RLDS versifications agree here with Orson Pratt’s 1879 versification (and against the King James versification):

2 Nephi 15:28–29
 and their wheels like a whirlwind
 their roaring like a lion
 [1ABCDEFGHIJ|29 IJLMNOQRT|74 K|99 PS]
 they shall roar like young lions

Isaiah 5:28–29 (King James Bible)
 and their wheels like a whirlwind
 29 [verse number]
 their roaring *shall be* like a lion
 they shall roar like young lions

The Book of Mormon text omits the words *shall be* (italicized in the King James text), thus making “their roaring like a lion” parallel to the preceding “and their wheels like a whirlwind”; therefore both clauses can be placed in the same verse. The King James translation, on the other hand, with the added words *shall be*, makes the resulting clause (“their roaring *shall be* like a lion”) parallel to the following clause (“they shall roar like young lions”). Thus the King James versification allows for these two parallel clauses to remain together. But the change in versification for 2 Nephi 15:28–29 is a natural consequence of the omission of the words *shall be* in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Revise the division between verses 26 and 27 in the LDS text for 2 Nephi 15 so that verse 27 begins with “none shall be weary nor stumble among them”, which is what Orson Pratt actually intended (and which agrees with the King James Bible versification); on the other hand, the current division between verses 28–29 in the LDS text (and between verses 98–99 in the RLDS text) appears to be intended.

■ 2 Nephi 15:29

*yea they shall roar and lay hold of the prey
 and shall carry away safe
 and none shall deliver*

□ Isaiah 5:29 (King James Bible)

yea they shall roar and lay hold of the prey
 and shall carry *it* away safe
 and none shall deliver *it*

Here we have two examples where the Book of Mormon text omits the direct object pronoun *it* that is found in the corresponding Isaiah passage of the King James Bible. In this verse, both are italicized in the King James text since neither is found in the original Hebrew. This passage is not the only one in this long Isaiah quotation where a direct object *it* has been omitted:

- 2 Nephi 16:7 (Isaiah 6:7 has *it* in italics)
 and he laid [1 | *it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon my mouth
- 2 Nephi 17:11 (the *it* in Isaiah 7:11 is not in italics)
 ask [1 | *it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] either in the depths
 or in the heights above
- 2 Nephi 20:17 (the *it* before *shall burn* in Isaiah 10:17 is not in italics)
 and shall burn and shall devour his thorns and his briars in one day
- 2 Nephi 24:27 (Isaiah 14:27 has *it* in italics)
 and who shall disannul [*it* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]
 [The original manuscript is not extant for “who shall disannul (it)”, but
 spacing between extant fragments of ☉ allows for an *it* (although it may
 have been crossed out); see the discussion under 2 Nephi 24:27.]

For the first two of these additional examples, the omitted *it* was supplied by the 1830 typesetter, probably by reference to his King James Bible. But in 2 Nephi 15:29, no *it* has ever been supplied in any edition. Here the critical text will follow the earliest textual reading, which has no direct object pronoun *it* after the verbs *carry* and *deliver*.

We should note that the Book of Mormon text does not omit every case of italicized direct object *it* found in Isaiah 2–14, as in the following nearby verse in 2 Nephi 15:

- 2 Nephi 15:19
 let him make speed
 hasten his work that we may see **it**
 and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come
 that we may know **it**
- Isaiah 5:19 (King James Bible)
 let him make speed
and hasten his work that we may see **it**
 and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come
 that we may know **it**

Summary: Maintain the two instances of omitted *it* in 2 Nephi 15:29, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant source for this passage).

2 Nephi 16

■ 2 Nephi 16:2

[1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *And* MQ]
[*above* 1MQ | *Above* ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST] *it*
stood the seraphims

□ Isaiah 6:2 (King James Bible)

above it stood the seraphims

For verse 2 the 1905 LDS edition added an *and*—capitalized, of course, since it begins the verse. This change is a conscious one since it involves capitalizing the *and* and changing the initial *A* of *Above* to lowercase. The abruptness of starting a sentence with a prepositional phrase (“above it”) may have played a role, but another factor may have been the fact that the two following verses, each typeset as a separate paragraph (numbered and indented), began with a capitalized *And*:

2 Nephi 16:2–4 (1905 accidentals; original word spacing retained)

2. **And** above it stood the seraphims; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly.

3. **And** one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory.

4. **And** the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke.

The 1911 LDS edition was set from the 1905 edition and continued this intrusive *and* in verse 2, but the 1920 LDS edition dropped it since neither the earliest editions nor the King James Bible had it.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 16:2 the original text without any initial *and*; this reading without the *and* agrees with the King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 16:2

above it stood the [Seraphims 1 | *seraphims* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *seraphim* RT]

□ Isaiah 6:2 (King James Bible)

above it stood the **seraphims**

The original Book of Mormon text uses the double plural *seraphims*, just like the King James Bible. In Hebrew, the *-im* ending makes *seraph* plural. But for English speakers, *seraphim* doesn’t

seem plural, thus the tendency to add the *-s* ending to the Hebrew plural *seraphim* to form a double plural, *seraphims*. This same double plural is found later in this chapter:

2 Nephi 16:6

then flew one of the [*seraphims* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *seraphim* RT]
unto me

Isaiah 6:6 (King James Bible)

then flew one of the **seraphims** unto me

The 1920 LDS edition replaced the King James *seraphims* with the correct Hebrew plural form, *seraphim*. The critical text will, of course, restore the original Book of Mormon reading in both cases (in agreement with the King James reading).

Summary: Maintain the double plural *seraphims* in 2 Nephi 16:2, 6.

■ 2 Nephi 16:5

woe [NULL >]s *is* unto 1 | A | *is* unto BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT] *me*

□ Isaiah 6:5 (King James Bible)

woe ***is*** me

As noted in the discussion for 2 Nephi 13:14, the Book of Mormon text frequently omits the linking verb *be* when it is italicized in the King James Bible (and therefore lacking in the original Hebrew text). Here in 2 Nephi 16:5, the original Book of Mormon text read “woe me”, without the *is* that is italicized in the corresponding King James passage. Such usage appears to be intended since it occurs fairly often (see the list under 2 Nephi 13:14). Yet not every *be* verb form that is italicized in the King James Bible is omitted in the original Book of Mormon text. For instance, out of 37 cases of italicized *is* in Isaiah 2–14, there are 27 that have retained the *is* in the corresponding Book of Mormon quotation, including two in a nearby verse in this chapter:

2 Nephi 16:3

holy holy holy **is** the Lord of Hosts
the whole earth **is** full of his glory

Isaiah 6:3 (King James Bible)

holy holy holy **is** the LORD of Hosts
the whole earth **is** full of his glory

In later editing, the omitted *be* verb has been supplied in nine out of the ten other cases (the only exception is in 2 Nephi 17:8) and always in agreement with the King James text except for here in 2 Nephi 16:5. In this case, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did more than supply the *is* found in the King James Bible: he also added the preposition *unto*. Such usage is partially consistent with usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. For instance, whenever we have “woe be”, we get a following *unto* (“woe be unto X”), with 24 occurrences (such as “woe be unto the Gentiles” in 1 Nephi 14:6). In addition, we have 47 occurrences of “woe unto X”—that is, without any *be* verb at all (such as “woe unto the rich” in 2 Nephi 9:30). Thus the use of *unto* is highly

expected after *woe*. However, there is one example of *woe* in the original Book of Mormon text that takes *is* as the form of the *be* verb, and in that one case, we get no preposition at all. And for this one instance, the complement is the object pronoun *me*, just like in the King James reading for 2 Nephi 16:5:

Mormon 2:19
and **woe is me** because of their wickedness

In the King James Bible, excluding the example in Isaiah 6:5, we have six examples of “woe is me”, all in the Old Testament. Interestingly, there is a single example in the King James Bible of “woe is unto me”, but it occurs in the New Testament:

1 Corinthians 9:16
yea woe is **unto** me if I preach not the gospel

Thus the Old Testament usage consistently supports “woe is me”, while the single New Testament occurrence supports “woe is unto me”.

Interestingly, the Hebrew original for Isaiah 6:5 literally reads “woe unto me”, which means that Joseph Smith’s emendation to “woe is unto me” is consistent with the Hebrew. Nonetheless, if the text in 2 Nephi 16:5 is to be revised, then only the *is* should be added. The two main reasons are (1) the only other instance in the Book of Mormon of “woe is (unto) me” reads “woe is me” (Mormon 2:19), and (2) the King James reading that corresponds to 2 Nephi 16:5 (namely, Isaiah 6:5) reads “woe *is* me”. The critical text will, of course, omit the *is* as well as the *unto*.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text in 2 Nephi 16:5 (“woe me”), which corresponds to the King James text except that the italicized *is* is omitted.

■ 2 Nephi 16:5

- *for I a man of unclean lips* 1*
- *for I am undone* 1^{C1}A
because I a man of unclean lips
- *for I am undone* 1^{C2}BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
*because I **am** a man of unclean lips*

□ Isaiah 6:5 (King James Bible)

for I am undone
because I **am** a man of unclean lips

Here in 2 Nephi 16:5, the original text (and the original manuscript) undoubtedly read like the corresponding Isaiah passage except that the italicized *am* of the King James text was omitted. When Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{D} , he accidentally skipped “I am undone because”. Later, probably when proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} , he supplied the missing text supralinearly (and with somewhat heavier ink flow). The probable reason for the error is that Oliver’s eye skipped from the *I am* of “**I am** undone” to the *I a m* of “**I a man**”.

The italicized King James *am* in “I *am* a man” was intentionally omitted from the original Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, the nonitalicized *am* in the preceding “I am undone” was in the original text. In the Hebrew, the equivalent for “I am undone” is a single verb form with the meaning ‘I am destroyed’; in other words, the verb is not a case involving the linking verb *be* (as is “I **am** a man of unclean lips”). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith supralinearly supplied the *am* for “I **am** a man of unclean lips”. The critical text will, of course, restore the original text without that *am* (“I a man of unclean lips”) but will maintain the *am* of the preceding “I am undone”.

Summary: The original text in 2 Nephi 16:5 had the *am* in “I am undone” but omitted it in “I a man of unclean lips”, which means that the original Book of Mormon text follows the corresponding literal Hebrew in Isaiah 6:5.

■ 2 Nephi 16:5

for I am undone because I a man of unclean lips

- & I dwell in the mids of a People of unclean lips 1
- and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST
- NULL K

for mine eyes have seen the King the Lord of Hosts

□ Isaiah 6:5 (King James Bible)

for I am undone because I *am* a man of unclean lips
and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips
for mine eyes have seen the King the LORD of Hosts

In this passage the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally dropped a whole clause when the typesetter’s eye skipped from the first “of unclean lips” to the following one. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the missing clause.

Summary: Maintain the original clause in 2 Nephi 16:5 that the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally skipped.

■ 2 Nephi 16:6

then flew one of the [seraphims 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | seraphim RT] unto me

□ Isaiah 6:6 (King James Bible)

then flew one of the **seraphims** unto me

As discussed under 2 Nephi 16:2, the critical text will restore the original double plural *seraphims* (the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 16:7

and he laid [1 | it ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon my mouth

□ Isaiah 6:7 (King James Bible)

and he laid **it** upon my mouth

As discussed under 2 Nephi 15:29, the King James italicized *it* was intentionally omitted in the original text for 2 Nephi 16:7 but was supplied by the 1830 typesetter, probably by reference to his King James Bible. The critical text will omit the *it*.

■ 2 Nephi 16:7

lo this [hath 1 | has ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] touched thy lips

□ Isaiah 6:7 (King James Bible)

lo this **hath** touched thy lips

Here the 1830 compositor set *has* rather than the original *hath*. This change definitely appears to be a typo since the 1830 compositor virtually always left *hath* in the text. Most instances of the occasional replacement of the third person singular ending *-(e)th* with *-(e)s* resulted from Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *hath* in 2 Nephi 16:7 (“this hath touched thy lips”), the reading of the earliest text (the printer’s manuscript) as well as the corresponding King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 16:8

[& > & also >+ also 1 | Also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I heard the voice of the Lord saying . . .

□ Isaiah 6:8 (King James Bible)

also I heard the voice of the Lord saying . . .

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and I heard the voice of the Lord”, where the *and* was written as an ampersand; then almost immediately Oliver wrote *also* right above the ampersand, but only later did he cross out the ampersand itself. The level of ink flow for *also* looks unchanged, but the crossout of the ampersand was done with a broader quill and shows a heavier ink flow. This difference suggests that some time elapsed after Oliver wrote the ampersand and the supralinear *also* before he decided to cross out the ampersand. Perhaps the crossout was done when Oliver was proofing \wp against \mathcal{O} . Most probably, the corrected reading in 2 Nephi 16:8 (*also* rather than *and*) represents the reading of the original manuscript rather than a correction based on referencing a King James Bible. The vast majority of minor differences between the Book of Mormon text for 2 Nephi 12–24 and the corresponding Isaiah passage (Isaiah 2–14) were left unchanged.

Furthermore, there would have been nothing strange about the initial *and* of “and (also) I heard the voice of the Lord” that would have motivated Oliver to consult a Bible. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the original Hebrew here actually has *and* rather than *also*. Even so, it seems highly unlikely that the original manuscript had the Hebrew *and* rather than *also*. The initial introduction of the *and* in \mathcal{D} seems to be simply the result of Oliver’s expectation. Elsewhere in this long King James quotation from Isaiah 2–14, there are 241 clauses that begin with *and* (an average of almost one every verse), but only one clause begins with *also*—namely, here in 2 Nephi 16:8 (which implies that the King James translators would have been more consistent to have translated the Hebrew *and* as *and* and not as *also*). In any event, the original Book of Mormon text appears to have followed the King James *also* here in 2 Nephi 16:8.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 16:8 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} (“also I heard the voice of the Lord”), which agrees with the corresponding King James reading.

■ **2 Nephi 16:8**

then I said
here I
send me

□ **Isaiah 6:8** (King James Bible)

then said I
here am I
send me

The word order in this passage of the Book of Mormon differs from the King James order (“then I said” versus “then said I”). It is possible that the switch in word order is due to an early error in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text since elsewhere in this chapter the original King James word order is retained: both 2 Nephi 16:5 and 2 Nephi 16:11 read “then said I”, each in agreement with the King James “then said I”. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has only one occurrence of this expression, and it reads “then I said” (in 1 Nephi 21:4), another Isaiah quote (from Isaiah 49:4), which actually reads “then I said” in the King James Bible. More generally, the King James Bible has both possibilities: 12 of “then I said” and 22 of “then said I”.

Since both word orders are possible in Isaiah, the critical text should probably rely on the earliest textual sources for determining the word order in the Book of Mormon text, thus maintaining the reading “then I said” in 2 Nephi 16:8. There is, of course, a distinct possibility that the switch in word order is an instance of an early error in transmission, especially since modern English speakers expect the word order “then I said” rather than the archaic “then said I”. Yet it should also be noted that the original 1611 King James Bible actually read “Then I saide” for this passage, thus supporting the Book of Mormon reading.

Summary: Maintain the word order “then I said” in 2 Nephi 16:8, the earliest extant reading, even though this expected word order may be due to an early transmission error.

■ 2 Nephi 16:8

*then I said**here* [NULL >]s *am* 1 | A | *am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I*
send me

□ Isaiah 6:8 (King James Bible)

then said I

here **am** I

send me

As already discussed under 2 Nephi 13:14, the King James italicized *am* is often missing in the corresponding Book of Mormon quotation. Also see the discussion in 2 Nephi 16:5, where the italicized *am* was omitted in the original Book of Mormon text while the nonitalicized *am* was retained. The critical text will retain the original “here I” in 2 Nephi 16:8.

■ 2 Nephi 16:9

*and he said / go and tell this people**hear ye indeed**but they* [*understand* 1A | *understood* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not**and see ye indeed**but they* [*perceived* 1 | *perceived* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *perceive* N] *not*

□ Isaiah 6:9 (King James Bible)

and he said / go and tell this people

hear ye indeed

but **understand** not

and see ye indeed

but **perceive** not

In the Hebrew original, the verbs *understand* and *perceive* are second person plurals. The King James translation leaves the subject pronoun *ye* unstated for these two verbs. The King James text could have been translated more literally as “hear ye indeed but ye understand not / and see ye indeed but ye perceive not”. Instead of supplying *ye*, the Book of Mormon text adds the third person plural pronoun *they*. Thus we end up with a repeated shift from second person to third person. There is no doubt that the two occurrences of *they* are intentional and should be retained in the critical text.

The earliest Book of Mormon sources for this passage differ in the tense for one of the verbs. The original manuscript is not extant for this verse, but the printer’s manuscript has the past-tense form *perceived* rather than the present-tense *perceive*, the reading of the King James text. Yet the parallel *understand* is in the present-tense in both \mathcal{P} and the King James Bible. In addition, the Book of Mormon text has consistently maintained the present-tense *hear* and *see* of the King James Bible. Thus the earliest Book of Mormon text has a single disagreement in tense (“understand . . . perceived”). The 1830 edition maintained this disagreement, but the 1837 edition changed the

text so that there is tense agreement with the second verb (“understood . . . perceived”) rather than with the first verb (“understand . . . perceive”).

It appears that an extra *d* was added to the verb *perceive* at some point early in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text, probably when Joseph Smith dictated the text to his scribe (apparently Oliver Cowdery for this part of the text). The scribe seems to have misheard “they perceive not” as “they perceived not”. The /n/ of the following *not* makes it difficult in normal speech to hear whether the preceding word would have ended in /v/ or /vd/—that is, in continuous speech the cluster /vɔn/ is typically pronounced without the *d*, so the scribe could have thought he heard /vɔn/ when in fact Joseph had pronounced /vɔnd/.

There is evidence elsewhere that Oliver Cowdery could misinterpret complex consonant clusters that are formed at the boundaries of words. In the following example, the consonant *d* was dropped from the consonant sequence of /zdð/ that occurred when *supposed* was immediately followed by *that*:

Alma 56:37

when they saw the army of Antipus pursuing them with their might
 they did not turn to the right nor to the left
 but pursued their march in a straight course after us
 and as we [*suppose* 01EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *supposed* ABCD]
 [*that* 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it was their intent to slay us
 before Antipus should overtake them . . .

Internal evidence argues that the original text in Alma 56:37 read in the past tense—that is, as “supposed that” rather than the present-tense “suppose that” (the reading in \mathfrak{C}). For instance, all the other finite verbs in the larger passage (*saw*, *did*, and *pursued*) are in the past tense. The 1830 typesetter realized there was an error in tense here, so he added the *d* to *suppose* (although he then dropped the following *that* which had facilitated the misinterpretation in the first place). For complete discussion, see Alma 56:37.

In another example, a consonant /z/ was added (similar to the adding of /d/ here in 2 Nephi 16:9). In this case, Joseph Smith undoubtedly dictated “my son see”, which Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted as “my sons see”, thus misconstruing /ns/ as /nzs/:

Alma 41:14

therefore
 my [*Sons* > *Son* > *Sons* 0 | *Son* 1 | *son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 see that ye are merciful unto your brethren

The context makes it very clear that Alma is speaking to only one son, Corianton. Thus Oliver, when he copied the text from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} , emended the plural *sons* to the singular *son*. See the discussion under Alma 41:14.

Here in 2 Nephi 16:9, we probably have one more example of the scribe mishearing Joseph Smith’s pronunciation of a sequence of consonants. The original text for this verse, just like the corresponding King James passage, had four present-tense verb forms: *hear*, *understand*, *see*, and *perceive*. The introduction of the past-tense *perceived* into the text (probably in \mathfrak{C} itself) then led to the 1837 editing of the preceding *understand* to *understood*, which further compounded the

confusion in tenses. The 1906 LDS edition set the present-tense *perceive* (apparently the original reading for this verb), but this change was probably a typo since the preceding past-tense *understood* was maintained in that edition. The critical text will maintain the four original present-tense verb forms in 2 Nephi 16:9, in agreement with the verb forms in the corresponding King James version (Isaiah 6:9).

Summary: Replace in 2 Nephi 16:9 the two past-tense verb forms found in the current text (*understood* and *perceived*) with their present-tense forms (*understand* and *perceive*); the past-tense *perceived* is probably the result of Oliver Cowdery misinterpreting Joseph Smith’s dictation of “perceive not” as the phonetically similar “perceived not”.

■ 2 Nephi 16:10

*lest they see with their eyes
and hear with their ears
and understand with their heart
and [convert >js be converted 1 | convert A | be converted BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and be healed*

□ Isaiah 6:10 (King James Bible)

lest they see with their eyes
and hear with their ears
and understand with their heart
and **convert**
and be healed

The original meaning of *convert* as used here in 2 Nephi 9:10 is given in the Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 8b for the verb) as ‘to turn from a course of conduct, purpose, disposition’. This intransitive use has been obsolete since Early Modern English but appears (as we would expect) in this Book of Mormon quotation from the King James Bible. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith altered *convert* so that it would read *be converted* (parallel to the following *be healed*). In our current language, this passive phraseology tends to imply a more externally caused conversion. The original (now archaic) *convert* forces the interpretation of an internally motivated conversion.

This editing of *convert* to *be converted* makes the text consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. The Book of Mormon text has 26 examples of the passive form “be converted”. In some cases, the past participle *converted* is used adjectivally, as in the expression “become converted” (3 Nephi 1:25 and 3 Nephi 2:12). There are also two examples of the transitive verb *convert* in the active voice (Jacob 7:7 and Helaman 9:16). All 30 of these examples are consistent with current English usage; there are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of the Early Modern English verb *convert* being used intransitively (as it was originally used here in 2 Nephi 16:10). In this regard, consider the following passage that is based in part on the King James language of Isaiah 6:10:

3 Nephi 9:13

will ye not now return unto me and repent of your sins
and **be converted** that I may **heal** you

Isaiah 6:10 (also the original text for 2 Nephi 16:10)

lest they see with their eyes
and hear with their ears
and understand with their heart
and **convert** and **be healed**

Both passages end with references to being converted and healed, yet 3 Nephi 9:13 uses the modern “be converted” rather than the original intransitive *convert* of Isaiah 6:10. In fact, the King James Bible itself prefers “be converted”. For instance, this Isaiah passage (Isaiah 6:10) is quoted four times in the New Testament (Matthew 13:15, Mark 4:12, John 12:40, and Acts 28:27). Yet each time the King James translation has *be converted* rather than the *convert* found in Isaiah 6:10. In fact, the language of 3 Nephi 9:13 parallels three of these New Testament passages:

3 Nephi 9:13	and	be converted that I may	heal you
Matthew 13:15	and should be converted and I should	heal them	
John 12:40	and	be converted and I should	heal them
Acts 28:27	and should be converted and I should	heal them	

Summary: Restore the original *convert* in 2 Nephi 16:10 since this is how the earliest Book of Mormon sources read; the intransitive *convert* is also in agreement with the corresponding King James reading in Isaiah 6:10.

■ 2 Nephi 16:11

then said I
Lord how long
and he said . . .

□ Isaiah 6:11 (King James Bible)

then said I
Lord how long
and he **answered** . . .

The Book of Mormon text repeats *said* here in 2 Nephi 16:11, while the King James Bible first has *said*, then *answered*. For both cases, the Hebrew original uses the same verb ²-m-r, which has the general meaning ‘say’. Thus the Book of Mormon increases the parallelism of the passage, in agreement with the original Hebrew text.

It is theoretically possible that the *answered* of the King James text was actually the original text in the Book of Mormon but that somehow *answered* was accidentally replaced by *said* in the early transmission of the text (perhaps under the influence of the preceding *said* in “then said I”). Elsewhere in the text, however, there is no explicit evidence of *answer* and *say* ever being mixed up in either the manuscripts or the printed editions. For further discussion of the relationship

between *answer* and *say*, especially in expressions like “he answered and said”, see the discussion under Alma 18:25.

Summary: Maintain the parallelism of 2 Nephi 16:11, with its two instances of *said* rather than the “said . . . answered” of the corresponding King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 16:11

*and he said
until the cities be wasted
without [inhabent 1 | inhabitant ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | inhabitants S]
and the houses without man*

□ Isaiah 6:11 (King James Bible)

and he answered
until the cities be wasted without **inhabitant**
and the houses without man

The 1953 RLDS edition has the plural *inhabitants*, which may be due to the preceding plural *cities*. Even so, the change is probably a typo since the following “and the houses without **man**” was not changed to “and the houses without **men**”. The King James text has the singular forms *inhabitant* and *man*.

Summary: Maintain the singular *inhabitant* in 2 Nephi 16:11, the earliest extant text for the Book of Mormon (as well as the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 16:11–12

*and he said
until the cities be wasted without inhabitant
and the houses without man
and the land be utterly desolate
[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the Lord **have** removed men far away
for there shall be a great forsaking in the midst of the land*

□ Isaiah 6:11–12 (King James Bible)

and he answered
until the cities be wasted without inhabitant
and the houses without man
and the land be utterly desolate
, [a comma]
and the LORD **have** removed men far away
and *there be* a great forsaking in the midst of the land

The 1830 compositor set the wrong punctuation after the word *desolate*. His semicolon creates a full stop and thus ends up stranding the first subordinate clause in verse 12. The *until*-clause that

starts in verse 11 extends into verse 12, which explains why the King James Bible has a comma after *desolate* as well as why all the verbs in the *until*-clause are in the subjunctive (“the cities **be** wasted . . . the land **be** utterly desolate . . . the Lord **have** removed men . . . and there **be** a great forsaking”). The Book of Mormon text separates off the second clause in verse 12 by replacing *and* with *for* and inserting the modal verb *shall* (“**for** there **shall** be a great forsaking in the midst of the land”), thus making the second clause indicative. But the first clause in verse 12 retains its subjunctive form (“and the Lord **have** removed men far away”), which means that there should only be a comma between verses 11 and 12 in the standard printed edition of the Book of Mormon. Given the semicolon, we expect something like “the Lord **has** removed men far away”. Of course, one could actually make this change of *have* to *has* (or the biblical *hath*) and thereby retain the semicolon. This change would separate the entire verse 12 from the *until*-clause in verse 11. The critical text, of course, will leave the text itself unchanged—and with the understanding that there is only a half stop between verses 11 and 12.

Summary: In the published text of the Book of Mormon, the 1830 typesetter’s semicolon after the word *desolate* should be replaced by the comma of the King James Bible; the initial clause of verse 12 is part of the *until*-clause that begins in verse 11 and requires the subjunctive verb form *have* in the clause “and the Lord have removed men far away”.

■ 2 Nephi 16:12–13

*for there shall be a great forsaking in the midst of the land
but yet [in it 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] there shall be a tenth
and they shall return*

□ Isaiah 6:12–13 (King James Bible)

*and there be a great forsaking in the midst of the land
but yet in it shall be a tenth
and it shall return*

The 1837 edition removed the words *in it*, which occur in the King James text as well as in the Hebrew. Literally, the Hebrew reads “in her”, where the pronoun refers to the grammatically feminine noun *land* at the end of verse 12. Although the 1837 deletion of *in it* could be accidental (this change was not marked in \mathcal{D} by Joseph Smith during his editing for the 1837 edition), it is also possible that its omission represents a conscious attempt to make the text flow more smoothly. The critical text will, of course, restore *in it*.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 16:13 the original prepositional phrase *in it*, which agrees with the reading of the King James Bible.

2 Nephi 17

■ 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
[& >js that 1 | and A | that BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Rezin king of Syria
and Pekah the son of Remaliah king of Israel
went up towards Jerusalem to war against it*

□ Isaiah 7:1 (King James Bible)

and it came to pass in the days of Ahaz
the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah
that Rezin the king of Syria
and Pekah the son of Remaliah king of Israel
went up toward Jerusalem to war against it

The earliest extant text of the Book of Mormon for 2 Nephi 17:1 has *and* instead of the *that* which is italicized in the King James Bible. The Hebrew text for this passage has no word for *that* (or *and*, for that matter). The King James translators inserted the *that* to distinguish between the king of Judah and the kings of Syria and Israel, who oppose him. Without the *that*, the sequence of three names would be difficult to interpret.

In the Hebrew, there is no problem separating the first king from the two others because the verb of the main clause comes immediately after the long prepositional phrase and before the subject of the main clause:

Isaiah 7:1 (a more literal translation of the Hebrew)
and it happened in the days of Ahaz son of Jotham son of Uzziah king of Judah
went up Rezin king of Aram and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel
to Jerusalem to fight against her

Thus the word order of English (subject before the verb) required the insertion of the *that* in order to maintain the distinction between the king of Judah and the two other kings.

One possible interpretation for the occurrence of the additional *and* in \mathcal{P} is that the *and* is the consequence of two stages in transmission: (1) the intentional omission of the italicized *that* of the King James text, followed by (2) the accidental insertion of the *and* during the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. As far as the second stage is concerned, we have evidence that on two different occasions Oliver Cowdery accidentally inserted an *and* after “it came to pass”:

1 Nephi 2:7 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
 and it came to pass
 [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | & > NULL 1]
 that he built an altar of stones

Alma 55:4 (initial error in \mathcal{G})
 and now it came to pass
 [& > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 that when Moroni had said these words
 he caused that a search should be made among his men

In both instances, however, there was no intervening prepositional phrase (like the long complex one in 2 Nephi 17:1).

There is some support for the intentional omission in 2 Nephi 17:1 of the italicized *that* of the King James Bible. For instance, elsewhere in this same chapter, the Book of Mormon text sometimes omits the italicized *that* following a “come to pass” clause:

- (1) 2 Nephi 17:21
 and it shall come to pass **that** in that day
 a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep
- Isaiah 7:21
 and it shall come to pass in that day
that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep
- (2) 2 Nephi 17:23
 and it shall come to pass in that day
 every place shall be where there were a thousand vines
- Isaiah 7:23
 and it shall come to pass in that day
that every place shall be where there were a thousand vines

The first example is complicated because the earliest Book of Mormon text has an additional *that* immediately after the “come to pass” clause. See the discussion below under verse 21.

The omission of the *that* after a “come to pass” clause is, however, not systematic. For instance, here in 2 Nephi 17, the italicized *that* of the King James Bible was retained in one place:

2 Nephi 17:18
 and it shall come to pass in that day
that the Lord shall hiss for the fly

Isaiah 7:18
 and it shall come to pass in that day
that the LORD shall hiss for the fly

Nonetheless, the occasional omission in the Book of Mormon text of the italicized King James *that* does suggest that the original text for 2 Nephi 17:1 may have omitted the italicized *that*, which produced a complex sequence of three noun phrases. Under this interpretation, either

Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery may have accidentally added the *and* in order to separate the first king from the two others.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith apparently felt that the *and* was inappropriate (or at least difficult to interpret) and changed it to *that*. Another editorial option would have been to simply delete the *and*, but then there would have been that same difficulty in interpreting the sequence of three complex noun phrases.

Another possible analysis for 2 Nephi 17:1 is that the extra *and* is some kind of literal Hebraism. As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:10, the original Book of Mormon text frequently has an extra *and* between a subordinate clause and its following main clause. For example, in the original text of the Book of Mormon we have instances of such extra *and*'s following a "come to pass" clause:

1 Nephi 16:10

and it came to pass that
as my father arose in the morning and went forth to the tent door
and to his great astonishment he beheld upon the ground
 a round ball of curious workmanship

Helaman 5:43

and it came to pass that
when they cast their eyes about
 and saw that the cloud of darkness was dispersed from overshadowing them
and behold they saw that they were encircled about . . . by a pillar of fire

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 **and** Amos died

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
and the king of the Lamanites sent an epistle unto me

But in each of these examples, we have an intervening subordinate clause rather than an intervening prepositional phrase (as found in 2 Nephi 17:1). Nonetheless, both types (the subordinate clause and the prepositional phrase) deal with time. Thus even for 2 Nephi 17:1 we could interpret the extra *and* after the prepositional phrase as some kind of Hebrew-like construction.

Yet another possibility would be to interpret the "come to pass" clause as an isolated clause, not as an introductory one. Thus the meaning of the first part of 2 Nephi 17:1 would be something like 'and the following came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah'. Under this interpretation, one could make this verse readable by placing a colon after the initial clause, in which case the following clause could then begin with (or without) the *and*:

2 Nephi 17:1 (revised punctuation for the original text)

and it came to pass in the days of Ahaz
 the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah :
 (and) Rezin king of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah king of Israel
 went up towards Jerusalem to war against it

The main problem with this proposed example of an isolated “come to pass” clause is that it seems so uncharacteristic of the Book of Mormon language, although there is one use of “come to pass” that could be cited in support of such a reading:

Ether 11:7

wherefore there began to be wars and contentions in all the land
and also many famines and pestilences
insomuch that there was a great destruction
such an one as never had been known upon the face of the earth
and **all this came to pass** in the days of Shiblom

Of course, this use of “come to pass” refers to the preceding, not the following, text. And instead of the expletive *it*, the subject is *all this*.

In general, there is a very strong expectation that an initial “come to pass” clause will be followed by a *that*-clause, thus the motivation to supply the *that* (both in the King James Bible as well as in Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition). Undoubtedly, it would be best for the standard printed text to maintain the *that*. The critical text could either adopt the *and* of \mathfrak{D} or assume that the original text purposely omitted the *that* but that the *and* was accidentally added. It is very difficult to decide between these two possibilities, although at the present I favor the second of these since the *and* alternative is so very difficult to interpret. A comma, of necessity, must follow the reference to the king of Judah; but in order to prevent confusion, no comma should be used to separate the listing of the two other kings:

2 Nephi 17:1 (with minimal punctuation and other accidentals)

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.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 17:1 by removing from the earliest text the *and* that follows the reference to the king of Judah; it appears that the italicized *that* of the King James Bible was purposely omitted, but the *and* in \mathfrak{D} seems to have been accidentally added in the early transmission of the text.

■ 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*

□ Isaiah 7:1 (King James Bible)

and it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah
that Rezin **the** king of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah king of Israel
went up toward Jerusalem to war against it

The Book of Mormon text has no *the* in front of three occurrences of the noun phrase “king of X”, which agrees with the Hebrew text. On the other hand, the Hebrew text also has no definite article in front of the three occurrences of the noun phrase “son of X”, whereas both the Book

of Mormon and the King James texts have *the* in all three cases. In any event, the Book of Mormon text consistently represents the text, without *the* for “king of X” but with *the* for “son of X”. Thus the Book of Mormon omission of the King James *the* before “king of Syria” appears to be deliberate. This missing *the* is an example of a word that could have been italicized in the King James Bible but wasn’t; nonetheless the word was omitted in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the original Book of Mormon text without the definite article *the* before “king of Syria”.

■ **2 Nephi 17:1**

the son of [Remaliah 1ABCDGHKQRST | Remalia EFIJLMNO]

□ **Isaiah 7:1** (King James Bible)

the son of **Remaliah**

Here in 2 Nephi 17:1, the *h* at the end of *Remaliah* was deleted in the 1849 LDS edition. The original source for the dropping of the final *h* was the 1837 edition, although not here in verse 1. In the four other cases where the word *Remaliah* appears in 2 Nephi 17–18 (Isaiah 7–8), the 1837 edition dropped the *h*:

2 Nephi 17:4 (Isaiah 7:4 = *Remaliah*)

the son of [*Remaliah* 1 | *Remaliah* ACGHKQRST | *Remalia* BDEFIJLMNO]

2 Nephi 17:5 (Isaiah 7:5 = *Remaliah*)

the son of [*Remaliah* 1 | *Remaliah* ACGHKQRST | *Remalia* BDEFIJLMNO]

2 Nephi 17:9 (Isaiah 7:9 = *Remaliah's*)

[*Remaliahs* 1 | *Remaliah's* ACGHKQRST | *Remalia's* BDEFIJLMNO] son

2 Nephi 18:6 (Isaiah 8:6 = *Remaliah's*)

[*Remaliahs* >jg *Remaliah's* 1 | *Remaliah's* ACGHKQRST | *Remalia's* BDEFIJLMNO] son

For these four cases, the 1840 edition correctly restored the final *h*. But because the 1841 British edition used the 1837 edition as its copy-text, it continued the spelling without the final *h*. When the 1849 edition was set (from a copy of the 1841 edition), Orson Pratt (the editor for the 1849 edition) made sure the spelling for the first occurrence of *Remaliah* (found in 2 Nephi 17:1) agreed with the spelling of the four other occurrences (that is, as *Remalia*). This misspelling continued throughout the LDS editions until 1911.

We should also note that in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery spelled the first occurrence of *Remaliah* correctly but misspelled the following four occurrences as *Remeliah*. The second vowel is an unstressed schwa, which may have been the reason Oliver had difficulty spelling that vowel. Frequently in the original manuscript, the first spelling of a name is correct, but subsequent occurrences of the name may be misspelled. The example here in 2 Nephi 17:1 suggests that Joseph Smith, when he dictated the original text to Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here in Ⓞ), may have spelled out the first occurrence of *Remaliah*, to make sure that Oliver got it

down correctly. Although the original manuscript is not extant here, the printer's manuscript may very well have followed the spellings for *Remaliah* as they were originally written down in \mathfrak{G} .

Summary: The correct spelling for *Remaliah* agrees with the King James spelling: the unstressed second vowel is spelled *a* and the name ends in an *h*.

■ 2 Nephi 17:1

. . . went up [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *toward* RT] *Jerusalem*

□ **Isaiah 7:1** (King James Bible)

. . . went up **toward** Jerusalem

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the earliest textual sources should be used in each case to determine whether the reading should be *towards* or *toward*. The discussion for 1 Nephi 21:23 shows that the tendency in the Isaiah quotations is to read *towards* instead of the King James *toward*.

Here in 2 Nephi 17:1, the 1920 LDS edition replaced *towards* with *toward*. This change may have resulted from consulting a King James Bible. This editing of *towards* to *toward* in that edition is definitely not a typo since the change was marked in the 1911 copy that the 1920 committee used to indicate changes for the 1920 edition. However, the committee changed only this one occurrence in a biblical quote of *towards* to *toward*; in the four other occurrences of *towards* that involve quotes from Isaiah, the 1920 edition kept the *towards* of preceding LDS editions:

<i>towards</i> (1920 edition)	<i>toward</i> (King James Bible)
1 Nephi 21:23	Isaiah 49:23
2 Nephi 6:7	Isaiah 49:23
2 Nephi 21:14	Isaiah 11:14
2 Nephi 27:25	Isaiah 29:13

The original 1611 King James Bible actually showed variation here, with *towards* in Isaiah 7:1 and also in Isaiah 29:13.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 17:1 the *towards* of the earliest textual sources.

■ 2 Nephi 17:2

Syria is [*confederate* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *confederated* G] *with Ephraim*

□ **Isaiah 7:2** (King James Bible)

Syria is **confederate** with Ephraim

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the adjective *confederate* with the past participle *confederated*. The text for the 1874 RLDS edition derives from a combined use of the 1858 Wright edition and the earlier 1840 Nauvoo edition, with apparently the Wright edition as the copy-text; in this instance, the King James reading (found in the 1840 edition) was maintained.

Summary: Retain the adjective *confederate* in 2 Nephi 17:2.

■ 2 Nephi 17:2

Syria is confederate with [*Ephraim* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *Ephriam* M]

□ Isaiah 7:2 (King James Bible)

Syria is confederate with **Ephraim**

Here the 1905 LDS edition intentionally changed the spelling of the name *Ephraim* to *Ephriam*. This spelling appears to be the result of the name's pronunciation in English as /ɪfriəm/ (rather than a more Hebrew-like pronunciation, /ɛfraɪjɪm/). In all, the name occurs 11 times within the long Isaiah quotation, and each time it is spelled as *Ephriam* in the 1905 edition. This same name, although with a different referent, is found in Ether 7:9 (“he came to the hill Ephraim”), but there the 1905 edition left the spelling *Ephraim* unchanged.

Summary: Maintain the King James spelling *Ephraim* throughout the long Isaiah quotation and in Ether 7:9.

■ 2 Nephi 17:3

thou and [*Shear Jashub* >+ *Shear-Jashub* 1 | *Shearjashub* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT |
Shear-jashub P | *Shear-jasub* S] thy son

□ Isaiah 7:3 (King James Bible)

thou and **Shear-jashub** thy son

Since this Hebrew name is a statement (meaning ‘a remnant will return’), we place a hyphen between the two Hebrew words and capitalize the first letter of only the first word (as *Shear-jashub*). The King James Bible and the RLDS text follow this spelling convention (although the 1953 RLDS edition accidentally misspelled the name as *Shear-jasub*). The LDS text has maintained the original spelling that the 1830 compositor set, *Shearjashub*—that is, without any spacing or hyphen between the two words. This spelling, however, is inconsistent with how the LDS editions spell the only other name that is a Hebrew statement (namely, *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* in 2 Nephi 18:1, 3). For discussion, see 2 Nephi 18:1.

The Masoretic Hebrew text places a space between these two words (that is, there is no connecting mark between the two words). In fact, this is how Oliver Cowdery originally spelled the name in the printer's manuscript, as *Shear Jashub*. We note also that he capitalized the initial *j* of *jashub*, as if it were a separate name. Somewhat later, Oliver inserted a hyphen between *Shear* and *Jashub* in the printer's manuscript (the ink flow for the hyphen is slightly heavier than for the surrounding text). This same basic use of spacing between the words holds for the name *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* found in 2 Nephi 18:1, 3. For both occurrences of this other name, Oliver initially wrote the name as separate words, then somewhat later inserted hyphens between the words (with a slightly different level of ink flow). On the other hand, he did not capitalize the initial letters of *shalal*, *hash*, and *baz*. For discussion, see 2 Nephi 18:1.

The critical text will follow the traditional spelling convention for the name *Shear-jashub*. Although the earliest extant spellings of *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* have spaces

between the individual words of the names (as in the Masoretic Hebrew text), this use of spacing is probably the result of Joseph Smith dictating these two names word by word. We cannot tell whether Joseph saw actual hyphens or spaces between the individual words of these sentences acting as names.

Summary: Follow the traditional King James spelling for the name *Shear-jashub* (which represents a sentence in Hebrew).

■ **2 Nephi 17:4**

*for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria
and [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | HKPS] the son of Remaliah*

□ **Isaiah 7:4** (King James Bible)

for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria
and **of** the son of Remaliah

The repeated *of* in the conjoined prepositional phrase “of Rezin with Syria and **of** the son of Remaliah” was accidentally dropped in the 1874 RLDS edition. The resulting text could be misread as conjoining *Syria* with *the son of Remaliah*—that is, both these noun phrases could be considered conjuncts of the prepositional phrase beginning with *with*.

The RLDS text has continued with this incorrect reading up through its present edition (1953). Clearly, the original Book of Mormon text here in 2 Nephi 17:4 read identically with the King James text. For additional discussion regarding the repeated preposition (here *of*) in the Book of Mormon text, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 17:4 the repeated *of* in the conjoined prepositional phrase “of Rezin with Syria and **of** the son of Remaliah”, the reading of the King James Bible.

■ **2 Nephi 17:8–9**

*for the head of Syria is Damascus
and the head of Damascus Rezin . . .
and the head of Ephraim is Samaria
and the head of Samaria is Remaliah’s son*

□ **Isaiah 7:8–9** (King James Bible)

for the head of Syria *is* Damascus
and the head of Damascus **is** Rezin . . .
and the head of Ephraim *is* Samaria
and the head of Samaria *is* Remaliah’s son

Here in 2 Nephi 17:8–9, we have two parallel couplets. The King James Bible has four instances of italicized *is* in this passage, but in the Book of Mormon text the second *is* is missing. We do not have the original manuscript for this passage, so it is difficult to determine whether *is* originally

occurred before *Rezin* in the Book of Mormon text. It is quite possible that the omitted *is* simply represents a scribal error. But it is also possible that the current Book of Mormon text is correct since the *is* is missing before a single word (*Rezin*) and the resulting text seems to read quite well. Note, in this regard, that no printed edition of the Book of Mormon has ever supplied the *is* before *Rezin*. On the other hand, it would seem somewhat awkward if the parallel *is* in the second couplet (that is, the *is* that comes before the more complex *Remaliah's son*) had been omitted.

Elsewhere in this long Isaiah quotation (2 Nephi 12–24), some examples of italicized *is* have been omitted and others have been kept. For examples of italicized *is* being omitted, see 2 Nephi 13:14. Here in 2 Nephi 17, we have another passage where italicized *is* has been retained (in this case, two times):

2 Nephi 17:18

and it shall come to pass in that day
that the Lord shall hiss for the fly
that **is** in the uttermost part of Egypt
and for the bee that **is** in the land of Assyria

Isaiah 7:18 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass in that day
that the LORD shall hiss for the fly
that **is** in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt
and for the bee that **is** in the land of Assyria

Since the omission of the second *is* in 2 Nephi 17:8–9 does work, the critical text will accept the reading of the earliest textual sources (namely, the *is* is omitted in only one case, before *Rezin*).

Summary: In 2 Nephi 17:8–9 we follow the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript) and accept the omission of *is* before *Rezin*.

■ 2 Nephi 17:10–11

moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz
[NULL >- *saying* 1 | *saying* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God

□ Isaiah 7:10–11 (King James Bible)

moreover the LORD spake again unto Ahaz
saying
ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God

As Oliver Cowdery copied 2 Nephi 17:10–11 from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially skipped the word *saying* but later added it, perhaps while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (the quill seems to be slightly sharper). The original manuscript (which is not extant here) probably had *saying*, the reading of the King James text.

Another example of Oliver Cowdery skipping the word *saying* is found in 1 Nephi 2:10. Here \mathcal{O} is extant and has *saying*, but Oliver omitted it as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 2:10

and he also spake unto Lemuel

[*saying* 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

O that thou mightest be like unto this valley

Nonetheless, there is a possibility that Oliver could have editorially added the *saying* here in 2 Nephi 17:10–11 since *spake* is usually followed by *saying* in the King James style. For an example of where Oliver added *saying* after *spake* (but inappropriately), see the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:1.

Summary: Maintain the word *saying* in 2 Nephi 17:10, the apparent reading of the original text (as well as the corresponding King James text).

■ 2 Nephi 17:11

ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God

ask [1 | *it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *either in the depths or in the heights above*

□ Isaiah 7:11 (King James Bible)

ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God

ask **it** either in the depth or in the height above

As noted in the discussion under 2 Nephi 15:29, there are several instances where *it* has been omitted from the long Book of Mormon quotation of Isaiah (in 2 Nephi 12–24). In most cases, the corresponding King James text has an italicized *it*, but here in 2 Nephi 17:11 the corresponding *it* in the King James Bible is in regular (roman) type. For a similar case, see 2 Nephi 20:17–18.

The original Hebrew for Isaiah 7:11 is difficult. Some have conjectured that the second word for ‘ask’ (spelled anomalously with an extra *h* at the end, as *š’lh*) may actually be a form of the noun *Sheol*, with the meaning ‘to hades’ (that is, “ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God in the depth to Sheol or in the height above”). In fact, the Latin Vulgate translated it this way (as *in profundum inferni*). In the original Greek Septuagint, the word *š’lh* (whether as ‘ask’ or ‘to hades’) was ignored, although some later Septuagint versions added ‘into hades’. The King James use of *it* seems to correspond to the extra *h* at the end of the word, and perhaps that is why the pronoun *it* was not set in italics. But the *h* does not really mean ‘it’, so the original Book of Mormon translation is at least correct in the decision to ignore the *it*.

In any event, the 1830 typesetter added the *it*, probably by reference to his King James Bible. The critical text will restore the earliest reading (without the *it*). This example provides one more case where a function word was not italicized in the King James text but perhaps should have been; nonetheless the word was omitted in the Book of Mormon text. For another example, see the case of the omitted *the* before “king of Syria” in 2 Nephi 17:1.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript), the *it* after the second *ask* in 2 Nephi 7:11 should be omitted.

■ 2 Nephi 17:11

ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God

ask [either 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | neither N] in the depths or in the heights above

□ Isaiah 7:11 (King James Bible)

ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God

ask it **either** in the depth or in the height above

The 1906 LDS edition accidentally set *either* as *neither*, which is clearly unexpected given the following *or*. The incorrect *neither* was probably the result of the correct occurrence of *neither* in the next verse. The spacing in the 1879 edition (the copy-text for the 1906 edition) is such that the *either* in verse 11 is separated by only white space from the *neither* in verse 12, thus facilitating the accidental replacement of *either* by *neither*:

2 Nephi 17:11–12 (1879 edition; original word spacing retained)

11. ^fAsk thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it **either**
in the depths, or in the heights above.

12. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, **neither** will I tempt
the Lord.

This obvious error in the 1906 edition was not continued in any subsequent LDS edition.

Summary: Maintain the correlative *either-or* in 2 Nephi 17:11.

■ 2 Nephi 17:11

ask either in the depths or in the heights above

□ Isaiah 7:11 (King James Bible)

ask it either in the **depth** or in the **height** above

Since in this verse both *depths* and *heights* are in the plural, the change in number seems to be intentional and should therefore be retained in the Book of Mormon text. The discussion under 1 Nephi 8:32 shows that *depths* is the normally expected form in the Book of Mormon. We get the singular *depth* when the text refers to measuring (namely, in Alma 49:18: “the depth of the ditch”). Similarly, we get the singular *heighth* (*height* in standard English) when measurement is involved:

Alma 50:2

and upon the top of those ridges of earth
he caused that there should be timbers
yea works of timbers built up
to the [*heighth* 1BCD | *height* AEF GHIJKLMN OPQRST] of a man

Alma 53:4

until they had encircled the city of Bountiful round about
with a strong wall of timbers and earth
to an exceeding [*highth* 0 | *heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMN OPQRST]

Helaman 14:23

and there shall be many places
which are now called valleys which shall become mountains
whose [*heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thereof is great

Ether 3:1

therefore the brother of Jared went forth unto the mount
which they called the mount Shelem
because of its exceeding [*heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Other than in 2 Nephi 17:11, the only occurrence of the plural *heights* is found in a nearby Isaiah quotation:

2 Nephi 24:14 (Isaiah 14:14)

I will ascend above the **heights** of the clouds

In this instance, the corresponding King James reading (as well as the original Hebrew) reads in the plural. Most importantly, 2 Nephi 17:11 does not deal with measuring; thus the extension to the plural forms *depths* and *heights* is consistent with Book of Mormon usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Retain the plurals *depths* and *heights* in 2 Nephi 17:11.

■ 2 Nephi 17:14–15

*behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son
and shall call his name Immanuel
butter and honey shall he eat
that he may know to refuse the evil and to choose the good*

□ Isaiah 7:14–15 (King James Bible)

behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son
and shall call his name Immanuel
butter and honey shall he eat
that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good

Once more the Book of Mormon text shows increased parallelism over the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible. First, in verse 14, the Book of Mormon has “**shall** conceive and **shall** bear . . . and **shall** call”, a multiple repetition of the modal auxiliary *shall*. There are two similar examples of such extensions of *shall* later on in this long Isaiah quotation:

(1) 2 Nephi 20:17

and the light of Israel shall be for a fire
and his Holy One for a flame
and **shall** burn and **shall** devour his thorns and his briars in one day

Isaiah 10:17 (King James Bible)

and the light of Israel shall be for a fire
and his Holy One for a flame
and it **shall** burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day

(2) 2 Nephi 24:16

they that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee
and **shall** consider thee and **shall** say . . .

Isaiah 14:16 (King James Bible)

they that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee
and consider thee *saying* . . .

A second case of increased parallelism in 2 Nephi 17:15 involves the repetition of the infinitive marker *to* (“**to** refuse . . . and **to** choose”). Such examples of increased parallelism appear to be intentional and will be maintained in the critical text.

Summary: Retain the increased parallelism of the Book of Mormon text in 2 Nephi 17:14–15 (a repetition of the auxiliary verb *shall* and a repetition of the infinitive marker *to*); other repetitions of *shall* are found in 2 Nephi 20:17 and 2 Nephi 24:16.

■ 2 Nephi 17:18

*for the fly that is in the uttermost part of Egypt
and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria*

□ **Isaiah 7:18** (King James Bible)

for the fly that *is* in the uttermost part **of the rivers** of Egypt
and for the bee that *is* in the land of Assyria

It appears that the prepositional phrase “of the rivers” could have been easily lost in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text since the scribe’s eye could have readily skipped from the first *of* to the second one. On the other hand, the omission of this prepositional phrase increases the parallelism of the poetic couplet by matching regions of land (“the uttermost part of Egypt” and “the land of Assyria”):

for the fly that is in the uttermost part **of** Egypt
and **for the bee that is in the** land **of** Assyria

Since the Book of Mormon text often increases the parallelism in the Isaiah quotations, it is probably best to assume that the omission of the phrase “of the rivers” is intentional.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the earliest textual sources for 2 Nephi 17:18; omitting the prepositional phrase “of the rivers” increases the parallelism in this passage.

■ 2 Nephi 17:21

and it shall come to pass
 [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in that day*
a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep

□ Isaiah 7:21 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass
 in that day
that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep

Here in 2 Nephi 17:21, the earliest reading is missing the italicized *that* of the King James text. For other examples of the omitted italicized *that*, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 17:1. Here in verse 21, however, we also have an extra *that* between “come to pass” and “in that day”. The 1830 typesetter removed this extra *that*, perhaps because he didn’t like the repetition of the *that* in “it shall come to pass **that** in **that** day”. Or perhaps the oddity of the phraseology led him to check his King James Bible.

Nonetheless, there are examples of “come to pass” followed by *that* and then a prepositional phrase of the form “in that <time period>”. In these instances, the time period is the year:

Helaman 11:29

but behold it came to pass **that** in **that** same year
 they were driven back even into their own lands

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
 which he was cast out from among the people
 there began to be a great war among the people

Since such phraseology (“that in that <time period>”) is possible, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 17:21 (“and it shall come to pass **that** in **that** day a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep”). For another example of this same difficulty in the earliest extant text, see the Isaiah quotation in 2 Nephi 24:3–4. Also see the discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 17:21 the earliest text with its two occurrences of *that* in close proximity (“and it shall come to pass **that** in **that** day a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep”).

■ 2 Nephi 17:23

*and it shall come to pass in that day
every place shall be
where there were a thousand vines
[that >jg at 1 | at ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a thousand silverlings*

□ Isaiah 7:23 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass in that day
that every place shall be
where there were a thousand vines
at a thousand silverlings

The original reading of the printer’s manuscript (“that a thousand silverlings”) seems impossible. The 1830 compositor corrected the printer’s manuscript to agree with the King James text. The original manuscript is not extant here, but a very likely possibility is that Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe here for \mathcal{O}) misheard Joseph Smith’s dictation of “vines at” /vainz æt/ as /vainz ðæt/. The extra /ð/ could have been introduced because of its phonetic similarity to the /z/ at the end of *vines* (both /ð/ and /z/ are voiced fricatives in the dental area of the mouth). For other examples of phonetic misinterpretation in \mathcal{O} , especially across word boundaries, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 16:9.

Summary: Follow the 1830 typesetter’s emendation that replaced *that* with *at*; this change agrees with the King James Bible and removes an impossible reading that was probably the result of the scribe mishearing Joseph Smith’s dictation of *vines at*.

■ 2 Nephi 17:25

*and all [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the G] hills
that shall be digged with the mattock
there shall not come thither the fear of briars and thorns*

□ Isaiah 7:25 (King James Bible)

and *on* all hills
that shall be digged with the mattock
there shall not come thither the fear of briars and thorns

The italicized *on* of the King James text was omitted in this verse. This difference appears to be intentional, although the resulting reading seems somewhat more awkward than the original King James reading.

The 1858 Wright edition inserted the definite article *the* before *hills*. This change is probably a typo, although “all the hills” does seem to flow more naturally than “all hills”. In any event, this reading with the intrusive *the* was not copied into the 1874 RLDS edition.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text for 2 Nephi 17:25: namely, the italicized *on* of the King James text is omitted and there is no definite article *the* before *hills*.

2 Nephi 18

■ 2 Nephi 18:1

moreover

[NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[NULL >- *word of* 1 | *word of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lord*
said unto me . . .

□ Isaiah 8:1 (King James Bible)

moreover the LORD said unto me . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "moreover the Lord said unto me", which is identical to the King James reading. He then inserted "word of" with slightly weaker ink flow, but later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he inserted the definite article *the* before "word of". The first insertion was probably his attempt to immediately correct a simple error in copying. Later, in checking his copy, he apparently discovered the additionally missing *the* and added it as well. In any event, the original manuscript undoubtedly included the whole phrase "the word of the Lord". There would have been nothing difficult about having the text read the same as the King James Bible; the phrase "the Lord said unto X" occurs 21 times in the Book of Mormon text (and 152 times in the King James Bible), while there are no other specific examples of "the word of the Lord said unto X" in the Book of Mormon (or in the King James Bible).

Although it may seem strange to modern English readers for the text to refer to the word of the Lord as saying something, there are examples of this usage in the Book of Mormon:

Alma 5:57

that the **word** of God may be fulfilled **which saith**
the names of the wicked shall not be mingled with the names of my people

Alma 7:11

and this that the **word** might be fulfilled **which saith**
he will take upon him the pains and the sicknesses of his people

Moroni 7:5

for I remember the **word** of God **which saith**
by their works ye shall know them

In the first and third examples, one could interpret the *which* as referring to the Lord rather than the word of the Lord, but the second example clearly shows that we can get expressions like "the

word saith”, followed by a quote. Moreover, for the two other examples, Joseph Smith never edited the relative pronoun *which* to *who*, an editing change one might expect if *which* referred to the Lord. In fact, both Alma 5:57 and Alma 7:11 refer to “the word being fulfilled”, which further supports the interpretation that the antecedent for *which* in Alma 5:57 is *the word of God* and not just *God*.

For a similar example of where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the reading of the King James Bible in the printer’s manuscript but then corrected it to a different reading, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:7.

Summary: Despite its unusualness, retain in 2 Nephi 18:1 the corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript (“the word of the Lord said unto me”).

■ 2 Nephi 18:1

take thee a great roll

and write in it with a man’s pen

concerning [Maher shalal hash baz >- Maher-shalal-hash-baz 1 |

Maher-shalal-hash-baz ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | Mahershalal-hash-baz KPS]

□ Isaiah 8:1 (King James Bible)

take thee a great roll

and write in it with a man’s pen

concerning **Maher-shalal-hash-baz**

The Hebrew name here in 2 Nephi 18:1 is a sentence meaning ‘quickly the plunder / swiftly the spoil’. As with the name *Shear-jashub* (discussed under 2 Nephi 17:3), we spell such sentence-names by capitalizing the first letter of only the first word in the name and by separating each word with a hyphen. This particular name occurs twice here in chapter 18. We get similar manuscript variation for its spelling in verse 3:

2 Nephi 18:3

call his name [*Mahershalal hash baz >+ Maher-shalal-hash-baz 1 |*

Maher-shalal-hash-baz ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Isaiah 8:3 (King James Bible)

call his name **Maher-shalal-hash-baz**

In the first occurrence (in verse 1), Oliver Cowdery originally wrote each word in the name separately and capitalized the first letter of only the first word (thus *Maher shalal hash baz*). This spelling corresponds to the way the name is spelled in the Masoretic Hebrew text. Somewhat later, Oliver placed hyphens between the words (the level of ink flow is slightly weaker). For the second occurrence of the name (in verse 3), Oliver originally wrote the name as *Mahershalal hash baz*. In this case, the first two words were written as one. Again, somewhat later, he placed hyphens between the individual words (the level of ink flow is now slightly heavier). We do not have the original manuscript for these two occurrences, but it appears that for the first occurrence of the

name, Joseph Smith must have separately spelled out each word in the name. We cannot be sure whether Joseph himself saw spaces or hyphens between the individual words of the name.

The 1892 RLDS edition spelled the first instance of the name as *Mahershalal-hash-baz*, but the second as *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*. This variation is the result of using the 1874 RLDS edition as the copy-text. In that edition, for the first instance of this name, *Maher* occurred at the end of the line:

great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning **Maher-shalal-hash-baz**. And I took unto me faithful witnesses to

It seems that the 1892 typesetter interpreted the end-of-line hyphen after *Maher* as a soft hyphen rather than as a hard hyphen (thus we get *Mahershalal-hash-baz* in the 1892 edition). On the other hand, the second instance of the name was set as follows in the 1874 edition:

a son. Then said the Lord to me, Call his name **Maher-shalal-hash-baz**. For behold, the child shall not have knowledge to

Here the 1892 typesetter recognized that the end-of-line hyphen was a hard hyphen and set it properly, probably because he had been forced to interpret the first hyphen in the name (the one after *Maher*) as a hard hyphen. Finally, we note that the mishyphenation of the first occurrence has continued in the RLDS text.

Summary: Follow the traditional King James spelling for the name *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, with only the first word capitalized and hyphens separating the words.

■ 2 Nephi 18:2

and Zechariah the son of [Jerebechiah 1 | Jeberechiah ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

□ Isaiah 8:2 (King James Bible)

and Zechariah the son of **Jeberechiah**

The printer's manuscript has the spelling *Jerebechiah* instead of the King James *Jeberechiah*. We do not have the original manuscript here, but somewhere in the early transmission of the text, the order of the *r* and the *b* in this name was switched. This metathesis of consonants could have occurred in the Hebrew source, although a more likely possibility is that the error occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . One contributing factor to such an error is that the text otherwise has a number of names where *r* follows an initial *J* (*Jared*, *Jarom*, *Jeremiah*, *Jershon*, and *Jordan*), but no other names where *b* follows an initial *J*. The name *Jeremiah* is particularly close to the misspelled *Jerebechiah*. The 1830 typesetter undoubtedly checked his King James Bible and decided that the reading in \mathcal{P} was in error.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Jeberechiah* in 2 Nephi 18:2 since the reading in \mathcal{P} is probably a scribal error introduced by the familiarity of names like *Jeremiah*.

■ 2 Nephi 18:3

and she conceived and [bear 1ABCDEIJLMNOQ | bare FGHKPRST] a son

□ Isaiah 8:3 (King James Bible)

and she conceived and **bare** a son

Here in 2 Nephi 18:3, the correct verb form is the past-tense *bare* (the King James reading). What is interesting about this particular example has been the difficulty in getting editors and typesetters to use the correct *bare* rather than its homophone, *bear*. The 1852 LDS edition, the 1858 Wright edition, and the 1920 LDS have each had to independently introduce the correct spelling. For additional discussion of the difficulty in spelling the past-tense *bare*, see BEAR in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the correct past-tense verb form *bare* in 2 Nephi 18:3 (“and she conceived and bare a son”).

■ 2 Nephi 18:6

*forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah
that go softly [along > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah’s son*

□ Isaiah 8:6 (King James Bible)

forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah
that go softly
and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah’s son

We do not have the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 18:6. In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery first wrote “go softly along”, probably because he expected some adverbial complement to “waters . . . go softly”. His crossout has the same level of ink flow as the surrounding writing, so his correction seems to be an immediate one—and in accord with the text of the King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} —that is, without the *along* that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote after “go softly”.

■ 2 Nephi 18:6

and rejoice in [Razin 1 | Rezin ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

□ Isaiah 8:6 (King James Bible)

and rejoice in **Rezin**

The printer’s manuscript reads *Razin*, which is undoubtedly a scribal error for *Rezin* (the King James form of the name). Quite possibly the misspelling here was influenced by the fairly common English words *raze* and *razor*; the only word in the Oxford English Dictionary that begins with *rez* is the obscure *rezai* ‘a quilted counterpane or coverlet’. The 1830 compositor supplied

the correct spelling for *Rezin* here in 2 Nephi 18:6; the name had previously occurred three times in the printer's manuscript (2 Nephi 17:1, 4, 8) and had always been spelled correctly up to this point. In fact, between these three previous occurrences of *Rezin* and the one here in 2 Nephi 18:6, the word *razor* is found in 2 Nephi 17:20 ("in the same day shall the Lord shave with a **razor** that is hired"). Most probably this preceding occurrence of *razor* primed Oliver Cowdery to misspell *Rezin* as *Razin* the first time it occurred after *razor*.

Summary: Maintain the King James spelling *Rezin* in 2 Nephi 18:6 rather than the misspelled *Razin* found here in the printer's manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 18:8

and he shall pass through Judah

[1 ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *and* KPS] *he shall overflow and go over
he shall reach even to the neck*

□ Isaiah 8:8 (King James Bible)

and he shall pass through Judah
he shall overflow and go over
he shall reach *even* to the neck

The 1892 RLDS text accidentally added an *and* here. For some reason this extra *and* has continued in the RLDS text. The tendency to supply the *and* is fairly strong, especially given the extensive use of the connective *and* in the Book of Mormon text proper. Interestingly, the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia notes that many Hebrew manuscripts also have an *and* at this point. But the earliest textual source for the Book of Mormon (the printer's manuscript) reads without the *and* and is therefore in agreement with the King James text. For other examples of the tendency for the editions to insert extra *and*'s in the Isaiah quotations, see 2 Nephi 16:2 and 2 Nephi 23:14.

Summary: Maintain the lack of a connective *and* at the beginning of "he shall overflow", in agreement with the King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 18:9

associate yourselves O ye people

and ye shall be broken in pieces . . .

gird yourselves and ye shall be broken in pieces

gird yourselves and ye shall be broken [in 1 ABCDGH IJKLMN OPQRST | to E | to > in F] pieces

□ Isaiah 8:9 (King James Bible)

associate yourselves O ye people
and ye shall be broken in pieces . . .
gird yourselves and ye shall be broken in pieces
gird yourselves and ye shall be broken **in** pieces

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced the third “broken **in** pieces” with “broken **to** pieces”, a frequent alternative form of the phrase. Note that for the two other occurrences of “broken in pieces” in this verse, the 1849 edition maintained the preposition *in*. The second, corrected printing of the 1852 LDS edition restored the original preposition *in* for this third case. The King James text uses the same preposition *in* for all three cases.

Summary: Maintain the repeated use of the phrase “broken in pieces” in 2 Nephi 18:9.

■ 2 Nephi 18:18

behold I and the children

[*whom* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *whom* F] *the Lord hath given me
are for signs and for wonders in Israel*

□ Isaiah 8:18 (King James Bible)

behold I and the children

whom the LORD hath given me

are for signs and for wonders in Israel

Initially, the 1852 LDS edition dropped the relative pronoun *whom*, probably because *whom* serves as the direct object and is therefore optional (“the children the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders”). The second printing of the 1852 edition supplied the missing *whom*, perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 18:18 the object relative pronoun *whom* (the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 18:18

from the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth in mount Zion

□ Isaiah 8:18 (King James Bible)

from the LORD of Hosts **which** dwelleth in mount Zion

Up to this point, Joseph Smith was fairly consistent in his 1837 editing of *which* to *who* (or *whom* or *that*) when the original *which* referred to persons, as in the preceding examples in this long Isaiah quote:

2 Nephi 12:12

and upon every one

[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] is lifted up

2 Nephi 13:12

O my people

they [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] lead thee

cause thee to err

2 Nephi 15:22–23
 woe unto the mighty to drink wine
 and men of strength to mingle strong drink
 [*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHK | *Who* IJLMNOPQRST] justify the wicked for reward
 and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him

But from chapter 18 until the end of chapter 24 (and even into chapter 25), Joseph temporarily ceased making this editorial change:

2 Nephi 18:18 the Lord of Hosts **which** dwelleth in mount Zion
 2 Nephi 23:17 against them **which** shall not regard silver and gold
 2 Nephi 24:12 art thou cut down to the ground **which** did weaken the nations
 2 Nephi 25:4 O my people **which** are of the house of Israel
 2 Nephi 25:10 those **which** are carried away captive into Babylon
 2 Nephi 25:18 a false Messiah **which** should deceive the people

Finally, in the middle of chapter 25, Joseph returned to editing the *which*:

2 Nephi 25:18
 he [*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should be rejected of the Jews
 2 Nephi 25:22
 the nations [*which* 1APS | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] shall possess them

Even so, from 2 Nephi 27 through Jacob 4, most of the examples of *which* referring to persons are left unedited. In general, the editing of *which* to *who* is inconsistently applied in the Book of Mormon text. For a detailed list and complete analysis, see WHICH in volume 3. Of course, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether a particular instance should read *which* or *who*.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain each case of *which* that refers to persons.

■ 2 Nephi 18:19

and unto wizards that peep and mutter

□ Isaiah 8:19 (King James Bible)

and unto wizards that peep and **that** mutter

The Book of Mormon omits the repeated relative pronoun *that* in 2 Nephi 18:19; the resulting reading is more natural in English. It is difficult to determine whether the original text itself omitted the repeated *that* since it is quite possible that the *that* was accidentally deleted during the early transmission of the text. Either alternative seems plausible.

There is another Isaiah passage where a repeated relative pronoun *that* was not omitted. In this instance, the Book of Mormon quote is partially paraphrastic:

2 Nephi 27:3
 and all the nations
that fight against Zion
 and **that** distress her
 shall be as a dream of a night vision

Isaiah 29:7 (King James Bible)
 and the multitude of all the nations
that fight against Ariel
 even all **that** fight against her and her munition
 and **that** distress her
 shall be as a dream of a night vision

When compared with 2 Nephi 18:19, the conjoined relative clauses in 2 Nephi 27:3 are longer (“that fight against Zion and that distress her”). Even so, the Book of Mormon text in 2 Nephi 27:3 would more easily read without the repeated *that*: “that fight against Zion and distress her”.

Ultimately, since the Book of Mormon reading is perfectly fine, the most reasonable solution is to accept the reading of the earliest textual source, “that peep and mutter”.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 18:19 the reading in \wp (“that peep and mutter”), which flows more easily than the King James expression (“that peep and that mutter”); nonetheless, it is possible that the omission of the repeated *that* was accidental.

■ 2 Nephi 18:22

*and they shall look unto the earth
 and behold trouble and darkness
 dimness [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | and κ] anguish*

□ Isaiah 8:22 (King James Bible)

and they shall look unto the earth
 and behold trouble and darkness
 dimness **of** anguish

The 1892 RLDS edition replaced the *of* here with *and*, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *of*, the reading in \wp as well as in the King James Bible.

The original phrase “dimness of anguish” seems odd: how can anguish be dim? The use of *and* turns this clause into a chiasmus (*trouble* is paired with *anguish* and *darkness* with *dimness*). Of course, the *of* is the way the King James text reads. In the Hebrew, there is no *and* between *dimness* and *anguish*. Instead, there is a construct relationship between the two nouns, so *of* is a correct translation. A more modern translation such as the Revised Standard Version renders this phrase as “the gloom of anguish”, which seems more reasonable than the King James reading, “dimness of anguish”.

Summary: Maintain the *of* in the phrase “dimness of anguish” in 2 Nephi 18:22.

■ 2 Nephi 18:22

*and they shall look unto the earth
and behold trouble and darkness / dimness of anguish
and shall be driven to darkness*

□ Isaiah 8:22 (King James Bible)

and they shall look unto the earth
and behold trouble and darkness / dimness of anguish
and *they shall be* driven to darkness

The text here at the end of 2 Nephi 18:22 is difficult to process since the second (italicized) *they* of the King James text is omitted in the Book of Mormon text. There are quite a few cases where italicized words in the King James Isaiah have been purposely omitted in the Book of Mormon version, even some that have ended up creating non-English language. (For a list of 11 examples involving the present-tense *be* verb, see 2 Nephi 13:14.)

There are several possible ways of dealing with this difficult reading here in 2 Nephi 18:22. One minimal solution would be to place dashes before and after the intervening *behold*-clause:

2 Nephi 18:22
and they shall look unto the earth
—and behold trouble and darkness / dimness of anguish—
and shall be driven to darkness

In this way, the omitted *they* could be viewed as being parallel to the preceding verse, where the *they* is not repeated for two following conjoined predicates:

2 Nephi 18:21 (Isaiah 8:21)
they shall fret themselves
and curse their king and their God
and look upward

However, this parallel usage is not complete: the *shall* is repeated in 2 Nephi 18:22 (“**shall** look . . . and **shall** be driven to darkness”) but not in 2 Nephi 18:21 (“**shall** fret . . . and curse . . . and look”).

Alternatively, one could treat *behold* in 2 Nephi 18:22 as a nonfinite verb form (an infinitive form) that is conjoined with the preceding “they shall look”, as if the passage read as follows:

and they **shall** look unto the earth
and **shall** behold trouble and darkness / dimness of anguish
and **shall** be driven to darkness

Of course, the actual text does not have *shall* before *behold*; in the original Hebrew, the form for *behold* is an interjection and is not used like a regular verb.

A third possibility is that the subject *they* was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text, either as Joseph Smith dictated the text or as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The original manuscript is not extant here, so it is difficult to know if this happened. We do have evidence elsewhere of *they* being accidentally dropped by Oliver after a connective *and*:

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 >+ *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be
the words of them which have slumbered

In other contexts, we have more examples of Oliver dropping the subject pronoun *they*; in some cases, he caught his error and supplied the *they*:

1 Nephi 19:13

and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
[*they* 0FIJLMNOQRST | 1ABCDEFGHIKP] shall be scourged by all people

1 Nephi 22:14

and all [*they* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which fight against Zion
shall be destroyed

Alma 45:22

and it came to pass that
[NULL > *they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did appoint
priests and teachers throughout all the land over all the churches

3 Nephi 14:15 (Matthew 7:15 has the *they*)

beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing
but inwardly [NULL > *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are
ravening wolves

Ether 6:3

and thus the Lord caused stones to shine in darkness
to give light unto men women and children
that [NULL > *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] might not cross
the great waters in darkness

The occasional loss of the subject pronoun *they* in the manuscripts, plus the difficulty of the reading in 2 Nephi 18:22 without the repeated *they*, argues that the *they* may have been accidentally deleted from “and **they** shall be driven to darkness” (the King James reading) in the early transmission of the text.

Since dashes can be used to separate off the intervening *behold*-clause, the critical text will accept this minimal solution and thus follow the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript). Even so, there is a distinct possibility that the *they* was accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 18:22 the earliest reading “and shall be driven to darkness”—that is, without the italicized *they* of the corresponding King James text, although it is possible that the *they* was lost early on in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text; placing dashes around the preceding *behold*-clause will help the reader comprehend this difficult passage.

2 Nephi 19

■ 2 Nephi 19:1

when at [*the* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun*

□ Isaiah 9:1 (King James Bible)

when at **the** first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun

The 1837 edition deleted the definite article *the* from the archaic phrase “at the first”. The King James Version has many more examples of “at the first” (26 in all) than “at first” (only one, in John 10:40). The only other occurrence of “at (the) first” in the Book of Mormon is in Alma 32:26, which reads “at first” in both manuscripts and all editions. The omitted *the* in the 1837 edition for 1 Nephi 19:1 may be unintentional rather than the result of Joseph Smith’s editing since the change is not marked in the printer’s manuscript. Modern English, of course, has “at first”, not “at the first”. The critical text will restore the original usage, as did the 1908 RLDS edition.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 19:1 “at **the** first”, the original reading of the Book of Mormon text (which is the same here as the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 19:1

the land of [*Zebulon* 1 | *Zebulun* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Zebulum* L]
and the land of Naphtali . . .
beyond [*Jordon* 1 | *Jordan* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in [*Gallilee* 1 | *Galilee* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the nations*

□ Isaiah 9:1 (King James Bible)

the land of **Zebulun**
and the land of Naphtali . . .
beyond **Jordan**
in **Galilee** of the nations

In this verse we have three biblical names that are misspelled in the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript: *Zebulun* as *Zebulon*, *Jordan* as *Jordon*, and *Galilee* as *Gallilee*. In all these cases, the 1830 compositor set the correct spelling. These misspellings in Ⓐ suggest that Joseph Smith did not spell out familiar biblical names to his scribes. He either assumed that the scribes knew how to spell them or, in any event, that the printer would correctly spell them. Similarly, at the end of this chapter, the name for the tribe Manasseh is misspelled (see the discussion at

2 Nephi 19:21). On the other hand, the completely unfamiliar sentence-names *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* are correctly spelled in the printer's manuscript, which suggests that in more complex cases like these, Joseph did spell out the name. For discussion of these examples, see 2 Nephi 17:3 and 2 Nephi 18:1.

In the Masoretic Hebrew text, the noun form referring to a descendant of Zebulun is *Zebulonite* rather than *Zebulunite*. The King James Bible spells two of these as *Zebulonite* (Judges 12:11–12) and one as *Zebulunite* (Numbers 26:27). Thus the Book of Mormon spelling *Zebulon* could be interpreted as interference from the rarely occurring *Zebulonite*. In a similar way, the New Testament spelling *Zabulon* (found in Matthew 4:13, 15 and in Revelation 7:8) could have served as the source for the spelling *Zebulon* (providing one ignores the fact that *Zabulon* has *a* for the first vowel rather than *e*). In fact, the passage in Matthew 4:15 cites this same verse of Isaiah.

More reasonably, the spelling *Zebulon* in \mathcal{D} is an error that was introduced either as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation or as he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} . The probable source for the error is the phonetically similar word *Babylon*, which would have been a very familiar name to Joseph and Oliver. The name *Babylon* also occurs fairly frequently in the Book of Mormon (11 times). *Zebulun* itself may have been pronounced as if it were *Zebulon* (which is, in fact, my own pronunciation of the name). A contributing factor may have been the occurrence of four other names in the Book of Mormon that end in *-lon* (namely, *Amulon*, *Shiblon*, *Shemlon*, and *Heshlon*) but none that end in *-lun* except *Zebulun*.

The name *Jordan* appears three other places in the Book of Mormon and was frequently misspelled (as here in 2 Nephi 19:1). We get the following variation for *Jordan* in the textual history:

1 Nephi 10:9 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{C})

[*jordan* 0 | *Jordan* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 17:32 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C} and initially in \mathcal{D})

[*Jorden* 0 | *Jordon* > *Jordan* 1 | *Jordan* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 5:3 (Oliver Cowdery in proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} ; also the 1849 LDS edition)

[§2 *Jordan* > §1 *Jordon* 1 | *Jordan* ABCDGHKPRST | *Jordon* EFIJLMNOQ]

For a complete discussion of the misspelling *Jordon*, see Mormon 5:3.

Summary: Follow the King James spellings *Zebulun*, *Jordan*, and *Galilee* in 2 Nephi 19:1.

■ 2 Nephi 19:1

and [*afterward* 1PS | *afterwards* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *did more grievously afflict by the way of the Red Sea*

□ Isaiah 9:1 (King James Bible)

and **afterward** did more grievously afflict *her*
by the way of the sea

The 1830 typesetter replaced the original *afterward* with the more frequent form *afterwards*, probably unintentionally. The only other occurrence of *afterward(s)* in the Book of Mormon text

ends in *s* (in Alma 13:19). Both forms occur in the King James Bible, with *afterward* favored over *afterwards* (66 versus 13 occurrences). For this Isaiah passage, the King James Bible reads *afterward*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *afterward*, probably by reference to \varnothing .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 19:1 the adverbial form *afterward*, the reading of the original Book of Mormon text and also the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 19:1

and afterward did more

[*grievously* 1 | *grievously* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *grievously* ILO] *afflict*
by the way of the Red Sea

□ Isaiah 9:1 (King James Bible)

and afterward did more **grievously** afflict *her*
by the way of the sea

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the earliest Book of Mormon text consistently has the non-standard *grievous* (spelled in various ways) instead of the standard *grievous*. This dialectal form even shows up in the Isaiah quotations, here in 2 Nephi 19:1 and also in the following chapter:

2 Nephi 20:1

woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees
and that write [*grievousness* 1 | *grievousness* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which they have prescribed

In both of these passages, the King James Bible has, of course, the standard form *grievous* instead of the dialectal *grievous*. The critical text will restore the nonstandard *grievous* in all ten cases in the Book of Mormon text, including the two cases involving Isaiah quotations (2 Nephi 19:1 and 2 Nephi 20:1). For a complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 17:25. A similar situation occurs in the case of *toward(s)*: Joseph Smith clearly favored *towards*, even when he dictated the Isaiah quotations (the standard King James Bible has only *toward*). When supported by the earliest textual sources, *towards* will be maintained in the Book of Mormon Isaiah quotations. For discussion of *toward(s)*, see 1 Nephi 21:23.

Summary: Accept the nonstandard *grievous* the two times that it occurs in the Isaiah quotations, here in 2 Nephi 19:1 and in 2 Nephi 20:1.

■ 2 Nephi 19:1

and afterward did more grievously afflict
by the way of the Red Sea

□ Isaiah 9:1 (King James Bible)

and afterward did more grievously afflict **her**
by the way of the sea

The object pronoun *her* (italicized in the King James Bible) is missing from the Book of Mormon text. This case is similar to the numerous instances where the object pronoun *it* is omitted from the Book of Mormon text (there are six cases listed under 2 Nephi 15:29).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 19:1 the original Book of Mormon text that omits the italicized *her* of the corresponding King James passage.

■ **2 Nephi 19:1**

*and afterward did more grievously afflict
by [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > the F] way of the Red Sea*

□ **Isaiah 9:1** (King James Bible)

and afterward did more grievously afflict *her*
by **the** way of the sea

The first printing of the 1852 LDS edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* from the phrase “by the way of”. The second, corrected printing of that edition restored the *the*, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. In modern English, “by way of” is favored over the archaic “by the way of”, which probably explains why the 1852 typesetter originally dropped the *the*. On the other hand, the King James Bible clearly prefers the archaic “by the way of” over “by way of” (34 to 1). In the original text of the Book of Mormon, the proportion is more balanced, with four occurrences of “by the way of” and six of “by way of”. In each instance, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the *the* should be there or not. For a case where the *the* was editorially removed from the phrase “by the way of”, see the discussion regarding “by the way of Gentiles” in the first paragraph in the title page of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Maintain the original phrase “by the way of” in 2 Nephi 19:1 (and wherever else it is supported by the earliest textual sources).

■ **2 Nephi 19:1**

*by the way of the [red Sea 1 | Red Sea ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations*

□ **Isaiah 9:1** (King James Bible)

by the way of the **sea**
beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations

The Book of Mormon reads “by the way of the Red Sea” rather than the King James “by the way of the sea”. John A. Tvedtnes has argued that the extra *red* is an error (see page 45, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984). The context implies that this sea is the Sea of Galilee, especially since the inheritance for the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali was in this region (as described in Joshua 19). Note, in particular, that when this prophecy of Isaiah’s is quoted in the New Testament, “the sea” is definitely interpreted as referring to the Sea of Galilee:

Matthew 4:12–15

now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison
 he departed into Galilee
 and leaving Nazareth he came and dwelt in Capernaum
 which is upon the **sea** coast
 in the borders of Zabulon and Nephtholim
 that it might be fulfilled
 which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying
 the land of Zabulon and the land of Nephtholim
by the way of the **sea**
 beyond Jordan
 Galilee of the Gentiles

Tvedtnes argues that the change to *Red Sea* derived from previous references in the Book of Mormon to the Red Sea: “This appears to be a case of scribal overcorrection, due to prior mention of the Red Sea in the [Book of Mormon] text.” The examples in 1 Nephi, however, do not show any particular similarity to the phraseology in 2 Nephi 19:1. In particular, the word *way* never collocates with *Red Sea*:

1 Nephi 2:5	by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 2:5	in the wilderness in the borders which was nearer the Red Sea
1 Nephi 2:8	and it emptied into the Red Sea
1 Nephi 2:9	the waters of the river emptied into the fountain of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 4:2	for he truly spake unto the waters of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 4:2	and were drowned in the waters of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 16:14	which was in the borders near the Red Sea
1 Nephi 17:26	the waters of the Red Sea was divided hither and thither
1 Nephi 17:27	the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea

A more likely source for the intrusive *red* in the Book of Mormon text is the explicit phrase “by the way of the Red Sea”, which occurs four times in the King James Bible:

Numbers 14:25

tomorrow turn you
 and get you into the wilderness **by the way of the Red Sea**

Numbers 21:4

and they journeyed from mount Hor **by the way of the Red Sea**
 to compass the land of Edom

Deuteronomy 1:40

turn you and take your journey
 into the wilderness **by the way of the Red Sea**

Deuteronomy 2:1

then we turned and took our journey
 into the wilderness **by the way of the Red Sea**

It appears that familiarity with this specific phrase led to replacing *sea* with *Red Sea* in 2 Nephi 19:1. This proposal implies that the intrusive *red* (actually /sūf/ ‘reed’ in the original Hebrew) may have originally been on the plates of brass or that Nephi himself added the word as he copied the Isaiah text from the plates of brass onto his small plates. Further, there is no evidence within the Book of Mormon manuscripts themselves that any of the scribes ever added *red* to the word *sea* (out of 82 occurrences), even as an initial error that was immediately corrected. This evidence suggests that the intrusive *red* in 2 Nephi 19:1, even though it may be a mistake, is a part of the original Book of Mormon text. Thus the critical text will maintain the earliest textual reading, “by the way of the **Red Sea**”.

Summary: Maintain the use of “by the way of the **Red Sea**” in 2 Nephi 19:1; the intrusion of the word *red* before *sea* seems to be in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 19:3

*thou hast multiplied the nation and increased the joy
they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest
and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil*

□ Isaiah 9:3 (King James Bible)

thou hast multiplied the nation *and not* increased the joy
they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest
and as *men* rejoice when they divide the spoil

The Book of Mormon text omits the *not* of the King James text. This extra *not* in the King James Bible seems completely out of place with the following two lines that directly emphasize the joy of the people. The Masoretic Hebrew text has the *not*, but scribes interpreted the negative word for ‘not’ (/lo’/ in Hebrew) as an error for “for him” or “to him” (/lō/ in Hebrew, which is phonetically close to /lo’/). The traditional note in the Masoretic text says that the consonants *l’* (/lo’/ ‘not’) should be read as *lw* (/lō/ ‘for him’). Most modern translations follow the Hebrew note but choose to translate the “for him” indirectly; thus the Revised Standard Version renders the line as “thou hast multiplied the nation / thou hast increased **its** joy”. Here the *its* before *joy* is an interpretation that derives from the more literal “for him” (the *him* refers to *nation*, a masculine noun in Hebrew). Thus one could literally translate the reinterpreted Hebrew as “thou hast multiplied the nation / **for it** thou hast increased the joy”.

Sidney B. Sperry referred to this Masoretic reinterpretation many years ago, originally in his *Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Stevens and Wallis, 1947), pages 176–177. John A. Tvedtnes has also referred to this scribal reanalysis of the text (see page 46 of his “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984); he lists other early biblical versions for which the *not* is missing.

The Book of Mormon text agrees with the suggestion of the traditional Masoretic note except that the “for him” is ignored. Perhaps the straightforward omission of the *not* is simply the result of the Book of Mormon tendency to add or delete individual words in the Isaiah quotations in

order to make a semantically coherent interpretation out of the King James text. The critical text will continue to follow the Book of Mormon text with its omitted *not* here in 2 Nephi 19:3.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 19:3 the earliest textual reading, which omits the inexplicable *not* of the corresponding King James passage.

■ 2 Nephi 19:4

*for thou hast broken the yoke of [his 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |] burden
and the staff of his shoulder
the rod of his oppressor*

□ Isaiah 9:4 (King James Bible)

for thou hast broken the yoke of **his** burden
and the staff of his shoulder
the rod of his oppressor

The 1888 LDS edition accidentally dropped the adjectival pronoun *his* before *burden*. This error was not continued in any subsequent edition (especially since the 1888 edition was never used as a copy-text). Obviously, the missing *his* breaks the parallelism of the passage (“the yoke of **his** burden and the staff of **his** shoulder / the rod of **his** oppressor”).

Summary: Maintain the repeated, parallel use of *his* in 2 Nephi 19:4.

■ 2 Nephi 19:5

*for every battle of the warrior [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | is RT] with confused noise
and garments rolled in blood*

□ Isaiah 9:5 (King James Bible)

for every battle of the warrior **is** with confused noise
and garments rolled in blood

Here is another example of an italicized *is* in the King James Bible that was intentionally omitted in the original Book of Mormon text. Unlike most other cases, Joseph Smith did not add the *is* in his editing of this verse for the 1837 edition. The 1920 LDS edition added the *is* to the LDS text. For additional discussion, see 2 Nephi 13:14.

Summary: In accord with the earliest Book of Mormon reading, maintain the lack of the *is* in 2 Nephi 19:5.

■ 2 Nephi 19:6

and the [government 1 | government ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be upon his shoulder

□ Isaiah 9:6 (King James Bible)

and the **government** shall be upon his shoulder

Oliver Cowdery consistently spelled the word *government* without the *n* before the *-ment* ending. In all, there are 26 occurrences of *government* in the Book of Mormon. In \mathcal{P} , all 26 are in the hand of Oliver and are spelled as *government* or *govornment*. Five of the occurrences of *government* are extant in \mathcal{O} , and again all are in the hand of Oliver and are spelled as *government*. Of course, the 1830 typesetter followed the standard spelling, *government*.

The pronunciation without the *n* before *-ment* is common in today's English and is, in fact, listed as a standard pronunciation in Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. The spelling *govornment* is listed on <www.google.com> (accessed 24 January 2004) as occurring 507,000 times (versus 92,600,000 for the standard spelling with the *n*). The online Oxford English Dictionary gives six instances of this spelling, dating from 1483 through 1650. Thus the misspelling based on the pronunciation does occur.

The critical text will maintain the standard spelling *government* throughout the text. Generally, the critical text will use nonstandard spellings only when the Book of Mormon spelling indicates a substantive difference in pronunciation. In the case of *government*, the standard spelling is commonly pronounced without the *n*. Typically, speakers are unaware of the loss of the *n* in pronunciation. For another example like *government*, see the discussion regarding the spelling *saith* for *sayeth* in 1 Nephi 2:1. For a case where there is a substantive difference in pronunciation, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:25 regarding *grievious* instead of the standard *grievous*.

Summary: Maintain the standard spelling *government* in the critical text rather than Oliver Cowdery's spelling (*govornment*) since the loss of the *n* when pronouncing *government* is common in speech and generally unrecognized by speakers.

■ 2 Nephi 19:6

and his name shall be [NULL >- called 1 | called ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Wonderful . . .

□ Isaiah 9:6 (King James Bible)

and his name shall be **called** Wonderful . . .

Here in 2 Nephi 19:6, Oliver Cowdery initially copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} as “and his name shall be Wonderful”, but somewhat later he supralinearly inserted *called* after the verb *be* (the level of ink flow is weaker, but only moderately so). The original manuscript is not extant here but probably had the *called* (the reading of the King James Bible). The correction may have been made when proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

The King James Bible has examples of both “one's name shall be X” and “one's name shall be called X”, as in the following verse where both types are found:

Genesis 17:5

neither shall **thy name** any more **be called** Abram
but **thy name** shall **be** Abraham

The Book of Mormon also has examples of both types:

Ether 14:10

and **his name was** Lib

Ether 14:17

now **the name** of the brother of Lib **was called** Shiz

Thus either way of expressing a person's name is possible in the Book of Mormon text. In modern English, speakers prefer the nonredundant "one's name is X" rather than the biblically styled "one's name is called X". This preference was probably the reason why Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the *called* in 2 Nephi 19:6. The most reasonable assumption is that the original Book of Mormon passage read like the King James text ("and his name shall be called Wonderful").

Summary: Maintain *called* in 2 Nephi 19:6, the reading of the corresponding King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 19:6

and his name shall be called

Wonderful [1IJLMNOQ | , ABCDEFGHKPRST] *Counselor*

the Mighty God

the Everlasting Father

the Prince of Peace

□ Isaiah 9:6 (King James Bible, with accidentals supplied)

and his name shall be **called**

Wonderful, Counsellor,

The mighty God,

The everlasting Father,

The Prince of Peace.

Traditionally, the biblical text in English has had a comma between *wonderful* and *counselor*, thus treating both words as separate titles. The Hebrew text here is complicated. Modern English translations (such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version) have favored interpreting "wonderful counselor" as a single title. The earliest translations into English of Isaiah (the Coverdale Bible of 1535 and the Matthew Bible of 1537) also rendered this as a single (but different) title: "the wondrous giver of counsel". This translation was superseded by "wonderful, counselor" (that is, two separate titles) in the Geneva Bible of 1560 and in the 1611 King James Bible.

Interestingly, the LDS editions from 1879 through 1911 omitted the comma between *wonderful* and *counselor*. The King James punctuation was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition. Although either punctuation (with or without the comma) will work, the standard Book of Mormon text should probably continue to follow the traditional King James punctuation (that is, with

the comma). The critical text will assume that a phrasal break occurs between the two words, as in the King James Bible.

Summary: In accord with the King James Bible, maintain the comma between *wonderful* and *counselor* in 2 Nephi 19:6.

■ 2 Nephi 19:9

*and all the people shall know
even Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria*

□ Isaiah 9:9 (King James Bible)

and all the people shall know
even Ephraim and the **inhabitant** of Samaria

The King James Bible has the singular *inhabitant* here, as does the Hebrew (literally, “the one inhabiting Samaria”). In the Book of Mormon text, the plural *inhabitants* may be a copying error in Ø, although the plural usage seems to fit well with the preceding plural noun phrase “all the people”. In fact, this plural noun phrase could have triggered a copy error (*inhabitants* instead of *inhabitant*). Interestingly, both ancient and modern translations of this Isaiah passage translate this noun in the plural: the ancient Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate as well as the modern Revised Standard Version and the New International Version have the plural *inhabitants*. We do not have the original manuscript here in 2 Nephi 19:9, but since the plural works very well here and the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript) reads in the plural, the critical text will maintain the plural.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 19:9 the plural *inhabitants*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; although the King James Bible and the Hebrew original have the singular *inhabitant*, this noun has been typically translated as a plural.

■ 2 Nephi 19:9

that say in the pride and [the 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stoutness of heart

□ Isaiah 9:9 (King James Bible)

that say in the pride and stoutness of heart

The repeated *the* in the earliest Book of Mormon text, however unnatural for English speakers, better exemplifies the parallelism of conjuncts in the Book of Mormon text, as can be seen in the following example that also has “the pride” as a conjunct:

Alma 51:21

and thus he put an end to **the** stubbornness and **the** pride
of those people which professed the blood of nobility

In the original Hebrew for Isaiah 9:9, neither *pride* nor *stoutness* takes the definite article, so a more literal translation would be “in pride and stoutness of heart”. By having *the* before each conjunct, the Book of Mormon text preserves some aspect of parallelism. In 2 Nephi 19:9, the 1837 edition removed the repeated *the*, thus making the text agree with the King James reading. Nonetheless, this omission of the *the* may have been accidental; its deletion was not marked in \mathcal{P} by Joseph Smith.

Here is another example of where the Book of Mormon text has a repeated *the* while the corresponding King James passage is missing it:

1 Nephi 21:10

they shall not hunger nor thirst
neither shall the heat nor **the** sun smite them

Isaiah 49:10 (King James Bible)

they shall not hunger nor thirst
neither shall the heat nor sun smite them

In this case, the original manuscript is extant and has the repeated *the*. Furthermore, this extra *the* has never been removed from this other passage. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 21:10.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 19:9 the repeated *the* that is found in the earliest extant text, the printer’s manuscript (“in the pride and **the** stoutness of heart”).

■ 2 Nephi 19:12

*for all this his anger is not turned away
but his hand [stretched 1 | stretched APS | is stretched BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] out still*

□ Isaiah 9:12 (King James Bible)

for all this his anger is not turned away
but his hand **is stretched** out still

As noted under 2 Nephi 13:14, the original Book of Mormon text frequently omitted the linking verb *be* that is italicized in the corresponding King James text. In this instance, the 1837 edition supplied the *is* before *stretched*, but the 1908 RLDS edition removed it since Joseph Smith did not mark its addition in the printer’s manuscript. For further discussion regarding the phrase “is stretched”, see 2 Nephi 19:17. The critical text will here maintain the earliest reading, which lacks the *is*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 19:12 the reading of the printer’s manuscript; there the italicized *is* of the King James reading is lacking: “but his hand stretched out still”.

■ 2 Nephi 19:14

therefore will the Lord cut off from Israel head and tail

□ Isaiah 9:14 (King James Bible)

therefore **the LORD will** cut off from Israel head and tail

In earlier English, when a declarative sentence began with an adverbial, the finite verb frequently came immediately after the adverbial. Here in 2 Nephi 19:14, the Book of Mormon text has this archaic word order, with *will* immediately following the adverbial *therefore* and before the subject of the sentence, *the Lord*. But the corresponding King James passage has the order of modern English, with *will* following the subject (“therefore the LORD will”). The switch in word order for the Book of Mormon passage almost implies a question except that the *therefore* sounds rather more like the beginning of a declarative statement. Other Book of Mormon examples in the Isaiah quotations show that *therefore* can be immediately followed by the modal auxiliary *shall* or *will*:

2 Nephi 7:7 (Isaiah 50:7)

therefore **shall I** not be confounded

2 Nephi 20:16 (Isaiah 10:16)

therefore **shall the Lord the Lord of Hosts** send among his fat ones leanness

2 Nephi 23:7 (Isaiah 13:7)

therefore **shall all hands** be faint

Mosiah 14:12 (Isaiah 53:12)

therefore **will I** divide him a portion with the great

Even so, in 2 Nephi 12–24 (quoting Isaiah 2–14 of the King James Bible) there are five occurrences of initial *therefore* for which the grammatical subject precedes the helping verb *shall* or *will*:

2 Nephi 13:17 (Isaiah 3:17)

therefore **the Lord will** smite with a scab
the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion

2 Nephi 17:14 (Isaiah 7:14)

therefore **the Lord himself shall** give you a sign

2 Nephi 19:11 (Isaiah 9:11)

therefore **the Lord shall** set up the adversaries of Rezin against him

2 Nephi 19:17 (Isaiah 9:17)

therefore **the Lord shall** have no joy in their young men

2 Nephi 23:13 (Isaiah 13:13)

therefore **I will** shake the heavens

In 2 Nephi 19:14, the change in word order could also be the result of a copying error. In fact, there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery had difficulty with the word order after a sentence-initial adverbial. In the following example, as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation, Oliver originally

wrote the text using the archaic word order in English—that is, with the modal auxiliary *will* immediately following an adverbial (“at that time”). Later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver corrected the text, probably when he read the text back to Joseph:

2 Nephi 25:16

Θ* & then at that time **will the day** come that . . .

Θ^c & then at that time **the day will** come that . . .

For 2 Nephi 19:14, on the other hand, we do not have the original manuscript, so there is no specific evidence of an error in word order for that passage. Since the order in the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript) will work, the critical text will accept the different word order, even though this variation could be due to an early transmission error.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 19:14 the word order in Θ, where the auxiliary verb *will* comes immediately after the adverbial (“**therefore will** the Lord cut off from Israel head and tail”); since this word order does occur in the King James text, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual source (Θ) even though here the King James Bible has a different word order.

■ 2 Nephi 19:17

for every one of them is a hypocrite and an evildoer

□ Isaiah 9:17 (King James Bible)

for every one *is* **an** hypocrite and an evildoer

The Book of Mormon text prefers the *a* form of the indefinite article before an *h*-initial word (providing that the *h* for that word is pronounced in current English). For a complete discussion, see 2 Nephi 13:7.

■ 2 Nephi 19:17

but his hand

[*stretched* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEFGHKNPS | *stretcheth* FIJLMOQ | *is stretched* RT] *out still*

□ Isaiah 9:17 (King James Bible)

but his hand **is stretched** out still

The King James clause “but his hand *is* stretched out still” occurs five times in the Isaiah quotation for 2 Nephi 12–24; in each case, the italicized *is* is omitted in the original Book of Mormon text. Besides this occurrence here in 2 Nephi 19:17, we have the following four examples:

2 Nephi 15:25 (Isaiah 5:25)

but his hand

[*stretched* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is stretched* RT] out still

2 Nephi 19:12 (Isaiah 9:12)

but his hand

[*stretched* 1 | *stretched* APS | *is stretched* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] out still

2 Nephi 19:21 (Isaiah 9:21)

but his hand

[*stretched* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is stretched* RT] out still

2 Nephi 20:4 (Isaiah 10:4)

but his hand

[*stretched* 1 | *stretched* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is stretched* RT] out still

There is one additional example of “his hand *is stretched out*”, and there too the original Book of Mormon text is missing the italicized *is* of the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 24:27 (Isaiah 14:27)

and his hand

[*stretched* 01 | *stretched* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is stretched* RT] out

and who shall turn it back

In 2 Nephi 19:12, the 1837 edition supplied the *is*. This example of the inserted *is* was removed in the 1908 RLDS edition. Most of the changes for that edition were based on a close examination of the printer’s manuscript, which shows no inserted *is* for 2 Nephi 19:12.

The LDS text has been edited in the opposite direction. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition accepted the 1837 change in 2 Nephi 19:12 and then extended it by inserting the *is* in the five other cases. But for 2 Nephi 19:17, these editors also had to remove one complicating change that had been introduced in the 1852 LDS edition. The context in 2 Nephi 19:17 (as well as in the five other cases) implies a present-tense reading. But in the 1852 edition, the verb form *stretched* in 2 Nephi 19:17 was interpreted as a simple past-tense form rather than as a past participle, with the result that *stretched* was replaced by *stretcheth*. Yet this change was not implemented in the subsequent three cases of “his hand stretched out” (or in the previous ones in 2 Nephi 15:25 or 2 Nephi 19:12), which suggests that the unique replacement of *stretched* by *stretcheth* in verse 17 was unintentional. This reading remained in the LDS text until the editors of the 1920 edition restored the original *stretched* and then supplied the King James *is* (consistent with their editing of the other instances of “his hand stretched out” to “his hand **is** stretched out”).

As noted in the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:14, the critical text will maintain the earliest Book of Mormon text whenever it lacks the linking verb *be* that is italicized in the corresponding King James text.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 12–24 the original text that omitted the *is* that is italicized in the King James Bible for all six occurrences of the Isaiah clause “his hand *is stretched out*”.

■ 2 Nephi 19:18

*it shall devour the briars and thorns
and shall kindle in the thickets of the forests*

□ Isaiah 9:18 (King James Bible)

it shall devour the briars and thorns
and shall kindle in the thickets of the forest

Here in 2 Nephi 19:18, the Book of Mormon text has the plural *forests* instead of the singular *forest* (the King James reading). The plural *forests* is also found when the same phraseology appears in the next chapter:

2 Nephi 20:34

and he shall cut down the thickets of the forests with iron

Isaiah 10:34 (King James Bible)

and he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron

The fact that for both these examples of “the thickets of the forest(s)” the Book of Mormon text replaces the singular *forest* with the plural *forests* suggests that the difference in number is intentional rather than accidental.

Summary: Maintain the plural *forests* in both instances of “the thickets of the forests” (2 Nephi 19:18 and 2 Nephi 20:34); this difference in number from the King James *forest* appears to be intentional.

■ 2 Nephi 19:21

[*Mannassah* >jg *Manasseh* 1 | *Manasseh* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Ephraim*
and *Ephraim* [*Mannassah* 1 | *Manasseh* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

□ Isaiah 9:21 (King James Bible)

Manasseh Ephraim
and Ephraim **Manasseh**

The Book of Mormon scribes always misspelled the name *Manasseh*. Oliver Cowdery misspelled it twice here in 2 Nephi 19:21 as *Mannassah* (by doubling the *n* and by making the last vowel an *a*). The name occurs once more in the text, and there the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} misspelled it as *Manassah*:

Alma 10:3

who was a descendant of [*Manassah* 1 | *Manasseh* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

who was the son of Joseph

Scribe 2 did not double the *n*, but his third vowel was *a*. In all three cases, the 1830 compositor set the name correctly. In the printer’s manuscript for 2 Nephi 19:21, the compositor partially corrected Oliver’s first *Mannassah* to *Manasseh*.

The original manuscript is not extant for any of these cases, but the repeated misspelling of the name in \mathcal{P} implies that Joseph Smith did not spell out this particular biblical name for his scribe. For another example of misspelling the name of a tribe of Israel, see the discussion regarding the name *Zebulun* under 2 Nephi 19:1.

Summary: Maintain the King James spelling *Manasseh* in 2 Nephi 19:21 and Alma 10:3, despite the repeated misspelling of this name in the manuscripts.

■ **2 Nephi 19:21**

but his hand [streachd 1 | stretched ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | is stretched RT] out still

□ **Isaiah 9:21** (King James Bible)

but his hand *is stretched* out still

As discussed under 2 Nephi 19:17, the *is* here in 2 Nephi 19:21 (italicized in the King James Bible and omitted in the earliest textual sources for the Book of Mormon) will be omitted in the critical text.

2 Nephi 20

■ 2 Nephi 20:1

*woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees
and that write [grieveousness 1 | grievousness ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which they have prescribed*

□ Isaiah 10:1 (King James Bible)

woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees
and that write **grievousness**
which they have prescribed

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the earliest Book of Mormon text has only the nonstandard *grievous* for the standard *grievousness*, even in the Isaiah quotations (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 19:1). The critical text will maintain the nonstandard *grievousness* here in 2 Nephi 20:1.

■ 2 Nephi 20:2

*to turn [aside 1APS | away BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the needy from judgment
and to take away the right from the poor of my people*

□ Isaiah 10:2 (King James Bible)

to turn **aside** the needy from judgment
and to take away the right from the poor of my people

This change of *aside* to *away* in the 1837 edition, not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript, appears to be a typo. The immediate source for the error is probably the *away* in the next line, a parallel infinitive clause ("to take **away** the right from the poor of my people"). In addition, the 1837 typesetter may have been prompted to set "to turn away" since that phraseology had just occurred three times in the previous chapter ("for all this his anger is not **turned away**", in 2 Nephi 19:12, 17, 21). There is also the language in Alma 34:28: "if ye turn **away** the needy and the naked".

In general, the use of "to turn away" is more frequent than "to turn aside" (26 versus 8 occurrences, counting the instance in 2 Nephi 20:2 as an example of *aside*). None of the other instances of "to turn away" and "to turn aside" have ever been switched in the history of the text, a fact that further supports the claim that the 1837 change here in 2 Nephi 20:2 was unintended. The 1908

RLDS edition restored the original *aside* (the King James reading), probably by reference to the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 20:2 “to turn *aside*”, the reading of the printer's manuscript and the King James Bible; the 1837 replacement of *aside* by *away* appears to be accidental.

■ **2 Nephi 20:3**

*and what will ye do in the [day 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | days s] of visitation
and in the desolation which shall come from far*

□ **Isaiah 10:3** (King James Bible)

and what will ye do in the **day** of visitation
and in the desolation *which* shall come from far

Once more the 1953 RLDS edition has replaced a singular with a plural. The change here may be intentional since that edition has a footnote referring the reader to Hosea 9:7, which reads in the plural: “the **days** of visitation are come / the days of recompense are come”. For a list of other places where the 1953 RLDS edition replaced a singular with a plural, see 2 Nephi 7:3. Some of these other changes seem to be intentional, others accidental, which suggests the possibility that the plural *days* may have accidentally entered the copy-text for the 1953 edition and that the footnotes were subsequently prepared from that copy-text. It is also possible that the reference to Hosea 9:7 was discovered first and that it motivated the change to the plural *days* in the RLDS text. In either case, the Isaiah text reads in the singular and the Book of Mormon text is quoting Isaiah, so this 1953 change to the plural *days* is clearly unwarranted from a textual point of view.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 20:3 the singular *day*, the reading of the earliest textual sources as well as the King James Bible; the 1953 RLDS change to the plural may be based on Hosea 9:7.

■ **2 Nephi 20:4**

but his hand [stretched 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQS | is stretched RT] out still

□ **Isaiah 10:4** (King James Bible)

but his hand **is stretched** out still

As discussed under 2 Nephi 19:17, the *is* here in 2 Nephi 20:4 (italicized in the King James Bible and added to the standard LDS text in the 1920 edition) will be removed in the critical text.

■ 2 Nephi 20:5

O Assyrian
 the rod of mine anger
 and [*their* >+- *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] staff in their hand
 is **their** indignation

□ Isaiah 10:5 (King James Bible)

O Assyrian
 the rod of mine anger
 and **the** staff in their hand
 is **mine** indignation

When copying this passage from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “their staff”, then somewhat later crossed out the *their* and wrote *the* above the crossed-out *their*. The ink flow for the crossout and the insert mark was made with heavier ink flow, while the supralinear *the* was written with weaker ink flow. The correction may have been made when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . The apparent source of the error was the *their* in the immediately following “in their hand”.

The Book of Mormon text for this passage reads “is **their** indignation”, whereas the King James Bible has “is **mine** indignation”. The parallelistic Hebrew text twice claims that the Assyrian symbol of power represents God’s judgment (“the rod of **mine** anger and the staff in their hand is **mine** indignation”). It seems possible that the final *their* (the one in “is their indignation”) is an error in copying, although we do not have the original manuscript here. Emending “in their indignation” to “in mine indignation” has been proposed by John A. Tvedtnes (for his arguments, see page 48 of “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984).

The preceding initial error in \mathcal{P} , where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *their* instead of *the* in the phrase “the staff in their hand”, shows that the original *their* before *hand* can lead to copy errors. More significantly for the reading here in 2 Nephi 20:5, there are instances in the manuscripts where the scribes accidentally wrote the wrong possessive pronoun under the influence of a preceding pronoun. In each of the following ten cases, the scribe corrected his initial manuscript error:

1 Nephi 4:35 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *I* led to an initial *my* in \mathcal{P})

and it came to pass that Zoram did take courage at the words which **I** spake
 —now Zoram was the name of the servant—
 and he promised that he would go down into the wilderness
 unto [*our* 0APST | *my* > *our* 1 | *my* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] father

1 Nephi 12:17–18 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} : a previous *they* led to an initial *their* in \mathcal{O})

that **they** perish and are lost
 and the large and spacious building
 which [*their* >% *thy* 0 | *thy* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] father saw
 is vain imaginations and the pride of the children of men

- 1 Nephi 13:11 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} : a previous *me* led to an initial *my* in \mathcal{C})
the angel saith unto **me** behold the wrath of God is upon the seed
of [*my* >% *thy* 0 | *thy* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brethren
- 1 Nephi 20:8–9 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *thou* led first to “thy womb” in \mathcal{P} ,
then to an initial *thy* in “thy name’s sake” in \mathcal{P})
for I knew that **thou** wouldst deal very treacherously
and wast called a transgressor
from [*the* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* >js *the* 1] womb
nevertheless for [*my* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* > *my* 1] name’s sake
will I defer mine anger
- 2 Nephi 8:16 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *thy* and *thee* led to an initial *thy* in \mathcal{P})
and I have put my words in **thy** mouth and hath covered **thee**
in the shadow of [*mine* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* > *mine* 1] hand
- 2 Nephi 8:22 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *thy* led to an initial *thy* in \mathcal{P})
the Lord and **thy** God pleadeth the cause
of [*thy* >+ *his* 1 | *his* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
- Mosiah 20:15 (Oliver Cowdery: two previous *my*’s led to an initial *my* in \mathcal{P})
therefore in **my** anger I did cause **my** people to come up to war
against [*my* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
- Mosiah 20:24 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *my* led to an initial *my* in \mathcal{P})
and I swear unto you with an oath that **my** people shall not slay
[*my* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
- Alma 60:16 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *our* led to an initial *our* in \mathcal{P})
and gone forth against **our** enemies instead of taking up
[*their* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *our* > *their* 1] swords against us
- Helaman 1:18–19 (Oliver Cowdery: a previous *their* led to an initial *their* in \mathcal{C})
for they had supposed that the Lamanites durst not come
into the heart of **their** lands and attackt that great city Zarahemla
but it came to pass that Coriantumr did march forth at the head of
[*their* > NULL 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his numerous host

Thus we have considerable evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts to suggest that “and the staff in **their** hand is **their** indignation” in 2 Nephi 20:5 could be an error for “and the staff in **their** hand is **mine** indignation” (the King James reading).

Ultimately, the reading in the Book of Mormon (“the staff in their hand is **their** indignation”) is not a difficult reading unless one notices the problem in the lack of parallelism with the previous “the rod of mine anger”. Clearly, if we did not have the King James Bible to compare the Book of Mormon text to, we would probably not notice any difficulty with “their indignation”. On the other hand, there would have been no clear motivation for changing “mine indignation” to “their indignation” (assuming that the King James reading, which follows the original Hebrew, is

indeed the original Book of Mormon reading). Thus we are left with a very difficult decision. Probably the safest solution here would be to retain the earliest Book of Mormon reading (“their indignation”), but with the understanding that this reading could very well be a scribal error for “mine indignation”.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 20:5 the reading “their indignation” (the reading of the printer’s manuscript, here the earliest textual source); nonetheless, this reading may be an error for “mine indignation” (the King James reading), where the replacement of *mine* by *their* in the Book of Mormon text could be an early transmission error caused by the *their* in the immediately preceding “in their hand”.

■ 2 Nephi 20:6

I will send him against a hypocritical nation

□ Isaiah 10:6 (King James Bible)

I will send him against **an** hypocritical nation

The Book of Mormon text normally prefers the *a* form of the indefinite article before an *h*-initial word (providing that the *h* for that word is pronounced in standard English). For discussion, see 2 Nephi 13:7.

■ 2 Nephi 20:10

as my hand hath founded the kingdoms of the idols

□ Isaiah 10:10 (King James Bible)

as my hand hath **found** the kingdoms of the idols

The Book of Mormon text for 2 Nephi 20:10 has *founded* instead of *found*. There are several examples elsewhere in the text that refer to the founding of churches, such as the references to the devil as the founder of the great and abominable church (in 1 Nephi 13–14) or to Alma as the founder of the Nephite church (in Mosiah 23:16 and Mosiah 29:47). And 2 Nephi 24:32, an Isaiah passage, refers to the Lord as the founder of Zion (“the Lord hath founded Zion”). But the problem here in 2 Nephi 20:10 is that the Assyrian king did not found the kingdoms of the idols. Instead, he seized them and plundered them, and he’s threatening to do the same to Jerusalem, another kingdom of idols (see verse 11: “shall I not . . . so do to Jerusalem and to her idols”).

John A. Tvedtnes has suggested that in 2 Nephi 20:10 the original word *found* was “apparently misunderstood by the scribe” (page 49, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984). Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally written down *founded* in \mathcal{O} or as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . It is also possible that Joseph Smith himself misread *found* as *founded*. The overriding factor in creating an error here is that one expects kingdoms to be founded rather than found. Unfortunately, there are no other cases in the Book of Mormon text where *found* has been accidentally replaced by *founded* (or vice versa), so we have no independent evidence for this specific error.

However, there are other instances in the Isaiah quotations where a single word has been replaced by a visually similar but different word. In two cases, we have clear evidence that Oliver Cowdery misread the word as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

2 Nephi 7:5 (\mathcal{O} and Isaiah 50:5 have *opened*, \mathcal{P} has *appointed*)
 the Lord God hath
 [*opened* 0CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *appointed* 1ABDEPS | *appointed* > *opened* F]
 mine ear

2 Nephi 24:25 (\mathcal{O} and Isaiah 14:25 have *break*, \mathcal{P} has *bring*)
 I will [*break* 0 | *bring* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST] the Assyrian in my land

In addition, there are examples where a single word may have been miscopied but where \mathcal{O} is not extant:

2 Nephi 13:1 (Isaiah 3:1 has “the whole **stay** of bread”)
 the stay and the staff
 the whole **staff** of bread
 and the whole stay of water

2 Nephi 20:13 (Isaiah 10:13 has “**removed** the **bounds**”)
 and I have **moved** the **borders** of the people

2 Nephi 23:11 (Isaiah 13:11 has “will lay **low**”)
 I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease
 and will lay **down** the haughtiness of the terrible

2 Nephi 23:15 (Isaiah 13:15 has “that is **found**”)
 every one that is **proud** shall be thrust through

2 Nephi 24:19 (Isaiah 14:19 has “the **raiment** of those”)
 and the **remnant** of those that are slain
 thrust through with a sword

Some of these may be errors in copying, but others appear to be intentional changes. For further discussion, see each passage.

Generally speaking, if a visually similar word in the Book of Mormon quotations of Isaiah does not make sense within the context of the passage, then the critical text will emend the word to agree with the corresponding King James word. But if the Book of Mormon word makes sense, that reading will be retained, even though an early scribal error may be involved. Since for this particular example in 2 Nephi 20:10 the word *founded* seems inappropriate, the critical text will replace *founded* (the reading in \mathcal{P}) with the King James *found*.

Summary: Emend *founded* to *found* in 2 Nephi 20:10, thus making the text here agree with the King James reading (“as my hand hath **found** the kingdoms of the idols”); *found* was probably misinterpreted as *founded* since kingdoms are typically founded rather than found.

■ 2 Nephi 20:10

and whose graven images

[NULL >jg *did excel* 1 | *did excel* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them*
of Jerusalem and of Samaria

□ **Isaiah 10:10** (King James Bible)

and whose graven images **did excel** them of Jerusalem and of Samaria

Here in 2 Nephi 20:10, the printer's manuscript as originally written lacked its verb. The original reading of the printer's manuscript was so incomprehensible ("whose graven images them of Jerusalem and of Samaria") that the 1830 compositor was forced to consult his King James Bible in order to supply the missing "did excel". He supralinearly inserted the words with heavier ink flow, using the same black ink that he had been using to add punctuation marks for surrounding pages of \mathcal{P} . A similar example of where the compositor may have consulted his King James Bible is found in 2 Nephi 17:23; there he replaced an impossible *that* with the King James *at* (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 17:23). Normally, the 1830 compositor set the words he found in the manuscript without checking his Bible. Note, for instance, the individual word differences listed above in the immediately preceding discussion of "my hand hath founded the kingdoms of the idols". As long as his copy-text read reasonably well enough, the 1830 compositor set the text as it read in \mathcal{P} .

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in the original Hebrew there is no verb *excel* and thus one could argue that the missing *did excel* in the earliest Book of Mormon text is a literal (and very awkward) Hebraistic translation and is not directly dependent on the King James text (since in that biblical translation the verb phrase *did excel* was not set in italics). As explained by Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor on page 265 of *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), the Hebrew here in Isaiah 10:10 uses a comparative construction for which the adjective is left unstated and must be supplied. Thus they translate the Hebrew of this passage as "their images were **more** than those of Jerusalem [and Samaria]", where the comparative *more* is supplied. A similar translation is found in the Revised Standard Version (dating from 1952): "whose graven images were **greater** than those of Jerusalem and Samaria"; here the comparative is *greater*. We even find a parallel translation in the Geneva Bible (dating from 1560): "seeing their idols *were above* Jerusalem and above Samaria". The Geneva Bible, like the King James Bible, used italics to represent translated words not found in the original Hebrew or Greek. Thus the past-tense verb form *were* was correctly set in italics, but the King James Bible neglected to set *did excel* in italics. Thus one could view the earliest Book of Mormon reading as a literal Hebraistic form of the King James text.

Even so, this earliest reading without *did excel* is simply too awkward to accept as the original text. Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant here. Even without that source, it is much more reasonable to assume that the verb phrase *did excel* was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text, probably when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Accept the 1830 compositor's emendation in 2 Nephi 20:10 whereby he supplied, in accord with the King James reading, the obviously missing verb phrase *did excel*.

■ 2 Nephi 20:11

*shall I not as I have done unto Samaria and her idols
so do to Jerusalem and **to** her idols*

□ Isaiah 10:11 (King James Bible)

shall I not as I have done unto Samaria and her idols
so do to Jerusalem and her idols

■ 2 Nephi 20:12

*when the Lord hath performed his whole work
upon mount Zion and **upon** Jerusalem*

□ Isaiah 10:12 (King James Bible)

when the Lord hath performed his whole work
upon mount Zion and **on** Jerusalem

In both of these passages, we have increased parallelism in the Book of Mormon text. In the first case, the Book of Mormon text repeats the preposition *to*. The Hebrew text has the prepositional prefix *l-* before both *Jerusalem* and *her idols*. In the second case, once more the Hebrew text has an identical prepositional prefix, this time *b-* before both *mount Zion* and *Jerusalem*. Thus in these instances the Book of Mormon text more faithfully represents the parallelism in the original Hebrew than does the King James translation.

It should be noted, however, that the Book of Mormon text does not consistently increase the parallelism. For instance, in the first example, the previous clause reads identically in the Book of Mormon and the King James Isaiah as “shall I not as I have done **unto** Samaria and her idols”. In the Hebrew, the prepositional prefix for *unto* is the same *l-* that is found in the following clause, but there it was translated in the King James Bible as *to* rather than *unto* (“**to** Jerusalem and her idols”). Moreover, the Hebrew prepositional *l-* is repeated before both *Samaria* and *her idols*; yet the Book of Mormon text does not repeat the *unto*, perhaps because the repetition of the longer *unto* is rather awkward (“unto Samaria and **unto** her idols”). Nor was there any attempt in this case to change the preposition *unto* to the simpler *to*—that is, “**to** Samaria and (**to**) her idols”.

Despite this one remaining case of nonparallelism, the two cases of increased parallelism here in 2 Nephi 20:11–12 seem intentional. For other examples of increased parallelism in the Isaiah quotations, see the discussion for each of the following:

1 Nephi 21:10	the heat nor the sun
2 Nephi 8:12	that thou shouldst be afraid of man which shall die and of the son of man which shall be made like unto grass
2 Nephi 9:50	come buy and eat yea come buy wine and milk
2 Nephi 12:16	and upon all the ships of the sea and upon all the ships of Tarshish and upon all the pleasant pictures
2 Nephi 16:11	then said I . . . and he said
2 Nephi 17:14	a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son

2 Nephi 17:15	to refuse the evil and to choose the good
2 Nephi 19:9	in the pride and the stoutness of heart
2 Nephi 20:17	and shall burn and shall devour his thorns and his briars
2 Nephi 24:16	and shall consider thee and shall say

In general, cases of increased parallelism appear to be intentional and will therefore be retained in the critical text.

Summary: Follow the more parallelistic Book of Mormon readings in 2 Nephi 20:11–12 (“**to** Jerusalem and **to** her idols” and “**upon** mount Zion and **upon** Jerusalem”).

■ 2 Nephi 20:13

*and I have **moved** the **borders** of the people
and have robbed their treasures
and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man*

□ Isaiah 10:13 (King James Bible)

and I have **removed** the **bounds** of the people
and have robbed their treasures
and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant *man*

For this verse, when we compare the Book of Mormon text with the King James Bible, we have two pairs of visually similar words: *moved* versus *removed*, and *borders* versus *bounds*. These differences could well be due to early errors in the transmission of the text (as suggested by John A. Tvedtnes in “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984, page 49), either when Joseph Smith read off the text or as Oliver Cowdery wrote it down in \mathcal{O} or copied it from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Once more, the original manuscript is not extant here.

In this passage, the words *border* and *bound* mean the same thing (namely, ‘boundary’). For speakers of Early Modern English, this meaning of ‘boundary’ for *bound* was common. See the definitions for both *border* and *bound* in the Oxford English Dictionary, which uses the word *boundary* to define both words: *border* ‘the boundary line which separates one country from another’ (definition 2b for *border*) versus *bound* ‘the boundary line of a territory’ (definition 2a for *bound*). In the Hebrew for Isaiah 10:13, the corresponding word means ‘boundary’. So in a modern English translation, we would expect either *boundaries* or *borders* rather than the archaic *bounds*. Of course, the substitution of *borders* in 2 Nephi 20:13 may be an early error in the Book of Mormon transmission; but since it works here, the critical text will accept *borders*, the earliest reading, in 2 Nephi 20:13.

In Early Modern English, *remove* and *move* were closer in meaning than in today’s English. See, for instance, definition 2a for the verb *remove* in the OED (‘to move from one place to another’), plus the citations in sources from the early 1800s with this meaning (such as “Elizabeth was now removed to Canterbury”). The King James Bible also uses *remove* in this way. Consider the following examples from Isaiah that are quoted in the Book of Mormon:

1 Nephi 21:21 (Isaiah 49:21)
and removing to and fro

- 2 Nephi 16:12 (Isaiah 6:12)
and the Lord have removed men far away
- 2 Nephi 20:31 (Isaiah 10:31)
Madmenah is removed
- 2 Nephi 23:13 (Isaiah 13:13)
and the earth shall remove out of her place
- 2 Nephi 27:25 (Isaiah 29:13)
but have removed their heart far from me
- 3 Nephi 22:10 (Isaiah 54:10)
for the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed

In two nonbiblical passages, the Book of Mormon text refers to “removing a mountain”, where *remove* has the meaning ‘move’:

Mormon 8:24
for in his name could they **remove** mountains

Ether 12:30
for the brother of Jared said unto the mountain Zerim
remove and it was **removed**
and if he had not had faith
it would not have **moved**

The concluding sentence in the Ether example shows that the verb *remove* (used twice in this passage) means ‘moved’ (“and if he had not had faith / it would not have **moved**”). The use of *remove* in referring to moving mountains is related to the language of the New Testament:

Matthew 17:20
if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed
ye shall say unto this mountain
remove hence to yonder place
and it shall **remove**

Finally, there are a few cases in the Book of Mormon where *remove* has the normal meaning of ‘to take away’:

Alma 46:40
but not so much so with fevers
because of the excellent qualities
of the many plants and roots which God had prepared
to [*move* >+ *remove* 1 | *remove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the cause of diseases

Helaman 5:40–41
what shall we do
that this cloud of darkness may be **removed** from overshadowing us . . .
and when ye shall do this
the cloud of darkness shall be **removed** from overshadowing you

Moroni 8:6

I desire that ye should labor diligently
that this gross error should be **removed** from among you

The first of these examples is particularly relevant since in that case Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *move* rather than *remove* in \mathcal{P} . Although the original manuscript is not extant for the word *remove*, it is obvious that *move* is incorrect. Later (probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C}) Oliver supralinearly inserted the *re* with somewhat heavier ink flow. The initial error in \mathcal{P} for Alma 46:40 supports the argument that the *move* in 2 Nephi 20:13 could be an error for *remove*.

In the original Hebrew for Isaiah 10:13, the verb form for “I have removed” is *ʾasir*, which means ‘I got rid of’, not ‘I moved’. Thus the King James use of the verb *remove* in this passage should be interpreted as meaning ‘to get rid of, to eliminate’, not ‘to move’. Within the context of the passage, the text is saying that the king of Assyria has gotten rid of the borders of the people so that he could invade the land, conquer the people, and plunder their treasures (“and have robbed their treasures and I have put down the inhabitants”).

As noted in the discussion under 2 Nephi 20:10 regarding the word *founded*, the critical text will accept word differences between the earliest Book of Mormon text and the corresponding King James quotation, providing the Book of Mormon word makes sense within the context of the passage. Based on this principle, the word *borders* is an acceptable substitute for *bounds*, but *moved* is not appropriate for *removed*. Therefore, the critical text will partially emend the text here in 2 Nephi 20:13 to read “and I have **removed** the **borders** of the people”. The word *removed* is the King James word, and this emendation assumes that *removed* was mistakenly replaced by *moved* in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, the change from *bounds* to *borders* could have been intentional. Since *borders* works in this passage, the critical text will accept it even though it too may represent an early error in the transmission of the text.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 20:13 so that the inappropriate *moved* (the earliest reading in the Book of Mormon sources) is replaced by the King James *removed*; on the other hand, the Book of Mormon *borders* can be retained since it is equivalent in meaning to the King James *bounds*, even though *borders* may be an early error in transmission just like *moved* seems to be.

■ 2 Nephi 20:13

and I have removed the borders of the people
and [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST | I MQ] have robbed their treasures
and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man

□ Isaiah 10:13 (King James Bible)

and I have removed the bounds of the people
and have robbed their treasures
and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant *man*

The 1905 LDS edition added the subject pronoun *I* in the second conjoined clause, thereby creating a more parallel passage where all three clauses begin with “and I have”. The 1911 LDS edition

followed this reading, but the 1920 edition removed the extra *I*. The King James Bible lacks this *I*, probably for stylistic reasons. In the Hebrew original, of course, each verb form necessarily includes an affix that indicates the first person singular.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 20:13 the King James reading without the repeated pronoun *I* in the second clause (“and have robbed their treasures”).

■ **2 Nephi 20:14**

*and as one [gathereth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | gathered s] eggs that are left
have I gathered all the earth*

□ **Isaiah 10:14** (King James Bible)

and as one **gathereth** eggs *that are left*
have I gathered all the earth

The 1953 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *gathereth* with *gathered*, probably under the influence of the past participle *gathered* in the following main clause. The King James Bible has present-tense finite verb forms throughout this sentence (*gathereth*, *are*, and *have*).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 20:14 the present-tense *gathereth*, the King James reading.

■ **2 Nephi 20:15**

*shall the ax boast itself against him that heweth therewith
shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it
as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up
or as if the staff should lift up itself as if it were no wood*

□ **Isaiah 10:15** (King James Bible)

shall the ax boast itself against him that heweth therewith
or shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it
as if the rod should shake *itself* against them that lift it up
or as if the staff should lift up *itself as if it were* no wood

The King James text adds two parallelistic *or*'s to clarify the poetic structure of this passage. Both *or*'s are in italics in the King James Bible since there are no *or*'s here in the Hebrew text. But the Book of Mormon text has only the second *or*. One would think that the text should have either both of them or neither, so perhaps the missing first *or* could be an error in the early transmission of the text. The original manuscript is not extant here.

There are a couple of passages where *or* was initially dropped in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 23:1 (the second and third *or*'s are extant in \mathcal{C})

behold now it came to pass that
 the king of the Lamanites sent a proclamation among all his people
 that they should not lay their hands on Ammon
 [NULL > *or* 1 | *or* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Aaron
 [*or* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *or* 1] Omner **or** Himni

Moroni 4:1

and the elder
 [*or* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *or* A] priest
 did minister it

In the first passage, when copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “Ammon Aaron Omner *or* Himni”, but then almost immediately he corrected it to “Ammon **or** Aaron **or** Omner *or* Himni” (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript is extant for part of this passage, and the last two *or*'s are extant. Apparently the first *or* occurred at the end of the line in \mathcal{C} . In the second passage (in Moroni 4:1), the 1830 compositor initially omitted the necessary *or* between *elder* and *priest*, then supplied it later as an in-press change. For a couple of other (more complicated) passages where *or* seems to have been accidentally omitted in copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , see Alma 58:18 and Mormon 6:10.

These examples suggest that in 2 Nephi 20:15 the first of the two italicized King James *or*'s could have been accidentally omitted. Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon text reads perfectly well the way it is, with only the second *or*. Note that it is clearly easier to omit the first *or* than the second one. In the first case, we have two rhetorical yes-no questions (“shall the ax boast itself . . . shall the saw magnify itself”). These two questions work without any connecting *or*. On the other hand, in the second case, by omitting the *or*, we end up with an awkward sequence of three subordinate clauses, each headed by *as if*:

as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up
as if the staff should lift up itself
as if it were no wood

Thus the second *or* here in Isaiah 10:15 seems necessary and may have been consciously kept, while the first *or* was unnecessary and may have been intentionally removed. Since the Book of Mormon reading will work with only the second *or*, the critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading for 2 Nephi 20:15.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 20:15, which omits the first *or* of the King James text but retains the second one.

■ 2 Nephi 20:17–18

and the light of Israel shall be for a fire and his Holy One for a flame and shall burn and shall devour his thorns and his briars in one day and shall consume the glory of his forest and of his fruitful field

□ Isaiah 10:17–18 (King James Bible)

and the light of Israel shall be for a fire and his Holy One for a flame and **it** shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day and shall consume the glory of his forest and of his fruitful field

In this passage, the Book of Mormon text is missing the subject *it* of the King James text in the clause “and shall burn”. Interestingly, this *it* is not in italics in the King James Bible, which suggests once more that the Book of Mormon text does not strictly follow the King James Bible’s use of italics to determine whether or not to delete a word like the pronoun *it*. (As part of the critical text project, my research assistants examined the text for 44 different editions of the King James Bible published in the United States at the beginning of the 1800s. In none of those copies was this particular *it* ever italicized.) For general discussion regarding the italicized *it*, see 2 Nephi 15:29; for one other example of a nonitalicized King James *it* being deleted in the Book of Mormon text, see 2 Nephi 17:11.

This passage in 2 Nephi 20:17–18 also provides one more example of increased parallelism: namely, the modal verb *shall* before the verb *devour*. Note also that omitting the *it* also increases the parallelism by giving three instances of *and shall*: “**and shall** burn and **shall devour** his thorns and his briars in one day **and shall** consume the glory of his forest”. For further discussion of increased parallelism involving *shall*, see 2 Nephi 17:14–15.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 20:17 the more parallelistic text of the Book of Mormon with its additional *shall* and omitted *it*.

■ 2 Nephi 20:26

*according to the slaughter of [Mideon 1 | Midian ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
at the rock of Oreb*

□ Isaiah 10:26 (King James Bible)

according to the slaughter of **Midian**
at the rock of Oreb

■ 2 Nephi 20:28

at [Mishmash 1 | Michmash ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he hath laid up his carriages

□ Isaiah 10:28 (King James Bible)

at **Michmash** he hath laid up his carriages

In the printer’s manuscript, the names *Midian* and *Michmash* were misspelled as *Mideon* and *Mishmash*. It appears that biblical names were frequently not spelled out for the scribe. For the

case of *Mideon*, we see the possible influence of the name *Gideon*, for *Mishmash* the influence of the English word *mishmash* (common from the 15th century on). The 1830 compositor set the correct spelling for both these names. For discussion regarding the spelling of biblical names, see 1 Nephi 11:13. Also see the discussion below regarding the Book of Mormon spelling *Ramath* (in 2 Nephi 20:29).

Summary: Maintain the King James spellings *Midian* and *Michmash* in the Isaiah quotations.

■ 2 Nephi 20:28

at *Michmash* he hath laid [up 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | upon PS] his carriages

□ Isaiah 10:28 (King James Bible)

at Michmash he hath laid **up** his carriages

The 1908 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the adverbial *up* with the preposition *upon*, which completely changes the meaning of the text (the original phrasal verb *lay up* means ‘to store’). The 1953 RLDS edition originally continued this reading, but some more recent printings of that edition have restored the correct *up*, the reading of the King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the original *laid up* in 2 Nephi 20:28.

■ 2 Nephi 20:29

Ramath is afraid

□ Isaiah 10:29 (King James Bible)

Ramah is afraid

The printer’s manuscript, the earliest extant reading, has *Ramath* instead of the King James *Ramah*. John A. Tvedtnes and Robert F. Smith have argued that the *ath* at the end of *Ramath* could represent the ancient feminine ending *-at(h)*, which was later reduced to the vowel *-ā* (with the final vowel orthographically represented by *h*) unless the *-at(h)* ending was followed by other morphological elements. Thus the original feminine ending *-at(h)* is retained in *Ramathite* (1 Chronicles 27:27), *Ramathaim* (1 Samuel 1:1), and compound names such as *Ramath-lehi* (Judges 15:17), *Ramath-mizpeh* (Joshua 13:26), and *Ramath-negev* (Joshua 19:8), of which the last was translated as “Ramath of the south” in the King James Bible. In other words, the Book of Mormon spelling *Ramath* could be said to represent the archaic form of the name, whereas the Masoretic Hebrew and King James *Ramah* represents the later form. For further discussion and additional examples, see John A. Tvedtnes, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984, page 84; Robert F. Smith, “Textual Criticism of the Book of Mormon”, *Reexploring the Book of Mormon*, edited by John W. Welch (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1992), page 77; and Robert F. Smith, *Book of Mormon Critical Text*, second edition (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1987), page 231.

Another possible explanation is based on the fact that orthographically *Ramath* would have been spelled with only a *t* at the end of the name and that *t* and *h* in the classical square script are very similar letters and could have been mixed up. This similarity, however, does not hold for the older archaic Hebrew script that would have been used on the plates of brass (assuming, perhaps incorrectly, that the characters on those plates were Hebrew rather than Egyptian); in the old Hebrew script (used prior to the Babylonian captivity), *t* and *h* were visually quite different.

But the most reasonable proposal, in my opinion, is that the *th* at the end of *Ramath* represents an error on the part of the scribe, Oliver Cowdery. First, the name *Ramah* does occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (in Ether 15:11), and there it is spelled correctly (albeit as the Jaredite name for the hill Cumorah). Second, a number of nearby names in this part of the Isaiah quotation end in *th*: namely, *Hamath* (2 Nephi 20:9 and 21:11), *Aiath* (2 Nephi 20:28), and *Anathoth* (2 Nephi 20:30). *Hamath* is especially similar to *Ramath*.

An important point to keep in mind here is that the spelling *Ramath* is the only name in the Isaiah quotations for which a variant spelling has been retained in the printed editions of the Book of Mormon. Yet this one spelling variant is simply the result of the 1830 typesetter neglecting to check his King James Bible and thus allowing *Ramath* into the text. Note further that here in 2 Nephi 20 he had recently set *Hamath* (in verse 9) and *Aiath* (in verse 28) and may have simply assumed that *Ramath* (in verse 29) was correct. If he had noticed that *Ramath* differed from the King James *Ramah*, he surely would have changed it as well.

For the more unfamiliar Isaiah names in \mathfrak{D} (including *Ramath*), there is a visually similar name or word that seems to have served as the most probable exemplar for the misspelling:

	KING JAMES BIBLE	MISSPELLING IN \mathfrak{D}	ANALOGICAL SOURCE
2 Nephi 18:2	Jeberechiah	Jerebechiah	Jeremiah
2 Nephi 18:6	Rezin	Razin	razor
2 Nephi 19:1	Zebulun	Zebulon	Babylon
2 Nephi 20:26	Midian	Mideon	Gideon
2 Nephi 20:28	Michmash	Mishmash	mishmash
2 Nephi 20:29	Ramah	Ramath	Hamath

Unlike the other analogical exemplars, *Hamath* would have been virtually unknown, but the recent occurrence of *Hamath* (with perhaps the help of the even nearer *Aiath*) may have primed Oliver Cowdery to write *Ramath* (and the 1830 compositor to set the same without checking his King James Bible). A similar effect occurred with the spelling of *Rezin*. The first three occurrences of *Rezin* were correctly spelled in \mathfrak{D} (in 2 Nephi 17:1, 4, 8), but between the third and fourth occurrences of *Rezin*, the word *razor* occurs (in 2 Nephi 17:20), which resulted in the misspelling *Razin* for the very next occurrence of *Rezin* (in 2 Nephi 18:6). The critical text will therefore restore in 2 Nephi 20:29 the King James spelling, *Ramah*, just as the 1830 compositor did for all the other misspelled names in this long Isaiah quotation. (For each of the other cases, see the individual passage for a complete discussion of what may have caused the misspelling.)

Summary: Emend the name *Ramath* to *Ramah*, the King James reading; evidence from misspellings in \mathfrak{D} of other biblical names from Isaiah suggests that *Ramath* is a scribal error that resulted from the preceding occurrence of the name *Hamath*.

■ 2 Nephi 20:30

*lift up **the** voice*
O daughter of Gallim

□ Isaiah 10:30 (King James Bible)

lift up **thy** voice
 O daughter of Gallim

Here in 2 Nephi 20:30, one may wonder whether the Book of Mormon's *the* is an error for the King James *thy*. Because of visual similarity, an original *thy* could have been accidentally replaced by *the* in the early transmission of the text. The original manuscript is not extant for this passage, which makes it difficult to recover the original text.

The Book of Mormon text prefers the use of the possessive pronoun before *voice* in the expression "lift (up) one's voice". If we exclude the Isaiah quotations, we have only examples with a possessive pronoun:

2 Nephi 4:35
 therefore I will lift up **my** voice unto thee

Mosiah 17:12
 but the priests lifted up **their** voices against him

Mosiah 24:22
 yea all their men and all their women
 and all their children that could speak
 lifted **their** voices in the praises of their God

Alma 31:26
 and he lifted up **his** voice to heaven

Helaman 5:36
 and they were in the attitude as if talking
 or lifting **their** voices to some being which they beheld

Only in the Book of Mormon Isaiah quotations do we get examples of *the* as the determiner for *voice*. Besides the use of *the* in 2 Nephi 20:30, there are four quotations of Isaiah 52:8, of which two have the *the* that is found in the King James version, but two others have *their*:

Isaiah 52:8	thy watchmen shall lift up the voice
(1) Mosiah 12:22	thy watchmen shall lift up the voice
(2) Mosiah 15:29	thy watchmen shall lift up their voice
(3) 3 Nephi 16:18	thy watchmen shall lift up the voice
(4) 3 Nephi 20:32	then shall their watchmen lift up their voice

This variability suggests that either *the* or *thy* is possible in 2 Nephi 20:30, although the tendency in the citations of Isaiah 52:8 has been to replace the original *the* with the possessive pronoun *their*. In 2 Nephi 20:30, the change is in the opposite direction, from a possessive pronoun (namely, *thy*) to *the*. In any event, the definite article *the* will work in 2 Nephi 20:30.

It turns out that the example in Isaiah 52:8 is the only example in all of the King James Isaiah that has *the* instead of a possessive pronoun in this expression referring to the lifting up of one's voice:

Isaiah 10:30	lift up thy voice
Isaiah 24:14	they shall lift up their voice
Isaiah 40:9	lift up thy voice with strength
Isaiah 42:11	let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice
Isaiah 52:8	thy watchmen shall lift up the voice
Isaiah 58:1	lift up thy voice like a trumpet

In the actual Hebrew for Isaiah 52:8, there is no *the* for *voice*, which means that orthographically the only difference between “the voice” and “thy voice” in the Hebrew is a suffixal *k* at the end of *qōl* ‘voice’. Interestingly, in the Great Isaiah Scroll found at Qumran (1QIsa^a), Isaiah 52:8 reads “listen / thy watchmen lift up **their** voice”. One could interpret this reading as evidence that there were no instances in the original Hebrew text of “lift up (the) voice”—that is, each instance of this expression originally had a possessive pronominal suffix at the end of *qōl*. Such an analysis would mean that the Masoretic text for Isaiah 52:8, which has no possessive pronominal suffix, would represent an early error in the Hebrew text. In fact, this verse begins with a different use of *qōl* for which there is no suffix. This *qōl* is typically translated as *listen* (as in the New International Version), but it was ignored in the King James translation. This sentence-initial use of *qōl* may have been the source for removing the possessive pronominal suffix for ‘their’ from the following *qōl*. This example would then show that the Hebrew text was susceptible to losing the pronominal suffix after *qōl*. In addition, this variation in the Hebrew text for Isaiah 52:8 could explain the variation in the Book of Mormon text, which has two occurrences of “lift up **their** voice” and two of “lift up **the** voice”. Finally, since in Isaiah 52:8 the second *qōl* may have lost its original pronominal suffix in the Hebrew, the same may have happened in Isaiah 10:30 in the Hebrew text for the Book of Mormon. In other words, Nephi’s own copy-text may have simply read as *qōl*, without the possessive pronominal suffix.

On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that *thy* tended to be replaced by the more common *the* in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text:

- 1 Nephi 11:7 (initial error in Θ by scribe 3)
 - after thou hast beheld the tree which bare the fruit
 - of which [*the* > *thy* 0 | *thy* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] father tasted
- Alma 2:30 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 - that I may be an instrument
 - in [*the* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] hands
- Alma 12:3 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 - he knows all [*the* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thoughts
- 3 Nephi 12:36 (typesetting error by the 1830 compositor)
 - neither shalt thou swear by [*thy* 1PST | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] head

The last example cites Matthew 5:36, which reads “neither shalt thou swear by **thy** head”.

Most important for this analysis, there are three examples in the original manuscript where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the*, then corrected it to *thy* by overwriting the *e* with a *y*:

1 Nephi 21:16 (line 4 on page 43 of \mathcal{O})

th{e|y} walls are continually before me

1 Nephi 21:19 (lines 8–9 on page 43 of \mathcal{O})

for th{e|y} waste & thy desolate places

Alma 40:1 (line 31 on page 301' of \mathcal{O})

for I perceive that th{e|y} mind is worried

And the first two are especially relevant since the errors occur in an Isaiah quotation:

Isaiah 49:16 **thy** walls *are* continually before me

Isaiah 49:19 for **thy** waste and thy desolate places

We therefore have substantial evidence to support the hypothesis that the original text for 2 Nephi 20:30 may have originally read “lift up **thy** voice” (that is, identically to the King James reading).

As discussed under 2 Nephi 20:10 (see *founded*) and 2 Nephi 20:13 (see *moved* and *borders*), the general practice in the critical text is to accept the earliest reading of the textual sources unless there is something wrong with the reading. Here in 2 Nephi 20:30, the reading with *the* is definitely acceptable; thus this variant will be accepted even though there is strong evidence that it could be an error for *thy*.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual reading (in \mathcal{P}), retain *the* in “lift up **the** voice / O daughter of Gallim”, even though there is considerable scribal evidence to support the King James (and Masoretic Hebrew) reading “thy voice” here in 2 Nephi 20:30.

■ 2 Nephi 20:33

and the high [ons 1 | ones ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | one J] of stature shall be hewn down

□ Isaiah 10:33 (King James Bible)

and the high **ones** of stature *shall be* hewn down

The 1888 LDS edition has the singular *one*, apparently a typo. This edition was not used as a copy-text, and so the error was not transmitted into subsequent LDS editions. The choice of *one* was perhaps influenced by the singular *bough* in the preceding clause (“the Lord of Hosts shall lop the **bough** with terror”).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 20:33 the plural *ones*, which agrees with the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 20:34

and he shall cut down

the thickets of the [forests 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | forest s] with iron

□ Isaiah 10:34 (King James Bible)

and he shall cut down the thickets of the **forest** with iron

The 1953 RLDS edition has the singular *forest*. This change may have been the result of consulting a King James Bible, although it should be pointed out that previously in 2 Nephi 19:18 the RLDS text retained the plural *forests*. The fact that the earliest textual sources for both 2 Nephi 19:18 and 2 Nephi 20:34 have the plural *forests* rather than the King James *forest* implies that the original change in number was intentional.

It should be noted that the original 1611 King James Bible actually read in the plural for Isaiah 10:34 (spelled as *forrests*) but in the singular for Isaiah 9:18 (*forrest*).

Summary: Maintain the plural *forests* here in 2 Nephi 20:34 as well as in 2 Nephi 19:18; the change in the Book of Mormon text from the King James singular *forest* to the plural *forests* appears to be intentional.

2 Nephi 21

■ 2 Nephi 21:2

and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him

[*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *and* s] *spirit of wisdom and understanding*

the spirit of counsel and might

the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord

□ Isaiah 11:2 (King James Bible)

and the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him

the spirit of wisdom and understanding

the spirit of counsel and might

the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD

The 1953 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the definite article *the* in “the spirit of wisdom” with *and*. The resulting phraseology “and spirit of wisdom” is awkward, especially since elsewhere the verse has three examples of *the spirit*: “the Spirit of the Lord . . . the spirit of counsel . . . the spirit of knowledge”. The copy-text for the 1953 edition was the 1908 RLDS edition, which for this verse read line for line as follows:

117 And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, **the**
spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel **and**
might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord;

In setting the first line of this verse, the 1953 typesetter’s eye apparently skipped down to the *and* at the end of the second line, with the result that he substituted an *and* for the *the* at the end of the first line:

117 ⁷And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, **and**
spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel **and**
might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord;

The critical text will retain the original sequence with four occurrences of “the spirit”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 21:2 the definite article *the* in “the spirit of wisdom” (the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 21:3

*and [he shall not > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] make him
of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord
and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes*

□ Isaiah 11:3 (King James Bible)

and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD
and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes

In this passage, as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote “and **he shall not** make him of quick understanding”, undoubtedly because the following clause read “and **he shall not** judge after the sight of his eyes”. Oliver immediately caught his error and crossed out the extra *he* and the *not* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossouts). The corrected text agrees with the King James reading and was undoubtedly the reading in \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 21:3 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“and shall make him of quick understanding”), which is also the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 21:6

*the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb
and the leopard shall lie down with the kid
and the calf and the young lion and [the 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] fatling together*

□ Isaiah 11:6 (King James Bible)

the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb
and the leopard shall lie down with the kid
and the calf and the young lion and **the** fatling together

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally dropped one of the repeated *the*'s in a long sequence of conjoined nouns in 2 Nephi 21:6; the LDS text has continued this reading. The tendency to remove the repeated determiner has been very strong throughout the history of the Book of Mormon text. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 17:22 as well as CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore *the* before *fatling* in 2 Nephi 21:6, the earliest reading of the Book of Mormon text as well as the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 21:8

*and the weaned child shall put his hand
on the [cockatrices >jg cockatrice's 1 | cockatrice's ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] den*

□ Isaiah 11:8 (King James Bible)

and the weaned child shall put his hand on the **cockatrice'** den

The Book of Mormon text has the standard possessive form *cockatrice's* rather than the King James *cockatrice'*, not only here in 2 Nephi 21:8 but also later when this same Isaiah passage is quoted once more near the end of 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 30:14

and the weaned child shall put his hand

on the [*cockatrice* > *cockatrices* 1 | *cockatrice's* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] den

Although in this second instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *cockatrice* in \mathcal{P} (spelled as *cockatrice*), he immediately corrected the word by adding the possessive *s*. In fact, he made sure that the *s* was placed so that it continued as an extension of the offstroke from the originally final *e* of *cockatrice*. This kind of connecting correction is characteristic of Oliver's corrections elsewhere in the manuscripts when he accidentally omitted a final *s* and then immediately added it. In addition, the ink flow for the *s* is unchanged. And finally, the *s* is rather small in size, as if the *s* was expected. In other words, Oliver did not insert a highly visible *s*, as if he were editing the word. Oliver seems to have just written the base word *cockatrice* (spelled *cockatrice*) and then added the *s* as a matter of course. Thus in 2 Nephi 30:14 as well as in 2 Nephi 21:8, the Book of Mormon text supports the use of the standard possessive form *cockatrice's*.

In Early Modern English, nouns and verbs ending in an /s/ in an unstressed syllable often lacked the expected *-(e)s* inflectional ending in contexts where normally it would have occurred, such as the plural or possessive for nouns or the third person singular present for verbs. Charles Barber (*Early Modern English* [Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997], page 145) gives the example from Shakespeare of "poor Clarence' death" (*Richard III*, act 1, scene 4, line 186); in modern English we would expect "poor Clarence's death". In the same way, the possessive in the King James text for Isaiah 11:8 reads *cockatrice'* rather than *cockatrice's* (the modern English form for the possessive).

The earliest sources in the Book of Mormon show the modern English form *cockatrice's*, although in the manuscripts the apostrophe was not originally written (thus *cockatrices* here in 2 Nephi 21:8 and *cockatrices* in 2 Nephi 30:14). In the first instance, the apostrophe was added in \mathcal{P} itself by the 1830 compositor (who used heavy black ink to mark the accidentals for this part of \mathcal{P}). The apostrophe was not marked in \mathcal{P} in the second instance, but the compositor added it when he set the type.

The critical text will continue to follow the modern form *cockatrice's* in both these instances. Of course, the extra *s* might have been added as Joseph Smith read off these two passages or as Oliver Cowdery wrote them down in \mathcal{C} or copied them into \mathcal{P} . Nonetheless, the modern form *cockatrice's* works and it will therefore be retained in the critical text. For another example of such a minor grammatical adjustment in the Isaiah quotations, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:7 regarding the use of the indefinite article *a(n)* before *h*-initial words. For a case in the Isaiah quotations that shows variation in a word form, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 21:23 regarding the word *toward(s)*.

Summary: Maintain the modern possessive form *cockatrice's* in 2 Nephi 21:8 and 2 Nephi 30:14; the King James Bible has *cockatrice'*, an expected possessive form in Early Modern English.

■ 2 Nephi 21:13

the envy of Ephraim also shall depart

□ Isaiah 11:13 (King James Bible)

the envy **also of Ephraim** shall depart

Here the placement of *also* is different in the Book of Mormon text than in the King James Bible. The word *also* is not found at all in the Hebrew original but was added in the English translation of Isaiah (although not in italics). The placement of *also* between the head noun *envy* and its postmodifying prepositional phrase *of Ephraim* is awkward in modern English; thus the Book of Mormon placement of the *also* after the entire noun phrase is probably intended. Of course, it is also possible that the change in word order may be due to an accident in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. There are a couple of examples in the printer's manuscript where Oliver Cowdery initially put *also* in the wrong place as he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} :

Mosiah 3:4

that they [*also may* > *may also* 1 | *may also* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
be filled with joy

Alma 33:10

yea and thou [*hast also* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *also hast* >+ *hast also* 1]
heard me

Alma 52:10

and that he [*would also* > *also would* 1 | *also would* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
fortify and strengthen the cities round about

In each of these cases, Oliver caught his error and corrected in \mathfrak{P} the placement of the *also*.

There are also examples in the printing of the editions where *also* has been accidentally put in the wrong place:

2 Nephi 11:3 (1888 LDS edition)

and my brother Jacob
[*also hath* 1A | *also has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *has also* J] seen him

2 Nephi 12:8 (1852 LDS edition)

their land [*also is* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *is also* FIJLMNOQRT] full of idols

Jacob 7:12 (1906 LDS edition)

and it [*also hath* 01A | *also has* BCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *has also* N]
been made manifest unto me by the power of the Holy Ghost

Alma 14:10 (1852 LDS edition)

he [*was also* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *also was* FIJLMNOQRT] pained

Alma 19:14 (1830 edition)

and he [*also was* 01 | *was also* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] overpowered
with joy

Alma 20:13 (1830 edition)

and now his children [*also are* 1 | *are also* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come amongst us

Mormon 8:30 (1849 LDS edition)

and there shall [*also be* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *be also* E] heard of wars

Like the three errors that Oliver Cowdery made in \mathcal{D} , these errors in the editions involve the placement of *also* with respect to the verb phrase. This confining of the errors to the verb phrase basically means that there is no specific evidence that the scribes or the printers had difficulty with the placement of *also* in other positions in the text. Since in 2 Nephi 21:13 the placement of *also* after the whole noun phrase will definitely work, the critical text will maintain that order.

Summary: Follow the word order of \mathcal{D} in 2 Nephi 21:13 (“the envy of Ephraim also shall depart”), which contrasts with the King James word order (“the envy also of Ephraim shall depart”).

■ 2 Nephi 21:14

but they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines

[*towards* >% *toward* 1 | *toward* ABCGHKPS | *towards* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *the west*

□ Isaiah 11:14 (King James Bible)

but they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines **toward** the west

This is the one example in the Isaiah quotations that supports the King James *toward* as the original reading in the Book of Mormon text. As discussed under 1 Nephi 21:23, all other examples in the Isaiah quotations replace the King James *toward* with *towards*. Here in 2 Nephi 21:14, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *towards* in \mathcal{D} but then immediately removed the *s* by erasure. Apparently, \mathcal{C} read *toward*, in agreement with the corresponding King James passage of Isaiah. This example suggests that the use of *towards* in the Book of Mormon quotations of Isaiah may be due to dialectal overlay by Oliver or perhaps Joseph Smith himself. In this one instance, an original *toward* seems to have made it through the early transmission of the text.

It has been difficult to maintain this *toward*. In the 1841 British edition, the typesetter replaced the *toward* of his copy-text (the 1837 edition) with *towards*. The LDS text has subsequently maintained the *-s* form of *toward(s)*. On the other hand, the RLDS text, which derives from the 1840 edition, has maintained the earlier *toward*; the copy-text for the 1840 edition was also the 1837 edition.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the most reasonable solution for each case of *toward(s)* is to accept the earliest textual reading, even if it differs from the reading in the King James Bible. Here in 2 Nephi 21:14, the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} (namely, *toward*) appears to be the original reading.

Summary: Maintain the adverbial form *toward* in 2 Nephi 21:14, the (immediately) corrected reading in \mathcal{D} and the apparent reading in \mathcal{C} ; in this instance, the original Book of Mormon text agrees with the King James reading in having *toward* rather than *towards* (the normal form in the Book of Mormon text).

■ 2 Nephi 21:15

and with his mighty wind he shall shake his hand over the river

□ Isaiah 11:15 (King James Bible)

and with his mighty wind **shall he** shake his hand over the river

As noted under 2 Nephi 19:14, the Book of Mormon text will sometimes vary in word order from the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible. Here in 2 Nephi 21:15, the King James text has the modal auxiliary *shall* immediately following an initial adverbial phrase (“with his mighty wind **shall he** shake his hand”), but the Book of Mormon text has the more modern word order, with *shall* following the subject *he*.

The normal order in the biblical style is to place the first verb right after a sentence-initial adverbial phrase, as in the following nearby Book of Mormon examples that have the King James order *shall he*:

2 Nephi 20:32 (Isaiah 10:32)

as yet **shall he** remain at Nob that day

2 Nephi 21:4 (Isaiah 11:4)

but with righteousness **shall he** judge the poor

2 Nephi 21:4 (Isaiah 11:4)

and with the breath of his lips **shall he** slay the wicked

Nonetheless, the more modern word order *he shall* can be found after an initial adverbial phrase in both an Isaiah passage and its corresponding Book of Mormon quote:

2 Nephi 20:16 (Isaiah 10:16)

and under his glory **he shall** kindle a burning

Although the difference in word order for 2 Nephi 21:15 could be due to an error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text, this difference could also be intentional. Since the Book of Mormon order will work, the critical text will accept it.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 21:15 the word order *he shall* in “and with his mighty wind **he shall** shake his hand over the river”, even though this word order disagrees with the order in the corresponding King James passage (*shall he*).

■ 2 Nephi 21:16

and there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people

□ Isaiah 11:16 (King James Bible)

and there shall be **an** highway for the remnant of his people

The Book of Mormon text prefers the *a* form of the indefinite article before an *h*-initial word (providing that the *h* for that word is pronounced in current English). For discussion, see 2 Nephi 13:7.

2 Nephi 22

■ 2 Nephi 22:1

and thou [comfortedst 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | comfortedest FIJLMNOQRT] me

□ Isaiah 12:1 (King James Bible)

and thou **comfortedst** me

For the past-tense *comforted*, the original Book of Mormon text used the reduced inflectional ending *-st*, the same one as in the corresponding King James passage. The 1852 LDS edition inserted an *e* to produce the fuller inflectional ending *-est*. For modal verb forms like *would(e)st* and *should(e)st*, the original Book of Mormon text has preferred the reduced form *-st* over the fuller *-est*. For discussion of the inflectional ending *-(e)st* for these two modal verbs, see under 1 Nephi 20:5.

Summary: In 2 Nephi 22:1 maintain *comfortedst* (the original reading in the Book of Mormon), which agrees with the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 22:2

*for the Lord [Jehovah >jg JEHOVAH 1 | JEHOVAH ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
is my strength and my song*

□ Isaiah 12:2 (King James Bible)

for the LORD JEHOVAH *is* my strength and *my* song

In the King James Bible for this passage, not only is the word *Jehovah* printed in all capitals, but the capitals are even larger than the capitals used to set the previous *Lord*. In general, all capitals were used in some of the early English Bible translations to represent the occurrence in the Hebrew Bible of the name YHWH (written without vowels in the original, pre-Masoretic Hebrew). In the Masoretic Hebrew text, YHWH (which stands for the name *Yahweh*, according to scholarly interpretation) is normally assigned the vowels of the word *'adōnāy* 'Lord', which ends up as *Jehovah* in English translations (the consonantal form JHVH is an alternative way to transliterate YHWH). The King James translators typically translated YHWH as LORD but sometimes as JEHOVAH. In the Hebrew for Isaiah 12:2, *Yah* (a variant of *Yahweh*) corresponds to LORD, while YHWH corresponds to JEHOVAH. The entire name was translated in the King James Bible as LORD JEHOVAH, with extra-large all capitals for *Jehovah*.

In the Book of Mormon manuscripts, there is no original use of all capitals. The 1830 compositor, on the basis of his King James Bible, decided here in 2 Nephi 22:2 to set *Jehovah* in all capitals. In *Ɔ* itself, he underlined *Jehovah* with three wavy lines (the standard proofreaders' mark for setting a word in all capitals). But the compositor never set in all capitals any example of *Lord* that was set as LORD in the King James Bible. There is one other example of *Jehovah* in the Book of Mormon, and it has never been set in all capitals: “the great Jehovah the eternal judge of both quick and dead” (Moroni 10:34). Of course, this second example is not a biblical quote.

The only other time when all capitals were introduced into the text occurred when the 1830 compositor set the words referring to deity on the title page of the Book of Mormon, as in the following phrases:

and hid up unto the LORD
 by the gift and power of GOD
 and hid up unto the LORD
 by the gift of GOD
 at the time the LORD confounded the language
 how great things the LORD hath done
 the covenants of the LORD
 JESUS is the CHRIST the ETERNAL GOD
 the things of GOD
 at the judgment seat of CHRIST

In the 1849 LDS edition (the second British edition, with editing by Orson Pratt), the all capitals were removed from the title page for all those words that refer to deity except for the four words that were set in all capitals in the single clause “JESUS is the CHRIST the ETERNAL GOD”. The use of all capitals for those four words has continued in the LDS text. The RLDS text, beginning with the 1874 edition, systematically removed the all capitals for every one of the words on the title page that refer to deity (including the four in that one clause).

Summary: Remove the all capitals for *Jehovah* in 2 Nephi 22:2 since this typesetting distinction derives directly from printing conventions in the King James Bible and not from the Book of Mormon manuscripts or from the original (pre-Masoretic) Hebrew; such use of all capitals for the names of deity has appeared elsewhere only on the printed title page of the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 22:2

he also [is 1APS | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] become my salvation

□ Isaiah 12:2 (King James Bible)

he also **is** become my salvation

In older English, *be* was used as the perfective helping verb (rather than the *have* of modern English) whenever the following past participle (the main verb) involved change or motion. For instance,

modern English uses “the Lord **has** come” while older English has “the Lord **is** come”. Here in 2 Nephi 22:2, the 1837 edition introduced *has* as the auxiliary verb for the past participle *become*, perhaps by accident (the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in \mathcal{P}). There are similar examples in the text of the *be* verb as the helping verb for the past participle *become*. Two instances of “art thou become” (found in a nearby Isaiah quote) have never been edited to “hast thou become”:

2 Nephi 24:10 (Isaiah 14:10)
art thou also become weak as we
art thou become like unto us

But in two other examples in the text, an original *be* has been replaced by *have*:

Helaman 13:36 (1840 change)
 and all things [*are* 01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *have* CGHKPS] become slippery
 3 Nephi 7:7 (1837 change, marked in \mathcal{P})
 although they [*were* >js *had* 1 | *were* A | *had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 nearly all become wicked

In the first instance, *have* showed up in the 1840 edition. Joseph Smith edited the 1840 edition, so it is possible that he is responsible for the change there (although the *have* could have been accidentally introduced by the 1840 typesetter). In the second instance, *were* was replaced by *had* in the 1837 edition, and for that case the change was marked by Joseph in the printer’s manuscript. This example clearly shows that at least one of these changes was fully intended. Thus it is also possible that in 2 Nephi 22:2, the 1837 change from *is* to *has* was the result of Joseph’s editing.

In any event, the original archaic use of *be* as the helping verb for the past participle *become* will be maintained in the critical text for all five of these cases since in each case the earliest textual sources support such a reading. Normally, the text prefers *have* with the past participle *become* (or the dialectal *became*), with 59 occurrences, including “they **had become** exceeding wicked” (in Helaman 6:31) and “they would not **have become** slippery” (in Helaman 13:33).

Summary: Restore the archaic *is* in “he also is become my salvation”, the original reading in 2 Nephi 22:2 and also the corresponding King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 22:6

cry out and shout
thou inhabitant of [*Zion* 1ABCDEFGHIKPNRST | *Sion* FIJLMOQ]

□ Isaiah 12:6 (King James Bible)

cry out and shout
 thou inhabitant of **Zion**

In the New Testament, the King James Bible uses the alternative (now archaic) spelling *Sion* for *Zion*. Except for one use of *Sion* in Psalm 65:1, the King James Old Testament has only the spelling *Zion*. As shown here in 2 Nephi 22:6, the New Testament spelling *Sion* intruded into an

Isaiah quotation in the Book of Mormon. Originally introduced in the 1852 LDS edition, this spelling was maintained in this verse in the LDS text until the 1920 edition (with the exception of the 1906 large-print edition, which had the correct *Zion*).

The alternative spelling *Sion* is found nowhere else in any of the Book of Mormon editions or the manuscripts. There are 44 other occurrences of this name in the text, and all are consistently spelled as *Zion*.

Summary: Maintain the current spelling *Zion* rather than the archaic *Sion* throughout the Book of Mormon text.

2 Nephi 23

■ 2 Nephi 23:3

*I have commanded my sanctified [one > ones 0 | ones 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I have also called my mighty ones*

□ Isaiah 13:3 (King James Bible)

I have commanded my sanctified **ones**
I have also called my mighty ones

While taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation here in 2 Nephi 23:3, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular “my sanctified one”. Almost immediately he corrected the *one* to *ones*, the King James reading (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Notice in particular the agreement in number with the following “my mighty ones”. For additional discussion regarding the tendency to omit the plural *s* ending, see under 2 Nephi 7:6.

Summary: Maintain both instances of the plural *ones* in 2 Nephi 23:3 (“my sanctified ones . . . my mighty ones”), which is the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 23:4

*the noise of **the** [multitudes >% multitude 0 | multitude 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the mountains like as of a great people
a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of nations gathered together*

□ Isaiah 13:4 (King James Bible)

the noise of **a multitude** in the mountains like as of a great people
a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of nations gathered together

Here in 2 Nephi 23:4, there is agreement between the Book of Mormon text and the corresponding King James reading except for the article in front of *multitude*. The Book of Mormon has *the* and the King James Bible has *a*. The Book of Mormon’s definite article could be an error introduced either from the immediately surrounding *the*’s (“**the** noise . . . in **the** mountains”) or from the use of *the* in the following parallel phrase “a tumultuous noise of **the** kingdoms of nations”. This passage is extant for \mathcal{C} (and is found on one of the Wilford Wood fragments). The text there shows that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the multitudes*, then he erased the plural *s* (an immediate correction). This plural *multitudes* suggests the influence of the plural nouns in the following parallel line:

the **noise of the** multitudes in the mountains . . .
a tumultuous **noise of the** kingdoms of nations

One could conjecture that in correcting *multitudes* to *multitude*, Oliver inadvertently left the extra *the* uncorrected.

Sometimes in the manuscripts an original *a* was accidentally replaced by *the*:

Alma 11:17 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P} ; \mathcal{C} reads *a*)
 and a leah is the half
 of [*a* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *the* >% *a* 1] shilum

Alma 35:13 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{C})
 and thus commenced [*the* > *a* 0 | *a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] war
 betwixt the Lamanites and the Nephites

Helaman 6:32 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 insomuch that [*the* > *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] more part of it
 had come unto them

Ether 12:8 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 he has shewn himself unto the world
 and glorified the name of the Father
 and prepared [*the* >+ *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] way
 that thereby others might be partakers of the heavenly gift

Of course, one could also view the change in 2 Nephi 23:4 to the definite article *the* as an intentional increase in the parallelism (with the following “**the** kingdoms of nations”). Note, however, that the definite article *the* before *noise* was not changed to the indefinite article *a* that occurs before *tumultuous noise* (or vice versa). And, of course, the singular *multitude* was ultimately retained. In other words, the increase in parallelism was only partial.

Since the use of the definite article *the* before *multitude* will work, the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{C} (“the noise of the multitude”), even though this *the* may represent an error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 23:4 the definite article *the* before *multitude* in “the noise of the multitude”, the immediately corrected reading of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 23:4

the Lord of Hosts mustereth the [host 0 | hosts 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the battle

□ Isaiah 13:4 (King James Bible)

the LORD of Hosts mustereth the **host** of the battle

Here Oliver Cowdery mistakenly copied the singular *host* as *hosts*, probably due to the influence of the preceding plural *hosts* in “the Lord of Hosts”. The original manuscript (extant here among the Wilford Wood fragments) clearly reads “the host of the battle”.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 23:4 the singular *host* in “the host of the battle”, the reading of the original manuscript as well as the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 23:7

*therefore shall all hands be faint
every man's heart shall melt*

□ Isaiah 13:7 (King James Bible)

therefore shall all hands be faint
and every man's heart shall melt

Under 1 Nephi 21:26, there is some discussion on the frequency with which a clause-initial *and* in the Isaiah passages is missing from the Book of Mormon text. Here in 2 Nephi 23:7, we have one more example of a missing *and*. In fact, one additional example is found a few verses later:

2 Nephi 23:11

and I will punish the world for evil and the wicked for their iniquity
I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease

Isaiah 13:11 (King James Bible)

and I will punish the world for *their* evil and the wicked for their iniquity
and I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease

As discussed under 1 Nephi 21:26, the critical text will accept such minor variation. Without any specific evidence that these omissions are due to scribal mistakes, we should assume that the missing *and*'s are intended.

Summary: As elsewhere in the text, we accept the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 23:7 and 2 Nephi 23:11 without the clause-initial *and*'s found in the corresponding King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 23:8

they shall be amazed one at another

□ Isaiah 13:8 (King James Bible)

they shall be **in pain as a woman that travaileth**
they shall be amazed one at another

The Book of Mormon text is missing a clause that may have been lost in transmission because two succeeding clauses begin with the same words (“they shall be”). Stan Larson, on page 568 of his 1978 article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon” (*Brigham Young University Studies* 18:563–569), lists this example as a possible case where the Book of Mormon text may be missing a part of the original text (as found in the King James Bible).

There is not as much similarity between the two corresponding Hebrew clauses, which suggests that this omission (if it is accidental) occurred in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text, with the eye skipping from the first “they shall be” to the second one. The original manuscript is not extant here, so one possibility is that the first clause could have been lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from ⸔ into ⸌. Another possibility is that the clause could have been omitted as Joseph Smith himself read off the text to Oliver.

On the other hand, there are quite a few cases where more than a few words are missing from the Isaiah quotations as they appear in the Book of Mormon text (when compared with the King James reading), and these do not seem to involve visual skipping. For 15 examples of such omissions from the Isaiah quotations, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 8:15. These other cases suggest that we should accept the reading of the original manuscript here in 2 Nephi 23:8, with its missing clause “they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth”. Clearly, the Book of Mormon reading will work, despite the loss in the parallelism of the King James reading. Nonetheless, there remains the distinct possibility of scribal error here in 2 Nephi 23:8.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 23:8 the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript), where the King James clause “they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth” is not found; it is possible that this is an omission due to the eye skipping from one “they shall be” to the next one.

■ 2 Nephi 23:9

*behold the day of the Lord cometh
cruel both with wrath and fierce anger
to lay the land desolate
and [he 1ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | ye EF] shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it*

□ Isaiah 13:9 (King James Bible)

behold the day of the LORD cometh
cruel both with wrath and fierce anger
to lay the land desolate
and **he** shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced the pronoun *he* with the visually similar *ye*. This pronoun will work within the narrow context of this passage; thus the error was not noticed when *ye* was copied into the subsequent LDS edition (1852). Orson Pratt, in his editing for the 1879 edition, removed this error from the LDS text.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 23:9 the pronoun *he* in “and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it”, which is also the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 23:10

*the sun shall be darkened in [his 1PST | her ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] going forth
and the moon shall not cause her light to shine*

□ Isaiah 13:10 (King James Bible)

the sun shall be darkened in **his** going forth
and the moon shall not cause her light to shine

The 1830 compositor set “**her** going forth” rather than the correct “**his** going forth”, the King James reading. Undoubtedly he was influenced by the use of *her* in the following clause (“and the

moon shall not cause **her** light to shine”). Based on the reading in the printer’s manuscript, the correct *his* was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition as well as in the 1981 LDS edition.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 23:10 the pronoun *his* in the phrase “in his going forth”, the reading of the King James Bible.

■ **2 Nephi 23:11**

*and I will punish the world for evil
and the wicked for their iniquity*

□ **Isaiah 13:11** (King James Bible)

and I will punish the world for **their** evil
and the wicked for their iniquity

The earliest extant Book of Mormon text is missing the italicized *their* of the corresponding King James passage. The following *their* in “the wicked for **their** iniquity” is maintained (this second *their* is not set in italics in the King James Bible). The Book of Mormon text thus follows the Hebrew original (where the first *their* is supplied in the King James translation). In the Hebrew the word for *world* is in the singular while *the wicked* is a plural form. Some modern translations (such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version) supply the possessive pronoun *its* for the singular *world*: “I will punish the world for **its** evil”. In any event, the Book of Mormon translation follows the literalism of the Hebrew text by omitting the possessive pronoun before *world*. The critical text will follow the reading of the earliest extant source (here the printer’s manuscript).

Summary: Maintain the reading of the earliest text for 2 Nephi 23:11 (“and I will punish the world for evil”), which omits the italicized *their* of the King James reading.

■ **2 Nephi 23:11**

*I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease
and will lay **down** the haughtiness of the terrible*

□ **Isaiah 13:11** (King James Bible)

and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease
and will lay **low** the haughtiness of the terrible

It is possible that the *down* of the Book of Mormon text (the reading in \mathcal{P}) is a copying error since *low* is visually similar. As discussed under 2 Nephi 20:10, there are some errors in the Isaiah quotations that involve visually similar words. In this particular case, such an error might have been facilitated by Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to write *dow* for *down* in the original manuscript:

¹ Nephi 2:5

and he came [*dow* 0 | *down* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] by the borders
near the shore of the Red Sea

2 Nephi 1:17

my heart hath been weighed [*dow* 0 | *down* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
with sorrow from time to time

Alma 51:18

they were hewn [*dow* 0 | *down* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Alma 51:19

there were four thousand of those dissenters
which were hewn [*dow* 0 | *down* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] by the sword

Normally, of course, Oliver correctly wrote *down* with its final *n*. But if he wrote *low* in the original manuscript but misinterpreted the *l* as a *d*, he could have read *dow*, which he then “corrected” to *down*. Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant here in 2 Nephi 23:11. Nor are there any specific examples in the manuscripts (or editions) where *down* and *low* have been mixed up.

From a semantic point of view, either *down* or *low* will work in 2 Nephi 23:11, especially if we interpret “I will lay down” as meaning ‘I will destroy’ (the Hebrew verb here means ‘to put a stop or an end to something’). In fact, there are numerous parallel expressions in the text that use either *down* or *low* almost interchangeably when referring to physical death and destruction (including cases where both words are used together). Many of these also involve the verbs *lie* and *lay*:

1 Nephi 18:18

yea their gray hairs were about to be brought **down** to **lie low** in the dust

2 Nephi 1:14

and hear the words of a trembling parent
whose limbs ye must soon **lay down** in the cold and silent grave

2 Nephi 9:7

and if so / this flesh must have **laid down** to rot
and to crumble to its mother earth
to rise no more

2 Nephi 26:15

and after that they shall have been brought **down low** in the dust . . .

Omni 1:30

and I am about to **lay down** in my grave

Alma 28:11

and the bodies of many thousands are **laid low** in the earth

The example in 2 Nephi 26:15 paraphrases Isaiah 29:4, which also uses both *down* and *low*:

Isaiah 29:4 (King James Bible)

and thou shalt be brought **down**
and shalt speak out of the ground
and thy speech shall be **low** out of the dust

We can even find competition between *down* and *low* with respect to the use of the word *haughtiness*:

2 Nephi 12:11 (quoting Isaiah 2:11)
 the lofty looks of man shall be humbled
 and the **haughtiness** of men shall be bowed **down**

2 Nephi 12:17 (quoting Isaiah 2:17)
 and the loftiness of man shall be bowed **down**
 and the **haughtiness** of men shall be made **low**

Since the reading with *down* will work and is found in the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript), the critical text will accept it here in 2 Nephi 23:11. Nonetheless, this *down* could be an error for the King James *low*.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 23:11 the reading of the printer's manuscript ("and will lay **down** the haughtiness of the terrible") rather than the King James *low*.

■ **2 Nephi 23:14**

*and it shall be as the chased roe
 and as a sheep that no man taketh up
 [1APS | and BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] they shall every man turn to his own people
 and flee every one into his own land*

□ **Isaiah 13:14** (King James Bible)

and it shall be as the chased roe
 and as a sheep that no man taketh up
 they shall every man turn to his own people
 and flee every one into his own land

The 1837 edition introduced the conjunction *and* before the clause "they shall every man turn to his own people". This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript; thus this addition of *and* may very well be a typo. There is no *and* in either the King James text or in the corresponding Hebrew text. In accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition removed this intrusive *and*, but it has continued in the LDS text.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 23:14 the original text without the *and* before the clause "they shall every man turn to his own people", the reading of the King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 23:15

*every one that is **proud** shall be thrust through
yea and every one that is joined **to the wicked** shall fall by the sword*

□ Isaiah 13:15 (King James Bible)

every one that is **found** shall be thrust through
and every one that is joined **unto them** shall fall by the sword

At first glance, it appears that the Book of Mormon's *proud* might simply be a visual misreading of the King James *found*. The original manuscript is not extant here, so this is a distinct possibility. However, the parallelism of the whole passage suggests that the original Book of Mormon text read *proud*. Note how the King James Isaiah text places no restriction on who will be slain ("every one that is **found** . . . every one that is joined **unto them**"), but the Book of Mormon text restricts it to evil people ("every one that is **proud** . . . every one that is joined **to the wicked**"). This parallelism strongly supports the Book of Mormon reading.

Alison Coutts also points out (personal communication) that a previous verse in this chapter supports the association of *proud* and *wicked* here in verse 15:

2 Nephi 23:11 (similarly for Isaiah 13:11)
and I will punish the world for evil
and the **wicked** for their iniquity
I will cause the arrogancy of the **proud** to cease
and will lay down the haughtiness of the terrible

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 23:15 the reading of the earliest textual source, *proud*; although visually similar to *found*, the word *proud* is most probably the intended reading because the phrase "to the wicked" replaces the italicized King James *unto them* in the following parallel clause.

■ 2 Nephi 23:17

*behold I will stir up the Medes against them
which shall not regard silver and gold
nor [they shall not 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | shall they RT] delight in it*

□ Isaiah 13:17 (King James Bible)

behold I will stir up the Medes against them
which shall not regard silver / and **as for** gold
they shall not delight in it

Here in 2 Nephi 23:17, the original Book of Mormon text varied from the King James text by omitting the italicized *as for* and inserting the negative conjunction *nor* before the clause "they shall not delight in it". This last difference created an awkward nonstandard construction as well as a double negative ("nor they shall not delight in it"). The RLDS text has retained the original Book of Mormon phraseology, while the 1920 LDS edition reconfigured the syntax, giving the standard inverted word order ("nor shall they delight in it"). The original Book of Mormon text

had only one case of *nor* preceding a clause for which the inverted word order showed up (that is, where the finite verb preceded the subject):

Mosiah 24:5

nevertheless they knew not God
 neither did the brethren of Amulon teach them
 any thing concerning the Lord their God
 neither the law of Moses
nor did they teach them the words of Abinadi

The current LDS text has one more case of the standard inverted word order after *nor*:

Mosiah 2:13 (1920 and 1981 editions)

nor even **have I** suffered
 that ye should commit any manner of wickedness

Originally the word order for this passage was different. In addition, there was a negative *not*. But instead of *nor*, the sentential conjunction was *or*:

Mosiah 2:13 (the reading in \mathcal{P} and all early editions; \mathcal{G} is not extant)

or even **I have not** suffered
 that ye should commit any manner of wickedness

This example is further complicated by having some preceding occurrences of *nor* and *or* (for further discussion, see Mosiah 2:13). The important point here is that this example originally had the noninverted word order (with the subject preceding the finite verb) followed by the negative *not*, just like originally in 2 Nephi 23:17.

Interestingly, the original text also had three examples where *nor* served to conjoin two subject noun phrases, which necessarily meant that the following verb phrase was forced to maintain the noninverted word order (that is, where the subject precedes the finite verb):

Omni 1:17

and Mosiah **nor the people of Mosiah could not** understand them

3 Nephi 1:25

yea the word came unto them that it must be fulfilled
 yea that one jot **nor tittle should not** pass away
 till it should all be fulfilled

3 Nephi 12:18

for verily I say unto you
 one jot **nor one tittle hath not** passed away from the law
 but in me it hath all been fulfilled

In each of these cases, the *nor*-conjunct is acting parenthetically and should perhaps be repunctuated using commas:

Omni 1:17	Mosiah, nor the people of Mosiah, could not understand them
3 Nephi 1:25	one jot, nor tittle, should not pass away
3 Nephi 12:18	one jot, nor one tittle, hath not passed away from the law

If we ignore the fact that these three clauses use the conjunction *nor* to conjoin a pair of subject conjuncts and start reading with the *nor*, all three of these have the same word order in the original text as does 2 Nephi 23:17:

2 Nephi 23:17	nor they shall not delight in it
Omni 1:17	nor the people of Mosiah could not understand them
3 Nephi 1:25	nor tittle should not pass away
3 Nephi 12:18	nor one tittle hath not passed away

In other words, each of these clauses contains the following sequence of words:

nor + noun phrase + helping verb + *not* + main verb

To be sure, the construction in all four cases is nonstandard in modern English. But since it is used this many times in the text, it appears to be intentional. For this reason, the critical text will retain the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 23:17, despite its awkwardness in modern English.

It should also be noted that the editing of the three passages with conjoined subjects involving *nor* has been uneven. In the first case, the *not* was deleted; in the second case, the *nor* was changed to *or*; but in the third case, there has been no change at all:

Omni 1:17 (editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)

and Mosiah **nor** the people of Mosiah could **not** understand them >
and Mosiah **nor** the people of Mosiah could understand them

3 Nephi 1:25 (editing for the 1920 LDS edition and the 1953 RLDS edition)

yea that one jot **nor** tittle should **not** pass away >
yea that one jot **or** tittle should **not** pass away

3 Nephi 12:18 (no editing in any edition)

one jot **nor** one tittle hath **not** passed away from the law

For further discussion, see NEGATION in volume 3.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the Book of Mormon reading removes the original parallelism of the Hebrew, which is followed very literally (and awkwardly) in the King James translation. In the original Hebrew, the words *silver* and *gold* are found in separate but parallel clauses. The *it* at the end of the second clause refers to *gold*. Consequently, a modern English translation such as the New International Version translates this parallelism as “who do not care for silver and have no delight in gold”. A very literalistic English translation might be “who for silver do not care / and for gold do not delight in it”. In Hebrew, the clause-final preposition translated as *in* is represented by the clitic *b-*, which cannot stand alone but must occur with some nominal or pronominal form. Here the suffixal *ō* (corresponding to *it* in English) must be added, which thereby refers the reader back to the preceding word *gold*. The King James translators chose to maintain the literal *in it*, and thus they inserted an italicized *as for* before the word *gold*. The Book of Mormon reading removes the *as for* and conjoins *gold* with the preceding *silver*. The rest of the second clause is then separated off by inserting *nor* in front of “they shall not delight in it”. However awkward, this alteration is clearly intended.

Summary: Restore the original reading in 2 Nephi 23:17 (“nor they shall not delight in it”); similar examples involving *nor* and conjoined subject noun phrases, despite their awkwardness, occur fairly frequently in the original text.

■ **2 Nephi 23:18**

their bows shall also dash the young men to pieces

□ **Isaiah 13:18** (King James Bible)

their bows also shall dash the young men to pieces

In the Book of Mormon text for 2 Nephi 23:18, the word *also* is placed after the auxiliary verb *shall*, which is the normal word order in English, while the King James Bible has the *also* before the *shall*. This difference in word order could be due to an early error in transmission. Even so, the critical text will retain the order of the earliest textual sources since that order does work and could therefore be intentional. For a similar example involving the position of *also*, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 21:13.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 23:18 the word order “shall also dash”, the reading of the earliest extant Book of Mormon text.

■ **2 Nephi 23:18**

their eyes shall not spare children

□ **Isaiah 13:18** (King James Bible)

their eye shall not spare children

As discussed under 2 Nephi 13:8–9, the Book of Mormon text prefers plurals when referring to the eyes, tongues, and hearts of people. Thus the text here in 2 Nephi 23:18 has *eyes* rather than the singular *eye* of the King James Bible. The original manuscript is not extant for this verse, but nearby verses are extant and are in the hand of Oliver Cowdery.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the plural *eyes* could be the result of mishearing *eye shall* as *eyes shall*—that is, the initial /š/ of *shall* would have made it difficult for Oliver to have heard the difference between /ai šæl/ and /aiz šæl/. Even so, the critical text will maintain the plural *eyes* because the other examples listed under 2 Nephi 13:8–9 show that the Book of Mormon often favors the plural when the King James Bible uses the singular, especially in reference to parts of the body.

Summary: Maintain the plural *eyes* in 2 Nephi 23:18 (“their eyes shall not spare children”), even though the plural here may be a mishearing on the part of Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for this part of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 23:21–22

*but wild beasts of the [desert 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | deserts N] shall lie there . . .
and the wild beasts of the [Islands 1 | islands ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | island HK]
shall cry in their desolate houses*

□ Isaiah 13:21–22 (King James Bible)

but wild beasts of the **desert** shall lie there . . .
and the wild beasts of the **islands** shall cry in their desolate houses

Here we have two cases where there has been a minor change in the number of a noun. In the first case, the singular *desert* was accidentally replaced by the plural *deserts* in the 1906 LDS large-print edition. In the second case, the plural *islands* was replaced by the singular *island* in the 1874 RLDS edition (and subsequently followed by the 1892 RLDS edition). Later editions have not followed these two typos. In both cases, the number in the original Book of Mormon text agrees with the King James reading.

It is interesting to note that in Isaiah 34:14 (which is not quoted in the Book of Mormon), both of these references to wild beasts are repeated:

Isaiah 34:14 (King James Bible)
the wild beasts of the **desert** shall also meet
with the wild beasts of the **island**

Although the singular *island* is found in Isaiah 34:14, it is very doubtful that the 1874 RLDS change from *islands* to *island* would have been based on that passage.

Summary: Maintain the singular *desert* in 2 Nephi 23:21 and the plural *islands* in 2 Nephi 23:22; in each case, the earliest Book of Mormon reading is the same as the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 23:22

*and her time is near to come
and her **day** shall not be prolonged*

□ Isaiah 13:22 (King James Bible)

and her time *is* near to come
and her **days** shall not be prolonged

Here the King James Bible has the plural *days*, while the Book of Mormon text has the singular *day*. The singular *her day* is consistent with *her time* in the previous line. Of course, the Book of Mormon reading could involve an error in the early transmission of the text (the original manuscript is not extant for this part of verse 22). The Hebrew original for Isaiah 13:22 has two indicators of plurality: the word for *her days* and the plural ending of the associated verb. So it seems less likely that the singular *day* is due to an error in the Hebrew.

If *day* is an error for *days* in 2 Nephi 23:22, it could have occurred as Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in \mathcal{C} , took down Joseph Smith's dictation. As David Calabro points out (personal

communication), it would have been difficult here for Oliver to have heard the difference between *day shall* and *days shall* since both *z* and *ʃ* are sibilants. In other words, Oliver could have readily misinterpreted /deiz šæl/ as /dei šæl/, especially since he might have expected the singular *her day*, given the preceding occurrence of the singular *her time*. For a similar example of the possibility of mishearing a sequence of sibilants, see the discussion under verse 18 of “eye(s) shall”.

Another possibility is that such an error could have occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . We have considerable evidence that in the manuscripts Oliver sometimes omitted the plural *s* for *days*:

- 1 Nephi 15:13 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
in the latter [*days* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *day* > *days* 1]
- Jacob 1:7 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
in the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of temptation
- Mosiah 18:7 (error in \mathcal{P} , corrected in the 1830 edition)
after many [*day* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
- Alma 36:16 (error in \mathcal{O} , corrected in \mathcal{P})
for three [*day* 0 | *days* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
- Helaman 13:2 (error in \mathcal{P} , corrected in the 1837 edition)
he did preach [*many day* 1 | *many-day* A | *many days* BCEFGHIJKLMNQRST |
manv days D]
- 3 Nephi 2:5 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
since the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of Mosiah

Thus the singular *day* in 2 Nephi 23:22 could be an early transmission error for *days*. (For two more examples that may involve an error of *day* for *days*, see Alma 50:23 and Helaman 8:16.)

Despite this manuscript evidence, the singular *day* will work in 2 Nephi 23:22. Thus the critical text will maintain the singular *day*, even though this reading could very well be due to an early transmission error.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 23:22 the singular *day*, the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript); the singular *her day* parallels the use of *her time* in the previous clause.

2 Nephi 24

■ 2 Nephi 24:1

and the [strangers 01ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST | stranger 0] shall be joined with them

□ Isaiah 14:1 (King James Bible)

and the **strangers** shall be joined with them

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition mistakenly set *stranger* instead of the plural *strangers* (the King James reading). This edition was not used as a copy-text for any subsequent LDS edition, and thus this typo was restricted to this edition.

Summary: Maintain the plural *strangers* in 2 Nephi 24:1, the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 24:3–4

and it shall come to pass

[*that the > that 0 | that >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*]

[*NULL > in that day 0 | in that day 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST*]

that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow and from thy fear

and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve

and it shall come to pass in that day

that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon

□ Isaiah 14:3–4 (King James Bible)

and it shall come to pass in **the** day

that the LORD shall give thee rest from thy sorrow and from thy fear

and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve

that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon

Here in 2 Nephi 24:3–4, the syntax text differs considerably from that of the King James text. In the King James Bible, the long clause in verse 3 that begins “that the Lord shall give thee rest” is a relative clause, with the result that the *that*-clause at the beginning of verse 4 of Isaiah 14 serves as the complement to the “come to pass” clause at the beginning of verse 3. Further, the King James reading has “in the day” rather than the Book of Mormon “in that day”. The King James interpretation is based on the reading of the Masoretic Hebrew text. A similar example of “in the day” being modified by a relative clause is found earlier in this long quotation from Isaiah 2–14:

2 Nephi 21:16 (Isaiah 11:16)

like as it was to Israel **in the day**
that he came up out of the land of Egypt

For 2 Nephi 24:3–4, on the other hand, the Book of Mormon text treats the long clause in verse 3 (the one that begins with “that the Lord shall give thee rest”) as a *that*-clause complementing the initial “come to pass” clause, which may explain why the intervening prepositional phrase is “in that day” rather than “in the day”. In other words, the *that* which follows “in that day” appears to be a subordinate conjunction, not a relative pronoun. The consequence is the *that*-clause beginning verse 4 is not the complement to the “come to pass” clause that begins verse 3. Instead, the Book of Mormon text inserts an additional “come to pass” clause at the beginning of verse 4:

2 Nephi 24:4

and it shall come to pass in that day
 that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon

This same basic interpretation of the Hebrew text is found in the Septuagint, the early Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. In the Greek, verse 3 begins with “and it shall come to pass in that day”, which is followed by the equivalent of a *that*-clause, while verse 4 is an independent clause that begins with the conjunction *and*:

Isaiah 14:3–4 (a literal translation of the Greek, in the King James style)

and it shall come to pass **in that** day
 the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow and vexation
 and thy hard servitude wherein thou didst serve them
and thou shalt take up this lamentation against the king of Babylon

For the Greek, see Alfred Rahlfs’ *Septuaginta*. The translation here is based on Lancelot C. L. Brenton’s *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1970 [1851]). For further discussion, see pages 56–57 of John A. Tvedtnes, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon” (FARMS preliminary report, 1984).

There is one textual problem here in 2 Nephi 24:3: the earliest extant text reads “and it shall come to pass **that** in **that** day **that** the Lord shall give thee rest” (that is, the subordinate conjunction *that* occurs both before and after “in that day”). The printer’s manuscript originally read this way. In the original manuscript, the word *pass* is apparently followed by *that* (although only the initial *t* of the *that* is extant). That initial *t* is definitely not crossed out. Theoretically, it is possible that the rest of the *that* was crossed out, but since the *that* was copied into the printer’s manuscript, the most reasonable assumption is that this *that* was not crossed out in \mathcal{O} . When we examine the space between extant fragments of \mathcal{O} , we also find that there is room for only about half of the words in the nonextant portion “in that day that the”. In my transcript of \mathcal{O} , I conjectured that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in \mathcal{O} , initially wrote “and it shall come to pass that the” — that is, he accidentally skipped “in that day” and started to write “and it shall come to pass that the Lord shall give thee rest”. The transcript in volume 1 of the critical text reads as follows:

2 Nephi 24:2–3 (lines 36–37 on page 78 of \mathcal{O})

()

IN THAT DAY

shall rule over their oppressers & it shall come to pass (t
HAT ^< > THAT THE

Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow & from th(y f
EAR & FROM THE HARD

If “in that day” was supralinearly inserted, there is room for an extra *the*, which I proposed was originally written in \mathcal{O} and then crossed out. If this analysis is correct, then the following question arises: Did Oliver neglect to cross out the extra *that*?

There are nine other occurrences of “come to pass” followed by “in that day”. Six of these are direct biblical quotes from Isaiah, and all have an italicized *that* after *day* in the King James Bible; for two of the Book of Mormon passages (each marked with an arrow), there is no *that* after *day*:

2 Nephi 17:18 (Isaiah 7:18)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
that the Lord shall hiss for the fly

2 Nephi 17:21 (Isaiah 7:21)

and it shall come to pass [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **in that day**
→ a man shall nourish a young cow

2 Nephi 17:23 (Isaiah 7:23)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
→ every place shall be where there were a thousand vines

2 Nephi 20:20 (Isaiah 10:20)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
that the remnant of Israel . . . shall no more again stay upon him

2 Nephi 20:27 (Isaiah 10:27)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
that his burden shall be taken away

2 Nephi 21:11 (Isaiah 11:11)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
that the Lord shall set his hand again

As noted above, there is a seventh occurrence inserted within the long Isaiah quotation:

2 Nephi 24:4 (Isaiah 14:4)

and it shall come to pass **in that day**
that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon

Isaiah 14:4 does not have the first line; here the *that* (which comes after *day* in the Book of Mormon text) is found in the King James Bible and is set in roman type, not italics.

Finally, there are two other occurrences of this usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (one of which is a biblical quote from Micah):

2 Nephi 28:3 (not a biblical quote)

for it shall come to pass **in that day**
that the churches which are built up . . .

3 Nephi 21:14 (compare with Micah 5:10)
 for it shall come to pass **in that day** saith the Father
that I will cut off thy horses out of the midst of thee
 and I will destroy thy chariots

Micah 5:10 has *and* instead of *for*, and *LORD* instead of *Father*; the *that* which comes after “saith the LORD” in the King James Bible is set in roman type rather than in italics.

In accord with the earliest readings, we therefore have the following summary of the usage in the Book of Mormon:

“and it shall come to pass **that** in that day”
 one time (in 2 Nephi 17:21)

“and it shall come to pass in that day”
 one time (in 2 Nephi 17:23)

“and it shall come to pass **that** in that day **that**”
 one time (in 2 Nephi 24:3)

“and it shall come to pass in that day **that**” (the King James pattern)
 seven times (listed above)

One example has omitted the italicized *that* of the corresponding King James reading (2 Nephi 17:23), and one other has moved the *that* to before the phrase “in that day” (2 Nephi 17:21). And 2 Nephi 24:3 has *that* both before and after “in that day”. Thus in two cases, the earliest text has a *that* before the phrase “in that day” (2 Nephi 17:21 and 2 Nephi 24:3). And for both these cases, the 1830 typesetter deleted the *that* from before the prepositional phrase “in that day”. In the first case, he simply omitted the *that* when he set the type. In the second case, he crossed out the *that* in the printer’s manuscript (found at the end of line 6 on page 79 of \mathcal{P}). The thick lines of his crossout are in heavy, dark ink, although not quite as heavy as his inked punctuation marks found on these pages of \mathcal{P} . It is possible that he crossed out the *that* in 2 Nephi 24:3 after consulting his King James Bible, which he used for other corrections on these pages of \mathcal{P} (see, for example, his supralinear insertion of “did excel” for 2 Nephi 20:10 in line 2 on page 76 of \mathcal{P}).

As discussed under 2 Nephi 17:21, the critical text will accept the variant phraseology regarding the *that* for that passage. The question here in 2 Nephi 24:3 is whether the original text had *that* both before and after “in that day”; in other words, is the earliest extant text (the original reading in \mathcal{P} and the proposed corrected reading in \mathcal{C}) the original text? We note that none of the other nine examples have *that* both before and after “in that day”. Furthermore, the lack of spacing between the extant portions of \mathcal{C} shows that Oliver Cowdery had some difficulty as he wrote down the text for the beginning of 2 Nephi 24:3. He made some mistake, which he corrected but perhaps only partially. All of this suggests that the earliest extant reading in 2 Nephi 24:3 involved some error and that the 1830 typesetter may have been correct in his decision to eliminate the extra *that* here in 2 Nephi 24:3.

Despite these arguments, there are other examples in the original Book of Mormon text of the subordinate conjunction *that* both before and after a simple prepositional phrase:

Alma 12:22 (☉ is not extant)
 and thus we see
that by his fall
 [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 all mankind became a lost and a fallen people

Helaman 6:15 (☉ not extant)
 and it came to pass **that** in the same year
that his son which had been appointed by the people in his stead
 was also murdered

These examples argue that for 2 Nephi 24:3 the earliest reading in ☐ (as well as the proposed corrected reading in ☉) is possible. For this reason, the critical text will accept that earliest reading, but with the understanding that the extra *that* before “in that day” may be a mistake. For another possible case of *that* occurring both before and after a simple prepositional phrase, see Ether 15:17. For other examples involving the repeated subordinate conjunction *that*, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 1:17 as well as under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 24:3 the earliest textual reading (the original reading in ☐ and the proposed corrected reading in ☉): “and it shall come to pass **that** in that day **that** the Lord shall give thee rest”; the use of the demonstrative *that* in the prepositional phrase “in that day” appears to be intended, given the syntactic interpretation for the larger passage (2 Nephi 24:3–4).

■ 2 Nephi 24:3

*the Lord shall give thee rest
 from thy [sorrow 0ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST | sorrows >% sorrow 1]
 and from thy fear and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve*

□ Isaiah 14:3 (King James Bible)

the LORD shall give thee rest from thy **sorrow**
 and from thy fear and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve

As Oliver Cowdery was copying from ☉ into ☐, he initially wrote the plural *sorrows*, but then he immediately corrected his error by erasing the plural *s*, thus giving *sorrow* (the King James reading). He was probably expecting a plural noun after the phrase “rest from”, as in Revelation 14:13 (“that they may rest from their **labors**”) and in these two examples elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 34:41
 with a firm hope that ye shall one day rest from all your **afflictions**

Alma 40:12
 a state of peace where they shall rest from all their **troubles**
 and from all care and sorrow etc.

Note in the last example that the text once more has the singular *sorrow* (as well as *care*) but in this case after a preceding plural, *troubles*.

Summary: Maintain the singular *sorrow* in 2 Nephi 24:3, the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 24:5

*the Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked
the **scepters** of the rulers*

□ Isaiah 14:5 (King James Bible)

the LORD hath broken the staff of the wicked
and the **scepter** of the rulers

Here the King James Bible and the Hebrew original provide a close parallelism between “staff of the wicked” and “scepter of the rulers”. In the Hebrew, both *wicked* and *rulers* are plural, but *staff* and *scepter* are both singular. The Book of Mormon *scepters* could be an error, given Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to add and delete plural *s*’s. We do not have the original manuscript here.

On the other hand, there is an apparent motivation for the change to *scepters*: each ruler would have his own scepter, which implies *scepters* for plural *rulers*. But *staff* can remain singular since it is possible to interpret the English *wicked* as “wicked one”, a singular. Or, one could reason, it is not as necessary for every wicked person to have a staff as for every king to have a scepter. Since this interpretational difference is possible, the critical text will retain the plural *scepters* in 2 Nephi 24:5.

We also note that the italicized *and* of the King James text is omitted in the Book of Mormon text. Without the *and*, the text does not read as naturally, but it is nonetheless possible (note also that the original Hebrew is missing the *and*). The critical text will accept this minor difference as well.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:5 the reading of the earliest extant source—that is, the plural *scepters* and the lack of the italicized King James *and*.

■ 2 Nephi 24:6

*he that [ruled 1ABCDGHKPRST | ruleth EFIJLMNOQ] the nations in anger is persecuted
and none hindereth*

□ Isaiah 14:6 (King James Bible)

he that **ruled** the nations in anger is persecuted
and none hindereth

The 1849 LDS edition replaced the past-tense *ruled* with the present-tense *ruleth*, probably in anticipation of the present-tense *hindereth* in the following clause. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *ruled*, which is also the King James reading.

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *ruled* in 2 Nephi 24:6, the earliest extant reading as well as the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 24:10

[*are* > *art* 1 | *Art* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou become like unto us*

□ Isaiah 14:10 (King James Bible)

art thou become like unto us

■ 2 Nephi 24:12

how [*art* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *are* J] *thou fallen from heaven*

□ Isaiah 14:12 (King James Bible)

how **art** thou fallen from heaven

These two examples show the tendency in the Book of Mormon text to replace the archaic *art* with *are*. In the first example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *are*, but then virtually immediately he corrected it to *art* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). In the second example, the typesetter for the 1888 LDS edition accidentally set *are*. Such accidental errors are readily corrected and generally do not persist in the history of the text.

Also in this chapter we have a couple of examples of the archaic *hast* being momentarily replaced by *has*:

2 Nephi 24:13 (typo in the 1906 LDS edition)

for thou [*hast* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *has* N] said in thy heart
I will ascend into heaven

2 Nephi 24:20 (typo in the 1888 LDS edition)

because thou [*hast* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *has* J] destroyed thy land

Summary: There is a tendency in the text for the archaic verb forms associated with *thou* to be replaced by the more general verb forms (*art* by *are* and *hast* by *has*); the critical text will retain the original archaic forms, providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ 2 Nephi 24:12

how art thou fallen from heaven
O Lucifer son of the morning
art thou cut down to the ground
*which **did** weaken the nations*

□ Isaiah 14:12 (King James Bible)

how art thou fallen from heaven
O Lucifer son of the morning
how art thou cut down to the ground
which **didst** weaken the nations

Here the Book of Mormon text has *did* rather than the *didst* of the King James Bible. The Hebrew underlying the King James text uses a participial phrase to express “which did(st) weaken the nations”, with the meaning ‘the one weakening the nations’. In older English, the inflectional

form of the verb in a relative clause was made to agree with the antecedent of the relative pronoun, thus “**thou . . . which **didst** weaken the nations**”. In modern English, the tendency is to favor interpreting the relative pronoun as a third person form, thus “**which **did** weaken the nations**”. We can see how this tendency could arise by noting the many more examples of a relative pronoun being followed by *did* rather than *didst*. Excluding this example in 2 Nephi 24:12, we get the following statistics for the original text of the Book of Mormon:

which did	42
who did	19
that did	14
which didst	0
who didst	0
that didst	2

The two examples involving *didst* are found in a later Isaiah quote:

3 Nephi 22:1 (Isaiah 54:1)
 sing O barren
thou that **didst not bear**
 break forth into singing and cry aloud
thou that **didst not travail with child**

Notice here that *thou*, the antecedent for the relative pronoun *that*, comes immediately before; thus there would have been less of a tendency to change the text to “**thou that **did** not bear . . . thou that **did** not travail**”. In 2 Nephi 24:12, on the other hand, the antecedent *thou* does not immediately precede the relative pronoun; instead, the immediately preceding noun is *ground*, which may have been the reason that *didst* was replaced by *did*, perhaps even accidentally in the earliest transmission of text. In other words, there appears to be a proximity effect at work here in 2 Nephi 24:12. The critical text will maintain the use of *did* since it is not particularly offensive (note that no edition has ever restored the King James *didst* in this passage). Nonetheless, it is quite possible that the occurrence of *did* is an early transmission error in the text.

There are a number of examples of *thou* in the earliest Book of Mormon text for which the verb is lacking the *-est* ending:

1 Nephi 14:8 **remember thou** the covenants of the Father
 Mosiah 26:11 that **thou may** judge them according to their crimes
 Alma 8:15 from the time which **thou received** thy first message from him
 Alma 11:25 when **thou had** it in thy heart to retain them from me
 Ether 12:31 for thus **did thou** manifest thyself unto thy disciples

These examples provide additional support for the Book of Mormon reading “**thou . . . which **did** weaken the nations**” in 2 Nephi 24:12. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 14:8.

Summary: Retain *did* in 2 Nephi 24:12 (the earliest extant reading), even though it may be an error for *didst*.

■ 2 Nephi 24:13

*for thou hast said in **thy** heart*

□ Isaiah 14:13 (King James Bible)

for thou hast said in **thine** heart

In Early Modern English, *h*-initial words were often pronounced as vowel-initial (in other words, the *h* was silent). As a consequence, *an*, *mine* and *thine* occurred with such words (instead of *a*, *my*, and *thy*), providing the *h* was silent. We have already noted the use of *an* in the King James text for Isaiah 2–14, while in the corresponding Book of Mormon quotation, *a* replaces *an* in such cases (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:7).

Yet when we consider *my* and *thy* for Isaiah 2–14, we find that in nearly all cases of *h*-initial words, the Isaiah of the King James Bible has *my* and *thy* rather than *mine* and *thine*:

Isaiah 3:6	thy hand
Isaiah 3:7	my house
Isaiah 10:10	my hand
Isaiah 10:13	my hand
Isaiah 10:14	my hand
Isaiah 11:9	my holy mountain
Isaiah 13:3	my highness

For all of these examples, the corresponding Book of Mormon usage is identical to the King James usage (that is, *my* and *thy* before these *h*-initial words). The only exception in Isaiah 2–14 of the King James Bible is *thine heart* in Isaiah 14:13, which corresponds with *thy heart* in 2 Nephi 24:13. Thus the Book of Mormon's *thy heart* is more consistent with respect to other *h*-initial words in this long Isaiah passage. (For further discussion of this issue, see under POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.)

Summary: Maintain the more consistent use of *thy* before the *h*-initial *heart* in 2 Nephi 24:13.

■ 2 Nephi 24:18

*all the kings of the [nations 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | nation HK]
yea all of them lie in glory
every one of them in his own house*

□ Isaiah 14:18 (King James Bible)

all the kings of the **nations**
even all of them lie in glory
every one in his own house

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the plural *nations* (the King James reading) with the singular *nation*. The error was followed by the subsequent RLDS edition (1892), but the 1908 RLDS edition corrected this typo. The previous verse (2 Nephi 24:17) refers to the entire world

and its cities; thus the reference to the “all the kings of the nations” is appropriate. The Hebrew original also has the plural *nations*.

Summary: Maintain the plural *nations* in 2 Nephi 24:18, which is also the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 24:19

*but thou art cast out of thy grave
like an abominable branch
and the **remnant** of those that are slain
thrust through with a sword
that go down to the stones of the pit
as a carcass trodden under feet*

□ Isaiah 14:19 (King James Bible)

but thou art cast out of thy grave
like an abominable branch
and as the **raiment** of those that are slain
thrust through with a sword
that go down to the stones of the pit
as a carcass trodden under feet

The Book of Mormon reading *remnant* does not work very well in this context, which refers to the dead, not those left alive. The phrase “the remnant of those that are slain” basically means nobody. The actual Hebrew word translated as *raiment* refers to being clothed, so that the phrase could have been more literally translated as “clothed like the slain”.

The English word *raiment* occurs only three (other) times in the Book of Mormon text (in Mosiah 4:19 and twice in the Sermon on the Mount quoted in 3 Nephi 13:25, 28). But in the Isaiah passages, *remnant* occurs fairly frequently. For instance, elsewhere in the Book of Mormon quotation of Isaiah 2–14, *remnant* occurs eight times (including six times nearby in 2 Nephi 20–21). Thus it is very plausible that *remnant* here in 2 Nephi 24:19 is an error for *raiment*, primed by the preceding occurrences of *remnant* in 2 Nephi 20–21. The original manuscript is not extant for 2 Nephi 24:19, but it could have read *raiment*. Another possibility is that the mistake could have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in ☉. The two words *raiment* and *remnant* are both visually and phonetically similar.

This emendation was first explicitly suggested by Stan Larson; see pages 565–566 of his article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 18 (1978): 563–569.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 24:19 by replacing *remnant* with the King James Bible *raiment*; the word *remnant* (although frequent in the book of Isaiah) makes no sense in this context, but it is both phonetically and visually similar to *raiment*.

■ 2 Nephi 24:20

the seed of evildoers

shall never be [renowned 1 | renowned ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | removed s]

□ Isaiah 14:20

the seed of evildoers shall never be **renowned**

Here the 1953 RLDS edition introduced a typo, replacing *renowned* (the King James reading) with the visually similar (but wholly inappropriate) *removed*. Possibly *removed* is the result of the repeated occurrence of the verb *remove* earlier in this long quotation: 2 Nephi 16:12, 2 Nephi 20:31, and 2 Nephi 23:13. To say that the Lord will never remove the seed of evildoers is clearly inappropriate.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:20 the original *renowned*, the King James reading.

■ 2 Nephi 24:21

prepare slaughter for his children

*for the **iniquities** of their fathers*

□ Isaiah 14:21 (King James Bible)

prepare slaughter for his children

for the **iniquity** of their fathers

The King James Bible has the singular *iniquity*, the Book of Mormon the plural *iniquities*. It is possible that the Book of Mormon reading could be due to a copying error. There is considerable evidence that the Book of Mormon scribes frequently mixed up *iniquity* and *iniquities*, as in the following examples of where the scribe initially wrote the wrong one, then corrected it:

2 Nephi 4:17 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})

my soul grieveth because of

mine [*iniquity* >+ *iniquities* 1 | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 15:9 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})

having broken the bands of death

and taken upon himself

their [*iniquities* >% *iniquity* 1 | *iniquity* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and their transgressions

Mosiah 29:30 (Hyrum Smith's initial error in \mathcal{P})

if these people commit sins

and [*iniquity* >% *iniquities* 1 | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 39:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P} of *iniquity* for *your iniquities*)

that ye refrain from

[*iniquity* > *your iniquities* 1 | *your iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 2:10 (Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} 's initial error)
 the Nephites began to repent of
 their [*iniquities* >% *iniquity* 1 | *iniquity* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

For one additional example (where it is difficult to determine whether the error occurred in \mathcal{P} or in the 1830 edition), see Mormon 8:36.

Of particular relevance for 2 Nephi 24:21 is Mosiah 14, where Isaiah 53 is quoted. There the King James Bible's singulars *iniquity*, *transgression*, and *sin* all read as plurals in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 14:6 (Isaiah 53:6 reads *iniquity*)
 and the Lord hath laid on him the **iniquities** of us all

Mosiah 14:8 (Isaiah 53:8 reads *transgression*)
 for the **transgressions** of my people was he stricken

Mosiah 14:12 (Isaiah 53:12 reads *sin*)
 and he bare the **sins** of many

The consistency of the plural usage in this other biblical quotation strongly supports the use of the plural *iniquities* in 2 Nephi 24:21.

Summary: Maintain the plural *iniquities* in 2 Nephi 24:21, the reading of the earliest textual source; the consistent plural usage in Mosiah 14 (which quotes Isaiah 53) shows that the replacement of singulars by plurals for words dealing with sin is most likely intentional, at least in biblical quotes.

■ 2 Nephi 24:22

for I will [raise >+ rise 1 | rise ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up against them

□ Isaiah 14:22 (King James Bible)

for I will **rise** up against them

As discussed under 2 Nephi 3:24, the Book of Mormon text frequently uses *raise* where standard English has *rise*. This tendency shows up here in 2 Nephi 24:22 when Oliver Cowdery, while copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , first wrote *raise*, then somewhat later corrected it to *rise*, probably when he checked his text against the original manuscript (his correction is written with slightly heavier ink flow). The original manuscript is not extant here, but it probably read *rise*, the reading of the King James Bible. For a complete discussion regarding *raise* versus *rise*, see RAISE in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 24:22 Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{P} of *raise* to *rise*; the intransitive *rise* is the King James reading as well as the probable reading in \mathcal{C} .

■ 2 Nephi 24:23

and I will sweep it
with the [*bosom* 0 | *bosom* >jg *besom* 1 | *besom* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of destruction

□ Isaiah 14:23 (King James Bible)

and I will sweep it
with the **besom** of destruction

The word *besom*, meaning ‘broom’, was obviously unknown to Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here. It is quite probable that Joseph Smith himself did not know the word. The Oxford English Dictionary explains that *besom* retains the general meaning of ‘broom’ only in Scottish dialects and that in literary English *broom* has now taken the place of *besom*. Since Oliver did not know the word, he wrote it as *bosom* in both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} (and perhaps Joseph himself misread *besom* as *bosom*). The 1830 compositor undoubtedly noticed that *bosom* just couldn’t be right and therefore decided to consult his King James Bible to see how it read. In the printer’s manuscript, he corrected *bosom* to *besom* by overwriting the first *o* of *bosom* with an *e*. The correction is in the same heavy, dark ink that he used to make the punctuation marks on these pages of \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:23 the obsolete word *besom* (the King James reading), which Oliver Cowdery (and perhaps Joseph Smith) mistook as *bosom*.

■ 2 Nephi 24:25

that I will [*break* 0 | *bring* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the Assyrian
in my [*land* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *hand* > *land* 1]
and upon my mountains tread him under foot

□ Isaiah 14:25 (King James Bible)

that I will **break** the Assyrian in my **land**
and upon my mountains tread him under foot

The original manuscript apparently read the same as did the King James text. We have a fragment from the Wilford Wood collection which reads *brea* at the end of a line, with the *a* only partially visible. (Apparently, the next line began with *-k*, but that part is not extant.) The *e* of *brea* is quite clear and the partially visible *a* is definitely not an *n*. In his copying, Oliver Cowdery sometimes misread a word at the end of the line, as in this case. The parallelism in the Isaiah text supports the reading *break*, with both lines repeating the same idea (namely, that the Assyrian armies will be thoroughly defeated in the land of Israel).

This example clearly shows how the copying process from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} introduced visually similar variants into the Book of Mormon text. In this particular instance, *bring* will work, even though it does upset the parallelism of the original text. But given the larger context, *break* is clearly correct, and indeed \mathcal{O} reads as such.

We also see that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in my hand” in \mathcal{P} . Having misread *break* as *bring*, he was therefore inclined to read *hand* rather than *land*, especially given the fairly frequent occurrence of the expression “to bring by the hand of the Lord”:

2 Nephi 1:6	save they should be brought by the hand of the Lord
2 Nephi 3:15	which the Lord shall bring forth by his hand
Omni 1:16	and was brought by the hand of the Lord across the great waters
Alma 9:9	our father Lehi was brought out of Jerusalem by the hand of God

Summary: Restore the word *break* in 2 Nephi 24:25, which is the reading of the original manuscript as well as the King James Bible.

■ **2 Nephi 24:26**

*and this is the hand
that [is 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | it s] stretched out upon all nations*

□ **Isaiah 14:26** (King James Bible)

and this *is* the hand
that **is** stretched out upon all the nations

The 1953 RLDS edition introduced a simple typo here in this verse, replacing *is* with *it*. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *is* of the earliest extant text, which is also the reading in the King James Bible. Note, by the way, that this *is* is not italicized in the King James Bible, nor is it deleted in the Book of Mormon. For discussion of the phrase “is stretched out”, see under 2 Nephi 19:17.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:26 the *is* in the relative clause “that is stretched out upon all nations”.

■ **2 Nephi 24:26**

*and this is the hand
that is stretched out upon all nations*

□ **Isaiah 14:26** (King James Bible)

and this *is* the hand
that is stretched out upon all **the** nations

Here the original manuscript is extant for the phrase “upon all nations”, and the King James *the* is definitely missing before *nations*. The original Hebrew has the definite article in front of *nations*. It is, of course, possible that the *the* was lost as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

Both “all nations” and “all the nations” occur fairly frequently in the King James version of the entire book of Isaiah (6 times without the *the*, 7 times with the *the*). In the earliest text of the Book of Mormon, we have 28 occurrences of “all nations” and 17 of “all the nations”. When we consider the prepositional phrase “upon all (the) nations”, we find that we get “upon all nations” whenever there is no postmodification, but “upon all **the** nations” when there is:

□ *no postmodification:*

2 Nephi 12:12

for the day of the Lord of Hosts soon cometh **upon all nations**
yea upon every one

2 Nephi 24:26–27

and this is the hand that is stretched out **upon all nations**
for the Lord of Hosts hath purposed . . .

2 Nephi 25:3

that they come **upon all nations**
according to the word which he hath spoken

□ *postmodification:*

2 Nephi 12:14

and **upon all the nations** which are lifted up

2 Nephi 29:7

yea even **upon all the nations** of the earth

3 Nephi 20:20

yea even **upon all the nations** of the Gentiles

It should also be noted that “upon all the nations” in Isaiah 14:26 is exceptional, even for the King James Bible. In two other cases, the King James Bible has “upon all nations” with no postmodification, including one in Isaiah:

1 Chronicles 14:17

and the LORD brought the fear of him **upon all nations**

Isaiah 34:2

for the indignation of the LORD *is* **upon all nations**

In fact, the Hebrew for “upon all (the) nations” in these two passages is identical to that of Isaiah 14:26; that is, the definite article is there, yet the King James translators correctly ignored the *the* in their English translation for these two cases lacking postmodification. Thus the Book of Mormon’s lack of the *the* for Isaiah 14:26 is actually consistent with how this prepositional phrase was translated in the rest of the King James Bible—namely, without the definite article *the*. The critical text will therefore maintain the reading of the original manuscript, without the *the* in the prepositional phrase “upon all nations”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:26 “upon all nations”, the reading of the original manuscript; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text as well as the King James Bible supports omitting the definite article *the* in this prepositional phrase since there is no postmodification.

■ 2 Nephi 24:27

*for the Lord of Hosts hath purposed
and who shall disannul
and his hand stretched out*

□ Isaiah 14:27 (King James Bible)

for the LORD of Hosts hath purposed
and who shall disannul *it*
and his hand *is* stretched out

Here in 2 Nephi 24:27, the original manuscript is not extant for the text “who shall disannul & his”, but spacing between the extant fragments provides enough room for an *it* after *disannul*. The printer’s manuscript does not have the *it*. If the *it* did appear in \mathcal{O} , it is possible that it was crossed out. Obviously, other corrections could have occurred in this missing portion, so we really have no strong evidence that the *it* was ever there in \mathcal{O} , even initially.

In the King James Bible, the *it* is in italics, which would support its deletion in the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere in this long Isaiah quotation covering 2 Nephi 12–24, there are a number of examples where an *it* in the King James text has been omitted in the original Book of Mormon text. In the following list, the King James *it* is supplied in square brackets (of which the first three are in italics in the King James Bible, but the last two are not):

2 Nephi 15:29	and shall carry [<i>it</i>] away safe
2 Nephi 15:29	and none shall deliver [<i>it</i>]
2 Nephi 16:7	and he laid [<i>it</i>] upon my mouth
2 Nephi 17:11	ask [it] either in the depths or in the heights above
2 Nephi 20:17	and [it] shall burn and shall devour his thorns and his briars

For 2 Nephi 24:27, the critical text will follow the earliest extant source, namely, the printer’s manuscript and its reading without the King James *it* after *disannul*. The persistent tendency in the Book of Mormon text of omitting *it* from King James quotations supports this decision.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 24:27 the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript) where the italicized King James *it* was omitted after the word *disannul*; such a difference is consistent with other examples of *it* being omitted from the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 24:27

*and his hand [stretched 01 | stretched ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | is stretched RT] out
and who shall turn it back*

□ Isaiah 14:27 (King James Bible)

and his hand **is stretched** out
and who shall turn it back

As discussed under 2 Nephi 19:17, the *is* here in 2 Nephi 24:27 (italicized in the King James Bible and added to the standard LDS text in the 1920 edition) will be removed in the critical text.

■ 2 Nephi 24:32

what shall then answer the messengers of the nations

□ Isaiah 14:32 (King James Bible)

what shall *one* then answer the messengers of the nation

When compared with the King James text, 2 Nephi 24:32 shows two differences. The first has to do with the grammatical subject of this clause. In the Book of Mormon text, the subject is “the messengers of the nations”; in the King James text, the subject is the italicized *one*, which means that the King James translators interpreted the Hebrew as having no explicit subject. The Hebrew verb is in the singular; since *messengers* is in the plural, one possibility (adopted in the King James translation) is to interpret the subject as missing and consider *messengers* as the object of the verb. Another possibility is to take “the messengers of the nation(s)” as the grammatical subject, which is what we find in the Greek Septuagint; there this clause was translated as “and what answered the kings of the nations”. The variation between the words *kings* and *messengers* is the result of the similarity in the Hebrew of *mlk* ‘king’ and *ml’k* ‘messenger’. (The vowels are omitted here since the original Hebrew text would have been written without vowels.) In any event, the Greek translators took the plural construct form *mlky/ml’ky* as the grammatical subject, as does the Book of Mormon text. For further discussion, see page 60 in John A. Tvedtnes, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon” (FARMS preliminary report, 1984).

The second difference here in 2 Nephi 24:32 has to do with the Book of Mormon’s plural form *nations* rather than the singular *nation* of the King James Bible and the Hebrew. Interestingly, ancient translations of the Hebrew have *nations* (the Greek, the Syriac, and Aramaic Targums). As mentioned above, the Greek refers to *kings* rather than *messengers*. Perhaps the reason in the Greek for the plural *nations* is because in Isaiah 14 there are two earlier references to “all the kings of the nations” (in verses 9 and 18). Given the plural *kings*, the plural *nations* is to be expected on semantic grounds. It should also be noted that for Isaiah 14:32 the Great Isaiah Scroll found at Qumran (1QIsa^a) also has *kings* instead of *messengers*, but it maintains the singular *nation* (that is, it reads “the kings of the nation”). This reading suggests that the original Hebrew text read “the messengers of the nation” (the Masoretic reading). The only other reference in the book of Isaiah to “messenger(s)” and “nation(s)” is in Isaiah 18:2 (which is not quoted in the Book of Mormon); this verse mentions “swift messengers to a nation scattered and peeled” (the King James reading), with definite reference to a single nation.

Summary: Follow the Book of Mormon text with its use of the noun phrase “the messengers of the nations” as the subject of the clause; the Book of Mormon reading is reflected in the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew.

2 Nephi 25

■ 2 Nephi 25:1–2

*for behold Isaiah spake many things
which were hard for many of my people to understand
for they [know 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | knew N] not
concerning the manner of prophesying among the Jews
for I Nephi have not taught them many things
concerning the manner of the Jews*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced the present-tense *know* with the past-tense *knew*, probably because the preceding relative clause is in the past tense (“which **were** hard for many of my people to understand”). This change, however, has never been implemented in any subsequent LDS edition, probably because the 1906 edition has never served as a copy-text.

Here in 2 Nephi 25:1–2 the present-tense *know* agrees with the present-tense perfect *have* in the following *for*-clause (which begins verse 2). In other words, both *for*-clauses agree in having the present tense. One could therefore propose that the original text had *are* instead of *were* in the earlier relative clause and that under the influence of the preceding past-tense *spake*, the past-tense *were* was accidentally introduced. This would mean that the original text could have read “for behold Isaiah **spake** many things which **are** hard for many of my people to understand”.

Nonetheless, tense shifting within a passage does occur elsewhere in the original text, as in the following two examples (both of which refer to the Jews back at Jerusalem):

1 Nephi 17:22

and we know that
the people which **were** in the land of Jerusalem **were** a righteous people
for they [*keep* 01 | *kept* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the statutes and the judgments of the Lord
and all his commandments according to the law of Moses
wherefore we know that they **are** a righteous people

Jacob 4:14

- (1) but behold the Jews **were** a stiff-necked people
and they **despised** the words of plainness and **killed** the prophets
and **sought** for things that they **could** not understand
wherefore because of their blindness
which blindness **came** by looking beyond the mark

- (2) they **must** needs fall
for God **hath** taken away his plainness from them
and delivered unto them many things which they **cannot** understand
- (3) because they **desired** it
and because they **desired** it
- (4) God **hath** done it that they **may** stumble

Both passages shift their time references, the first one only once, but the second one several times. In the second one, we get the simple past tense (beginning at 1 and 3) and the present-tense perfect (in 2 and in 4) as well as four modal verbs of which one refers to past time (*could* in 1), two to present time (*must* and *can* in 2), and one to future time (*may* in 4). Note, in particular, the use of the past-tense modal *could* early in the verse (“things that they **could** not understand”), but then the use of the corresponding present-tense modal *can* later in the verse (“things which they **cannot** understand”).

These examples show that the tense shifting in 2 Nephi 25:1 is possible. The relative clause can have the past-tense *were* followed by the present-tense *know* in the next clause. The critical text will therefore retain the tenses of the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript, in 2 Nephi 25:1.

Summary: Maintain the tense shifting in 2 Nephi 25:1, where a past-tense *were* is followed by a present-tense *know*.

■ 2 Nephi 25:2

*for their works were works of darkness
and their doings were doings of [abomination 1PS | abominations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]*

Here it appears that the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the singular *abomination* with the plural. Although the plural *abominations* is considerably more frequent in the Book of Mormon text, there are specific cases of singular usage that contextually do not permit the plural usage:

Jacob 2:16

O that he would rid you from **this** iniquity and abomination

Alma 39:5

these things are **an** abomination in the sight of the Lord

Helaman 7:25

yea woe be unto you
because of **that** great abomination which hath come among you
and ye have united yourselves unto **it**

Moroni 9:9

and notwithstanding **this** great abomination of the Lamanites
it doth not exceed **that** of our people in Moriantum

Note, in particular, the pronominal use of the singular *it* in the last two examples.

There are no other examples of *doing(s)* occurring with *abomination(s)*, so a comparison with another example of this specific construction “doing(s) of abomination(s)” is not possible. The critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest textual source here in 2 Nephi 25:2.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 25:2 the singular *abomination*, the reading in the printer’s manuscript (“doings of abomination”); the singular is clearly possible in this context.

■ 2 Nephi 25:4

and give ear [to >+ unto 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my words

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *to* in the printer’s manuscript, but later he changed the *to* to *unto* by supralinearly inserting the *un* and adding an insert mark (all in considerably heavier and darker ink). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, “give ear” can be followed by either *to* or *unto*:

2 Nephi 4:3	I would that ye should give ear unto my words
2 Nephi 8:4	and give ear unto me
2 Nephi 9:40	give ear to my words
Alma 36:1	give ear to my words
Alma 38:1	give ear to my words
Helaman 12:5	and to give ear unto his counsels

None of these other examples show any variation between *unto* and *to*. Theoretically, either preposition is possible in 2 Nephi 25:4. In modern English, *to* is the expected form, so Oliver’s initial *to* in \mathcal{P} was probably an error based on his expectations. His later correction in heavier and darker ink was probably made when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 25:4 the preposition *unto*, the corrected reading in the printer’s manuscript and the probable reading of the original manuscript (“give ear unto my words”).

■ 2 Nephi 25:5

yea [& 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | GHK] my soul delighteth in the words of Isaiah

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the *and* here in “yea and my soul delighteth”. The first two RLDS editions (1874 and 1892) followed this reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and* (probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript). A similar example of this usage is found in Alma 36:22: “yea **and** my soul did long to be there”. There is nothing inappropriate about the original usage here in 2 Nephi 25:5.

The loss of *and* after *yea* has been fairly frequent in the history of the text, as exemplified by the following instances:

2 Nephi 9:5 (loss of <i>and</i> in the 1837 edition)
yea [& 1 and A BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I know that ye know that in the body he shall shew himself unto they at Jerusalem

Jacob 2:6 (loss of *and* in the 1830 edition)

yea [& 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it grieveth my soul
and causeth me to shrink with shame
before the presence of my Maker

Alma 8:29 (loss of *and* in the 1874 RLDS edition)

yea [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] I will not turn
my fierce anger away

Alma 36:22 (loss of *and* in the 1837 edition)

yea [& 01 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] methought I saw
even as our father Lehi saw
God sitting upon his throne

4 Nephi 1:6 (loss of *and* in the 1874 RLDS edition)

yea [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] even until fifty and nine years
had passed away

For additional discussion of the frequent use of “yea and” in the text, see 2 Nephi 9:5.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:5 the *and* in “yea and my soul delighteth”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 2 Nephi 25:5

*and I know that the Jews do understand the things of the prophets
and there is none other people
that understand the things
[of the Prophets > which were 1 | which were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] spoken unto the Jews
like unto them*

Here Oliver Cowdery made a scribal error in \mathcal{D} that he immediately caught and corrected. Earlier in this passage the text read “understand the things of the prophets”, so when Oliver came to the same “understand the things” a little further on in the verse, he followed the earlier phraseology by initially writing “understand the things of the prophets”. He then crossed out “the prophets”, supralinearly inserted “which were” (with no change in the level of ink flow), and continued writing the rest of the relative clause. Although the original manuscript is not extant here, Oliver’s corrected reading was undoubtedly the reading of the original text.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:5 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} (“that understand the things **which were spoken** unto the Jews”).

■ 2 Nephi 25:6

*and I have made mention unto my children
concerning the judgments of God which hath come to pass among the Jews
unto my children
according to all that which Isaiah hath spoken*

Here the same phrase “unto my children” occurs twice within the same sentence. The original manuscript is extant here and contains both occurrences of “unto my children”. Dittographies in the text typically involve adjacent repetitions of words and phrases; thus this instance seems unusual. If the repetition here is an error, perhaps the error was found on the small plates of Nephi.

Another possibility is that the first “unto my children” is an error resulting from Oliver Cowdery falling behind as Joseph Smith dictated this sentence, especially if he dictated too much at a time. As Oliver finished writing down “and I have made mention”, he could have heard Joseph dictating the only occurrence of “unto my children” in the sentence—namely, the one that came after the long intervening phrase “concerning the judgments of God which hath come to pass among the Jews”. Thus Oliver could have ended up writing down “unto my children” twice; he should have deleted his first “unto my children”, but he didn’t. In other words, the original text was probably a difficult reading, with “unto my children” coming only after the long intervening phrase. Similar examples of a postponed prepositional phrase can be found elsewhere in the text, as in “for **Christ will shew** unto you with power and great glory that they are his words **at the last day**” (2 Nephi 33:11) and “**he made** the remainder of this record viewing the destructions which came upon the people **by night**” (Ether 13:14).

One clear example of this kind of anticipatory error occurred elsewhere in *ℳ*, although in this instance Oliver caught his dittography and crossed it out:

Alma 56:41
and it came to pass that again
[we saw the Lamanites > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
when the light of the morning came
we saw the Lamanites upon us

Since the dittography in the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 25:6 is so unusual, it seems reasonable to assume that the first occurrence of “unto my children” is an error of anticipation. The critical text will therefore emend the text here in 2 Nephi 25:6 by deleting the first occurrence of “unto my children”:

2 Nephi 25:6 (emended)
and **I have made mention** concerning the judgments of God
which hath come to pass among the Jews
unto my children
according to all that which Isaiah hath spoken

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 25:6 by removing the first occurrence of “unto my children”; the resulting text is a difficult reading, but it explains why Oliver Cowdery could have created a very strange dittography in the original manuscript as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

■ 2 Nephi 25:8

*wherefore they are of worth unto the children of men
and he that supposeth that they are not
unto **them** will I speak particularly*

During 1998 I had Dale Caswell, a researcher on the Book of Mormon critical text project, search for cases of potential pronominal mix-up between *them* and *him* in the Book of Mormon text. This instance in 2 Nephi 25:8 is one that he identified as a possible candidate for emendation. From a grammatical viewpoint, one would expect “and **he** that supposeth that they are not / unto **him** will I speak particularly”. We already know of cases where Oliver Cowdery initially mixed up Joseph Smith’s dictation of either *them* or *him* (for examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18–19). Here in 2 Nephi 25:8, we do not have the original manuscript for the word *them*, but it probably read as *them*. It is very possible, however, that the original text read *him* and that Oliver misinterpreted Joseph’s pronunciation of *him* as *them* (given that both can be pronounced as /əm/ in unstressed contexts), especially since he had just heard Joseph read off the pronoun *they* (“and he that supposeth that **they** are not . . .”).

In discussing this issue elsewhere (see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19 and 1 Nephi 17:48), I have argued that the original text allows pronominal switching between singular and plural, providing the pronoun is generic. And here in 2 Nephi 25:8, the pronoun *he* is generic, which means that the following *them* may be intended. For that reason, the critical text will accept the *them*, the earliest extant reading. Nonetheless, there is a distinct possibility here of scribal mishearing. One possible revision of the standard text would be to replace the *them* with *him*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:8 the *them* of the earliest extant text, the printer’s manuscript (“and he that supposeth that they are not / unto **them** will I speak particularly”); the original text allows switching in number for generic pronouns; nonetheless, in this passage *them* may be a mishearing of an original *him*.

■ 2 Nephi 25:8

*for I know that they shall be of great worth unto them
in the last [days >jg day 1 | days ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for in that day shall they understand them*

In the printer’s manuscript, the 1830 typesetter corrected the plural *days* to *day*, probably because in the following clause the text has the singular “in that day”. Nonetheless, he did not implement this change in the 1830 edition itself. Of course, it is possible that the original text read in the singular (“in the last day”) and that early on in the transmission of the text Oliver Cowdery replaced an original *day* with *days*. (It is also possible, of course, that Joseph Smith accidentally dictated *days*.) Elsewhere in the manuscripts, there are numerous examples where Oliver mixed up *day* and *days*, although the examples show that almost always his tendency was to accidentally replace the plural with the singular:

1 Nephi 15:13 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
in the latter [days 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | day > days 1]

Jacob 1:7 (initial error in \mathcal{P})

in the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of temptation

Mosiah 18:7 (error in \mathcal{P})

after many [*day* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 36:16 (error in \mathcal{O})

for three [*day* 0 | *days* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Helaman 13:2 (error in \mathcal{P})

he did preach

[*many day* 1 | *many-day* A | *many days* BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *manv days* D]
repentance unto the people

3 Nephi 2:5 (initial error in \mathcal{P} ; here both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition derive from \mathcal{O})

since the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mosiah

Apparently, there is only one case where Oliver replaced an original *day* with the plural *days*:

Helaman 15:16 (error probably in \mathcal{P} ; here both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition derive from \mathcal{O})

in the [*days* 1 | *day* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of my wisdom

For discussion, see the analysis of that passage.

The use of the plural phrase “the last days” in 2 Nephi 25:8 is expected, especially since it consistently refers to the days close to Christ’s second coming. Consider the plural usage in the following passages:

2 Nephi 12:2 (quoting Isaiah 2:2)

and it shall come to pass in **the last days**

when the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established . . .

2 Nephi 26:14

but behold I prophesy unto you concerning **the last days**

concerning **the days** when the Lord God shall bring these things forth

2 Nephi 27:1

but behold in **the last days**

or in the **days** of the Gentiles . . .

Lehi also uses this plural phraseology to refer to his own last days in this life: “I have spoken these few words unto you all my sons in **the last days** of my probation” (2 Nephi 2:30).

On the other hand, the singular “last day” always refers to the day of judgment in the Book of Mormon (57 times), including the following nearby occurrence in 2 Nephi 25:18: “wherefore he shall bring forth his words unto them / which words shall judge them at **the last day**”. Thus the 1830 typesetter’s emendation (but only in \mathcal{P}) of “the last days” to “the last day” in 2 Nephi 25:8 is inappropriate, despite the fact that the immediately following clause refers to these last days prior to the second coming of Christ as “in that day”.

Summary: In 2 Nephi 25:8, the critical text will reject the 1830 typesetter’s emendation in \mathcal{P} of “in the last days” to “in the last day” since the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural “last days”, not the singular “last day”, to refer to those days preceding the second coming of Christ.

■ 2 Nephi 25:9

*and never [hath 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | have O] any of them been destroyed
save it were foretold them by the prophets of the Lord*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition changed *hath* to *have*, perhaps because of some grammatical notion that the subject “any of them” is plural. However, Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage provides considerable evidence that in standard English *any* can be treated as either singular or plural (see the discussion there under *any*). And of course, the original text itself generally permits considerable variation with respect to subject-verb agreement (see, for instance, the extensive discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4). As far as the original Book of Mormon text is concerned, there are examples of both singular and plural *any* (although most examples take singular verb forms in the original text):

Mosiah 28:10

for there **was** not **any** of his sons which would accept of the kingdom

Mosiah 29:3

neither [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] **any**
of the sons of Mosiah willing to take upon them the kingdom

Mosiah 29:32

yea even as long as **any** of our posterity
[*remaineth* >js *remains* 1 | *remaineth* A | *remains* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]
upon the face of the land

Alma 23:14

and the Amlicites were not converted save only one
neither [*was* 01A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] **any** of the Amulonites

Alma 30:33

I have never received so much as even one senine for my labor
neither [*hath* 0A | *hath* >js *has* 1 | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] **any**
of my brethren

Alma 51:21

and thus Moroni put an end to those kingmen
that there **were** not **any** known by the appellation of kingmen

Ether 12:18

and neither at any time **hath any** wrought miracles until after their faith

Since variation is possible, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether a singular or plural verb form should occur with the subject *any*.

Summary: Retain the original use of the historically singular *hath* in 2 Nephi 25:9 (“and never hath any of them been destroyed”).

■ 2 Nephi 25:10

nevertheless they hardened their hearts

[NULL > & >% NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[NULL > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *according to my prophecy they have been destroyed*

save it be those which are carried away captive into Babylon

As Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially skipped the *and* before *according*. He first corrected the text by supralinearly inserting an ampersand at the end of the line (line 9 on page 81 of \mathcal{P}), but then he erased the ampersand and supralinearly inserted it at the beginning of the next line (line 10). Perhaps Oliver was bothered by having a line end with a supralinear ampersand, although generally he allowed lines to end with an ampersand written inline (see, for instance, the uninserted ampersand written inline at the end of line 18 on this same page of \mathcal{P}).

The Book of Mormon text never allows *according* to immediately begin a sentence. Instead, there is always some kind of discourse connective that comes before the *according*, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 7:17

but it came to pass that I prayed unto the Lord saying

O Lord according to my faith which is in me

wilt thou deliver me from the hands of my brethren

1 Nephi 17:31

and it came to pass **that** according to his word he did destroy them

and according to his word he did lead them

and according to his word he did do all things for them

2 Nephi 25:19

for according to the words of the prophets

the Messiah cometh in six hundred years

from the time that my father left Jerusalem

Alma 42:13

therefore according to justice the plan of redemption could not be brought about

only on conditions of repentance of men in this probationary state

Alma 57:21

yea and even according to their faith it was done unto them

Helaman 9:37

and behold the words which he had said were true

for according to the words he did deny

and also according to the words he did confess

Helaman 12:15

and thus according to his word the earth goeth back

3 Nephi 5:18

nevertheless there are many things

which according to our language we are not able to write

Thus there is some need in 2 Nephi 25:10 for a connective before “according to my prophecy they have been destroyed”. The most common connective for *according* is the conjunction *and* (with ten occurrences), as in the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for this passage. Another common connective is *for* (with five occurrences).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:10 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , with its connective *and* before the following *according*.

■ 2 Nephi 25:11

and notwithstanding [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they have been carried away
they shall return again and possess the land of Jerusalem

In the original text of the Book of Mormon, there is some variation with respect to whether *notwithstanding* should be immediately followed by the subordinate conjunction *that* whenever a finite clause follows. In most cases (11 out of 13 occurrences involving finite clauses), there is no *that* in the earliest textual sources:

1 Nephi 17:6	and notwithstanding we had suffered many afflictions
1 Nephi 20:22	and notwithstanding he hath done all this
2 Nephi 25:24	and notwithstanding we believe in Christ
2 Nephi 28:32	for notwithstanding I shall lengthen out mine arm unto them
Alma 2:35	notwithstanding they were so numerous that . . .
Alma 5:37	notwithstanding a shepherd hath called after you
Alma 18:5	notwithstanding they believed in a Great Spirit
Helaman 15:12	and notwithstanding they shall be driven to and fro
3 Nephi 7:11	notwithstanding they were not a righteous people
3 Nephi 8:4	notwithstanding so many signs had been given
Ether 9:10	notwithstanding they had sworn unto him to do all manner of iniquity

But in two cases, the original text had the subordinate conjunction *that* before the finite clause. In addition to the example here in 2 Nephi 25:11, we have this example later on in the text:

3 Nephi 16:8
 for notwithstanding [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they have come forth upon the face of this land
 and have scattered my people which are of the house of Israel . . .

In the 1837 edition, these two instances of *that* following *notwithstanding* were removed. The first of these (in 2 Nephi 25:11) was marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition. The critical text will, of course, restore both these original occurrences of *that*. For further discussion regarding the optionality of the subordinate conjunction *that* after adverbial connectors, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after *notwithstanding* in 2 Nephi 25:11 and in 3 Nephi 16:8; when *notwithstanding* is followed by a finite clause in the Book of Mormon text, the occurrence of *that* is optional.

■ 2 Nephi 25:11

*they shall return again and possess the land of Jerusalem
wherefore they shall be restored again
to the [lands 1APS | land BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] of their inheritance*

In the discussion for 2 Nephi 9:2, I noted that for the phrase “the land(s) of their inheritance”, the plural *lands* is actually the more frequent form in the original Book of Mormon text, although the singular *land* also occurs quite often. Since most cases of the plural “the lands of their inheritance” have been retained in the text, this particular change in the 1837 edition may be a typo rather than due to editing by Joseph Smith (he did not mark the change in the printer’s manuscript). The preceding clause has the singular *land* (“they shall return again and possess the **land** of Jerusalem”), which may be the reason why the 1837 edition replaced (perhaps accidentally) *lands* with *land* later on in the verse. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural *lands*, probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: According to the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore in 2 Nephi 25:11 the plural *lands* in “the lands of their inheritance”.

■ 2 Nephi 25:12

*behold they will reject him
because of [Priestcrafts > their iniquities 1 | their iniquities ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Since either of these readings will work, it appears that this correction in the printer’s manuscript is a virtually immediate correction to the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). The level of ink flow for the crossout and the supralinear *their iniquities* is unchanged. The initial choice of the word *priestcrafts* may be due to the occurrence of the phrase “because of priestcrafts and iniquities” earlier in the text, prior to the long Isaiah quotation that starts at 2 Nephi 12:

2 Nephi 10:5
but because of priestcrafts and iniquities
they at Jerusalem will stiffen their necks against him
that he be crucified

We also notice here in 2 Nephi 25:12 that in the printer’s manuscript Oliver Cowdery spelled *priestcrafts* as *Priestcrafts*—that is, the first word in the compound noun is the plural *priests*. This misspelling is due to the fact that the word *priestcraft* is normally pronounced /priskræft/. When the final /st/ of *priest* is combined with the initial /kr/ of *craft*, the resulting complex consonant cluster /stkr/ is readily pronounced as /skr/—that is, without the *t*. This resulting pronunciation

can therefore lead one to think that the first word in this compound is the plural *priests* since that plural is normally pronounced as /pris/ rather than as /prists/, the more careful pronunciation. In 2 Nephi 10:5, Oliver also misspelled *priestcrafts* this same way in the printer's manuscript, although there he later tried to cross out the extra *s* but ended up crossing out the *s* before the *t* rather than the one after it. There are two more occurrences of this compound noun in 2 Nephi 26:29, and here too Oliver misspelled both in \mathcal{P} as *priestcrafts*. Elsewhere in the text, there are seven other occurrences of *priestcraft(s)*, but all of these were spelled with the singular *priest* in \mathcal{P} (six by the unknown scribe 2 and one by Oliver Cowdery, in 3 Nephi 16:10). None of the ten instances of *priestcraft(s)* are extant in \mathcal{C} . Of course, the critical text will use the standard spelling, *priestcraft(s)*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:12 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “because of their iniquities”.

■ 2 Nephi 25:13

*and after that he is laid in a sepulchre for the space of three days
he shall rise from the dead with healing in his wings*

In the subordinate *after*-clause, the verb phrase *is laid* seems strange given the following adverbial phrase “for the space of three days”. The use of *is laid* implies a single completive action, which contradicts the continuing sense of “for the space of three days”. In the King James Bible, there are a number of New Testament examples that refer to “being laid in a sepulchre”. Four describe the placement of Jesus's body in the tomb:

Mark 15:46

and he bought fine linen and took him down and wrapped him in the linen
and **laid** him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock
and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre

Luke 23:53

and he took it down and wrapped it in linen
and **laid** it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone
wherein never man before was **laid**

John 19:41

now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden
and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man yet **laid**

Acts 13:29

and when they had fulfilled all that was written of him
they took *him* down from the tree and **laid** *him* in a sepulchre

Another refers to the patriarch Jacob:

Acts 7:15–16

so Jacob went down into Egypt and died
he and our fathers
and were carried over into Sychem
and **laid** in the sepulchre that Abraham bought . . .

The Book of Mormon has one other example of this phraseology. Here the text refers to king Lamoni:

Alma 19:1

and it came to pass that after two days and two nights
they were about to take his body
and **lay** it into a sepulchre
which they had made for the purpose of burying their dead

In each of these cases, the verb *lay* is transitive and describes a single completive action.

One possibility for 2 Nephi 25:13 is that the original text read “and after that he **has laid** in a sepulchre for the space of three days / he shall rise from the dead with healing in his wings”. In other words, instead of the passive verb form *is*, the original text may have had the perfect verb form *has*. As helping verbs in unstressed positions, both *has* and *is* are typically pronounced the same, as /əz/. One might object that if the verb form were *has*, then the past participle *laid* should be *lain* (that is, “and after that he **has lain** in the sepulchre for the space of three days / he shall rise from the dead with healing in his wings”). The use of *lain* would assume, of course, that the verb here is the intransitive *lie* rather than the historically transitive *lay*. But for many speakers of English, the verb *lay* may also be used intransitively. In fact, the original text of the Book of Mormon has an intransitive use of *lay*:

2 Nephi 9:7

and if so
this flesh must have [*laid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | *lain* s] down to rot
and to crumble to its mother earth to rise no more

Thus the original text in 2 Nephi 25:13 could have read *has laid*, with the meaning ‘has lain’. The argument would be that in pronouncing the *has*, Joseph dropped the *h* and reduced the vowel to schwa, which Oliver then interpreted as the verb *is*, also normally pronounced with a schwa vowel in this context.

One argument against this analysis is that if the helping verb had been the perfect *have*, then the expected verb form here would have been *hath* rather than *has*, as in the following verse:

2 Nephi 25:14

and behold it shall come to pass that
after the Messiah **hath** risen from the dead
and **hath** manifested himself unto his people . . .

Even so, the specific form *has* is possible in 2 Nephi 25:13, even if its occurrence in the text is fairly rare when compared with *hath*. For instance, in the small plates of Nephi, there are four invariant occurrences of *has* in the text:

1 Nephi 6:1	the record which has been kept by my father
1 Nephi 17:43	the time has come that they have become wicked
2 Nephi 6:3	and ye yourselves know that it ever has been
Omni 1:11	no revelation save that which has been written

Thus *has* is possible in 2 Nephi 25:13.

Despite all these arguments for *has*, there is one other example of the transitive verb *lay* being used in the same way as in the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 25:13:

Alma 19:5
 therefore if this is the case
 I would that ye should go in and see my husband
 for he **has been laid** upon his bed **for the space of two days and nights**

We note here that the perfect auxiliary is *has*; but of greater significance for interpreting 2 Nephi 25:13, the passive auxiliary verb form *been* also occurs (and is, in fact, extant in the original manuscript). King Lamoni was, of course, unconscious when he was laid upon his bed; thus the passive use here is appropriate. This passage gives us a second example that refers to “someone being laid somewhere for a period of time”. In other words, the use in 2 Nephi 25:13 of “after that he is laid in a sepulchre for the space of three days” is acceptable. Thus evidence elsewhere in the text suggests that no emendation is necessary in 2 Nephi 25:13.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 25:13 (“after that he **is laid** in a sepulchre for the space of three days”); similar phraseology in Alma 19:5 supports the use of the passive *is laid* in 2 Nephi 25:13.

■ 2 Nephi 25:13

*wherefore my soul [delighteth 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | delighted A]
 to prophesy concerning him*

Here we have a reading unique to the 1830 edition: namely, the accidental replacement of the present-tense *delighteth* with the past-tense *delighted*. The tense was corrected in the subsequent edition (1837). The present-tense *delighteth* agrees with the parallel present tense in the following main clause (“and my heart **doth** magnify his holy name”). And of course “my soul *delighteth*” is one of Nephi’s favorite expressions:

2 Nephi 4:15	for my soul delighteth in the scriptures
2 Nephi 4:16	behold my soul delighteth in the things of the Lord
2 Nephi 11:2	for my soul delighteth in his words
2 Nephi 11:4	behold my soul delighteth in proving unto my people . . .
2 Nephi 11:5	and also my soul delighteth in the covenants of the Lord
2 Nephi 11:5	yea my soul delighteth in his grace
2 Nephi 11:6	and my soul delighteth in proving unto my people . . .
2 Nephi 25:4	for behold my soul delighteth in plainness unto my people
2 Nephi 25:5	yea and my soul delighteth in the words of Isaiah
2 Nephi 31:3	for my soul delighteth in plainness

In none of these other cases did the 1830 typesetter accidentally change *delighteth* to *delighted*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:13 (and everywhere else) the present-tense usage in the expression “my soul *delighteth*”.

■ 2 Nephi 25:16

and then at that time

[*will* >+ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *the day*

[NULL >+ *will* 0 | *will* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *come that . . .*

Here Oliver Cowdery first wrote “at that time will the day come that . . .”, but later (probably when he read back the text to Joseph Smith) he crossed out the original *will* before the subject *the day* and then supralinearly inserted it after the subject, all with somewhat heavier ink flow (which shows the change was not that immediate). Since either word order is acceptable, this change does not appear to be editing on the part of Oliver or Joseph; instead it seems to represent their attempt to get the text down correctly.

This passage is the only example in the Book of Mormon text where the adverbial “at that time” appears at the beginning of a clause. So we have no evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text as to whether we should have the noninverted word order of modern English for this adverbial (“then at that time the day will come”) or the inverted word order of earlier English (“then at that time will the day come”). In the King James Bible, we have examples of both types of word order after a clause-initial “at that time”. The noninverted modern word order is more frequent (20 versus 8). One interesting example of this contrast is found in the following King James passage:

Zephaniah 3:19–20

behold at that time **I will undo** all that afflict thee . . .

at that time **will I bring** you *again*

With other sentence-initial adverbial phrases, we get either word order in the Book of Mormon, as in the following pair of examples involving “at that day” and the modal verb *shall*:

- *noninverted word order*: adverbial + subject + auxiliary verb + main verb

1 Nephi 14:17

then **at that day**

the work of the Father **shall commence**

- *inverted word order*: adverbial + auxiliary verb + subject + main verb

1 Nephi 15:14

and **at that day**

shall the remnant of our seed **know** that . . .

Since either word order is possible in the Book of Mormon, the critical text will follow Oliver Cowdery’s corrected word order in the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 25:16 (“and then **at that time** the day **will** come”).

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 25:16 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected word order in \mathcal{C} : “then at that time the day will come”.

■ 2 Nephi 25:16–17

- (1) *and when that day shall come
that they shall believe in Christ
and worship the Father in his name with pure hearts and clean hands
and look not forward any more for another Messiah*
- (2) [*& 0 | & >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*]
*then at that time the day will come
that it must needs be expedient that they should believe these things*
- (3) [*0 | NULL >+ & 1 | and ABCDEFGHK | And IJKLMNOPQRST*]
*the Lord will set his hand again the second time
to restore his people from their lost and fallen state*

In this passage, after copying the text of the original manuscript into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery decided to move the location of the conjunction *and*, from position 2 to position 3 as indicated above (verse 17 begins at position 3). The ink flow for this change is heavier and considerably darker than the original ink. The original manuscript is extant here and agrees with the original reading of the printer's manuscript. Thus this change in the printer's manuscript reflects later editing on the part of Oliver.

No matter how this passage is interpreted, the syntax is quite complex. In fact, verse 16 starts with an *after*-clause (see position 0 below) that fails to achieve closure. Instead of being completed, the *after*-clause is immediately followed by a *when*-clause (at position 1):

2 Nephi 25:16

- (0) **and after** that they have been scattered
and the Lord God hath scourged them by other nations
for the space of many generations
yea even down from generation to generation
until they shall be persuaded to believe in Christ the Son of God
and the atonement which is infinite for all mankind
- (1) **and when** that day shall come that . . .

In other words, this whole passage seems to be one more example of a very long complex argument that apparently got out of Nephi's syntactic control. So it is not very surprising that Oliver Cowdery tried to sort it all out by moving the *and* to a place later on in the passage.

Perhaps the simplest solution here in 2 Nephi 25:16–17 would be to restore the original reading and treat the last clause of verse 16 (the part beginning at position 2 and ending just before position 3) as a parenthetical statement (by inserting dashes or parentheses to set off that clause), with the result that the first clause of verse 17 (beginning at position 3) would then complete the preceding *when*-clause (which begins at position 1):

2 Nephi 25:16–17 (with parenthetical punctuation)

- (1) **and when** that day shall come that they shall believe in Christ
and worship the Father in his name with pure hearts and clean hands
and look not forward any more for another Messiah
- (2) (and then at that time the day will come
that it must needs be expedient that they should believe these things)
- (3) the Lord will set his hand again the second time
to restore his people from their lost and fallen state

The problem with Oliver Cowdery’s emendation is that he created a rather odd redundancy. Basically, his revision says that “when the house of Israel will believe / then the time will come that they will believe / and the Lord will restore them”. The syntax of the original text attempted to use the parenthetical clause to summarize the previously stated list of three changes that would be necessary for the restoration of the house of Israel—in other words, they must become true followers of Christ in all those things. The entire verse 16 gives the conditions necessary for the restoration of Israel, which is then described in verse 17. From a logical point of view, this arrangement (as reflected by the original location of *and*) makes for a more reasonable argument, but unfortunately the resulting syntax is especially difficult. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading (as found in \mathfrak{C} and initially in \mathfrak{D}), with some indication that the *then*-clause is parenthetical.

Summary: Restore the original placement of *and* in 2 Nephi 25:16–17; in addition, the *then*-clause (which summarizes the change of mind that the house of Israel will undergo) must be separated from the rest of the text by some kind of parenthetical punctuation, by either dashes or parentheses.

■ 2 Nephi 25:19

*for according to the words of the prophets
the Messiah cometh in six hundred years from the time that my father left Jerusalem
and according to the words of the prophets and also the word of the angel of God
his name [should 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be Jesus Christ the Son of God*

The 1830 typesetter changed *should* to *shall* in this passage, probably because here the historically past-tense *should* is readily interpreted as the conditional *should*, as if the clause meant ‘his name ought to be Jesus Christ’. Of course, the actual meaning is ‘his name will be Jesus Christ’.

Elsewhere in this passage the past-tense *should* is retained, despite the potential confusion. For instance, in the previous verse (2 Nephi 25:18), we have “and that Messiah is he which **should** be rejected of the Jews”, which has never been edited to read “which **shall** be rejected of the Jews” (which is what it means). And directly relevant to this reference to the word of the angel is the following passage that occurs prior to the long Isaiah quotation in 2 Nephi 12–24:

2 Nephi 10:3
wherefore as I said unto you
it must needs be expedient that Christ
—for in the last night the angel spake unto me
that this **should** be his name—
that he **should** come among the Jews

Note that this previous passage has not been edited to read “this **shall** be his name” or “Christ . . . **shall** come among the Jews”.

Nonetheless, there has been a sporadic tendency to edit *should* to *shall*, as in the following example:

2 Nephi 1:6

there shall be none come into this land
 save they [*should* 0A | *should* >js *shall* 1 | *shall* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 be brought by the hand of the Lord

For a complete list of cases involving this change of *should* to *shall*, see under MODAL VERBS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *should* in 2 Nephi 25:19 (“his name **should** be Jesus Christ the Son of God”); no conditional sense is implied by this use of the historically past-tense modal *should*.

■ 2 Nephi 25:20

and now my brethren

I have spoken [*plane* 1 | *plain* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *plainly* RT]

that ye cannot err

Historically, there are two adverbial endings in English, *-ly* and *-e*. The latter was originally pronounced as a schwa in Middle English but became silent by the end of the Middle English period, resulting in what might be called the bare (or flat) adverb. The result was that there was no difference anymore between this adverbial form and the corresponding adjective. The tendency in the modern language (supported explicitly by prescriptivist dicta) has been to favor the alternative adverbial form ending in *-ly* because this alternative form is distinguishable from the adjective. Nonetheless, there are expressions in modern English where the earlier adverbial form that originally ended in *-e* has been maintained, as in “he ran fast” and “she worked hard”. And of course, there is variability in speech, so that “he drove slow” and “he drove slowly” are both heard. (For further discussion and examples, see *flat adverbs* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.)

In the Book of Mormon text, this kind of variability between the two different adverbial forms is found with the adverb *plain*(*ly*), providing it occurs with the verb *speak*. Besides the example listed here in 2 Nephi 25:20, there are four others that originally read *plain* rather than *plainly*:

2 Nephi 25:28

wherefore I have spoken [*plane* 1 | *plain* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *plainly* RT]
 unto you
 that ye cannot misunderstand

Mosiah 2:40

for I have spoken [*plain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *plainly* RT] unto you
 that ye might understand

Alma 5:43

for behold I have spoken unto you
 [*plain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *plain* > *plainly* M | *plainly* OQRT]
 that ye cannot err

Helaman 8:4

and those judges were angry with him
 because he spake [*plane* 1 | *plain* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *plainly* RT] unto them
 concerning their secret works of darkness

For all five cases of the original adverbial *plain*, the current LDS text has the standard adverbial form *plainly*. The 1920 edition is responsible for making the change in four out of the five cases; the example in Alma 5:43 was first changed in 1907 (in the third printing of the Chicago missionary edition and in the 1907 vest-pocket edition). On the other hand, the RLDS text has consistently maintained the original *plain*.

It should be noted that there are four cases of the standard “to speak plainly” in the earliest text. Of course, none of these have ever been edited:

2 Nephi 31:2	wherefore I shall speak unto you plainly
Jacob 7:17	and he spake plainly unto them
Jacob 7:18	and he spake plainly unto them
Alma 12:12	and Amulek hath spoken plainly concerning death

With verbs other than *speak*, the Book of Mormon text has only *plainly*:

1 Nephi 1:19	and also the things which he read in the book manifested plainly of the coming of a Messiah
Jacob 4:13	wherefore these things are manifested unto us plainly
Alma 14:3	and because they had testified so plainly against their wickedness they sought to put them away privily
Alma 24:30	and thus we can plainly discern that . . .

The critical text will retain the original adverbial form (either the *-ly* form or the bare adverb) according to the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain each case of “to speak plain” when it is supported by the earliest sources, here in 2 Nephi 25:20 as well as in 2 Nephi 25:28, Mosiah 2:40, Alma 5:43, and Helaman 8:4.

■ 2 Nephi 25:20

*and as the Lord God liveth that brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt
 and gave unto Moses power that he should heal the nations*
 [*that* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after [NULL > *that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they had been bitten by the poisonous serpents . . .

While copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *that* before the subordinate conjunction *after*, but then almost immediately he corrected the word order by crossing out the *that*

and supralinearly inserting it after the subordinate conjunction (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The preceding *that* in the clause “that he should heal the nations” probably played a role in Oliver’s initial misinterpretation. Of course, he may have also been unconsciously avoiding the archaic construction “after that”. The same kind of error in word order occurred later on in the text, once more as Oliver was copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Ether 6:2

for it came to pass
 [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *that* > NULL 1]
 after [*that* 0A | NULL > *that* 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 the Lord had prepared the stones . . .

For both 2 Nephi 25:20 and Ether 6:2, Joseph Smith later removed the archaic *that* which followed the subordinate conjunction *after*. The critical text will restore the original usage here and elsewhere; for further discussion, see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:20 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“**after that** they had been bitten by the poisonous serpents”).

■ 2 Nephi 25:20

*and as the Lord God liveth that brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt
 and gave unto Moses power that he should heal the nations
 after that they had been bitten by the poisonous serpents
 if they would cast their eyes unto the serpent which he did raise up before them
 and also [give 1 | gave ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] him power
 that he should smite the rock
 and the water should come forth*

The structure of the discourse suggests that the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *give* (the reading in \mathcal{P}) to *gave* (the 1830 reading) parallels the preceding use of *gave* in this passage:

and gave unto Moses **power that he should** heal the nations
and also gave him **power that he should** smite the rock

The occurrence of the *also* especially supports the use of *gave*. Similar instances of “gave . . . also gave” are found elsewhere in the text:

Mosiah 1:15–16

and it came to pass that
 after king Benjamin had made an end of these sayings to his son
 that he **gave** him charge concerning all the affairs of the kingdom
 and moreover he **also gave** him charge concerning the records

3 Nephi 20:3, 5

and it came to pass that
 he brake bread again and blessed it
 and **gave** to the disciples to eat . . .
 and when they had given unto the multitude
 he **also gave** them wine to drink

Furthermore, scribal mix-ups between *gave* and *give* are possible. Here are three examples of this error in the original manuscript, although Oliver Cowdery is not responsible for any of these scribal errors:

1 Nephi 3:7 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{C})

for I know that
the Lord [*gave* > *giveth* 0 | *giveth* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
no commandments unto the children of men . . .

1 Nephi 5:8 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{C})

yea and I also know of a surety that the Lord hath protected my sons
and delivered them out of the hands of Laban
and [*give* > % *gave* 0 | *gave* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *given* RT] them power
whereby they could accomplish the thing
which the Lord hath commanded them

1 Nephi 5:11 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{C})

and he beheld that they did contain the five books of Moses
which [*give* > *gave* 0 | *gave* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] an account
of the creation of the world

My own sense is that the 1830 typesetter's emendation is probably correct here in 2 Nephi 25:20 since it is supported by the resulting parallelism of "gave . . . also gave" (which is found elsewhere in the text).

One possible explanation for the *give* in \mathcal{P} for 2 Nephi 25:20 is that Oliver Cowdery, when copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , was influenced by the infinitive form *raise* in the preceding clause ("which he did **raise** up before them")—that is, Oliver ended up writing *give* as if the text read "did give". (It is also possible that such an error could have been introduced by Joseph Smith himself as he dictated the text to Oliver.) This interpretation suggests another possible reading for the original text here in 2 Nephi 25:20—namely, "and **did also give** him power" (or "and **also did give** him power", depending on where the *did* would have originally occurred). Accidentally omitting a *did* in 2 Nephi 25:20 seems quite possible since elsewhere such an error sometimes occurred during the copying of \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 44:22 (Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *did* in \mathcal{P})

and it came to pass that
they [*did* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *did* 1] cast their dead
into the waters of Sidon

4 Nephi 1:38 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} omitted the *did*, which Oliver Cowdery later supplied)

and they did teach their children
that they should not believe
even as their fathers from the beginning
[§2 NULL >+ §1 *did* 1 | *did* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dwindle

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 25:20 the 1830 typesetter's emendation of *give* to *gave*; this conjecture reinforces the parallelism between the two conjoined predicates "gave unto Moses power" and "also gave him power".

■ 2 Nephi 25:22

*and the nations [which 1APS | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] shall possess them
shall be judged of them*

The 1837 edition introduced the relative pronoun *who* in place of the original *which*. This change may not be due to Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition since it was not marked by him in the printer's manuscript. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, *which* is generally retained when it postmodifies *nation(s)*:

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 . . .

1 Nephi 22:14

and every **nation which** shall war against thee O house of Israel
shall be turned one against another

2 Nephi 12:14

and upon all the **nations which** are lifted up

Mosiah 12:8

and I will preserve them
for other **nations which** shall possess the land

Alma 37:25

and I will bring to light all their secrets and abominations
unto every **nation**
[*which* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] shall hereafter possess the land

Ether 1:43

and there shall be none greater
than the **nation which** I will raise up unto me of thy seed

In one of these cases (Alma 37:25), *which* was accidentally changed to *that* as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} (but not to *who*, it should be noted). Elsewhere there are three cases of “nation(s) that” in the original text:

2 Nephi 10:3

and there is none other **nation** on earth **that** would crucify their God

2 Nephi 27:3

and all the **nations that** fight against Zion and **that** distress her
shall be as a dream of a night vision

2 Nephi 27:3

yea even so shall the multitude of all the **nations** be
that fight against mount Zion

But there are no occurrences of “nation(s) who” in the original text. Thus the 1837 change here in 2 Nephi 25:22 is anomalous. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading in all these

cases, either as “nation(s) which” or as “nation(s) that”. For further discussion of *which* versus *who*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the relative pronouns *which* and *that* for *nation(s)*, including here in 2 Nephi 25:22 (where the 1837 change to *who* may be accidental).

■ 2 Nephi 25:23

for we know that it is by grace that we are saved

after all [that 1AN | BCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] we can do

The 1837 edition removed the relative pronoun *that* from this verse. We cannot be sure whether this deletion is intentional or not. Joseph Smith did not mark it in the printer’s manuscript. When we compare similar texts containing “all (that)” followed by a pronoun, we find that the relative pronoun *that* occurs in most cases (12 out of 16 occurrences). The ones without the *that* are marked with an asterisk in the following list:

1 Nephi 7:21	I did frankly forgive them all that they had done
1 Nephi 8:11	above all that I ever had before tasted
Mosiah 2:22	all that he requires of you
Mosiah 2:34	to render to him all that you have and are
* Mosiah 10:17	and do all they could to destroy them
Alma 7:27	upon you and upon . . . all that you possess
Alma 11:46	this is all that I have written
Alma 20:26	because this is all that thou hast desired
Alma 22:15	I will give up all that I possess
Alma 24:11	since it has been all that we could do
* Alma 24:11	for it was all we could do
Alma 29:8	all that he seeth fit that they should have
* Alma 52:29	and all they feared was Lehi and his men
* Alma 60:4	were this all we had suffered
Helaman 9:13	and they told them all that they had done
3 Nephi 6:2	they did take with them all that they had not devoured

One interesting contrast occurs in Alma 24:11; there we have examples of both types (one with the *that* and one without). This variability shows that in each case we should rely on the earliest textual sources to determine whether *that* follows *all*. There does not seem to be much tendency to edit out the *that*, so the 1837 change in 2 Nephi 25:23 could well be a typographical error. Note, by the way, that the 1906 LDS large-print edition restored the *that* (but probably accidentally since there is no evidence elsewhere to show that the 1830 edition was used to correct the text for that edition).

In addition to this general case, there are also six instances where the word *all* is preceded by a measure phrase. Unlike the general case, here we find that no *that* ever follows *all* in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 7:22	and even one half of all we have or possess
Mosiah 11:3	one fifth part of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:15	even one half of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:22	one half of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:26	even one half of all they possessed
Alma 13:15	one tenth part of all he possessed

It should also be noted that each of these refers to a portion of one's possessions. For further discussion regarding the omission of the relative pronoun *that*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the relative pronoun *that* in 2 Nephi 25:23 (“after all **that** we can do”).

■ 2 Nephi 25:28

wherefore I have spoken [plane 1 | plain ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | plainly RT] unto you

As discussed under 2 Nephi 25:20, the original bare adverbial form *plain* will be maintained wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in 2 Nephi 25:28.

■ 2 Nephi 25:29

*wherefore ye must bow down before him
and worship him with all your might mind and strength
and your whole [soul 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | strength > soul F]*

Here the typesetter for the 1852 LDS edition accidentally set the noun *strength* instead of *soul* in the phrase “and your whole soul”, undoubtedly because of the immediately preceding occurrence of *strength*. For the second printing of the edition, the appropriate *soul* was restored (by correcting the stereotyped plates).

Elsewhere the text has no examples of “whole strength”, but there are six examples of “whole soul(s)”, which read as follows in the earliest text:

Enos 1:9	I did pour out my whole soul unto God for them
Omni 1:26	and offer your whole souls
The Words of Mormon 1:18	and the faculty of his whole soul
Mosiah 2:20	which your whole souls hath power to possess
Mosiah 2:21	with all your whole soul
Mosiah 26:14	after he had poured out his whole soul to God

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 25:29 the original reading “with all your might mind and strength and your whole soul”.

2 Nephi 26

■ 2 Nephi 26:4

*wherefore all [they >js thos 1 | they A | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[that >js who 1 | that A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are proud
and **that** do wickedly
the day that cometh shall burn them up*

Here is an interesting example where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, replaced *they that* with *those who* in the first relative clause, but then he left unedited the relative pronoun *that* in the following conjoined relative clause, probably because it wasn't immediately preceded by a pronominal determiner like *they* (or *those*). Of course, mixed uses of the relative pronouns *who*, *which*, and *that* are not impossible, as in the following example:

Mosiah 15:21

*yea even a resurrection of those **that** have been
and [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are
and [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be*

Even though Joseph Smith edited the two instances of *which* to *who* in Mosiah 15:21, he did not change the first *that* to *who* but instead maintained the original mixture of the relative pronouns. For further discussion of the editing of the relative pronouns *who*, *which*, and *that*, see WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original use of “they that” in 2 Nephi 26:4; this reading is consistent with the repetition of the relative pronoun *that* in the following conjoined relative clause.

■ 2 Nephi 26:5

*[& 1 | and ABCDEFHIJKLMNOQRT | G | And PS]
[1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNPQRST | the GO] mountains shall cover them
and whirlwinds shall carry them away
and buildings shall fall upon them*

There are two minor changes here. First, in the 1858 Wright edition, the original *and* at the beginning of the first clause was accidentally omitted. Second, in the 1907 LDS edition as well as in the 1858 Wright edition, the definite article *the* was inserted before *mountains* (but not before *whirlwinds* or *buildings*). Neither of these two changes persisted in the text. One possible motivation

for adding the *the* is that earlier in the Isaiah quotation in 2 Nephi 12–24, the text refers to “the mountains” twice:

2 Nephi 12:2	the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains
2 Nephi 23:4	the noise of the multitude in the mountains

However, references to destruction in the Book of Mormon typically refer to mountains without using the definite article *the*:

1 Nephi 12:4	and I saw mountains tumbling into pieces
1 Nephi 19:11	and by mountains which shall be carried up

Thus the original usage in 2 Nephi 26:5 is wholly appropriate.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 26:5: “and mountains shall cover them” — that is, with an *and* at the beginning and without a *the* before *mountains*.

■ 2 Nephi 26:7

for I Nephi [hath 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | have FIJLMNOQRT] seen it

As discussed under 2 Nephi 8:16, the inflectional ending *-(e)th* originally occurred even with the first person pronoun *I*, as here in 2 Nephi 26:7. In this instance, the 1852 LDS edition replaced *hath* with *have*, which has continued in the LDS text, but the RLDS text has maintained the original *hath*. The critical text will retain the nonstandard usage. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

■ 2 Nephi 26:8

*but behold the righteous that hearken unto the words of the prophets and destroy them not
but look forward unto Christ with steadfastness for the signs which are given
notwithstanding all [persecutions 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | persecution LMQRT] . . .*

The 1902 and 1905 LDS editions introduced the singular *persecution*, which the current LDS text continues. This change may be a typo since elsewhere the text retains the plural in nearly the same context:

Alma 1:28
and thus they began to have continual peace again
notwithstanding all their **persecutions**

More generally, the earliest text has 12 examples of the plural *persecutions* but only 4 of the singular *persecution*. Since either singular or plural is possible, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading for each case.

Incidentally, the object pronoun *them* in the conjoined predicate “and destroy them not” apparently refers to destroying the prophets themselves rather than to destroying the words of the prophets. The following passage supports this interpretation:

Ether 11:2

and it came to pass that the **prophets** were rejected by the people
and they fled unto Com for protection
for the people sought to destroy **them**

Even so, there is one reading where the phraseology about destroying the prophets refers to that section of prophetic writings in the Hebrew Bible that is traditionally referred to as “the prophets”:

3 Nephi 15:6

behold I do not destroy the prophets
for as many as have not been fulfilled in me
— verily I say unto you —
shall all be fulfilled

However, this interpretation for *prophets* does not apply in 2 Nephi 26:8; there the text explicitly refers to “the words of the prophets”.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 26:8 the plural *persecutions*, the earliest reading for this passage.

■ 2 Nephi 26:9

*but the **Son** of [righteousness 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | Righteousness CGHKPS]
shall appear unto them
and he shall heal them and they shall have peace with him
until three generations shall have passed away
and many of the fourth generation shall have passed away in righteousness*

This passage refers to the appearance of Christ among the Nephites and briefly states that he will heal them. The language here agrees with the language in Malachi:

Malachi 4:2 (King James Bible)

but unto you that fear my name
shall the **Sun** of righteousness arise with healing in his wings
and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall

Both passages are clearly connected, yet Malachi refers to “the **Sun** of righteousness” and the Book of Mormon text reads “the **Son** of righteousness”. Interestingly, the King James Bible capitalizes *Sun* because the reference is to the Lord, not to the star in our solar system. It is as if the biblical passage is using the phrase “the Sun of righteousness” as a name or title for the Lord.

In 3 Nephi 24–25, Jesus quotes Malachi 3–4 to the Nephites, yet there the Book of Mormon text again reads “the **Son** of righteousness”, just like in 2 Nephi 26:9:

3 Nephi 25:2 (quoting Malachi 4:2)

but unto you that fear my name
shall the **Son** of [righteousness 1ABCDGHKPS | Righteousness EFIJLMNOQRT]
arise with healing in his wings
and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall

Except for the one word *Sun/Son*, Malachi 4:2 and 3 Nephi 25:2 read precisely the same. (See 3 Nephi 25:2 for discussion of some minor textual variation in this direct quotation from Malachi.) And finally, there is one more place in the Book of Mormon where the text refers to “the **Son** of righteousness”:

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

Since *sun* and *son* are homophones in English, their phonetic identity suggests that there may be an error here in the Book of Mormon text, at least for the direct Malachi quote in 3 Nephi 25:2. In the Hebrew original for Malachi 4:2, there is virtually no chance that the words for ‘sun’ and ‘son’ could be mixed up since phonetically they are so different (*šemeš* ‘sun’ versus *ben* ‘son’). This possible emendation to *Sun* in the Book of Mormon text was first proposed by Sidney B. Sperry in “The Book of Mormon and Textual Criticism”, *Book of Mormon Institute*, 5 December 1959 (Provo, Utah: Extension Publications, Brigham Young University), pages 5–6.

We should first note that for all three Book of Mormon passages the earliest textual sources consistently read *Son* (the printer’s manuscript in all three cases and, in addition, the 1830 edition for 3 Nephi 25:2). The original manuscript is not extant for any of these three passages. However, if *Son* is an error for *Sun*, it probably would have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to his scribe (probably Oliver Cowdery in each case). For 3 Nephi 25:2, both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript have the spelling *Son*, from which we can deduce that the original manuscript probably did so too since for this part of the text both the 1830 edition and Ø are first-hand copies of Ø.

One can also argue that misinterpreting *Sun* as *Son* in 3 Nephi 25:2 may have been facilitated by the possessive pronoun *his* that occurs at the end of the clause (“with healing in **his** wings”). In earlier English, however, *his* was the possessive pronoun for *it* as well as *he*. In other words, the *his* in Malachi 4:2 could mean ‘its’, as in the King James reading for Matthew 5:13: “if the salt have lost **his** savor”. In Malachi 4:2 we cannot be sure whether the King James translators meant ‘his’ or ‘its’ when they translated this passage as “with healing in **his** wings”, although the fact that they capitalized the word *Sun* suggests that they interpreted the passage as dealing with deity and therefore ‘his’, not ‘its’, was what they intended. In the Hebrew original, the pronominal suffix literally reads ‘her’ since in this verse the noun *šemeš* ‘sun’ is grammatically feminine. In the Hebrew Bible, *šemeš* is sometimes grammatically masculine, other times grammatically feminine. In Malachi 4:2 it is grammatically feminine. But grammatical gender should not be confused with natural gender. Literally translating Malachi 4:2 into English as “with healing in her wings” would be misleading. Modern translations (such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version) translate this phrase as “with healing in **its** wings”.

Normally, the scribes did not mix up *son* and *sun*. But in one place in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *son* in place of the correct *sun*:

3 Nephi 12:45 (quoting Matthew 5:45)
 for he maketh his [*son* > *sun* 1 | *sun* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to rise on the evil and on the good

The error here, although immediately corrected, is facilitated by the context. Just hearing “for he maketh his son/sun”, Oliver may have first thought that text was referring to the Father making his Son do something. In the same way, the reference in 3 Nephi 25:2 to “the Sun/Son of righteousness arising with healing in **his** wings” could readily have led Oliver to write down *Son* rather than *Sun* in \mathcal{O} .

The two other Book of Mormon passages with “the Son of righteousness” (2 Nephi 26:9 and Ether 9:22), although not directly quoting Malachi 4:2, clearly refer to the Messiah, the Son of God; thus the use of *Son* in those two cases seems expected or maybe even intended. But if we interpret “the Sun of righteousness” as a name or title for Christ, even 2 Nephi 26:9 and Ether 9:22 could read as “the Sun of righteousness”. A similar example of metaphorical naming is found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible:

Jeremiah 33:15 (King James Bible)
 in those days and at that time
 will I cause **the Branch of righteousness** to grow up unto David
 and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land

Here “the Branch of righteousness”, given its capitalization as *Branch* in the King James Bible, is being interpreted as a reference to Christ (although it should be pointed out that the original 1611 King James Bible did not capitalize *branch*). Both phrases, “the Sun of righteousness” and “the Branch of righteousness”, use physical objects (the sun and a branch) to refer to the Messiah. The postmodifying phrase “of righteousness” further supports the metaphorical interpretation of these phrases as names or titles for the Messiah.

And the Book of Mormon text itself introduces another possible name or title for Christ that has the same basic form, namely, “the fountain of all righteousness”. This characterization of Christ occurs twice in the book of Ether:

Ether 8:26
 but that they may be persuaded to do good continually
 that they may come unto **the fountain of all righteousness** and be saved

Ether 12:28
 and I will shew unto them that faith hope and charity bringeth
 unto me / **the fountain of all righteousness**

This reference to Christ could also be behind Lehi’s language to Laman:

1 Nephi 2:9
 O that thou mightest be like unto this river
 continually running into **the fountain of all righteousness**

Once more, this kind of name or title metaphorically refers to a physical object (here a fountain), and it is postmodified by “of all righteousness”, very much as in the case of “the Sun of righteousness” and “the Branch of righteousness”.

This internal evidence suggests that the phrase “the Sun of righteousness” should be taken as a special name or title for Christ in the Book of Mormon text, just as it is in Malachi 4:2. Thus not only 3 Nephi 25:2 (which cites Malachi 4:2) but also 2 Nephi 26:9 and Ether 9:22 should be emended to read “the **Sun** of righteousness”. It was very easy for Oliver Cowdery, the probable scribe in \mathcal{O} for all three of these passages, to misinterpret “the **Sun** of righteousness” as “the **Son** of righteousness”, especially since each passage does refer to the Son of God.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 26:9, 3 Nephi 25:2, and Ether 9:22 to read “the **Sun** of righteousness” rather than the homophonous “the **Son** of righteousness”; the phrase “the Sun of righteousness” acts as a name or title for Christ and is similar in form to “the Branch of righteousness” (in Jeremiah 33:15) and “the fountain of all righteousness” (in 1 Nephi 2:9, Ether 8:26, and Ether 12:28).

■ 2 Nephi 26:10

and when these things

[NULL >+ shall 1 | shall APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *have passed away*
a speedy destruction cometh unto my people

■ 2 Nephi 26:15

after that my seed and the seed of my brethren

[NULL > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have dwindled in unbelief*
and shall have been smitten by the Gentiles . . .

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:7, Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally drop the modal *shall* in the future perfect. In both of these passages here in 2 Nephi 26, Oliver corrected his initial error in \mathcal{P} . In each case, *shall* is supralinearly inserted; in the first case (in verse 10), the ink flow for the *shall* is somewhat heavier, while there is no difference in ink flow for the second case (in verse 15). The first *shall* may have been inserted somewhat later (perhaps when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}). Later the 1837 edition accidentally deleted the *shall* from the first example; this error has continued in the LDS text, but the RLDS text restored the *shall* in the 1908 edition, probably because the printer’s manuscript reads that way.

The original text allows both the perfect and the future perfect in describing future events. The critical text will maintain each instance of the future perfect, providing it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain the future perfect readings in 2 Nephi 26:10, 15 (“shall have passed away” and “shall have dwindled in unbelief”).

■ 2 Nephi 26:15

and after that they shall have been brought down low

[in 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | into A] *the dust . . .*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally changed the preposition *in* to *into*. There are two other passages in the Book of Mormon that refer to “being brought . . . low **in** the dust”:

1 Nephi 18:18

yea their gray hairs were about to be brought down to lie low **in** the dust

1 Nephi 22:23

it is they which must be brought low **in** the dust

There are no instances of “into the dust” in the Book of Mormon. So the restoration in 2 Nephi 26:15 of “in the dust” for the 1837 edition is obviously correct. The printer’s manuscript was the probable source for restoring the correct reading.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 16:15 the preposition *in* in the phrase “in the dust”, the reading of the earliest textual source (here the printer’s manuscript).

■ 2 Nephi 26:18

*and the [multitudes >% multitude 1 | multitude ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of their terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away*

□ **Isaiah 29:5** (King James Bible)

and the **multitude** of the terrible ones *shall be* as chaff that passeth away

Here in 2 Nephi 26:18, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *multitudes* in the printer’s manuscript, but then he immediately corrected *multitudes* to *multitude* by erasing the plural *s*. His correction undoubtedly restored the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). The singular *multitude* is also the reading of the King James Bible.

Summary: Retain the singular *multitude*, the corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript, which is also the reading of the corresponding Isaiah passage.

■ 2 Nephi 26:18

*and the multitude of **their** terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away*

□ **Isaiah 29:5** (King James Bible)

and the multitude of **the** terrible ones *shall be* as chaff that passeth away

Here the Book of Mormon text has *their* before “terrible ones”, while the King James text has *the*. Much of Isaiah 29 is paraphrased in 2 Nephi 26–28. In this Book of Mormon paraphrase, the first and second persons of Isaiah 29 have been replaced by the third person, so the introduction of *their* here in 2 Nephi 26:18 can be seen as being consistent with the paraphrase. Further, the immediately preceding text here in 2 Nephi 26 uses *they* to refer to those who “seek to destroy the things of God” and who will also be “destroyed speedily”:

2 Nephi 26:17–18 (original text)

and **they** that have dwindled in unbelief shall not have them
for **they** seek to destroy the things of God
wherefore as **they** which have been destroyed have been destroyed speedily
and the multitude of **their** terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away

We do not have the original manuscript here for 2 Nephi 26:18, so we cannot be sure whether it read *their* or *the* before “terrible ones”; but without any strong evidence against the current reading of *their*, it seems most reasonable to keep *their* rather than replace it with the King James *the*. The possessive pronoun *their* works well within the larger context.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 26:18 the *their* of the Book of Mormon text (“the multitude of **their** terrible ones”) rather than the King James *the* (“the multitude of **the** terrible ones”).

■ 2 Nephi 26:20

*nevertheless they put down
the power and [the 1ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] miracles of God*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally removed the repetition of *the* in this conjoined phrase (“the power and **the** miracles of God”). The loss of the repeated *the* is found sporadically throughout the history of the Book of Mormon text. For this passage, the lack of the repeated *the* has continued in the LDS text. For another example, plus some discussion, see 1 Nephi 1:1; for a complete list of examples, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the definite article *the* before *miracles* in 2 Nephi 26:20; this repeated *the* reflects the original style of the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 26:20

*nevertheless they put down the power and the miracles of God
and preach unto themselves their own wisdom and their own learning
that they may get gain and grind upon the **face** of the poor*

One wonders here in 2 Nephi 26:20 if the singular *face* (the reading of \mathfrak{P} , the earliest textual source) might be an error for the plural *faces*. Note first that the phraseology “grind (upon) the face(s) of the poor” does occur elsewhere in the text:

2 Nephi 13:15 (Isaiah 3:15)
ye beat my people to pieces and grind the **faces** of the poor

Here both the King James passage and the Book of Mormon text have the plural *faces*.

Errors elsewhere in the text indicate that sometimes the singular *face* may be an error for the plural *faces*. Consider the following example, which is also an Isaiah quote:

Mosiah 14:3 (Isaiah 53:3)
and we hid as it were
our [*faces* 1AT | *face* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] from him

The corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible has the plural reading *faces*, which supports the plural of the earliest textual sources in Mosiah 14:3. In this case, the 1837 edition accidentally replaced the plural *faces* with *face*.

Another example of variation for *face(s)* is found later in the Book of Mormon text:

Helaman 5:36–37

and behold he saw through the cloud of darkness the **faces** of Nephi and Lehi
and behold they did shine exceedingly
even as the [*face* 1A | *faces* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of angels . . .
and they did behold the **faces** of Nephi and Lehi

The original manuscript is not extant for this case of *face* (“the face of angels”), but the earliest reading (in \mathcal{P}) does clearly seem to be an error, especially given the two corresponding occurrences of “the faces of Nephi and Lehi” in this passage. The 1837 edition emended the text here to read in the plural (“the faces of angels”), which may be the original reading. If so, then this passage would provide another example of *faces* being accidentally changed to *face*. For further discussion, see Helaman 5:36–37.

There are four additional biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon that refer to the *face(s)* of more than one person. Two of these have the plural *faces*, just like their corresponding King James passages:

2 Nephi 23:8 (Isaiah 13:8)

their **faces** shall be as flames

3 Nephi 13:16 (Matthew 6:16)

for they disfigure their **faces**

The two other cases cite a single Isaiah passage:

Isaiah 49:23

they shall bow down to thee with *their face* toward the earth

In the Book of Mormon text, one of these citations has the singular *face*, but the other one has the plural *faces*:

1 Nephi 21:23

they shall bow down to thee with their **face** towards the earth

2 Nephi 6:7

they shall bow down to thee with their **faces** towards the earth

Clearly, the singular *face* is intended in 1 Nephi 21:23 since the corresponding King James text also has the singular. In general, however, the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural *faces* when referring to more than one person, as in the case of 2 Nephi 6:7. For further discussion of this variability regarding *face(s)* (including its Hebrew basis in the Isaiah quotations), see 2 Nephi 6:7.

Despite all of this argumentation, it should be noted that the use of the singular *face* in 1 Nephi 21:23 and 2 Nephi 26:20 is not at all objectional. The singular *face* in 1 Nephi 21:23 works since the text can be interpreted as if it read “they shall **each** bow down to thee with their **face** towards the earth”. As for 2 Nephi 26:20, the singular *face* is acceptable because the corresponding *poor* is also singular in form, even though the intended number is plural. Further, this lack of difficulty in both cases would explain why there has been no tendency in the history of the text to emend

face in 2 Nephi 26:20 (or in 1 Nephi 21:23) to read in the plural. Consequently, the critical text will accept the singular *face* here in 2 Nephi 26:20 (the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the earliest textual source). The possibility remains, of course, that the singular *face* in 2 Nephi 26:20 may be an error (for *faces*) that entered the text early on in its transmission.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 26:20 the singular *face* since it will work (“and grind upon the **face** of the poor”), even though it is possible that the original text read *faces*, as it does in 2 Nephi 13:15 (“and grind the **faces** of the poor”).

■ 2 Nephi 26:22

*for he is the [founder >js founderation 1|founder AT|foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
of all these things
yea the [founder >js founderation 1|founder AT|foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
of murder and works of darkness*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:6, the original noun *founder* here in 2 Nephi 26:22 works perfectly well, in fact, better than the noun *foundation* that replaced it in the 1837 edition.

■ 2 Nephi 26:24

*wherefore he [commandeth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST|commanded > commandeth F] none
that they shall not partake of his salvation*

The 1852 LDS edition originally had *commanded*, a typo that was corrected in the second printing of that edition. This entire passage is in the present tense, with *worketh*, *doeth*, *loveth*, *layeth*, *commandeth*, *doth*, *saith*, and *hath* in verses 23–26.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources as well as the usage throughout this passage, the present-tense *commandeth* will be maintained in 2 Nephi 26:24.

■ 2 Nephi 26:26

*behold I say unto you
[nay > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] nay*

Initially in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery seems to have written a dittography, “nay nay”, which he corrected by deleting the first *nay*. The correction appears to be based on the reading in \mathcal{O} , which is no longer extant for this passage. (It is also possible that Oliver simply rewrote the word *nay* because the first one involved a scribal slip: his first *nay* looks like it was initially written as *ray*.)

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text repeats *nay* only once, and that occurs in a biblical quotation from the King James Bible:

3 Nephi 12:37 (Matthew 5:37)
 but let your communication be
 yea yea / nay nay

In fact, this is also the only passage in the entire Book of Mormon text where *yea* is repeated. Thus the introduction of “nay nay” in 2 Nephi 26:26 most probably involves a scribal error that Oliver Cowdery immediately corrected.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 26:26 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} that has only a single *nay* (“behold I say unto you nay”).

■ 2 Nephi 26:27

and he hath commanded his people that they should persuade all men
 [unto 1A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *repentance*

The 1837 edition replaced *unto* with *to*. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith and appears to be a typo. The Book of Mormon text clearly favors “unto repentance” over “to repentance”. Excluding this case, the text has 34 instances of “unto repentance”, but only 6 of “to repentance”. In fact, five of those six occur with the verb *bring* (the sixth one with the verb *call*). The instances of “unto repentance” also occur with the verbs *bring* (nine times) and *call* (once) as well as with a multitude of other verbs (*stir up, baptize, have faith, exercise faith, lead, be, come, and believe*). So the occurrence of “unto repentance” with the verb *persuade* is clearly consistent with the diversity in verb choice for the rest of the text; there was no need for the 1837 replacement of *unto* with *to* in 2 Nephi 26:27.

Summary: Restore the frequently used phraseology “unto repentance” in 2 Nephi 26:27, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ 2 Nephi 26:29

that they may get gain
 and praise of [men >+ the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *world*

In copying from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery originally wrote inline the impossible “praise of men world” (and without any change in the level of ink flow). Somewhat later he corrected the text by crossing out *men* and supralinearly inserting *the*. The original manuscript must have read as the corrected text in \mathcal{P} . The correction itself is in somewhat heavier ink flow and could have been made almost immediately (after redipping his quill) or somewhat later when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{G} .

The Book of Mormon has two other instances of “praise of the world” (in 1 Nephi 13:9 and Mormon 8:38), a phrase which never occurs in the King James Bible. Oliver Cowdery was perhaps influenced by the familiar language from John 12:43 (“for they loved **the praise of men** more than the praise of God”) when he initially wrote “praise of men” in 2 Nephi 26:29. An improbable source for the initial error in 2 Nephi 26:29 is the virtually identical phraseology in

Helaman 7:21 (“but behold it is to get gain / to be praised of men”); this passage in Helaman is considerably far away from 2 Nephi 26:29.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 26:29 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} of “praise of the world”.

■ 2 Nephi 26:32

*and again the Lord God hath commanded
that men should not murder
that they should not lie
that they should not steal
that they should not take the name of the Lord their God in vain
that they should not envy
that they should not have malice
that they should not contend one with another
that they should not commit whoredoms
and that they should [not >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] do **none** of these things*

Apparently it was John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, who deleted the *not* here. The crossout is precisely like the crossout of *with* found a few verses later in 2 Nephi 27:2. (The crossed-out *not* is on line 17 of page 85 of \mathcal{P} , while the crossed-out *with* is on line 26.) We know that the later crossout (of the *with*) is Gilbert’s because the supralinearly inserted *of* looks precisely like the *of* that he later inserted in Alma 51:7; there he emended “many the people of liberty” to “many **of** the people of liberty” (see the discussion under Alma 51:7).

Here in 2 Nephi 26:32, the earliest text has a sequence of eight occurrences of the same phraseology (“that they should not”), preceded by an initial “that men should not”. Clearly, one could view the last occurrence (“that they should **not** do **none** of these things”) as an error—that is, one could presume that the *not* was accidentally added because of the preceding eight occurrences of *should not*. On the other hand, multiple negatives (also known as double negatives when only two negatives are involved) are found in the original text, as in the following examples:

2 Nephi 33:9 (“for **none** of these I **cannot** hope)
but behold for **none** of these
[*I cannot* 0A | *I cannot* >js *can I* 1 | *can I* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hope
except they shall be reconciled unto Christ

3 Nephi 17:17 (“**no** tongue **cannot** speak”)
and **no** tongue [*can not* 1 | *can* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] speak

Mormon 8:26 (“**no** one need **not** say”)
and **no** one need [*not* >js NULL 1 | *not* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] say
they shall not come

Ether 12:6 (“ye receive **no** witness **not** until after . . .”)
for ye receive **no** witness
[*not* 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] until after the trial of your faith

(Note, in particular, the examples in 3 Nephi 17:17 and Ether 12:6; there the 1830 compositor is the one responsible for deleting the extra *not*.) These four examples are all similar to the example here in 2 Nephi 26:32 in that each one involves a *not* following either *none* or *no*. In each case, the *not* has been removed by editing.

Interestingly, there is evidence that the manuscript scribes and even the 1830 compositor himself sometimes created multiple negatives:

Alma 9:12 (initial error in \mathcal{P} by scribe 2, corrected by himself)

and except ye repent
 ye [*can not* > *can* 1 | *can* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 in [*no wise* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *nowise* RT]
 inherit the kingdom of God

Alma 29:2 (the 1830 compositor added an extra *not*)

that they should repent and come unto our God
 that there might [*be no* 01PS | *not be no* A | *not be* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
 more sorrow upon all the face of the earth

Ether 6:25 (no room in \mathcal{G} for *not*; initial error in \mathcal{P} by Oliver Cowdery,
 corrected by himself)

and he commanded them that
 they should [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT | *not* > NULL 1] constrain **no** man
 to be their king

So it is possible that the five cases where the earliest sources support the multiple negative could be due to dialectal interference during the early transmission of the text.

Even so, the critical text does not necessarily favor standard English. Instead, in each case of negation, we allow the earliest textual sources to determine whether the multiple negative should be included in the original text. When supported by the earliest reading, the critical text will accept multiple negation, despite its unacceptability in standard English.

For examples of multiple negation involving the negative conjunction *nor*, see 2 Nephi 23:17. For examples of multiple negation involving the prepositional *but*, see 1 Nephi 14:28. And for a complete discussion, see NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Accept the original multiple negative in 2 Nephi 26:32 (“and that they should **not** do **none** of these things”); in this instance, the 1830 compositor removed the *not*.

2 Nephi 27

■ 2 Nephi 27:1

*both they which shall come upon this land
and they which shall [come > be 1 | be ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon other lands
yea even upon all the lands of the earth*

As Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{S} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote “and they which shall **come** upon other lands”, undoubtedly because he had just written “both they which shall **come** upon this land”. Oliver immediately corrected the text by crossing out the repeated *come* and supralinearly inserting *be* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript, which is not extant here, undoubtedly read *be*. The contrast here is between those who came to the promised land and those who did not.

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for 2 Nephi 27:1 (“they which shall **be** upon other lands”).

■ 2 Nephi 27:1

*behold they will be [drunken 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | drunk D] with iniquity
and all manner of abominations*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the past participle *drunken* with the alternative shortened past participial form *drunk*. This reading was not continued in the following LDS edition (1849).

The past participial form *drunken* rather than *drunk* is consistently found in adjectival and passive contexts in the Book of Mormon text—that is, when the helping or main verb is *be* (or is at least implied). There are 17 examples of this usage in the text, all of which refer either directly or indirectly to alcoholic intoxication, as in Mosiah 22:7 (“when they **are drunken** and asleep”) or Ether 15:22 (“they **were drunken** with anger even as a man which **is drunken** with wine”). Thus the use of *drunken* rather than *drunk* is correct here in 2 Nephi 27:1.

On the other hand, there are six cases of the verb *drink* in perfect contexts (that is, when the helping verb is *have*). For these cases, we get more variation in the Book of Mormon text. In one case, an Isaiah quotation, we have both *drunk* and *drunken*:

2 Nephi 8:17 (Isaiah 51:17)
awake awake stand up O Jerusalem
which **hast drunk** at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury
thou **hast** [*drunk* >+ *drunken* 1 | *drunken* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the dregs of the cup of trembling wrung out

Note here that Oliver Cowdery, when he copied this Isaiah passage, initially wrote “hast drunk” instead of “hast drunken” for the second occurrence, perhaps because he had just written “hast drunk” for the first occurrence. Oliver later corrected *drunk* to *drunken*, perhaps when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (the level of ink flow is slightly heavier). The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read the same as the corresponding King James text (“hast drunk . . . hast drunken”).

Elsewhere in the text, we have either *drunk* or *drank* (but not *drunken*) as the past participial form in the perfect:

Mosiah 3:25–26

therefore they **have drunk** damnation to their own souls
therefore they **have drunk** out of the cup of the wrath of God

3 Nephi 11:11

and I **have** [*drank* 1A | *drunk* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] out of that bitter cup
which the Father hath given me

3 Nephi 20:9

now when the multitude **had** all
[*eat and drank* 1A | *eaten and drunk* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
behold they were filled with the Spirit

In the two original cases of “have drank” in 3 Nephi, the simple past-tense form *drank* was extended to the past participial form. Such usage is common in the Book of Mormon text, as in “we had came down” rather than “we had come down” (see 1 Nephi 5:1 for discussion of this example). For complete discussion of this usage, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of *drunken* rather than *drunk* whenever the text uses the past participial form of *drink* to refer to states of drunkenness (here in 2 Nephi 27:1 and in 16 other places in the text).

■ 2 Nephi 27:2

they shall be visited

[*with >jg of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *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 1830 compositor probably thought the use of *with* in the phrase “visited with the Lord of Hosts” seemed inappropriate, so he changed the preposition *with* to *of*, undoubtedly by reference to his King James Bible. It is quite possible that the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here) is in error, especially when we consider the multiple use of the preposition *with* that follows: “with thunder and with earthquake and with a great noise and with storm and tempest and with the flame of devouring fire”. When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} ,

Oliver Cowdery may have accidentally introduced the *with* because of its many occurrences in the rest of the clause.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, people are specifically “visited with” destructions of various kinds (13 times), including the following examples:

2 Nephi 26:6

and they shall be **visited with** thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes
and all manner of destructions

Jacob 2:33

for they shall not lead away captive the daughters of my people
because of their tenderness
save I shall **visit** them **with** a sore curse
even unto destruction

Helaman 12:3

and thus we see that
except the Lord doth chasten his people with many afflictions
yea except he doth **visit** them **with** death and **with** terror
and **with** famine and **with** all manner of pestilences
they will not remember him

On the other hand, people are visited “with the Lord’s voice” (1 Nephi 19:11), “with the Lord’s Spirit” (Alma 17:10), “with assurances” (Alma 58:11), “with fire and with the Holy Ghost” (3 Nephi 11:35 and 3 Nephi 12:2), and “with the manifestations of the Lord’s Spirit” (Ether 4:11). These six examples are positive rather than negative, and all deal with the visitation of the Lord’s Spirit and influence rather than the Lord himself. There are no examples of people being directly “visited **with** the Lord”, either positively or negatively.

One possibility is that the original preposition in the Book of Mormon text was *by* (that is, the original text read “they shall be visited **by** the Lord of Hosts”). The preposition *by* occurs with negatives uses of the verb *visit*:

1 Nephi 19:11

the Lord God surely shall **visit** all the house of Israel at that day
some **with** his voice because of their righteousness
unto their great joy and salvation
and others **with** the thunderings and the lightnings of his power
by tempest **by** fire and **by** smoke and vapor of darkness
and **by** the opening of the earth and **by** mountains which shall be carried up

2 Nephi 1:18

and ye are visited **by** sword and **by** famine

Notice in the first example that the preposition *with* is first used to refer to the visitation of the Lord’s voice (positively) and then to “the thunderings and the lightnings of his power” (negatively). The remainder of the passage continues the list of negative uses but switches from the preposition *with* to *by*. We should also note that there are also four positive uses of *visit* that involve the preposition *by*:

Alma 9:21	having been visited by the Spirit of God
Alma 24:14	in his mercy he doth visit us by his angels
3 Nephi 7:15	having been visited by angels and also by the voice of the Lord
3 Nephi 7:21	they had been visited by the power and Spirit of God

Of course, the original preposition in 2 Nephi 27:2 might have been *of*, in which case the original text read like the King James Bible. For 2 Nephi 27:2 the 1830 typesetter did not have access to the original manuscript, but nonetheless his emendation may represent the original text. In support of this reading, we do have one other occurrence of the preposition *of* with the verb *visit*, in Mormon 1:15 (“I was visited **of** the Lord”). Thus the Book of Mormon text allows either phraseology, “visited **of** the Lord” and “visited **by** the Lord”. The preposition *of* is the older agentive preposition in English and is commonly found in the King James text. For further discussion of mix-ups in the use of the prepositions *of*, *with*, and *by*, see 1 Nephi 11:31.

The Oxford English Dictionary (the online version) cites 74 instances of “visited by” but none of “visited of”. The archaic use of “visited of” (as found in Isaiah 29:6) must be relatively rare in the history of English. The OED also lists examples of “visited with”, but nearly all of these are used like the instances of “visited with” found in the Book of Mormon. One clear exception cited in the OED uses “visited with” in the sense of ‘visited by’:

Peter Heylin (1662)

The State of Avignon, . . . being **visited with** such of the French Preachers as had been studied [educated] at Geneva.

(For the OED citation, see definition 8b under the verb *study*.) This example shows that “visited with X”, where X refers to people, did sometimes occur in Early Modern English.

In the original Hebrew text for Isaiah 29:6, the word for the King James *of* in “thou shalt be visited **of** the Lord of Hosts” literally translates as “from with”, so the *with* of the printer’s manuscript is not theoretically impossible. It should also be noted that originally the English preposition *of* meant ‘from’ (it is etymologically related to the adverb *off*).

Despite this minor linguistic evidence in support of “visited with the Lord” in 2 Nephi 27:2, it seems more reasonable to assume that the *with* here is an error that took place in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. The original text probably read “visited **of** the Lord”, but this use of the preposition *of* was sufficiently strange that it was accidentally replaced by the highly frequent *with* that immediately followed (five times in “**with** thunder and **with** earthquake and **with** a great noise and **with** storm and tempest and **with** the flame of devouring fire”). Thus the 1830 compositor was probably correct when he changed the *with* to the King James *of*.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 27:2 the 1830 compositor’s emendation: namely, his change of *with* to *of* that restored the King James reading (“visited **of** the Lord of Hosts”); the additional *with* is probably the result of the many *with*’s that occur in the remainder of the clause.

■ 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 [1A | with BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] 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

Coordination in this passage is completely parallel in the current Book of Mormon text since each additional noun phrase after the initial “with thunder” is preceded by “and with”. The earliest Book of Mormon text was almost completely parallel; only the conjunct *tempest* was not preceded by *with*. But the 1837 edition supplied the *with* and thus completed the parallelism. This one case without the *with* follows the corresponding Isaiah passage, but of course elsewhere in this passage the paraphrastic Book of Mormon reading often diverges from the corresponding Isaiah text. In particular, there are two more cases in the earliest Book of Mormon text where *with* precedes a noun phrase that does not have a *with* in the King James text—namely, “and **with** a great noise . . . and **with** the flame of devouring fire”).

The King James text basically follows the Masoretic Hebrew text except for the final *with* (the one before *storm*). This *with* is not found in the Hebrew, so it should have been set in italics in the King James Bible but was not. Related to the last phrase is a passage from the following chapter of Isaiah that reads in the King James Bible as follows:

Isaiah 30:30
with the indignation of *his* anger
and *with* the flame of a devouring fire
with scattering and tempest and hailstones

The Masoretic Hebrew text for the second conjunct reads identically in both Isaiah 29:6 and Isaiah 30:30; that is, there is no *with* before “the flame” (thus the italics for that *with* in Isaiah 30:30). In addition, there is no indefinite article in Hebrew, but in the King James Bible for Isaiah 30:30 the indefinite *a* is found before “devouring fire” (but not in Isaiah 29:6).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we find cases where the conjoined structure has *with* only in front of the first noun phrase, such as:

2 Nephi 26:6
and they shall be visited **with** thunderings
and lightnings and earthquakes and all manner of destructions

On the other hand, there are quite a few cases (like the current text in 2 Nephi 27:2) where every noun phrase in a series of conjuncts is preceded by *with*. Some deal with lists of weapons:

Mosiah 9:16

with bows and **with** arrows
with swords and **with** scimitars and **with** clubs and **with** slings
and **with** all manner of weapons which we could invent

(For other examples involving weapons, see Mosiah 10:8, Alma 2:12, Helaman 1:14, 3 Nephi 3:26, and Mormon 6:9.) A number of examples, like the one here in 2 Nephi 27:2, deal with lists of what God may inflict on the unrighteous:

Helaman 12:3

except he doth visit them **with** death and **with** terror and **with** famine
and **with** all manner of pestilences

Helaman 13:9

yea I will visit them **with** the sword and **with** famine and **with** pestilence

Despite these consistent examples, there is considerable evidence that the preposition *with* is not always repeated for nominal conjuncts. For instance, there are a number of cases where one of the middle conjuncts lacks the repeated *with*:

1 Nephi 16:23

with a bow and an arrow / **with** a sling and **with** stones

Mosiah 11:9

with gold and silver and **with** precious things

Mosiah 13:8

with wonder and amazement and **with** anger

Helaman 3:30

with Abraham and Isaac and **with** Jacob and **with** all our holy fathers

3 Nephi 17:9

with their sick and their afflicted and their lame
and **with** their blind and **with** their dumb
and **with** all they that were afflicted in any manner

And in some cases the repeated *with* is missing from only the final conjunct:

Alma 5:24

with Abraham **with** Isaac and **with** Jacob and also all the holy prophets

Alma 43:18

with swords and **with** scimitars and all manner of weapons of war

Alma 60:2

with swords and **with** scimitars and all manner of weapons of war of every kind

Helaman 10:6

with famine and **with** pestilence and destruction

It is very doubtful that all these examples involving the omission of the repeated *with* represent errors in the text. Instead, all this variation simply suggests that the preposition *with* is not always

repeated, which means that we should rely in each case upon the earliest textual evidence in determining whether a given conjunct should begin with a repeated *with*. Thus in 2 Nephi 27:2, the critical text will allow for the one nominal conjunct where *with* is not repeated (“and tempest”). All the other instances of the repeated *with* will be maintained in this passage, even though two of them are not found in the corresponding King James passage (“and **with** a great noise . . . and **with** the flame of devouring fire”).

Summary: In 2 Nephi 27:2 we follow the earliest textual sources, which means that the preposition *with* is repeated before every nominal conjunct except one (namely, “and tempest”).

■ 2 Nephi 27:2

*they shall be visited of the Lord of Hosts
with thunder and with earthquake and with a great noise
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

Here the Book of Mormon text has *a* before “great noise”. The Hebrew has no indefinite article *a*, but it appears in the King James Bible according to the inclination of the translators (as in Isaiah 30:30, “the flame of **a** devouring fire”, in contrast to “the flame of devouring fire” here in 2 Nephi 27:2 and in the King James translation of Isaiah 29:6).

The extra *a* here in the Book of Mormon text for 2 Nephi 27:2 (“and with **a** great noise”) could be an error in the early transmission of the text. But it may also be intentional, especially given the use of the *a* in the same phraseology elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (namely, in Alma 14:29, “now the people having heard **a great noise** came running together by multitudes to know the cause of it”). Similarly, in 2 Peter 3:10 of the King James Bible, we have the same prepositional phrase as in 2 Nephi 27:2 (“the heavens shall pass away **with a great noise**”). Such examples suggest that the reading “**a** great noise” in 2 Nephi 27:2 is intended.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 27:2 the use of the indefinite article *a* in the prepositional phrase “with a great noise”.

■ 2 Nephi 27:3

a hungry man

□ Isaiah 29:8 (King James Bible)

an hungry *man*

In the long Isaiah quote in 2 Nephi 12–24, the Book of Mormon text uses *a* rather than *an* before *h*-initial words (providing the *h* is pronounced in standard English). As discussed under 2 Nephi 13:7, the critical text will maintain the use of *a* in these cases. This example from 2 Nephi 27:3 adds

one more example to the list of cases showing this difference in usage between the Book of Mormon and the language of the King James Bible.

Summary: Retain the use of *a* rather than *an* before *hungry* in 2 Nephi 27:3 (in an Isaiah quotation from the King James Bible).

■ **2 Nephi 27:3**

and behold he drinketh
but he [awaketh 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | waketh G]
and behold he is faint

□ **Isaiah 29:8** (King James Bible)

and behold he drinketh
 but he **awaketh**
 and behold *he is faint*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced the biblically styled verb *awake* with the more modern English verb *wake*. The 1874 RLDS edition restored the original and textually correct *awaketh*, the King James verb form. Note that earlier in this verse the text reads “but he **awaketh** and his soul is empty”. This first case of *awaketh* was not changed to *waketh* in the 1858 Wright edition (or in any other), thus showing that the 1858 change in the second case was unintended.

The Book of Mormon text definitely prefers the verbs *awake* and *awaken* over the more modern verbs *wake* and *waken*. In fact, the only place where the text has the *w*-initial verbs is in an Isaiah quotation that also has the *w*-initial verbs in the King James translation:

2 Nephi 7:4 (☉ reads identically to Isaiah 50:4)
 he [*wakeneth* 0 | *waketh* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST] morning by morning
 he [*wakeneth* 0 | *waketh* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST] mine ear
 to hear as the learned

Otherwise the Book of Mormon text allows only the *a*-initial verbs *awake* and *awaken* (43 times). The King James Bible, on the other hand, freely allows both the *a*-initial and *w*-initial verbs, although the *a*-initial verbs are considerably more frequent than the *w*-initial verbs (64 to 12).

Summary: Retain the verb form *awaketh* in 2 Nephi 27:3 (which is also the King James verb form).

■ **2 Nephi 27:4**

for behold all ye that [do 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQS | doeth QRT] iniquity
stay yourselves and wonder

□ **Isaiah 29:9** (King James Bible)

stay yourselves and wonder

The initial line of text here (“for behold all ye that do iniquity”) is not found in the corresponding King James text. The 1911 edition accidentally changed *do* to the more biblical-sounding *doeth*, although the tendency in the editorial history of the text has been to restrict the *-(e)th* verbal

ending to the third person singular. Here the 1911 edition incorrectly extended it to the second person plural, even though in “standard” Early Modern English the plural *ye* should take *do* rather than *doeth*.

Summary: Restore the *do* in 2 Nephi 27:4, the reading of the earliest text; the subject is second person plural, not third person singular, so the use of *do* is grammatically correct.

■ 2 Nephi 27:5

and the seers hath he covered

because of your [iniquity 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | iniquities A]

□ Isaiah 29:10 (King James Bible)

the seers hath he covered

The 1830 edition accidentally replaced the singular *iniquity* with the plural *iniquities*. The earliest text reads in the singular: “because of your iniquity”. The 1837 edition restored the original singular, probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

The prepositional phrase “because of your iniquity” is not found in the corresponding King James text (probably because much of this passage paraphrases Isaiah 29). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have instances of both the singular and plural in referring to “one’s iniquity/iniquities”, with the plural occurring nearly two-thirds of the time (for the statistics, see 2 Nephi 4:17). In each case, we therefore allow the earliest textual sources to determine the number.

Summary: Maintain the singular *iniquity* in 2 Nephi 27:5 (“because of your iniquity”), the reading of the earliest textual source (here the printer’s manuscript).

■ 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*

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery’s text, as he initially wrote it, lacked a subject in the final main clause. The subject pronoun *they* was later supralinearly inserted with heavier and darker ink flow. The hand does not quite look like Oliver’s. One possibility is that the *they* was inserted by John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, especially since this inserted word looks somewhat like the *of* that Gilbert supralinearly inserted on the previous page of *ᐅ* (see line 26 on page 85 of *ᐅ*). If the correction here in 2 Nephi 27:6 is Gilbert’s, then this example provides a clear case of editing on the part of the typesetter. Such editing by the 1830 typesetter did not occur very often. For another possible example of his editing, see 2 Nephi 10:3 (there Gilbert was apparently the one who deleted a redundant “that he”).

Obviously, some emendation seems necessary in 2 Nephi 27:6 since the text does not intend to say that “the Lord God . . . shall be the words of them”. The most reasonable conjecture is that

the subject pronoun *they* was lost during the early transmission of the text, perhaps as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} or as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation for \mathcal{O} . The omitted subject was probably the short pronoun *they* rather than a full noun phrase such as "these words" (which is found later in verse 9: "and he shall deliver **these words** unto another").

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that another possible subject pronoun that could have been accidentally lost is *it*:

2 Nephi 27:6 (alternative emendation)

and it shall come to pass that
the Lord God shall bring forth unto you the words of a book
and **it** shall be the words of them which have slumbered

Here the *it* could refer to either the book or the words as a collective whole. In support of this alternative, there is one clear example where the scribe (in this case, Oliver Cowdery) omitted the pronoun *it*, at least initially, as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 51:25

but he kept them down by the seashore
leaving men in every city to maintain
and defend [*it* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *it* 1]

We should note, however, that this example involves the loss of the *it* in object position rather than in subject position. One possible example involving the loss of a subject *it* can be found later on in the text when scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} was copying the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} (here the 1830 edition is also a firsthand copy of \mathcal{O}):

3 Nephi 28:37 (based on the earliest textual sources)

and he hath made it manifest unto me
that there must needs be a change wrought upon their bodies
or else [1 | *it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] needs be
that they must taste of death

This example, however, is complicated in that there appears to have also been an accidental omission of the modal verb *must* in the original manuscript (which is not extant here). See 3 Nephi 28:37 for discussion of the emended reading "or else it **must** needs be".

In general, however, there is not an abundance of evidence that the Book of Mormon scribes tended to drop the pronoun *it*. (For another example of the possible loss of an object *it*, see Jacob 5:24.)

On the other hand, there are numerous examples of the subject pronoun *they* being accidentally omitted in the manuscripts:

1 Nephi 7:1 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})

but that his sons should take daughters to wife
that [0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] might raise up seed

1 Nephi 19:13 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
[*they* 0FIJLMNOQRST | 1ABCDEFGHIK] shall be scourged by all people

1 Nephi 22:14 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{D})

and all [*they* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] which fight against Zion shall be destroyed

Mosiah 25:16 (initial omission by scribe 2 of \mathcal{D})

and he did exhort the people of Limhi and his brethren all those that had been delivered out of bondage that [NULL >- *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] should remember that it was the Lord that did deliver them

Alma 45:22 (initial omission by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{G})

and it came to pass that [NULL > *they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] did appoint priests and teachers throughout all the land

3 Nephi 14:15 (initial omission by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{D})

beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly [NULL > *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] are ravening wolves

Ether 6:3 (initial omission by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{D})

and thus the Lord caused stones to shine in darkness to give light unto men women and children that [NULL > *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] might not cross the great waters in darkness

Usage elsewhere also favors the occurrence of the pronoun *they*, not *it*, in the context of “the words”. Besides the *they* in 2 Nephi 27:6, there are in this same book of 2 Nephi four occurrences of *they* that refer to someone’s words:

2 Nephi 6:4

wherefore I will read you the words of Isaiah and **they are the words** which my brother hath desired me that I should speak unto you

2 Nephi 33:10–11 (three occurrences)

and if ye shall believe in Christ ye will believe in these words for **they are the words** of Christ and he hath given them unto me and they teach all men that they should do good and if **they are not the words** of Christ judge ye for Christ will shew unto you with power and great glory that **they are his words** at the last day

Thus the internal evidence as well as evidence from scribal errors shows that the later insertion of *they* in \mathcal{D} for 2 Nephi 27:6 is most probably the correct reading.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 27:6 the corrected text in \mathcal{P} (“and **they** shall be the words of them which have slumbered”); most probably, the *they* was accidentally lost in the early transmission of the text.

■ 2 Nephi 27:10

for behold they reveal all things from the foundation of the world
 [*to* >+ *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the end thereof*

Oliver Cowdery first wrote *to* as he copied the text from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} ; then later in somewhat heavier ink flow he corrected the *to* to *unto* (perhaps while checking copy against the original manuscript, no longer extant here). The correction here in \mathcal{P} is clearly Oliver’s, unlike the insertion of *they* in verse 6. The use of the preposition *unto* is unexpected in modern English, so the correction here probably represents the reading of the original manuscript.

The Book of Mormon text has only one example of “to the end of X”, in 1 Nephi 20:20 where Isaiah 48:20 is being quoted: “utter to the end of the earth”. Otherwise, the Book of Mormon text has “unto the end of X”:

2 Nephi 27:11	even unto the end of the earth
Mosiah 4:6	even unto the end of his life
Mosiah 4:7	even unto the end of the world
Mosiah 4:30	even unto the end of your lives
Mosiah 5:8	unto the end of your lives

Summary: Follow in 2 Nephi 27:10 Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *to* to *unto* in \mathcal{P} since *unto* probably represents the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 27:11

and the day cometh that the words of the book
which [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | was > were F] sealed
shall be read upon the housetops

The question here is whether the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* should be simply “the book” or “the words of the book”. The earliest text reads “which were”, which implies that the *which* refers to the head of the noun phrase (namely, *words*). The first printing of the 1852 edition replaced the plural *were* with the singular *was*, but in the second printing the original *were* was restored, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Usage in the previous verse shows that both the words and the book can be sealed:

2 Nephi 27:10
 but **the words which are sealed** he shall not deliver
 neither shall he deliver the book
 for **the book shall be sealed** by the power of God

Thus we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the words are sealed or the book is sealed. For other examples, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 27:11: “the words of the book which **were** sealed”.

■ 2 Nephi 27:12

the book shall be hid from the eyes of the world

that the eyes of none shall behold [it 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > it F]

save it be that three witnesses shall behold it

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally dropped the pronoun *it* in this verse, but the *it* was restored in the second printing, perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition. The following *that*-clause shows that the *it* is expected: “three witnesses **shall behold it**”.

Summary: Maintain the pronoun *it* for both occurrences of “shall behold it” in 2 Nephi 27:12.

■ 2 Nephi 27:13

to bear testimony of his word

unto the children of [men 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | man > men F]

Once more the 1852 LDS edition accidentally created an error in the first printing of that edition. Clearly, the 1852 typesetter was having some difficulty in following his copy-text for this short portion of the text (verses 11–13). Here in verse 13, he accidentally replaced “children of men” with “children of man”. This obvious error was corrected in the second printing of the 1852 edition. Elsewhere, the text permits only “children of men” (131 occurrences).

Summary: Follow the earliest text in 2 Nephi 27:13, “the children of men”.

■ 2 Nephi 27:15

and the learned [will > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] say

*bring hither the book and I **will** read them*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *will* (the normal modal verb in modern English for expressing the future), then he corrected it to *shall*. The change occurs with the same level of ink flow, so this correction appears to be virtually immediate. In the surrounding verses (from verses 6 through 24) we have the following sequence of modal *shall*’s and *will*’s (the reading here in 2 Nephi 27:15 is marked by an arrow):

verses 6–11	17 <i>shall</i> ’s
verse 11	1 <i>will</i>
verses 12–13	7 <i>shall</i> ’s
verse 14	2 <i>will</i> ’s
verse 15	3 <i>shall</i> ’s
→ verse 15	<i>will > shall</i>
verse 15–16	2 <i>will</i> ’s

2 Nephi 27

verses 17–19	3 <i>shall</i> 's
verse 19	1 <i>will</i>
verses 19–20	4 <i>shall</i> 's, 1 <i>shalt</i>
verse 21	2 <i>will</i> 's
verse 22	1 <i>shall</i> , 1 <i>shalt</i>
verse 23	1 <i>will</i>
verse 24	4 <i>shall</i> 's

Since either *shall* or *will* is possible (especially given the surrounding variation), Oliver Cowdery was probably correcting \mathcal{P} to the reading in \mathcal{C} when he changed *will* to *shall* in verse 15. The source for the *will* may have been the following *will* in “and I will read them”.

Summary: Retain Oliver Cowdery’s corrected *shall* in 2 Nephi 27:15 (“and the learned shall say”).

■ 2 Nephi 27:22

*wherefore when thou hast read the words which I have commanded thee
and obtained the witnesses which I have promised unto thee
then shalt thou seal up the book [NULL >+ again 1 | again ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and hide it up unto me*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text without *again*, then somewhat later supralinearly inserted the word *again* with heavier ink flow. There are two possibilities: either (1) Oliver edited the text, or (2) while checking the printer’s manuscript, he corrected it so that it would agree with the reading in the original manuscript. The text could read without *again*, which suggests that there is no strong motive for Oliver to have edited the text here. Therefore, the more plausible possibility is that Oliver was correcting the text to agree with the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here).

Later on in 2 Nephi, we have a second reference to how the plates would be resealed after Joseph Smith’s translation was complete:

2 Nephi 30:3
 for after the book of which I have spoken
 shall come forth and be written unto the Gentiles
 and **sealed up again** unto the Lord
 there shall be many which shall believe the words which are written
 and they shall carry them forth unto the remnant of our seed

Here *again* is once more used to refer to what Joseph Smith would do with the plates after finishing the translation: he would seal them up **again**. This nearby reading thus supports the corrected reading in 2 Nephi 27:22.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 27:22 the reading with *again* (“then shalt thou seal up the book again”), Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{P} (which apparently made \mathcal{P} agree with \mathcal{C}).

■ 2 Nephi 27:25

*forasmuch as this people draw near unto me
with their mouth and with their lips do honor me
but have removed their [heart 1 | hearts ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] far from me
and their fear towards me is taught
by the [precept 1 | precepts ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of men . . .*

□ Isaiah 29:13 (King James Bible)

forasmuch as this people draw near *me*
with their mouth and with their lips do honor me
but have removed their **heart** far from me
and their fear toward me is taught
by the **precept** of men . . .

Here the 1830 typesetter pluralized two words, *heart* and *precept*. The original text of the Book of Mormon, as reflected in the printer's manuscript, agrees with the King James text, which has the singular for these two words (as does the Masoretic Hebrew text).

One could argue that the plural *hearts* makes more sense since each person has one heart and we are talking about many persons ("this people"). Yet the 1830 typesetter did not change *mouth* to *mouths* in this verse, so this pluralization does not seem to be consistently applied. The Hebrew text for this passage consistently assigns to "this people" the singular or plural according to whether the individual person has singular or plural forms of these parts of the body ("their mouth", "their lips", "their heart"). The King James Bible and the original Book of Mormon text also follow this consistent usage here in 2 Nephi 27:25. But in other places in the Isaiah quotations, the earliest Book of Mormon reading frequently does use plural forms for parts of the body rather than the singular forms found in the corresponding Isaiah passages in the King James Bible. See the example of *tongue(s)* under 2 Nephi 13:8–9 and *eye(s)* under 2 Nephi 23:18.

In English usage, the plural "the precepts of X" is consistently more frequent than the singular "the precept of X". The Oxford English Dictionary, for instance, lists 67 instances of "precepts of X" but 29 of "precept of X". The ratio of comparison is about the same in current English, as exemplified by the statistics found on <www.google.com> for 4 June 2004: namely, 99,600 instances of "precepts of X" and 40,700 of "precept of X". Both historically and currently, the plural is over two times more frequent than the singular. It is therefore not surprising that the 1830 compositor accidentally set the plural "the precepts of men".

The rest of the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural "precepts of men", with three occurrences in the next chapter; in each of these cases the printer's manuscript (here the earliest extant text) reads in the plural:

2 Nephi 28:14	because they are taught by the precepts of men
2 Nephi 28:26	unto him that hearkeneth unto the precepts of men
2 Nephi 28:31	or shall hearken unto the precepts of men

Thus only in a direct quote of Isaiah does the earliest text have the singular "the precept of men".

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 27:25 the singulars *heart* and *precept*, in accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript as well as the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 27:25

*and their fear [towards 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | toward HK] me is taught
by the precept of men*

□ Isaiah 29:13 (King James Bible)

and their fear **toward** me is taught
by the precept of men

Once more we have the question of whether the Book of Mormon text should read *towards* or follow the King James *toward*. Here the earliest Book of Mormon sources have the form *towards*. It should be noted, however, that here the original 1611 King James Bible actually read *towards* rather than *toward*.

The 1874 RLDS edition introduced the form *toward*, but this form was removed from the RLDS text in the 1908 edition, probably because the printer's manuscript reads *towards*. For two other cases where the 1874 edition replaced *towards* with *toward*, see Mosiah 20:20 and Alma 62:14.

In the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:22, it was determined that the critical text should in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the text should read *towards* or *toward*. Usually the textual sources favor *towards*, even in Isaiah quotations (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 17:1).

Summary: Retain *towards* in 2 Nephi 27:25, a biblical quote from Isaiah 29:13; *towards* is the expected Book of Mormon form for this word, even though the standard King James text has *toward*.

■ 2 Nephi 27:26–27

*for the wisdom of their wise and learned shall perish
and the understanding of their prudent shall be hid
[but >+ & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] woe unto them
that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord*

□ Isaiah 29:14–15 (King James Bible)

for the wisdom of their wise *men* shall perish
and the understanding of their prudent *men* shall be hid
woe unto them
that seek deep to hide their counsel from the LORD

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *but* in the printer's manuscript, but he later altered it to *and* (written as an ampersand) and with heavier ink flow. In the original text, there are 7 occurrences of "but woe" and 12 of "and woe" in sentence-initial position, so either is syntactically possible in 2 Nephi 27:27. The correction here looks much like the *again* that was supralinearly inserted earlier in verse 22 of this chapter. As with that insertion involving *again*, the correction here in verse 27 probably occurred when Oliver proofed \wp against \wp (which is no longer extant for this part of the text). For further discussion of scribal errors involving mix-ups between *and* and *but*, see the list provided under 1 Nephi 8:20 (in the discussion regarding *straight* versus *strait*).

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 27:27 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected *and* in \mathcal{D} ; this corrected reading (*and* rather than *but*) was probably based on the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ 2 Nephi 27:28

*but behold saith the Lord of Hosts
I will shew unto the children of men that
it is [not 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | IJLMNOQRT] yet a very little while
and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field*

□ Isaiah 29:17 (King James Bible)

*is it not yet a very little while
and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field*

The Book of Mormon text is in the form of a statement (“it is not yet a very little while”), whereas the King James reading takes the form of a question (“*is it not yet a very little while*”). The 1879 LDS edition deleted the *not* (“it is yet a very little while”) in order to avoid the multiple negative involving *not* and *little*. The original Book of Mormon statement actually means that ‘it will be a very little while and Lebanon will be turned into a fruitful field’, not that ‘it will be a long time before Lebanon will be turned into a fruitful field’. On the other hand, the negative *not* is perfectly acceptable in a yes-no question that expects a positive answer (as in a yes-no question like “Isn’t it true that Angie is coming?”).

A similar kind of editing involving multiple negation is found in Alma 58:5, where *not* originally occurred with the adjective *little*:

Alma 58:5
this did [*not* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] profit us but little

For a related example, see 1 Nephi 14:28; for a more general discussion, see NEGATION in volume 3.

One might wonder here if the Book of Mormon word order (as a statement) might not be the result of an early error in the transmission of the text. Yet elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are no examples in the manuscripts of errors in word order that replace a yes-no question with a declarative statement or vice versa. There has, however, been some minor tendency in individual printed editions for such switches in word order to occur:

1 Nephi 7:12 (typo in the 1911 LDS edition)
yea and how [*is it* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | *it is* Q]
that ye have forgotten that the Lord is able to do all things

Alma 33:15 (typo in the 1841 British edition)
for [*it is* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *is it* D] not written
that Zenos alone spake of these things

Alma 39:19 (typo in the 1905 LDS edition)
[*is it* 01 | *Is it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *It is* M] not as easy at this time
for the Lord to send his angel to declare those glad tidings unto us

But the manuscript scribes themselves show no evidence of ever confusing “it is” with “is it”. Thus the occurrence of the declarative word order “it is not yet a very little while” in 2 Nephi 27:28 should be accepted. The original *not* should also be accepted since the Book of Mormon text is quoting Isaiah 29:17, which has the *not*. The original text here in 2 Nephi 27:28 has a multiple negative (“not yet a very little while”), which appears to be fully intentional.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 27:28 the *not* of “it is not yet a very little while”, the original reading of the Book of Mormon text; the *not* is found in the corresponding King James passage, although there is a difference in the word order.

■ 2 Nephi 27:33

*therefore thus saith the Lord who redeemed Abraham
concerning [NULL > the house of 1 | the house of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jacob
Jacob shall not now be ashamed
neither shall his face [NULL > now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wax pale*

□ Isaiah 29:22 (King James Bible)

therefore thus saith the LORD who redeemed Abraham
concerning **the house of** Jacob
Jacob shall not now be ashamed
neither shall his face **now** wax pale

In this verse, we have a couple of minor omissions in \mathcal{P} that Oliver Cowdery corrected almost immediately (there is no change in the level of the ink flow for the two supralinear insertions). The corrections made the text agree with the corresponding King James text. The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read according to the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain the two corrected readings in \mathcal{P} , which are most probably corrections to the original manuscript (and in agreement with the corresponding King James passage).

■ 2 Nephi 27:34

*but when he seeth his children
the work of **my** hands in the midst of him
they shall sanctify my name*

□ Isaiah 29:23 (King James Bible)

but when he seeth his children
the work of **mine** hands in the midst of him
they shall sanctify my name

Under 2 Nephi 24:13, I discuss the occurrence of *my* versus *mine* and *thy* versus *thine* before *h*-initial words in the Book of Mormon text. The tendency for the original text has been to replace the *mine* and *thine* of the Isaiah quotes with *my* and *thy*. Here in 2 Nephi 27:34 we have one more example of this tendency.

Summary: In 2 Nephi 27:34 the critical text will follow the reading of the Book of Mormon text (“my hands”); the original text favors the personal pronouns *my* and *thy* rather than the now archaic use of *mine* and *thine* before *h*-initial words (common in the King James text since the initial *h* was often not pronounced in Early Modern English).

■ **2 Nephi 27:34**

*they shall sanctify my name
and sanctify the Holy One of [Israel > Jacob 1 | Jacob ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and shall fear the God of Israel*

□ **Isaiah 29:23** (King James Bible)

they shall sanctify my name
and sanctify the Holy One of **Jacob**
and shall fear the God of Israel

The expression “the Holy One of Israel” is the expected phraseology in the scriptures, occurring 40 times in the Book of Mormon. On the other hand, “the Holy One of Jacob” occurs only here in 2 Nephi 27:34 (but in agreement with the corresponding King James reading in Isaiah 29:23). Thus it is not surprising that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the Holy One of Israel”, then nearly immediately corrected it—there is no difference in ink flow—to “the Holy One of Jacob”, which was undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

The tendency to replace *Jacob* with the expected *Israel* is also found in the phrase “the house of Jacob”:

- 1 Nephi 20:1 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P} , corrected with slightly heavier ink flow)
hearken and hear this
O house of [*Jacob* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *Israel* >+ *Jacob* 1]
- 4 Nephi 1:49 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ’s initial error, corrected almost immediately)
that they might come again unto the remnant
of the house of [*Israel* > *Jacob* 1 | *Jacob* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the first example, the text cites Isaiah 48:1, which in the King James Bible reads “hear ye this O house of **Jacob**”. The original manuscript is extant for 1 Nephi 20:1 and also reads “O house of Jacob”. In the second example, the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of \mathcal{C} for this passage, and it too reads “the house of Jacob”; thus \mathcal{C} (which is not extant here) undoubtedly also read “the house of Jacob”.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 27:34 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathcal{P} to the reading of the original text (“the Holy One of Jacob”), which is the same as the corresponding King James reading for this passage.

2 Nephi 28

■ 2 Nephi 28:1–2

wherefore I know that they must surely come to pass

[& 1 | ABDEFIJLMNOQR | *And* CGHKPST] *the things which shall be written out of the book shall be of great worth unto the children of men*

The printer’s manuscript begins verse 2 with an *and* (written as an ampersand), but the 1830 compositor missed it when he set the type for this verse. The 1840 edition restored the *and*, perhaps because the sentence seems to need some kind of connector to the previous text. It is possible, but unlikely, that Joseph Smith used the original manuscript to restore the *and*. For the 1840 edition, Joseph used \mathcal{O} to restore some longer phrases that had been lost when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , but he generally did not use \mathcal{O} to restore minor changes such as missing *and*’s. The 1981 LDS edition also restored the *and*, perhaps by reference to the printer’s manuscript or the 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain the sentence-initial *and* at the beginning of 2 Nephi 28:2; although this *and* was omitted in the 1830 edition, the current LDS and RLDS texts have both restored it.

■ 2 Nephi 28:2

and especially unto our seed

which [are >js is 1 | are A | is BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a remnant of the house of Israel*

In this verse, Joseph Smith revised the subject-verb agreement for the 1837 edition so that *seed* would be treated as a singular (thus “our seed which **is** a remnant of the house of Israel”). He was perhaps influenced by the singular subject complement that follows the *be* verb (“a remnant of the house of Israel”). Earlier in his editing, Joseph made the opposite change in subject-verb agreement:

1 Nephi 13:30

the mixture of thy seed

which [is 0A | is >js are 1 | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] among thy brethren

For further discussion, see under 1 Nephi 13:30. The critical text, of course, will maintain the original plural *are* in 2 Nephi 28:2 but the singular *is* in 1 Nephi 13:30.

Summary: Restore the plural *are* in 2 Nephi 28:2 (“our seed which are a remnant of the house of Israel”).

■ 2 Nephi 28:3

when the one shall say unto the other

behold **I** [NULL > I 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] am the Lord's
and the other shall say

I [NULL > I 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] am the Lord's

In the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "I am the Lord's" two times, then corrected each to "I I am the Lord's" by supralinearly inserting in each case a second *I*. The ink flow for the corrections is the same as the surrounding text, so the corrections appear to be virtually immediate. Since the corrected text is the more unusual one and there is nothing wrong with the clause having only one *I*, it appears that Oliver was simply correcting the printer's manuscript to agree with the reading of the original manuscript (which is not extant here). The critical text will therefore follow the corrected text of \mathcal{P} with its two occurrences of "I I".

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has no examples of the pronoun *I* being immediately repeated as "I I". But there are other examples in the earliest text where there is a single intervening word (such as *behold*, *even*, or a name functioning as an appositive) between two *I*'s:

2 Nephi 3:18

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

Omni 1:10

Behold **I Abinadom I** am the son of Chemish

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

Mormon 8:3

and **I even I** remaineth alone
to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people

We note that the first occurrence of "I I" in 2 Nephi 28:3 also involves *behold*, but it precedes the two *I*'s ("behold I / I am the Lord's") rather than intervening between them ("I behold I am the Lord's").

The phrases "I behold I" and "I even I" are also found in the King James Bible, as in the following examples:

Genesis 9:9

and **I behold I** establish my covenant with you
and with your seed after you

Isaiah 43:11

I even I am the LORD
and beside me *there is* no savior

The construction “I even I” is especially interesting since literally the Hebrew reads “I I” (literally “I I the LORD” in Isaiah 43:11). In other words, the two *I*’s are contiguous, just like in 2 Nephi 28:3. Further, the literal “I I” is used emphatically in the Hebrew, which is precisely how it is used in 2 Nephi 28:3. Thus there is considerable linguistic support for the use of “I I” in 2 Nephi 28:3.

Summary: Retain both occurrences of the repeated “I I” in 2 Nephi 28:3; Oliver Cowdery’s correction of the printer’s manuscript undoubtedly reflects the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

■ 2 Nephi 28:3

*when the one shall say unto the other
behold I / I am the Lord’s
and the [other 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | others FIJLMNOQRT] shall say
I / I am the Lord’s*

The 1852 LDS edition introduced the plural *others* in place of the singular *other*, the reading of the original text. Subsequent LDS editions have followed this plural reading, yet the context clearly indicates that the singular is the correct reading. We first have “one” speaking to “the other”, then “the other” replying. The parallel reciprocal structure requires the use of the singular in both cases. Elsewhere in the text, there are ten occurrences of “the one . . . the other” but none of “the one . . . the others”. See Alma 41:5 for an example where Oliver Cowdery started to write “the others” in *Œ* but immediately corrected it to “the other”.

Summary: Restore the singular *other* in 2 Nephi 28:3 (“and the other shall say”), the reading of the original text.

■ 2 Nephi 28:5

for the Lord and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | o] Redeemer hath done his work

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally deleted the repeated *the* before *Redeemer*. Such repetition of *the* in conjoined constructions is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. This change has not been maintained in the LDS text because the 1907 edition was never used as the copy-text for any subsequent LDS edition.

Elsewhere the text repeats the determiner whenever *Lord* and *Redeemer* are conjoined by means of *and*:

1 Nephi 10:14

or come to the knowledge of the true Messiah
their Lord and **their** Redeemer

2 Nephi 31:17

wherefore do the things which I have told you
that I have seen that **your** Lord and **your** Redeemer should do

The same repetition of the determiner is found whenever *Savior* and *Redeemer* are conjoined by *and*. All the examples pattern after the King James “thy Savior and thy Redeemer” (the reading in Isaiah 49:26):

1 Nephi 21:26 and 2 Nephi 6:18 (both quote Isaiah 49:26)

and all flesh shall know that
I the Lord am **thy** Savior and **thy** Redeemer

1 Nephi 22:12 (a paraphrase of Isaiah 49:26)

and they shall know that
the Lord is **their** Savior and **their** Redeemer

Thus it is clear that the repetition of the definite article *the* should be maintained in 2 Nephi 28:5.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 28:5 the repeated *the* in “the Lord and **the** Redeemer”; such repetition of the determiner is characteristic of the language style in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 28:8

there is no harm

[NULL > *in doing these things* >+ *in this* 1 | *in this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and do all these things for tomorrow we die

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the original “in this”. But when he first corrected his error, he supralinearly inserted “in doing these things”, probably because of the influence of the following clause (“and do all these things”). Later, probably when he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (which is not extant here), he discovered that his first correction was in error. With heavier ink flow, he crossed out the supralinear “in doing these things”, then supralinearly wrote (again with heavier ink flow) the words “in this” in front of his first supralinear insertion, now crossed out. Most probably, the original text read “there is no harm in this”, the final corrected text in \mathcal{P} . Elsewhere, the text has two other occurrences of the prepositional phase “in this” — namely, “**in this** I do not glory” (Mosiah 23:11) and “**in this** ye have sinned” (Helaman 8:24).

Summary: Follow Oliver Cowdery’s final correction of 2 Nephi 28:8 in the printer’s manuscript, “there is no harm in this”.

■ 2 Nephi 28:9

yea and there shall be many which shall teach after this manner

false and vain and foolish [*doctrine* > *doctrines* 1F | *doctrines* ABCDGHJKLMNOPQRST | *doctrine* E]

Here in verse 9 we see some difficulty in determining the number for the word *doctrine*. We have similar variability in the number for *doctrine* in two other nearby verses:

2 Nephi 28:12

and because of false teachers
and false [*doctrints* >% *doctrines* > *doctrine* 1 | *doctrine* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
their churches have become corrupted

2 Nephi 28:15

and all they that preach

false [*doctrine* > *doctrines* 1 | *doctrines* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In all three cases, there is a nearly immediate correction in the number of *doctrine* in the printer's manuscript. In two cases (verses 9 and 15), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *doctrine*, then inserted inline the plural *s* using the same ink flow as the surrounding text, which implies that these two corrections were virtually immediate. In verse 12, Oliver initially wrote *doctrins*, then erased the *ts* and by accident the preceding *n*. He then overwrote the *ts* with *es* but finally crossed out the final *s*, with considerable ink smearing. So this correction was also virtually immediate.

The first example (in verse 9) has also undergone variation in the printed editions: the 1849 LDS edition replaced the plural *doctrines* with *doctrine*. The first printing of the subsequent LDS edition (1852) continued with the singular, but the second printing of that edition restored the plural, probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

The problematic reading is the singular *doctrine* in verse 12. When we consider all other instances of the word *doctrine* in the Book of Mormon text, we find that the plural *doctrines* is always used to refer to false doctrines. Besides the two cases in verses 9 and 15 of this chapter, we have two other examples:

2 Nephi 3:12

and that which shall be written by the fruit of thy loins

and also that which shall be written by the fruit of the loins of Judah

shall grow together unto the confounding of **false doctrines**

Alma 1:16

and they went forth preaching **false doctrines**

Note further that incorrect doctrines are always identified as being “false doctrines” (including the one in verse 9 that refers to “false and vain and foolish doctrines”). On the other hand, if we exclude the one case of *doctrine* in 2 Nephi 28:12, the singular *doctrine* is always used to refer to true doctrine (24 times):

1 Nephi 15:14	the very points of his doctrine
2 Nephi 27:35	they that murmured shall learn doctrine
2 Nephi 31:2	concerning the doctrine of Christ
2 Nephi 31:21	this is the doctrine of Christ
2 Nephi 31:21	the only and true doctrine of the Father and of the Son . . .
2 Nephi 32:6	this is the doctrine of Christ
2 Nephi 32:6	and there will be no more doctrine given
Jacob preface	to overthrow the doctrine of Christ
Jacob 7:2	that he might overthrow the doctrine of Christ
Jacob 7:6	the gospel or the doctrine of Christ
Alma 41:9	upon those points of doctrine
Helaman 11:22	concerning the points of doctrine . . . laid down by the prophets
Helaman 11:23	concerning the true points of doctrine

3 Nephi 2:2	the doctrine of Christ was a foolish and a vain thing
3 Nephi 11:28	concerning the points of my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:30	this is not my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:30	but this is my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:31	I will declare unto you my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:32	and this is my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:32	and it is the doctrine which the Father hath given unto me
3 Nephi 11:35	this is my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:39	this is my doctrine
3 Nephi 11:40	and establisheth it for my doctrine
3 Nephi 21:6	the true points of my doctrine

So except for 2 Nephi 28:12, we have a clear demarcation between the true doctrine of the Lord and the false doctrines of others. This distinction strongly suggests that the current singular reading in 2 Nephi 28:12 is probably an error.

We should also note that the King James Bible uses the plural *doctrines* when speaking negatively of incorrect doctrines:

Matthew 15:9 (similarly in Mark 7:7)
 but in vain they do worship me
 teaching *for* **doctrines** the commandments of men

Colossians 2:22
 . . . after the commandments and **doctrines** of men

1 Timothy 4:1
 some shall depart from the faith
 giving heed to seducing spirits and **doctrines** of devils

Hebrews 13:9
 be not carried about with divers and strange **doctrines**

But in the Bible the singular can be used for either true or false doctrine:

Matthew 7:28
 and it came to pass
 when Jesus had ended these sayings
 the people were astonished at his **doctrine**

Matthew 16:12
 then understood they how that
 he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread
 but of the **doctrine** of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees

So the biblical text would permit an example like “false doctrine” in 2 Nephi 28:12.

The three nearly immediate corrections here in 2 Nephi 28 imply that Oliver was correcting to the original manuscript rather than editing, which would mean that \mathcal{O} probably read identically to the corrected readings in \mathcal{P} :

	ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT (CONJECTURED)	PRINTER'S MANUSCRIPT
verse 9	doctrines	doctrine > doctrines
verse 12	doctrine	doctrines > doctrine
verse 15	doctrines	doctrine > doctrines

Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant for 2 Nephi 28. But the examples in \mathcal{P} for verses 9 and 15 suggest that Oliver Cowdery definitely had a problem with the plural *doctrines*: he tended to write the singular. On the other hand, of the 24 examples of the singular *doctrine* (all referring to true doctrine), Oliver never once accidentally wrote *doctrines* and then had to remove the extra *s*. This difference in error tendency suggests that for the example in verse 12, Oliver accidentally wrote the singular in \mathcal{O} instead of the correct plural. Then when he copied this part of the text into \mathcal{P} , in verse 9 he initially wrote *doctrine* (his natural tendency), then corrected it to *doctrines*. When he came to verse 12, he was prepared to write the plural, which he did, but then he discovered that his copy read in the singular, so he had to correct the manuscript once more. Finally, when he got to verse 15, he again initially wrote the singular (his natural tendency) but discovered once more that \mathcal{O} read in the plural.

It seems pretty clear from the examples elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text that 2 Nephi 28:12 should read “because of false teachers and false doctrines”, especially since each teacher would tend to teach a different doctrine. The original manuscript probably read in the singular for this one case, but this could have been an early error on Oliver Cowdery’s part.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 28:12 to read in the plural: “because of false teachers and false **doctrines**”; elsewhere the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural *doctrines* to refer to false doctrine (as in 2 Nephi 28:9, 15) and the singular *doctrine* to refer to true doctrine.

■ 2 Nephi 28:11–12

*yea they have all gone out of the way
they have become corrupted*

[1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[1 ABCDEFGH | 12 IJKLMNOPQRT | 14 PS]

(1) *because of pride*

[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

(2) *and because of false teachers and false doctrines*

[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

their churches have become corrupted

[1 | ; ABCDGHKPS | , EFIJLMNOQRT]

and their churches are lifted up

[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

(3) *because of pride*

[1 EFIJLMNOQRT | , ABCDGHKPS]

they are puffed up

As discussed under 1 Nephi 18:17–18, it is sometimes difficult to tell whether a *because-of* phrase should be attached to the end of the preceding sentence or to the beginning of the following

sentence. Here in 2 Nephi 28:11–12, we have three *because-of* phrases that show this difficulty (numbered above as 1, 2, and 3). The punctuation in the printed editions (all of which derive from John Gilbert’s 1830 punctuation) assigns each of these three *because-of* phrases to the beginning of the following sentence. But it is possible that one or more of these *because-of* phrases could be assigned to the end of the preceding sentence.

Let us first consider the third case. Nearby verses clearly show that *pride* is associated with *puffed up*:

2 Nephi 28:13–14

they rob the poor because of their fine sanctuaries
 they rob the poor because of their fine clothing
 and they persecute the meek and the poor in heart
because in their pride they are puffed up
 they wear stiff necks and high heads

The text here reads “in their pride”, not “of their pride”. Another nearby verse supports the collocation of *pride* and *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

A more distant passage also has this collocation of *pride* and *puffed up*:

Alma 5:53

yea can ye be **puffed up** in the **pride** of your hearts

In any event, the immediately following verses for 2 Nephi 28:12 support associating the word *pride* with *puffed up*.

Nonetheless, there are examples where *pride* collocates with *lifted up*, with at least 18 occurrences involving the phraseology “lifted up in pride” (for a 19th possibility, see the discussion under Mormon 8:28). The nearest of these occurrences is not as close as 2 Nephi 28:14 is to 2 Nephi 28:12:

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

There are five other passages where *pride* occurs with the verb *lift up*:

Alma 4:12	some lifting themselves up with their pride
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
3 Nephi 6:10	and some were lifted up unto pride and boastings
Mormon 8:36	save a few only which do not lift themselves up in the pride of their hearts

Since *pride* collocates with *lifted up* as well as *puffed up*, the phrase “because of pride” near the end of 2 Nephi 28:12 can be assigned to either “and their churches are lifted up” or “they are puffed up”, although the nearest examples (in fact, twice in the following three verses) associate *pride* with *puffed up*, not *lifted up*. Another factor to consider is that the text appears to read more connectedly when we assign “because of pride” to the following “they are puffed up”. The

previous “and their churches are lifted up” already has an initial conjunctive *and* that provides a connected reading, but the following “they are puffed up” seems awkward and disconnected unless “because of pride” is assigned to it. Thus it seems that the most reasonable solution would be to accept the current punctuation for the third case of *because-of* in 2 Nephi 28:11–12 (“because of pride they are puffed up”).

Let us now turn to the first two cases of *because-of*. There are three possible ways to parse these contiguous *because-of* phrases (here given with minimal accidentals):

- (1) a conjoined pair of *because-of* phrases at the end of the preceding sentence:
 They have become corrupted **because of** pride
 and **because of** false teachers and false doctrines.
 Their churches have become corrupted and their churches are lifted up.
- (2) the first *because-of* phrase at the end of the preceding sentence, the second one at the beginning of the following sentence:
 They have become corrupted **because of** pride.
 And **because of** false teachers and false doctrines
 their churches have become corrupted and their churches are lifted up.
- (3) a conjoined pair of *because-of* phrases at the beginning of the following sentence:
 They have become corrupted.
Because of pride and **because of** false teachers and false doctrines
 their churches have become corrupted and their churches are lifted up.

The 1830 typesetter chose the third option, and this parsing has been followed in all the printed editions.

When we consider other instances of contiguous *because-of* phrases in the text, we find examples for all three options:

- (1) both attached to the end of a clause:
 1 Nephi 16:35
 the daughters of Ishmael did mourn exceedingly
because of the loss of their father and **because of** their afflictions
 in the wilderness
 Jacob 5:59
 and this I do that perhaps the roots thereof may take strength
because of their goodness and **because of** the change of the branches
 Alma 4:6
 the people of the church began to wax proud
because of their exceeding riches and their fine silks
 and their fine-twined linen
 and **because of** their many flocks and herds
 and their gold and their silver and all manner of precious things
 3 Nephi 4:7
 and great and terrible was the appearance of the armies of Giddianhi
because of their armor and **because of** their being dyed in blood

3 Nephi 4:18–19

for it was impossible for the robbers to lay siege sufficiently long
to have any effect upon the Nephites
because of their much provision which they had laid up in store
and **because of** the scantiness of provisions among the robbers

4 Nephi 1:28

and this church did multiply exceedingly
because of iniquity and **because of** the power of Satan

(2) attached to two different clauses:

3 Nephi 5:2

and they knew that it must be expedient that Christ had come
because of the many signs which had been given
according to the words of the prophets
and **because of** the things which had come to pass already
they knew it must needs be that all things should come to pass
according to that which had been spoken

Mormon 1:17

but I were forbidden that I should preach unto them
because of the hardness of their hearts
and **because of** the hardness of their hearts
the land was cursed for their sake

Ether 3:18–19

and all this that this man knew that he was God
because of the many great works which the Lord had shewed unto him
and **because of** the knowledge of this man
he could not be kept from beholding within the veil

(3) both attached to the beginning of a clause:

3 Nephi 16:7

behold **because of** their belief in me saith the Father
and **because of** the unbelief of you O house of Israel
in the latter day shall the truth come unto the Gentiles

Syntactically, all three parsings are therefore possible in 2 Nephi 28:11–12.

From a semantic point of view, the second option presents a nice balance: people are corrupted by pride, and churches are corrupted by false teachers and false doctrines. It is also the only option that provides a narrative connector (namely, *and*) between the two sentences. The critical text will therefore accept the second option, which separates the two *because-of* phrases. It should be noted, however, that the decision causes a minor difficulty with respect to the LDS and RLDS versifications: both systems of versification start a new verse with “because of pride”. Given the proposed punctuation change in the standard text, the more natural place to begin the new verse would be after “because of pride”.

Summary: Emend the punctuation for 2 Nephi 28:11–12 so that the phrase “because of pride” is attached to the preceding sentence (thus “they have become corrupted because of pride”); maintain the punctuation for the last sentence in verse 12, which attaches the *because-of* phrase to the following sentence (thus “because of pride they are puffed up”).

■ **2 Nephi 28:12**

and because of false teachers

and false [doctrins >% doctrines > doctrine 1 | doctrine ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

their churches have become corrupted

Evidence elsewhere in the text argues that the reading here in 2 Nephi 28:12 should be emended to “because of false teachers and false **doctrines**” (that is, *doctrine* should be in the plural). See the discussion under 2 Nephi 28:9 for the evidence from scribal errors and usage elsewhere in the text in support of this emendation.

■ **2 Nephi 28:15**

O the wise and the learned and the rich

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts

and all they that preach false doctrines

and all they that commit whoredoms and pervert the right way of the Lord

woe woe woe be unto them

saith the Lord God Almighty

for they shall be thrust down to hell

The 1830 typesetter placed a comma after “the rich”, which could lead the reader to think that the wise and the learned and the rich are all proud. In earlier English, the relative pronoun *that* could be used restrictively (as in current English) and nonrestrictively. Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage (under *that 1*) cites nonrestrictive examples from Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (“Fleance his son, that keeps him company”) and Oliver Goldsmith (“Age, that lessens the enjoyment of life, increases our desire of living”). This source also gives citations of nonrestrictive *that* in literature from the 1800s, so it is theoretically possible that the relative pronoun *that* here in 2 Nephi 28:15 could be interpreted as nonrestrictive.

Even so, the relative pronoun *that* here in “that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts” is restrictive: the Lord doesn’t condemn all the wise and the learned and the rich, only those that are proud. Note, for instance, Jacob’s clarification in 2 Nephi 9:29: “but to be learned is good if it so be that they hearken unto the counsels of God”. Thus the comma should be removed from before this particular *that* in the standard text for 2 Nephi 28:15. We note, in particular, that the 1830 typesetter did not, of course, place commas before the *that*’s in the two following relative clauses in 2 Nephi 28:15 (“and all they **that** preach false doctrines and all they **that** commit whoredoms and pervert the right way of the Lord”).

This same use of a restrictive relative pronoun is found in a similar passage from Jacob's discourse earlier in this book:

2 Nephi 9:42

and the wise and the learned and they that are rich

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are puffed up

because of their learning and their wisdom and their riches

yea they are they whom he despiseth

Just as in 2 Nephi 28:15, the 1830 typesetter placed a comma before the relative pronoun *which*. This punctuation has been retained in all the printed editions, but the critical text will interpret the relative pronoun here as restrictive rather than nonrestrictive.

Summary: Remove the comma before the restrictive *that* in 2 Nephi 28:15 (“O the wise and the learned and the rich **that** are puffed up in the pride of their hearts”); similarly, the relative pronoun *which* in 2 Nephi 9:42 should be interpreted as restrictive (“they that are rich **which** are puffed up because of their learning and their wisdom and their riches”).

■ 2 Nephi 28:15

and all they that preach false [doctrine > doctrines 1 | doctrines ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

As discussed under 2 Nephi 28:9, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (the plural *doctrines*) is apparently the reading of the original text here in 2 Nephi 28:15.

■ 2 Nephi 28:16

woe unto them that turn aside the just for a thing of naught

and revile against that which is good

and say that [it 1ACGHKPS | BDEFIJLMNOQR | NULL > it T] is of no worth

The 1837 edition removed the pronoun *it* before *is*, with the result that the original subordinate conjunction *that* is reinterpreted as the subject pronoun *that* (“and say: that is of no worth”). The 1981 LDS edition initially followed the preceding LDS textual tradition in omitting the *it*, but in later printings of that edition (beginning sometime in 1983) the *it* was restored. The 1837 change was probably a typo since it is uncharacteristic of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition. Nor was this change marked by Joseph in the printer's manuscript. In fact, the *it* was restored in the 1840 edition, which was also edited by him. The earliest textual sources (\mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition) have the correct reading (“and say that **it** is of no worth”).

Summary: Retain the reading with *it* in “it is of no worth”, in accord with the earliest textual sources for 2 Nephi 28:16.

■ 2 Nephi 28:18

*but behold that great and abominable church
the whore of all the earth
must tumble to the earth
and great must be the fall* [NULL >+ thereof 1 | thereof ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially omitted the *thereof* that came after *the fall*. Oliver caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *thereof* with slightly heavier ink flow. It looks like he redipped his quill just before making the correction. The usage here parallels the language in 1 Nephi 11:36 (“the great and spacious building was the pride of the world and **the fall thereof** was exceeding great”).

Another possibility, however, is that the original text here in 2 Nephi 18:18 read “and great must be **the fall of it**”, as in another passage:

1 Nephi 22:14
yea that great and abominable church shall tumble to the dust
and great shall be **the fall of it**

In fact, both 1 Nephi 22:14 and 2 Nephi 28:18 use virtually the same language to refer to the fall of that great and abominable church. Thus it is possible that the original manuscript (which is not extant here in 2 Nephi 28:18) defectively read “and great must be the fall” (that is, in \mathcal{O} there was no postmodifier after *the fall*), with the result that Oliver Cowdery emended the printer’s manuscript by inserting *thereof*, when another possibility would have been to insert *of it*, as in 1 Nephi 22:14.

The fact that the ink flow in \mathcal{P} for the supralinearly inserted *thereof* is only slightly heavier argues that this correction was simply the result of trying to accurately copy the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Elsewhere, Oliver Cowdery only once had a problem in writing down *thereof*; in that one instance, it seems that he initially started to write *of it* instead of the correct *thereof*:

Alma 31:14
therefore whosoever desired to worship must go forth and stand
upon the top [*of* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thereof

Oliver’s correction here is immediate (the *of* is erased and the correct *thereof* is written immediately afterwards inline). If anything, this example of a scribal slip shows that Oliver’s natural tendency was to supply *of it* rather than *thereof*. Therefore, the inserted *thereof* in 2 Nephi 28:18 is perhaps not what Oliver would have naturally supplied on his own.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 28:18 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “and great must be the fall **thereof**”.

■ 2 Nephi 28:21–22

*and thus the devil cheateth their souls
and leadeth them away carefully down to hell
and behold others he* [*flatereth* 1 | *flattereth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *flattered* K] *away
and telleth them there is no hell*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1892 RLDS edition: namely, the replacement of the present-tense *flattereth* with the past-tense *flattered*. All the other verbs in this passage maintain their present-tense forms (*cheateth*, *leadeth*, and *telleth*).

Summary: Maintain the present-tense forms throughout 2 Nephi 28:21–22.

■ 2 Nephi 28:23

yea they are grasped with death and hell

[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | : D]

and death and hell and the devil

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and all that have been seized therewith

must stand before the throne of God

and be judged according to their works

The current text here in 2 Nephi 28:23 seems to involve a textual dittography. The original manuscript is not extant here, but it appears that Oliver Cowdery repeated the words *death and hell and* as he copied from the original manuscript into the printer's manuscript. This emendation was first brought to my attention by Nathaniel Skousen.

We note first of all that the resulting repetition has caused problems. The 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon after the first *death and hell*, but a comma after *the devil*, which makes the resulting text read that death and hell and the devil as well as those that he has seized must stand before God and be judged. This seems incorrect. Such a reference to the devil, much less death and hell, standing before God to be judged at the day of judgment is definitely odd. Yet all subsequent editions have basically followed the punctuation of the 1830 edition and its implausible reading.

Nearby in 2 Nephi 9, we have several references to death and hell that have the same basic phraseology as here in 2 Nephi 28:23 except that there is no repetition:

2 Nephi 9:10

O how great the goodness of our God
 who prepareth a way for our escape from the grasp of this awful monster
 yea that monster **death and hell**
 which I call the death of the body and also the death of the spirit

2 Nephi 9:12

and this death of which I have spoken
 which is the spiritual death
 shall deliver up its dead
 which spiritual **death is hell**
 wherefore death and hell must deliver up its dead
 and hell must deliver up its captive spirits
 and the grave must deliver up its captive bodies

2 Nephi 9:19

for he delivereth his saints from that awful monster
the devil and death and hell
 and that lake of fire and brimstone which is endless torment

2 Nephi 9:26

for the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice
 upon all those who hath not the law given to them
 that they are delivered from that awful monster
death and hell and the devil
 and the lake of fire and brimstone which is endless torment

In the last two examples, all three nouns (*death*, *hell*, and *the devil*) are conjoined, yet in each case we get only a single occurrence of each noun, although the order varies. These parallel passages suggest that 2 Nephi 28:23 should also read without any repetition of *death* and *hell*.

The most plausible solution to the difficulties of the current reading for 2 Nephi 28:23 is to emend the text by removing the extra *death and hell and*. In addition, a semicolon should be placed after *and the devil*, thus stating that those who have been seized by “death and hell and the devil” will stand before God to be judged:

2 Nephi 28:23 (emended, with minimal accidentals)

Yea, they are grasped with death and hell and the devil;
 and all that have been seized therewith
 must stand before the throne of God
 and be judged according to their works,
 from whence they must go into the place prepared for them,
 even a lake of fire and brimstone,
 which is endless torment.

Summary: Remove in 2 Nephi 28:23 the apparent dittography involving “death and hell and”, thus giving “yea they are grasped with death and hell and the devil”; in addition, the following clause should be separated from the preceding clause by a semicolon so that the following clause reads “and all that have been seized therewith must stand before the throne of God”.

■ **2 Nephi 28:30**

I will give unto the children of men
line upon line
 [& >js NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *precept upon precept*
here a little and there a little

□ **Isaiah 28:10** (King James Bible)

for precept *must be* upon precept / precept upon precept
 line upon line / line upon line
 here a little *and* there a little

□ **Isaiah 28:13** (King James Bible)

but the word of the LORD was unto them
 precept upon precept / precept upon precept
 line upon line / line upon line
 here a little *and* there a little

The Book of Mormon text is a paraphrase of the two Isaiah passages. The repetition of “precept upon precept” and “line upon line” is omitted in the Book of Mormon text, and the order is reversed. In addition, the earliest text has an *and* between “line upon line” and “precept upon precept”. The 1830 typesetter omitted this *and*, although in this case it seems doubtful whether he would have done so by reference to his King James Bible. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, crossed out the *and* in the printer’s manuscript, probably because the 1830 edition itself omitted it, although his possible familiarity by that later time with this Isaiah phraseology could have played a role. Joseph frequently edited the printer’s manuscript to agree with changes (including errors) that had earlier been introduced into the 1830 edition.

This same language from Isaiah 28 occurs twice in the Doctrine and Covenants. Yet in each instance, the text follows the order and the nonrepetitiveness of the Book of Mormon text rather than the King James language from Isaiah 28:

D&C 98:12

for he will give unto the faithful
line upon line
precept upon precept

D&C 128:21

giving line upon line
precept upon precept
here a little and there a little

Consistent with the 1830 edition for 2 Nephi 28:30, these two quotes from the Doctrine and Covenants (the current LDS edition) also omit the *and* before “precept upon precept”.

On the other hand, the earliest text for 2 Nephi 28:30 demonstrates increased parallelism by having an *and* before the second and fourth lines (cited below), which is generally consistent with the increased parallelism of the Book of Mormon text when compared with the King James translation of Isaiah:

2 Nephi 28:30 (the reading in \mathcal{P} , the earliest extant text)

line upon line **and** precept upon precept
here a little **and** there a little

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 28:30 the earliest text, with its extra *and* (“line upon line **and** precept upon precept”), which allows an increase in parallelism with the following “here a little **and** there a little”.

■ 2 Nephi 28:30

for unto him that receiveth I will give more

and [NULL >]s from 1 | A | *from* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **them**

that shall say we have enough

[*from them* >]s NULL 1 | *from them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | PS] *shall be taken away*

even that which they have

In 2 Nephi 28:30, the original text (as found in the printer’s manuscript) read “and **them** that shall say we have enough / **from them** shall be taken away even that which they have”. Grammatically,

there were two difficulties with this passage: (1) the sentence-initial occurrence of the object form *them* instead of the subject form *they*; and (2) the repetition of the previous subject pronoun in the main clause (“**them** that shall say . . . **from them** shall be taken away . . .”). In his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated both problems by deleting the phrase *from them* and adding *from* to the front of “them that shall say we have enough”. But the 1837 edition ended up adding only the *from* and ignoring the deletion of *from them*, thus giving the current text a double redundancy in both preposition and object form of the pronoun (“and **from them** that shall say we have enough / **from them** shall be taken away even that which they have”). By following Joseph’s original editing (as marked in \mathcal{P}), this problem of extra redundancy could be eliminated: “and **from them** that shall say we have enough shall be taken away even that which they have”.

Several examples elsewhere in the text still have the original type of redundancy that is found in the earliest text for 2 Nephi 28:30:

2 Nephi 25:8

and **he** that supposeth that they are not
unto them will I speak particularly

[The original text for this passage may have actually read *unto him* rather than *unto them*. See the discussion for 2 Nephi 25:8.]

Alma 12:10

and **he** that will not harden his heart
to him is given the greater portion of the word

Alma 12:11

and **he** that will harden his heart
to him is given the lesser portion of the word
until they know nothing concerning his mysteries

Joseph Smith edited the last passage so that it would read in the plural throughout, but he nonetheless left the redundant construction unchanged:

Alma 12:11 (current text)

and **they** that will harden **their hearts**
to them is given the lesser portion of the word
until they know nothing concerning his mysteries

We should also note that the redundant language in 2 Nephi 28:30 reminds one of the Savior’s words in Matthew (translated fairly literally from the Greek in the King James Bible):

Matthew 13:12

for whosoever hath
to him shall be given and he shall have more abundance
but whosoever hath not
from him shall be taken away even that he hath

The edited text in Alma 12:11 suggests that the object form *them* in the earliest text for 2 Nephi 28:30 could be grammatically revised to the subject form *they*:

2 Nephi 28:30 (with minimal grammatical revision)
 and **they** that shall say we have enough
 from them shall be taken away even that which they have

Interestingly, the earliest text had examples of the object form *them* being used in subject position:

2 Nephi 14:3
 and it shall come to pass
 [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *they* RT]
 that are left in Zion and remaineth in Jerusalem
 shall be called holy

Mosiah 26:36
 and [*them* >js *those* 1 | *them* A | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 that would not confess their sins and repent of their iniquity
the same were not numbered among the people of the church

3 Nephi 24:15
 yea [*them* 1ABCGHKPS | *they* DEFIJLMNOQRT] that tempt God
 are even delivered

The example in 2 Nephi 14:3 is particularly supportive of *them that* in subject position. In Isaiah 4:3 the King James Bible reads in the singular: “*that he that* is left in Zion and *he that* remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy”. But the corresponding Book of Mormon text in 2 Nephi 14:3 is in the plural and originally read “them that” rather than the standard “they that” (“**them that** are left in Zion and remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy”).

In addition, the example in Mosiah 26:36 is particularly relevant for 2 Nephi 28:30 since it also restates the original pronominal subject (“**them** that would not confess . . . **the same** were not numbered . . .”). In this particular case, the object form *them* was edited to *those* rather than to the subject form *they*. Similarly, 2 Nephi 28:30 could also be grammatically revised to read “and **those** that shall say we have enough / **from them** shall be taken away even that which they have”.

The critical text will, of course, restore the original language in 2 Nephi 28:30, despite its repetition of the pronominal subject and its use of the nonstandard object form *them* rather than the subject form *they* (or the demonstrative *those*).

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 28:30 the original construction: “and **them** that shall say we have enough / **from them** shall be taken away even that which they have”.

■ 2 Nephi 28:31

*cursed is he that putteth his trust in man
 or maketh flesh his arm
 or shall hearken unto the [precepts 1 | precepts ABCDEFGHIJLMNQRST | precept K] of men
 save their precepts shall be given by the power of the Holy Ghost*

The 1892 RLDS typesetter accidentally set the singular “the **precept** of men” instead of the correct plural, “the **precepts** of men”. Perhaps he was influenced by the preceding use of the singular

precept in 2 Nephi 28:30 (“precept upon precept”). In any event, the 1892 typesetter left unchanged the following occurrence of the plural *precepts* (“save their **precepts** shall be given by the power of the Holy Ghost”).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 28:31 both occurrences of the plural *precepts*.

■ 2 Nephi 28:32

saith the Lord God of [hosts 1CGHKPS | Hosts AEFIJLMNOQRT | host BD]

The 1837 typesetter accidentally replaced the plural *hosts* with the singular *host*. The 1841 British edition, set from the 1837 edition, retained this typo, but subsequent editions (the 1840 edition and the 1849 LDS edition) restored the correct “the Lord God of Hosts”. Of course, the Book of Mormon text consistently reads “the Lord God of **Hosts**” (five times), never the impossible “the Lord God of **Host**”; similarly, the King James Bible has only the plural *hosts* in “the Lord God of Hosts” (22 times).

Summary: Maintain the plural use of *hosts* in “the Lord God of Hosts”.

■ 2 Nephi 28:32

for [mine 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | my D] arm is lengthened out all the day long

The original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes has the archaic use of *mine* (and *thine*) rather than *my* (and *thy*) before vowel-initial words. In this particular example of *mine arm*, the 1841 typesetter accidentally replaced the archaic use of *mine* with *my*, yet earlier in this verse he correctly set *mine arm* (“notwithstanding I shall lengthen out **mine arm** unto them from day to day”). The 1849 LDS edition replaced the 1841 *my arm* with the original *mine arm*. For further discussion of this characteristic of the biblical style in the Book of Mormon text, see POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain each archaic use in the Book of Mormon of *mine* (and *thine*) before vowel-initial words, providing it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

2 Nephi 29

■ 2 Nephi 29:2–3

*and that the words of your seed should proceed forth out of my mouth unto your seed
and my [word > words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall hiss forth
unto the ends of the earth
for a standard unto my people which are of the house of Israel
and because my words shall hiss forth . . .*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *my word* in \mathfrak{P} , then almost immediately corrected the phrase to *my words* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). His correction apparently followed the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). This plural use of *words* both precedes and follows in this passage: “the words of your seed” and “my words shall hiss forth”.

There is one other occurrence of “word(s) hissing forth”, and this one has the singular *word* rather than the plural *words*:

Moroni 10:28
and his **word** shall hiss forth

Despite this difference, the occurrence here in 2 Nephi 29:2 is clearly plural because of the consistency of the plural in the whole passage. More generally, God’s word can be referred to in either the singular or the plural. For some statistics regarding “my word(s)”, see under 1 Nephi 16:24.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 29:2 the plural *words*, which is consistent for this passage and most probably represents the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 29:4

*and what thank they the Jews for the Bible
which they receive from them*

The syntax for this question seems rather odd, and one wonders if there might not be some error. There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of this kind of construction involving the verb *thank* (which otherwise occurs as a verb 16 times in the text, as in Mosiah 2:19: “O how had you ought to thank your heavenly King”). Of equal frequency is the expression “to give thanks”, which occurs 17 times in the text. One could, for instance, revise the text here in 2 Nephi 29:4 so that it reads “and what **thanks do** they **give** the Jews for the Bible” or perhaps the archaic “and what **thanks give** they the Jews for the Bible”. It seems doubtful, however, that either of these revisions

represent the actual original text for 2 Nephi 29:4, although the second would involve the least amount of change (accidentally omitting the verb *give* and dropping the *s* of the word *thanks*).

The King James Bible, however, does have three examples of “what thank” (and all in the same passage), but in these examples the word *thank* is a noun rather than a verb:

Luke 6:32–34

for if ye love them which love you
 what thank have ye . . .
 and if ye do good to them which do good to you
 what thank have ye . . .
 and if ye lend *to them* of whom ye hope to receive
 what thank have ye

There is, however, one example in the King James Bible where the verb *thank* is used somewhat similarly to how it is used in 2 Nephi 29:4:

1 Thessalonians 2:13

for this cause also **thank we God** without ceasing

In this case we have the word order *thank* <subject> <recipient>, just as in 2 Nephi 29:4 (“thank they the Jews”). But one important difference is that there is no direct object in the biblical passage that corresponds to the fronted *what* of 2 Nephi 29:4 (“**what** thank they the Jews”); instead, there is the prepositional phrase “for this cause”. A perfectly equivalent construction would be if 1 Thessalonians 2:13 read “this cause also thank we God without ceasing” (in other words, if the preposition *for* were lacking). In any event, the Book of Mormon construction does have a *for*, but it occurs later in the clause (“and what thank they the Jews **for** the Bible”).

Obviously, the construction in 2 Nephi 29:4 seems very unusual. It seems that we have a case of the verb *thank* taking two different objects, with *what* acting as the direct object and *the Jews* as the indirect object. The Oxford English Dictionary lists such a construction under definition 4a of the verb *thank*, describing the use of “dative of person (indirect object) and accusative thing (direct object)” as obsolete. The last instance cited there in the OED is from late Middle English (and in Scottish dialect):

The Taill of Rauf Coilyear [The Tale of Ralph the Collier] (about 1475)

Mair the King spak nocht, Bot thankit thame thair deid.
 ‘more the king spake naught but thanked them their deed’

Given such examples in earlier English, it is perhaps safest to assume that the strange use in 2 Nephi 29:4 of “what thank they the Jews” is intended and not the result of an error in transmission. We further note that no edition or manuscript has shown any attempt to revise the text here so that it might read more acceptably.

Summary: Retain the unusual usage of “what thank they the Jews” in 2 Nephi 29:4; this construction appears to be very archaic but is nonetheless understandable.

■ 2 Nephi 29:4

*but thus saith the Lord God
O fools they shall have a Bible
and it shall proceed forth from the Jews mine ancient covenant people
and what thank they the Jews for the Bible
which they [receive 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | received PS] from them*

The last sentence in this passage is in the present tense, which is appropriate given the preceding use of the future modal *shall* (“they **shall** have a Bible and it **shall** proceed forth from the Jews”). More recent RLDS editions have the past-tense form *received*, but this is not necessary. In fact, *received* may represent a typo in the 1908 RLDS edition.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 29:4 the present-tense verb form *receive*; such usage is consistent with the preceding text (which uses the future modal *shall*).

■ 2 Nephi 29:4

*do they remember the [travels 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQRS | travails T]
and the labors and the pains of the Jews
and their diligence unto me in bringing forth salvation unto the Gentiles*

In English the now separate words *travail* and *travel* descend from the same Old French word (with the meaning ‘to toil, work hard, labor’). Later the meaning in French generalized to mean ‘to work’. Borrowed from Old French into Middle English, the word also developed a separate meaning in English, namely, ‘to journey’ (since journeying in those times always involved considerable toil). Two separate pronunciations developed, one with stress on the first syllable /trævəl/ and the other with stress on the final syllable /trəveil/, based on the French spelling. And over time, in standard American English, separate meanings have been associated with the spellings. Thus the noun *travel* /trævel/ refers to journeying, while the noun *travail* /trəveil/ refers to ‘trouble, suffering’. But such a clear-cut distinction has never been followed historically and dialectally in English. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary—from which this information comes (see under the verb *travail*)—lists /trævəl/ as the first pronunciation for *travail*. Standard American English makes a clear distinction, but such a distinction did not exist for many (perhaps most) speakers during the early 1800s in America.

The noun *travail* ‘labor, toil, suffering’, in contrast to *travel* ‘journey’, occurs as many as six times in the Book of Mormon text. And in each case, the scribe wrote *travel*:

2 Nephi 29:4 (Oliver Cowdery in Ⓟ)

do they remember the [travels 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQRS | travails T]
and the labors and the pains of the Jews
and their diligence unto me in bringing forth salvation unto the Gentiles

Mosiah 14:11 (Oliver Cowdery in Ⓟ)

he shall see of the [travel 1 | travail ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQRS] of his soul

Mosiah 27:33 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

they did impart much consolation to the church
 confirming their faith and exhorting them
 with long-suffering and much [*travel* 1 | *travail* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to keep the commandments of God

Mosiah 29:33 (Hyrum Smith in \mathcal{P})

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 [*travels* 1 | *travails* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of soul
 for their people

Alma 18:37 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and he also rehearsed unto them
 —for it was unto the king and to his servants—
 all the journeyings of their fathers in the wilderness
 and all their sufferings with hunger and thirst
 and their [*travel* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *travail* T] etc.

3 Nephi 22:1 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

break forth into singing and cry aloud
 thou that didst not [*travel* 1 | *travail* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with child

Three different scribes are responsible for the spelling *travel*: Oliver Cowdery, Hyrum Smith, and the unknown scribe 2 in \mathcal{P} . And probably Joseph Smith himself pronounced the word as /trævəl/.

For four of these cases, the context clearly indicates that the word is *travail*. Two refer to the “travail(s) of one’s soul”: Mosiah 14:11 and Mosiah 29:33, with the first one quoting Isaiah 53:11 from the King James Bible (“he shall see of the travail of his soul”). In Mosiah 27:33, we have *much travail* conjoined with *long-suffering*; further, one exhorts others “with much travail” (rather than “with much travel”) to keep the commandments of God. And in 3 Nephi 22:1, Isaiah 54:1 from the King James Bible is being quoted, and the word here is *travail*, not *travel*. The 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, easily recognized that the intended word in these four cases was *travail*, and thus he spelled each of these as *travail*. In fact, considerably later in his life, in a letter to James Cobb (written on 10 February 1879), Gilbert explained that he was surprised to discover that Oliver Cowdery, when proofing copy, pronounced *travail* the same as *travel* (that is, as /trævəl/):

In one instance he [Oliver Cowdery] was looking over the manuscript, when the word “travail” occurred twice in the form, but spelled in the manuscript, travel. Mr. Grandin when reading the proof pronounced the word correctly, but Cowdery did not seem to know the difference.

Gilbert here refers to two occurrences of *travail* in the same form (that is, in the same gathering of 16 pages) in the 1830 edition. He must therefore be referring to the two instances near the end of Mosiah since these are the only two that occur in the same 1830 gathering:

	GATHERING	PLACEMENT
2 Nephi 29:4	8	page 115, line 26
Mosiah 14:11	12	page 186, line 14
Mosiah 27:33	14	page 214, line 37
Mosiah 29:33	14	page 219, line 43
Alma 18:37	18	page 276, line 3
3 Nephi 22:1	32	page 501, line 30

(I wish to thank Larry Porter for providing me a photocopy of Gilbert’s letter to Cobb. A typescript of part of the letter appears on pages 88–89 of Porter’s 1971 BYU doctoral dissertation, *A Study of the Origins of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the States of New York and Pennsylvania, 1816–1831*.)

For two occurrences of *travel*, John Gilbert did not interpret the word as *travail*. The reason for this is that in these two cases it is possible to interpret the word as referring to journeying rather than toiling or suffering. In 2 Nephi 29:4, the end of the passage refers to the Jews “bringing forth salvation unto the Gentiles”, which involved traveling throughout the Roman Empire (by Paul as well as by Peter and the other apostles). Similarly, Alma 18:37 refers to journeying—in this case, the journeyings of Lehi and his party in the wilderness of Arabia. Only in the 1981 LDS edition have these two occurrences of *travel* been reinterpreted as *travail*. These changes apparently derive from the analysis of Stan Larson, who first suggested that these two additional cases of *travel* should be considered as instances of *travail*. See pages 230–231 of his 1974 BYU master’s thesis, *A Study of Some Textual Variations in the Book of Mormon Comparing the Original and the Printer’s Manuscripts and the 1830, the 1837, and the 1840 Editions*; also see page 566 of his article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 18 (1978): 563–569.

Even though these two passages deal with journeying, the actual word *travel/travail* is conjoined with nouns that are semantically related to *travail*. In the case of 2 Nephi 29:4, three plural noun phrases are conjoined (“**the travails and the labors and the pains** of the Jews”). Each conjunct begins with the definite article *the* and is conjoined to the following conjunct by the conjunction *and*. Elsewhere in the text, we consistently find that for conjunctive structures of this form (namely, “the X and the Y and the Z”), the nouns X, Y, and Z always belong to the same semantic class, as in the following examples involving three or more conjoined nouns:

- 1 Nephi 13:8 (ostentatious signs of decadence)
 - the gold and the silver and the silks and the scarlets
 - and the fine-twined linen and the precious clothing and the harlots
- 1 Nephi 18:25 (domesticated and tameable animals)
 - 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
- 2 Nephi 2:12 (attributes of God)
 - and also the power and the mercy and the justice of God

- 2 Nephi 5:10 (the laws of God)
 - the judgments and the statutes and the commandments of the Lord
- 2 Nephi 9:28 (weaknesses of mankind)
 - O the vainness and the frailties and the foolishness of men
- 2 Nephi 28:15 (powerful people in this world)
 - O the wise and the learned and the rich
 - that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts
- 2 Nephi 32:7 (ways that mankind resist God)
 - the unbelief and the wickedness and the ignorance
 - and the stiffneckedness of men
- Jarom 1:8 (projectiles used as weapons)
 - the sharp pointed arrow and the quiver and the dart and the javelin
- Jarom 1:11 (servants of God)
 - the prophets and the priests and the teachers
- Alma 1:27 (types of suffering people)
 - the poor and the needy and the sick and the afflicted
- 3 Nephi 8:12 (destructive natural disturbances)
 - the tempests and the whirlwinds and the thunderings and the lightnings
 - and the exceeding great quaking of the whole earth
- 3 Nephi 10:10 (types of lamentation)
 - and the mourning and the weeping and the wailing of the people
- Mormon 2:10 (types of criminals)
 - the thieves and the robbers and the murderers
- Ether 4:12 (characterizations of Christ)
 - the light and the life and the truth of the world

All of these examples suggest that in 2 Nephi 29:4 the word *travails* would work better than *travels* (“the travails and the labors and the pains of the Jews”). Nonetheless, *travels* is not impossible here, but since we have to choose, the more reasonable interpretation is *travails*.

In Alma 18:37, the passage begins by specifically mentioning “all the journeyings of their fathers in the wilderness”; then the following text lists “and all their sufferings with hunger and thirst and their **travail** etc.” If *travel* were selected here, then we would wonder why the redundant reference to both journeyings and travel within the same clause. In fact, the use of *etc.* at the end argues that *travail* is just one more in the list of the sufferings of Lehi’s people in the wilderness. Consider the strikingly similar passage that first refers to the journeyings of the sons of Mosiah into the land of Nephi and then follows with a list of their sufferings:

Alma 17:5

now these are the circumstances which attended them in their **journeyings**
 for they had many **afflictions**
 they did **suffer** much both in body and in mind
 such as **hunger thirst** and **fatigue** and also much **labor** in the spirit

Thus Alma 18:37 parallels the nearby Alma 17:5, providing *travel* is reinterpreted as *travail*:

Alma 18:37

and he also rehearsed unto them
 —for it was unto the king and to his servants—
 all the **journeyings** of their fathers in the wilderness
 and all their **sufferings** with **hunger** and **thirst** and their **travail** etc.

In this parallel, *travail* in Alma 18:37 corresponds to the word *labor* in Alma 17:5.

Thus internal evidence supports the 1981 reinterpretation of these two cases of *travel* in 2 Nephi 29:4 and Alma 18:37 as *travail*. The critical text will therefore accept these two emendations, as well as the four others that the 1830 compositor made (Mosiah 14:11, Mosiah 27:33, Mosiah 29:33, and 3 Nephi 22:1).

All other occurrences of *travel* in the manuscripts clearly refer to journeying (31 times), although it is interesting to note that in two cases Oliver Cowdery spelled the correct *travel* as *travail*. Both of these refer to the travels of Lehi's people in the wilderness of Arabia:

Alma 37:39

and behold it was prepared to shew unto our fathers the course
 which they should [*travel* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *travail* 1]
 in the wilderness

Alma 37:42

therefore they tarried in the wilderness
 or did not [*travel* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *travail* 1] a direct course
 and were afflicted with hunger and thirst because of their transgression

These two occurrences of *travail* are found in the printer's manuscript and occur after the two occurrences of *travail* (near the end of Mosiah) that John Gilbert referred to in his 1879 letter to James Cobb. (All other occurrences of *travel* and *travail* are spelled indistinguishably as *travel* by the scribes, including Oliver's original spelling of *travel* in the original manuscript for these two instances in Alma 37.) It is possible that Gilbert mentioned the pronunciation difference between *travel* and *travail* to Oliver as they were proofing the 14th gathering (although he does not specifically mention this in his letter to Cobb). It would seem that all Oliver learned from this discussion (if it did occur) was that /trævəl/ could be also spelled as *travail*. In his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} for Alma 37, Oliver continued to remain oblivious to any differentiation between the spellings *travel* and *travail* on the basis of meaning.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 29:4 and Alma 18:37 the emended spelling *travail* that was introduced in the 1981 LDS edition; also accept the emended spelling *travail* for the four cases that the 1830 compositor introduced in Mosiah 14:11, Mosiah 27:33, Mosiah 29:33, and 3 Nephi 22:1.

■ 2 Nephi 29:10

*wherefore because that ye have a Bible
ye need not suppose that it contains all my words
neither need [ye >+ NULL >+ ye 1 | ye ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] suppose
that I have not caused more to be written*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “neither need ye suppose”. Somewhat later (with slightly heavier ink flow), he crossed out the *ye*, but then he immediately restored the *ye* supralinearly (again with slightly heavier ink flow). He may have been confused by the word order of “ye need not suppose”, which is found in the preceding clause (“ye need not suppose that it contains all my words”) as well as earlier in the preceding verse (“ye need not suppose that I cannot speak another”). The inverted word order of “neither need ye suppose” may have momentarily confused Oliver since in the earlier clauses there is no *ye* after *need* or immediately before *suppose*. In any event, the original manuscript (which is not extant here) undoubtedly read “neither need ye suppose”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 29:10 the original (and final) reading in \mathcal{P} of “neither need **ye** suppose”.

■ 2 Nephi 29:11

*for out of the [Book > Books 1 | books ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which shall be written
I will judge the world
every man according to their works*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *book* (with capitalized *B*) rather than the correct *books*. However, he almost immediately corrected his error by inserting inline the plural *s* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). This passage parallels the following passage from the King James Bible:

Revelation 20:12
and the dead were judged out of those things
which were written in the **books**
according to their works

The plural *books* here in Revelation 20:12 supports Oliver’s virtually immediate correction of \mathcal{P} to the plural *books*, the probable reading of \mathcal{C} (which is not extant here).

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 29:11 the plural *books*, which is consistent with Revelation 20:12.

■ 2 Nephi 29:11

*I will judge the world
every man according to [their 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | his s] works*

From a prescriptive point of view, *their* could be changed to *his* (as was done in the 1953 RLDS edition). Nonetheless, the treatment of *every* as a grammatical plural is very common in everyday speech—and even in standard English when the plural referent occurs in an adjacent clause.

(Consider, for instance, expressions like “everyone came, didn’t they” versus the impossibility of “everyone came, didn’t he or she”.) For further discussion, see *every* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

One reason that the original text in 2 Nephi 29:11 has *their* may be because the language here is related to Revelation 20:12 (as noted in the previous discussion): “and the dead were judged out of those things . . . according to **their** works”. Moreover, usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text supports the use of *their* since the original text has a number of similar examples (some of which show a mixed use of *his* and *their*):

Mosiah 27:4

every man should esteem **his** neighbor as **himself**
laboring with **their** own hands for **their** support

Alma 9:28

[*every man* >js *all men* 1 | *every man* A | *all men* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
shall reap a reward of [*their* >js *his* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] works
according to that which **they** have been:

Alma 17:37

every man that lifted **his** club to smite Ammon
he smote off **their** arms with his sword

Alma 51:31

for **every man** of Teancum did exceed the Lamanites
in **their** strength and in **their** skill of war
insomuch that **they** did gain advantage over the Lamanites

Only in one example (Alma 9:28) has the number been edited. There Joseph Smith initially changed the *their* to *his*, but then he realized that he would also need to change the following clause to read “according to that which **he has** been”. Joseph apparently changed his mind and decided to simply alter the singular *every man* to *all men* and thus keep the following plural pronouns *their* and *they*.

Summary: Maintain the so-called ungrammatical plural use of *their* with *every man* in 2 Nephi 29:11 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ 2 Nephi 29:11

I will judge the world

every man according to their works

according [to 1ABCDEFGHIKMPQRST | IJLN] *that which is written*

Here the 1879 LDS edition is missing the *to* of “according to that which is written”. It is rather amazing that this obvious typo was maintained so long in the LDS text, being reproduced in three subsequent LDS editions (the 1888 and 1906 large-print editions as well as the 1902 Kansas City edition). In any event, this typo was finally corrected in the 1905 Chicago edition.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 29:11 the necessary *to* in “according to that which is written”.

■ 2 Nephi 29:12

and I shall also speak unto all

[*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *nations of the earth*

This omission of the definite article *the* (beginning in the 1837 edition) is probably a typo rather than the result of a conscious editorial change. There seems to be no motivation for such a change, nor was it marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. In fact, nearby in 2 Nephi 29:7, we have the same basic phraseology in "yea even upon all **the** nations of the earth", so this 1837 change seems very much like a typo. Elsewhere in the text, we have five occurrences of "all **the** nations of the Gentiles" as well as one occurrence of "all **the** nations and kindreds of the earth" (in 1 Nephi 14:15). Except for this accidental error in 2 Nephi 29:12, we have no examples of "all nations" postmodified by a prepositional phrase headed by *of*.

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* in 2 Nephi 29:12 so that it reads according to the earliest text: "all **the** nations of the earth".

■ 2 Nephi 29:14

my people which are of the house of Israel shall be gathered home

unto the lands of their [*possession* > *possessions* 1 | *possessions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in 2 Nephi 29:14, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the lands of their possession", but then almost immediately he corrected the number of *possession* by inserting inline a plural *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read in the plural.

The common Book of Mormon expression for this construction has both *land* and *possession* in the plural (that is, "the lands of one's possessions"). Based on the earliest textual sources, there are five other examples of the double plural construction:

2 Nephi 1:11 (both plurals are extant in ☉)

the **lands** of their

[*possessions* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *inheritance* > *possessions* 1]

Alma 50:9 (both plurals are extant in ☉)

the **lands** of their own

[*possessions* 0 | *possessions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 50:12 (only *possessions* is extant in ☉)

the **lands** of their **possessions**

Alma 50:12 (neither plural is extant in ☉)

the **lands** of their [*possessions* 1PS | *possession* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

Alma 54:6 (both plurals are extant in ☉)

except ye repent and withdraw your armies into your own **lands**

[NULL >- or the **lands** 0 | or the **lands** 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | or the **land** RT]

of your **possessions** which is the **land** of Nephi

Over time the text has occasionally replaced either *lands* or *possessions* with the singular form. In Alma 50:12, the 1830 typesetter replaced the second instance of *possessions* with *possession* but left the first instance (which shows that his change to the singular was probably accidental). On the other hand, in Alma 54:6, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition consciously replaced *lands* with *land*, even though the preceding phrase reads in the plural (“into your own lands”). The reason for the change (which is explicitly marked in the 1920 committee copy) is because the following relative clause has *land* in the singular (“which is the land of Nephi”). In both cases, as in all the others listed above, the original text had both nouns in the plural (“the **lands** of one’s **possessions**”). It should also be pointed out that there has been a tendency in the text to replace the plural *lands* in “the **lands** of one’s inheritance” with the singular *land* (thus “the **land** of one’s inheritance”). For discussion of those instances, see under 2 Nephi 9:2 and 2 Nephi 25:11.

In the original text, the double plural construction is the most frequent form of the phrase “the land(s) of one’s possession(s)”. But there are two examples for which the earliest text supports singular rather than plural forms:

Helaman 5:52

and it came to pass that they did yield up unto the Nephites
the **lands** of their [*possession* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMOPQRST | *possessions* HKN]

Helaman 7:22

for if ye will not repent
behold this great city and also all those great cities which are round about
which are in the **land** of our **possession**
shall be taken away

The original manuscript is not extant for either of these two passages, so one wonders if these might involve an error in number, especially given the dominance of “the lands of one’s possessions” as well as the clear tendency to replace the plurals *lands* and *possessions* with singulars. It is also interesting to note that in the first of these two examples (Helaman 5:52), both the 1874 RLDS edition and the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced the singular *possession* with its plural, thus ending up with the dominant construction, “the lands of one’s possessions”. For further discussion of these two exceptional cases, see under Helaman 5:52 and Helaman 7:22.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 29:14 the double plural construction “the lands of their possessions”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; similarly, this double plural usage should be restored in Alma 50:12 (the second occurrence) and in Alma 54:6.

2 Nephi 30

■ 2 Nephi 30:1

for [NULL >+ *behold* 1 | *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
except ye shall keep the commandments of God
ye shall all likewise perish

The original manuscript (which is not extant here) probably had *behold*. The supralinear *behold* was inserted with heavier ink flow in the printer's manuscript. Oliver Cowdery probably made this correction when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . A similar supralinear insertion with the same heavy ink flow is found three lines later on this same page of \mathcal{P} :

2 Nephi 30:2
as many of the Gentiles
[NULL >+ *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will repent

Since *behold* is not necessary, we can be confident that it was in \mathcal{O} . There are numerous examples of “for behold” in the original text (261 times, including this one).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 30:1 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , which reads “for behold” at the beginning of a clause.

■ 2 Nephi 30:2

for behold I say unto you
[1RT | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
[1A | *that* BCDEFGRT | *That* HIJKLMNOPQS]
as many of the Gentiles as will repent are the covenant people of the Lord
and as many of the Jews as will not repent shall be cast off

The 1837 edition introduced the subordinate conjunction *that* before the first “as many”. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. And one might wonder whether it is necessary here. The 1830 and 1837 editions both had a comma after “I say unto you”, so there was no crucial need to insert the *that* in order to prevent misunderstanding. The 1920 LDS edition removed the comma since it was unnecessary given the following *that*.

When we compare this example with other examples of clauses preceded by “I say unto you” and beginning with *as*, we find five cases in the original text where *that* precedes the *as*:

2 Nephi 25:20 (two conjoined *as*-clauses)

yea behold I say unto you
that as these things are true and **as** the Lord God liveth
 there is none other name given under heaven
 save it be this Jesus Christ of which I have spoken
 whereby man can be saved

Mosiah 2:12

I say unto you
that 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 manner of riches of you . . .

Mosiah 4:11

and again I say unto you
 —as I have said before—
that as ye have come to the knowledge of the glory of God . . .
 even so I would that ye should remember . . .

Alma 5:47 (*as* deleted in the 1852 LDS edition)

and moreover I say unto you
that [*as* 1ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] it has thus been revealed unto me
 that the words which have been spoken by our fathers are true
 even so according to the spirit of prophecy . . .

Alma 10:10

for behold I say unto you
that as the Lord liveth
 even so he hath sent his angel to make these things manifest unto me

Note, in particular, the example in Mosiah 4:11 where there is first an intervening parenthetical *as*-clause (“as I have said before”), which is then followed by the subordinate *as*-clause that complements the verb *say* (“as ye have come to the knowledge of the glory of God”).

But there are also two cases that are similar to the earliest text for 2 Nephi 30:2—that is, in both cases the *that* is omitted in the earliest text:

Mosiah 23:12

and now I say unto you
 [*as* >js NULL 1 | *As* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] you have been oppressed
 by king Noah . . .
 therefore ye were bound with the bands of iniquity

Alma 23:6

yea I say unto you
 —as the Lord liveth—
as many of the Lamanites as believed in their preaching
 and were converted unto the Lord
 never did fall away

Note that Alma 23:6, just like Mosiah 4:11, has a parenthetical *as*-clause (“as the Lord liveth”), but in this case the following *as*-clause (the one that complements the verb *say*) has no *that*.

In the majority of cases where a choice is possible, the subordinate conjunction *that* occurs after “I say unto you”, but in over a third of the cases, no *that* occurs:

- followed by an independent clause:
93 examples with *that*, 55 without *that*
- followed by a subordinate clause:
30 examples with *that*, 16 without *that*

When “I say unto you” is followed by *yea* or *nay*, we never have *that* (40 times). Similarly, the *that* is omitted after “I say unto you” if the independent clause is a question (13 times), an imperative (13 times), an inverted conditional clause (3 times), an exclamation (1 time), an adverbial (1 time), or a simple noun phrase (1 time). Otherwise, we find examples of both possibilities, although examples with *that* dominate.

Summary: In agreement with the earliest textual sources, remove from 2 Nephi 30:2 the intrusive *that*; a comma after “I say unto you” helps facilitate the original reading.

■ 2 Nephi 30:2

and as many of the Jews as will not repent

shall be [cut > cast 1 | cast ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | ca~st F] off

Oliver Cowdery’s initial *cut* was probably a simple misreading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). The words *cut* and *cast* are visually similar, and both are semantically acceptable here. Moreover, Oliver’s correction has the same level of ink flow as the surrounding text, so the correction seems to have been virtually immediate.

Another place in the text where *cut* and *cast* were mixed up occurred when the 1830 compositor was setting the type:

Alma 38:1

and inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God
ye shall be [*cut* 01T | *cast* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] off from his presence

In this particular instance, the change was in the other direction: an original *cut* was accidentally replaced by *cast*.

Overall, the Book of Mormon text, when referring to one being either cut off or cast off from the Lord, has 28 occurrences of “cut off” and 15 of “cast off”. In this count, I exclude a number of cases found only in biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon (these King James quotations consistently use “cut off”). The main point here is that for all these nonbiblical cases, either “cut off” or “cast off” is possible. Thus in each instance we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether we have a case of “cut off” or “cast off”.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 30:2 the verb *cast* (Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathcal{P}).

■ 2 Nephi 30:2

*for the Lord [covenanteth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | covenanted N] with none
save it be with them that repent and believe in his Son*

The 1906 LDS edition accidentally replaced the present-tense *covenanteth* with the past-tense *covenanted*. Since this edition never served as a copy-text for any subsequent LDS edition, this typo has never continued in the text. God’s willingness to covenant with mankind holds throughout time; thus the use of present tense is appropriate here.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *covenanteth* in 2 Nephi 30:2.

■ 2 Nephi 30:3

[NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] *now I would prophesy somewhat more
concerning the Jews and the Gentiles*

Here we have a virtually immediate correction in Ø. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “now I would prophesy somewhat more”, but then he supralinearly inserted an ampersand without any change in the level of ink flow. Since either reading will work, the corrected reading is not the result of editing. The original manuscript (which is not extant here) undoubtedly read “**and** now I would prophesy somewhat more”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 30:3 the use of *and* in “and now I would prophesy somewhat more”.

■ 2 Nephi 30:4

*and then shall the remnant of our seed know concerning us
how that we came out from Jerusalem
and that they are [a decendant >js decendants 1 | a descendant A |
descendants BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] of the Jews*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 6:2, there are four places in the original text where the singular “a descendant” occurs in contexts where we expect the plural “descendants”. The singular is clearly intended in these four places, even if it is unusual.

■ 2 Nephi 30:5

*wherefore they shall be restored unto the knowledge of their fathers
and also [NULL >+ to 1 | to ABCDEFHIJKLMNQPQRST | unto G] the knowledge of Jesus Christ*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and also the knowledge of Jesus Christ” — that is, without any preposition before “the knowledge”. Shortly thereafter, he supralinearly inserted the *to* with no change in the level of ink flow, but then he apparently redipped his quill when he wrote in the insert mark (it was written with a heavier ink flow). The virtual

immediacy of the change argues that the original manuscript (which is not extant here) had the preposition *to*.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have numerous cases of the verb *restore* or the noun *restoration* being followed by either *to* or *unto*, with 25 occurrences of *to* and 17 of *unto*, so this distribution provides little evidence for determining the preposition here in 2 Nephi 30:5. Moreover, in five of these cases we have some kind of parallel coordination for the prepositional phrase after the verb *restore* or the noun *restoration*. In one case, the preposition is not repeated:

2 Nephi 9:2
 until the time cometh
 that they shall be restored **to the** true church and fold of God

Notice here, however, that the “fold of God” is synonymous with “the true church”. Since they are the same entity, not only is the preposition *to* not repeated but neither is the definite article *the*. On the other hand, in the four other cases involving coordination, each pair of conjoined prepositional phrases combines distinct items, and in each instance the same preposition (either *to* or *unto*) is repeated in the original text:

2 Nephi 3:24
 unto the bringing to pass
 much **restoration unto** the house of Israel
 and **unto** the seed of thy brethren

Alma 40:23
 the soul shall be **restored to** the body
 and the body **to** the soul

Alma 41:4
 therefore all things shall be **restored to** their proper order
 everything **to** its natural frame

Alma 41:5 (the reading in the original manuscript)
 the one **restored to** happiness according to his desires of happiness
 or **to** good according to his desires of good

[In this last example, Oliver Cowdery made two copying errors when he copied from \mathfrak{G} into \mathfrak{P} : *restored* was accidentally changed to *raised*, and the parallel *to* after the conjunction *or* was accidentally deleted.]

These four examples suggest that the original text for 2 Nephi 30:5 could have read either “**unto** the knowledge of their fathers and also **unto** the knowledge of Jesus Christ” or “**to** the knowledge of their fathers and also **to** the knowledge of Jesus Christ”. In fact, the first of these two possibilities was actually introduced into the 1858 Wright edition for 2 Nephi 30:5. More generally, however, there is considerable evidence that with conjoined prepositional phrases, the first preposition can be *unto* and the second one *to*, as in the following nearby examples:

2 Nephi 1:5

yea the Lord hath consecrated this land
unto me and **to** my children forever

Jacob 2:12

many of you have begun to search for gold and for silver
 and for all manner of precious ores
 in the which this land which is a land of promise **unto** you and **to** your seed
 doth abound most plentifully

For a list of eight more examples of *unto* conjoined with *to*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:38–39. Thus there is really nothing wrong with the corrected text in the printer’s manuscript for 2 Nephi 30:5. The fact that the supralinearly inserted *to* itself actually involved no change in the level of ink flow argues that the original manuscript also had *to* rather than *unto* for the repeated preposition.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 30:5 the construction “unto X and also to Y” since such constructions occur elsewhere in the text, although not with the verb *restore* or the noun *restoration*.

■ 2 Nephi 30:6

*and their scales of darkness shall begin to fall from their eyes
 and many generations shall not pass away among them
 save they shall be a [white 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRS | pure CGHKT]
 and [a 1ABCDGHKPST | EFIJLMNOQR] delightful people*

The 1840 edition introduced the reading “a pure and a delightful people” instead of “a white and a delightful people”, the reading in the printer’s manuscript and the two earliest editions (1830 and 1837). The original manuscript is no longer extant here. The 1840 change of *white* to *pure* seems to be a conscious one and was probably made by Joseph Smith as a part of his editing for the 1840 edition. The change does not appear to be an accidental error based on any visual or phonetic resemblance between the two words. We do know that Joseph Smith made a few changes in the 1840 edition based on the original manuscript, but it is very doubtful that the original manuscript ever read *pure* here since such a reading would presume that Oliver Cowdery had mis-copied the word as *white* when he produced the printer’s manuscript, a mistake that seems highly unlikely given the distinctiveness of the two words. No mix-ups of *white* and *pure* are found anywhere else in the whole history of the text, in either the manuscripts or the printed editions.

The early RLDS textual tradition followed the 1840 reading, *pure*, but in the 1908 edition the earlier *white* was restored since it was the reading of the printer’s manuscript. On the other hand, the LDS text followed the earlier reading until the 1981 edition, when *pure* (the 1840 reading) was adopted.

The text here in 2 Nephi 30:6 appears to be a reference to the curse that came upon the Lamanites as well as upon those who would intermarry with them:

2 Nephi 5:21–23

wherefore as they were white and exceeding fair and delightsome
that they might not be enticing unto my people
therefore the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them
and thus saith the Lord God
I will cause that they shall be loathsome unto thy people
save they shall repent of their iniquities
and cursed shall be the seed of him that mixeth with their seed
for they shall be cursed even with the same cursing

Just before verse 6 in 2 Nephi 30, Nephi refers to “the remnant of our seed” and discusses how the Book of Mormon will be brought to them:

2 Nephi 30:3–5

there shall be many which shall believe the words which are written
and they shall carry them forth unto **the remnant of our seed**
and then shall **the remnant of our seed** know concerning us
how that we came out from Jerusalem
and that they are a descendant of the Jews
and the gospel of Jesus Christ shall be declared among them
wherefore they shall be restored unto the knowledge of their fathers
and also to the knowledge of Jesus Christ
which was had among their fathers

The question here is whether the phrase “the remnant of our seed” refers to only the descendants of the Nephites or more generally to all the descendants of Lehi and his people (namely, the Lamanites and the Nephites). Yet even under the more narrow interpretation (that is, Nephi is referring to only his own people), this remnant of the Nephites would have been forced to join with the Lamanites and ultimately to become indistinguishable from them:

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

In other words, the surviving descendants of the Nephites would have been forced to become Lamanites and over time indistinguishable from them; thus the reference in 2 Nephi 30:3–6 to “the remnant of our seed” becoming “a white and a delightsome people” will work irrespective of whether the possessive pronoun *our* refers to all the descendants of Lehi’s people (both the Lamanites and the remnant of the Nephites) or to the Nephites specifically. Therefore, the original use of *white* in 2 Nephi 30:6 is wholly appropriate.

Of course, the 1840 change of *white* to *pure* avoids all of this complex reasoning, especially the need to interpret the remnant of the Nephites as being dark skinned. In other words, the editing change to *pure* may represent a conscious attempt at avoiding what was perceived as a difficult reading (the Nephites are supposed to be light skinned), which therefore explains why the change from *white* to *pure* was made here—and only here—in 2 Nephi 30:6. There has never been any attempt to emend any of the passages that directly comment on the dark skin of the Lamanites:

1 Nephi 12:23

after they had dwindled in unbelief
they became a dark and loathsome and a filthy people

2 Nephi 5:21

wherefore as they were white and exceeding fair and delightsome
that they might not be enticing unto my people
therefore the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them

Jacob 3:5

behold the Lamanites your brethren
whom ye hate because of their filthiness and the cursing
which hath come upon their skins
are more righteous than you

Jacob 3:8–9

O my brethren 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
wherefore a commandment I give unto you—which is the word of God—
that ye revile no more against them because of the darkness of their skin

Alma 3:6

and the skins of the Lamanites were dark
according to the mark which was set upon their fathers
which was a curse upon them because of their transgression and their rebellion

3 Nephi 2:14–16

and it came to pass that those Lamanites which had united with the Nephites
were numbered among the Nephites
and their curse was taken from them
and their skin became white like unto the Nephites
and their young men and their daughters became exceeding fair

Mormon 5:15

and also that the seed of this people may more fully believe his gospel
which shall go forth unto them from the Gentiles
for this people shall be scattered
and shall become a dark a filthy and a loathsome people

In addition, Alma 3:7–19 refers to this dark skin as a curse and a mark set upon the Lamanites to keep them separate from the Nephites.

When the Book of Mormon text specifically refers to light-colored skin, it consistently uses the word *white* rather than *pure*. Moreover, the word *white* collocates with the adjective *fair* for most of these passages:

1 Nephi 11:13

and in the city of Nazareth I beheld a virgin
and she was exceeding **fair** and **white**

1 Nephi 13:15

and I beheld the Spirit of the Lord that it was upon the Gentiles
that they did prosper and obtain the land for their inheritance
and I beheld that they were **white** and exceeding **fair** and beautiful
like unto my people before that they were slain

2 Nephi 5:21

wherefore as they were **white** and exceeding **fair** and delightsome
that they might not be enticing unto my people
therefore the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them

2 Nephi 26:33

and he denieth none that come unto him
black and **white** / bond and free / male and female

Jacob 3:8

O my brethren 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

3 Nephi 2:15–16

and their curse was taken from them
and their skin became **white** like unto the Nephites
and their young men and their daughters became exceeding **fair**

On the other hand, when *white* collocates with *pure*, we find that the passages describe a state of righteous perfection (referring either to the righteous at the day of judgment, to the garments of the righteous at that day, or to the fruit of the tree of life). In most of these passages *pure* and *white* collocate with the word *spotless*; all of these adjectives emphasize purity and cleanliness:

Alma 5:24

behold my brethren do ye suppose that
such an one can have a place to sit down in the kingdom of God
with Abraham with Isaac and with Jacob and also all the holy prophets
whose garments are cleansed and are **spotless pure** and **white**

Alma 13:12

now they after being sanctified by the Holy Ghost
and having their garments made **white**
being **pure** and **spotless** before God
could not look upon sin save it were with abhorrence

Alma 32:42

behold by and by
 ye shall pluck the fruit thereof which is most precious
 which is sweet above all that is sweet
 and which is **white** above all that is **white**
 yea and **pure** above all that is **pure**

Mormon 9:6

cry mightily unto the Father in the name of Jesus
 that perhaps ye may be found **spotless pure** fair and **white**
 having been cleansed by the blood of the Lamb at that great and last day

The critical text will therefore restore the word *white* in 2 Nephi 30:6; it is the earliest extant reading, and its occurrence there is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

We should also note here that the 1849 LDS edition accidentally lost the repeated indefinite article *a* in this conjoined construction (thus creating “a white and delightsome people”). The repeated *a* was restored in the 1981 LDS edition since the earliest text as well as the 1840 edition had the repeated *a* (even if *white* had been replaced by *pure* in the 1840 edition). For further discussion of such repetition of the indefinite article, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 30:6 the original reading “a **white** and a delightsome people”, the earliest extant reading in the text; for the 1840 edition, *white* was replaced by *pure*, probably because of a perceived difficulty in allowing a change in skin color to apply to the descendants of the Nephites.

■ 2 Nephi 30:14

*and the weaned child shall put his hand
 on the [cockatrice > cockatrices 1 | cockatrice’s ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] den*

□ Isaiah 11:8 (King James Bible)

and the weaned child shall put his hand
 on the **cockatrice’** den

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *cockatrice* (his spelling for *cockatrice*); then he immediately added a small *s* at the end of the word (and without any change in the level of ink flow). One could interpret the original *cockatrice* as evidence for the King James *cockatrice’*, although the addition of the final *s* appears to be a correction to the reading of the original manuscript (which is not extant here). Another possible explanation for *cockatrice* is that it simply represents Oliver’s tendency to omit a final grammatical *s*, especially when the word already ends in an /s/ sound in an unstressed syllable. In the one other place where the Book of Mormon quotes this passage (2 Nephi 21:8), Oliver wrote *cockatrices* (and the 1830 typesetter added the apostrophe in heavy ink). See the discussion under 2 Nephi 21:8.

Summary: Retain the typical adjustment to standard English in the Book of Mormon quotations of Isaiah, namely, *cockatrice’s den* rather than *cockatrice’ den* (the King James reading).

■ 2 Nephi 30:17

*there is nothing which is secret
 save it shall be revealed
 there is no [works 1ABCDEG | work FHIJKLMNOPQRST] of darkness
 save it shall be made manifest in the light
 and there is nothing which is sealed upon earth
 save it shall be loosed*

Parallelism in this passage suggests that the original text probably read “work of darkness” rather than “works of darkness”. Both the preceding and following sentences consistently use the singular (“there **is nothing** which **is** secret save **it** shall be revealed . . . and **there is nothing** which **is** sealed upon earth save **it** shall be loosed”. Even more significant, “there is no work(s) of darkness” is immediately followed by the same singular pronoun *it* (“save **it** shall be made manifest in the light”), which argues for the singular *work*.

Scribes typically had problems adding and deleting the plural *s*, but all manuscript instances involving *work(s)* show that for this lexical item the tendency was to accidentally drop the plural *s* from *works* rather than add it to the singular *work*:

- 1 Nephi 15:33 (the original text probably read *works*)
 - wherefore they must be brought to stand before God
 - to be judged of their [*work* 01 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 7:24 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 - and then ye will always abound
 - in good [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 12:14 (the original text probably read *works*)
 - yea all our [*work* 1A | *works* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us
- Alma 12:32 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 - for the [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of justice
 - could not be destroyed
- Alma 37:41 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})
 - nevertheless it did shew unto them
 - marvelous [*work* > *worke* >+ *works* 0 | *works* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]
- Alma 40:13 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 - for behold they chose
 - evil [*works* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *work* > *works* 1] rather than good
- Alma 50:2 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})
 - he caused that there should be timbers
 - yea [*work* > *works* 0 | *works* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] of timbers
 - built up to the heighth of a man
- 3 Nephi 21:5 (two errors by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , one of which was corrected by him)
 - therefore when these [*work* >+ *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]
 - and the [*work* 1PS | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
 - which shall be wrought among you hereafter
 - shall come forth from the Gentiles unto your seed . . .

3 Nephi 26:4 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 when all people and all kindreds and all nations and tongues
 shall stand before God
 to be judged of their [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

3 Nephi 28:33 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 and if ye had all the scriptures which gives an account of
 all the marvelous [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Christ
 ye would according to the words of Christ know that these things must surely come

Mormon 9:26 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 and now behold who can stand
 against the [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lord

Since there are no manuscript examples of an original *work* being incorrectly replaced by *works*, there is some question here of whether the plural “there is no works of darkness” in 2 Nephi 30:17 is actually a scribal error. (See 1 Nephi 15:33, Alma 12:14, and 3 Nephi 21:5 for discussion of the more complicated cases listed above.)

In addition, the original text had examples of “there <singular *be* verb> no <plural noun>”, as in the following four examples involving *was*:

Alma 4:1
 there [*was* > *js were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 no contentions nor wars in the land of Zarahemla

3 Nephi 4:2
 but behold there [*was* > *js were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 no wild beasts nor game in those lands which had been deserted by the Nephites

4 Nephi 1:2
 and there [*was* > *js were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 no contentions and disputations among them

Ether 7:27
 and there [*was* > *js were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 no more wars in the days of Shule

In each of these cases, Joseph Smith edited the singular *was* to the plural *were*. These examples show that the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 30:17 is therefore possible: “there is no **works** of darkness”. Even so, the following singular *it* does seem very odd (“there **is** no **works** of darkness save **it** shall be made manifest in the light”). Thus the 1852 LDS edition and the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *works* with the singular *work* (rather than attempting to make the whole sentence plural: “there **are** no **works** of darkness save **they** shall be made manifest in the light”).

The anomalous *works* here in 2 Nephi 30:17 may simply be the result of an early error in the transmission of the text, especially given the dominance of the plural “works of darkness” elsewhere in the text:

2 Nephi 9:9 and all manner of secret **works** of darkness
 2 Nephi 10:15 I must needs destroy the secret **works** of darkness

2 Nephi 25:2	for their works were works of darkness
2 Nephi 26:10	and choose works of darkness rather than light
2 Nephi 26:22	yea the founder of murder and works of darkness
Alma 37:21	the mysteries and the works of darkness
Alma 37:23	yea their secret works / their works of darkness
Alma 45:12	and fall into the works of darkness
Helaman 6:28	which spread the works of darkness
Helaman 6:30	he doth carry on his works of darkness and secret murder
Helaman 8:4	concerning their secret works of darkness
Helaman 10:3	their secret works of darkness and their murderings
Mormon 8:27	because of secret combinations and the works of darkness

Note, in particular, the three occurrences of the plural “works of darkness” earlier in 2 Nephi 25–26. In fact, the only occurrence of “work of darkness” (in Helaman 6:29) may be an error for “works of darkness” since preceding and following verses have the plural:

Helaman 6:28–30

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 . . .

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 . . .

and behold it is he which is the author of all sin
and behold he doth carry on his **works of darkness** and secret murder

In fact, the third instance closely parallels the second:

to still **carry on the work of darkness and of secret murder**
he doth **carry on his works of darkness and secret murder**

For further discussion of this example, see Helaman 6:29.

Summary: Maintain the emended singular in 2 Nephi 30:17: “there is no **work** of darkness save it shall be made manifest in the light”; parallelism with the other sentences in this verse argues for the singular; the probable source for the plural *works* (the earliest text here) is the dominance of the plural “works of darkness” elsewhere in the text, including three times in 2 Nephi 25–26.

■ 2 Nephi 30:17

there is nothing which is secret save it shall be revealed
there is no work of darkness save it shall be made manifest in the light
and there is nothing which is sealed upon [1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth
save it shall be loosed

Here in 2 Nephi 30:17, the 1830 typesetter added the definite article *the* before *earth*, thus replacing “upon earth” with “upon **the** earth”. The Book of Mormon text has two other occurrences of “upon earth”, one of which quotes the King James Bible:

3 Nephi 13:19 (Matthew 6:19)

lay not up for yourselves treasures **upon earth**

3 Nephi 19:25

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

The original manuscript undoubtedly read “upon earth” in these two other passages since in 3 Nephi both the 1830 edition and the printer’s manuscript are firsthand copies of the original manuscript. Thus “upon earth” is definitely possible in 2 Nephi 30:17.

Elsewhere in the earliest text, there are 13 occurrences of “upon the earth”, one of which is found nearby in 2 Nephi 30:8 (“to bring about the restoration of his people **upon the earth**”). This preceding occurrence of “upon the earth” may have influenced the 1830 typesetter to add the definite article *the* later on in verse 17.

There are also four examples of “on earth” in the earliest text, of which three deal with sealing and loosing, just like in 2 Nephi 30:17:

2 Nephi 33:15

for what I seal **on earth** shall be brought against you at the judgment bar

Helaman 10:7

whatsoever ye shall seal **on earth** shall be sealed in heaven
and whatsoever ye shall loose **on earth** shall be loosed in heaven

All these examples parallel the language of the King James Bible (except that the King James text has the verb *bind* rather than *seal*):

Matthew 16:19

and whatsoever thou shalt bind **on earth** shall be bound in heaven
and whatsoever thou shalt loose **on earth** shall be loosed in heaven

Matthew 18:18

whatsoever ye shall bind **on earth** shall be bound in heaven
and whatsoever ye shall loose **on earth** shall be loosed in heaven

Note, in particular, that none of these parallel examples have the definite article *the* in the phrase “on earth”, which strongly argues that the phrase “upon earth” in 2 Nephi 30:17 never had the definite article in the original text.

These two other Book of Mormon passages dealing with sealing and loosing suggest the possibility that the preposition *upon* in 2 Nephi 30:17 could be an error for *on*. In support of such a possible error, there are a couple of examples elsewhere in the manuscripts where the prepositions *upon* and *on* were initially mixed up:

Helaman 5:26 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

ye cannot lay your hands [*upon* > *on* 1 | *on* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] us
to slay us

3 Nephi 20:2 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

and they arose up
and stood [*on* > *upon* 1 | *upon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their feet

In each case, the correction is virtually immediate; there is no change in the level of ink flow in either case. The first example is of particular interest since Oliver Cowdery is the scribe (as also in 2 Nephi 30:17) and his error was to replace *on* with the more biblical-sounding *upon* (as one might hypothesize happened in 2 Nephi 30:17).

Nonetheless, there are only these three examples in the Book of Mormon of “on earth” involving sealing and loosing. Furthermore, 2 Nephi 30:17 does not really refer to heavenly sealing or loosing but rather to the revealing of all the hidden works of mankind, so the parallel language does not have to precisely agree. Finally, the prepositions *upon* and *on* are clearly synonymous. Thus there is no strong motivation for emending “upon earth” (the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 30:17) to “on earth”. Nor is there any reason why the intrusive *the* of the 1830 typesetter should be accepted. The critical text will follow the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 30:17 (“which is sealed **upon earth**”).

Summary: The intrusive *the* should be removed from “upon the earth” in 2 Nephi 10:17, but the preposition *upon* should not be changed to *on*.

■ 2 Nephi 30:18

*and Satan shall have power
over the [heart > hearts 1 | hearts ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the children of men
no more for a long time*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *heart* in \mathcal{P} ; then he corrected the singular to *hearts* but without any change in level of ink flow (which suggests a virtually immediate correction). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon there are 13 occurrences of “the hearts of the children of men” but (as one might suspect) none of “the heart of the children of men”.

Summary: Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction of *heart* to *hearts* in \mathcal{P} undoubtedly made \mathcal{P} agree with the reading in \mathcal{O} (no longer extant here).

■ 2 Nephi 30:18

*and now my beloved brethren
I [must 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRS | CGHKT] make an end of my sayings*

The 1840 edition omitted the modal verb *must*. This omission could be a typo. On the other hand, it could represent editing since in all other instances when a Book of Mormon writer refers to ending his account, the word *must* is never used. There are 27 examples of “had made an end”, 15 of “make an end”, and one of “having made an end”. For instance, at the beginning of the next chapter, Nephi writes: “and now I Nephi **make an end** of my prophesying unto you” (2 Nephi 31:1), with no use of *must*.

The RLDS textual tradition followed the 1840 reading until the 1908 edition, where the *must* was restored, in accord with its occurrence in the printer’s manuscript. The 1981 LDS edition removed the *must*, undoubtedly by reference to the 1840 edition.

We do not have the original manuscript here, so we cannot tell if it read *must* or not. Nonetheless, the accidental insertion of *must* seems to be a highly unlikely error in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text. There are no examples elsewhere in the entire textual history (in either the manuscripts or the printed editions) where the modal verb *must* has been either deleted or added. (On the other hand, there are numerous examples involving the deletion and addition of the future modal verbs *will* and *shall*.) Although the use of *must* is unique in this context of “making an end” of speaking or writing, it seems perfectly reasonable: Nephi here feels moved upon or perhaps even obligated to end his sayings.

Summary: Restore *must* in 2 Nephi 30:18 (“I must make an end of my sayings”) since it seems to be intentionally used here.

- *praying*
 - 3 Nephi 17:18 when Jesus had made an end of **praying** unto the Father
 - 3 Nephi 19:35 when Jesus had made an end of **praying**
- *abridging*
 - Moroni 1:1 after having made an end of **abridging** the account of . . .

But the text also has nine examples where the complement is a plural count noun, with *sayings* occurring seven times (but there are no occurrences of *prophesyings*):

- 2 Nephi 30:18 I must make an end of **my sayings**
- Mosiah 1:15 after king Benjamin had made an end of **these sayings** to his son
- Mosiah 6:3 when king Benjamin had made an end of all **these things**
- Mosiah 13:25 after Abinadi had made an end of **these sayings**
- Alma 24:17 when the king had made an end of **these sayings**
- Alma 35:1 after Amulek had made an end of **these words**
- 3 Nephi 10:19 therefore for this time I make an end of **my sayings**
- 3 Nephi 18:36 when Jesus had made an end of **these sayings**
- 3 Nephi 26:12 and now I Mormon make an end of **my sayings**

Finally, like the original text here in 2 Nephi 31:1, there are a few more cases of a possessive pronoun preceding a gerund-like noun:

- Jacob 7:27 and I make an end of **my writing** upon these plates
- Omni 1:30 and I make an end of **my speaking**
- 3 Nephi 5:19 and now I make an end of **my saying** which is of myself

For the third example (3 Nephi 5:19), it is possible that *my saying* is an error for *my sayings*, especially since *my sayings* occurs fairly often in the text, including nearby in 3 Nephi 10:19 and 3 Nephi 26:12. Of course, in 3 Nephi 5:19 the singular *is* in the following relative clause (“which is of myself”) suggests that the singular *my saying* could be correct, although one could argue that singular *is* may have been the source for accidentally writing *my saying* instead of *my sayings*. For further discussion of this example and its possible emendation, see 3 Nephi 5:19.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 31:1 the gerundive noun *prophesying* in “I Nephi make an end of my prophesying unto you”.

■ 2 Nephi 31:4

*wherefore I would that ye should remember that I have spoken unto you
concerning that prophet which the Lord shewed unto me
that should baptize the Lamb of God which should take away
the [Sin 1 | sins ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | sin PS] of the world*

Here in 2 Nephi 31:4, the 1830 typesetter changed the singular *sin* to *sins*. Yet this passage is virtually identical to the language in John 1:29 (“the Lamb of God which taketh away the **sin** of the world”). Thus the singular *sin* is appropriate here. The text underwent the same change of *sin* to *sins* earlier in 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 10:10

and after that he had baptized the Messiah with water
 he should behold and bear record that
 he had baptized the Lamb of God which should take away
 the [*sin* 0 | *sin* >+ *sins* 1 | *sins* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the world

In fact, these two passages are the only ones in the Book of Mormon that refer directly to John the Baptist and his declaration that Christ would take away the sin of the world—and in both cases the earliest Book of Mormon text reads *sin* just as in John 1:29. For further discussion, see 1 Nephi 10:10.

In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the singular *sin* here in 2 Nephi 31:4, but not in 1 Nephi 10:10. Oliver Cowdery is responsible for the change to *sins* in 1 Nephi 10:10; in the printer’s manuscript, he added the *s* later with heavier ink flow. The original manuscript is extant for 1 Nephi 10:10 and it reads *sin*.

Summary: Restore the singular *sin* in 2 Nephi 31:4; the original reading here directly reflects John the Baptist’s language in John 1:29.

■ 2 Nephi 31:7

*according to the flesh he humbleth himself before the Father
 and witnesseth unto the Father that he would be obedient
 unto [the Father > him 1 | him ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 in keeping his commandments*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “obedient unto the Father”, probably because of the two preceding occurrences in the same verse of “the Father”. Almost immediately Oliver corrected the text here by crossing out “the Father” and supralinearly inserting *him*, all with no change in the level of ink flow. Undoubtedly, the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here) read *him*.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 31:7 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading: “that he would be obedient unto **him**”.

■ 2 Nephi 31:9

*and again it sheweth unto the children of men
 the [straitness 1T | straightness ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] of the path
 and the narrowness of the gate by which they should enter*

Under 1 Nephi 8:20, I identified this passage in 2 Nephi 31:9 along with another one in 2 Nephi 33:9 for which either *strait* ‘narrow’ or *straight* ‘not crooked’ would work. The parallel language between 2 Nephi 33:9 and Matthew 7:13–14 (both refer to the way or path as “leading to life”) especially argues for the use of *strait* in 2 Nephi 33:9. There is, however, additional evidence in this chapter to suggest that here in 2 Nephi 31:9 this path “leads to life”:

2 Nephi 31:18

and then are ye in **this** straight and narrow path which **leads to eternal life**
yea ye have entered in by the gate . . .

The use of the demonstrative *this* refers the reader back to the earlier mentioned path in verse 9. And there is one more nearby verse that refers to this path:

2 Nephi 31:19

after that ye have got into **this** straight and narrow path
I would ask if all is done

In other words, 2 Nephi 31 links verses 18 and 19 to verse 9. This connection provides strong evidence that together 2 Nephi 31:9 and 2 Nephi 31:18 refer to the language of Matthew 7:13–14, just as 2 Nephi 33:9 does.

One could further argue that the use of *strait* in verse 9 implies that verses 18 and 19 should read “this strait and narrow path”—that is, redundantly. And correspondingly, the two other uses of “straight and narrow” in the Book of Mormon text (in 1 Nephi 8:20 and Helaman 3:29) should therefore read “strait and narrow”. This linkage may explain why the editors for the 1981 LDS edition decided to change all four instances of “straight and narrow” to “strait and narrow”. For further discussion of this issue, see 1 Nephi 8:20.

Summary: Evidence from 2 Nephi 31:18 argues that the text in 2 Nephi 31:9 refers to Matthew 7:13–14; thus 2 Nephi 31:9 should probably read “the straitness of the path” even though 2 Nephi 31:18 reads “this straight and narrow path”.

■ 2 Nephi 31:10–11

*and he [sayeth >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto the children of men
follow thou me . . .*

*and the Father [sayeth >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
repent ye repent ye and be baptized in the name of my Beloved Son*

Here in 2 Nephi 31:10–11, we have two instances of the present-tense *saith*. Throughout the larger passage in 2 Nephi 31, the text uses the present tense intermingled with the past tense to describe Christ’s baptism:

2 Nephi 31:6–9

and now I would ask of you my beloved brethren
wherein the Lamb of God **did fulfill** all righteousness
in being baptized by water
know ye not that he **was** holy
but notwithstanding he being holy
he **showeth** unto the children of men
that according to the flesh
he **humbleth** himself before the Father
and **witnesseth** unto the Father
that he would be obedient unto him in keeping his commandments

wherefore after that he **was baptized** with water
 the Holy Ghost **descended** upon him in the form of a dove
 and again it **sheweth** unto the children of men
 the straitness of the path
 and the narrowness of the gate by which they should enter
 he having set the example before them

The following two verses use the present tense to refer to two specific commandments of the Lord that relate to Christ's baptism:

2 Nephi 31:10

and he **saith** unto the children of men
 follow thou me

2 Nephi 31:11

and the Father **saith**
 repent ye repent ye and be baptized in the name of my Beloved Son

Joseph Smith edited both of these instances of the present-tense *saith* to *said*. One can view these two statements as instances of the historical present tense for the verb *say*, which Joseph Smith typically edited from *saith* to *said* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:1 and more generally under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3).

The language in the first case of *saith* (in verse 10) reminds us of Christ's frequent admonition to his disciples (expressed numerous times in the New Testament) to follow him. Sometimes the King James Bible uses the historical-present *saith* when Christ gives this commandment, but other times the past-tense form *said* is used:

Matthew 4:19	and he saith unto them: follow me
Matthew 8:22	but Jesus said unto him: follow me
Matthew 9:9	and he saith unto him: follow me
Mark 2:14	and said unto him: follow me
Luke 5:27	and he said unto him: follow me
Luke 9:59	and he said unto another: follow me
John 1:43	and saith unto him: follow me
John 21:19	he saith unto him: follow me

There is even one biblical example where **thou** appears as part of the command (just as in 2 Nephi 31:10):

John 21:22 (Christ speaking to Peter, referring to John)

Jesus **saith** unto him
 if I will that he tarry till I come
 what *is that* to thee
 follow **thou** me

All of these King James passages involving *saith* are found within a past-tense narrative.

For the second case of *saith* (in verse 11), there is no specific biblical source for the Father giving the commandment to repent and be baptized in the name of the Son. The closest biblical

language to this phraseology is found in Peter’s declaration on the day of Pentecost: “repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ” (Acts 2:38). In an earlier discourse in 2 Nephi, Jacob referred to this commandment as coming from the Son:

2 Nephi 9:21–23

and he cometh into the world . . .
for behold he suffereth the pains of all men . . .
and he commandeth all men
that they must repent and be baptized in his name

Ultimately this commandment would come from the Father, as is suggested in Joseph Smith’s “New Translation” of the Bible where Enoch reports that God the Father spoke the following to Adam:

Moses 6:52

if thou wilt turn unto me and hearken unto my voice and believe
and **repent** of all thy transgressions and be **baptized**
even by water in the name of **mine Only Begotten Son**
which is full of grace and truth which is Jesus Christ
the only name which shall be given under heaven
whereby salvation shall come unto the children of men . . .

The text here represents the original reading of this passage, now canonized in the Pearl of Great Price. See pages 101 and 612 of Scott H. Faulring, Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews, *Joseph Smith’s New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts* (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2004).

Thus passages elsewhere in the scriptures suggest that the two instances of *saith* in 2 Nephi 31:10–11 may represent the eternal present rather than the historical present. Both of these commandments are eternal, so here Nephi may not be specifically referring to any one time that the Lord gave either of these commandments. As far as the critical text is concerned, it makes no difference whether these two instances of *saith* are cases of the historical present or the eternal present. The earliest text reads *saith* in both instances; thus the critical text will restore the *saith* in each instance. For two other examples where there is some question of whether *saith* should be interpreted as the historical present or the eternal present, see 1 Nephi 17:53 and 2 Nephi 6:11.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 31:10–11 the two occurrences of the present-tense *saith*, the reading of the earliest textual sources; in this instance, the present-tense usage may be interpreted as either the historical present or the eternal present.

■ 2 Nephi 31:12

and also the voice of the Son

came [to > unto 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me

Although *unto* is archaic for speakers of modern English, its occurrence is quite prevalent in the Book of Mormon text. In fact, for the clause “the voice came”, we have 12 other occurrences in the text with the preposition *unto* but only 3 with *to* (each marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 16:25	the voice of the Lord came unto my father
1 Nephi 17:7	the voice of the Lord came unto me
1 Nephi 18:5	the voice of the Lord came unto my father
2 Nephi 31:14	thus came the voice of the Son unto me
Enos 1:5	and there came a voice unto me
* Mosiah 24:13	the voice of the Lord came to them in their afflictions
Mosiah 24:16	the voice of the Lord came unto them again
* Mosiah 26:14	the voice of the Lord came to him
* Alma 20:2	the voice of the Lord came to Ammon
Helaman 5:46	there came a voice unto them
Helaman 10:3	behold a voice came unto him
Helaman 13:3	but behold the voice of the Lord came unto him
3 Nephi 1:12	and behold the voice of the Lord came unto him
3 Nephi 10:3	there came a voice again unto the people
Mormon 3:14	behold the voice of the Lord came unto me

Note, in particular, the occurrence of *unto* nearby in 2 Nephi 31:14 (“thus came the voice of the Son **unto** me”). Yet variation is possible: Mosiah 24:13 reads *to*, but the nearby Mosiah 24:16 reads *unto*. Of course, modern English speakers expect *to* rather than the archaic *unto*. Here in the printer’s manuscript for 2 Nephi 31:12, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *to* (the expected preposition in modern English); then almost immediately he corrected the manuscript to read *unto* (the level of ink flow for the crossout and the supralinear *unto* is unchanged).

Summary: In 2 Nephi 31:12 follow Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in $\text{\textcircled{D}}$ that restored the biblically styled preposition *unto*.

■ 2 Nephi 31:13

yea by following

your Lord and [1A | *your* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Savior

The 1837 edition increased the parallelism of the text by inserting *your* before *Savior*; perhaps the change was consciously made, although Joseph Smith did not mark the change in the printer’s manuscript. Elsewhere in the text there are two occurrences of “**our** Lord and Savior”:

Mormon 3:14	by our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ
Mormon 8:6	since the coming of our Lord and Savior

But there are no cases for which the determiner occurring with *Lord* is repeated before a following conjunct. These two examples of “our Lord and Savior” suggest that the 1837 change in 2 Nephi 31:13 does not represent systematic editing. The earliest reading in 2 Nephi 31:13, without the repeated *your*, probably represents the original text. For additional discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 31:13 the reading of the earliest text, without the repeated *your* in “**your** Lord and Savior”; this reading is consistent with the two occurrences of “**our** Lord and Savior” in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 31:13

yea by following your Lord and Savior
down into the water according to his word
behold then shall ye receive **the Holy Ghost**

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| □ NULL | 1* |
| □ yea then cometh the baptism of fire
and of the Holy Ghost | 1 ^c ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |

and then can ye speak with the tongue of angels

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially omitted a whole clause in this verse. His eye must have skipped down from the first *Holy Ghost* to the second one. He seems to have caught his error almost immediately; the long supralinear insertion was written without any change in the level of ink flow.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 31:13 the longer, corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ 2 Nephi 31:17

wherefore do the things which I have told you
[that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] I have seen
that your Lord and your Redeemer should do

Here we have a sequence of three relative clauses, each of which begins with a direct object relative pronoun that refers to the antecedent *the things*:

do **the things which** I have told you
[the things] **that** I have seen
[the things] **that** your Lord and your Redeemer should do

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the second of these relative pronouns, thus ending up with “do the things **which** I have told you I have seen **that** your Lord and your Redeemer should do”. The resulting construction is more fluent, but the original reading works well enough. The critical text will restore the original *that*. For further examples of cases where a direct object relative pronoun such as *which* or *that* has been omitted, see under WHICH in volume 3. For another example of where Joseph Smith edited a sequence of relative pronouns, see 1 Nephi 13:30.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 31:17 the relative pronoun *that* which Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition: “do the things which I have told you **that** I have seen that your Lord and your Redeemer should do”.

■ 2 Nephi 31:18

and then are ye in this [strait 1ST | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] and narrow path
which leads to eternal life

As I argued under 1 Nephi 8:20, the correct reading here conjoins two nonsynonymous adjectives, *straight* and *narrow*. For additional discussion especially relevant to this verse and its connection to Matthew 7:13–14, see 2 Nephi 31:9.

■ 2 Nephi 31:18

ye have done according to the [commandments 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | commandment HK] of the Father and the Son

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *commandments* with the singular *commandment*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural, probably by reference to the printer's manuscript. Also see the discussion under 2 Nephi 5:19 for another example where the RLDS text replaced *commandments* with *commandment*.

Elsewhere, when referring to God's commandment(s), the original text has ten occurrences of the plural "according to the commandments" and two of the singular "according to the commandment" (in Mormon 5:13 and Ether 4:5). So theoretically either reading is possible in 2 Nephi 31:18; the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 31:18 the plural form "according to the commandments" (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ 2 Nephi 31:18

*and ye have received the Holy Ghost
which [witness 1A | witnesses BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the Father and the Son
unto the fulfilling of the promise which he hath made*

Here the 1837 edition changed the verb form *witness* to the third person singular form *witnesses*. This editing change is consistent with standard English. It could well be that the original text here actually read *witnesses* but that it was difficult for Oliver Cowdery to hear the third person singular /əz/ added onto the /əs/ of the final syllable in *witness*, especially given the following of /əv/. (Or perhaps Joseph Smith himself did not pronounce the third person singular ending in this case.) An alternative explanation for *witness* (suggested by Alison Coutts, personal communication) is that the original text here read "which **witness is** of the Father and the Son", which would have been pronounced virtually the same as "which **witnesses of** the Father and the Son". Under this interpretation, *witness* would be a noun rather than a verb, but parallel usage in 3 Nephi 16:6 (discussed below) suggests that *witness* is a verb, not a noun, here in 2 Nephi 31:18.

Another possibility is that the verb form *witness*, but without the *-es* ending, is actually intended. In Early Modern English, the lexical form *witness* often occurred in place of *witnesses*. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary cites many such examples where the plural noun form is *witness* rather than *witnesses*. Consider these examples from 1440 to 1713 listed in the OED under "uninflected plural" for definition 4a of the noun *witness*:

- 1440 and he would be **one** of his chief **witness**
- 1483 to have letters to summon his **witness** and the party to hear **them** sworn
- 1533 he hath **divers witness**
- 1535 besides the **witness** which **are** against you
- 1713 the pleader . . . had **witness** ready to attest

(For these examples, the spelling has been regularized.) Under the verb *witness*, the OED explains that *witness* frequently stood for the third person singular *witnesses* in earlier English: “In some Middle English texts, forms of the type *witness* (= *witnesses*) may be inflected forms of [the verb] WITNESS.” One example (here with original spelling) dates from 1338: “William of Malmesburie **witnesse** it in his writte.”

The Book of Mormon text has one other example involving the editing of the third person singular verb form *witness* to *witnesses*. In this instance, the 1920 LDS edition introduced the standard *witnesses*:

3 Nephi 16:6

and blessed are the Gentiles because of their belief in me
in and of the Holy Ghost
which [*witness* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *witnesses* RT] unto them
of me and of the Father

Note that in both these examples (2 Nephi 31:18 and 3 Nephi 16:6) the word *witness* occurs in a relative clause and immediately after the relative pronoun *which*.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there is one example of the alternative third person singular form, the archaic *witnesseth*:

2 Nephi 31:7

according to the flesh he humbleth himself before the Father
and **witnesseth** unto the Father that he would be obedient unto him

But there are no other cases in the text of *witness*, *witnesses*, or *witnesseth* for the third person singular, which means that in the earliest text there are no examples of the third person singular form *witnesses*, only *witnesseth* (once) and *witness* (twice).

Turning to the noun *witness*, we find in the text two occurrences of the form *witness* that could theoretically be interpreted as the plural *witnesses*:

Alma 10:13

nevertheless there were some among them
which thought to question them
that by their cunning devices they might catch them in their words
that they might find **witness** against them
that they might deliver them to the judges

Mormon 3:21

and also that the Jews the covenant people of the Lord
shall have other **witness** besides that which they saw and heard

These two instances of the noun *witness* could actually refer to what one witnesses rather than to people who witness. Unlike the case of the verb *witness*, we find no specific manuscript evidence that the form *witness* ever replaced the plural noun *witnesses*. There are 20 occurrences of the plural *witnesses* (including two in the witness statements), but each one has consistently read as *witnesses*, never *witness*, in all the textual sources. These examples suggest that Joseph Smith and his scribes never had any particular problem mishearing or miscopying the plural noun *witnesses*

as *witness*. Thus the occurrence in 2 Nephi 31:18 and 3 Nephi 16:6 of the base form *witness* for the third person singular *witnesses* seems to be intentional rather than due to error. The critical text will therefore restore these two instances of the archaic third person singular *witness*.

For another word ending in *-ness* that could stand for *-nesses*, see the discussion regarding the word *wilderness* in Alma 34:26. The plural conjuncts in that verse imply that the word *wilderness* actually means ‘wildernesses’:

Alma 34:26
 ye must pour out your souls
 in your **closets** and your **secret places** and in your **wilderness**

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 31:18 and 3 Nephi 16:6 the archaic third person singular *witness* (in place of the standard *witnesses*).

■ 2 Nephi 31:18

*and ye have received the Holy Ghost which witness of the Father and the Son
 unto the fulfilling of the promise which he hath made
 that if ye [entered 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | enter s] in by the way
 ye should receive*

The original reading here in 2 Nephi 31:18 uses the past-tense *entered* in an *if*-clause; this past-tense usage is a form of the subjunctive and corresponds with the historically past-tense modal form *should* that is found in the associated main clause (“ye should receive”). The 1953 RLDS edition replaced the subjunctive past-tense *entered* with the present indicative *enter*.

Similar examples of such past-tense subjunctive usage are found elsewhere in *if*-clauses in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 37:22
 therefore the Lord said
if they did not repent
 they **should** be destroyed from off the face of the earth

Alma 41:3
 and **if** their works **were** good in this life
 and the desires of their hearts **were** good
 that they **should also** at the last day be restored unto that which is good

Alma 42:19
 now if there was no law given
 —**if** a man **murdered** he **should** die—
 would he be afraid he should die if he should murder

Such usage is also found in the King James Bible:

John 9:22
 for the Jews had agreed already
 that **if** any man **did confess** that he was Christ
 he **should** be put out of the synagogue

John 11:57

now both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment
that **if** any man **knew** where he were
he **should** shew *it* that they might take him

Galatians 1:10

for **if** I yet **pleased** men
I **should** not be the servant of Christ

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 31:18 the original subjunctive past-tense usage (“if ye **entered** in by the way / ye **should** receive”).

■ 2 Nephi 31:19

and now my beloved brethren

after that ye have [got >js gotten 1 | got A | gotten BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

into this straight and narrow path

I would ask if all is done

The grammatical question here is whether *got* or *gotten* should be the past participle for the verb *get*. Related to this issue is whether or not the meaning of the verb *get* involves change. For instance, an original “he has got the plates” (see the statement of the eight witnesses cited below) could mean either ‘he has possession of the plates’ (a static situation) or ‘he has obtained the plates’ (a dynamic situation). In the latter case, *got* could be replaced by *gotten*.

The choice between *got* and *gotten* is one that grammarians have discussed at some length. In American English, *got* is typically used when possession is involved (a static condition) and *gotten* when something has been obtained (a dynamic condition). For discussion, see *got, gotten* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

The original Book of Mormon text had only the shortened past participial forms *got* and *gat*; there were no instances of *gotten*. (For discussion of the possibility of *gat*, see Alma 47:5 and Alma 55:2.) For three cases involving the dynamic meaning, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) replaced *got* with *gotten*. Besides the one here in 2 Nephi 31:19, we have two other examples of Joseph Smith changing *got* to *gotten*, one of which was marked in the printer’s manuscript:

Alma 8:9

now Satan had [got >js gotten 1 | got A | gotten BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
great hold upon the hearts of the people of the city of Ammonihah

Helaman 3:36

and it came to pass that the fifty and second year ended in peace also
save it were the exceeding great pride
which had [got 1A | gotten BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into the hearts
of the people

Yet in 11 other instances, some of which are clearly dynamic (each marked below with an asterisk), *got* has been left unchanged in the standard text:

eight-witness statement

the said Smith has **got** the plates of which we have spoken

2 Nephi 29:3

a Bible a Bible we have **got** a Bible and there cannot be any more Bible

2 Nephi 29:6

a Bible we have **got** a Bible and we need no more Bible

Alma 10:25

why hath Satan **got** such great hold upon your hearts

* Alma 16:21

and now after the church having been established throughout all the land
having **got** the victory over the devil . . .

Alma 47:5 (the original manuscript may be read as either *got* or *gat*;
in the 1911 LDS edition, *got* was changed to *gotten*)

and now he had [*got* / *gat* 0 | *got* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | *gotten* Q]
the command of those parts of the Lamanites
which were in favor of the king

Alma 55:2 (the original manuscript has *gat*)

for I will not grant unto him that he shall have any more power
than what he hath [*gat* 0 | *got* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST]

Alma 61:8

they have **got** possession of the land or the city of Zarahemla

* Helaman 6:31

and now behold he had **got** great hold upon the hearts of the Nephites
yea insomuch that they had become exceeding wicked

* Helaman 7:14

yea because I have **got** upon my tower
that I might pour out my soul unto my God

Helaman 7:15

the devil hath **got** so great hold upon your hearts

In fact, three of these unchanged examples parallel one of the changed examples—namely, the ones that refer to “getting great hold upon the hearts of X”:

- *edited*: Alma 8:9
- *unedited*: Alma 10:25, Helaman 6:31, Helaman 7:15

This comparison clearly demonstrates the uneven nature of the editing for the past participle *got* in the Book of Mormon text. In many cases, the (potentially) dynamic *got* has simply been left unchanged. Some of the unchanged dynamic cases could be changed to *gotten*, but the problem is that some of these cases are ambiguous (see, for instance, Alma 55:2 and Alma 61:8), with the result that the editor would be forced to determine if the verb here was static or dynamic in meaning.

For a complete discussion of *got* (and *gat*) versus *gotten*, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. Also see under PAST TENSE in volume 4 for additional discussion of the form *gat* (and the related archaic past-tense form *forgat*).

Summary: Restore the original past participial form *got* in 2 Nephi 31:19, Alma 8:9, and Helaman 3:36.

■ 2 Nephi 31:19

after that ye have got into

[*this* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* G]

[*strait* 1ST | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] *and narrow path*

I would ask if all is done

As noted in the discussion of the same phraseology nearby in verse 18 (“and then are ye in **this** straight and narrow path”), the demonstrative *this* ultimately refers the reader back to the discussion in verse 9. The *this* is clearly intended in both verses 18 and 19. Here in verse 19, the 1858 Wright edition replaced the *this* with *the*, but the instance of *this* in verse 18 was left unchanged, thus showing that the 1858 change here in verse 19 was probably a typo. As also discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20 and 2 Nephi 31:18, the conjoined adjective here is *straight*, not *strait*.

Summary: Maintain the demonstrative *this* in 2 Nephi 31:19 as well as the nonredundant conjuncts *straight* and *narrow*.

2 Nephi 32

■ 2 Nephi 32:1

*I suppose that ye ponder **somewhat***

in your [minds > hearts 1 | hearts ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*[somewhat > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] concerning that which ye should do
after that ye have entered in by the way*

Here Oliver Cowdery made a couple of scribal slips that he corrected almost immediately. His first error was to initially write “ye ponder somewhat in your **minds**”, which he corrected by crossing out the word *minds* and supralinearly inserting the correct *hearts* (the probable reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here). The level of ink flow for the supralinear *hearts* is no different from the preceding writing, including the word *minds* that was crossed out. The second error occurred when he wrote *somewhat* as the next word. This word was written inline but with a sharper quill, which means that after correcting *minds* to *hearts*, Oliver must have either sharpened his quill or switched to a sharper one. When he resumed his copy work, he apparently had the word *somewhat* still in his mind (having recently written down “ye ponder **somewhat** in your hearts”), and thus he accidentally repeated the *somewhat*. Oliver quickly caught this dittography and crossed out the repeated *somewhat*.

Oliver Cowdery’s initial writing of *minds* rather than *hearts* probably resulted because English readers expect “to ponder in one’s mind” more than “to ponder in one’s heart”. Interestingly, however, the Book of Mormon text has only collocations of *ponder* and *heart*, never *ponder* and *mind*:

1 Nephi 11:1	as I sat pondering in mine heart
2 Nephi 4:15	and my heart pondereth them
2 Nephi 4:16	and my heart pondereth continually upon the things which . . .
2 Nephi 32:1	ye ponder somewhat in your hearts concerning . . .
2 Nephi 32:1	why do ye ponder these things in your hearts
2 Nephi 32:8	I perceive that ye ponder still in your hearts
Helaman 10:3	as he was thus pondering in his heart
Moroni 10:3	and ponder it in your hearts

Note that three of these eight examples occur in chapter 32 of 2 Nephi (twice here in verse 1 and another in verse 8).

Summary: For 2 Nephi 32:1, follow Oliver Cowdery’s corrected text in \mathcal{D} (“ye ponder **somewhat** in your **hearts** concerning that which ye should do”).

■ 2 Nephi 32:1

*I suppose that ye ponder somewhat in your hearts
concerning that which [ye 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | we s] should do
after that ye have entered in by the way*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition accidentally replaced one occurrence of the pronoun *ye* with *we*; this error was probably the result of the 1953 typesetter visually misreading *ye* as *we*. The error makes no sense. Elsewhere in this sentence the pronoun is *ye*, not *we*: “**ye** ponder . . . **ye** have entered”. And *ye* continues to be used in the following sentences for verses 1 and 2 (“why do **ye** ponder . . . do **ye** not remember . . . after **ye** had received . . . **ye** could speak . . . how could **ye** speak”).

Summary: Maintain the pronoun *ye* in 2 Nephi 32:1.

■ 2 Nephi 32:2

do ye not remember that I [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | have G] said unto you . . .

The 1858 Wright edition inserted the perfect auxiliary *have* in this sentence. This error is most probably a typo since in the next verse the same use of the past-tense *said* was left unchanged in that edition:

2 Nephi 32:3
wherefore I **said** unto you
feast upon the words of Christ

There would have been no motivation for the 1858 typesetter to consciously insert the *have* in verse 2 but not in verse 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of the past-tense *said* in 2 Nephi 32:2.

■ 2 Nephi 32:2

*do ye not remember that I said unto you
that after [that >+ NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
ye [have >+ had 1| had ABCDEFGIJKLMNQRST | have HK] received the Holy Ghost
ye could speak with the tongue of angels*

Here in verse 2, we have a couple of corrections that Oliver Cowdery apparently made somewhat later, perhaps when he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (although conceivably these two changes could be due to editing on Oliver’s part). The ink flow for both corrections is heavier, especially the crossouts, which implies that both corrections were made together but at a later time.

In the first case, Oliver wrote *that* after the subordinate conjunction *after*, probably because he had gotten used to the biblically styled subordinate construction “after that <sentence>”, which occurred very frequently in the original text (but which was, for the most part, edited out of the text in the 1837 edition). The simultaneous use of *that* both before and after the subordinate conjunction *after* is quite rare in the original text, with only one clear example of its use in the earliest textual sources:

1 Nephi 11:9 (the original reading in \mathcal{O} , \mathcal{P} , and the 1830 edition)
 and it came to pass **that after that** I had seen the tree
 I said unto the Spirit . . .

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted both of the *that*'s in 1 Nephi 11:9, so that the 1837 and all subsequent editions have read "and it came to pass **after** I had seen the tree". But we note that Oliver Cowdery himself did not emend the text for 1 Nephi 11:9 when he copied it from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . It is therefore quite possible that in 2 Nephi 32:2, Oliver's deletion of the second *that* was the result of his proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} rather than editing.

The second correction in \mathcal{P} for 2 Nephi 32:2 replaced the present perfect *have* that Oliver Cowdery originally wrote ("that after that ye **have** received the Holy Ghost"). Later, apparently at the same time when he deleted the repeated *that*, he crossed out the *have* and supralinearly inserted the *had*. Both crossouts were done with heavier ink flow, but the level of ink flow for the supralinear *had* is only somewhat heavier. Like the deletion of the *that*, this emendation of *have* to *had* is more likely the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

The use of the perfect *had received* as well as the past-tense modal *could* is expected here in 2 Nephi 32:2 for two reasons. First, Nephi's statement is in the subjunctive since he is speaking conditionally: he is not saying that they have received the Holy Ghost, but rather that after they do receive it, they will be able to speak with the tongue of angels. And second, the preceding past-tense clause ("I said unto you") leads to the use of the past tense in the following indirect quote. Such tense shifting in subordinate clauses is common in English (as in the sentence "I **told** him that I **was** coming **tomorrow**"). Thus we end up here in 2 Nephi 32:2 with the past-tense subjunctive forms *had received* and *could*. Nonetheless, the tendency to replace the *had* with *have* in this verse has persisted in the text. Thus the 1874 RLDS edition reintroduced *have* here in this passage, but the *had* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 edition, probably by reference to the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 32:2 Oliver Cowdery's two corrections in \mathcal{P} : namely, his removal of the extra *that* and his replacement of *have* with *had*; both corrections are probably the result of his proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (which is no longer extant here).

■ 2 Nephi 32:3

*for behold the words of Christ will tell you
 all things [what 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | that G] ye should do*

The 1858 Wright edition introduced *that* in place of *what*. In this passage, the word *what* functions as a relative pronoun whose antecedent is the preceding noun phrase *all things*. Such usage is dialectal but has nonetheless not been generally edited out of the text (namely, by replacing the *what* with *that* or by deleting it). In fact, we find the same usage a couple of verses later:

2 Nephi 32:5
 it will shew unto you **all things what** ye should do

Notice in this later verse that the 1858 edition did not change the *what* to *that*. This difference implies that the change in verse 3 was unintended and was probably a typo on the part of the 1858 typesetter.

One instance of where the relative pronoun *what* has been edited involves the phrase “but what”:

Mosiah 6:2

and it came to pass that there was not one soul
save it were little children
but [*what* 1ABCDEF GHIJKLOPS | *what* > *who* M | N | *who* QRT] had entered
into the covenant

Here in the 1906 LDS large-print edition, the *what* was omitted, while in the third (1907) printing of the 1905 LDS missionary edition, the *what* was edited to *who*. This second emendation (*who* in place of *what*) has persisted in the LDS text. Yet another instance in the text of this same “but what” has never been edited:

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

For further discussion of these two examples involving “but what”, see under Mosiah 6:2.

In general, editors have not removed the dialectal use of the relative pronoun *what*. The critical text will, of course, retain this nonstandard usage.

Summary: Maintain the dialectal use of *what* as a relative pronoun in 2 Nephi 32:3 (and also in 2 Nephi 32:5).

■ 2 Nephi 32:6

behold this [*is* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRST | KP] *the doctrine of Christ*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally skipped the linking verb *is*, probably because the preceding word, *this*, ends in the same letters, *is*. The result was that this edition accidentally created a Hebraism, so to speak. (In Hebrew this passage would be expressed without the *be* verb.) What is surprising here is that this omission was carried over into the subsequent RLDS edition (1908). The 1953 RLDS edition finally restored the *is*. This typo provides one more example of how Hebraistic-like readings may sometimes accidentally enter the text. For another example, see 1 Nephi 17:11, where the 1874 RLDS edition introduced an extra *and* that could be interpreted as a primitive Hebraism if one didn’t know the history of the text.

Summary: Maintain the linking verb *is* in 2 Nephi 32:6 (“behold this **is** the doctrine of Christ”).

2 Nephi 33

■ 2 Nephi 33:3

for I pray [for them > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] continually
[NULL > for them 1 | for them ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by day

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery made a correction in the word order; he initially wrote "I pray for them continually by day"; then shortly afterwards he crossed out *for them* and supralinearly inserted it after *continually* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Either word order is possible, so Oliver was probably correcting to \mathcal{G} rather than editing the text.

Other examples in the text show that the word *continually* can come before or after the verb *pray*, although most come after the verb:

2 Nephi 9:52	pray unto him continually by day
Alma 13:28	and watch and pray continually
Alma 15:17	watching and praying continually that they might be delivered
Alma 26:22	and prayeth continually without ceasing
Alma 62:51	and they did pray unto the Lord their God continually
Moroni 8:3	continually praying unto God the Father

Note that in two of the above cases (2 Nephi 9:52 and Alma 62:51), *continually* comes after a prepositional phrase, which is the same word order that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 2 Nephi 33:3 ("I pray for them continually by day"). But two examples are not enough to show that the corrected word order in 2 Nephi 33:3 is somehow in error.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 33:3 the corrected word order in \mathcal{D} : "I pray continually for them by day".

■ 2 Nephi 33:4

and the [things >]s word 1 | things A | words BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which I have written in weakness
will he make strong unto them
*for **it** persuadeth them to do good*
***it** maketh known unto them of their fathers*
*and **it** speaketh of Jesus and persuadeth men to believe in him*

The Book of Mormon frequently switches between plural and singular when referring to what has been written. A good example of this shifting in number is found in a passage that uses the singular pronoun *it* to refer to "these records":

Mosiah 28:17

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

Here in 2 Nephi 33:4, the text originally read “the **things** which I have written”, which was then followed three times by the singular pronoun *it* in collectively referring to what had been written (“**it** persuadeth them . . . **it** maketh known unto them . . . **it** speaketh of Jesus”). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith attempted to correct this grammatical difficulty by changing *things* to the singular *word* in the printer’s manuscript. But the 1837 compositor ended up setting *words* rather than *word*, thus maintaining the original shift in number in the standard text. As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:21, the critical text will retain such shifts in number whenever the text refers to written records, including this one involving the word *things*.

Using the plural *things* to refer to subject matter is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. There are, for instance, 108 instances where the original text refers to the writing of **things**. But there are also two instances where the text refers to the writing of a singular **thing**:

3 Nephi 23:11–12

and Jesus saith unto them
 how be it that ye have not written **this thing**
 that many saints did arise and appear unto many and did minister unto them
 and it came to pass that Nephi remembered
 that **this thing** had not been written

Of course, the text can also refer to the writing of **words** (40 times in the original text). And there is also one instance where the text refers to the writing of the **word** of God:

The Words of Mormon 1:11

according to **the word of God** which is written

In general, either *things* or *words* can be written. And sometimes the text refers to a particular thing or the word of God as being written. The statistics show that in most instances either the plural *things* or *words* is expected. In each case we therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the correct reading is *things* or *words*—or whether either of these occur in the singular rather than the expected plural.

Summary: Restore the original plural *things* in 2 Nephi 33:4, the reading of the earliest text for that passage; the Book of Mormon text sometimes uses the singular pronoun *it* to collectively refer to the things that have been written in records.

■ 2 Nephi 33:4

and the things which I have written in weakness
will [he make 1PS | be made ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] strong unto them

The 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *he make* as *be made*. The original reading was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition by reference to the printer’s manuscript, but the 1830 reading has been retained in the LDS text. The reading of the original text clearly identifies the Lord as the one

who will make the words of the Book of Mormon strong. There is no reason to lose the explicit identification of the agent by using the passive mood. Elsewhere in the text, whenever an individual is made strong, the passive is indeed used:

2 Nephi 3:13

and out of weakness he shall **be made strong**

Ether 12:37

and because thou hast seen thy weakness

thou shalt **be made strong**

But whenever the text refers to weak things being made strong, the Lord is always referred to as the agent:

2 Nephi 3:21

and the weakness of their words will **I make strong** in their faith

2 Nephi 33:4 (original text)

and the things which I have written in weakness

will **he make strong** unto them

Ether 12:27

then will **I make** weak things become **strong** unto them

Thus the original reading in 2 Nephi 33:4 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 33:4 the active *he make*, the reading of the earliest text.

■ 2 Nephi 33:4

*and I know that the Lord God will consecrate my prayers for the gain of my people
and the things which I have written in weakness will he make strong unto **them**
for it persuadeth **them** to do good
it maketh known unto **them** of their fathers and it speaketh of Jesus
and persuadeth [men 1A | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to believe in him*

Here the 1837 edition introduced the reading *them* in place of the original reading, *men*. The probable source for the change is the use of *them* three times earlier in the verse, especially the use of *persuadeth them* in the clause “for it persuadeth them to do good”. Yet these three occurrences of *them* refer to Nephi’s own people: note the use of the phrase “for the gain of my people” at the beginning of the verse as well as the reference to their fathers following the last occurrence of *them* (“it maketh known unto them of their fathers”). But at the end of the verse, Nephi changes the reference to all of mankind. Indeed, the Book of Mormon seeks to persuade all men (not just Nephi’s people) to believe in Jesus Christ.

This 1837 change is undoubtedly a typo, especially since it makes an unintended change in meaning. Moreover, the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. Surprisingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the *men* here. The critical text will restore the original *men*; it is definitely the superior reading.

Summary: Restore *men* in 2 Nephi 33:4 since this reading clearly represents the intended meaning of the original text.

■ 2 Nephi 33:5

and it speaketh [harsh 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | harshly RT] against sin

The original text here has the bare adverbial form *harsh* instead of the standard adverbial form ending in *-ly* (that is, *harshly*). The 1920 LDS edition supplied the *-ly* ending. The original Book of Mormon text has a strong preference for the bare adverb when the verb is *speak*. In the following list, we see that the original text had five examples of the bare adverb *plain* when the verb was *speak*:

2 Nephi 25:20	and now my brethren I have spoken plain
2 Nephi 25:28	wherefore I have spoken plain unto you
Mosiah 2:40	for I have spoken plain unto you
Alma 5:43	for behold I have spoken unto you plain
Helaman 8:4	because he spake plain unto them

Thus the original use of *harsh* in 2 Nephi 33:5 is not surprising. There are also four examples of “to speak **plainly**” in the original text (see 2 Nephi 25:20 for the list), but there are no examples of “to speak **harshly**” in the original text.

Summary: Restore the original bare adverb form *harsh* in 2 Nephi 33:5; such usage is common in the original text when the verb is *speak*.

■ 2 Nephi 33:6

I glory in [the >% NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] truth

When copying from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the truth” but then erased the definite article *the*. The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read “in truth”. Either possibility, with or without the *the*, can be found elsewhere in the text, although “in truth” dominates over “in the truth” (five to one):

1 Nephi 20:1	yet they swear not in truth
2 Nephi 20:20	but shall stay upon the Lord the Holy One of Israel in truth
Alma 34:38	and worship God . . . in spirit and in truth
Alma 43:10	that whosoever should worship God in spirit and in truth
Helaman 6:34	and to walk in truth
Moroni 7:45	but rejoiceth in the truth

For 2 Nephi 33:6 the critical text will follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 33:6 the prepositional phrase “in truth” (that is, without the definite article *the*).

■ 2 Nephi 33:7–9

- (1) *I have charity for my people
and great faith in Christ that I shall meet many souls spotless at his judgment seat*
- (2) *I have charity for the Jew
I say Jew because I mean them from whence I came*
- (3) *I also have charity for the Gentiles
but behold for **none of these** I cannot hope
except they shall be reconciled unto Christ
and enter into the narrow gate
and walk in the strait path which leads to life
and continue in the path until the end of the day of probation*

David Carlisle (personal communication, 23 October 2003) suggests that “none of these” should properly refer to all three of the preceding groups: Nephi’s own people, the Jews, and the Gentiles, not just the Gentiles. He points out that the LDS versification might lead one to think that the word *these* applied only to the Gentiles. This is one of the problems when each verse is printed as a short paragraph. The RLDS versification in chapter XV (the original chapter system) places the reference to Nephi’s people in verse 8 and the references to the Jews and the Gentiles in verse 9, while the phrase “none of these” follows in verse 10, thus helping the reader to interpret *these* as referring to at least the Jews and the Gentiles.

A similar use of “none of these” is found earlier in this discourse of Nephi’s here at the end of 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 26:32–33
and again the Lord God hath commanded
that men should not murder
that they should not lie
that they should not steal
that they should not take the name of the Lord their God in vain
that they should not envy
that they should not have malice
that they should not contend one with another
that they should not commit whoredoms
and that they should not do **none of these things**
for whoso doeth them shall perish
for **none of these iniquities** come of the Lord

In this case, however, the whole list is contained within a single verse (2 Nephi 26:32 in the LDS text and verse 110 of chapter XI in the RLDS text).

Summary: The phrase “none of these” in 2 Nephi 33:9 refers to a preceding list—namely, Nephi’s own people, the Jews, and the Gentiles (mentioned across verses 7–9); this phrase is not restricted to just the Gentiles, the only group mentioned in verse 9.

■ 2 Nephi 33:9

but behold for none of these

[*I cannot* >js *can I* 1 | *I cannot* A | *can I* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *hope*
except they shall be reconciled unto Christ

In the original Book of Mormon text, multiple negatives combining *not* with *none* or *no* can be found, such as “they should **not** do **none** of these things” in 2 Nephi 26:32. The critical text will restore such instances of multiple negation, including here in 2 Nephi 33:9. For further discussion, see 2 Nephi 26:32 as well as NEGATION in volume 3.

Also note here that Joseph Smith reversed the word order by placing the modal verb *can* before the subject pronoun *I*. Normally in English, such inverted order is expected after an initial adverbial phrase like “for none of these”.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 33:9 the original multiple negative as well as the noninverted word order (“for **none** of these I **cannot** hope”).

■ 2 Nephi 33:9

except they shall be reconciled unto Christ
and enter into the narrow gate

and walk in the [strait 1T | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *path*
which leads to life

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the more probable reading here is the word *strait* rather than *straight*, although *straight* will also work. The argument is based essentially on the fairly close parallelism between this passage and Matthew 7:14 (“and narrow *is* the way **which leadeth unto life**”); both 2 Nephi 33:9 and the Matthew passage refer to the path or way “which leads to life”. Also see the discussion under 2 Nephi 31:9.

■ 2 Nephi 33:10

and if ye believe not in [the > these 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *words*
believe in Christ

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the words” for this part of 2 Nephi 33:10, but then almost immediately he corrected “in **the** words” to “in **these** words”. The level of ink flow is unchanged, so Oliver was probably correcting to Œ. Elsewhere this verse uses *these words*: “hearken unto **these** words . . . ye will believe in **these** words”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 33:10 the corrected reading in Ø: “if ye believe not in **these** words”.

■ 2 Nephi 33:12

*and I pray the Father in the name of Christ
that many of us if not all may be saved in his kingdom
at [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the κ] great and last day*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition replaced the demonstrative *that* with the definite article *the* in the phrase “that great and last day”, probably accidentally. The 1908 edition restored the *that* to the RLDS text. The immediately preceding verse specifically refers to the day of judgment:

2 Nephi 33:11
and you and I shall stand face to face before his bar

Thus the use of *that* is perfectly appropriate in verse 12. Elsewhere in the text we get the same kind of initial reference to the day of judgment followed by the demonstrative *that*:

Mormon 9:2, 6
yea **in that great day** when ye shall be brought
to stand before the Lamb of God . . .
O then ye unbelieving
turn ye unto the Lord
cry mightily unto the Father in the name of Jesus
that perhaps ye may be found
spotless pure fair and white
having been cleansed by the blood of the Lamb
at **that** great and last day

There is one other example where *the* has replaced *that* in the expression “that great and last day”. The 1905 LDS edition initiated this change, probably accidentally:

Helaman 12:25
but we read that
in [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *the* MQRT] great and last day
there are some which shall be cast out

In this case, the incorrect use of *the* has persisted in the LDS text. Like 2 Nephi 33:12 and Mormon 9:6, this particular instance also has a preceding reference to the day of judgment, at least by implication:

Helaman 12:20–21
and behold if the Lord shall say unto a man
because of thine iniquities thou shalt be accursed forever
and it shall be done
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

On the other hand, there are two cases in the original text of “**the** great and last day”; for each of these, there is no preceding reference to the day of judgment:

2 Nephi 2:26

and the Messiah cometh in the fullness of time
that he might redeem the children of men from the fall
and because that they are redeemed from the fall
they have become free forever
knowing good from evil
to act for themselves and not to be acted upon
save it be by the punishment of the law at **the great and last day**
according to the commandments which God hath given

3 Nephi 26:3–4

and he did expound all things even from the beginning
until the time that he should come in his glory
yea even all things which should come upon the face of the earth
even until the elements should melt with fervent heat
and the earth should be wrapped together as a scroll
and the heavens and the earth should pass away
and even unto **the great and last day**
when all people and all kindreds and all nations and tongues
shall stand before God to be judged of their works
whether they be good or whether they be evil

Thus the use of the demonstrative *that* is wholly appropriate in 2 Nephi 33:12, Helaman 12:25, and Mormon 9:6. For further discussion, see Helaman 12:25.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 33:12 the use of the *that* in “that great and last day”, the reading of the earliest extant text; the *that* is supported by a preceding reference to the day of judgment.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Jacob

Jacob 1

■ Jacob 1:1

*for behold it came to pass that fifty and five years had passed away
from the time [NULL >+ that 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lehi left Jerusalem*

Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *that* after “from the time” in this passage, but later he supralinearly inserted it with somewhat heavier ink flow. Including this example, there are 18 examples of this expression referring to Lehi and his party leaving Jerusalem (for the list, see 2 Nephi 1:24). Of those 18 examples, 11 have the *that* and 7 do not, so either reading is possible. There would have been no strong motivation for Oliver to have emended the text here in Jacob 1:1. Instead, the correction is probably the result of Oliver’s proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Accept in Jacob 1:1 Oliver Cowdery’s addition of *that* in the printer’s manuscript (“from the time **that** Lehi left Jerusalem”); the original manuscript (not extant here) probably had the *that*.

■ Jacob 1:1

*wherefore Nephi gave me Jacob a commandment
concerning [these 1PS | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]
[things > small 1 | small ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] plates
upon which **these things** are engraven*

While copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *these things*, probably because the same phraseology occurs in the following relative clause (“upon which **these things** are engraven”). Oliver crossed out the word *things* and supralinearly inserted the word *small*. The correction appears to be immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow and the following word, *plates*, is written inline. However, the 1830 typesetter replaced the determiner *these* with the definite article *the*. This second change was a typo on his part. Yet it is difficult to know whether Oliver Cowdery’s original *these* was itself part of his original scribal error and should have been replaced by some other word, such as the *the* of the 1830 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *these* here in Jacob 1:1, undoubtedly by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

There is considerable evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes occasionally mixed up *these* and *the*. There are examples of an original *the* being momentarily replaced by *these*:

1 Nephi 12:14 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{C})
[these Angels >% the Angel 0 | the Angel 1 | the angel ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Jacob 1

1 Nephi 14:24 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

[*these* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things

Alma 25:8 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*these* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites

Alma 30:46 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*these truths* >% *the truth* 0 | *the truth* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 32:37 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*these* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] tree

Alma 48:25 (initial correction by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*the* > *these* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commandments

Alma 56:41 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*these* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites

And there are examples of errors in the other direction, where an original *these* was momentarily replaced by *the*:

2 Nephi 33:10 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[*the* > *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] words

Mosiah 1:3 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[*the* > *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commandments

Mosiah 28:16 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} 's error, corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

[§2 *the* > §1 *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things

Alma 18:7 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[*the* > *these* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *these* T] Lamanites

Alma 24:17 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[*the* >+ *these* 0 | *these* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sayings

Alma 37:21 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[*the* > *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] directors

3 Nephi 6:25 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[*the* >+ *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] judges

Thus there is clear evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes had difficulty with *these* versus *the*. There is also additional evidence that the 1830 compositor would sometimes incorrectly set *the* in place of *these*:

Alma 18:7

[*the* > *these* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *these* T] Lamanites

Alma 31:20

[*these* 01T | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] same prayers

Alma 33:14

[*these* 01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] scriptures

In the small plates of Nephi (including the Words of Mormon), the text normally refers to the small plates as *these plates* (37 times). Near the end of the small plates, the text twice refers to those plates as simply *the plates* rather than *these plates*:

Jarom 1:14 for **the plates** are small
Omni 1:8 I did deliver **the plates** unto my brother Chemish

These two cases of *the plates* could perhaps be errors for *these plates*, but there is no substantive evidence for changing *the plates* to *these plates* in these two cases. Theoretically, either “these small plates” or “the small plates” could be correct in Jacob 1:1.

There are no other occurrences of “small plates” in the text, although there are a couple of cases where *small* occurs as the subject complement for *plates*:

Jarom 1:2 and as these plates are small
Jarom 1:14 for the plates are small

A demonstrative determiner can occur before *plates* with an intervening modifier:

1 Nephi 19:2 upon **those** first **plates**
Alma 37:21 concerning **those** twenty-four **plates**
Mormon 6:6 save it were **these** few **plates**

Thus “these small plates” in Jacob 1:1 is clearly possible.

It appears that the original Book of Mormon text never had the specific phraseology “**the** small plates”, neither in Jacob 1:1 nor elsewhere. Of course, this is the terminology that church members systematically use to refer to this first portion of the Book of Mormon. But Book of Mormon writers seem to have used the adjective *small* to characterize only the smallness of Nephi’s second set of plates, not as the name for those plates. The phrase “these small plates” is quite appropriate in Jacob 1:1 and should therefore be restored.

Summary: Assume in Jacob 1:1 that Oliver Cowdery corrected the printer’s manuscript as intended, which means that the 1830 reading, “**the** small plates”, should be removed in favor of the earlier, corrected reading in \emptyset , “**these** small plates”.

■ Jacob 1:2

*that I should not touch save it were lightly
concerning the history of [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPQRST | the LM] people
which are called the people of Nephi*

Here in the 1902 and 1905 LDS missionary editions, the determiner *this* in the phrase “the history of this people” was replaced (probably accidentally) by *the*. The change was apparently due to the influence of the phrase “the people of Nephi” that is found in the following relative clause (“which are called **the** people of Nephi”). The correct *this* was restored to the LDS text in the 1911 edition.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 1:2 the original determiner *this* (“the history of this people”).

■ **Jacob 1:4**

*that I should [engraven 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | engrave QS]
the heads of them upon these plates*

As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:1, the Book of Mormon text typically uses the archaic verb *engraven* rather than the current verb *engrave*. Here in Jacob 1:4, the 1911 LDS edition and the current 1953 RLDS edition substituted the standard verb *engrave*. The critical text will maintain the original *engraven* here.

■ **Jacob 1:4**

*and if there were preaching which was sacred or revelation which was great or prophesying
that I should engraven the **heads** of them upon these plates*

The plural *heads* here in Jacob 1:4 seems strange to today's English readers, although it is not difficult from the context to guess that it means something like 'the main points'. The Oxford English Dictionary lists the meaning 'one of the chief points of a discourse' for the noun *head* (under definition 27) and gives the following citations with the plural *heads* (here cited with original accidentals):

J. Lee (1632)

The Contents or principall **heads** handled in this whole Discourse.

Connop Thirlwall (1838)

The accusation comprised several **heads**.

Benjamin Jowett (1875)

The **heads** of our yesterday's discussion.

A related meaning for *head* under this same definition 27 is 'category'. A common use is the expression "under this head", as in the following OED citation:

Thomas Macaulay (1849)

The expenditure **under this head** must have been small indeed.

The same meaning of 'category' for *head* is found in the Book of Mormon, and in each case the verb *call* is used to specify the category:

Mosiah 5:7–8

and now because of the covenant which ye have made
ye shall be **called the children of Christ** his sons and his daughters
for behold this day he hath spiritually begotten you
for ye say that your hearts are changed through faith on his name
therefore ye are born of him
and have become his sons and his daughters
and **under this head** ye are made free
and there is no other **head** whereby ye can be made free

Alma 3:10

therefore whomsoever suffered himself
to be led away by **the Lamanites**
were **called under that head**
and there was a mark set upon him

In the first instance, the category is “the children of Christ”; in the second, it is “the Lamanites”. The critical text will maintain these unusual uses of the word *head*. The printed editions have also maintained these instances of *head*, despite their difficulty for modern readers.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 1:4, Mosiah 5:8, and Alma 3:10 the word *head* with its archaic meanings ‘main point’ and ‘category’.

■ **Jacob 1:7**

*lest by any means he should swear in his wrath they should not enter in
as in the [days of > provocation 1 | provocation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the [day > days 1 | days ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of temptation
while the children of Israel were in the wilderness*

While copying from Θ into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the day of temptation” but nearly immediately corrected the singular *day* to *days* by inserting the plural *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The plural *days* is probably correct since just previously Oliver had initially written “in the days of” and then corrected it to “in the provocation” (by crossing out *days of* and supralinearly inserting *provocation*, spelled by Oliver as *provocation*).

Jacob’s language here parallels two biblical passages that read as follows in the King James translation (the Old Testament passage is the source for the New Testament one):

Psalms 95:8

harden not your heart as in the provocation
and as in the **day** of temptation in the wilderness

Hebrews 3:8

harden not your hearts as in the provocation
in the **day** of temptation in the wilderness

Both these biblical passages have the singular *day* in “in the day of temptation”. This reading suggests the possibility that the original text in Jacob 1:7 could have also read “in the day of temptation”. However, the fact that the singular *day* was virtually immediately corrected to *days* and that previously Oliver incorrectly wrote *days* argues that the original manuscript (not extant here) had *days*. It is still possible, of course, that the original text itself had *day* and that earlier, when Joseph Smith dictated this passage to Oliver Cowdery, the plural *days* was accidentally substituted for *day*. There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally mixed up *day* and *days* in the manuscripts (for a list of seven instances, see under 2 Nephi 25:8).

On the other hand, there is at least one case where the Book of Mormon text apparently disagrees with a corresponding biblical passage in the number for *day*:

2 Nephi 23:22
and her time is near to come
and her **day** shall not be prolonged

Isaiah 13:22 (King James Bible)
and her time *is* near to come
and her **days** shall not be prolonged

In this case, the earliest Book of Mormon text has the singular *day* and the biblical text has the plural *days* (the reverse of the situation here in Jacob 1:7). However, this example may involve a scribal mishearing of “days shall” as “day shall”. For discussion, see 2 Nephi 23:22.

Since the plural *days* will work in Jacob 1:7 and it appears to be supported by the earliest textual source (namely, the printer’s manuscript), the critical text will accept “in the **days** of temptation”, in contrast to the biblical phraseology (“in the day of temptation”).

Summary: Accept the plural *days* in Jacob 1:7 (“in the days of temptation”), the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} and the probable reading in \mathcal{G} ; even so, it is possible that the original text read “in the **day** of temptation”, just like in Psalm 95:8 and Hebrews 3:8.

■ **Jacob 1:9**

wherefore he anointed a man to be

- *a king and a ruler* 1ABDEFIJNOPRST
- *a king and ruler* CGHK
- *king and a ruler* LMQ

over his people

In the original text for this verse, the indefinite article *a* is repeated in the phrase “**a** king and **a** ruler”. In the 1840 edition, the repeated *a* was omitted, probably accidentally. The RLDS text restored the repeated *a* in the 1908 edition. The tendency to drop the repeated *a* is fairly common in the history of the text. For another example involving “a king and a ruler”, see 1 Nephi 16:38. For a complete discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Here in Jacob 1:9, the first *a* in this conjunctive expression was accidentally omitted in three early 20th-century LDS editions (1902, 1905, and 1911). The 1920 LDS edition restored this first *a*. The phraseology “to be king and a ruler over his people” is not impossible since elsewhere in the text there are instances of “to be king” (that is, without any article):

Ether 6:27	he was anointed to be king over the people
Ether 9:14	and he anointed Emer to be king to reign in his stead
Ether 9:15	and after that he had anointed Emer to be king

Besides here in Jacob 1:9, there are other instances of “to be **a** king”:

Mosiah 23:13	and that ye trust no man to be a king over you
Alma 2:2	to establish Amlici to be a king over the people
Alma 46:4	and Amalickiah was desirous to be a king

Jacob 1

Alma 47:6 and they had appointed a man to be a king and
 a leader over them
Ether 6:22 that they should anoint one of their sons to be a king over them

More significant for analyzing Jacob 1:9 is the fact that whenever *king* is conjoined with a semantically related conjunct like *ruler*, *leader*, or *protector*, there is always a determiner (almost always *a*) for both conjuncts:

1 Nephi 16:38 he hath thought to make himself a king and a ruler over us
2 Nephi 6:2 my brother Nephi unto whom ye look as a king or as a protector
Jacob 1:9 he anointed a man to be a king and a ruler over his people
Mosiah 1:10 that thou art a king and a ruler over this people
Mosiah 2:11 that I should be a ruler and a king over this people
Mosiah 2:30 that my son Mosiah is a king and a ruler over you
Mosiah 6:3 and had consecrated his son Mosiah to be a ruler and a king
 over his people
Mosiah 23:39 that he should be a king and a ruler over his people
Mosiah 29:2 that Aaron thy son should be our king and our ruler
Alma 47:6 and they had appointed a man to be a king and
 a leader over them

Thus the secondary readings “to be a king and ruler” and “to be king and a ruler” in Jacob 1:9 are inconsistent with all other usage in the text.

Summary: Maintain the repeated determiner in Jacob 1:9: “he anointed a man to be a king and a ruler”.

■ **Jacob 1:9–11**

wherefore he anointed a man to be a king and a ruler over his people
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] **now**
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] **according to the reigns of the kings**
[1 |. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[1ABCDEFGHI | 10 IJKLMNQRST | 9 K]
the people having loved Nephi exceedingly
he having been a great protector for them
having wielded the sword of Laban in their defense
and having labored in all his days for their welfare

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

In this passage, the 1830 compositor interpreted the *now* as an adverb of time rather than as a narrative connector. He placed a comma after the *now* and a period after the first occurrence of

the phrase “according to the reigns of the kings”. All the LDS and RLDS editions have maintained this punctuation. But more reasonably, the end of verse 9 actually begins a new sentence and this passage should read as follows:

Jacob 1:9–11 (with minimal accidentals added)

Wherefore he anointed a man to be a king and a ruler over his people.
Now according to the reigns of the kings—
 the people having loved Nephi exceedingly,
 he having been a great protector for them,
 having wielded the sword of Laban in their defense
 and having labored in all his days for their welfare—
 wherefore the people were desirous to retain in remembrance his name
 and whoso should reign in his stead were called by the people
 second Nephi and third Nephi etc.,
according to the reigns of the kings;
 and thus they were called by the people,
 let them be of whatsoever name they would.

In other words, Jacob started out this part of his narrative by first referring to “the reigns of the kings”; then he allowed a long parenthetical description to intervene in order to explain why his brother Nephi was held in such honor by the Nephites, so much so that it led them to call their subsequent kings after him. In other words, the phrase “according to the reigns of the kings” occurs both before and after the entire parenthetical explanation. It is also clear that the word *now* cannot be used as a simple adverb of time to refer to the anointing of the succeeding king since that anointing of the king had already taken place, prior to Nephi’s death.

This change in the punctuation was first suggested to me by D. Charles Pyle (personal communication, 6 October 2003). He indicated that this punctuation change is also found in the Restored Covenant Edition of the Book of Mormon (Independence, Missouri: Zarahemla Research Foundation, 1999).

Summary: Change the punctuation in Jacob 1:9–11 so that the last part of verse 9 (“now according to the reigns of the kings”) is assigned to the text at the beginning of verse 10.

■ **Jacob 1:11**

*and whoso should reign in his stead were called by the people
 second Nephi* [& 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *third Nephi*
 [&C. 1 | &c. ABCDEFGILMNOQ] *etc.* HJKPS | *and so forth* RT]

The Book of Mormon text often uses *and* to separate each member in a list of names, as in the following examples:

Mosiah 27:34

and four of them were the sons of Mosiah
 and their names were Ammon **and** Aaron **and** Omner **and** Himni
 these were the names of the sons of Mosiah

3 Nephi 19:4
 behold Nephi
and his brother whom he had raised from the dead whose name was Timothy
and also his son whose name was Jonas
and also Mathoni **and** Mathonihah his brother
and Kumen **and** Kumenonhi **and** Jeremiah **and** Shemnon
and Jonas **and** Zedekiah **and** Isaiah
 now these were the names of the disciples whom Jesus had chosen

4 Nephi 1:37–38
 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

On the other hand, there are cases where only the last name is preceded by an *and*:

1 Nephi preface
 and his four sons being called beginning at the eldest
 Laman Lemuel Sam **and** Nephi

Jacob 1:13
 nevertheless they were called
 Nephites Jacobites Josephites Zoramites
 Lamanites Lemuelites **and** Ishmaelites

So here in Jacob 1:11, either reading is theoretically possible; thus the use of “second Nephi **and** third Nephi etc.” in the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript) is quite normal. The 1830 compositor, probably accidentally, omitted the *and* before “third Nephi”. Since either reading is possible, the critical text will accept the earliest reading, the one with the *and*.

Also here in Jacob 1:11, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the original *etc.* with the expanded English form “and so forth”. The critical text will maintain the original *etc.* For a brief discussion, see the 1 Nephi preface; for a complete discussion, see ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, restore the *and* before “third Nephi” in Jacob 1:11; also restore the original *etc.* (which was edited to “and so forth” in the 1920 LDS edition).

■ **Jacob 1:11**

and thus they were called by the people
let them be of [whatsoever 1 | whatever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] name they would

There are 72 occurrences of *whatsoever* in the current Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, the current text has two occurrences of the word *whatever*, here in Jacob 1:11 and later in the text:

Helaman 3:5
 yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land
 in [*whatsoever* 01 | *whatever* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] parts
 it had not been rendered desolates

Yet in Helaman 3:5, both the original and printer’s manuscripts read “whatsoever parts”, not “whatever parts”. In one other case, an original occurrence of *whatsoever* has been edited out of the text:

Helaman 6:20

and they did use every means
[*whatsoever was* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in their power
to destroy them

Thus the original Book of Mormon text had no occurrences at all of the word *whatever*, only *whatsoever* (75 times). In two cases, the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *whatsoever* with *whatever*, with the result that these two instances of *whatever* have continued in all the printed editions. Obviously, these two passages should be changed so that only *whatsoever* occurs, thus restoring the original consistency of the text for this word choice. (And of course, the deleted “whatsoever was” will be restored in Helaman 6:20.)

Summary: Replace *whatever* in Jacob 1:11 and Helaman 3:5 with the original word, *whatsoever*; the original Book of Mormon text had no instances of the word *whatever*.

■ Jacob 1:14

*but I Jacob shall not hereafter distinguish them by these names
but I shall call them Lamanites*
[1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | . A]
[*they* >js NULL 1 | *They* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | , CGHKPS]
that seek to destroy the people of Nephi
[1 | , AEFIJLMNOQRT | ; BCDGHKPS]
and they which are friendly to Nephi
I shall call Nephites

The 1830 typesetter misinterpreted the syntax in this passage. He placed a period after “but I shall call them Lamanites” and then conjoined the following two noun phrases to produce the following single sentence: “They that seek to destroy the people of Nephi, and they which are friendly to Nephi, I shall call Nephites” (cited here using the 1830 accidentals). Obviously, the Nephites did not seek to destroy the people of Nephi! The original text for this passage clearly intends the first noun phrase to act as an appositive for the preceding *Lamanites*:

Jacob 1:14

but I shall call them **Lamanites**
they that seek to destroy the people of Nephi
and **they** which are friendly to Nephi
I shall call **Nephites**

The correct interpretation thus forms a chiasmic structure. Note, in particular, the parallelism of the second and third lines: each relative clause is headed by the pronoun *they*.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that this incorrect 1830 interpretation of the syntax may have been the motivation for Joseph Smith’s decision to edit Jacob 1:14 for the

1837 edition. In the printer's manuscript, Joseph deleted the redundant pronoun *they* from the appositive clause “**they** that seek to destroy the people of Nephi”, thus forcing the relative pronoun *that* to directly refer to the preceding *Lamanites*. The 1837 typesetter also placed a semicolon after the relative clause “that seek to destroy the people of Nephi”, thus clearly separating that relative clause from the following “and they which are friendly to Nephi”. The 1849 LDS edition replaced the semicolon with a comma, which by then had become permissible since the preceding *they* had been earlier deleted (in the 1837 edition).

The original reading is perfectly understandable, providing the punctuation is appropriate. The use of the *they* seems quite acceptable; in fact, the parallelism with the following line seems to require it. The critical text will therefore restore the *they* to the text in Jacob 1:14.

Other examples of Joseph Smith editing out a redundant pronoun *they* include the following:

Mosiah 18:17

and it came to pass that **whosoever** was baptized by the power
and authority of God
[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was added to his church

Alma 25:6

for **many of them**
after having suffered much loss and so many afflictions
[*they* 0A | *they* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] began
to be stirred up in remembrance of the words
which Aaron and his brethren had preached to them in their land

In these two examples, the redundant *they* is some distance away from its earlier (pronominal) referent.

Summary: Restore the redundant pronoun *they* that Joseph Smith deleted from Jacob 1:14 in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ Jacob 1:16

yea and they also began to search much gold and silver

It appears here that the preposition *for* might be missing after the verb *search*, especially since *for* does occur in a similar passage nearby:

Jacob 2:12

and now behold my brethren
this is the word which I declare unto you
that many of you have begun to search
for gold and **for** silver . . .

There is also evidence that the preposition *for* was sometimes lost during manuscript transmission, although the only instances involve the repeated *for* in conjuncts, as in the following example where scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} initially dropped a repeated *for* but then almost immediately supplied it (the level of ink flow is unchanged):

3 Nephi 19:23
 and now Father I pray unto thee **for** them
 and also [NULL > *for* 1 | *for* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all they
 which shall believe on their words

In this example, the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of the original manuscript and that edition reads *for*, so undoubtedly the repeated *for* was in 3 Nephi 19:23. (For another example, see the discussion regarding the example cited above, Jacob 2:12.)

Here in Jacob 1:16 we are investigating the possibility that a nonrepeated instance of the preposition *for* was omitted. Elsewhere in the text, we have examples of “searching X”, where the meaning is ‘searching through X’. The most common possibility involves searching scriptures and records (15 times), as in the following examples:

2 Nephi 5:33	they must search mine other plates
Jacob 4:6	wherefore we search the prophets
Jacob 7:23	and they searched the scriptures
3 Nephi 23:1	ye had ought to search these things [the words of Isaiah]
Mormon 8:23	search the prophecies of Isaiah

In one case, the text refers to searching people:

Mosiah 20:17	and do not search this people
--------------	-------------------------------

In a couple of cases, the text uses the preposition *among* when referring to searching records or people:

The Words of Mormon 1:3	I searched among the records
Mosiah 20:16	I will search among my people

Notice that Mosiah 20:16 uses *among*, but in the next verse (Mosiah 20:17) the *among* is omitted (“do not search this people”).

The question here is whether the preposition *for* can be omitted when the verb is *search*. There is one other relevant example involving the verb *search*:

2 Nephi 32:7
 and I am left to mourn because of the unbelief
 and the wickedness and the ignorance and the stiffneckedness of men
 for they will not **search knowledge**
 nor understand great knowledge when it is given unto them in plainness

Like Jacob 1:16, this phrase “search knowledge” may mean ‘search for knowledge’, especially since there seems to be a contrast here between searching for knowledge and understanding knowledge that has already been given.

In earlier English, the verb *search*, when it meant ‘search for’, did not always state the preposition *for*. The Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 11a of the verb *search*, provides a number of citations from Early Modern English where *search* was used without the preposition *for* or the adverb *out* that we would expect in today’s English (here cited with original accidentals):

John Capgrave (1440)

He sente oute letteris on-to euery Iustice
To **searche the cristene**, to hange hem and to drawe.

William Caxton (1471)

We shall followe the and goo wyth the
and **serche our auentures** in other landes

William Caxton (1471)

Perseus gaf hym many woundes, **serchyng his herte**.
And at laste he fonde hit.

Melusine (about 1500)

And thenne geffray **cerched the keyes**
so longe tyl he fonde them.

William Shakespeare (1611)

He hath bin search'd among the dead & liuing;
But no trace of him.

There is also one example of this usage in the King James Bible; in the larger passage, the first instance of *search* has the *for* but not the second:

Ezekiel 34:8, 11

neither did my shepherds **search for my flock** . . .
behold I *even* I will both **search my sheep** and seek them out

The Hebrew original here uses the same verb for both *search for* and *search*. (In fact, the same single Hebrew word is used for *my flock* and *my sheep*.) Such variant usage regarding the preposition *for* implies that in Jacob 1:16 the expression “search much gold and silver” may be fully intended, just as the use of “search knowledge” in 2 Nephi 32:7 also seems to be intended. There is not much scribal evidence to support the accidental loss of the preposition *for* in these two passages.

It should be pointed out that in Jacob 1:16 the word *much* in “to search much gold and silver” can be interpreted in two different ways, either as an adverb (‘to search **much for** gold and silver’) or as a determiner modifying *gold and silver* (‘to search **for much** gold and silver’). The first interpretation is supported by the usage in 2 Nephi 9:4: “thou hast **searched much**—many of you—to know of things to come”. If the first interpretation is accepted, then it seems that the preposition *for* would need to be explicitly stated. On the other hand, by accepting the reading found in all the textual sources (the one without the preposition *for*), we are forced, it would appear, to interpret *much* as referring to gold and silver rather than to searching. In any event, if Jacob 1:16 were emended, we would have to decide whether the *for* should go before the *much* or after it.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 1:16 the use of the verb *search* without the preposition *for* (“they also began to search much gold and silver”); such usage is archaic but may be intended here; similarly, the expected *for* in 2 Nephi 32:7 may have been purposely omitted (“they will not search knowledge”).

■ Jacob 1:17

wherefore I Jacob gave unto them these words as I taught them in the temple
having [*firstly* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQS | *first* ORT] obtained mine errand from the Lord

Speakers of standard English expect the adverbial form *first* rather than *firstly*, unless perhaps there is an explicit listing such as “firstly, secondly, thirdly, etc.” And even here there has been some prescriptive opposition to *firstly* (see under *firstly* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage). In Jacob 1:17, of course, there is no *secondly* or *thirdly*. Jacob is simply saying that initially or earlier he had obtained his errand from the Lord. The Oxford English Dictionary lists ‘before anything else’ as a definition for *firstly*, which is consistent with the usage here in Jacob 1:17.

Based on the historical development, the English adverb can take either the *-ly* ending or no ending (historically, the adverbial ending *-e*). Originally here in Jacob 1:17, the text has *firstly*, but the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition made the change to the standard *first*. This edition was not used as a copy-text. The 1920 LDS edition independently made the same change, and the subsequent LDS text has continued with the standard *first*. The RLDS text, on the other hand, has maintained the original *firstly*. For further discussion regarding the variant use of the *-ly* ending, see under 2 Nephi 25:20 for *plain(ly)* and under 2 Nephi 33:5 for *harsh(ly)*.

There are two other instances of this nonstandard *firstly* in the original text, both of which were edited to *first* in the LDS text early in the 20th century:

Alma 21:4

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

Alma 55:31

yea they would not take of wine
save they had [*firstly* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *firstly* > *first* M | *first* NOQRT]
given to some of the Lamanite prisoners

The original Book of Mormon text has many examples of the adverb *first* (16 in all):

Alma 5:1	Alma began to declare the word . . . first in the land of Zarahemla
Alma 8:7	after the name of him who first possessed them
Alma 12:31	they having first transgressed the first commandments
Alma 17:2	at the time the angel first appeared unto him
Alma 58:17	that same place where we had first pitched our tents
Alma 60:15	the wickedness which first commenced at our head
Alma 60:23	God hath said that the inward vessel shall be cleansed first
Alma 60:24	until we have first cleansed our inward vessel
Helaman 7:7	when my father Nephi first came out of the land of Jerusalem
3 Nephi 12:24	and first be reconciled to thy brother
3 Nephi 13:33	but seek ye first the kingdom of God
3 Nephi 14:5	first cast out the beam out of thine own eye

3 Nephi 20:26	the Father having raised me up unto you first
3 Nephi 26:9	and when they shall have received this which is expedient that they should have first to try their faith
Mormon 7:10	and are baptized first with water then with fire
Ether 12:18	wherefore they first believed in the Son of God

The critical text will restore all three original uses of *firstly*; the earliest textual sources support the standard adverbial form *first* in 16 cases.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the use of the nonstandard *firstly* in Jacob 1:17, Alma 21:4, and Alma 55:31.

■ **Jacob 1:19**

wherefore by laboring
with our [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT]
their blood might not come upon our garments

The original text of the Book of Mormon has numerous instances of plural *mights* where in modern English we expect the singular *might*. The plural form, in fact, is the normal one in the original text, providing we are dealing with a plurality of people and there are no adjoining conjuncts that are semantically related to *might*. In all, there are 12 instances of *mights* in the earliest textual sources. Besides the one here in Jacob 1:19, we have these instances:

Jacob 5:61
 that we may labor diligently
 with our [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT] in the vineyard

Jacob 5:62
 wherefore let us go to and labor
 with our [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT] this last time

Jacob 5:71
 go to and labor in the vineyard
 with your [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT]

Jacob 5:71
 and if ye labor
 with your [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT] with me
 ye shall have joy in the fruit . . .

Jacob 5:72 (Ⓞ is not extant here)
 and it came to pass that the servants did go to it
 and labor with their **mights**

Alma 26:5
 for ye did thrust in the sickle
 and did reap with your [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT]

Alma 44:17

yea and the Lamanites did contend with their swords
and their [*mights* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT]

Alma 56:15

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

Alma 56:37

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

Mormon 2:4

and it came to pass that we did fortify the city
with our [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT]

Ether 15:24

and they contended
in their [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *might* RT]
with their swords and with their shields all that day

Each instance is of the form “<preposition> <plural possessive pronoun> *mights*”, where the preposition is either *with* or *in* and the plural possessive pronoun is *our*, *your*, or *their*.

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed all but one of these instances of *mights* to the expected singular, *might*. The only surviving case of *mights* in the LDS text is in Jacob 5:72; undoubtedly this exception was simply missed in the editing for the 1920 edition. The critical text will retain all 12 cases of the original *mights*.

On the other hand, there are seven cases where the earliest text reads *might* instead of *mights*. In two of these cases (each marked below with an asterisk), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *mights* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . In both cases, he erased the plural *s*, so we can tell that these two corrections were immediate. And in one of the two (in Alma 58:13), the original manuscript is extant and reads in the singular, thus showing in that case that Oliver’s correction in \mathcal{P} restored the original singular *might*. All of these examples show that in the earliest extant text the singular *might* is also found in plural contexts:

Jacob 7:25 (\mathcal{O} is not extant here)

wherefore the people of Nephi did fortify against them
with their arms and with all their **might**

* Mosiah 10:19

I did stimulate them to go to battle
with their [*mights* >% *might* 1 | *might* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
putting their trust in the Lord

Alma 2:36 (\mathcal{O} is not extant here)

and the Nephites did pursue them with their **might**
and did slay them

Alma 19:16 (the end of *might* is extant in \mathcal{G})

and it came to pass that they did call on the name of the Lord in their **might**

* Alma 58:13

and thus we did go forth

with all our [*might* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *mights* >% *might* 1]

against the Lamanites

Helaman 9:3 (\mathcal{G} is not extant here)

and it came to pass that they ran in their **might**

and came in unto the judgment seat

3 Nephi 3:16 (\mathcal{G} is not extant here)

and they did exert themselves in their **might**

to do according to the words of Lachoneus

Of course, when dealing with only one person, the text has only *might*:

The Words of Mormon 1:18

wherefore with the help of these

king Benjamin by laboring with all the **might** of his body

and the faculty of his whole soul . . .

Mosiah 9:18

and God did hear our cries and did answer our prayers

and we did go forth in his **might**

Finally, when there are adjoining conjuncts that are semantically related to *might* (words like *strength*, *mind*, *dominion*, *power*, and *majesty*), we get only the singular *might*, irrespective of whether there is one person or many:

1 Nephi 22:24

and the Holy One of Israel must reign

in dominion and **might** and power and great glory

2 Nephi 21:2 (Isaiah 11:2)

and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him

the spirit of wisdom and understanding

the spirit of counsel and **might**

the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord

2 Nephi 25:29

wherefore ye must bow down before him

and worship him with all your **might** mind and strength

and your whole soul

Mosiah 2:11

to serve thee with all the **might** mind and strength

which the Lord hath granted unto me

Alma 5:50

yea the Son of God cometh in his glory
and in his **might** majesty power and dominion

Alma 12:15

we must come forth and stand before him in his glory and in his power
and in his **might** majesty and dominion

Alma 39:13

that ye turn to the Lord with all your mind **might** and strength

Mormon 4:8

they did again boast of their own strength
and they went forth in their own **might**
and took possession again of the city Desolation

Moroni 10:32

and if ye shall deny yourselves of all ungodliness
and love God with all your **might** mind and strength
then is his grace sufficient for you

Mormon 4:8 does not fit in well in this list. Nonetheless, there is a connection (although not conjunctive) with the previous *strength* (“of their own strength”). Also note the use of *own* (“in their own might”); this is the only occurrence of *might* that is modified by *own*.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual evidence, maintain all 12 cases of original plural *mights* (including here in Jacob 1:19); the earliest text also has seven cases of singular *might* in plural contexts, so either singular *might* or plural *mights* is possible whenever the context allows plurality.

Jacob 2

■ Jacob 2:1–2

*The words [of > which 1 | which ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jacob the brother of Nephi
spake unto the people of Nephi after the death of Nephi:
Now my beloved brethren . . .*

When copying *here* from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially intended to write “The words **of** Jacob the brother of Nephi **which he** spake unto the people of Nephi”, probably because he had gotten used to this phraseology in introducing a speaker’s words:

2 Nephi 6:1–2

The words **of** Jacob the brother of Nephi
which he spake unto the people of Nephi:
Behold my beloved brethren . . .

Alma 7 preface, followed by the first part of Alma 7:1

The words **of** Alma **which he** delivered to the people in Gideon
according to his own record:
Behold my beloved brethren . . .

Alma 9 preface

The words **of** Alma and also the words **of** Amulek
which was declared unto the people which was in the land of Ammonihah
and also they are cast into prison
and delivered by the miraculous power of God which was in them
according to the record of Alma

Moroni 2:1–2

The words **of** Christ
which he spake unto his disciples the twelve whom he had chosen
as he laid his hands upon them
and he called them by name saying
ye shall call on the Father in my name in mighty prayer

For all four of these passages, Oliver was the probable scribe in \mathcal{O} (the nearest extant fragments of \mathcal{O} are all in his hand). And for the first instance listed above (2 Nephi 6:1–2), Oliver had recently copied that passage into \mathcal{P} . Of course, here at the beginning of Jacob 2, the phraseology is specifically different. Oliver did not finish writing out the entire clause that he expected. Instead, he crossed out the *of* that he had written and supralinearly inserted the word *which*. Oliver’s correction is virtually immediate (the level of ink flow for the supralinear *which* is unchanged).

It should also be noted here that usually the 1830 compositor highlighted such introductory words by setting them in italics and inserting a blank line to separate these words from the main body of the text that followed. I refer to these introductory statements (such as at the beginning of Alma 7 and Alma 9) as prefaces. In a few instances the 1830 compositor did not explicitly identify such introductory words as prefaces but instead set them in roman type and as part of the main text, without any intervening spacing. A good example of this difference in treatment arises when we compare the phraseology for the Alma 7 preface with that of 2 Nephi 6:1 and Jacob 2:1. Essentially, all three have the same narrative form. Note further how in each of these three cases the following main text starts out with the same vocative phrase, “my beloved brethren”. Because of the decision of the 1830 compositor to set 2 Nephi 6:1 and Jacob 2:1 as regular narrative, later LDS and RLDS editions have assigned a verse number to each of these two prefaces, unlike the prefaces that the 1830 compositor specifically set in italics.

Summary: In Jacob 2:1 we follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “The words **which** Jacob the brother of Nephi spake unto the people of Nephi”; this verse (as well as 2 Nephi 6:1) acts as a preface, just like the one at the beginning of Alma 7, even though only the Alma 7 preface was specifically identified as such by the 1830 compositor.

■ Jacob 2:6

yea [& 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it grieveth my soul and causeth me to shrink*

The original text here began with *yea and*. As noted under 2 Nephi 25:5, the text has in a number of cases lost the *and* from *yea and*. Also see the discussion under 2 Nephi 9:5 regarding this narrative connector. Here in Jacob 2:6, the critical text will restore the original *and*. Note that the immediately preceding clause contains an instance of *yea and* (“which sin appeareth very abominable unto me / **yea and** abominable unto God”). Perhaps the repetition of the same *yea and* bothered the 1830 typesetter. In any event, he ended up partially removing the repetition (perhaps unintentionally) by omitting the *and* from the second *yea and*. Yet the Book of Mormon has examples of multiple repetition of *yea and* that have never been changed:

Alma 30:44

yea and all things denote there is a God
yea even the earth and all things that is upon the face of it
yea and its motion
yea and also all the planets which move in their regular form doth witness
 that there is a Supreme Creator

In this verse, there are three occurrences of *yea and*, two of which are very close to each other, just like originally in Jacob 2:6.

Summary: Restore the *and* of the connective *yea and* that originally began Jacob 2:6 (“yea and it grieveth my soul”).

■ Jacob 2:6

*yea and it grieveth my soul
and causeth me to shrink with shame before the presence of my Maker
that I [must 1PST | might ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] testify unto you
concerning the wickedness of your hearts*

The 1830 compositor accidentally changed the modal *must* to *might* here in Jacob 2:6; *must* was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition (and later in the 1981 LDS edition) by reference to \mathcal{P} . Obviously, *must* works much better than *might*, especially given the typical forcefulness of Jacob’s language.

Summary: Maintain the original modal auxiliary *must* in Jacob 2:6, the reading of the printer’s manuscript: “I must testify unto you”.

■ Jacob 2:10

*I must do according to
the strict [commands 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | commandments D] of God*

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the word *commands* with *commandments*. Normally, the text refers to “the commandments of God” or to “the commandments of the Lord”, but Jacob himself sometimes uses the more immediate and forceful expression “the commands of God”:

Jacob 2:16
and O that ye would listen unto the word of **his commands**

Jacob 4:5
even as it was accounted unto Abraham in the wilderness
to be obedient unto **the commands of God** in offering up his son Isaac

The only other occurrence of “the commands of God” in the current text is an error:

Alma 30:7
for it was strictly contrary
to the [commandments 0 | commands 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
that there should be a law which should bring men onto unequal grounds

In this instance, Oliver Cowdery is responsible for miscopying *commandments* as *commands*. (See Alma 30:7 for further discussion of this example, plus a list of other cases where Oliver accidentally wrote *commands* instead of *commandments* in the manuscripts.) Of course, *commands* is generally used to refer to the orders of military generals, but Jacob is the only Book of Mormon writer who uses the plural *commands* to refer to the commandments of God. There are other references to the command of God (that is, in the singular), although all but one of these refer to something being done “**at** God’s command”:

Mormon 5:23

know ye not that ye are in the hands of God
 know ye not that he hath all power
 and **at his great command** the earth shall be rolled together as a scroll

Ether 4:8–9

for unto them will I shew no greater things
 saith Jesus Christ
 for I am he which speaketh
 and **at my command** the heavens are opened and are shut
 and at my word the earth shall shake
 and **at my command** the inhabitants thereof shall pass away
 even so as by fire

Moroni 7:30

for behold they are subject unto him
 to minister **according to the word of his command**

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 2:10 Jacob’s distinctive use of the expression “the commands of God”.

■ **Jacob 2:11**

*Jacob get **thou** up into the temple on the morrow
 and declare the word which I shall give thee unto this people*

This passage brings up an issue of grammar: should we have *get thou* or *get thee* in this imperative construction? In the King James Bible, there are 42 occurrences of *get thee* but none of *get thou*. Similarly, the King James Bible has 27 occurrences of *get you* but none of *get ye*. In other words, the King James text allows only the object form (*thee* or *you*) after the imperative *get*.

In the Book of Mormon text, the usage is mixed, with three occurrences of *get thee* and two of *get thou*:

1 Nephi 17:7	arise and get thee into the mountain
Jacob 2:11	get thou up into the temple on the morrow
Mosiah 24:23	haste thee and get thou and this people out of this land
Mosiah 24:23	therefore get thee out of this land
Alma 27:12	therefore get thee out of this land

Also note in these examples that conjoined verb phrases may differ in the pronominal form; thus in Mosiah 24:23, we have “haste **thee**” immediately followed by “and get **thou**”. The Book of Mormon text, unlike the King James text, permits variability; we therefore follow the earliest textual sources in order to determine the pronoun form for such imperative constructions.

Summary: Maintain the subject form *thou* in the imperative phrase *get thou* in Jacob 2:11; most other passages have *get thee* as the imperative form, although Mosiah 24:23 has one example of *get thou* and another of *get thee*.

■ **Jacob 2:11**

*Jacob get thou up into the temple on the morrow
and declare the [words >% word 1 | word ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which I shall give thee unto this people*

The erasure of the final *s* of *words* in the printer’s manuscript shows that the correction here in Jacob 2:11 was immediate and that the singular *word* was probably the reading in the original manuscript. Earlier in verse 11 as well as later on in verse 12 the text refers to “the word” rather than “the words”, thus supporting the singular reading:

Jacob 2:11–12

for behold as I inquired of the Lord
thus came **the word** unto me saying
Jacob get thou up into the temple on the morrow
and declare **the word** which I shall give thee unto this people
and now behold my brethren
this is **the word** which I declare unto you

As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:24, the Book of Mormon text often uses the singular *word* to refer to the word of God while *word* is less frequently used to refer to the words of a human being. We let the earliest textual sources determine the reading in each case. The immediately corrected *word* here in Jacob 2:11 argues that the original manuscript read *word*, not *words*.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 2:11 the singular reading “the word” (the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{D}); the Book of Mormon text frequently uses the singular *word* to refer to the word of God.

■ **Jacob 2:12**

*many of you have [begun 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | began A]
to search for gold and for silver and for all manner of precious ores*

The original text has examples of both *begun* and *began* as the past participle for the verb *begin*. The original Book of Mormon text frequently used the simple past-tense form of a verb for the past participle. See, for instance, the examples of “had spake” in 1 Nephi 3:30 and “had came” in 1 Nephi 5:1. (For a complete discussion, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.)

According to the earliest textual sources, the original text had at least three occurrences of the standard past participial form *begun* (each marked below with an asterisk) but up to six occurrences of the nonstandard past participial *began*:

* Jacob 2:12	have [begun 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST began A]
Jacob 5:17	had sprang forth and [began 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO begun RST]
Mosiah 23:31	had [began 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP began > begun M begun OQRST]
Mosiah 23:31	had [began 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP began > begun M begun OQRST]
* Alma 4:7	had [begun 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
* Alma 38:10	have [begun 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]

Alma 51:12	had [<i>began</i> / <i>begun</i> 01 <i>began</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLNP <i>began</i> > <i>begun</i> M <i>begun</i> OQRST]
Alma 52:15	had [<i>began</i> 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNOP <i>began</i> > <i>begun</i> M <i>begun</i> QRST]
Helaman 4:23	had [<i>began</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOP <i>began</i> > <i>begun</i> M <i>begun</i> QRST]

The manuscript reading for Alma 51:12 can be interpreted either way, although in both manuscripts the second vowel looks more like an *a* than a *u*.

Here in Jacob 2:12, the 1830 typesetter replaced the standard *begun* with *began*. Otherwise, the textual tendency has been to replace the nonstandard *began* with *begun* (especially in 20th-century editions), with the result that now the standard LDS and RLDS editions have *begun* in all nine cases. The critical text will restore the nonstandard cases of past participial *began* whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, retain the standard past participial form *begun* in Jacob 2:12, Alma 4:7, and Alma 38:10; in most instances, the earliest text uses the nonstandard *began* for the past participle of *begin*.

■ Jacob 2:12

*many of you have begun to search for gold and for silver
and [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | for OQRT] all manner of precious ores*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1911 LDS edition introduced the repeated preposition *for* before the last phrase of this coordinate structure. Subsequent LDS editions have followed this emendation. The RLDS text has retained the earlier text without the *for* (since it is not found in the printer's manuscript or in any of the early editions).

It is quite possible that the original manuscript read *for* here and that the word was accidentally dropped when Oliver Cowdery copied the text into the printer's manuscript. We have fragments of \mathcal{O} for part of this verse, and there is definitely room for the word *for* between the extant fragments. Nonetheless, the lacuna is quite long; thus this evaluation cannot be conclusive (see the transcript for lines 29–30 on page 98 of \mathcal{O}). But we can determine that if the *for* was in \mathcal{O} , it would have occurred at the end of a manuscript line, a place where Oliver frequently made mistakes (by either misreading or deleting a line-final word) when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

Internal evidence from parallel coordinate structures elsewhere in the text supports the repetition of the preposition *for* at least the immediately following conjunct whenever the two preceding conjuncts are *gold* and *silver*:

1 Nephi 18:25
and we did find all manner of ore
both **of** gold and **of** silver and **of** copper

2 Nephi 5:15
and I did teach my people that . . .
they should work in all manner of wood
and of iron and of copper and of brass and of steel
and **of** gold and **of** silver and **of** precious ores

Jarom 1:8

and we . . . became exceeding rich
in gold and **in** silver and **in** precious things

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

Mosiah 11:8

and he ornamented them with fine work of wood
and of all manner of precious things:
of gold and **of** silver and **of** iron and **of** brass and **of** ziff and **of** copper

Alma 1:29

they began to be exceeding rich
having abundance of all things whatsoever they stood in need . . .
and also abundance of grain
and **of** gold and **of** silver and **of** precious things

Alma 31:24

yea he saw that their hearts were set
upon gold and **upon** silver and **upon** all manner of fine goods

Helaman 6:9

and they did have an exceeding plenty
of gold and **of** silver and **of** all manner of precious metals

Helaman 6:11

and behold there was all manner **of** gold in both these lands
and **of** silver and **of** precious ore of every kind

Helaman 12:2

yea and we may see at the very time when he doth prosper his people
yea in the increase of their fields their flocks and their herds
and **in** gold and **in** silver and **in** all manner of precious things of every kind

3 Nephi 27:32

for they will sell me **for** silver and **for** gold
and **for** that which moth doth corrupt

Ether 9:17

having all manner of fruit and of grain and of silks and of fine linen
and **of** gold and **of** silver and **of** precious things

Ether 10:12

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

Ether 10:23

wherefore they did cast up mighty heaps of earth
for to get ore **of** gold and **of** silver and **of** iron and **of** copper

The only exceptional example is one where the preposition is repeated for the third conjunct but not for the second one:

Mosiah 11:9

and he also built him a spacious palace
and a throne in the midst thereof
all of which was of fine wood
and was ornamented **with** gold and silver and **with** precious things

There is a possibility that the original text for this passage read “**with** gold and **with** silver and **with** precious things”. For discussion, see under Mosiah 11:9. Yet even this example repeats the preposition *with* for the third conjunct, thus providing indirect support for the reading with the repeated preposition in Jacob 2:12: “for gold and for silver and **for** all manner of precious ores”.

Finally, note that for over half of these additional examples (8 out of 15) the third conjunct involves the adjective *precious* (just like in Jacob 2:12). These examples with *precious* give further support to the emendation of Jacob 2:12 to read with a repeated *for* before “all manner of precious ores”.

Summary: In accord with the spacing between extant fragments of \mathfrak{C} , follow the emended reading for Jacob 2:12 that supplies the repeated preposition *for* before the third conjunct in “to search for gold and for silver and **for** all manner of precious ores”; the systematic nature of usage elsewhere in the text supports this emendation.

■ Jacob 2:13

*and the hand of Providence hath smiled upon you most pleasingly
that [ye 01 | you ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have obtained many riches*

In the King James biblical style, the expected pronoun form in subject position is *ye*, not the *you* found in object positions. The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the archaic *ye* with *you*, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *you* (“the hand of Providence hath smiled upon **you** most pleasingly”). In the following verses, we find *ye* in subject position (15 times through verse 21) but never *you* in that position. More generally, the text does permit both *ye* and *you* as the subject pronoun; thus for each case the correct reading is determined by the earliest textual sources. For further discussion of the variance between *ye* and *you*, see 2 Nephi 7:1; also see YE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the grammatically correct pronoun *ye* in Jacob 2:13; the earliest textual sources (here both \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{P}) support *ye* here rather than the modern *you*.

■ Jacob 2:14

do ye suppose that

God [*Justifieth* 0 | *justifieth* >js *justifies* 1 | *justifieth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *you*
in this thing

Here Joseph Smith edited *justifieth* to *justifies* in the printer's manuscript, but this change was never implemented in the 1837 or any later edition, perhaps because the following *condemneth* was not edited to *condemns*: "behold I say unto you nay but he **condemneth** you".

Joseph Smith's replacement of the *-(e)th* ending with *-(e)s* was very unevenly applied in his editing for the 1837 edition. For a complete discussion, as well as a list of examples where he made this change, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 2:14 the current *-eth* ending for *justifieth*, which is the reading of both manuscripts; *justifieth* is also stylistically consistent with the following *condemneth*.

■ Jacob 2:15

O that he would show [01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *unto* κ] *you that he can pierce you*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition inserted the preposition *unto* after the verb *show/shew*. The 1908 RLDS edition removed this intrusive *unto* from the RLDS text.

The Book of Mormon text has 167 occurrences of *shew/show*, of which 148 take an indirect object. In most cases, the preposition for the indirect object is expressed, with *unto* being the most frequent (129 times) and *to* quite infrequent (only 3 times). There are also 16 cases where no preposition is expressed, as here in Jacob 2:15 (in accord with the earliest textual sources). Here is an example for each of the three possibilities:

title page ("shew/show unto X")

which is **to shew unto the remnant** of the house of Israel
how great things the Lord hath done for their fathers

1 Nephi 14:26 ("shew/show to X")

and also others which have been
to them hath he shown all things

1 Nephi 17:8 ("shew/show X")

thou shalt construct a ship
after the manner which **I shall shew thee**

There is considerable variation in some passages, as in these examples from Alma 30 (four with *unto* and three without a preposition):

Alma 30:43 if thou wilt shew me a sign

Alma 30:43 shew **unto** me that he hath power

Alma 30:44 shew **unto** me a sign

Alma 30:45 except ye shall shew me a sign

Alma 30:48 except ye shew me a sign

Alma 30:51 to shew **unto** thee a sign
Alma 30:51 he hath shewed **unto** you a sign

All three types occur in the text, but since *unto* dominates, it is not surprising that the 1892 typesetter accidentally introduced the expected *unto* here in Jacob 2:15. (For one case where the scribe omitted the preposition *unto*, see Mormon 9:11.) In each case the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining how the indirect object for *shew/show* should be expressed.

Summary: Maintain the reading in Jacob 2:15 without the preposition *unto* after the verb *shew/show* (“O that he would **show** you that . . .”).

■ Jacob 2:15

and O that ye would listen

unto the [word 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | word~s > word F] of his commands

Here the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition read in the plural: “the **words** of his commands”. (The tilde in *word~s* means that the *s* was set upside down.) For the second printing of this edition, this plural *s* was removed, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. All other textual sources have the singular *word* here in Jacob 2:15.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:24, the Book of Mormon text often uses the singular *word* to refer to the word of God; thus the use of the singular *word* is fully acceptable here in Jacob 2:15. For a similar example of this kind of variation, see the discussion under Jacob 2:11.

The text has a similar example of this particular expression “the word of his command(s)”; in this case the singular *command* is found rather than the plural *commands*:

Moroni 7:30
for behold they are subject unto him
to minister according to **the word of his command**

Despite the difference in *command(s)*, this other passage does have the singular *word*, so there is therefore nothing inappropriate about the reading “the word of his commands” in Jacob 2:15.

Summary: Maintain the singular *word* in Jacob 2:15 (“and O that ye would listen unto the word of his commands”), the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ Jacob 2:17

think of your brethren like [to 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] yourselves

The preposition *to* in “like to yourselves” (the earliest reading, found in the printer’s manuscript) was changed to *unto* by the 1830 compositor, probably because the Book of Mormon text otherwise has only the preposition *unto* in this construction and the compositor was used to setting “like unto”. In fact, later on in this verse, the same expression is found and here the preposition is *unto*: “that they may be rich **like unto** you”. In the original Book of Mormon text, there are 89 occurrences of “like unto” followed by a noun phrase (as in this example from later on in Jacob 2:17) but only one of “like to” followed by a noun phrase (here at the beginning of Jacob 2:17). There is

also one example of “like to” followed by a verb (“I was like to be cast off”, Mosiah 27:27), but there the meaning is quite different.

In the King James biblical text, we can have either “like unto” or “like to” followed by a noun phrase, with the first one dominating: 86 occurrences of “like unto” and 13 of “like to”. For instance, in the book of Matthew, the initial occurrence of the clause “the kingdom of heaven is like (un)to <noun phrase>” has *to*, but the remaining six have *unto*:

Matthew 13:31	the kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed
Matthew 13:33	the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven
Matthew 13:44	again the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field
Matthew 13:45	again the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man
Matthew 13:47	again the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net
Matthew 20:1	for the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man <i>that is</i> an householder
Matthew 22:2	the kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king

In the original Greek, there is no explicit preposition in these cases, only the dative inflectional ending; thus the choice of the English-language preposition in the King James text was decided by the translators.

This same choice between the prepositions *to* and *unto* is found in other English texts. The Oxford English Dictionary gives citations of the adjective *like* with either preposition (cited here with original accidentals):

William Cunningham (1559)

A sphere of rounde fourme, **like unto** a Ball.

a manuscript in the Canterbury Cathedral Library (1571)

You did say that one of Agnes Fullagor’s children ys **leeke vnto** me.

Joseph Butler (1736)

A state of trial . . . analogous or **like to** our moral or religious trial.

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1819)

Sweet sleep, were death **like to** thee.

The OED lists the use of *unto* as “now archaic” (that is, by the end of the 19th century, at the time of publication for this part of the OED). The Book of Mormon text, like the King James Bible, prefers the archaic usage, “like unto”.

One could view the unique occurrence of “like to” in Jacob 2:17 as the result of an error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. The original manuscript is not extant here, so it is possible that an original *unto* was replaced by *to*. Elsewhere in the manuscripts, we have numerous examples where Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in \mathcal{P} and presumably in \mathcal{C} since nearby fragments are in his hand) accidentally replaced an original *unto* with *to*:

1 Nephi 15:33 (corrected *unto* in \mathcal{C} miscopied as *to* in \mathcal{P})

which are pertaining [*to* > *unto* 0 | *to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] righteousness

1 Nephi 17:22 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} immediately corrected inline to *unto*)

because we would hearken

[0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *to* > NULL 1] **unto** his word

- 2 Nephi 25:4 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} corrected to *unto* when proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C})
 and give ear [*to* >+ *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my words
- 2 Nephi 27:10 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} corrected to *unto*, perhaps when proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C})
 for behold they reveal all things from the foundation of the world
 [*to* >+ *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the end thereof
- 2 Nephi 31:12 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 and also the voice of the Son came
 [*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me saying . . .
- Alma 19:11 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 for behold the Lord receiveth them
 up [*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] himself in glory
- Alma 24:7 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 our great God has in goodness sent these our brethren the Nephites
 [*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1] us to preach unto us
- Alma 29:4 (initial *to* in \mathcal{C} immediately corrected to *unto*)
 yea I know that
 he allotteth [*to* >% *unto* 0 | *unto* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] man . . .
- Alma 34:15 (*unto* in \mathcal{C} miscopied as *to* in \mathcal{P})
 and thus he shall bring salvation
 [*unto* 0 | *to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all those
 who shall believe on his name
- Alma 52:12 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 and had made known
 [*unto* 0ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1 | *uuto* D] the queen
 concerning the death of his brother
- Alma 53:17 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 yea to protect the land
 [*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1] the laying down of their lives
- Alma 57:6 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 and we had also a plenty of provisions
 brought [*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] us
- Helaman 3:26 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} almost immediately corrected to *unto*)
 the work of the Lord did prosper
 [*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the baptizing and uniting
 to the church of God many souls
- 3 Nephi 9:9 (initial *to* in \mathcal{P} immediately corrected inline to *unto*)
 and the saints should not come up
 [*to* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **unto** me any more against them

So the reading “like to yourselves” in Jacob 2:17 may be an error. Nonetheless, the preposition *to* is clearly possible, and therefore the critical text will restore it in this expression.

Summary: Restore the original *to* in Jacob 2:17 (“think of your brethren like **to** yourselves”); this is the only occurrence of “like to <noun phrase>” in the Book of Mormon text and could be due to a scribal error on Oliver Cowdery’s part; this use of *to* is common in the English of Joseph Smith’s time, although the Book of Mormon clearly prefers *unto* in the expression “like (un)to <noun phrase>”.

■ Jacob 2:18

*but before that ye seek **for** riches*
*seek ye **for** the kingdom of God*

Mark Skousen has suggested (personal communication) that the second clause in this passage may have originally read “seek ye **first** the kingdom of God”, especially since the language of this clause parallels Matthew 6:33 (which is quoted in 3 Nephi 13:33): “but seek ye **first** the kingdom of God and his righteousness”. A parallel example from the synoptic Gospels is even closer to this Book of Mormon clause, and it too lacks the *for*: “but rather seek ye the kingdom of God” (Luke 12:31). Indeed, it also lacks the adverb *first*. One could even argue that the original text for the second clause in Jacob 2:18 read “seek ye the kingdom of God” and that the *for* was accidentally added, perhaps under the influence of the preceding clause (“but before that ye seek **for** riches”). One could also argue that an original *first* might have been replaced by *for* because of the phonetic similarity between the initial part of *first* and *for*, especially if *for* was pronounced /fər/, a common colloquial pronunciation for *for*. On the other hand, there is no independent evidence in the manuscripts or the editions that *first* and *for* have ever been mixed up in the text of the Book of Mormon.

The Book of Mormon text has examples of both “seek X” and “seek for X”, so either is possible here in Jacob 2:18. In this verse the text has a matched pair of “seek for X”, while in the next verse there is a matched pair of “seek X”:

Jacob 2:19
and after that ye have obtained a hope in Christ
ye shall obtain riches if ye **seek them**
and ye will **seek them** for the intent to do good

Also note that the proposed *first* is actually unnecessary in the second clause of verse 18 since the first clause begins with the subordinate conjunction *before* (“before that ye seek for riches”). No such redundancy is found in the two quotes from the synoptic Gospels (Matthew 6:33 and Luke 12:31). The text in Jacob 2:18 works perfectly fine, and we should therefore not emend *for* to *first*. Nor is there strong reason to suppose that the second clause in Jacob 2:18 originally read without the *for*. In each case of “seek (for) X”, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the *for* was in the original text.

Summary: Accept in Jacob 2:18 the occurrence of *for* in “seek ye **for** the kingdom of God”, the reading of all the textual sources; there is no substantive evidence for emending this clause to read “seek ye **first** the kingdom of God”, the King James reading.

■ **Jacob 2:21**

*do ye not suppose that such things are abominable unto him
who created all [things > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] flesh*

The original manuscript is no longer extant here. Oliver Cowdery, while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , first wrote “who created all things”, probably because of the high expectation of *all things* after the verb *create*. In the King James text, there are four occurrences of “create all things”: Ephesians 3:9, Colossians 1:16 (two times), and Revelation 4:11. In the Book of Mormon, there are 12 occurrences of this phraseology, including three at the beginning of 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 2:14	for there is a God and he hath created all things
2 Nephi 2:15	and in fine all things which are created
2 Nephi 2:22	all things which were created must have remained in the same state

Here in Jacob 2:21, the immediately preceding occurrence of “such things” probably helped Oliver to initially write *things* rather than *flesh*.

No other passage in the Book of Mormon text refers to “creating flesh”; in fact, such phraseology is not found in the biblical text. Thus there would have been no motivation here for Oliver Cowdery to have edited *things* to *flesh*. The original manuscript undoubtedly read *flesh*. Moreover, the correction in the printer’s manuscript is inline and is without any change in the level of ink flow.

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript (“who created all flesh”), which was undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Jacob 2:23**

*but the word of God
[burthens 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS|burdens T] me*

The LDS text has consistently eliminated the archaic word *burthen* in favor of the modern *burden*. The Oxford English Dictionary gives many examples of *burthen* being used in the 19th century (especially in the first third of that century):

1803	Arthur Wellesley	a beast of burthen
1812	John Wilson	the burthen of despair
1825	John Nicholson	to carry a greater or less burthen
1827	John Keble	thine own sad burthen
1832	Harriet Martineau	without burthening the parish
1833	Isaac Taylor	the burthen of the dull echoes
1834	Charles Hoffman	the burthensome steamboats from New Orleans
1876	Edward Freeman	certain feudal burthens

The King James Bible, as currently printed, consistently has *burden* (101 times), but in the original 1611 printing, seven of these were *burthen* (from 2 Corinthians 8:13 through Galatians 6:5). In Shakespeare’s works, *burthen* is favored, although *burden* also occurs, with 63 occurrences of

burthen versus 10 of *burden* (according to a standard electronic database). Nearly all the occurrences of *burden* in the original Book of Mormon text were *burden* (18 examples, including five that are found in quotes from Isaiah), but there were originally three occurrences of *burthen*:

Jacob 2:23	[<i>burthens</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS <i>burdens</i> T]
Mosiah 6:7	[<i>burthensome</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS <i>burthensome</i> > <i>burdensome</i> M <i>burdensome</i> NOQRT]
Alma 62:29	[<i>burthen</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRS <i>burden</i> NT]

All three of these occurrences of *burthen* have been replaced by the corresponding form of *burden* in 20th-century editions of the LDS text, beginning (in two of the three cases) with the 1906 large-print edition. The critical text will restore the three original occurrences of *burthen* but leave all the other cases of original *burden*. In each case we let the earliest textual sources determine the original reading.

Summary: Restore the three original occurrences of *burthen* in the Book of Mormon text: Jacob 2:23, Mosiah 6:7, and Alma 62:29.

■ Jacob 2:23

this people

[*begineth* >js *begines* 1 | *begin* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *to wax in iniquity*

The original text of the Book of Mormon uses the *-(e)th* verbal ending for both singular and plural third person (rather than for only the singular, the standard biblical style). Here in Jacob 2:23, the 1830 typesetter dropped the *-(e)th* ending. In his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the final *th* of *begineth* with an *s*, but the 1837 edition itself continued with the *begin* of the 1830 edition.

Generally speaking, the 1830 typesetter did not remove nonstandard uses of the *-(e)th* ending. Thus the 1830 reading for Jacob 2:23 might have been unintentional, especially since the typesetter left unchanged two other occurrences of *this people* followed by a verb ending in *-(e)th*:

2 Nephi 18:6	forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah
Helaman 11:10	O Lord behold this people repenteth

Note further that no edition has ever removed the *-(e)th* ending from these two cases involving *this people*. In addition, there are places in the text where the verb for *this people* takes no inflectional ending:

2 Nephi 27:25	forasmuch as this people draw near unto me
Mosiah 11:23	except this people repent and turn unto the Lord their God
Alma 9:23	if this people who have received so many blessings
Helaman 11:14	if this people repent / I will spare them

In two of these cases (Mosiah 11:23 and Helaman 11:14) the lack of an inflectional ending for the verbs could be the result of the verbs being in the subjunctive rather than the indicative. But the other two cases are clearly indicative and omit the *-(e)th* ending. Also note that only the example

here in Jacob 2:23 involves variation. We should probably treat the three original cases with the *-(e)th* ending as an instance of the biblical style rather than as a third person singular ending. In fact, Joseph Smith's emendation to *begins* is nonstandard ("this people **begins** to wax in iniquity").

The original text thus appears to be variable with respect to the phrase *this people* and the inflectional ending for the associated verb. This variability continues in the current text. Grammatical purists may want to remove the *-(e)th* ending in the two remaining cases involving *this people*, although one of these (2 Nephi 18:6) is a quote from Isaiah (which has the *-(e)th* ending in the King James Bible). Interestingly, 2 Nephi 27:25 also quotes Isaiah (namely, Isaiah 29:13), and there the King James Bible has *draw*, not *draweth*. So even the King James Bible shows variability in subject-verb agreement for *this people*. For further discussion of this issue, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the *-(e)th* ending for the verb *begin* in Jacob 2:23 ("this people **beginneth** to wax in iniquity").

■ Jacob 2:23

*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*

The 1830 typesetter changed the present-tense *are* to past-tense *were*, probably unintentionally. Since the biblical text can be thought of as existing in the eternal present, there is nothing wrong with the original reading, as represented by the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here).

The Book of Mormon text has quite a few references to the biblical text in the present tense, as either "is written" or "are written":

1 Nephi 14:23

wherefore the things which he shall write are just and true
and behold they **are written** in the book
which thou beheld proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew

1 Nephi 19:21

for he surely did shew unto prophets of old all things concerning them . . .
wherefore it must needs be that we know concerning them
for they **are written** upon the plates of brass

2 Nephi 2:17

and I Lehi according to the things which I have read
must needs suppose that an angel of God
according to that which **is written**
had fallen from heaven

2 Nephi 4:2

and he prophesied concerning us and our future generations
and they **are written** upon the plates of brass

2 Nephi 6:3

and I have spoken unto you concerning all things
which **are written** from the creation of the world

Mosiah 12:20

what meaneth the words which **are written**
and which have been taught by our fathers saying
how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him
that bringeth good tidings

3 Nephi 20:11

ye remember that I spake unto you and said that
when the words of Isaiah should be fulfilled
— behold they **are written**
ye have them before you
therefore search them—

In 3 Nephi, when citing scriptures, Jesus always uses the present tense, either “it is written” or “which is written” (six times in all).

The past tense (either “was written” or “were written”) is also used to refer to the scriptures:

1 Nephi 14:23

and at the time they proceeded out of the mouth of the Jew
or at the time the book proceeded out of the mouth of the Jew
the things which **were written** were plain and pure and most precious
and easy to the understanding of all men

1 Nephi 19:23

wherefore I did read unto them that which **was written** by the prophet Isaiah

3 Nephi 11:15

until they had all gone forth and did see with their eyes
and did feel with their hands and did know of a surety and did bear record
that it was he of whom it **was written** by the prophets that should come

So theoretically either the present tense or past tense is possible when referring to the scriptures. In each case we allow the earliest textual sources to determine the tense. Here in Jacob 2:23, the critical text will restore the present-tense “are written”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out a systematic difference between these two lists. The three past-tense examples are each found within a past-tense historical narrative; thus the past-tense verb form *was* or *were* is appropriate. On the other hand, the present-tense examples all occur in discourse or dialogue (including two cases where the writer is directly speaking to us as Book of Mormon readers, in 1 Nephi 19:21 and 2 Nephi 4:2). Here in Jacob 2:23, we have a case of discourse where Jacob is speaking to the people of Nephi; thus the present tense is appropriate.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 2:23 the present-tense reading of the original text: “because of the things which **are written** concerning David and Solomon his son”.

■ **Jacob 2:27**

*for there shall not any [more > man 1 | man ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] among you
have save it be one wife
and concubines **he** shall have none*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "any more among you", then almost immediately crossed out the *more* and supralinearly inserted *man* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). The error here is a visual one, especially since Oliver Cowdery's *a* and *o* as well as his *n* and *r* are written similarly. (For another instance where there may have been some mix-up between *men* and *more*, see Alma 59:9.)

Theoretically, the nominal use of *more* is possible here, although the gender-specific noun *man* is more plausible. Elsewhere, the phrase "any more" is typically used as an adverb (17 times), as in "they need not look forward **any more** for a Messiah to come" (2 Nephi 25:18). There are four cases where "any more" modifies a following noun:

2 Nephi 29:3	and there cannot be any more Bible
Alma 46:30	it was not expedient that the Lamanites should have any more strength
Alma 55:2	for I will not grant unto him that he shall have any more power
3 Nephi 2:3	and they did not believe that there should be any more signs or wonders given

In only one place can the *more* of "any more" be considered a nominal head (although here "any more" could be interpreted as adverbial):

Moroni 1:4	for I had supposed not to have written any more
------------	--

Even here the *more* does not refer to people. There is only one place where *more* refers to people, but in that case, instead of "any more", we have its negative equivalent, "no more":

Alma 39:13	that ye lead away the hearts of no more to do wickedly
------------	---

This is the only example of this usage in the Book of Mormon text (excluding the initial manuscript reading here in Jacob 2:27). On the other hand, there are 14 other occurrences of "any man" in the text. Theoretically, either *more* or *man* is possible in Jacob 2:27, but the critical text will accept *man* in Jacob 2:27 since the corrected reading ("any man") appears to be virtually immediate.

Summary: Accept in Jacob 2:27 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : "there shall not **any man** among you have save it be one wife".

■ **Jacob 2:28**

*for I the Lord God [delighteth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | delight RT]
in the chastity of women*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 4:15, the original text had a number of cases where the verb for the subject pronoun *I* ended in *-(e)th*, especially when there was some intervening text (such as "the Lord God" here in Jacob 2:28). The 1920 LDS edition removed the *-(e)th* ending here, but the critical text will restore it. For further discussion of the phrase "I saith", see under 1 Nephi 11:3.

Jacob 2

Leviticus 18:22	it <i>is</i> abomination
Deuteronomy 22:5	for all that do so <i>are</i> abomination unto the LORD thy God
Deuteronomy 23:18	for even both these <i>are</i> abomination unto the LORD thy God
Deuteronomy 24:4	for that <i>is</i> abomination before the LORD
Proverbs 3:32	for the froward <i>is</i> abomination to the LORD
Proverbs 11:1	a false balance <i>is</i> abomination to the LORD
Proverbs 11:20	they that are of a froward heart <i>are</i> abomination to the LORD
Proverbs 12:22	lying lips <i>are</i> abomination to the LORD
Proverbs 13:19	but <i>it is</i> abomination to fools to depart from evil
Proverbs 17:15	even they both <i>are</i> abomination to the LORD
Proverbs 21:27	the sacrifice of the wicked <i>is</i> abomination
Proverbs 29:27	and <i>he that is</i> upright in the way <i>is</i> abomination to the wicked
Luke 16:15	for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God

Of course, in the original languages (Hebrew and Greek) for all these instances (plus the 20 with the article *an*, not listed here), no article is expressed, nor is the linking *be* verb ever there. This means that in all 32 cases of subject predicate *abomination*, the original language expression is always identical (namely, as “X abomination”), no matter whether the subject X is singular or plural. The English language translators are therefore responsible for selecting the number for the linking verb in these King James examples, and of course they followed the standard rules of subject-verb agreement by always making the *be* verb agree with the number of the subject. Thus the King James text consistently uses *is* with singular subjects and *are* with plural subjects, so there is no direct biblical support for the original singular verb in Jacob 2:28 (“whoredoms **is** abomination”). Nonetheless, such nonstandard subject-verb agreement is characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4, especially the example from Mosiah 8:19 (“these interpreters **was** doubtless prepared for the purpose of unfolding all such mysteries”). For a complete discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Clearly, the King James translators varied in their decision on whether to include the indefinite article before *abomination* (19 with the *an* and 13 without); we also get variation in the earliest Book of Mormon text (one with *an* and one without). For this reason the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in assigning the reading for Jacob 2:28 (“and whoredoms **is** abomination before me”) and for Alma 39:5 (“these things **are an** abomination”). Notice, in particular, the syntactic and semantic similarity between Jacob 2:28 and Deuteronomy 24:4 in the King James text. In each case *abomination* is postmodified by a prepositional phrase headed by *before* and both have the singular *is* and lack the indefinite article *an*:

Jacob 2:28	and whoredoms is abomination before me
Deuteronomy 24:4	for that is abomination before the LORD

Thus there is a striking syntactic and semantic similarity between the two passages, even down to the use of *is* in both passages. Interestingly, in both cases the subject matter is multiple marriage, with Jacob 2:22–35 dealing with polygyny and Deuteronomy 24:1–4 with divorce and remarriage:

Deuteronomy 24:1–4

when a man hath taken a wife and married her
 and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes
 because he hath found some uncleanness in her
 then let him write her a bill of divorcement
 and give *it* in her hand and send her out of his house
 and when she is departed out of his house
 she may go and be another man's *wife*
 and if the latter husband hate her and write her a bill of divorcement
 and giveth *it* in her hand and sendeth her out of his house
 or if the latter husband die which took her *to be* his wife
 her former husband which sent her away may not take her again
 to be his wife after that she is defiled
for that is abomination before the LORD

It could well be that the language in Jacob 2:28 draws upon the language of Deuteronomy 24:4, thus supporting Jacob's use of the precise expression "and whoredoms **is abomination before me**".

Summary: Retain in Jacob 2:28 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in the printer's manuscript: "and whoredoms **is abomination** before me"; the omitted *an* before *abomination* is commonly found in the King James Bible and is supported especially by the reading in Deuteronomy 24:4.

■ **Jacob 2:34**

*and now behold my brethren ye know that
 these commandments [was 1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] given to our father Lehi*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed the singular *was* to plural *were*, even though a few verses earlier (in Jacob 2:28) he left the singular verb *is* in the nonstandard "and whoredoms **is an abomination**" (although there he did add the indefinite article *an* before *abomination*). As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4, cases of nonstandard subject-verb agreement will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard use of the singular verb *was* in Jacob 2:34 ("these commandments **was** given to our father Lehi"), the reading of the printer's manuscript.

■ **Jacob 2:34**

*and now behold my brethren
 ye know that these commandments was given to our father Lehi
 wherefore ye have known them before
 and ye have come **unto** great condemnation
 for ye have done these things
 which ye ought not to have done*

Joanne Case has suggested (personal communication, 14 September 2004) that the preposition *unto* here in Jacob 2:34 may be an error for *under*. In the same expression elsewhere in the text, the preposition is *under*:

Helaman 14:19 ye shall suffer yourselves to **come under** condemnation
 3 Nephi 18:33 that ye **come not under** condemnation

With verbs besides *come*, we also get *under*:

Mosiah 26:31 the same hath **brought** himself **under** condemnation
 Moroni 8:22 or he that **is under** no condemnation cannot repent
 Moroni 8:24 for repentance is unto them that **are under** condemnation
 Moroni 9:6 we should be **brought under** condemnation

There is one other case where we get *unto*:

3 Nephi 26:10 then shall the greater things be withheld from them
unto their condemnation

This expression is similar to examples that state that some act is “**to** someone’s condemnation”:

Alma 10:26 but I have spoken in favor of your law **to** your condemnation
 Alma 60:12 and behold it is **to** your condemnation

The equivalence of *unto* and *to* suggests that Jacob 2:34 could alternatively read as “ye have come **to** great condemnation”. In modern English, of course, we expect *under*.

The King James Bible shows more variety in the choice of the preposition for *condemnation*; in some instances (each marked below with an asterisk), the preposition could be *under* in a modern English translation rather than the preposition used by the King James translators:

* Luke 23:40 seeing thou art **in** the same condemnation
 * John 5:24 and shall not come **into** condemnation
 Romans 5:16 for the judgment *was* by one **to** condemnation
 Romans 5:18 *judgment came* upon all men **to** condemnation
 1 Corinthians 11:34 that ye come not together **unto** condemnation
 * 1 Timothy 3:6 lest . . . he fall **into** the condemnation of the devil
 * James 5:12 lest ye fall **into** condemnation
 Jude 1:4 who were before of old ordained **to** this condemnation

The variety in choice of preposition for these New Testament passages argues that the *unto* in Jacob 2:24 should be retained, despite its unusualness for modern English speakers.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 2:34 the preposition *unto* (“ye have come unto great condemnation”); although *unto* could be an error for *under*, passages in the King James Bible show that in the biblical style the noun *condemnation* can take a variety of prepositions (*in*, *into*, *to*, and *unto*).

■ **Jacob 2:35**

*behold ye have done greater [iniquity 1PS | iniquities ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
 than the Lamanites*

Here the 1830 typesetter pluralized *iniquity*. When we consider all other examples of “do iniquity” and “do iniquities” in the Book of Mormon text, we consistently find only the singular *iniquity*,

never the plural. In each of these other cases, there has been no change of *iniquity* to *iniquities* in any of the textual sources:

- “do iniquity”, 12 other times
1 Nephi 17:45, etc.
- “do all manner of iniquity”, 8 times
1 Nephi 22:23, etc.
- “do all manner of that which is iniquity”, 1 time
Helaman 12:5
- “do whatsoever iniquity”, 1 time
3 Nephi 6:17

Thus in Jacob 2:35 the 1830 typesetter introduced an inconsistency into the text by changing *iniquity* to *iniquities*. Most likely, this change was accidental since the typesetter changed no other examples of “do iniquity” to “do iniquities”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original singular.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 2:35 the singular *iniquity* (the reading of the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript); there are no examples in the text of the plural “do iniquities”.

Jacob 3

■ Jacob 3:1

*and he will console you in your afflictions
and [he 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | we D] will plead your cause*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1841 British edition, the replacement of the pronoun *he* with *we*. This visual misreading was corrected in the following LDS edition (1849). Although *we* is theoretically possible, Jacob does not use the personal pronoun *we* in any of the discussion contained in chapters 2–3 (the original single chapter II), which deals with the moral transgressions of the Nephites. Nor does Jacob ever use the royal *we* in speaking to his people.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, continue with the pronoun *he* in Jacob 3:1.

■ Jacob 3:3

*for except ye [shall 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] repent
the land is cursed for your sakes*

Here the 1837 edition omitted the modal verb *shall*. This deletion could be an error by the 1837 typesetter; the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. Moreover, in the original (and current) text, there are 16 other examples where *shall* appears in *except* clauses, including five with the exact phraseology as originally in Jacob 3:3 (“except ye **shall** repent”): Helaman 7:22, Helaman 7:23, Helaman 9:22, Helaman 15:1, and Mormon 5:22. Elsewhere there are 18 occurrences of the phraseology “except ye repent” (that is, without the *shall*, including one nearby in Jacob 3:4 (which may have had some influence on the 1837 loss of the *shall* in the preceding verse). Interestingly, in Helaman 9:22 Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the phrase “except ye shall repent” without the *shall*, but he caught his error almost immediately and supralinearly inserted the *shall* (without any change in the level of ink flow). Obviously, the *shall* is definitely possible in “except ye (shall) repent”.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 3:3 the modal verb *shall* to the *except*-clause (“except ye shall repent”).

■ Jacob 3:5

behold the Lamanites

[NULL >+ *your Brethren* 1 | *your brethren* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

whom ye hate . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the Lamanites whom ye hate"; later he supralinearly inserted "your Brethren" with heavier, but uneven, ink flow. It appears that he used a defective quill to make this correction in the printer's manuscript. There would have been nothing wrong with what he originally wrote; if anything, the corrected reading is unusual and awkward for English, which argues that the phrase was in the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

There is at least one other example in the text of an appositive intervening between a relative pronoun and its antecedent:

Alma 19:14

now Ammon seeing the Spirit of the Lord poured out

according to his prayers upon **the Lamanites his brethren**

[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been

the cause of so much mourning among the Nephites . . .

In this example from the book of Alma, Joseph Smith edited the relative pronoun *which* to *who*. Yet even for *which*, its antecedent is clearly "the Lamanites".

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 3:5 the appositive "your brethren" that follows "the Lamanites" and precedes the relative clause that modifies "the Lamanites".

■ Jacob 3:5

behold the Lamanites your brethren whom ye hate

because of their filthiness and the [cursings 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *cursing* RT]

which hath come upon their skins

are more righteous than you

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed *cursings* to *cursing* in the LDS text. The singular *cursing* is in agreement with the third person singular *hath* that occurs in the following relative clause ("the cursing which **hath** come upon their skins"). Nonetheless, this argument does not have much force since in the original Book of Mormon text the biblical *hath* could occur with plural subjects. (See the discussion regarding *hath* under 1 Nephi 13:32 and 1 Nephi 13:34 as well as under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.)

All other references to the Lord's cursing of the Lamanites are indeed in the singular, as in these examples where *cursing* is used as a count noun:

2 Nephi 1:18

or that **a cursing** should come upon you for the space of many generations

Jacob 3

2 Nephi 1:22

that ye may not be cursed with **a sore cursing**
and also that ye may not incur the displeasure of a just God upon you

2 Nephi 4:6

wherefore if ye are cursed behold I leave my blessing upon you
that **the cursing** may be taken from you
and be answered upon the heads of your parents

2 Nephi 5:21 (two times)

and he had caused **the cursing** to come upon them
yea even **a sore cursing** because of their iniquity

2 Nephi 5:23

for they shall be cursed even with **the same cursing**

2 Nephi 5:24

and because of **their cursing** which was upon them
they did become an idle people

Jacob 3:3

nevertheless they are cursed with **a sore cursing**

In fact, the count noun *cursing* never appears in the plural anywhere in the Book of Mormon text except in Jacob 3:5. Besides the examples that refer to the cursing of the Lamanites, there is one more later on in Alma for which the word *cursing* is used:

Alma 45:16

for this is **the cursing** and the blessing of God upon the land

In all, there are nine occurrences of the noun *cursing* in the earliest text but none of *cursings* except in Jacob 3:5.

In addition, there are 30 occurrences of the count noun *curse* in the Book of Mormon and all of these occur in the singular, including the following eight that specifically refer to the cursing that came upon the Lamanites:

1 Nephi 2:23

for behold in that day that they shall rebel against me
I will curse them even with **a sore curse**

Alma 3:6

and the skins of the Lamanites were dark
according to the mark which was set upon their fathers
which was **a curse** upon them because of their transgression
and their rebellion against their brethren

Alma 3:9

and it came to pass that
whosoever did mingle his seed with that of the Lamanites
did bring **the same curse** upon his seed

Alma 3:18–19 (two times)

now the Amlicites knew not that they were fulfilling the words of God
when they began to mark themselves in their foreheads
nevertheless as they had come out in open rebellion against God
therefore it was expedient that **the curse** should fall upon them
now I would that ye should see that they brought upon themselves **the curse**

Alma 17:15

thus they were a very indolent people
many of whom did worship idols
and **the curse** of God had fell upon them
because of the traditions of their fathers

Alma 23:18

yea and they were friendly with the Nephites
therefore they did open a correspondence with them
and **the curse** of God did no more follow them

3 Nephi 2:14–15

and it came to pass that
those Lamanites which had united with the Nephites
were numbered among the Nephites
and **their curse** was taken from them
and their skin became white like unto the Nephites

Except for Jacob 3:5, the text consistently refers to either “the curse” or “the cursing” that came upon the Lamanites.

All of this evidence suggests that the plural *cursings* in Jacob 3:5 is a scribal error for *cursing*. We do not have the original manuscript for this word, but Oliver Cowdery may have added the plural *s* while copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} (a common error on his part), or he might have accidentally added the *s* as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation (also a common error on his part). The plural *skins* in the following relative clause may have prompted Oliver to accidentally write *cursings*, the antecedent in the previous clause for the relative pronoun *which*.

We have examples in the manuscripts of Oliver Cowdery accidentally adding an *s* to create an unusual if not impossible plural for English:

1 Nephi 21:10 (Isaiah 49:10 has *water*)

even by the springs of [*water* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *waters* 1]
shall he guide them

1 Nephi 21:26 (Isaiah 49:26 has *wine*)

they shall be drunken with their own blood
as with sweet [*wines* >+ *wine* 0 | *wine* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the first example, Oliver’s error occurred as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . In the second one, the error occurred as Oliver took down Joseph’s dictation. Note in both cases that the corresponding Isaiah passage (as well as English usage) prefers the singular.

Summary: Accept in Jacob 3:5 the 1920 emendation in the LDS text of *cursings* to *cursing*; everywhere else the text uses only the singular count nouns *cursing* and *curse*, never *cursings* or *curses*.

■ Jacob 3:5

for they have not forgotten
 the [commandments >% commandment 1 | commandment ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT |
 commandments PS] of the Lord
 which [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRT | were s] given
 unto our [father 1T | fathers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | fathcrs F]
 that they should have save it were one wife

There are two problems here in this verse, both of which deal with number. The first problem concerns the word *commandment(s)*. Lehi was given a single commandment against having more than one wife, but when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the word in \mathcal{P} , he wrote it as the plural *commandments*. He immediately corrected his error by erasing the plural *s*; the resulting erased *s* is lighter and shows minor ink smearing and some slight abrasion. The 1830 compositor correctly set the singular *commandment*. However, in revising the RLDS text, the editors for the 1908 edition did not recognize that the *s* had been erased (the *s* is still clearly visible), so they emended the text to read in the plural. Although \mathcal{O} is not extant for this particular word, the immediate correction in \mathcal{P} suggests that the singular is correct. Also note that the verb in the following relative clause is in the singular (“which **was** given unto our father”), but in truth this cannot be used as evidence to support the singular *commandment* since the original text allowed singular verb forms with plural subjects, as in 1 Nephi 18:15: “and loosed the **bands** which **was** upon my wrists” (also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4). However, since the 1908 RLDS edition reintroduced the plural *commandments*, the subsequent RLDS edition (1953) changed the singular *was* to the plural *were*.

The very next verse twice refers to “this commandment”, which could be taken as support for the use of the singular *commandment* in Jacob 3:5:

Jacob 3:6
 and now **this commandment** they observe to keep
 wherefore because of this observance in keeping **this commandment**
 the Lord God will not destroy them

Of course, one could argue that these two singular instances of *commandment* led Oliver Cowdery to erase the plural *s* in the preceding verse. We also need to consider the text at the end of Jacob 2; there we have an instance of “these commandments” that refers to the same injunction against multiple wives:

Jacob 2:33–34
 for they shall not commit whoredoms like unto they of old
 saith the Lord of Hosts
 and now behold my brethren
 ye know that **these commandments** was given to our father Lehi

One could take this reading as evidence that Jacob 3:5 should read “the commandments of the Lord”. Of course, this preceding plural *commandments* in Jacob 2:34 can be viewed as what led Oliver to initially write “the commandments of the Lord” in Jacob 3:5. Ultimately, the safest decision is to follow the earliest textual sources for each instance of *commandment(s)*, which means that here in Jacob 3:5 we accept the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (that is, *commandment*).

The history of the text has involved considerable variation with respect to the number of *commandment*. For other examples where Oliver added an *s* to *commandment*, see 1 Nephi 3:16 and 1 Nephi 4:34.

The second textual problem here in Jacob 3:5 deals with the number of *father(s)*. The printer's manuscript reads in the singular: "which was given unto our **father**". The 1830 compositor, however, replaced this singular with the plural *fathers*, probably unintentionally. The 1981 LDS edition restored the singular *father*, but interestingly the RLDS text never has, even though \mathcal{P} reads *father*. A preceding verse in this part of the text (cited just above) clearly indicates that the commandment against more than one wife was given to Lehi: "ye know that these commandments was given to **our father Lehi**" (Jacob 2:34). Perhaps the RLDS editors preferred the plural use of *fathers* since such a reading would argue that the injunction against multiple wives predated Lehi. But as Robert F. Smith and others have pointed out, there was no injunction in ancient Israel against polygyny, so the use of the plural *fathers* would be problematic in Jacob 3:5; see page 79, "Textual Criticism of the Book of Mormon", *Reexploring the Book of Mormon*, edited by John W. Welch (Salt Lake City and Provo, Utah: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1992), 77–79.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the singular *commandment* and the singular *father* in Jacob 3:5 ("the commandment of the Lord which was given unto our father"); the language of nearby readings supports these two singulars.

■ Jacob 3:9

*wherefore a commandment I give unto you which is the word of God
that ye revile no more against them
because of the darkness of their [skin 1 | skins ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Generally speaking, the current Book of Mormon text uses the plural *skins* to refer to the skin color of peoples:

Jacob 3:5	and the cursing which hath come upon their skins
Jacob 3:8	that their skins will be whiter than yours
Alma 3:6	and the skins of the Lamanites were dark

There are two exceptions in the current text:

2 Nephi 5:21	the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them
3 Nephi 2:15	and their skin became white like unto the Nephites

The first of these two instances of *skin* is clearly singular since it is preceded by the indefinite article *a*. It is possible that the second one is an error. The original manuscript is no longer extant for 3 Nephi 2:15. But in 3 Nephi, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} , and for this verse both read "their skin"; thus the original manuscript probably read in the singular as *skin*. Counting the example here in Jacob 3:9, we appear to have three occurrences of the singular *skin*, of which one ("a skin" in 2 Nephi 5:21) is firm. Thus the singular *skin* is possible. For this reason, the critical text will restore the singular *skin* in Jacob 3:9, even though it could be an early transmission error for *skins*. The 1830 compositor's decision to set "their skins" in verse 9 was

not based on the original manuscript (which he did not examine here) but instead was based on the fact that the immediately preceding text used the plural “their skins” twice (in verses 5 and 8, cited above).

The Book of Mormon text has other examples of plural uses of *skins*, as in discussions about how the skin of more than one person might be injured:

Alma 20:29

for behold they were naked
and **their skins** were worn exceedingly
because of being bound with strong cords

Alma 44:18

their naked [*skin* > *skins* 0 | *skins* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and their bare heads were exposed to the sharp swords of the Nephites

The second example provides independent evidence that Oliver Cowdery had problems with the plural *s* in *skins*. In the original manuscript for Alma 44:18, Oliver first wrote *skin*, then inserted an *s* after *skin* to form the plural. (There is no apparent difference in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*, so the insertion probably occurred quite soon after writing *skin*.) This correction suggests that Oliver’s tendency was simply to write the singular *skin* — as all speakers of modern English would tend to do, even when the context applies to more than one individual.

Summary: Restore the singular *skin* in Jacob 3:9, even though the two preceding references to the skin of the Lamanites uses the plural *skins*; two other passages support the use of the singular *skin* to refer to more than one person: 2 Nephi 5:21 (“a skin”) and 3 Nephi 2:15 (“their skin”).

■ Jacob 3:10

wherefore ye shall remember your children
how that ye have grieved their hearts because of the example
that ye have [*sot* 1 | *set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *before them*

The printer’s manuscript here reads *sot*, which the 1830 typesetter interpreted as *set*. However, another possibility is that Oliver Cowdery’s scribal slip *sot* stands for *sat* rather than *set*. Elsewhere in the standard edited text, there are 43 occurrences where the transitive verb *set* is used in either the simple past, the perfect, or the passive. In the earliest text, five of these instances read *sat* instead of *set*—that is, as either the simple past, the perfect, or the passive of the historically intransitive verb *sit*:

1 Nephi 11:1 (past perfect)

I was caught away in the Spirit of the Lord
yea into an exceeding high mountain
a mountain which I never had before seen
and upon which I never had before
[*sat* 01ABCD | *set* EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my foot

Mosiah 10:2 (simple past)

and I [*sat* 1 | *set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] guards round about the land

Mosiah 11:11 (passive)

and the seats which was [*sat* 1 | *set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] apart
for the high priests
which was above all the other seats
he did ornament with pure gold

Alma 8:21–23 (simple past)

and he brought forth bread and meat
and [*sat* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *set* RT] before Alma
and it came to pass that Alma ate bread and he was filled
and he blessed Amulek and his house
and he gave thanks unto God
and after he had eat and was filled
he saith unto Amulek . . .

[The original text here does not mean that Amulek **sat down in front of** Alma. Instead, as a good host, Amulek set food before Alma and let Alma eat until he was filled. The direct object for the verb *set* is understood. For further discussion on interpreting this passage, see Alma 8:21.]

3 Nephi 17:12 (simple past)

so they brought their little children
and [*sat* 1ABCEFGIJKLMNOPQS | *set* DHKRT] them down upon the ground
round about him

Thus *sat* is possible where standard English expects *set*, although in the 38 other cases the earliest textual sources have the standard *set* rather than the dialectal *sat*. And there is one example, the first one listed above (1 Nephi 11:1) where *sat* occurs as the perfect form in a transitive case. There are 14 cases in the earliest text where the standard *set* occurs in the perfect (that is, preceded by the perfect auxiliary *have*), of which three cases refer to setting an example, just like Jacob 3:10:

2 Nephi 31:9	he having set the example before them
Alma 39:1	behold has he not set a good example for thee
3 Nephi 18:16	I have set an example before you

In these three examples, both *set* and *example* are in the same clause (and take the form “set <determiner> example”). But in Jacob 3:10 *sat* ‘set’ is in a relative clause, and *example* is in the preceding clause and acts as the antecedent for the relative pronoun *that* which follows. This difference in phraseology may have played a role in allowing the nonstandard use of *sat* to occur in Jacob 3:10.

Given the sporadic occurrence of *sat* for *set*, it is therefore possible that in the printer’s manuscript for Jacob 3:10, Oliver Cowdery’s *sot* stands for *sat* rather than the standard *set*. When we look at the kinds of scribal slips that Oliver Cowdery made in the manuscripts, we find that he accidentally miswrote the letter *a* as *o* quite a few times:

INTENDED WORD	SCRIBAL SLIP	LOCATION
Battle	Bottle	2 Nephi 19:5 (D)
commanded	commonded	Helaman 6:25 (D)
commandments	commondments	Jacob 5:74 (D), Alma 37:13 (G), Alma 48:15 (G)
fathers	fothers	Alma 37:17 (G)
harrowed	horrowed	Alma 36:17 (G)
Helaman	Helamon	Alma 48:19 (G)
Lamanites	Lamonites	Alma 48:21 (G), Alma 48:22 (G)
man	mon	Alma 48:11 (G), Alma 48:18 (G)
many	mony	Alma 37:19 (G), Alma 48:22 (G), Alma 48:23 (G)
narrow	norrow	Jacob 6:11 (D)
Northward	Northword	Alma 50:11 (G)
notwithstanding	notwithstonding	Alma 48:21 (G), Alma 48:22 (G)
snare	snore	2 Nephi 18:14 (D)
than	thon	Alma 26:32 (G)

The tendency to write *o* instead of *a* is usually influenced by a following *n* (15 out of the 21 instances). And for some of these words, an *o* elsewhere in the word may have facilitated the miswriting of an *a* as *o* (*commanded*, *commandments*, *harrowed*, *narrow*, *northward*, and *notwithstanding*). Even so, there are two examples where *a* was miswritten as *o* right before a *t* and there was no *o* elsewhere in the word: namely, *Bottle* and *fothers*. These two examples provide support for the possibility that Oliver could have miswritten *sat* as *sot*. In contrast to all of these examples of miswriting *a* as *o*, there are only two examples where Oliver miswrote *e* as *o*; and in both of these examples there is an *o* elsewhere in the word that may have led to miswriting the *e* as an *o* (*behold* and *others*):

INTENDED WORD	SCRIBAL SLIP	LOCATION
behold	bohold	3 Nephi 12:15 (D)
others	othors	3 Nephi 6:12 (D)

Overall, the chances are less that Oliver Cowdery miswrote *set* as *sot*.

The critical text will therefore interpret the *sot* in D as a scribal slip for *sat*. There are five cases where the earliest text clearly read *sat* instead of the standard *set*, and Jacob 3:10 appears to be a sixth case of this nonstandard usage. For further discussion of the nonstandard use of *sat*, see 1 Nephi 11:1 as well as SIT in volume 3.

Summary: Interpret *sot* (the reading in D for Jacob 3:10) as a scribal slip for *sat*, the standard past participial form for the verb *sit* but here used as the past participial form for the verb *set*; evidence from Oliver Cowdery's scribal miswritings supports interpreting *sot* as *sat* for the original reading in Jacob 3:10.

■ Jacob 3:11

*O my brethren hearken unto my [words 1T | word ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
arouse the faculties of your [souls 1T | soul ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]*

In this verse we have two plural words in \mathfrak{P} (*words* and *souls*) that the 1830 compositor set in the singular (“hearken unto my **word** / arouse the faculties of your **soul**”). The 1981 LDS edition restored both of the plural readings. The Book of Mormon usually refers to a person’s speech by means of the plural *words*, but nonetheless the singular *word* is possible (as in Alma 7:26, “because of the exceeding diligence and heed which ye have given unto my **word**”). In 1 Nephi 16:24, Oliver Cowdery himself replaced “my words” with “my word”; here in Jacob 3:10, it was the 1830 compositor who made the mistake. In both places, the 1981 LDS edition restored the correct plural, “my words”. Although the 1908 RLDS edition is based on \mathfrak{P} , these two instances of the plural *words* have not been restored to the RLDS text. For further discussion regarding “my word(s)”, see 1 Nephi 16:24.

As far as the plural *souls* in “the faculties of your souls” is concerned, the overwhelming tendency of the Book of Mormon text is to use the plural *souls* when the text refers to more than one person. In fact, whenever we have “of <plural possessive pronoun> soul(s)” (as a postmodifying prepositional phrase), we get only the plural *souls* (15 times):

2 Nephi 2:30	the everlasting welfare of your souls
2 Nephi 6:3	the welfare of your souls
Jacob 2:3	the welfare of your souls
Jacob 3:11	the faculties of your souls
Jacob 4:13	the salvation of our souls
Mosiah 25:11	the welfare of their souls
Alma 9:28	the salvation of their souls
Alma 9:28	the damnation of their souls
Alma 12:36	the everlasting destruction of your souls
Alma 26:20	the salvation of our souls
Alma 26:26	some few of their souls
Alma 37:8	the salvation of their souls
Helaman 5:11	the salvation of their souls
3 Nephi 5:20	the salvation of our souls
Moroni 6:5	the welfare of their souls

Thus the critical text will maintain in Jacob 3:11 the plural *souls* in “the faculties of your souls”.

Summary: Follow in Jacob 3:11 the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript, for the two plurals *words* and *souls* (“hearken unto my words / arouse the faculties of your souls”).

■ Jacob 3:12

*and now I Jacob spake many more things unto the people of Nephi
warning them against fornication and lasciviousness and every kind of sin
telling them [of > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the awful consequences of them*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “telling them **of** the awful consequences of them”, but then he crossed out the *of*. Elsewhere in the text, the verb *tell* typically does not have the preposition *of*, but there are eight instances of “**tell** (someone) **of** something”:

Jacob 7:7	for he cannot tell of things to come
Enos 1:2	and I will tell you of the wrestle which I had before God
Mosiah 7:26	yea a chosen man of God who told them of their wickedness
Mosiah 19:22	and the men of Gideon told them of all that had happened
Mosiah 20:19	tell the king of these things
Helaman 7:13	that I may tell you of your iniquities
Helaman 16:5	telling them of things which must shortly come
Ether 13:2	for he truly told them of all things

Note that half of these examples involve the plural noun *things*. On the other hand, there are 23 occurrences of the verb *tell* where the complement is *things* but without the *of*, including one example without the *of* for which there is a matching example with the *of*:

Mosiah 20:19	tell the king of these things
Mosiah 20:23	and now Limhi told the king all the things concerning his father

In each case we therefore let the earliest textual sources determine whether the verb *tell* takes the *of* or not. Here in Jacob 3:12, the crossout of the *of* looks virtually immediate, which argues that in this instance the original manuscript lacked the *of*.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 3:12 the current reading without the *of* that is sometimes associated with the verb *tell*: “telling them the awful consequences of them”.

■ Jacob 3:13

*but many of their proceedings are written upon the larger plates
and their wars and [NULL > their 1| their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] contentions
and the reigns of their kings*

When he copied this part of the text from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the conjoined construction involving *wars* and *contentions* without repeating the determiner *their*. Shortly thereafter, he supralinearly inserted the repeated *their* (without any change in the level of ink flow). Normally the text does not repeat determiners in conjuncts involving *wars* and *contentions*:

1 Nephi 9:4	and the wars and contentions of my people (2 times)
1 Nephi 19:4	a greater account of the wars and contentions and destructions of my people
Mosiah 29:36	and all the wars and contentions

Alma preface	and the wars and contentions among the people
Alma 3:25	all these wars and contentions
Alma 28:9	the account of the wars and contentions among the Nephites
Alma 51:22	the wars and contentions among his own people
Helaman preface	their wars and contentions and their dissensions
Helaman 3:14	and their wars and contentions and dissensions
Helaman 3:22	the wars and contentions

Notice, in particular, the example found in the Helaman preface; there the determiner is not repeated for the immediately conjoined nouns *wars* and *contentions*, but it does occur with the following conjunct, *dissensions* (“**the** wars and contentions and **the** dissensions”).

There is one example in addition to Jacob 3:13 for which the determiner is repeated, but in this example the conjuncts *wars* and *contentions* are not immediately conjoined:

Alma 35:15	the wars and the bloodsheds and the contentions which were among them
------------	---

Thus the evidence is not particularly strong for repeating the determiner in the immediately conjoined *wars* and *contentions*. The expected phraseology is without any repeated determiner, which may explain why Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “their wars and contentions” in Jacob 3:13. Ultimately, there would have been little motivation for Oliver to have inserted the repeated *their* in this passage except that it must have occurred in the original manuscript. Therefore, the critical text will maintain the repeated *their* here in Jacob 3:13.

Generally speaking, we allow the earliest textual sources to determine in each case whether a determiner should be repeated for a given conjunct. For an example of a conjunctive structure where the determiner is usually not repeated, see “great and terrible” (under 1 Nephi 12:18). For the opposite possibility, where the determiner is usually repeated, see “statutes and judgments” (under 1 Nephi 17:22). For a general discussion of the repetition of determiners, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , maintain in Jacob 3:13 the repeated *their* in “their wars and **their** contentions”, despite its unusualness.

Jacob 4

■ Jacob 4:1

and I cannot write but [NULL > a 1 | a ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | GHKPS] little of my words

When producing the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “but little” here in Jacob 4:1; then he inserted inline the indefinite article *a*. There is no change in the level of ink flow, so the correction appears to have been virtually immediate. There seems to be little motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have grammatically edited the text here. Either variant seems acceptable. The fact that the RLDS textual tradition (beginning with the 1858 Wright edition) has continually had the variant “but little” suggests that there doesn’t seem to be anything ungrammatical about “but little” in Jacob 4:1.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has six occurrences of “but little”, but no other occurrence of “but a little”:

Mosiah 18:27 (two times)

and he that hath **but little**
but little should be required

Alma 58:5

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

Helaman 3:7

and there being **but little** timber upon the face of the land . . .

Helaman 16:12

and there were **but little** alteration in the affairs of the people

Ether 12:24

and thou hast made us that we could write **but little**
because of the awkwardness of our hands

But these six examples are all consistently different than the one in Jacob 4:1. In each of these six examples, *little* either serves as the head of a noun phrase (the first three occurrences and the last one) or is followed by a mass noun (*timber*, *alteration*). Only in Jacob 4:1 is *little* followed by a count noun (*words*). Moreover, the count noun necessarily occurs in a prepositional phrase (“of my words”) since the sentence “I cannot write but little words” means something different; in such a case, *little* would have to be replaced by *few* to maintain the meaning (“I cannot write but few words”).

This difference implies that Jacob 4:1, even without the inserted *a*, differs considerably from the six other occurrences of “but little” and should therefore be considered a unique expression in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 4:1 the unique reading “but a little”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ **Jacob 4:3**

and we labor diligently

to [engraven 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPRST | engrave OQ] these words upon plates

As discussed under 1 Nephi 19:1, the archaic verb *engraven* should be maintained whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. Here in Jacob 4:3, the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1911 LDS edition took on the more modern form of the verb, *engrave*, but the current standard editions have maintained the original *engraven*.

■ **Jacob 4:5**

and for this intent

we keep the law of Moses

it pointing our souls to him

and for [this 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRT | their S] cause

it is sanctified unto us for righteousness

The 1953 RLDS edition here introduced an obvious typo, “for **their** cause”. Parallelism with the preceding main clause supports the original use of “for **this** cause”:

and for this intent we keep the law of Moses . . .

and for this cause it is sanctified unto us for righteousness

The critical text will retain the original *this* in both instances.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 4:5 the use of *this* in “for this cause” (the earliest extant reading).

■ **Jacob 4:5**

even as it was accounted unto Abraham in the wilderness

to be obedient unto the commands of God in offering up his son Isaac

which [was 1A | is BCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] a similitude of God and his Only Begotten Son

The 1837 edition introduced the present-tense *is* in place of the original past-tense *was*. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, so one might question whether the 1837 change to *is* was actually intended. The past-tense *was* also agrees with the past tense in the main clause (“it **was** accounted”).

The use of the past tense suggests the possibility that Abraham himself realized (even if only afterwards) the symbolism in the sacrifice of his son Isaac. Of course, any act of symbolism in the past can remain symbolic in the present, so the switch to the present tense is not really necessary.

It is also possible to interpret the past-tense *was* in the relative clause as a case of tense backshifting, where the *was* in the relative clause “which **was** a similitude of God and his Only Begotten Son” occurs because the preceding clause is in the past tense (“even as it **was** accounted unto Abraham in the wilderness”). A striking instance of such usage is found later in Jacob 7:22 (“which **was** in heaven); this example of *was* has never been replaced by the present-tense *is*:

Jacob 7:22

and this thing was pleasing unto me Jacob
for I had requested it of my Father which **was** in heaven
for he had heard my cry and answered my prayer

The whole passage in Jacob 7:22 is in the past tense (“was pleasing . . . had requested . . . had heard”), including the relative clause “which **was** in heaven”. Of course, we expect “my Father which **is** in heaven”. For further discussion of the possibility of tense backshifting in relative clauses, see the discussion under Jacob 7:22.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 4:5 the past-tense *was*, the reading in the printer’s manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here).

■ **Jacob 4:7**

*nevertheless the Lord God sheweth us our **weakness**
that we may know that
it is by his grace and his great condescensions unto the children of men
that we have power to do these things*

Although here in Jacob 4:7 the invariant form is the singular *weakness*, its meaning may very well be the plural ‘weaknesses’. As discussed under 2 Nephi 31:18, there is some evidence that the word *witness*, as a verb, seems to have twice stood for ‘witnesses’, the third person singular present, in the original Book of Mormon text (also see under 3 Nephi 16:6). Contextual evidence suggests that the noun *wilderness* may stand for ‘wildernesses’ in Alma 34:26 (see the discussion there). As explained under 2 Nephi 31:18, words ending in *-ness* commonly failed to take the expected inflectional *-es* ending in earlier English; such bare forms appear to have occasionally occurred in the original Book of Mormon text.

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out that a later passage in the book of Ether seems to uniformly use the form *weakness* to stand for ‘weaknesses’:

Ether 12:27–28

and if men come unto me I will shew unto them their **weakness**
I give unto men **weakness** that they may be humble
and my grace is sufficient for all men that humble themselves before me
for if they humble themselves before me and have faith in me
then will I make **weak things** become strong unto them
behold I will shew unto the Gentiles their **weakness**

Note especially the use in this passage of *weak things*, a plural form, that seems to act as a plural substitute for *weakness* ‘weaknesses’. In other words, the clause containing *weak things* could be interpreted as meaning ‘then will I make **weaknesses** become **strengths** unto them’.

Summary: Maintain *weakness* in Jacob 4:7, with the understanding that this form may mean ‘weaknesses’.

■ Jacob 4:9

wherefore if God being able to speak

and the [world 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | word G] was

and to speak and man was [NULL > created 1 | created ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] . . .

The typesetter for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally misread *world* as *word*. There may have been some marginal influence here from the well-known phrase “and the word was” in John 1:1: “In the beginning was the Word **and the Word was** with God **and the Word was** God”. The passage here in Jacob 4, of course, refers to Genesis 1, where God spoke and created both the world and man (as in verse 1, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth”; and in verses 26–27, “and God said let us make **man** in our image . . . so God **created** man in his *own* image”).

Also relevant to the creation account in Genesis 1 is an error that Oliver Cowdery initially made when he copied this passage from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} —namely, when he initially wrote “and man was” but then almost immediately corrected his error by supralinearly inserting the word *created* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Oliver’s error was undoubtedly influenced by the partial parallelism of the previous clause (where the word *created* does not appear):

to speak and the world was
and **to speak and man** **was created**

Summary: Maintain the original text in Jacob 4:9, “and the world was . . . and man was **created**”.

■ Jacob 4:11

wherefore beloved [NULL >jg brethren 1 | brethren ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

be reconciled unto him

In the printer’s manuscript, the word *brethren* was supralinearly inserted after *beloved* in darker ink, not by Oliver Cowdery (the original hand in this part of \mathcal{P}) but instead by another hand. The word is definitely not in the hand of the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} or in the hand of Hyrum Smith, the two other scribes in \mathcal{P} . In other words, this emendation does not appear to be the result of scribal proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{G} . Rather, the intrusive *brethren* appears to be in the hand of John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor. (Compare this insertion with the words *did excel* that Gilbert inserted earlier in 2 Nephi 20:10, an Isaiah passage.) Here in Jacob 4:11, Gilbert may have felt that the word *brethren* was missing. Perhaps he had gotten used to reading “beloved brethren” in his copy and the use of *beloved* alone seemed like it lacked a following head noun.

In his various discourses, Jacob usually uses *beloved brethren* (19 times), but the bare *beloved* occurs two other times. Here in the book of Jacob, we have the following sequence of occurrences of “beloved (brethren)” in the original text:

Jacob 2:2	now my beloved brethren / I Jacob according to . . .
Jacob 4:2	our children and also our beloved brethren
Jacob 4:3	our beloved brethren and our children
Jacob 4:11	wherefore beloved / be reconciled unto him
Jacob 4:12	and now beloved / marvel not that . . .
Jacob 4:17	and now my beloved / how is it possible that . . .
Jacob 4:18	behold my beloved brethren / I will unfold this mystery
Jacob 6:5	wherefore my beloved brethren / I beseech of you . . .
Jacob 6:11	O then my beloved brethren / repent ye

According to the earliest textual sources, the bare *beloved* occurs three times in a row, first here in verse 11 and then the next two times (in verses 12 and 17). And the example in verse 11 is the first time the bare *beloved* occurs in the text, which may be the reason why John Gilbert decided to emend the text by adding *brethren*. But he did not continue making this emendation, thus leaving the two following cases of bare *beloved* unchanged. Notice also that there is no possessive pronoun before *beloved* in verse 11 or in verse 12; all the other examples in the book of Jacob are preceded by either *my* or *our*. Perhaps the lack of the expected possessive pronoun *my* may have also played a role in making “wherefore beloved” sound strange to Gilbert.

Thus the conscious addition of *brethren* here in Jacob 4:11 appears to be secondary. The critical text will restore the original bare *beloved* and maintain the two following cases of the same (in verses 12 and 17).

Summary: Remove the intrusive *brethren* in Jacob 4:11 that was apparently inserted by the 1830 compositor in order to make the text more consistent with previous usage.

■ Jacob 4:11

wherefore beloved

be reconciled unto him through the atonement of Christ his Only Begotten Son

[*that* 1A | *and* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *That* PS] *ye may obtain a resurrection*

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

according to the power of the resurrection which is in Christ

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and *be presented as the firstfruits of Christ unto God*

The original text’s *that* introduces a conjunctive resultive clause (that is, “ye may obtain a resurrection . . . **and** be presented as the firstfruits of Christ unto God”). The 1837 edition changed the subordinate conjunction *that* to *and*, perhaps because the editor did not want the reader to interpret the passage as saying that the resurrection was contingent upon being reconciled to God. But the original meaning is that we need to be reconciled to God so that we can be resurrected in the first resurrection (“**and** be presented as the firstfruits of Christ”). This interpretation is supported by language elsewhere that identifies Christ himself as the firstfruits unto God since he was the first one resurrected:

2 Nephi 2:8–9

that he may bring to pass the resurrection of the dead
being the first that should rise
wherefore he is the firstfruits unto God

This example from 2 Nephi 2 suggests that in Jacob 4:1 the original *that* extends beyond the initial reference to the resurrection to include the additional clause that refers to the firstfruits of the resurrection. The replacement of *that* with *and* weakens the logical connection between these two conjoined clauses. In accord with the reading in \mathcal{P} , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that*.

In addition to restoring the *that*, the commas separating off the intervening phrase “according to the power of the resurrection which is in Christ” should probably be eliminated. (The commas were introduced in the 1830 edition and have been present in all subsequent editions.) Removing the commas might help the reader interpret the second clause as the result of being reconciled to God.

Summary: Restore the original *that* in Jacob 4:11 so the clausal relationship is correctly understood; also remove the commas around “according to the power of the resurrection which is in Christ” in order to help the reader include the second clause (“and be presented as the firstfruits of Christ unto God”) as a part of the reconciliation with God.

■ **Jacob 4:11**

wherefore beloved
be reconciled unto him through the atonement of Christ his Only Begotten Son
that ye may obtain a resurrection
according to the power of the resurrection which is in Christ
and be presented as the firstfruits of Christ unto God
having faith and obtained *a good hope of glory in him*
before he manifesteth himself in the flesh

Here in Jacob 4:11, one wonders if the present participle *having* is missing before *obtained*. The text appears to mean ‘**having** faith and **having** obtained a good hope of glory in him’. What seems unusual here is that the ellipsis involves two different uses of the verb *have*. The *having* before *faith* is the main verb *have*, while the *having* before *obtained* would be the perfect auxiliary *have*. Elsewhere the text always repeats *having* for such mixed conjuncts, although only some use *and* to join the conjuncts (each marked below with an asterisk):

* Mosiah 4:3 (perfective *having*, main verb *having*)

having received a remission of their sins
and having peace of conscience

Mosiah 15:9 (perfective *having*, main verb *having*)

having ascended into heaven
having the bowels of mercy

* Alma 9:21 (perfective *having*, main verb *having*)
 having been visited by the Spirit of God
 having conversed with angels
 and **having been spoken** unto by the voice of the Lord
and having the spirit of prophecy

Alma 47:36 (main verb *having*, perfective *having*)
having the same instruction and the same information of the Nephites
 yea **having been instructed** in the same knowledge of the Lord

* 3 Nephi 4:4 (main verb *having*, perfective *having*)
 and the Nephites being in one body
 and **having** so great a number
and having reserved for themselves provisions and horses and cattle
 and flocks of every kind

It is quite possible that in Jacob 4:11 the original text had *having* before *obtained* but that it was accidentally dropped in the early transmission of the text. Of course, even an emended “**having** faith and **having** obtained a good hope” seems awkward since the two *having*’s are so close. Of course, such extreme proximity of the two *having*’s could have been the source for removing the second one. Usually the text does not have repeated *having*’s under conditions of proximity, as in the following two examples with conjoined past participles:

Mosiah 15:9	having redeemed them and satisfied the demands of justice
Mosiah 28:11	and after having translated and caused to be written the records

But there is one exception:

Helaman 2:6	having been out by night and having obtained through disguise a knowledge of those plans
-------------	---

Similarly, the King James Bible typically avoids repeating *having* under conditions of proximity:

Judges 19:3	having his servant with him and a couple of asses
Jeremiah 41:5	having their beards shaven and their clothes rent

But there is one striking exception involving nouns:

Nehemiah 10:28	every one having knowledge and having understanding
----------------	---

There is also evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted *having*, if only momentarily, as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} ; for both of the following examples, *having* is the perfect auxiliary:

Mosiah 18:32
 but behold it came to pass that the king
 [NULL >+ *having* 1 | *having* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] discovered
 a movement among the people
 sent his servants to watch them

Alma 58:23
 and it came to pass that we took our course
 after [*having* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *having* 1] traveled
 much in the wilderness towards the land of Zarahemla

For a third possible case where *having* might have been accidentally omitted, see the discussion under Mosiah 15:9 regarding the current reading “**having broken** the bands of death / **taken** upon himself their iniquity”.

The current reading in Jacob 4:11 is clearly exceptional and probably represents a case where the closeness of two *having*’s led to the second one being accidentally dropped. The critical text will emend the text in Jacob 4:11 to read “having faith and **having** obtained a good hope in him”.

David Calabro (personal communication) proposes an alternative emendation: “having obtained faith and a good hope of glory in him”. He suggests that the word order got mixed up here and that the verb form *obtained* was accidentally shifted from before *faith* to before *a good hope*. There are two problems here: first, there are no examples of such a shift in word order in the entire history of the text; second, the Book of Mormon text consistently refers to people as “having faith”, never to them as “obtaining faith”. On the other hand, people can obtain and keep hope:

Jacob 4:6

and having all these witnesses we **obtain a hope**
and our faith becometh unshaken

Alma 22:16

yea if thou repent of all thy sins
and will bow down before God and call on his name in faith
believing that ye shall receive
then shalt thou **receive the hope** which thou desirest

Alma 25:16

now they did not suppose that salvation came by the law of Moses
but the law of Moses did serve to strengthen their faith in Christ
and thus they did **retain a hope** through faith unto eternal salvation

Summary: Emend Jacob 4:11 by inserting the perfective form *having* before *obtained* (“having faith and **having** obtained a good hope of glory in him”); the incongruity of the current reading in the text seems quite unacceptable.

■ Jacob 4:11

*that ye may obtain a resurrection
according to the power of the resurrection which is in Christ
and be presented as the firstfruits of Christ unto God
having faith and having obtained a good hope of glory in him
before he [manifesteth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | manifested o] himself in the flesh*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition introduced the past-tense *manifested* in place of the present-tense *manifesteth*. Either tense will work here, although it appears that Jacob is speaking in the eternal present tense; note the use of the present-tense *is* earlier in this verse (“the power of the resurrection which **is** in Christ”). Thus the use of the present-tense *manifesteth* is acceptable, although unexpected. The 1907 past-tense reading has never been followed by any subsequent LDS edition since that vest-pocket edition was never used as a copy-text.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 4:11 the present-tense *manifesteth*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Jacob 5

■ Jacob 5:1–2

*do ye not remember to have read the words of the prophet Zenos
which [1ABCDEFGHIJKPS | he IJLMNOQRT] spake unto the house of Israel saying
hearken O ye house of Israel
and hear the words of me
a prophet of the Lord*

This variant deals with the question of whether *which* originally referred to “the words” or “the prophet Zenos”. If *which* refers to *words*, then the subject for the relative clause seems to be missing, which would then motivate the insertion of *he* (the reading of the LDS text since 1879). If *which* refers to Zenos, then *which* means ‘who’ (and could be edited to *who*, in accord with Joseph Smith’s normal editing of the Book of Mormon text).

There are a number of passages in the Book of Mormon with the construction “the words of X which he spake . . . saying”, where X refers to a person and the relative pronoun *which* refers to the words rather than to the person:

1 Nephi 4:14

I remembered **the words** of the Lord **which he spake** unto me in the wilderness
saying . . .

1 Nephi 22:20

and the Lord will surely prepare a way for his people
unto the fulfilling of **the words** of Moses **which he spake**
saying . . .

Moroni 2:1–2

The words of Christ **which he spake** unto his disciples
—the twelve whom he had chosen—
as he laid his hands upon them and he called them by name
saying . . .

In each of these examples, a direct quote follows the word *saying*. Thus the 1879 emendation of the text in Jacob 5:1 (so that *he* is explicitly stated) is precisely consistent with these examples.

On the other hand, there are examples where an original *which* apparently refers to the person rather than to the words. But in each of these cases, the actual words are not quoted and the word *saying* is lacking:

1 Nephi 15:20

and I did rehearse unto them **the words of Isaiah**
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **spake**
 concerning the restoration of the Jews or of the house of Israel

2 Nephi 6:9

and after that he should manifest himself
 they should scourge him and crucify him
 according to **the words of the angel**
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **spake** it unto me

The earliest text in Jacob 5:1 could be interpreted as an instance of this second type, where *which* means ‘who’. But in terms of narrative structure, the reading in Jacob 5:1 seems to be closer to the first type.

It should also be noted that the King James Bible has an example for each of these two types:

Genesis 39:19

and it came to pass
 when his master heard **the words** of his wife
which she spake unto him **saying**
 after this manner did thy servant to me
 that his wrath was kindled

2 Chronicles 33:18 (*that* is equivalent to *which* ‘who’)

now the rest of the acts of Manasseh
 and his prayer unto his God
 and **the words of the seers**
that spake to him in the name of the LORD God of Israel
 behold they *are written* in the book of the kings of Israel

Notice once more that the Jacob 5:1 example has precisely the same narrative form as the Genesis example—except, of course, for the missing subject pronoun in the relative clause. On the other hand, the Chronicles example provides no direct quote (and therefore the word *saying* is lacking).

We do not have the original manuscript in Jacob 5:1, but it is quite possible that it had a subject *he* that was accidentally deleted during copying. Consider, for instance, the rather numerous examples of where the scribes accidentally omitted the pronoun *he*, sometimes only momentarily, in the early transmission of the text:

Mosiah 27:19 (*he* omitted by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , supplied by Oliver Cowdery while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C})

therefore he was taken by those that were with him and carried helpless
 even until [§2 NULL > §1 *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was laid
 before his father

Alma 5:41 (*he* omitted by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , supplied by Oliver Cowdery while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C})

therefore if a man bringeth forth good works
 [§2 NULL > §1 *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hearkeneth
 unto the voice of the good shepherd

Alma 42:17 (Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *he* in \mathcal{C})

now how could a man repent except he should sin
 how could [NULL > *he* 0 | *he* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sin
 if there was no law

Alma 46:29 (*he* omitted by Oliver Cowdery originally in \mathcal{C} and initially in \mathcal{D} ;

Oliver later supplied the pronoun in \mathcal{C} while copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D})
 therefore fearing that he should not gain the point
 [NULL >+ *he* 0 | NULL > *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] took
 those of his people which would and departed into the land of Nephi

Alma 48:7–8 (Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *he* in \mathcal{C})

Moroni on the other hand had been a preparing the minds of the people
 to be faithful unto the Lord their God
 yea [NULL > *he* 0 | *he* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been strengthening
 the armies of the Nephites

3 Nephi 4:14 (Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *he* in \mathcal{D})

Giddianhi who had stood and fought with boldness was pursued as he fled
 and being weary because of his much fighting
 [NULL > *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was overtaken and slain

3 Nephi 26:15 (*he* omitted by scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} , supplied by Oliver Cowdery
 while proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C})

and it came to pass that
 after [§2 NULL > §1 *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had ascended
 into heaven . . .

In addition to the two straightforward interpretations of the relative pronoun *which* in Jacob 5:1, there is a third possibility: namely, the relative clause actually states that “the words . . . spake unto the house of Israel”. There are at least two examples where the Book of Mormon text refers to a record or its words as speaking:

2 Nephi 27:13–14

for the Lord God hath said that
the words of the faithful **should speak** as if it were from the dead
 wherefore the Lord God will proceed to bring forth **the words of the book**

Ether 1:3

and as I suppose that **the first part of this record**
which speaketh concerning the creation of the world and also of Adam . . .

Similarly, the verb *say* can be used to refer to what was actually written, not spoken, as in the end of Alma 30 when Korihor has been struck dumb (and perhaps deaf too) by Alma:

Alma 30:51, 52, 54–55

and now when the chief judge saw this
 he put forth his hand and **wrote** unto Korihor **saying** . . .
 and Korihor put forth his hand and **wrote saying** . . .
 now when he had **said** this
 he besought that Alma should pray unto God
 that the curse might be taken from him
 but Alma **said** unto him . . .

Thus the words of the prophet Zenos in Jacob 5:1 could be thought of as speaking to the house of Israel.

So there are three possible ways to interpret the earliest text in Jacob 5:1: (1) the relative pronoun *which* means ‘who’ and refers to Zenos speaking; (2) *which* means ‘which’ and refers to the words themselves as speaking; or (3) *which* is the direct object in the relative clause and there is a missing subject pronoun, *he*. The earliest reading in Jacob 5:1, except for the missing pronoun *he*, is otherwise identical to three other introductions to long quotations, both in specific word usage and in narrative patterning. The critical text will therefore accept the emended reading that was introduced into the LDS text in 1879. The most reasonable assumption is that early in the transmission of the text, the pronoun *he* was accidentally omitted in Jacob 5:1.

Summary: Maintain the 1879 emendation to Jacob 5:1, where the subject pronoun *he* was added to the relative clause (“the words of the prophet Zenos which **he** spake unto the house of Israel saying . . .”); the reading of the earliest text is very close in narrative structure to several similar examples, including two in the small plates of Nephi.

■ Jacob 5:8

*and behold saith the Lord of the vineyard
I will take away many of these young and tender branches
and I will graft them whithersoever I will*

Except for here in Jacob 5:8, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) changed all the narrative examples of *saith* in the olive tree allegory to *said* (30 times). There is one other *saith*, which prefaces the allegory in verse 3 (“for behold—thus **saith** the Lord—I will liken thee O house of Israel like unto a tame olive tree”), but this *saith* is not, strictly speaking, a part of the narrative (that is, between the master of the vineyard and his servant) in the allegory. Apparently, Joseph missed editing the *saith* in Jacob 5:8 because the inverted word order is the same as in the familiar “thus saith the Lord”. For two other examples of where Joseph missed editing *saith* in a similar expression, see 1 Nephi 17:53 (“saith the Lord”) and 2 Nephi 6:11 (“for thus saith the angel”).

The critical text will, of course, restore all instances of the historical present that are found in the earliest textual sources, including here in the allegory of the olive tree. For one case where the historical present could be in error, see the discussion regarding *calleth* under Jacob 5:75. For a complete list of all the changes from the historical present to the past tense, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore each instance of the historical present tense *saith* throughout the allegory of the olive tree (Jacob 5); the original *saith* in Jacob 5:8 that has never been edited to *said* will, of course, be maintained as *saith*.

■ Jacob 5:8

and behold saith the Lord of the vineyard
I take away many of these young and tender branches
and I will graft them whithersoever I will

The phrase “I take” seems strange here since the Lord of the vineyard is actually announcing what he is going to do, not what he is in the process of doing. We do not have the original manuscript here, but it appears that the helping verb *will* was accidentally dropped out during the early transmission of the text. Support for this emendation comes from the rest of the text for this verse, especially the last part, which parallels the first part of the verse except that “I will take” is found rather than “I take”:

Jacob 5:8
 wherefore **I will take** these young and tender branches
 and **I will graft** them whithersoever I will

This parallel language shows that the Lord of the vineyard has not yet begun to take away these young and tender branches, but he will. In fact, throughout the allegory, the Lord of the vineyard generally refers to what he is going to do by using the modal verbs *will* and *shall*, with *will* predominating (22 to 5).

There is also considerable evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in Jacob 5 for \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P} , sometimes omitted the modal *will*. In the following four examples, Oliver initially omitted the *will* in the printer’s manuscript (including one in Jacob 5):

Jacob 5:76
 for behold for a long time
 [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I lay up
 of the fruit of my vineyard unto mine own self

Alma 18:17
 therefore whatsoever thou desirest which is right
 that [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I do

Alma 44:14
 so shall ye fall to the earth
 except ye [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] deliver up
 your weapons of war

Helaman 16:21
 and thus will they keep us in ignorance
 if we [*will* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *will* 1] yield ourselves
 unto them all the days of our lives

For one more (but more complex) example of such an initial omission in \mathcal{P} , see Alma 22:16.

Summary: Emend Jacob 5:8 by adding the modal verb *will* to the verb *take* near the beginning of the verse (“**I will** take away many of these young and tender branches”), thus making the phraseology agree with the parallel clause later in the verse (“**I will** take these young and tender branches”); some kind of modal verb seems necessary here at the beginning of Jacob 5:8.

■ Jacob 5:10

*and it came to pass that
the servant of the Lord of the vineyard [done 1A | did BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
according to the word of the Lord of the vineyard
and grafted in the branches of the wild olive tree*

The original text had ten occurrences of *done* as the simple past-tense form for the verb *do* (instead of the standard *did*). Joseph Smith replaced nine of these instances with the standard *did* in his editing for the 1837 edition, as in this example. He missed one in Ether 9:29, which ended up being edited to *did* in the 1874 RLDS edition and in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition. Also see 1 Nephi 7:20 for one instance of *done* that was accidentally introduced in the 1849 LDS edition but removed decades later (first in the 1888 LDS edition). For a complete list of this nonstandard use of *done*, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard past-tense form *done* in Jacob 5:10 and elsewhere, whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ Jacob 5:13

*and I do it that I [may 1ABCDEFGHIKPRST | might FIJLMNOQ] preserve unto myself
the natural branches of the tree*

Here the 1852 LDS edition accidentally replaced the modal verb *may* with *might*. The 1920 edition restored the correct reading to the LDS text; the RLDS text has maintained the original *may*, as will the critical text.

There has been a considerable amount of unintended shifting between these two modal verbs elsewhere in the text, six times in the manuscripts and three times in the 1841 British edition:

1 Nephi 19:23 (*might* to *may*, Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{O})

but that I [*may* > *might* 0 | *might* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] more fully persuade them to believe in the Lord their Redeemer

Alma 20:24 (*may* to *might*, 1841 edition)

and also that Lamoni [*may* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *might* D] retain his kingdom

Alma 22:15 (*may* to *might*, 1841 edition)

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

Alma 38:9 (*might* to *may*, Oliver Cowdery's error in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P})

and now my son I have told you this
that ye [*might* 0 | *may* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] learn wisdom

Alma 52:19 (*might* to *may*, Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{O})

that they [*may* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **might** gain advantage over them

Alma 56:43 (*may* to *might*, Oliver Cowdery’s error in copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D})
 behold we know not but they have halted for the purpose
 that we should come against them
 that they [*may* 0 | *might* 1 ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | *should* HK] catch us
 in their snare

Alma 58:19 (*might* to *may*, Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{C})
 for they were exceedingly desirous to overtake us
 that they [*may* > *might* 0 | *might* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] slay us

Helaman 3:11 (*might* to *may*, 1841 edition)
 and thus they did enable the people in the land northward
 that they [*might* 0 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *may* D] build many cities

3 Nephi 27:14 (*might* to *may*, initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{D})
 and my Father sent me
 that I [*may* > *might* 1 | *might* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be lifted up
 upon the cross

In six cases, Joseph Smith edited *might* to *may*, apparently in order to avoid the conditional sense that *might* has taken on in English:

1 Nephi 3:19
 that we [*might* 0A | *might* >js *may* 1 | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] preserve
 unto our children the language of our fathers

2 Nephi 2:26
 that he [*might* >js *may* 1 | *might* A | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] redeem
 the children of men from the fall

Alma 13:26
 that the words of our fathers
 [*might* >js *may* 1 | *might* A | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be fulfilled

Alma 17:26
 that they [*might* >js *may* 1 | *might* A | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have water

Alma 22:7
 that they [*might* >js *may* 1 | *might* A | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 assemble themselves together to worship him

Alma 34:17
 that ye [*might* 0A | *might* >js *may* 1 | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] begin
 to exercise your faith unto repentance

In each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine which modal is correct. For further discussion, see under MODALS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original modal *may* in Jacob 5:13 (“that I **may** preserve unto myself the natural branches of the tree”).

■ Jacob 5:13–14

and these will I place

in the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **part** of my vineyard . . .

the Lord of the vineyard went his way and hid the natural branches of the tame olive tree

in the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **parts** of the vineyard

In the olive tree allegory, the Lord of the vineyard places the branches from the tame olive tree in various faraway places in the vineyard. We have six references to these “nithermost part(s)”. (For discussion of *nithermost* versus *nethermost*, see below.) In each case, the plural *parts* is required by the context since the Lord of the vineyard always refers to each of the different branches that were distributed throughout those parts; he also travels from one place to another, and some of the spots are poor and one is very good (see verses 20–25 and verses 38–40). In no instance can the singular *part* be used to refer to all of “the nithermost parts” of the vineyard. In fact, when the text in Jacob 5 refers to one of these particular places, the word used is always *spot* rather than *part*:

Jacob 5:21	it was the poorest spot in all the land of thy vineyard
Jacob 5:22	I knew that it was a poor spot of ground
Jacob 5:23	this spot of ground was poorer than the first
Jacob 5:25	this have I planted in a good spot of ground
Jacob 5:43	this last . . . I did plant in a good spot of ground
Jacob 5:44	I also cut down that which cumbered this spot of ground

The plural *parts* is also used in one of these cases to refer to various places in the vineyard but without the word *nithermost*:

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

In all, there are seven instances of *part(s)* in Jacob 5. Besides the two in verses 13–14 and the one in verse 43 (just cited), there are three invariant cases of the plural *parts*:

Jacob 5:38
 let us go down
 into the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **parts**
 of the vineyard

Jacob 5:39
 they went down
 into the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **parts**
 of the vineyard

Jacob 5:52
 wherefore let us take of the branches of these which I have planted
 in the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **parts**
 of my vineyard

In one case, the printer’s manuscript originally had *parts*, but the 1830 typesetter accidentally changed it to *part*:

Jacob 5:19

come let us go
to the [*nithermost* 1 | *nethermost* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*parts* 1PS | *part* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] of the vineyard

The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural *parts* in verse 19. Thus in only one case, in verse 13, does the printer’s manuscript itself have the singular *part*, and this singular form has been followed in all the printed editions. We do not have the original manuscript for this instance, but it is quite clear from the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery frequently added and deleted final *s*’s in his copy work (see, for instance, the discussion regarding *border(s)* and *shore(s)* under 1 Nephi 2:5). Here in Jacob 5, the allegory itself requires *parts* for all six cases of “nithermost part(s)”.

The printer’s manuscript consistently has *nithermost* instead of the standard *nethermost* (the form found in all the printed editions). The *i* vowel can be found in the Old English stem, *niðer* ‘lower’, with the base word *nither* being retained in northern British and Scottish dialects (at least as a verb meaning ‘to bring low’, used metaphorically). In other British dialects, the competing form *nether* (with citations dating from Middle English) has replaced *nither*. (For discussion and examples, see the Oxford English Dictionary under *nether* and *nither*.) The consistency of the spelling *nithermost* in the printer’s manuscript argues for including this spelling in the critical text (although this particular form could be the result of dialectal overlay on the part of Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith).

Summary: Emend *part* in Jacob 5:13 to read *parts*; also restore the plural *parts* in Jacob 5:19; maintain the dialectal *nithermost* instead of the standard *nethermost* throughout the allegory.

■ Jacob 5:17

*and it came to pass that the Lord of the vineyard looked
and beheld the tree [in the which 1 | in the which ABCDEFGHIJKNOPRST | in which LMQ]
the wild olive branches had been grafted*

As noted under 1 Nephi 3:2, the archaic *in the which* has sometimes been replaced in the text with *in which*. In this instance, the definite article *the* was omitted in three early 20th-century LDS editions (1902, 1905, and 1911). The 1920 LDS edition restored the *the*, undoubtedly by reference to the earlier text. For a general discussion, see IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original *in the which* in Jacob 5:17.

■ Jacob 5:17

*and it had [sprang 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOP | sprang > sprung M | sprung QRST] forth
and [began 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQ | begun RST] to bear fruit*

The original text frequently used the simple past-tense form of the verb for the past participle. Here we have an example of *had sprang*, which was edited to *had sprung* in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition. The conjoined *began* has also been interpreted as a past participle and therefore edited to *begun* in both the LDS text (in 1920) and the RLDS text (in 1953). It is possible, however, that this *began* could be interpreted as an instance of the simple past tense. For discussion of this second possibility, see under 1 Nephi 1:14.

This sentence in Jacob 5 is the only example in the text where the verb *spring* takes the past participial form. There are no instances of the simple past tense for this verb, only three examples of the base form *spring*. On the other hand, there are six cases of the past participial *began* and three of *begun* (see under Jacob 2:12 for the list). Also see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3 for a complete discussion of past participial forms in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Restore the original verb forms *sprang* and *began* in Jacob 5:17.

■ Jacob 5:18

*behold the branches of the wild tree [have > hath 1 | hath ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | have RT]
taken hold of the moisture of the root thereof
that the root thereof **hath** brought forth much strength
and because of the much strength of the root thereof
the wild branches [hath >js have 1 | hath AMQ | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST] brought forth
tame fruit*

When copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the branches of the wild tree **have** taken hold”, which is correct according to standard English grammar, but then almost immediately Oliver corrected the *have* to *hath* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *hath*). Undoubtedly, the original manuscript (not extant here) read *hath*. Present-tense verbs with plural subjects frequently took the biblical third person singular ending *-(e)th* in the original Book of Mormon text. In accord with standard English, the 1920 LDS edition replaced this *hath* in Jacob 5:18 with the plural *have*.

Similarly, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the instance of *hath* in “the wild branches **hath** brought forth wild fruit” with *have*. In this second case, the 1905 LDS edition unintentionally restored the *hath*; the typesetter was probably influenced by the similar phraseology of the preceding “the root thereof **hath** brought forth much strength” (where the subject noun *root* is in the singular and therefore *hath* has never been edited to *have*). The 1911 LDS edition followed the 1905 *hath*, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the grammatically emended *have* that had been earlier introduced into the 1837 edition. For a complete discussion of this variation in the text, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Jacob 5 has many similar examples of the editing of *hath* to *have*, providing the subject is plural:

Jacob 5:19

and behold if the natural branches of the tree
 [hath 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | have RT] not brought forth much fruit also . . .

Jacob 5:46

the trees thereof [hath >js have 1 | hath AEFIJLMNQ | hath > have B |
 have CDGHKOPRST] become corrupted

Jacob 5:48

[hath 0 | hath >js has 1 | Hath A | Has BDP | Have CGHKS | has EFIJLN | has > have M |
 have OQRT] not the branches thereof overcame the roots which are good

Jacob 5:48

is not this the cause that the trees of thy vineyard
 [hath 0A | hath >js have 1 | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] become corrupted

Jacob 5:75

for because that **ye have** been diligent in laboring with me in my vineyard
 and **have** kept my commandments
 and [hath >js have 1 | hath A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brought unto me
 again the natural fruit . . .

The last example is somewhat different in that the original form *hath* takes the second person plural pronoun *ye* as its subject (“ye have . . . and have . . . and hath”). In fact, this last passage may have read “ye have . . . and have . . . and **it** hath” in the original text. For discussion, see under Jacob 5:75.

Summary: Maintain the original use of *hath* with plural subjects whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources (twice here in Jacob 5:18 and elsewhere in Jacob 5).

■ Jacob 5:19

come let us go
to the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [parts 1PS | part ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *of the vineyard*

The plural *parts* is consistently used in the original text for the olive tree allegory, but here in verse 19 the 1830 compositor accidentally set the singular *part*. In verse 13, Oliver Cowdery apparently made the same error during the early transmission of the text, either in \mathcal{O} or in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . See the discussion under Jacob 5:13–14 for the dialectal form *nithermost* as well as for why *parts* should be in the plural throughout Jacob 5.

■ Jacob 5:19

that I may lay up [of 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *the fruit thereof*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the preposition *of* here in Jacob 5:19, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. The *of* adds a partitive sense to the meaning. Here in Jacob 5 (the olive tree allegory), the direct object for the phrasal verb “lay up” does not usually take the partitive *of*:

Jacob 5

Jacob 5:13	that I may lay up fruit thereof
Jacob 5:18	I shall lay up much fruit
Jacob 5:18	the fruit thereof I shall lay up
Jacob 5:20	take of the fruit thereof and lay it up
Jacob 5:23	gather it and lay it up
Jacob 5:27	that thou canst lay it up
Jacob 5:29	I must lay up fruit
Jacob 5:31	I have laid up unto myself against the season much fruit
Jacob 5:46	these I had hope to preserve to have laid up fruit thereof
Jacob 5:71	the fruit which I shall lay up

Note, in particular, that for the last example listed above (in verse 71), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “ye shall have joy in the fruit **of** which I shall lay up” but then almost immediately corrected the text by crossing out the *of*. Even so, the partitive *of* is found elsewhere in the olive tree allegory:

Jacob 5:76	for a long time will I lay up of the fruit of my vineyard
Jacob 5:76	I will lay up unto mine own self of the fruit

Thus the occurrence of *of* is possible, and it should be maintained in verse 19 and twice in verse 76 (but not in verse 71).

Summary: Retain the partitive *of* in Jacob 5:19 (“that I may lay up **of** the fruit thereof”).

■ **Jacob 5:20**

*and it came to pass that they went forth
whither the master [NULL > of the vineyard 1 | of the vineyard APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR]
had hid the natural branches of the tree*

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote simply “the master”, then corrected the text by inserting “of the vineyard”. The level of ink flow is the same, which suggests that his correction here in \mathfrak{D} is an almost immediate one and is based on the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

Later, the 1837 edition omitted the phrase once more, probably by accident. There is nothing wrong with “the master of the vineyard”, nor was it marked for deletion by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. In fact, this phrase occurs two other times in the olive tree allegory and without variation:

Jacob 5:4	and it came to pass that the master of the vineyard went forth
Jacob 5:7	and it came to pass that the master of the vineyard saw it

The phrase “the master” (that is, without “of the vineyard”) occurs nowhere else in the allegory. There are four occurrences of “his master” (verses 16, 21, 34, and 48), where of course it would be inappropriate to add “of the vineyard”.

Summary: Restore the whole phrase “the master of the vineyard” to Jacob 5:20, the expression that is consistent with the reading of the printer’s manuscript as well as with the two other occurrences of this phrase in the allegory.

■ Jacob 5:20

and it hath brought forth much [NULL > *fruit* 1 | *fruit* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery’s insertion of *fruit* in the printer’s manuscript seems to be a virtually immediate correction to the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). The level of ink flow is the same. And *much* is never otherwise used as the head of a noun phrase in the olive tree allegory; for noun phrases, we find *much* used only as the determiner for a head noun, such as “much strength” (three times) and “much (evil) fruit” (ten times). Moreover, in the allegory there are 29 clauses that refer to “bringing forth fruit”, including this one in Jacob 5:20.

Summary: Retain “much fruit” in Jacob 5:20, Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{P} ; the original manuscript, no longer extant here, undoubtedly read this way.

■ Jacob 5:21

for behold it was the poorest spot

in all the land of [*thy* 1ABDEPST | *the* CGHIJKLMNOPQR | *thy* > *the* F] *vineyard*

The 1981 edition, along with the two 20th-century RLDS editions, has the original *thy*. The change to *the* first showed up in the 1840 edition, probably as a typo. The incorrect *the* entered the LDS text in the second printing of the 1852 British edition; for that printing, the stereotyped plates were corrected from *thy* to *the* by consulting the 1840 edition. Throughout the history of the text, the visually similar determiners *thy* and *the* have often been mixed up. (For a list of instances in the manuscripts and the 1830 edition where *thy* was replaced by *the*, if only momentarily, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 20:30.)

Elsewhere in the text, there are no examples of “the land of **the** vineyard”, but in the olive tree allegory there are two examples of “the land of **my** vineyard” (in Jacob 5:43 and Jacob 5:69). So we do expect a possessive pronoun like *my* or *thy* before *vineyard* in the allegory.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 2:21 the original possessive pronoun *thy* in “the land of thy vineyard”.

■ Jacob 5:23

behold I have planted another branch

[NULL > *of the tree* 1 | *of the tree* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *also*

Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted “of the tree” with no change in the level of ink flow. Since either reading (with or without “of the tree”) seems quite possible here, we can surmise that Oliver’s correction was nearly immediate and not due to any desire to edit the text. Elsewhere in the allegory, we have one example of the singular *branch* postmodified by “of the tree”:

Jacob 5:21

how comest thou hither to plant this tree or **this branch of the tree**

There is one more example of *another branch* in the allegory, but for this example (which is nearby in verse 24) there is no following “of the tree”:

Jacob 5:24

look hither and behold **another branch** also which I have planted

Summary: Follow in Jacob 5:23 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“another branch of the tree”).

■ **Jacob 5:24**

behold that I have nourished [1 | it ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] also

Here in Jacob 5:24, the 1830 typesetter added *it* since he interpreted the *that* as a subordinate conjunction rather than as a direct object. We do not have the original manuscript here, but it is quite reasonable to assume that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the small word *it* as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or while copying from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} .

When comparing the two possible readings from a usage point of view, we discover evidence both for and against each reading. The original Book of Mormon text has a number of examples of “behold that” where *behold* is in the imperative and *that* is the subordinate conjunction (although some cases have a short intervening phrase, each marked below with an asterisk):

* 1 Nephi 22:15

for **behold** saith the prophet **that** the time cometh speedily
that Satan shall have no more power over the hearts of the children of men

* 2 Nephi 6:2

behold my beloved brethren **that** I Jacob
having been called of God and ordained after the manner of his holy order . . .

Mosiah 4:5

for **behold that** if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time
hath awakened you to a sense of your nothingness . . .

Moroni 8:22

for **behold that** all little children are alive in Christ

On the other hand, in the verse immediately following Jacob 5:24, we have a direct object, *this*, coming directly after an imperative *behold*:

Jacob 5:25

behold **this** have I planted in a good spot of ground

However, note here that inversion has taken place: the helping verb *have* comes before the subject pronoun *I*, whereas the example in verse 24 has the noninverted order “behold that **I have** nourished”. Still, the Book of Mormon allows either inverted or noninverted order after a clause-initial direct object pronoun such as *this*:

□ *inverted examples*

1 Nephi 13:27	and all this have they done
1 Nephi 19:4	and now this have I done
Jacob 5:25	behold this have I planted

□ *noninverted examples*

1 Nephi 3:16	and all this he hath done
Alma 10:10	and this he hath done
Alma 60:9	yea and this they have done
Helaman 5:6	and this I have done

But in all these examples the direct object pronoun is *this* rather than *that*; besides the possible example here in Jacob 5:24, there are no examples of the pronoun *that* serving as the direct object in initial position.

Finally, when we consider the verb *nourish* in the olive tree allegory, we discover that (when-ever there is a choice) the direct object always occurs after the verb. In fact, there are ten instances where the verb *nourish* is followed by the direct object pronoun *it* (besides the potential one here in Jacob 5:24):

Jacob 5:4	I will prune it and dig about it and nourish it
Jacob 5:5	he pruned it and digged about it and nourished it
Jacob 5:12	watch the tree and nourish it
Jacob 5:20	this long time have I nourished it
Jacob 5:22	I have nourished it this long time
Jacob 5:23	I have nourished it this long time
Jacob 5:25	and I have nourished it this long time
Jacob 5:27	let us prune it and dig about it and nourish it a little longer
Jacob 5:47	have I slackened mine hand that I have not nourished it
Jacob 5:47	I have nourished it and I have digged about it and I have pruned it

All of this internal evidence suggests that interpreting *that* in Jacob 5:24 as a direct object pronoun is considerably more unusual than interpreting it as a subordinate conjunction following the imperative *behold*, although the latter construction is relatively rare in the text. Moreover, there is scribal evidence for the accidental omission of the object pronoun *it*, as in the following clear example where Oliver Cowdery momentarily omitted the word while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 51:25
 leaving men in every city
 to maintain and defend [*it* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *it* 1]

In this instance, \mathcal{O} is extant and has the *it*.

Summary: Accept the 1830 typesetter's inserted *it* in Jacob 5:24 ("behold that I have nourished **it** also"); the object pronoun *it* could have readily been omitted while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} or as Oliver Cowdery was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation.

■ **Jacob 5:29**

*come let us go down [in 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the vineyard
 that we may labor again in the vineyard*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed the preposition from *in* (the reading in the printer's manuscript) to *into*. Whenever the verb involves motion from one place to another and the adverb

down occurs, the Book of Mormon text nearly always uses the preposition *to*, *unto*, or *into* to describe the place one is going to—that is, the preposition contains the morpheme *to*. Consider the following sampling from those cases where the preposition is *into*:

1 Nephi 3:4	and bring them down hither into the wilderness
1 Nephi 18:5	we should arise and go down into the ship
2 Nephi 31:13	by following your Lord and Savior down into the water
Mosiah 7:6	and they went down into the land of Nephi
Alma 43:32	and so down into the borders of the land Manti
Alma 62:23	they were all let down into the city by night
3 Nephi 28:20	and they were cast down into the earth
Ether 1:42	thou shalt go at the head of them down into the valley

There are only two cases for which the preposition does not contain the morpheme *to*. And in both cases, the exceptional preposition is *in*: namely, here in Jacob 5:29 and in 1 Nephi 4:33 (which reads “if he would go down **in** the wilderness with us” in all the textual sources, including \mathcal{O}). For the second of these, evidence from errors made by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} and internal evidence regarding the phrase “in(to) the wilderness” argue that the original text for 1 Nephi 4:33 read “if he would go down **into** the wilderness with us” (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:33).

Here in Jacob 5, all the other instances refer to “going **down into** (the nithermost parts of) the vineyard”:

Jacob 5:15	let us go down into the vineyard
Jacob 5:16	the Lord of the vineyard and also the servant went down into the vineyard
Jacob 5:30	the Lord of the vineyard and the servant went down into the vineyard
Jacob 5:38	let us go down into the nithermost parts of the vineyard
Jacob 5:39	they went down into the nithermost parts of the vineyard

The probable source for the error “**in** the vineyard” in Jacob 5:29 is the use of that very phrase in the following clause:

Jacob 5:29 (proposed original text)
 come let us go down **into the vineyard**
 that we may labor again **in the vineyard**

In anticipation of the following “that we may labor again in the vineyard”, the scribe accidentally wrote down “let us go down **in** the vineyard” instead of the correct “let us go down **into** the vineyard”. This error could have occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or when Oliver copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} (\mathcal{O} is not extant here).

Summary: Accept in Jacob 5:29 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *in* to *into*; elsewhere the text consistently uses *into* rather than *in* in such contexts involving motion and the adverb *down*; the probable source for the error here is the use of *in* in the immediately following clause, “that we may labor again **in** the vineyard”.

■ Jacob 5:35

*the tree **profiteth** me nothing*

and the roots thereof [profiteth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | profit RT] me nothing

As noted in the discussion under the 1 Nephi preface regarding the grammar of “Nephi’s brethren **rebelleth** against him”, the Book of Mormon text permits the biblical *-e(th)* ending with plural subjects. In this particular passage in Jacob 5, the use of this inflectional ending is supported by nearby uses of this phraseology (but where the subject is in the singular):

Jacob 5:32 and it profiteth me nothing

Jacob 5:35 the tree profiteth me nothing

This same use of *profiteth* is also found in Moroni 7:6, 9 (“it profiteth him nothing”) and in the King James Bible, but again only with singular subjects (“it profiteth a man nothing” in Job 34:9 and “it profiteth me nothing” in 1 Corinthians 13:3).

Here in Jacob 5:35 it is possible that the immediately preceding “the tree profiteth me nothing” led Oliver Cowdery early on in the transmission to accidentally add the *-eth* ending to the verb *profit* in the following clause. However, there are so many examples elsewhere of the *-e(th)* ending being used with plural subjects that its use here in Jacob 5:35 should probably be accepted. In each instance, we basically follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the biblically sounding *-e(th)* ending was originally used.

Summary: Restore the inflectional ending *-eth* in Jacob 5:35 (“the roots thereof **profiteth** me nothing”).

■ Jacob 5:37

but behold the wild branches

have [grew >+ grown 1 | grown ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

and have [overran 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQ | overrun RST] the roots thereof

Here the original text had two instances of the simple past-tense verb form being used as the past participle. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “have grew” in \mathcal{P} , but later he edited the *grew* to *grown* by crossing out *grew* and supralinearly inserting *grown*. The change was clearly produced later with a broader quill and a heavier and darker ink flow. Oliver did not, however, correct the “have overran” that immediately follows. That was changed to the standard “have overrun” in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition.

Elsewhere there is only one other example of the past participle for the verb *grow*, and in that instance the form is the standard *grown*:

Alma 32:29

yea nevertheless it **hath** not **grown** up to a perfect knowledge

There are no other examples in the text of the past participle for the compound verb *overrun*. But there are two for the verb *run*, and both of these take the simple past-tense form *ran* in the earliest text:

Mosiah 12:11

even as a dry stalk of the field
 which is [*ran* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | *run* OQRST] over by the beasts
 and trodden under foot

Alma 30:59

and as he went forth amongst them
 behold he was [*ran* 01 | *run* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon
 and trodden down even until he was dead

For further discussion of this use of the simple past-tense form as the past participle, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 25 August 2004) has suggested that the word *overran/overrun* might be an error for *overcame/overcome*. Note that this first sentence in verse 37 is immediately followed by a *because*-clause that uses the verb *overcome*, which suggests that the preceding verb should be identical (in this case, either *overcame* or *overcome*):

Jacob 5:37 (earliest reading except that *overran* is emended to *overcame*)

but behold the wild branches have grew and have **overcame** the roots thereof
 and because that the wild branches have **overcome** the roots thereof
 it hath brought forth much evil fruit

A parallel verse later in the allegory could be used to support this repetition of the verb *overcome*:

Jacob 5:48

hath not the branches thereof
 [*overcame* 01A | *overcome* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the roots
 which are good
 and because that the branches have
 [*overcame* >js *overcome* 1 | *overcame* A | *overcome* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 the roots thereof
 for they grew faster than the strength of the roots thereof
 taking strength unto themselves . . .

We should also note that the verb *overrun* never occurs elsewhere in the olive tree allegory.

One problem with this emendation is that it is somewhat difficult to explain why the verb *overrun* should have replaced a purported original *overcome*. There is no preceding text that could have prompted Oliver Cowdery to have replaced *overcome* with *overrun*. In fact, the uniqueness of the verb in the allegory suggests that *overrun* is intended. Further, one can interpret the earliest text as saying that the wild branches grew very quickly and thereby overwhelmed the roots. Note that in verse 48 the text says that the branches “grew faster than the strength of the roots thereof”, where the reference to “growing **faster** than the roots” is consistent with the idea of “growing and **overrunning** the roots”. Consequently, this excessive growth would lead to the branches overcoming the roots. Since it is possible to interpret the earliest reading in verse 37 in a consistent manner, the critical text will maintain that reading (“and have **overran** the roots thereof”).

Summary: Restore the original *grew* and *overran* as the past participial forms in Jacob 5:37 (“the wild branches have **grew** and have **overran** the roots thereof”); maintain the unique use of the verb *overrun* in this part of the olive tree allegory since it can actually be supported by the language in Jacob 5:48.

■ Jacob 5:37

*and because that it hath brought forth so much evil fruit
thou [beheldest 1 | beholdest ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that it beginneth to perish*

In Jacob 5:37, the tense for the verb *behold* was altered by the 1830 typesetter. The printer’s manuscript has the verb in the past tense, *thou beheldest*, which seems odd because the servant was observing the perishing right then and there (“it beginneth to perish”). Notice, for instance, that the surrounding verbs are in the present tense (the present perfect *hath brought* and the simple present *beginneth*). David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the past-tense *thou beheldest* also seems incongruous with the previous statement of the servant three verses earlier:

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
wherefore thou beholdest that they are yet good

The 1830 typesetter seems to have noticed the incongruity with the surrounding and preceding text, with the result that the 1830 edition ended up with the present-tense *thou beholdest*.

The use of the present-tense *thou beholdest* is directly supported in three other places in the allegory of the olive tree. In each case, the surrounding verbs are in the present tense, again either the present perfect or the simple present:

Jacob 5:22 and thou **beholdest** that it **hath brought** forth much fruit
Jacob 5:34 wherefore thou **beholdest** that they **are** yet good
Jacob 5:75 and thou **beholdest** that I **have done** according to my will

Moreover, there is evidence elsewhere in the original text supporting the present-tense form of the verb *behold* in a present-tense context:

Alma 34:6
and ye also [*behold* 0 | *beheld* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that my brother **hath proven** unto you in many instances
that the word is in Christ unto salvation

This example from Alma 34:6 is particularly relevant for analyzing *thou beheldest*, the reading in \mathcal{P} for Jacob 5:37. The original manuscript is extant for Alma 34:6 and reads in the present tense (“ye also behold”). Moreover, the following clause has a present perfect form (“my brother hath proven”). Yet when Oliver Cowdery copied Alma 34:6 from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he accidentally replaced *behold* with *beheld*, thus ending up (as in Jacob 5:37) with precisely the same incongruous use of the past tense of the verb *behold* in a present-tense context.

Evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts shows that the scribes (especially Oliver Cowdery) frequently wrote the past-tense *beheld* in place of the correct *behold*:

1 Nephi 14:24 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
and [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *beheld* > *behold* > NULL 1] **behold**
the remainder shalt thou see

- 2 Nephi 9:44 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 [*beheld* > *behold* 1 | *Behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 I take off my garments and I shake them before you
- Alma 39:17 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{G})
 [*beheld* > *behold* 0 | *behold* 1 | *Behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 you marvel why these things should be known so long beforehand
- Alma 51:9 (Oliver Cowdery's error in \mathcal{G})
 but [*Beheld* 0 | *behold* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] this was a critical time
 for such contentions to be among the people of Nephi
- Alma 61:2 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 [*beheld* > *behold* 1 | *Behold* APRST | *behold* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ]
 I say unto you Moroni that I do not joy in your great afflictions
- Alma 63:12 (Oliver Cowdery's error in \mathcal{G})
 now [*beheld* 0 | *behold* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 all those engravings which were in the possession of Helaman
 were written and sent forth among the children of men
- 3 Nephi 1:15 (Oliver Cowdery apparently wrote *beheld* in \mathcal{G} ; for this passage
 the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{G})
 for [*he beheld* 1 | *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 at the going down of the sun there was no darkness
- 3 Nephi 17:5 (either the 1830 typesetter misread *behold* as *beheld*, or Oliver
 Cowdery originally wrote *beheld* in \mathcal{G} ; the reading in \mathcal{P} is the correct one)
 and it came to pass that when Jesus had thus spoken
 he cast his eyes round about again on the multitude
 and [*behold* 1 | *beheld* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they were in tears and did look steadfastly upon him
- 3 Nephi 19:30 (initial error in \mathcal{P} by scribe 2)
 and it came to pass that when Jesus had spake these words
 he came again unto his disciples
 and [*beheld* > *behold* 1 | *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they did pray steadfastly without ceasing unto him
- 3 Nephi 28:13 (initial error in \mathcal{P} by scribe 2)
 and [*beheld* > *behold* 1 | *behold* A | *behold* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 the heavens were opened

We should also note here that sometimes the scribes made errors in the opposite direction—that is, sometimes they incorrectly wrote *behold* instead of *beheld*:

- 1 Nephi 8:9 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 I [*beheld* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *behold* > *beheld* 1]
 a large and spacious field

1 Nephi 8:26 (Oliver Cowdery’s error in \mathcal{P})
 and I also cast my eyes around about
 and [*beheld* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *behold* 1]
 on the other side of the river of water a great and spacious building

1 Nephi 15:27 (scribe 2’s initial error in \mathcal{S})
 and so much was his mind swallowed up in other things
 that he [*behold* > *beheld* 0 | *beheld* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] not
 the filthiness of the water

The number of these examples is considerably less than the errors in the other direction.

All of this evidence strongly suggests that the reading “thou **beheldest** that it beginneth to perish”, the earliest extant reading for Jacob 5:37, is probably an error for “thou **beholdest** that it beginneth to perish”; the 1830 typesetter was correct to emend the past-tense *beheldest* to *beholdest*.

Summary: Accept in Jacob 5:37 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *thou beheldest* to *thou beholdest*; this emendation is supported by usage elsewhere in the text as well as by Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to frequently write *beheld* in place of *behold*.

■ **Jacob 5:38–39**

let us go down into the [*nithermost* 1 | *nethermost* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *parts*
of the vineyard . . .
they went down into the [*nithermost* 1 | *nethermost* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *parts*
of the vineyard

The critical text will accept the historical form *nithermost*. For discussion, see under Jacob 5:13–14.

■ **Jacob 5:44–45**

and thou [*beholdest* >+ *beheldest* 1 | *beheldest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that I also cut down that which cumbered this spot of ground . . .
and thou [*beholdest* >+ *beheldest* 1 | *beheldest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that a part thereof brought forth good fruit and the other part thereof brought forth wild fruit

Here in verses 44 and 45, Oliver Cowdery changed both occurrences of *thou beholdest* to *thou beheldest* in the printer’s manuscript, the opposite of the change of *thou beheldest* to *thou beholdest* that the 1830 typesetter made in verse 37. Oliver’s changes in verses 44–45 seem to be motivated by the fact that here the Lord of the vineyard is referring to events that have already occurred (“I also **cut** down that which **cumbered** this spot of ground” and “a part thereof **brought** forth good fruit”). In both cases of original *beholdest*, Oliver corrected the *o* by overwriting it with an *e*, but he used the same heavier flowing and darker ink that he had used earlier on this page of \mathcal{P} to edit the nonstandard *have grew* in Jacob 5:37 to *have grown* (see line 4 on page 104 of \mathcal{P}). Thus these two changes in tense appear to be the result of later editing rather than Oliver’s proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{S} . Moreover, the tense change was not necessary since one can observe in the present the results of what has happened in the past, as in the following example later on in the allegory when the Lord refers to all that he has done in order to preserve the natural fruit:

Jacob 5:75

and **thou beholdest** that I **have done** according to my will
and I **have preserved** the natural fruit

Also consider the following passage that uses the verb *see* in the present tense to refer to an event that has already taken place:

Alma 14:15

behold **ye see** that ye **had** not power
to save these which **had been cast** into the fire

When used indicatively, the verbs *behold* and *see* often mean ‘realize’ rather than their etymological meaning ‘view’; thus the present tense *thou beholdest* can be used to refer to events that have already occurred in the olive tree allegory.

By restoring in verses 44–45 the original readings in \mathcal{P} (namely, *thou beholdest*), we find that the original text of the olive tree allegory had only instances of *thou beholdest* (given that we accept the 1830 typesetter’s emendation to *thou beholdest* in verse 37). In other words, the original text in Jacob 5 apparently had only the present-tense *thou beholdest*, even when the Lord of the vineyard was referring to events in the past.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 5:44–45 the two original present-tense uses of *beholdest*; Oliver Cowdery later edited both of these to *beheldest*, but the original text in Jacob 5 prefers the present tense when referring to the servant beholding events, including ones that have already occurred.

■ Jacob 5:45

and thou beholdest that a part thereof brought forth good fruit
and [the 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] part thereof brought forth wild fruit

Here the printer’s manuscript reads “a part . . . the part”. The 1830 typesetter couldn’t make much sense of this, so he replaced the definite article *the* with the indefinite article *a*, thus producing “a part . . . a part”. There is another example of “a part . . . a part” in the Book of Mormon text:

Ether 14:20

and they were divided
and **a part** of them fled to the army of Shiz
and **a part** of them fled to the army of Coriantumr

As David Calabro points out (personal communication), here in Jacob 5:45 an original *and a* could have been misinterpreted as *and the* during the early transmission of the text. If such an error occurred, it would have probably occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, especially if the *d* of the *and* had been pronounced by Joseph (compare *and a* /ændə/ with *and the* /ændðə/).

A completely parallel example in the olive tree allegory itself suggests that the original reading in Jacob 5:45 was actually “a part . . . the other part”:

Jacob 5:25

and only **a part** of the tree hath brought forth tame fruit
and **the other part** of the tree hath brought forth wild fruit

In other words, while copying, Oliver Cowdery dropped out the word *other*, thus producing the incomprehensible “the part”. Under this analysis the occurrence of the definite article *the* in the printer’s manuscript is itself correct and is not an error for *a*.

Further support for the definite article *the* can be found later on in the book of Alma, where the original text apparently read “a part . . . the remainder part”:

Alma 43:25

now Moroni leaving **a part** of his army in the land of Jershon
lest by any means a part of the Lamanites should come into that land
and take possession of the city
and Moroni took **the remainder part** of his army
and marched over into the land of Manti

This reading is based on the printer’s manuscript; the reading in the original manuscript is only partially extant, but the definite article *the* is clearly in \mathcal{O} .

Theoretically, either “a part . . . the other part” or “a part . . . a part” will work as an appropriate emendation in Jacob 5:45. But the parallel use of “a part . . . the other part” in verse 25 of the allegory supports emending the text by inserting the word *other* in verse 45.

Summary: Replace “a part . . . a part” in Jacob 5:45 with the parallel expression “a part . . . **the other part**”, as implied by “a part . . . the other part” in Jacob 5:25 and by the anomalous reading of the printer’s manuscript in Jacob 5:45 itself (“a part . . . the part”), with its use of the definite article *the*.

■ Jacob 5:45–46

and because [that >js NULL 1 | that ACEFGHIJKLMNOQ | that > NULL B | DPRST]

I plucked not the branches thereof and cast them into the fire

behold they have overcome the good branch

that it [hath >js has 1 | hath ACEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | hath > has B | has DPS] withered away

and now behold notwithstanding all the care which we have taken of my vineyard

the trees thereof [hath >js have 1 | hath AEFIJLMNQ | hath > have B | have CDGHKOPRST]

become corrupted that they bring forth no good fruit

and these I had [hope >js hoped 1 | hope A | hope > hoped B | hoped CDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

to preserve to have laid up fruit thereof against the season unto mine own self

In his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith marked several changes, mostly minor, here in verses 45–46. The initial 1837 sheets that were printed for this gathering of four leaves (signature F2) did not include these changes, but later while proofing his copy-text (a marked-up copy of the 1830 edition, not the printer’s manuscript itself), the 1837 printer apparently discovered that these changes had been missed. So he stopped the presswork and made the following in-press changes for that gathering:

1837, initial state

because **that** I plucked not the branches
it **hath** withered away
the trees thereof **hath** become corrupted
I had **hope** to preserve

1837, final state

because I plucked not the branches
it **has** withered away
the trees thereof **have** become corrupted
I had **hoped** to preserve

All these changes are found on the last seven lines on page 144, the last page of the gathering.

The 1837 edition was used as the copy-text for both the 1840 Cincinnati/Nauvoo edition and the 1841 British edition. It also seems to have been occasionally consulted for the 1849 British edition. Because of these in-press changes, the 1837 copies varied for this page, and thus we get considerable variation in the subsequent printing history for these four changes. For further discussion of the complex relationships between these early editions, see the textual history of the editions in volume 3.

Joseph Smith's editing of *hath* to *has* was extremely idiosyncratic. For instance, in the olive tree allegory, he changed three cases of *hath* to *has*, all in this same part of the text (namely, in Jacob 5:45–48):

Jacob 5:45

that it [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *hath* > *has* B | *has* DPS]
withered away

Jacob 5:47

who is it
that [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] corrupted my vineyard

Jacob 5:48

[*hath* >js *has* 1 | *Hath* A | *Has* BDP | *Have* CGHKS | *has* EFIJLN |
has > *have* M | *have* OQRT]
not the branches thereof overcame the roots which are good

In the last case, Joseph should have edited the *hath* to *have*. Later, in his editing for the 1840 edition, he changed this *has* to the grammatically correct *have*.

In all other places in the olive tree allegory, Joseph Smith either left *hath* unchanged (14 times) or changed *hath* to *have* to achieve number agreement with a plural subject (4 times). See Jacob 5:18 for a list of the instances of *hath* that were edited to *have*. The critical text will, of course, restore all instances of *hath* whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3. Also see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3 for discussion of the editing of *because that* to *because*. For the in-press change involving *had hope(d)*, see the immediately following discussion.

Summary: Restore the original use of the archaic *because that* and *hath* wherever they are supported by the earliest textual sources (including here in Jacob 5:45–46).

■ Jacob 5:46

and these I [*have* > *had* 1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*hope* >js *hoped* 1 | *hope* A | *hope* > *hoped* B | *hoped* CDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to preserve*
to have laid up fruit thereof against the season unto mine own self

While copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *have hope*, but this was apparently an error that he immediately corrected to *had hope* (that is, he corrected the tense from the present to the past). The level of ink flow appears to be the same, and the context definitely requires the past-tense *had*.

Joseph Smith later added a *d* to *hope*, thus reinterpreting the main verb *had* and the noun *hope* as a past perfect verb phrase, *had hoped*. As noted in the previous discussion, this change was implemented in the 1837 edition as an in-press change. Subsequent editions have consistently followed the corrected state (*had hoped*), unlike three other in-press changes made in Jacob 5:45–46 (see the preceding discussion).

Nonetheless, this change of *hope* to *hoped* is wholly inconsistent with the rest of the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere, there are numerous examples of the main verb *have* taking the noun *hope* as a direct object (17 times):

1 Nephi 19:24	that ye may have hope as well as your brethren
Jacob 4:4	and we had a hope of his glory
Jacob 4:4	and not only we ourselves had a hope of his glory
Jacob 7:5	and he had hope to shake me from the faith
Alma 7:24	and see that ye have faith hope and charity
Alma 13:29	having a hope that ye shall receive eternal life
Mormon 6:4	and here we had hope to gain advantage over the Lamanites
Ether 12:9	ye may also have hope
Ether 12:32	in the which man might have a more excellent hope
Moroni 7:40	save ye shall have hope
Moroni 7:41	that ye shall have hope through the atonement of Christ
Moroni 7:42	he must needs have hope
Moroni 7:43	he cannot have faith and hope
Moroni 7:48	that we may have this hope
Moroni 8:14	for he hath neither faith hope nor charity
Moroni 10:21	neither can ye if ye have no hope
Moroni 10:22	and if ye have no hope ye must needs be in despair

And for seven of these, the direct object *hope* has no modifier or determiner and is unconjoined with any other noun (just as originally in Jacob 5:46). And in two cases (Jacob 7:5 and Mormon 6:4), we have the same *had hope* as originally in Jacob 5:46. In fact, all three cases of *had hope* are immediately followed by an infinitive clause (“these I had hope **to preserve**”, “he had hope **to shake me**”, and “we had hope **to gain** advantage”). On the other hand, there are no examples of the verb *hope* taking the perfect auxiliary *have*—that is, there are no examples at all in the original text of *have hoped*, *hath hoped*, *has hoped*, *had hoped*, or *having hoped*.

Summary: Restore the original reading *had hope* in Jacob 5:46; the original Book of Mormon text is consistent in its usage with respect to “have hope”, with no examples of “have hoped”.

■ Jacob 5:47

have I slackened [mine 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | my KPS] hand

The Book of Mormon text has examples of both *mine hand* and *my hand*—and in equal numbers: eight of *mine hand* (of which five are in Isaiah quotes) and eight of *my hand* (of which four are

in Isaiah quotes). There has been no consistent editing in favor of *my hand*, the accepted form in current English. The King James Bible also has examples of both variants (note the variation within the Isaiah passages that are quoted in the Book of Mormon). For discussion regarding *mine arm* versus *my arm*, see 2 Nephi 28:32. For a general discussion, see POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

In this passage, the archaic *mine hand* was replaced by *my hand* in the RLDS text beginning with the 1892 edition. This was probably an unintended change since none of the other instances of *mine hand* have been altered in the RLDS text (including another one here in verse 47: “and I have stretched forth **mine** hand”).

Summary: Retain the examples of *mine hand* in the text, including here in Jacob 5:47.

■ Jacob 5:47

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 dunged it

The printer’s manuscript does not have the word *about* between *digged* and *it*. Although the original manuscript is not extant for the word *about*, the nearby fragments that do exist suggest that there is no room for *about* except by insertion. But if it had been supralinearly inserted in \mathcal{O} , it most likely would have been copied into \mathcal{P} . In other words, if the *about* was accidentally lost here in Jacob 5:47, it probably occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith supplied the word *about* for Jacob 5:47, which is consistent with all other usage in the olive tree allegory:

Jacob 5:4	I will prune it and dig about it and nourish it
Jacob 5:5	he pruned it and digged about it and nourished it
Jacob 5:11	it should be digged about and pruned and nourished
Jacob 5:27	let us prune it and dig about it and nourish it
Jacob 5:63	graft in the branches . . . and dig about the trees
Jacob 5:64	dig about them and prune them and dung them
Jacob 5:76	for the last time have I nourished my vineyard and pruned it and dug about it and dunged it

As David Calabro notes (personal communication), the same language referring to digging about a tree is found in Christ’s parable of the fig tree in the Lord’s vineyard, a parable that clearly parallels the olive tree allegory here in Jacob 5:

Luke 13:6–8

a certain *man* had a fig tree planted in his vineyard
and he came and sought fruit thereon and found none
then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard
behold these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree and find none
cut it down / why cumbereth it the ground

and he answering said unto him
 Lord let it alone this year also
 till I shall **dig about** it and dung *it*
 and if it bear fruit / *well*
 and if not / *then* after that thou shalt cut it down

Thus in the olive tree allegory, we expect trees to be “dug about”. In the example from Jacob 5:47, the preposition *about* was probably accidentally omitted from the original manuscript because the surrounding transitive verbs (*nourished*, *pruned*, and *dunged*) are all immediately followed by the pronoun *it*. Notice, however, that in the other examples (in verses 4, 5, 27, and 76), the pronoun *it* directly follows other conjoined verbs, but that does not prevent the *about* from occurring between the verb *dig* and the *it*.

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith’s emendation “digged about it” in Jacob 5:47; for this passage the word *about* was apparently lost during the dictation of the text; usage elsewhere consistently supports the use of *about* in the expression “to dig about a tree”.

■ Jacob 5:48

hath not the branches thereof
 [overcame 1A | overcome BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the roots which are good*
and because that the branches
have [overcame >js overcome 1 | overcome A | overcome BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the roots thereof . . .

In the original Book of Mormon text, the verb *come* frequently takes the simple past-tense form *came* as its past participle (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4). This same tendency is found with the compound verb *overcome*. Here in Jacob 5:48 we have two examples, both of which were edited to the standard *overcome* in the 1837 edition. A third example of this nonstandard usage is found in the book of Alma:

Alma 19:6
 yea he knew that
 this had [overcome >+ overcome 1 | overcome A |
 overcome BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his natural frame

The critical text will maintain the occurrences of the nonstandard past participle *overcame* here in Jacob 5:48 as well as in Alma 19:6. Also see the general discussion under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard *overcame* as the past participle in Jacob 5:48 (two times) and in Alma 19:6.

■ Jacob 5:48

and because that the branches have overcome the roots thereof

[1 | ? A | , BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[for 0 | for > | s NULL 1 | For A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

behold *they grew faster than the strength of the roots thereof
taking strength unto themselves*

[0 | NULL > | jg . 1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

behold *I say: is not this the cause
that the trees of thy vineyard hath become corrupted*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith was here confronted with a sentence fragment that the 1830 typesetter had created when he placed a question mark after the initial *because*-clause and a period between the first and second *behold*-clauses. As part of the attempt to emend the syntax here, Joseph deleted the *for*, thus making the first *behold*-clause the independent clause for the initial *because*-clause. Consistent with this emendation, the 1837 printer replaced the 1830 question mark with a comma but left the period between the two *behold*-clauses.

In actuality, the first *behold*-clause does not complete the preceding *because*-clause. Semantically, the first *behold*-clause explains why the branches have overcome the roots—namely, they grew too fast given the strength of the roots. It is the second *behold*-clause that explains why the trees became corrupted—namely, the branches overcame the roots. Thus the *for* should not have been deleted. Instead, dashes should have been set around the first *behold*-clause:

Jacob 5:48 (original text, repunctuated)

and because that the branches have overcome the roots thereof
—for behold they grew faster than the strength of the roots thereof
taking strength unto themselves—
behold I say: is not this the cause
that the trees of thy vineyard hath become corrupted

The resulting complex construction is very characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text: an initial dependent construction is followed by a rather long parenthetical comment, and then the reader is brought back to the original idea. In the following example from 3 Nephi, a second *therefore* reminds the reader of the original idea that had been stated at the beginning of the sentence in a dependent participial clause (that is, “and I knowing of their unconquerable spirit . . . therefore I have wrote this epistle”):

3 Nephi 3:4–5

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

For further discussion of this kind of construction, see under 1 Nephi 3:17.

Summary: Restore the original *for* in the first *behold*-clause in Jacob 5:48; add dashes before and after this clause so that the reader will recognize that the first *behold*-clause is parenthetical and that the initial *because*-clause is actually completed by the second *behold*-clause.

■ **Jacob 5:48**

*and because that **the branches** have overcame the roots thereof
for behold **they** grew faster than the strength of the roots
[thereof 0A | thereof >]s NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*

The 1837 edition deleted the second *thereof* in this passage. Since this deletion was marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, we can be sure that he intended it. This is the only *thereof* that Joseph deleted in the olive tree allegory—or, for that matter, in the entire text of the Book of Mormon. The 1920 LDS edition deleted *thereof* seven times in the book of Ether; for discussion of that editing, see under Ether 2:20.

One possible reason for the deletion of the *thereof* here in Jacob 5:48 is that Joseph Smith may have thought the second “the roots thereof” was too close to the first one, although elsewhere in the allegory there are examples of “the root(s) thereof” that are extremely close to each other, sometimes even closer than here in verse 48:

Jacob 5:18

behold the branches of the wild tree
hath taken hold of the moisture of **the root thereof**
that **the root thereof** hath brought forth much strength
and because of the much strength of **the root thereof**
the wild branches hath brought forth tame fruit

Jacob 5:37

but behold the wild branches have grew and have overran **the roots thereof**
and because that the wild branches have overcome **the roots thereof**
it hath brought forth much evil fruit

The first two occurrences of “the root thereof” in Jacob 5:18 are separated by only one word, *that*.

Another possible explanation is that Joseph Smith deleted the second *thereof* in Jacob 5:48 because its antecedent was the pronoun *they*, which refers, of course, to the branches explicitly mentioned earlier in the initial *because*-clause (“and because that **the branches** have overcame the roots thereof”). The second *thereof* thus seems somewhat strange because the reader must first refer to the *they* and then look even earlier in the sentence to determine that this *they* refers to the preceding *the branches*. Yet this same difficulty in interpretation occurs later on in the allegory:

Jacob 5:58–59

and we will pluck from the trees
those branches which are ripened that must perish
and cast **them** into the fire
and this I do that perhaps **the roots thereof** may take strength
because of their goodness

In this second case, the nearest antecedent for *thereof* is the pronoun *them*, which ultimately refers to the earlier *those branches*. So even under this alternative explanation, the deletion of *thereof* in Jacob 5:48 seems problematic. The critical text will restore the *thereof* in Jacob 5:48 since its original use there appears to have been intended and not the result of an error in the text.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 5:48 the *thereof* that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition: “they grew faster than the strength of the roots **thereof**”.

■ Jacob 5:52

*wherefore let us take of the branches of these which I have planted
in the [nithermost 1 | nethermost ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] parts of my vineyard*

The critical text will accept the historical form *nithermost*. For discussion, see under Jacob 5:13–14.

■ Jacob 5:57

*pluck not the wild branches from the trees
save it be those [that > which 1 | which ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are most bitter*

In copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the relative pronoun *that* but almost immediately corrected it to *which* by crossing out the *that* and supralinearly inserting the *which* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Since either *that* or *which* is possible here, the critical text will follow the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} . For further discussion of the competition between *which* and *that* in the Book of Mormon text, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 5:57 the relative pronoun *which*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“save it be those **which** are most bitter”).

■ Jacob 5:59

*and this I do
that perhaps the roots thereof may take strength
because of their goodness
[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and because of the change of the branches
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that the good may overcome the evil*

In this passage, the punctuation in all editions has a semicolon after the first *because-of* phrase; this is clearly an error. Both *because-of* phrases explain why the roots may take strength—namely, because of the inherent goodness of the roots and because of the grafting in of other branches. The semicolon should be removed; in fact, there should probably be no punctuation at all between the two instances of *because-of*, not even a comma, so that the reader will readily associate the two *because-of* prepositional phrases.

Summary: Remove the semicolon between the two *because-of* phrases in Jacob 5:59; these prepositional conjuncts give two reasons why the Lord of the vineyard expects the roots to take strength.

■ **Jacob 5:61–62**

*that we may labor diligently
with our [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT] in the vineyard . . .
wherefore let us go to and labor
with our [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT] this last time*

The committee for the 1920 LDS edition edited nearly all examples of *mights* to *might* in the olive tree allegory. For the single exception, see the discussion under Jacob 5:71–72. For a complete discussion of the use of the plural *mights* for the entire text, see under Jacob 1:19. The critical text will restore the plural *mights* wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in Jacob 5:61–62.

■ **Jacob 5:64**

*and if it [so be 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | be so FIJLMNOQRT] that these last grafts shall grow
and bring forth the natural fruit
then shall ye prepare the way for them*

As already discussed under 1 Nephi 22:17–18, the original text had no occurrences of the word order “if it **be so**”, only “if it **so be**”. Thus the secondary word order that the 1852 LDS edition introduced here in Jacob 5:64 will be reversed.

■ **Jacob 5:67–68**

*and the branches of the **natural tree** will I graft in again into the **natural tree**
and the branches of the **natural tree** will I graft into the natural branches
of the [natural > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] tree*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *natural tree* at the end of the second clause in this passage, undoubtedly because *natural tree* had just occurred three times, so he was very much expecting it when he came to the fourth occurrence of *tree*. The crossout of *natural* appears to be virtually immediate (there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Therefore, the original manuscript seems to have read “the natural branches of the tree”, not “the natural branches of the natural tree”—that is, the word *natural* was not repeated within this complex noun phrase.

The corrected expression “the natural branches of the tree” agrees with usage elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 10:14	the natural branches of the olive tree . . . should be grafted in
1 Nephi 15:7	concerning the natural branches of the olive tree
Jacob 5:13	that I may preserve unto myself the natural branches of the tree
Jacob 5:14	and hid the natural branches of the tame olive tree

Jacob 5:19	and behold if the natural branches of the tree hath not brought forth much fruit also
Jacob 5:20	the master of the vineyard had hid the natural branches of the tree
Jacob 5:52	and graft in the natural branches of the tree in the stead thereof
Jacob 5:54	and behold the roots of the natural branches of the tree

And there are the two examples of “the branches of the natural tree” here in Jacob 5:67–68, but there are no cases at all in which *natural* is repeated twice within a complex noun phrase (excluding, of course, “the natural branches of the natural tree” that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote here in Jacob 5:68).

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 5:68 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “the natural branches of the tree”.

■ Jacob 5:70–71

*and the servant went and did as the Lord had commanded him
and brought other servants and they were few
and the Lord of the vineyard saith
unto [him > them 1 | them ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Oliver Cowdery was used to writing the singular *him* since up to now in the olive tree allegory there had been only one servant that the Lord of the vineyard had been speaking to. From verse 7 through verse 57, there are 19 instances where the text refers to the Lord speaking to this servant, although only one of these instances uses the pronoun *him* to refer to the servant (in verse 22: “and the Lord of the vineyard saith unto **him**”).

This copying error involving *him* and *them* occurs only once in the olive tree allegory, here in verse 71. For the rest of the olive tree allegory, Oliver Cowdery correctly wrote *them* in \mathcal{P} without any initial error, as in the following instance of “saith unto them”:

Jacob 5:75 he calleth up **his servants** and saith unto **them**

Of course, the nearby occurrence of *his servants* in this sentence made it easier to avoid the error.

Summary: Maintain the plural pronoun *them* in Jacob 5:71 since the context here clearly refers to more than one servant.

■ Jacob 5:71

and the season [soon > speedily 1 | speedily ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cometh

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the season **soon** cometh” in \mathcal{P} ; then almost immediately he crossed out the *soon* and supralinearly inserted *speedily*. The correction shows no change in the level of ink flow, so probably \mathcal{O} (which is not extant here) read *speedily*. The text is about equally divided between “coming speedily” and “coming soon”, with 12 occurrences of the first and 10 of the second. In fact, later on in verse 71 there is an occurrence of *soon* (“against the time which will **soon** come”). We find similar variation in usage elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 22:15

for behold saith the prophet
that the time cometh **speedily**
that Satan shall have no more power over the hearts of the children of men
for the day **soon** cometh
that all the proud and they which do wickedly shall be as stubble

Thus there would have been no motivation in Jacob 5:71 for Oliver to have edited *soon* to *speedily*.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 5:71 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “the season **speedily** cometh”.

■ Jacob 5:71

ye shall have joy in the fruit

[*of* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which I shall lay up*

[*for* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *myself*

against the time which will soon come

Here in the printer’s manuscript we have two nearly immediate corrections by Oliver Cowdery. He initially wrote “in the fruit **of** which I shall lay up **for** myself”; then without any change in the level of ink flow, Oliver deleted the *of* and corrected the *for* to *unto* by supralinear insertion. Theoretically, the *of* is possible in the expression “to lay up (of) fruit”, as in Jacob 5:19: “that I may lay up **of** the fruit thereof” (see the discussion under that passage).

The olive tree allegory is consistent in using the preposition *unto* in the expression “to lay up something **unto** oneself”, with nine occurrences of it:

Jacob 5:13	that I may lay up fruit thereof against the season unto myself
Jacob 5:18	and the fruit thereof I shall lay up against the season unto mine own self
Jacob 5:19	that I may lay up of the fruit thereof against the season unto mine own self
Jacob 5:29	I must lay up fruit against the season unto mine own self
Jacob 5:31	I have laid up unto myself against the season much fruit
Jacob 5:46	to have laid up fruit thereof against the season unto mine own self
Jacob 5:71	ye shall have joy in the fruit which I shall lay up unto myself against the time which will soon come
Jacob 5:76	for a long time will I lay up of the fruit of my vineyard unto mine own self against the season which speedily cometh
Jacob 5:76	I will lay up unto mine own self of the fruit for a long time

In addition, there are 11 occurrences in Jacob 5 of the expression “to preserve something **unto** oneself”:

Jacob 5:8	I may preserve the fruit thereof unto myself
Jacob 5:11	that I might preserve them unto myself
Jacob 5:13	that I may preserve unto myself the natural branches of the tree
Jacob 5:20	that I may preserve it unto mine own self

Jacob 5:23	that I may preserve it unto mine own self
Jacob 5:33	that I may preserve again good fruit thereof unto mine own self
Jacob 5:53	perhaps I may preserve unto myself the roots thereof for mine own purpose
Jacob 5:54	that I may preserve the roots also unto mine own self
Jacob 5:74	and the good the Lord had preserved unto himself
Jacob 5:74	and the Lord of the vineyard had preserved unto himself the natural fruit
Jacob 5:77	and the good will I preserve unto myself

Thus the archaic preposition *unto* is expected in these expressions here in Jacob 5 rather than the preposition *for* that speakers of modern English would prefer.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 5:71 the corrected text in \mathcal{P} : “ye shall have joy in the **fruit which** I shall lay up **unto** myself”.

■ Jacob 5:71–72

go to and labor in the vineyard

with your [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT] . . .

and if ye labor with your [mights 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | might RT] with me

ye shall have joy . . .

and it came to pass that the servants did go to it

*and labor with their **mights***

Only in Jacob 5:72 did the committee for the 1920 LDS edition fail to edit out the plural *mights*. The critical text will restore all such instances of this plural usage, providing the earliest textual sources support it. For a complete discussion of the use of the plural *mights* in the Book of Mormon text, see Jacob 1:19.

■ Jacob 5:72

and it came to pass that the servants did go

[to it >]s NULL 1 | to it A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

*and labor with their **mights***

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, deleted the *to it* after *did go*. There is no referent for the pronoun *it*, so perhaps Joseph considered this reading anomalous.

One possibility is that the original phrase actually read “the servants did **go to** and labor with their **mights**”. This colloquial phrase, “go to and <do something>”, is very prominent in the olive tree allegory:

Jacob 5:49	let us go to and hew down the trees of the vineyard and cast them into the fire
Jacob 5:61	wherefore go to and call servants
Jacob 5:62	wherefore let us go to and labor with our mights this last time
Jacob 5:71	go to and labor in the vineyard with your mights

There is also one other occurrence of the phrase “go to and <do something>” in the Book of Mormon text:

Ether 1:41 **go to and** gather together thy flocks

Perhaps here in Jacob 5:72, Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the object pronoun *it* during the early transmission of the text. Consider, for instance, the following example where he made such an error, at least momentarily, when he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} :

1 Nephi 1:11
 and the first came and stood before my father
 and gave unto him a book and bade him that
 that he should [NULL >+ read it >% read 1 | read ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In his supralinear correction for this passage, Oliver initially wrote read *it*, but then he erased the *it* (see 1 Nephi 1:11 for discussion of this error). This initial error shows that Oliver could have accidentally added an *it* also in Jacob 5:72. In other words, perhaps Joseph Smith should have deleted only the pronoun *it* when he edited the text for Jacob 5:72. In fact, it is even possible that he intended to do that but accidentally ended up deleting the preceding *to* as well.

The Oxford English Dictionary gives examples of this expression “go to” (see definition 93 under *go*), including an example from the 1400s (in *Palladius on husbandrie*) that is quite close to the themes of the olive tree allegory: “go to And transplaunte hit” (that is, “go to and transplant it”). The OED gives the meaning for “go to” as ‘to go about one’s work, to get to work’, noting also that it is chiefly found in the imperative as an exhortation.

The four established examples of “go to and <do something>” in the olive tree allegory involve major, long-term activities. The examples in Jacob 5:62 and Jacob 5:71 refer to the general activity of laboring, and the one in Jacob 5:61 refers to the calling of other servants to help with this general labor. And the first example (in Jacob 5:49) refers to the major work of hewing down trees and burning them. These semantic regularities suggest that the example in Jacob 5:72 should have actually read “go to and labor”. Yet the proposed reading “go to and labor” here in verse 72 would be in the past tense and would be the only one for which “go to” does not function as an exhortation. However, the use of the periphrastic *did* allows the infinitive forms *go* and *labor* to be conjoined; thus the phrase “did go to and labor” in Jacob 5:72 is possible, but “went to and labored” seems problematic.

There are also two other imperative examples in the current Book of Mormon text of “go to” with the same meaning but without any following conjoined predicate:

2 Nephi 15:5 (quoting Isaiah 5:5)
 and now go to—
 I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard

Enos 1:8
 wherefore go to [*it* >]s NULL 1 | *it* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]—
 thy faith hath made thee whole

This last example is particularly interesting in that the text there originally read “go to it”, just as Jacob 5:72 originally did. But unlike his editing for Jacob 5:72, in Enos 1:8 Joseph Smith deleted only the *it*. This example could therefore be used to support the idea that Joseph should have

deleted only the *it* in Jacob 5:72. But the editing here is not as important as the realization that the original text for Enos 1:8 provides direct support for the original reading in Jacob 5:72 (namely, “the servants did **go to it** and labor with their might”).

The King James Bible has 11 examples of the colloquial “go to”, all without a following *and*:

Genesis 11:3	go to—let us make brick and burn them throughly
Genesis 11:4	go to—let us build us a city and a tower
Genesis 11:7	go to—let us go down and there confound their language
Genesis 38:16	go to I pray thee—let me come in unto thee
Judges 7:3	now therefore go to—proclaim in the ears of the people . . .
2 Kings 5:5	go to—go and I will send a letter unto the king of Israel
Ecclesiastes 2:1	go to now—I will prove thee with mirth
Isaiah 5:5	and now go to—I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard
Jeremiah 18:11	now therefore go to—speak to the men of Judah . . .
James 4:13	go to now ye that say . . .
James 5:1	go to now ye rich men—weep and howl for your miseries

Although the Bible has no examples of “go to it”, there are other biblical examples of idiomatic verbs having “to it”, where *it* has no specific referent:

Exodus 10:10	look <i>to it</i>
Matthew 27:24	see ye <i>to it</i>
Acts 18:15	look ye <i>to it</i>

The fact that the King James Bible has all these examples of *to it* in italics shows that this phrase represents idiomatic English not expressed in the original languages, Greek and Hebrew. Thus there is indirect biblical support for the original expression “go to it” in Jacob 5:72 and Enos 1:8.

Joseph Smith’s edited text in Jacob 5:72 (from “the servants did **go to it** and labor” to simply “the servants did **go** and labor”) is, of course, also a possible reading for the original text. Of the 14 examples of “go and <do something>” in the original Book of Mormon text, one is found in the olive tree allegory:

Jacob 5:7
 wherefore **go and pluck** the branches from a wild olive tree
 and bring them hither unto me

One might argue that this passage also represents an error for “go to and <do something>”. However, the Lord’s command here involves going and doing a specific task. The labor is not a general and long-term activity, but instead it describes a well-defined task (namely, “pluck the branches from a wild olive tree”). And when we look at the 13 other original examples of “go and <do something>”, the text assumes that a specific well-defined task is intended:

1 Nephi 3:7 (Nephi will return to Jerusalem to get the plates of brass)
 I will **go and do** the things which the Lord hath commanded

2 Nephi 12:3 (Isaiah 2:3)
 and many people shall **go and say**
 come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord

2 Nephi 16:9 (Isaiah 6:9)

go and tell this people
hear ye indeed but they understand not

Mosiah 12:1 (Abinadi's specific prophecy follows in verses 2–8)

go and prophesy unto this my people

Mosiah 28:8 (the sons of Mosiah will go to preach to the Lamanites)

Mosiah granted that they might **go and do** according to their request

Alma 17:33

and I **go and contend** with these men which do scatter our flocks

Alma 20:5

go and deliver thy brethren
for they are in prison in the land of Middoni

Alma 22:21

and she commanded her servants that they should **go and call** the people
that they might slay Aaron and his brethren

Alma 27:7 (Ammon will find out whether the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi
will be received by the Nephites)

I will **go and inquire** of the Lord

Alma 30:53

go and reclaim this people
for they have all gone astray after an unknown god

Helaman 10:11

I command you that ye shall **go and declare** unto this people . . .
except ye repent / ye shall be smitten even unto destruction

Ether 1:38

go and inquire of the Lord whether he will drive us out of the land

Ether 13:20 (Ether's specific prophecy follows in verses 20–21)

the word of the Lord came to Ether
that he should **go and prophesy** unto Coriantumr

Thus the example of “go and pluck” in Jacob 5:7 is probably not an error for “go to and pluck” and should not be changed. And since Jacob 5:72 definitely involves a continuing task (“the servants did **go to it** and labor”, the emendation to “the servants did **go** and labor” is inconsistent with all other instances in the Book of Mormon text of the expression “go and <do something specific>”.

Summary: Accept the original use of the expression “go to it” in Jacob 5:72 and Enos 1:8; Joseph Smith's emendation of Jacob 5:72 to “the servants did go and labor” is inconsistent with the 14 cases of “go and <do something specific>” in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Jacob 5:74

*and thus they labored with all diligence
according to the commandments of the Lord of the vineyard
even until the bad had been cast away out of the vineyard
and the Lord had preserved unto himself
that the trees had become again the natural fruit*

Paul Huntzinger (personal communication, 6 February 2004) points out that the last sentence in this passage does not make sense. One possible emendation he considers is to replace the verb form *preserved* with *observed*: “and the Lord had **observed** unto himself that the trees had become again the natural fruit”, but Huntzinger recognizes that in the Book of Mormon text the verb *observe* is never used reflexively as in “one observes (un)to oneself”.

Another possibility Huntzinger suggests is that during the early transmission of the text there was a switch in word order such that an original “the trees that” was altered to “that the trees”; in other words, the original text might have read: “and the Lord had preserved unto himself **the trees that** had become again the natural fruit”. One major problem with this suggestion is that there are no examples of such an odd kind of metathesis anywhere in the history of the text.

I would suggest a third possibility here, one that would propose that during the early transmission of the text a short noun phrase—namely, the words “the good”—was lost from the beginning of the main clause. Such an emendation would work well within the larger passage:

Jacob 5:74 (proposed emendation)
and thus they labored with all diligence
according to the commandments of the Lord of the vineyard
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

This emendation proposes that the original text for this passage had a contrastive pair of clauses, the first one referring to “the bad” and the second to “the good”. And for each clause, the contrasting noun phrase comes at the beginning of the clause. One possible explanation for the loss of “the good” is that it was immediately followed by “the Lord”; in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery’s eye might have skipped over “the good” to “the Lord”. Not only do both phrases have the definite article *the*, but in each case the noun has an *o* vowel and ends in *d*.

The manuscripts provide a few examples of where Oliver Cowdery momentarily omitted a noun phrase, showing that the loss of a noun phrase like “the good” is possible:

Mosiah 4:9 (lines 27–28 on page 124 of \mathcal{P})
God
believe in ^ believe that he is & that he created all things

Mosiah 18:13 (line 23 on page 145 of \mathcal{P})
authority
I baptise thee having ^ from the Almighty God

Alma 46:13 (line 22 on page 316’ of \mathcal{O})
his rent coat
& he took the pole which had on the end thereof ^ & he called it . . .

Jacob 5

Alma 46:13 (line 24 on page 316' of \mathcal{C})

for the blessings of liberty to rest upon ^{his brethren} ^ so long as there should . . .

Alma 48:1 (line 29 on page 288 of \mathcal{P})

yea he ^{did} ^ appoint^{men}<ed> ^ to speak unto the Lamanites from their towers

3 Nephi 6:25 (line 11 on page 374 of \mathcal{P})

against ^{these} <th^e> Judges which had condemned ^{the prophets of the Lord} ^ unto death

3 Nephi 14:16 (line 32 on page 386 of \mathcal{P})

do men gather ^{grapes} ^ of thorns or figs of thistles

Here I list only examples where the incorrect initial reading is clearly unacceptable.

There are several nearby passages that support the contrastive pairing up of “the good” with “the bad”:

Jacob 5:65

and as they begin to grow
ye shall clear away the branches which bring forth bitter fruit
according to the strength of **the good** and the size thereof
and ye shall not clear away **the bad** thereof all at once
lest the roots thereof should be too strong for the graft

Jacob 5:66

wherefore ye shall clear away **the bad** according as **the good** shall grow
that the root and the top may be equal in strength
until **the good** shall overcome **the bad**

Jacob 5:77

and when the time cometh that evil fruit shall again come into my vineyard
then will I cause **the good** and **the bad** to be gathered
and **the good** will I preserve unto myself
and **the bad** will I cast away into its own place

The second contrastive pair in Jacob 5:77 is strikingly similar to the proposed emendation for verse 74. Not only do both have “the good” and “the bad” at the beginning of parallel clauses, but the very same verbs are found associated with “the good” and with “the bad” (namely, *preserve* and *cast away*):

Jacob 5:74 **and the good** the Lord had **preserved unto himself** [emended]

Jacob 5:77 **and the good** will I **preserve unto myself**

Jacob 5:74 even until **the bad** had been **cast away** out of the vineyard

Jacob 5:77 and **the bad** will I **cast away** into its own place

Summary: Emend the current text in Jacob 5:74 so that it reads “and **the good** the Lord had preserved unto himself”; the parallel language in Jacob 5:77 supports adding “the good” to this clause in verse 74.

■ Jacob 5:74

*and thus they labored with all diligence
according to the commandments of the Lord of the vineyard
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 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | fruits RT] were equal*

In the olive tree allegory, the earliest text has 67 occurrences of the singular *fruit* but none of the plural *fruits*. The plural is found 10 times elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (for examples, see under 1 Nephi 8:1). And except for here in verse 74, all other instances in Jacob 5 of the singular *fruit* occur with only singular forms, as in the following examples:

Jacob 5:20

and he beheld the first
that it had brought forth **much fruit**
and he beheld also that **it was** good
and he saith unto the servant
take of **the fruit** thereof and lay **it** up against the season
that I may preserve **it** unto mine own self

Jacob 5:52

and let us pluck from the tree those branches
whose **fruit is** most bitter

The example of fruit in verse 74 is the only one in Jacob 5 that takes a plural form (namely, *were*). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition decided to eliminate the subject-verb disagreement in this verse by emending the subject *fruit* to the plural *fruits*. It seems quite reasonable that if there is an error in Jacob 5:74, it would more probably involve the loss of a plural *s* rather than *was* being accidentally replaced by *were*. There are a number of places in the history of the text where *fruit* has varied with *fruits*:

1 Nephi 8:1

both of grain of every kind
and also of the seeds
of [*fruits* 01ABDEPS | *fruit* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *fruits* > *fruit* F] of every kind

1 Nephi 15:36

whose fruit is most precious and most desirable
of all other [*fruits* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *fruit* J]

Alma 36:25

the Lord doth give me exceeding great joy
in the [*fruits* 0 | *fruit* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of my labors

3 Nephi 24:11 (quoting Malachi 3:11, which reads *fruit*)

neither shall your vine cast
her [*fruit* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *fruits* D] before the time in the field

Even so, there are a number of cases similar to Jacob 5:74 where the original text had the plural *were* instead of the expected singular *was*. In each of these cases, the earliest text has an overtly singular subject, but the underlying meaning is plural and therefore the verb can be in the plural:

Jacob 7:24

and it came to pass that many means were devised
to reclaim and restore the Lamanites to the knowledge of the truth
but **it all were** vain

Alma 22:23

and the king stood forth and began to minister unto them
and he did minister unto them
insomuch that **his whole household were** converted unto the Lord

Mormon 5:7

and it came to pass that we did again take to flight
and they **whose flight were** swifter than the Lamanites did escape

Although *fruit* is in the singular in Jacob 5:74, the larger passage refers to the fruit of different trees and branches that have been reunited; thus there is an underlying plural sense for the singular *fruit*, with the result that the verb can be in the plural. In other words, the subject-verb disagreement in “the fruit were equal” is acceptable and should therefore be restored to the text. The RLDS text has left the original usage unchanged, an indication that the disagreement in number is not especially egregious.

Summary: Restore the original singular *fruit* in Jacob 5:74 (“and the fruit were equal”); although the subject is singular in form, its implied meaning is plural and thus *fruit* is acceptable as the subject for the plural verb form *were*.

■ Jacob 5:75

*and it came to pass that when the Lord of the vineyard saw that his fruit was good
and that his vineyard was no more corrupt
he [calleth >js called 1 | calleth A | called BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up his servants
and [sayeth >js said 1 | sayeth A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto them*

Here we have the conjoining of two instances of the historical present, both of which were edited to the simple past tense by Joseph Smith. There is one other occurrence in the original text of two historical present-tense verbs being conjoined, but in this case both verbs are the same (namely *saith*):

Mosiah 7:27–28

and because he **saith** unto them that Christ was the God the Father of all things
and **saith** that he should take upon him the image of man . . .
and now because he said this / they did put him to death

But the conjoining of two different verbs both in the historical present tense does not occur in the Book of Mormon text except for here in Jacob 5:75. There are 26 cases where we have one or

two verbs in the past tense followed by the historical present; and in every case, the verb in the historical present is *saith*:

1 Nephi 2:1	the Lord spake unto my father . . . and saith unto him
2 Nephi 4:3	he called the children of Laman . . . and saith unto them
Jacob 5:41	the Lord of the vineyard wept and saith unto the servant
Mosiah 12:9	and they took him and carried him bound before the king and saith unto the king
Alma 14:14	and he smote them with his hand . . . and saith unto them
Alma 14:19	the judge stood before them and saith
Alma 14:24	and the chief judge stood before them and smote them again and saith unto them
Alma 18:2	he was astonished exceedingly and saith
Alma 18:14	Ammon turned himself unto the king and saith unto him
Alma 20:13	his father was angry with him and saith
Alma 20:17	but Ammon stood forth and saith unto him
Alma 20:26	he was astonished exceedingly and saith
Alma 32:7	but he stretched forth his hand and cried unto those . . . and saith unto them
Alma 44:8	he came forth and delivered up his sword . . . and saith unto him
Alma 45:2	Alma came unto his son Helaman and saith unto him
3 Nephi 13:25	he looked upon the twelve whom he had chosen and saith unto them
3 Nephi 15:1	he cast his eyes round about on the multitude and saith unto them
3 Nephi 17:14	Jesus groaned within himself and saith
3 Nephi 17:23	and he spake unto the multitude and saith unto them
3 Nephi 18:17	he turned again unto the multitude and saith unto them
3 Nephi 18:26	he turned his eyes again upon the disciples . . . and saith unto them
3 Nephi 19:35	he came again to the disciples and saith unto them
3 Nephi 23:8	and he cast his eyes upon them and saith
3 Nephi 27:2	and Jesus came and stood in the midst of them and saith unto them
Ether 8:9	she did talk with her father and saith unto him
Ether 8:13	Akish gathered in unto the house of Jared all his kinsfolks and saith unto them

In all these instances of the historical present, Joseph Smith substituted the past-tense *said* for *saith* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

The systematic nature of the rest of the text with respect to this use of the historical present makes one wonder if the present-tense *calleth* in Jacob 5:75 is a mistake for *called*. Based on the 26 other examples, we should expect “he **called** up his servants and **saith** unto them”. On the other hand, there is nothing inherently wrong with having the historical present occur throughout the sentence. In fact, when we look at how the historical present *saith* is used in the King James Bible, we find considerable variation with respect to the tense of the preceding conjoined verbs. In the

following classification based on usage in the four Gospels, the ending *-eth* stands for the historical present and *-ed* for the simple past tense. For each type, I cite the first occurrence in the Gospels:

- <verb>-**ed** and **saith**

Mark 6:50

and immediatly he **talked** with them
and **saith** unto them

16 times
- <verb>-**eth** and **saith**

Matthew 26:36

then **cometh** Jesus with them
unto a place called Gethsemane
and **saith** unto the disciples

13 times
- <verb>-**ed** and <verb>-**ed** and **saith**

Matthew 20:6

he **went** out
and **found** others standing idle
and **saith** unto them

8 times
- <verb>-**eth** and <verb>-**eth** and **saith**

Matthew 4:5–6

then the devil **taketh** him up into the holy city
and **setteth** him on a pinnacle of the temple
and **saith** unto him

5 times
- <verb>-**ed** and <verb>-**eth** and **saith**

John 1:43

the day following Jesus **would** go forth into Galilee
and **findeth** Philip
and **saith** unto him

1 time
- <verb>-**eth** and <verb>-**ed** and **saith**

Mark 14:33–34

and he **taketh** with him Peter and James and John
and **began** to be sore amazed and to be very heavy
and **saith** unto them

1 time

Thus there is considerable variation in the tense of conjoined verbs in the King James text (as also in the underlying Greek original). Note, in particular, the last example, which switches from the historical present (*taketh*) to the simple past tense (*began*) and then back to the historical present (*saith*). Thus we should probably not expect the Book of Mormon text to be fully systematic with respect to the historical present. The critical text will maintain the unique occurrence of conjoined occurrences of the historical present for two different verbs in Jacob 5:75.

Summary: Restore both occurrences of the historical present in Jacob 5:75 (“he **calleth** up his servants and **saith** unto them”).

■ Jacob 5:75

*for because that ye have been diligent in laboring with me in my vineyard
and have kept my commandments
and [hath >js have 1 | hath A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brought
unto me again the natural fruit
that my vineyard is no more corrupted
and the bad is cast away
behold ye shall have joy with me
because of the fruit of my vineyard*

Here we have a strange series of conjoined verb forms: “ye have . . . and have . . . and hath”. Obviously, “ye hath” is grammatically incorrect, which explains why Joseph Smith edited the *hath* to *have*. David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that the text here originally read *it hath* and that early in the transmission of the text the pronoun *it* was accidentally dropped, thus creating the odd “ye have . . . and have . . . and **hath**”. Note, in particular, that the preceding verbal conjunct has no explicit subject (“and have”) and yet it does have the correct verb form for *ye*—namely, *have*. One wonders, then, why the final verbal conjunct shouldn’t have also read “and have”.

Calabro points out that elsewhere the allegory refers only to the trees of the vineyard as bringing forth fruit (28 times). In one case, there is a reference to the Lord himself as bringing forth fruit: “that I may bring forth again the natural fruit” (verse 61); the vineyard, of course, is the Lord’s, so if the vineyard brings forth the natural fruit again, then metaphorically the Lord does as well. Early in the allegory, there is a reference to the servant bringing branches to the master to be burned (verse 7), but there are no references to the servant bringing fruit to the master of the vineyard. Two earlier references, however, refer to the trees in the vineyard as “bringing forth fruit unto the master of the vineyard”:

Jacob 5:27 (referring to the tree representing the Nephites and the Lamanites)

but behold the servant saith unto him
let us prune it and dig about it and nourish it a little longer
that perhaps it may **bring forth good fruit unto thee**
that thou canst lay it up against the season

Jacob 5:54 (referring to the roots of the mother tree, the house of Israel)

yea I will graft in unto them the branches of their mother tree
that I may preserve the roots also unto mine own self
that when they shall be sufficiently strong
that perhaps they may **bring forth good fruit unto me**

Thus in verse 75, if the predicate “hath brought unto me again the natural fruit” is referring to the vineyard itself as once more bringing forth natural fruit, then all is explained, including the resultive clause that immediately follows: “that my vineyard is no more corrupted”. Basically, we can interpret this passage as having a long, intervening parenthetical statement about how successful the Lord and his servants were in their labor:

Jacob 5:75 (as emended)

for because that ye have been diligent in laboring with me in my vineyard
and have kept my commandments
—and **it hath** brought unto me again the natural fruit
that my vineyard is no more corrupted
and the bad is cast away—
behold ye shall have joy with me
because of the fruit of my vineyard

The critical text will therefore emend Jacob 5:75 to read “and **it hath** brought unto me again the natural fruit”. It is quite possible that the pronoun *it* was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text, either as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or as Oliver copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . See Jacob 5:24 for another example in the olive tree allegory where the pronoun *it* was apparently dropped in the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Emend Jacob 5:75 by adding *it* before the original verb form *hath*: “and **it hath** brought unto me again the natural fruit”; this single emendation clears up several difficulties in the earliest extant reading.

■ Jacob 5:76

for a long time [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I lay up of the fruit
of my vineyard unto mine own self against the season which speedily cometh*

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the modal verb *will*. Almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the *will* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). He placed the *will* before the subject pronoun *I*, although it would have also been possible to insert it after the *I* (that is, “for a long time **I will lay up** of the fruit of my vineyard”). Either the inverted or non-inverted word order is possible after a clause-initial adverbial phrase such as “for a long time”. For further discussion regarding the word order of the auxiliary verb *will* after an initial adverbial phrase, see under 2 Nephi 25:16 (which discusses the placement of the *will* in “then at that time **the day will come**”).

We should also consider the possibility that the original text here in Jacob 5:76 had no modal verb—that is, it is possible that the text here read in the simple present tense as “for a long time **I lay up** of the fruit of my vineyard”. But such present-tense usage would be completely foreign to the narrative nature of the olive tree allegory. In most instances the verb *lay up* takes some kind of modal in Jacob 5:

Jacob 5:13	that I may lay up fruit thereof
Jacob 5:18	I shall lay up much fruit
Jacob 5:18	the fruit thereof I shall lay up
Jacob 5:19	that I may lay up of the fruit thereof
Jacob 5:27	that thou canst lay it up
Jacob 5:29	I must lay up fruit
Jacob 5:71	the fruit which I shall lay up
Jacob 5:76	I will lay up unto mine own self of the fruit

There are also examples where *lay up* takes the perfect auxiliary *have*:

Jacob 5:31	I have laid up unto myself against the season much fruit
Jacob 5:46	and these I had hope to preserve to have laid up fruit thereof

There are also two instances of the verb *lay up* in the imperative:

Jacob 5:20	take of the fruit thereof and lay it up
Jacob 5:23	therefore gather it and lay it up

But there are no examples of *lay up* in the simple present or simple past tenses (such as “I lay up fruit unto myself” or “I laid up fruit unto myself”). Such usage would probably have sounded strange in this narrative-based allegory. A similar argument was made regarding the oddity of *I take* in the earliest extant reading for Jacob 5:8 (“I take away many of these young and tender branches”).

The second example of *lay up* in verse 76 provides strong support for the modal verb *will* that was supralinearly inserted in the first example: both examples repeat the same phrases but in a different order:

FIRST OCCURRENCE	SECOND OCCURRENCE
for behold	wherefore
(a) for a long time	(b') I will lay up
(b) will I lay up	(d') unto mine own self
(c) of the fruit of my vineyard	(c') of the fruit
(d) unto mine own self	(a') for a long time

Since the supralinear *will* in the first example was inserted almost immediately, we can safely assume that it represents the original text in Jacob 5:76.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 5:76 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} that placed the modal auxiliary *will* right after the clause-initial adverbial phrase (“for a long time **will I lay up** of the fruit of my vineyard unto mine own self”).

Jacob 6

■ Jacob 6:1

And now [NULL >+ *behold* 1 | *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *my brethren*
—*as I said unto you that I would prophesy*—
behold *this is my prophecy*

Here Oliver Cowdery corrected the initial text of the printer's manuscript when he supralinearly inserted *behold* with a heavier ink flow. This change does not appear to be grammatically motivated, especially since it creates a sentence with two *behold*'s. Oliver Cowdery probably added the *behold* while proofing his copy against the original manuscript (which is not extant here).

There are 22 examples in the text of two or more *behold*'s in the same sentence, including the following examples where there is an intervening subordinate clause headed by a subordinate conjunction:

Alma 34:35

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

Alma 52:1

And now it came to pass in the twenty and sixth year
of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
behold when the Lamanites awoke on the first morning of the first month
behold they found Amalickiah was dead in his own tent

Helaman 14:20

but **behold**
—*as I said unto you concerning another sign / a sign of his death*—
behold in the day that he shall suffer death the sun shall be darkened

The last example has the same subordinate conjunction that Jacob 6:1 has (namely, *as*). From the perspective of usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there is nothing unusual about the use of multiple *behold*'s within the same sentence; the insertion of the first *behold* in Jacob 6:1 should therefore be accepted as the reading of the original text.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 6:1 the two *behold*'s that occur within the same sentence; Oliver Cowdery probably inserted the first *behold* when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

■ **Jacob 6:1**

*behold this is my prophecy: that the things
which this [NULL >+ Prophet 1 | prophet ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Zenos
spake concerning the house of Israel . . .*

As in the previous example of *behold*, Oliver Cowdery here supralinearly inserted the word *prophet* with heavier ink flow. This alteration seems to be a correction based on the original manuscript (which is not extant here). This correction, however, creates an unusual reading. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are three distinct ways, besides the common use of X alone, to refer to a prophet X (where X is a name): either “the prophet X”, “X the prophet”, or “this (same) X”:

□ *the prophet X*

the prophet Zenos	1 Nephi 19:12 1 Nephi 19:16 Jacob 5:1 Helaman 8:19 Helaman 15:11 3 Nephi 10:16
the prophet Isaiah	1 Nephi 19:23 3 Nephi 16:17
the prophet Samuel	3 Nephi 8:3

□ *X the prophet*

Samuel the prophet	3 Nephi 1:9 Mormon 2:10
Elijah the prophet	3 Nephi 25:5

□ *this (same) X*

this Amlici	Alma 2:2
this Alma	Alma 10:10
this same Melchizedek	Alma 13:15
this Melchizedek	Alma 13:17
this Lehi	Alma 53:2
this Gaddianton	Helaman 2:12 Helaman 2:13
this Nephi	Helaman 9:16
this Lachoneus	3 Nephi 3:12
this Gidgiddoni	3 Nephi 3:19

In the last of these three types, the X can refer to any individual, not just a prophet. But outside of Jacob 6:1, there are no occurrences of “this prophet X”—or even with some other title such as captain, general, chief judge, or governor. Interestingly, in 3 Nephi 3:12, we have a case where the

title follows the name as an appositive (“this Lachoneus **the governor** was a just man”), but the title does not come between *this* and the name (as in “this governor Lachoneus”).

This contrastive patterning suggests that the original manuscript in Jacob 6:1 actually read “the prophet Zenos”. Such a reading would be consistent with all prior occurrences of “the prophet Zenos” (two by Nephi in 1 Nephi 19 and one by Jacob himself at the beginning of the olive tree allegory in Jacob 5:1). By the time the reader gets to Jacob 6, Zenos is already known, and thus one could argue that there is no need for Jacob to use *this* when he has already referred to Zenos as “the prophet Zenos” (in Jacob 5:1). Otherwise in the text, the demonstrative *this* prefaces a name soon after the individual’s name has first been mentioned or in a quote of someone else’s speech where the person’s name would have been new to the speaker and his audience at the time (see, for instance, Alma 10:10, where Amulek refers to Alma, who is already well known to the reader, as “this Alma”).

Now if Oliver Cowdery, when copying “the prophet Zenos” from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , accidentally missed the word *prophet*, he could have initially written “this Zenos” since “the Zenos” would have been impossible. Later, while proofing against the original manuscript, he noticed that the word *prophet* was missing, so he inserted it but neglected to correct the *this* to *the*. In this way, Oliver would have ended up creating a unique reading, “this prophet Zenos”.

In contrast to this argument, the use of “this prophet Zenos”, despite its uniqueness, is not especially difficult here in Jacob 6:1. Jacob has just finished reading the long olive tree allegory, and the *this* here seems to be used more in the sense of ‘this prophet Zenos that I have just been quoting from’. Even though we may have an error here in Jacob 6:1, the earliest reading is possible. Unique readings do occur in the Book of Mormon text and should not be removed simply because they are unique. Thus the critical text will retain the corrected reading “this prophet Zenos” here in Jacob 6:1.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 6:1 the unique phraseology of “this prophet Zenos”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (although this reading could be an error for “the prophet Zenos”, used elsewhere by Jacob in Jacob 5:1 and by Nephi in 1 Nephi 19:12 and 1 Nephi 19:16).

■ Jacob 6:2

*and [in 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] the day
that he shall set his hand again the second time to recover his people
is the day—yea even the last time—that the servants of the Lord shall go forth*

The committee for the 1920 LDS edition removed the preposition *in* here at the beginning of Jacob 6:2, thus equating the two days (“the day that S_1 is the day that S_2 ”, where S_1 and S_2 stand for finite clauses). This editing rejects the idea of one day being included as part of another day. Yet the word *day* in this passage stands for a period of time, not a literal 24-hour day, so the second *day* can actually be considered a part of the first. In fact, the explanatory “yea even the last time”, in reference to the second *day*, implies as much. In other words, the meaning of the text is:

and **in the period of time**
that he shall set his hand again the second time to recover his people
is **the last period of time** that the servants of the Lord shall go forth

It is possible, of course, that the preposition *in* was accidentally introduced during the early transmission of the text, perhaps because of the familiarity of the phraseology “in the day that”. This language occurs seven other times in the original Book of Mormon text, as in Omni 1:9: “and he wrote it **in the day that** he delivered them unto me”. But more significantly, this phraseology would have been familiar to the scribes from the creation story in the King James Bible:

Genesis 2:4

these *are* the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created
in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens

Genesis 2:17

for **in the day that** thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die

Even so, there is no evidence in the manuscripts (or the printed editions, for that matter) of the preposition *in* being accidentally introduced into the text unless there already is an *in* elsewhere in the same sentence (for an example, see the discussion regarding the intrusive *in* in 2 Nephi 11:5). The critical text will accept the earliest reading in Jacob 6:2 since the *in* is possible when the word *day* is figuratively interpreted as a period of time.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 6:2 the original “and **in** the day that” since the word *day* can be metaphorically interpreted as referring to a period of time of varying length, thus allowing a day to be within a day.

■ Jacob 6:5

*and while his arm of mercy is extended towards you
in the light of [the 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] day
harden not your hearts*

In modern English, speakers expect “the light of day”; thus the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the definite article *the* before *day*, probably unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *the* in “the light of **the** day”. Elsewhere, the original Book of Mormon text consistently has “of the day”, never “of day”:

Alma 47:14

so that before they awoke
at the dawn **of** [the 0ABCDEFGHJKPS | NULL > the 1 | IJLMNOQRT] **day**
they were surrounded by the armies of Lehonti

Alma 51:33

and behold sleep had overpowered them because of their much fatigue
which was caused by the labors and heat **of the day**

(I exclude from this list the one example where “of the day” is postmodified; in such a situation the definite article *the* is required: “until the end of **the** day of probation”, in 2 Nephi 33:9.) The example in Alma 47:14 shows that on two different occasions the *the* was deleted from the phrase “of the day”: (1) initially by Oliver Cowdery as he was copying from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{D} , and (2) by the typesetter for the 1879 LDS edition.

Summary: Maintain the use of the definite article in the prepositional phrase “of the day” in Jacob 6:5.

■ Jacob 6:9–10

- (0) *know ye not **that** if ye will do these things*
 (1) ***that** the power of the redemption and the resurrection which is in Christ will bring you
 to stand with shame and awful guilt before the bar of God
 and according to the power of justice—for justice cannot be denied—*
 (2) [*that* >js NULL 1 | *That* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *ye must go away
 into that lake of fire and brimstone*

The syntax is very complex here in Jacob 6:9–10, but basically Jacob is rhetorically asking his listeners to acknowledge that if they are evil they will stand guilty before the bar of God and, according to God’s justice, they will be sent into eternal punishment. In the original text, each of the two stages in God’s judgment is preceded by the subordinate conjunction *that* (identified above as 1 and 2). These two *that*’s are instances of what may be called the repeated *that* since they each repeat an earlier *that* (identified above as 0). In other words, there is a *that* both before and after an initial conditional clause, thus “know ye not **that** if S_0 **that** S_1 and . . . **that** S_2 ” (where S_0 , S_1 , and S_2 are finite clauses). The repeated *that* is considered ungrammatical in standard written English, but it is common in spoken English. Some instances of the repeated *that* have been edited out of the text, as in the following two examples:

2 Nephi 10:24
 and remember
 [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after ye are reconciled unto God
that it is only in and through the grace of God that ye are saved

Jacob 5:54
 yea I will graft in unto them the branches of their mother tree
 that I may preserve the roots also unto mine own self
that when they shall be sufficiently strong
 [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 perhaps they may bring forth good fruit unto me

In the first example, the initial *that* was deleted; in the second example, the repeated *that* was deleted. But other passages have not been edited, as in the following two examples:

Mosiah 4:1
 And now it came to pass
that when king Benjamin had made an end of speaking the words
 which had been delivered unto him by the angel of the Lord
that he cast his eyes round about on the multitude

Alma 45:23
 and now it came to pass
that after Helaman and his brethren had appointed priests and teachers
 over the churches
that there arose a dissension among them

There are many more examples of the repeated *that*, with some edited and some left unedited in the text. For further discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

Here in Jacob 6:9–10, Joseph Smith removed the second repeated *that* in his editing for the 1837 edition. But the first repeated *that* was not removed. It would appear that the reason for removing the second *that* was because the original syntax was extremely awkward, given the preceding adverbial phrase and parenthetical clause (“according to the power of justice / for justice cannot be denied”).

Another factor that has complicated the syntax for this passage has been the punctuation. The continual use of question marks in the 1830 edition at least preserved the connection between the two stages of God’s judgment and maintained both stages as part of Jacob’s rhetorical question. But otherwise the accidentals made the passage almost incoherent:

Jacob 6:9–10 (1830 accidentals)

Know ye not that if ye will do these things,
 that the power of the redemption and the resurrection which is in Christ,
 will bring you to stand with shame and awful guilt before the bar of God,
 and according to the power of justice?
 for justice cannot be denied.
 That ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone,
 whose flames are unquenchable,
 and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever?
 which lake of fire and brimstone, is endless torment.

The punctuation for the second edition (1837) considerably improved the reading; but by deleting the *that*, Joseph Smith separated the second stage from the first stage of God’s judgment, with the result that the second stage no longer belongs to Jacob’s rhetorical question:

Jacob 6:9–10 (1837 accidentals)

Know ye not that if ye will do these things,
 that the power of the redemption and the resurrection which is in Christ,
 will bring you to stand with shame and awful guilt before the bar of God?
 And according to the power of justice,
 for justice cannot be denied,
 ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone,
 whose flames are unquenchable,
 and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever,
 which lake of fire and brimstone, is endless torment.

The critical text will restore the second repeated *that* and parse the passage so that both stages of God’s judgment are contained within Jacob’s rhetorical question:

Jacob 6:9–10 (the original text, with minimal punctuation)

Know ye not that if ye will do these things
 that the power of the redemption and the resurrection which is in Christ
 will bring you to stand with shame and awful guilt before the bar of God,
 and, according to the power of justice (for justice cannot be denied),
 that ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone,
 whose flames are unquenchable
 and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever,
 which lake of fire and brimstone is endless torment.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 6:10 the second repeated *that* (which Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition); the two repeated *that*'s help the reader identify Jacob's rhetorical question as referring to two different stages in God's judgment of evildoers.

■ Jacob 6:11

O then my beloved brethren
repent ye and enter [ye 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in
 at the [strait 01RST | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ] gate
 and **continue** in the way which is narrow

Both the original and the printer's manuscripts have *ye* after *enter*. The 1830 typesetter deleted this second *ye* in the passage. The omission was probably accidental, although there is the possibility that the typesetter noticed that the third verb, *continue*, did not have a *ye* and he therefore decided that the text would read more consistently with only the one *ye* at the beginning (thus “**repent ye** and **enter** in at the strait gate and **continue** in the way which is narrow”).

Even so, the occurrence of the *ye* after *enter* is correct. The language of this passage parallels the biblical phraseology in the Sermon on the Mount:

Matthew 7:13 enter **ye** in at the strait gate

Jesus twice quoted this same language to the Nephites, and in both cases the *ye* is in the text:

3 Nephi 14:13 enter **ye** in at the strait gate

3 Nephi 27:33 enter **ye** in at the strait gate

Thus “enter ye” is appropriate in Jacob 6:11, and the *ye* should be restored.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the adjective here is *strait*, not *straight*. Note, in particular, that the language of this passage is found in Matthew 7:13, which clearly refers to “the strait gate”, not “the straight gate”.

Summary: Restore the *ye* after *enter* in Jacob 6:11 (in accord with the reading of both manuscripts); all three Book of Mormon occurrences of “enter **ye** in at the strait gate” read identically and have the pronoun *ye*; as noted under 1 Nephi 8:20, the correct adjective for *gate* is *strait*, not *straight*.

■ Jacob 6:13

finally I bid you farewell until I shall meet you
 before the [NULL > pleasing 0 | pleasing 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] bar of God
 which bar striketh the wicked with awful dread and fear

The word *pleasing* is not itself extant in the original manuscript, but spacing considerations based on surrounding fragments indicate that it was probably inserted supralinearly—that is, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “before the bar of God” and then corrected it by inserting *pleasing*. The transcript of ☉ reads as follows:

Jacob 6

Jacob 6:12–13 (lines 3–5 on page 111 of *Œ*)

(I b)i(d you f)a(r)ewell untill I shall (y)ou be
I SAY MORE FINELY MEET
()
PLEASING
(d) which bar striketh the wic(ke) with awful dr
-FORE THE ^ BAR OF GO D
() Chapter (V) ~~~~~ ()
-EAD & FEAR - AMEN — ~

Accidentally omitting the word *pleasing* is perfectly reasonable here since normally the Book of Mormon refers to simply “the bar of God” (in nine different places) but only twice to “the **pleasing** bar of God” — here in Jacob 6:13 and once more at the end of the entire text, where Moroni declares:

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
the eternal judge of both quick and dead

The problem here in these two passages is that the word *pleasing* does not really work as a descriptive adjective for “the bar of God”. For the righteous, it may well be pleasing, but not for the wicked, as Jacob himself says in Jacob 6:13: “which bar striketh the wicked with awful dread and fear”. Nor do the nine other occurrences of “the bar of God” denote anything necessarily pleasing, including three that are definitely negative (each marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 33:11

and you and I shall stand face to face **before his bar**

* 2 Nephi 33:15

for what I seal on earth shall be brought against you **at the judgment bar**

* Jacob 6:9

know ye not that if ye will do these things
that the power of the redemption and the resurrection which is in Christ
will bring you to stand with shame and awful guilt **before the bar of God**

Mosiah 16:10

even this mortal shall put on immortality
and this corruption shall put on incorruption
and shall be brought to stand **before the bar of God**
to be judged of him according to their works
whether they be good or whether they be evil

* Alma 5:22

how will any of you feel if ye shall stand **before the bar of God**
having your garments stained with blood and all manner of filthiness

Alma 11:44

but all things shall be restored to its perfect frame
as it is now or in the body
and shall be brought and be arraigned **before the bar of Christ**

Alma 12:12

and Amulek hath spoken plainly concerning death
and being raised from this mortality to a state of immortality
and being brought **before the bar of God**
to be judged according to our works

Mormon 9:13

and they shall come forth both small and great
and all shall stand **before his bar**
being redeemed and loosed from this eternal band of death

Moroni 10:27

for ye shall see me **at the bar of God**

Christian Gellinek (personal communication, 25 September 2003) suggests that the reading “the **pleasing** bar” is actually an error for “the **pleading** bar”. Gellinek further suggests that this change of *pleading* to *pleasing* (in Jacob 6:13 and Moroni 10:34) could have taken place as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . He proposes that \mathcal{O} had the correct *pleading* but that Oliver misread the *d* of *pleading* as an elongated *s* (that is, as *pleafing*) and ended up writing *pleasing* in \mathcal{P} . Presumably, Oliver twice made this same error in copying, here in Jacob 6:13 and also in Moroni 10:34. Yet nowhere else, while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} did Oliver ever misinterpret a *d* as an elongated *s*. In fact, Oliver himself rarely used that form of *s* in the manuscripts unlike scribes 2 and 3 of \mathcal{O} , so he would not have been inclined to visually misinterpret *pleading* as *pleafing*.

I myself would conjecture that if such an error entered the text, it probably occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. (For Jacob 6:13, Oliver was definitely the scribe in \mathcal{O} ; for Moroni 10:34, he is the most likely candidate since the nearest extant portions of \mathcal{O} are in his hand.) Phonetically, *pleading* and *pleasing* are identical except for the manner of articulation for one sound: *pleading* has the voiced alveolar **stop** /d/ and *pleasing* the voiced alveolar **fricative** /z/. In the case of Jacob 6:13, Oliver could have also been influenced by the fact that previously in the book of Jacob there were several references to the very similar “pleasing **word** of God”:

Jacob 2:8 and it supposeth me that they have come up hither
to hear **the pleasing word of God**

Jacob 2:9 and those which have not been wounded
instead of feasting upon **the pleasing word of God**
have daggers placed to pierce their souls

Jacob 3:2 O all ye that are pure in heart: lift up your heads
and receive **the pleasing word of God** and feast upon his love

But this source for influencing the text cannot explain the use of *pleasing* in Moroni 10:34 since there are no prior occurrences of the adjectival *pleasing* in the entire second half of the Book of Mormon text (that is, after Alma 30:53). Moreover, the book of Moroni was apparently dictated

before the small plates of Nephi (see volume 3 for discussion of the order of translation). Since the small plates include the book of Jacob, there could have been no influence from the book of Jacob when Oliver took down Joseph’s dictation at the end of the book of Moroni. In fact, the phraseology in Moroni 10:34 is not literally “the pleasing bar of God” but instead is “the pleasing bar of the great Jehovah”, so the influence of “the pleasing word of God” from Jacob 2–3 couldn’t have been that strong even if the book of Jacob had been dictated prior to the book of Moroni.

What seems to have happened is that Oliver Cowdery, being completely unfamiliar with the legal term *pleading bar*, substituted the more familiar word *pleasing* for *pleading*, even though *pleasing* itself did not make much sense. There are a number of examples in the original manuscript where Oliver made this kind of mistake—that is, if a word or a phrase was unknown to him, he tended to substitute a more common word or phrase (but with varying degrees of success). In each of these cases, the substitution seems to have occurred in the original manuscript as Oliver took down Joseph Smith’s dictation; then it was later copied as such into the printer’s manuscript:

- *weed* (Œ, Ø) instead of *reed* (1830 edition)
 - 1 Nephi 17:48
 - and whoso shall lay their hands upon me shall wither
 - even as a dried [*weed* 01 | *reed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- *bosom* (Œ, Ø) instead of *besom* (1830 edition)
 - 2 Nephi 24:23
 - and I will sweep it
 - with the [*bosom* 0 | *bosom* >jg *besom* 1 | *besom* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 - of destruction
- *arrest* (Œ, Ø, 1830 edition) instead of *wrest* (1837 edition)
 - Alma 13:20
 - behold the scriptures are before you
 - if ye will [*arest* >js *wrest* 1 | *arrest* A | *wrest* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them
 - it shall be to your own destruction
 - Alma 41:1
 - for behold some have
 - [*arested* 0 | *arested* >js *wrestid* 1 | *arrested* A |
 - wrested* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the scriptures
 - and have gone far astray because of this thing
- *drugs* (Œ, Ø) instead of *dregs* (1830 edition)
 - Alma 40:26
 - and they drink
 - the [*drugs* 01 | *dregs* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of a bitter cup
- *fraction* (Œ, Ø) instead of *faction* (1830 edition)
 - Alma 58:36
 - behold we fear that
 - there is some [*fraction* 0 | *fartion* > *farction* 1 |
 - fraction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the government

The examples of *weed* for *reed* and *fraction* for *faction* are not impossible readings, but given Oliver’s predilection to misinterpret unfamiliar expressions, *weed* and *fraction* are probably errors. For each of the five cases listed above, English language usage supports the current reading. (See the individual discussion for each of these examples.)

It should also be pointed out that for all these examples, Joseph Smith himself could have been responsible for the misreading. Even so, the fact that Oliver Cowdery copied these mistakes from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} is an indication that Oliver himself was probably unfamiliar with the original words and phrases found in these examples. For four of these expressions, the 1830 compositor figured out the correct interpretation and emended the text appropriately (in the case of *besom*, he probably consulted his King James Bible). But the 1830 compositor, just like Oliver Cowdery, could not figure out the correct reading for two cases—namely, the phrase “wrest the scriptures” and the legal expression “before the pleading bar”. The 1830 compositor set both as Oliver had written them: “arrest the scriptures” and “before the pleasing bar”. The first of these was later corrected by Joseph Smith himself in his editing for the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon, but the other has remained in all printed editions, apparently because no one until recently has recognized *pleasing bar* as an error for *pleading bar*.

One may wonder how Oliver Cowdery could have twice misinterpreted *pleading bar* as *pleasing bar*. Moroni 10:34 and Jacob 6:13 are located some distance apart (with about 110 manuscript pages of \mathcal{O} separating them, under the assumption that the small plates of Nephi were translated last). But one should note that the example of “wrest the scriptures” is also twice misinterpreted as “arrest the scriptures”, and the distance between Alma 13:20 and Alma 41:1 is almost 70 manuscript pages of \mathcal{O} , also a large amount. It is clearly possible to make the same misinterpretation at two different times.

The term *pleading bar* appears to have been used in the English courts of earlier times, according to the following historical information available on the Internet:

“Report on Fordwich Trip” in *Kent Message* “Extra”, 10 September 1999
<www.powell-pressburger.org>, accessed on 23 October 2003:

The tour ended at the town hall. Mr. Tritton said: “That was the most interesting part of the day. The people who made the film reproduced the court room back at their studio. They had the jury bench, **the pleading bar**, everything, right down to the smallest detail of King Charles II’s coat of arms.”

At the head of the stairs, Sgt. Bassett ducks under a beam inscribed ‘Love and honour the truth.’ In real life **the court’s pleading bar, where prisoners stood while on trial**, is at the head of the stairs. It does not obstruct anyone entering the room, nor bear an inscription—though the motto ‘Love and honour the truth’ is prominent under King Charles II’s Coat of Arms, displayed on the ceiling above the panelled rear wall.

Fordwich Town Hall website (updated on 23 July 2003)
<www.canterbury.gov.uk>, accessed on 23 October 2003:

On the first floor is the Court Room where all criminal cases in Fordwich were tried until 1886. **The accused would stand flanked by the Town Constables, at the “pleading bar” situated at the head of the stairs. (Hence the expression “prisoner at the bar”).** The Judge or chief magistrate was the Mayor for the

time being and he sat in the chair at the north end of the room, flanked by six Jurats on each side, seated on the “bench”. The Mayor’s seat and bench together with the paneling are early Tudor in origin.

In *The English Legal Heritage* (Leicester, England: Oyez Publishing, 1979), there are three pertinent pictures (on pages 14–15, 26, and 85), each showing a defendant standing at the pleading bar and facing the judges or the jury. And the examples in the Book of Mormon text refer to the person being judged at the bar of God as standing:

2 Nephi 33:11	you and I shall stand face to face before his bar
Jacob 6:9	to stand with shame and awful guilt before the bar of God
Mosiah 16:10	to stand before the bar of God
Alma 5:22	ye shall stand before the bar of God
Mormon 9:13	all shall stand before his bar

The term *pleading bar* is now archaic in Britain. Note that the first website provides a definition for “the court’s pleading bar”; the second website uses quotation marks in referring to the “pleading bar”; and the book *The English Legal Heritage* never uses the term *pleading bar* anywhere in the text or in any of the captions for the pictures. The legal language now used refers to the defendant “in the dock” (no longer “standing at the bar”). The Oxford English Dictionary lists no citations of the term *pleading bar*, but Ed Cutler (personal communication, 1 October 2004) has found the following two instances of the term on *Literature Online* (<lion.chadwyck.com>); both citations date from the early 1600s (spelling regularized here):

John Harington, *Orlando Furioso* (1607), stanza 46, lines 369–372:

If you deny my claim, here I will prove it,
This field the court, this list my **pleading bar**,
My plea is such, as no writ can remove it,
My judge must be the sequel of the war.

John Webster, *Appius and Virginia* (no later than 1634), act 5, scene 1

Fortune hath lift thee to my Chair,
and thrown me headlong to thy **pleading bar**.

And the actual translator of the Book of Mormon—the Lord himself or his translation committee—seems to have been familiar with the term! And it provides a vivid picture of how momentous and potentially dreadful the day of judgment will be for us as defendants standing at the pleading bar, with the Lord as judge, twelve apostles as jury (see 1 Nephi 12:8–10 and Mormon 3:18–19), and Nephi, Jacob, and Moroni as witnesses.

Summary: Emend Jacob 6:13 and Moroni 10:34 to read “the pleading bar” instead of the problematic “the pleasing bar”; Oliver Cowdery was apparently unfamiliar with the legal term and substituted *pleasing* for *pleading*, probably when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for these two passages.

Jacob 7

■ Jacob 7:1

And now it came to pass that

[NULL >+ *after* 01 | *after* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *some years had passed away*
there came a man among the people of Nephi whose name was Sherem

In both the original and printer’s manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “And now it came to pass that some years had passed away there came a man among the people of Nephi”. There was obviously some error here, which Oliver corrected by supralinearly inserting in both manuscripts the word *after*. Not only is the correction in both manuscripts with the same heavier ink flow, but it is awkwardly inserted with an unsteady hand in \mathcal{O} . This change appears to be Oliver’s emendation of the text, and the insertion in both manuscripts seems to have taken place when Oliver produced the printer’s manuscript. So the question is whether his emendation is in fact correct.

Elsewhere the current Book of Mormon text has examples similar to Oliver Cowdery’s emendation here in Jacob 7:1; all of these examples are found in 4 Nephi and Mormon, although in two of these cases (each marked below with an asterisk) the original text also had a Hebraistic *and* between a preceding parenthetical clause and the following independent clause:

4 Nephi 1:27

and it came to pass that **when** two hundred and ten years had passed away
there were many churches in the land

4 Nephi 1:45

and it came to pass that **when** three hundred years had passed away
both the people of Nephi and the Lamanites had become exceeding wicked

* 4 Nephi 1:47 (the printer’s manuscript has an & before *Amos*)

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

4 Nephi 1:48

and it came to pass that **when** three hundred and twenty years had passed away
Ammaron being constrained by the Holy Ghost did hide up the records

* Mormon 3:4 (the printer’s manuscript has an & before *the king*)

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

Mormon 6:5

and **when** three hundred and eighty and four years had passed away
we had gathered in all the remainder of our people unto the land Cumorah

But the Book of Mormon text uses another way to describe events after the passage of time. This alternative is found throughout the small plates of Nephi and even a few times in Mormon's abridgment of the large plates; it is basically of the form "x years have passed away **and** something happened":

2 Nephi 5:28–29

and thirty years had passed away from the time we left Jerusalem
and I Nephi had kept the records upon my plates

2 Nephi 5:34

and it sufficeth me to say that forty years had passed away
and we had already had wars and contentions with our brethren

Jacob 5:29

and it came to pass that a long time had passed away
and the Lord of the vineyard saith unto his servant . . .

Enos 1:25–26

and an hundred and seventy and nine years had passed away
from the time that our father Lehi left Jerusalem
and as I saw that I must soon go down to my grave . . .

Jarom 1:5

and now behold two hundred years had passed away
and the people of Nephi had waxed strong in the land

Omni 1:3

and it came to pass that two hundred and seventy and six years had passed away
and we had many seasons of peace

Omni 1:3

yea and in fine two hundred and eighty and two years had passed away
and I had kept these plates

Omni 1:5

behold it came to pass that three hundred and twenty years had passed away
and the more wicked part of the Nephites were destroyed

3 Nephi 1:1

Now it came to pass that the ninety and first year had passed away
and it was six hundred years from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem

4 Nephi 1:14

yea even an hundred years had passed away
and the disciples of Jesus whom he had chosen had all gone to the paradise of God
save it were the three which should tarry

4 Nephi 1:40

and it came to pass that two hundred and forty and four years had passed away
and thus were the affairs of the people

Mormon 4:10

and it came to pass that the three hundred and sixty and sixth year had passed away
and the Lamanites came again upon the Nephites to battle

In other words, excluding Jacob 7:1, the small plates of Nephi have only examples of this second type of expression, which implies that for Jacob 7:1 the original text probably read without a subordinate conjunction. Further, it would have been much easier for Oliver Cowdery, when copying down Joseph Smith’s dictation, to have accidentally omitted an *and* (written as an ampersand) than to have dropped out a subordinate conjunction like *after*. In fact, there is no example of Oliver Cowdery ever omitting the subordinate conjunction *after* in the manuscripts, but there are dozens of cases where he omitted the *and*, sometimes only momentarily. Here are two nearby examples:

2 Nephi 30:3

[NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] now I would prophesy
 somewhat more concerning the Jews and the Gentiles

Omni 1:17

and their language had become corrupted
 and they had brought no records with them
 and they denied the being of their Creator
 [NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Mosiah
 —nor the people of Mosiah— could not understand them

All of this evidence suggests the following emendation:

Jacob 7:1 (emended)

And now it came to pass that some years had passed away
and there came a man among the people of Nephi whose name was Sherem

Summary: Emend Jacob 7:1 to read “some years had passed away **and** there came a man among the people of Nephi”; it is rather doubtful that the original text here had the subordinate conjunction *after* (which Oliver Cowdery later inserted in both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} after copying this passage from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D}).

■ **Jacob 7:2**

*and it came to pass that he began to preach among the people
 and [to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] declare unto them
 that there should be no Christ*

In the Book of Mormon the infinitival *to* is typically repeated for conjuncts, as here in Jacob 7:2 and in the following instances where “to preach” is conjoined with other infinitive verb forms:

Mosiah 18:18	to preach unto them and to teach them
Alma 8:32	to preach and to prophesy unto the people
Alma 23:4	to preach and to teach the word of God among them

Alma 24:7 to preach unto us **and to** convince us
Helaman 16:7 to preach **and to** prophesy among his own people

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated *to* here in Jacob 7:2, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the repeated infinitival *to* wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ **Jacob 7:3**

and he knowing that I Jacob had faith in Christ which should come
[wherefore 0A | wherefore >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he sought much opportunity*
that he might come unto me

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the *wherefore* here in Jacob 7:3. Interestingly, there was no attempt to delete the repeated subject *he* (“and **he** knowing that I Jacob had faith in Christ which should come / **he** sought much opportunity”).

Other instances in the text of the repeated subject preceded by *wherefore* have been left unedited:

1 Nephi 2:16
and it came to pass that **I Nephi** being exceeding young
—nevertheless being large in stature
and also having great desires to know of the mysteries of God—
wherefore I cried unto the Lord

Ether 13:16
and now **Coriantumr**
having studied himself in all the arts of war and all the cunning of the world
wherefore he gave battle unto them which sought to destroy him

For further discussion of Joseph Smith’s occasional deletion of *wherefore*, see under 1 Nephi 11:1.

Summary: Restore the original *wherefore* in Jacob 7:3 since it works perfectly well here; similar instances of this construction have been left unedited elsewhere in the text.

■ **Jacob 7:4**

and he was learned
that *he had a perfect knowledge of the language of the people*
wherefore he could use much flattery and much power of speech
according to the power of the devil

James Siebach (personal communication, 26 July 2004) wonders if there is something defective here in the use of the subordinate conjunction *that*. He suggests that the text should read *in that*. In such a case, the *that* would be an explanatory *that*. In the original text there is only one example of *in that*, but the *in* was deleted in the 1837 edition:

1 Nephi 8:37

and he did exhort them then with all the feeling of a tender parent
that they would hearken to his words
[*in* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that perhaps
the Lord would be merciful to them and not cast them off

Thus an *in* could have been deleted in Jacob 7:4, but only as Joseph Smith dictated it to Oliver Cowdery since the original manuscript is extant here and reads without any *in*: “& he was learned that he had . . .”.

Another possible emendation along these lines would be *so that*. Under this interpretation the *that* would be a resultive that. The text has 12 instances of *so that*, including the following example:

Alma 14:27

and the earth shook mightily
and the walls of the prison were rent in twain
so that they fell to the earth

Despite these examples, there are also examples in the text of *that* alone and with the meaning ‘in that’ or ‘so that’, as in the following:

1 Nephi 8:17

wherefore I cast mine eyes toward the head of the river
that perhaps I might see them

So the use of *that* without *in* or *so* is possible in Jacob 7:4, despite its awkwardness for modern English readers.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:4 the use of *that* without any preceding *in* or *so* (“and he was learned / **that** he had a perfect knowledge of the language of the people”); such usage is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Jacob 7:6

*for I have heard and also [know 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | known D]
that thou goest about much
preaching that which ye call the gospel or the doctrine of Christ*

Here we have a typo in the 1841 edition that is marginally possible; instead of the *know* of the original text (“I have heard and also **know**”), the 1841 edition reads “I have heard and also **known**”. The 1841 typesetter may have been influenced by the expected phraseology from “have heard and seen”, where both verbs are past participles, as in the nearby example in Jacob 7:12: “for I have heard and seen”. Of course, the use of the present-tense *know* is more appropriate since Sherem’s knowledge of Jacob’s preaching is continuous and is not complete.

Summary: Maintain the original present-tense *know* in Jacob 7:6 (“I have heard and also know”).

■ Jacob 7:8

*but behold the Lord God poured **in** his Spirit **into** my soul
insomuch that I did confound him in all his words*

Joanne Case (personal communication, 7 December 2003) suggests that here the adverbial *in* seems to be an error and should perhaps be deleted. If the use of *in* is an error in Jacob 7:8, it may have come from the following *into* (“**into** my soul”) or from the *in* in the following clause (“insomuch that I did confound him **in** all his words”).

Another possible emendation would be to replace *in* with *out* since elsewhere there are numerous examples of “the Lord pouring **out** his Spirit”:

Mosiah 4:20	may he hath poured out his Spirit upon you
Mosiah 18:10	that he may pour out his Spirit more abundantly upon you
Mosiah 18:12	O Lord pour out thy Spirit upon thy servant
Mosiah 18:13	and may the Spirit of the Lord be poured out upon you
Mosiah 25:24	and the Lord did pour out his Spirit upon them
Alma 8:10	that he would pour out his Spirit upon the people
Alma 19:36	thus the Lord did begin to pour out his Spirit upon them
Helaman 6:36	the Lord began to pour out his Spirit upon the Lamanites

This usage is also found in the familiar phrase from Joel in the Old Testament, which is quoted by Peter in Acts 2:17:

Joel 2:28 (King James Bible)
and it shall come to pass afterward
that I will pour **out** my Spirit **upon** all flesh

Yet all of these examples refer to the Lord “pouring **out** his Spirit **upon** someone” rather than “**into** their soul”.

Evidence elsewhere in the text shows that phrasal verbs can sometimes repeat their adverbial by allowing the adverbial to occur immediately after the verb proper and also after the direct object. This kind of redundancy has generally been edited out of the text:

Mosiah 10:8 (“to be girded **about** with something **about** one’s loins”)
and they were girded
[*about* >js NULL 1 | *about* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
with a leathern girdle **about** their loins

Alma 55:16 (“to cast **in** something **in** unto someone”)
and Moroni had prepared his men with weapons of war
and he went to the city Gid
while the Lamanites were in a deep sleep and drunken
and cast **in** the weapons of war
[*in* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] unto the prisoners
insomuch that they were all armed

Alma 62:6 (“to drive **out** someone **out** of somewhere”)
 they became exceeding strong even stronger than the men of Pachus
 which was the king of those dissenters
 which had driven [*out* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] the freemen
out of the land of Zarahemla

Such adverbial repetition is also found in the King James Bible, including one passage from the Sermon on the Mount that is quoted in 3 Nephi:

3 Nephi 14:4–5 (original Book of Mormon text, quoting Matthew 7:4–5)
 let me pull **out** the mote **out** of thine eye
 and behold a beam is in thine own eye
 thou hypocrite first cast **out** the beam **out** of thine own eye
 and then shalt thou see clearly to cast **out** the mote **out** of thy brother’s eye

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the adverbial redundancy for the two phrasal verbs *pull out* and *cast out* in this King James quotation (by deleting the first *out* in each instance). The occurrence of such repetition in the King James text, as well as the examples of *gird about*, *cast in*, and *drive out* in the Book of Mormon text, argues that the redundancy of *pour in* in Jacob 7:8 is intentional rather than attributable to an error in transmission. If the text were to be edited here, the *in* should probably be deleted, just as the first adverbial was deleted in Mosiah 10:8, Alma 62:6, and 3 Nephi 14:4–5. The critical text, however, will keep the original reading in Jacob 7:8 even though the proposed revision “the Lord God poured his Spirit **into** my soul” reads more fluently.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:8 the original reading with its redundant use of *in* and *into* (“the Lord God poured **in** his Spirit **into** my soul”); such adverbial redundancy is found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Jacob 7:9**

deniest thou the Christ
which [should >js shall 1 | should ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR | shall PST] come
*and he saith if there **should** be a Christ I would not deny him*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the *should* here to *shall*, probably because he was concerned that *should* might be interpreted as a conditional modal. In particular, the actual conditional use of *should* in the following clause (“if there should be a Christ”) probably motivated this change. Nonetheless, the change was not implemented in the 1837 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition, following Joseph’s editing in Ø, introduced it into the RLDS text, and this was followed by the LDS text in the 1981 edition.

Elsewhere, whenever a relative clause is used to refer to the coming of Christ, the modal verb can be either *should* or *shall*, but *should* is more frequent (11 to 7):

1 Nephi 10:11	the Messiah which should come
1 Nephi 10:17	the Messiah which should come
Jacob 7:3	Christ which should come
Jacob 7:7	a being which ye say shall come

Mosiah 4:2	Jesus Christ . . . who shall come down among the children of men
Mosiah 4:3	Jesus Christ which should come
Alma 4:13	for Christ’s sake which should come
Alma 5:21	him of whom it hath been spoken by our fathers which should come
Alma 6:8	Jesus Christ the Son of God which should come
Alma 11:32	he that shall come
Alma 39:15	him that surely shall come
Alma 45:4	Jesus Christ which shall come
Alma 46:15	Christ which should come
Helaman 5:9	Jesus Christ which shall come
Helaman 8:14	even so should he be lifted up which should come
Helaman 11:15	he of whom it was written by the prophets that should come
Helaman 13:6	the Lord Jesus Christ which surely shall come
3 Nephi 11:10	Jesus Christ of which the prophets testified that should come

The critical text will therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the modal in any particular relative clause should be *shall* or *should*. For further discussion of the editing of *should* to *shall*, see under 2 Nephi 25:19; also see under MODALS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 7:9 the original modal *should* (“deniest thou the Christ which should come”), even though *should* can here be misinterpreted by modern speakers of English as having a conditional sense; the use of *should* in a nonconditional sense is common in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Jacob 7:9**

*but I know that there is no Christ
neither hath been nor [never >js ever 1 | never A | ever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will be*

Joseph Smith usually removed instances of multiple negation in his editing for the 1837 edition, including two instances of “nor never”, here in Jacob 7:9 and later in the book of Alma:

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 0 | never >js ever 1 | never A | ever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] will be

The original text had no instances of the standard “nor ever”, only these two of “nor never”. For a general discussion regarding the removal of double negatives from the text, see MULTIPLE NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original multiple negative in Jacob 7:9 (“there is no Christ / neither hath been **nor never** will be”).

■ Jacob 7:12

*it hath been made manifest [unto 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | to K] me
for I have heard and seen
and it also hath been made manifest
[NULL >+ unto me 0 | unto me 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
by the power of the Holy Ghost*

In this passage there are two cases where the verb phrase “to be made manifest” is followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *unto*. In the 1892 RLDS edition, the preposition *unto* in the first case was replaced by *to*, but the original *unto* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 edition. In the second case, the whole prepositional phrase “unto me” was momentarily omitted as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Oliver’s supralinear insertion of the phrase is in somewhat heavier ink flow; he probably made the correction after reading back to Joseph what he had initially written and discovering that “unto me” had been omitted.

The text is consistent in selecting the preposition *unto* for the verb phrase “to make manifest” (17 times); similarly, for the verb phrase “to manifest”, only the preposition *unto* occurs (32 times). Thus the 1892 replacement of *unto* with *to* in Jacob 7:12 is clearly an error.

Summary: Maintain the two prepositional phrases headed by *unto* in Jacob 7:12; the preposition *unto* is expected with the verb phrases “to manifest” and “to make manifest”.

■ Jacob 7:12

*and it [also hath 01A | also has BCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | has also N] been made manifest
unto me by the power of the Holy Ghost*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 11:3, the word *also* can appear right before the perfect auxiliary *have*. Here in Jacob 7:12, the 1906 LDS edition accidentally shifted the *also* to after the perfect auxiliary. Both word orders are found in the original text, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources in determining the correct order.

The 1837 edition here changed the perfect auxiliary *hath* to *has*. For further discussion of this kind of editing, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:12 the original word order in “it **also hath** been made manifest”.

■ Jacob 7:14

*what am I that I should tempt God to shew unto thee a sign
in the [things >% thing 1 | thing ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] which thou knowest to be true
yet thou wilt deny it*

The original manuscript is not extant here, but Oliver Cowdery, in his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , initially wrote *things*, then erased the plural *s*. The erasure shows that the change was immediate. Moreover, the use of the singular pronoun *it* at the end of the passage supports the singular *thing*, although one could interpret the change from *things* to *thing* as a case of editing (that is, as an attempt to make *thing* agree with the following *it*). A similar error is found in 1 Nephi 15:11.

There the original manuscript is extant and reads “do ye not remember the **thing** which the Lord hath said”. There too Oliver initially wrote *things* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , and then he immediately erased the plural *s* ending. This example suggests that the same thing occurred in Jacob 7:14: Oliver probably corrected the printer’s manuscript to make it agree with the reading of the original manuscript. For additional examples of the scribal tendency to mix up *things* and *thing*, see under 1 Nephi 15:11.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:14 the singular *thing* (“in the **thing** which thou knowest to be true”), Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} and the probable reading of \mathcal{C} .

■ Jacob 7:17

and it came to pass that on the morrow

that the [multitude 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | multitudes L] were gathered together

The 1902 LDS missionary edition corrected *multitude* to *multitudes*, apparently in order to make the subject overtly agree with the following plural verb *were*. However, the Book of Mormon text allows the singular *multitude* to act as a plural in meaning and thus take a plural verb form, as in the following examples:

3 Nephi 11 preface

Jesus Christ sheweth himself unto the people of Nephi
as **the multitude were** gathered together in the land Bountiful
and did minister unto **them**

3 Nephi 11:1

there **were a great multitude** gathered together of the people of Nephi
round about the temple which was in the land Bountiful
and **they were** marveling and wondering one with another

3 Nephi 18:5

and when **the multitude** had eaten and **were** filled
he saith unto the disciples . . .

Of course, there are also examples in the text of the standard “multitude was” and “multitudes were”:

1 Nephi 8:33	and great was the multitude that did enter into that strange building
1 Nephi 11:28	and the multitudes were gathered together to hear him
1 Nephi 11:35	and the multitude of the earth was gathered together
Alma 12:2	for the multitude was great
Alma 22:24	now there was a multitude gathered together
Helaman 10:12	the multitudes which were scattered about upon the face of the land
3 Nephi 19:4	when the multitude was gathered together
3 Nephi 19:5	and behold the multitude was so great

For each instance of this type, the earliest textual sources determine the reading for the critical text.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 7:17 (and elsewhere) the use of “multitude were” since the singular *multitude* can be interpreted as a semantic plural.

■ **Jacob 7:17**

*and he spake plainly unto them
and denied the things which he had taught them
and confessed the Christ and the power of the Holy Ghost
and the [ministering 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | ministry o] of angels*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally replaced the gerundive *ministering* with the non-gerundive *ministry*, perhaps because this final conjunct was joined with a preceding nongerundive noun, *power*. The Book of Mormon text otherwise has only “the ministering of angels” (two times, in Omni 1:25 and Moroni 7:25), never “the ministry of angels”.

Summary: Maintain the original expression “the ministering of angels” in Jacob 7:17.

■ **Jacob 7:17–18**

- (1) *and he [spake 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | speak 1] plainly unto them
and denied the things which he had taught them
and confessed the Christ and the power of the Holy Ghost
and the ministering of angels*
- (2) *and he [spake 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | speak >js spake 1] plainly unto them
that he had been deceived by the power of the devil*
- (3) *and he **spake** of hell and of eternity and of eternal punishment*

In this passage Oliver Cowdery twice wrote *speak* rather than the expected *spake* in the printer’s manuscript (numbered above as 1 and 2). Only in the third case did he get the correct *spake*. In the original manuscript, the first two instances of *spake* are partially extant. In the first case, only the final *e* of *spake* is extant in \mathcal{O} , but we can tell that it is the final *e* (there is no following *ak*). In the second case, only the ascender of the *k* is extant; the ascender for the first *l* in the following word *plainly* is also extant, but it is difficult to determine from the spacing whether the original read *spake* or *speak*, although I presume that it did read *spake*. The third case is not at all extant in \mathcal{O} . The 1830 compositor set all three instances as *spake*.

There is the theoretical possibility that these instances of *spake* read as *spoke* in the original manuscript. Yet usage elsewhere in the text argues that in the original text the simple past-tense form for the verb *speak* was consistently *spake*, not the modern *spoke*. For a complete discussion, see under 1 Nephi 12:19; also see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Jacob 7:17–18 the 1830 compositor’s decision to emend two instances of *speak* to *spake*; the context requires the past tense, and *spake* (not *spoke*) is the consistent past-tense form for the verb *speak*.

■ **Jacob 7:18**

*and he spake of [eternity > Hell 0 | hell 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
and of eternity and of eternal punishment*

The original manuscript is only partially extant here, but it is clear that in writing down Joseph Smith's dictation, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote some other word after "he spake of", crossed it out, and then supralinearly inserted *Hell*. One possibility is that the initial word was *eternity*—that is, Oliver started to write "and he spake of eternity", thus initially omitting the first prepositional conjunct ("of hell"). In any event, there is no reason to reject the earliest extant reading "he spake of hell" (the corrected reading in \mathcal{O}).

Summary: Maintain the earliest extant reading for Jacob 7:18 ("and he spake **of hell** and of eternity and of eternal punishment").

■ **Jacob 7:22**

*and this thing was pleasing unto me Jacob
for I had requested it of my Father which **was** in heaven
for he had heard my cry and answered my prayer*

One wonders here if the original text, perhaps even the original manuscript (which is not extant here) read "I had requested it of my Father which **is** in heaven"—that is, the relative clause read in the present tense rather than the past tense. Perhaps the surrounding past-tense verb forms ("was pleasing . . . had requested . . . had heard") led Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write down "was in heaven" or Joseph Smith to accidentally dictate "was in heaven".

The synoptic Gospels have 18 examples of the *be* verb being used to link the subject *Father* with *in heaven*—and in all 18 cases, the verb is in the present tense (as in the Lord's prayer: "Our Father which **art** in heaven"). Yet all 18 of these cases are surrounded by verbs in the present tense, not the past tense. Seven of these present-tense instances are in the Sermon on the Mount and are therefore cited in 3 Nephi. In each of these seven Book of Mormon cases, the present-tense forms prevail.

It is possible that the use of the past-tense *was* in Jacob 7:22 may actually be intentional. As a related phenomenon, consider that aspect of English syntax which allows past-tense forms in indirect quotes even if the meaning has shifted from the past to the present or future, as in sentences like "I **told** him that I **was** coming next week". Here the subordinate *that*-clause takes the tense of its main clause, even if it is semantically wrong. The Book of Mormon text seems to allow a related kind of tense backshifting for relative clauses in a past-tense context, as in the following example found earlier in this same book:

Jacob 4:5

even as it **was** accounted unto Abraham in the wilderness
to be obedient unto the commands of God in offering up his son Isaac
which [*was* 1A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] a similitude of God
and his Only Begotten Son

It seems that in both Jacob 4:5 and Jacob 7:22 the text intentionally maintains the past tense even when there has been a semantic shift to the present in a relative clause. In fact, in both cases the text refers to two facts that are eternally true: namely, the Father **is** in heaven and Abraham's offering up of Isaac **is** a symbol of God offering up his Son. But the preceding past-tense verb forms allow for a shift in the overt tense from the present to the past in the following relative clause. Since this kind of tense backshifting could be intentional, the critical text will allow it here in Jacob 7:22 as well as in Jacob 4:5.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:22 the past-tense *was* in the relative clause “which **was** in heaven”; although the phrase “my Father which **is** in heaven” is normal, the preceding use of the past tense seems to permit the past tense to be extended into the following relative clause; there is a similar example of this tense backshifting in Jacob 4:5.

■ Jacob 7:22

for he had heard my cry

and answered my [prayers >% prayer 1 | prayer ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is not extant here, but Oliver Cowdery's erasure in \mathcal{P} of the final *s* indicates an immediate change, probably to the original reading. The preceding singular noun *cry* supports the singular reading *prayer*, especially in light of the consistent number agreement between *cry/cries* and *prayer/prayers* elsewhere in the text (although all these other examples are in the plural):

Mosiah 9:18	and God did hear our cries and did answer our prayers
Mosiah 23:10	the Lord did hear my cries and did answer my prayers
Alma 9:26	quick to hear the cries of his people and to answer their prayers

One could argue that given the singular *cry* in Jacob 7:22, we expect the matching singular *prayer*. In any event, the singular *prayer* is the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Retain in Jacob 7:22 the singular *prayer*, Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{P} to the probable reading in \mathcal{C} .

■ Jacob 7:23

and it came to pass that

peace and the love of God [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | were s] restored again among the people

The current LDS text retains the original singular *was* in this verse, but the RLDS text has had the plural *were* since the 1953 edition. This grammatical emendation relies on interpreting *peace* and *the love of God* as different entities. One could argue that the singular *was* is acceptable since the love of God and peace co-occur and are manifestations of the same thing. In fact, this close relationship may be the reason why the LDS text has never been changed to the plural *were* in this verse. In a noun phrase like “law and order”, the associated verb can be in either the singular or plural: “law and order **is** crucial” or “law and order **are** crucial”, the choice depending on whether one interprets *law* and *order* as manifestations of the same thing or not.

Another example of where this issue arises in the Book of Mormon text involves the two nouns *faith* and *hope*:

Moroni 7:44

his faith and hope [*is* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | *are* HKS] vain

By replacing the original singular *is* with the plural *are*, the RLDS text (except for the 1908 edition) has treated *faith* and *hope* as distinct entities, yet semantically they can be considered manifestations of the same thing.

In any event, this semantic issue is irrelevant as far as establishing the original text for Jacob 7:23 (and Moroni 7:44) is concerned. The earliest textual sources read in the singular, and therefore the critical text will accept the singular verb form. There is nothing textually inappropriate about the original reading in Jacob 7:23 since the original text had many examples of *was* taking a subject noun phrase composed of conjoined singular nouns, as in Alma 15:3 (“for he supposed that Alma and Amulek **was** no more”) and in Alma 58:17 (“now Gid and his men **was** on the right”). For further discussion, see 1 Nephi 4:4 as well as SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3. The critical text will maintain the singular form *was* here in Jacob 7:23, no matter how the conjunctive subject is interpreted.

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:23 the singular *was* since the earliest textual sources read this way; in this instance, the question of whether the conjoined noun phrases *peace* and *the love of God* are semantically similar is irrelevant in determining the reading of the original text.

■ Jacob 7:24

*and it came to pass that many means were devised
to reclaim and restore the Lamanites to the knowledge of the truth
but it [all were 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQ | all was RT | was all S]
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | in S] vain*

There are two minor editing changes in the clause “but it all were vain”. The lack of agreement between *it* and *were* was emended in the 1920 LDS edition by replacing the plural *were* with the singular *was* (giving “but it all **was** vain”). In the 1953 RLDS edition, the editing was extended. Not only was the number of the verb adjusted, but the word order was changed and the preposition *in* was inserted before *vain* (giving “but it **was all in** vain”).

Of course, the subject *it all* can be interpreted as referring to the entire process of trying to convert the Lamanites, but the use of the plural *were* suggests that *it all* can also refer to the preceding *many means*, a plural noun phrase. Given this latter interpretation, the plural *were* is acceptable. For another example of a singular subject form taking a plural verb (given that the subject is semantically plural), see the discussion regarding “the fruit were equal” in Jacob 5:74.

The reading of the current RLDS text (“but it was all in vain”) seems to follow the colloquial style of today’s English. In the Book of Mormon text there is some competition between *vain* and *in vain* in the expression “to be (in) vain”, but “to be vain” dominates:

□ *vain* (10 times)

Jacob 7:24	but it all were vain
Enos 1:14	for at the present our strugglings were vain
Enos 1:20	but our labors were vain
Alma 34:28	behold your prayer is vain
3 Nephi 1:6	therefore your joy and your faith . . . hath been vain
3 Nephi 1:8	their faith had not been vain
3 Nephi 29:3	the words which have been spoken are vain
Mormon 2:13	but behold this my joy was vain
Moroni 7:37	and all is vain
Moroni 7:44	his faith and hope is vain

□ *in vain* (5 times)

Mosiah 7:18	notwithstanding our many strugglings which have been in vain
Alma 27:1	it was in vain to seek their destruction
Alma 47:32	but it was in vain
Mormon 3:3	but it was in vain
Mormon 5:6	but it was all in vain

Notice that the last example (in Mormon 5:6) has the same phraseology that the current RLDS text has for Jacob 7:24 (“but it was all in vain”).

In any event, the text permits either “to be vain” or “to be **in** vain”, so in each instance we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. In addition, the text has one other example of *it all*:

Mosiah 29:33 and he explained **it all** unto them

So there is nothing inappropriate about *it all*. Thus here in Jacob 7:24 we maintain the original reading, without the *in* and with the original word order (*all were*).

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:24 the original reading “but it all were vain”; the use of the plural *were* with the singular *it*, as well as the word order *all were*, appears to be intended.

■ **Jacob 7:24**

for they delighted in

wars and [bloodsheds 1ABCDEG | bloodsheds > bloodshed F | bloodshed HIJKLMNOPQRST]

The second printing of the 1852 LDS edition introduced the singular *bloodshed* as a correction in the stereotyped plates. Except for the 1858 Wright edition (which derives from the 1840 Cincinnati/Nauvoo edition), all subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon have had the singular *bloodshed*. As discussed under 2 Nephi 10:6, in each case we let the earliest textual sources determine the number for *bloodshed(s)*. Thus here in Jacob 7:24, the critical text will maintain the plural *bloodsheds*.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 7:24 the original plural *bloodsheds*.

■ Jacob 7:25

*wherefore the people of Nephi did fortify against them
with their [arms 01T | armies ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
and with all their might*

The original text here in Jacob 7:25 stated that the Nephites defended themselves “with their arms”, not “with their armies”. The 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *arms* (the reading in Ø) as *armies*. The original manuscript is not fully extant for the word *arms*, but the small lacuna between extant fragments allows room for the single final *s* of *arms* but not for the three letters *ies* at the end of *armies*:

Jacob 7:25 (line 4 on page 113 of Ø)

() did fortify against them with (r) ar(m) with
-FORE THE PEOPLE OF NEPHI THEI S &

The 1981 LDS edition restored the correct reading *arms*.

As Stan Larson has pointed out, armies would not have yet existed for the people of Nephi, given their small population at this time. The first references to Nephite and Lamanite armies are found in the Words of Mormon, which records events about 450 years after Lehi (and only after the Nephites had united with the people of Zarahemla):

The Words of Mormon 1:13

and it came to pass also that
the **armies** of the Lamanites came down out of the land of Nephi
to battle against his people
but behold king Benjamin gathered together his **armies**
and he did stand against them

(See page 251 of Stan Larson’s 1974 Brigham Young University master’s thesis, *A Study of Some Textual Variations in the Book of Mormon Comparing the Original and the Printer’s Manuscripts and the 1830, the 1837, and the 1840 Editions.*)

Summary: Maintain in Jacob 7:25 the original reading with its use of *arms*, not *armies* (“the people of Nephi did fortify against them with their **arms**”).

■ Jacob 7:25

*wherefore the people of Nephi did fortify against them with their arms and with all their might
trusting in the God and [the 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rock of their salvation*

The 1837 edition omitted the definite article *the* before *rock*, probably unintentionally. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not mark this deletion in the printer’s manuscript. And there is clearly nothing inappropriate about the original reading with its repetition of the definite article *the*. The critical text will restore the repeated *the* in this expression.

The original Book of Mormon text has many examples of the repeated determiner in conjunctive constructions. Here in Jacob 7:25 we have a conjoining of *God* and *rock*. There are two other examples that conjoin these two nouns, and in each case we have a determiner for both conjuncts:

2 Nephi 4:30

yea my soul will rejoice in thee
my God and **the** rock of my salvation

2 Nephi 4:35

behold my voice shall forever ascend up unto thee
my rock and **mine** everlasting God

For further discussion of the Book of Mormon tendency to repeat the determiner in conjoined noun phrases, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore the definite article *the* before *rock* in Jacob 7:25.

■ **Jacob 7:26**

*we being a lonesome and a solemn people
 wanderers cast out from Jerusalem
 born in tribulation
 in a [wild 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wilderness
 and hated of our brethren*

The 1830 typesetter removed the adjective *wild* that modifies the following noun *wilderness*, probably because he considered it a redundancy. One possibility is that the original manuscript (which is extant and reads *wild wilderness*) represents a dittography—that is, the scribe, Oliver Cowdery, accidentally first wrote the *wild* of *wilderness*, then wrote the whole *wilderness*. There is, however, little evidence for this kind of dittography in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text. It is possible for such a dittography to have occurred at a line break (that is, with *wild* at the end of a line and *wilderness* at the beginning of the following line). But in this instance, *wild wilderness* is found in *Œ* in the middle of a line. More generally, we do not find dittographies where the first part of a word is repeated as a separate word.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word *wilderness* is related to the word *wild* and refers to a region untamed or uncultivated by man. Given this meaning, the use of *wild* with *wilderness* here in Jacob 7:26 is a clear redundancy. But a related meaning listed in the OED for *wilderness* is a desolate, uninhabited region. Given this meaning, both *wild* and *wilderness* could co-occur without redundancy.

The phrase “a wilderness” occurs in 2 Nephi 7:2 and 2 Nephi 24:17 (both Isaiah quotes), as well as in the book of Ether:

Ether 10:21

and they did preserve the land southward for a wilderness to get game
 and the whole face of the land northward was covered with inhabitants

Here one can interpret the wilderness as an untamed region (since wild animals inhabited it) and also as an uninhabited region (since no people live there). The reference to the northern region as being “covered with inhabitants” seems to emphasize that the southern region is uninhabited. The word *wilderness* can therefore be used to specifically refer to an uninhabited territory, which means that “a wild wilderness” in Jacob 7:26 can be interpreted as a wild, uninhabited region. Consequently, the critical text will restore the original, difficult reading in Jacob 7:26.

Summary: Restore in Jacob 7:26 the original phraseology, “a wild wilderness” (the reading of the two manuscripts); this phraseology can be interpreted nonredundantly as meaning ‘an untamed uninhabited region’; the repetition of the morpheme *wild* does not have to be interpreted as a dittography.

Enos

Jarom

Omni

Enos

■ Enos 1:1

*behold it came to pass that I Enos knowing my father
that he was [a just man 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | just a man Q]
for he taught me in his language and also in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*

The typesetter for the 1911 LDS edition accidentally set “he was just a man”, one of the more amusing typos in the history of the text—and obviously wrong. This error in the 1911 LDS edition was corrected in the subsequent LDS edition (1920).

Summary: Retain the original text in Enos 1:1 (“he was a just man”).

■ Enos 1:3

behold I went to hunt beasts in the [forest 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | forests LMQRT]

The 1902 LDS missionary edition first introduced the plural *forests* in this passage. The 1905 LDS missionary edition also read this way, as have subsequent LDS editions.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 18:25, the Book of Mormon text has instances of both the singular *forest* and the plural *forests*, where context is the determining factor. Thus for the phrase “in the forest(s)”, we get the singular whenever only one forest is expected and the plural when there are multiple forests:

1 Nephi 18:25

there was beasts in the **forests** of every kind

Mosiah 18:30

all this was done in Mormon
yea by the waters of Mormon
in the forest that was near the waters of Mormon
yea the place of Mormon
the waters of Mormon
the **forest** of Mormon

Mosiah 20:8

therefore he gathered his people together
and laid wait for them in the fields and **in the forests**

There were many forests in the land of promise (1 Nephi 18:25) as well as many forests where the people of Limhi could lay in wait for the Lamanite attack (Mosiah 20:8), but there was only one forest of Mormon (Mosiah 18:30). Similarly, Enos probably went to hunt beasts in a particular forest, and thus the singular *forest* in Enos 1:1 is most likely correct. For additional discussion, see 1 Nephi 18:25.

Summary: Restore the original singular *forest* in Enos 1:3 since Enos probably would have been hunting in a single forest.

■ Enos 1:3

*behold I went to hunt beasts in the forest
and the words which I had often heard my father speak
concerning eternal life and the joy of the saints
[& the words of my father >js & 1 | and the words of my father A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
sunk deep into my heart*

The earliest text in this verse contains a long noun-phrase fragment: “and the words which I had often heard my father speak concerning eternal life and the joy of the saints”. After this long noun phrase, the earliest text basically starts over with “and the words of my father sunk deep into my heart”. One could argue that this reading, however awkward, is intended and represents the original language since just before this passage, we have the opening to the book of Enos, which shows a similar kind of initial incompleteness and then abruptness in starting over:

Enos 1:1–3

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

In other words, Enos does not seem to be particularly fluent in his writing, at least on plates of metal. When he sometimes gets tangled up in his syntax, especially after inserting a parenthetical statement, he abruptly cuts off and starts over again.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith left the initial infelicities here at the beginning of the book of Enos (from verse 1 through the first sentence in verse 3). But the difficulty of the following noun phrase fragment in verse 3 was wholly unacceptable. Joseph decided to keep the long initial noun-phrase fragment (“and the words which I had often heard my father speak concerning eternal life and the joy of the saints”), but he decided to complete it by deleting the following redundant noun phrase “the words of my father”. He undoubtedly intended to also cross out the ampersand in \wp but neglected to do so. The 1837 edition omitted both the *and* and the repeated noun phrase.

Lyle Fletcher has suggested (personal communication, 9 October 2004) that the original text had a past-tense verb form, either *pondered* or *remembered*, preceding the long noun phrase. In fact, there is considerable evidence to support the use of the verb *remember* with direct objects that refer to the words which someone has spoken:

1 Nephi 4:14	I remembered the words of the Lord which he spake unto me
1 Nephi 7:15	and remember the words which I speak unto you
2 Nephi 9:51	and remember the words which I have spoken
Alma 9:13	do ye not remember the words which he spake unto Lehi
Alma 37:32	remember the words which I have spoken unto you
Alma 57:21	and I did remember the words which they said unto me
Helaman 5:5	they remembered the words which their father Helaman spake unto them
Helaman 5:9	O remember remember my sons the words which king Benjamin spake unto his people
Helaman 5:10	and remember also the words which Amulek spake unto Zeezrom
3 Nephi 13:25	remember the words which I have spoken
Ether 15:1	he began to remember the words which Ether had spoken unto him
Ether 15:3	he began to remember the words which had been spoken by the mouth of all the prophets

On the other hand, there are no examples of this kind of construction involving the verb *ponder* (as in “to ponder the words which someone has spoken”). Thus if there is a missing verb here in Enos 1:3, the chances are greater that it was *remember* rather than *ponder*.

If such a proposed emendation is accepted, we need to consider whether there would have also been a subject pronoun *I* before *remembered*. The subject pronoun may be omitted when the meaning is something like ‘go and do something’ (as in 1 Nephi 1:18: “**he went** forth among the people **and began** to prophesy”), but when the two actions are clearly distinct and not necessarily connected, such as Enos going into the forest and there remembering the words of his father, then we expect the subject pronoun. Thus the most reasonable emendation is to insert *I remembered*:

Enos 1:3 (proposed emendation)
 behold I went to hunt beasts in the forest
 and **I remembered** the words which I had often heard my father speak
 concerning eternal life and the joy of the saints
 and the words of my father sunk deep into my heart

If the original text actually read *I remembered*, then the question is: Do we have evidence in the manuscripts for the scribes ever accidentally skipping an instance of “<subject pronoun> <main verb>”? In fact, there is one example in the original manuscript for which the subject pronoun *these* and the main verb *are* were initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation:

Alma 26:1 (line 8, page 269’ of Ⓞ)
 these are
 particular [&] now ^ the words of Ammon to his Bret(h
 REN WHICH SAYETH THUS MY)

In this passage the verb complement is of the form “the words which”, just like in Enos 1:3. One reason why Oliver may have started the clause in Enos 1:3 with “the words which” is that there are five preceding examples in nearby 2 Nephi and Jacob where a clause begins with a subject of the form “the words <relative clause>”:

2 Nephi 3:19

and **the words which** he shall write shall be the words
which is expedient in my wisdom should go forth unto the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 6:5

and now **the words which** I shall read are they
which Isaiah spake concerning all the house of Israel

2 Nephi 25:28

and **the words which** I have spoken shall stand
as a testimony against you

2 Nephi 26:1

and **the words which** he shall speak unto you shall be the law
which ye shall do

Jacob 2:1

The words which Jacob the brother of Nephi spake unto the people of Nephi
after the death of Nephi

In taking down Joseph’s dictation in Enos 1:3, Oliver may have expected the clause to start out with “the words which I heard my father speak”, especially given the prevalence of such usage in the preceding books. More generally, there are eight other examples where a Book of Mormon clause begins with “and the words”. In fact, one of these other examples is found in this same verse of Enos 1:3—namely, in the immediately following clause (“and the words of my father sunk deep into my heart”). Thus Oliver could have readily omitted *I remembered* as he took down Joseph’s dictation or as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Supplying *I remembered* works very well and is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. The critical text will therefore accept this conjectural emendation, especially since the earliest reading in Enos 1:3 does seem quite implausible.

Summary: Emend the earliest text for Enos 1:3 to read “and **I remembered** the words which I had often heard my father speak concerning eternal life and the joy of the saints”; this conjecture corrects a difficult (if not impossible) reading and is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ Enos 1:8

because of thy faith in Christ whom thou hast

[*not >js never before* 1 | *not* A | *never before* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *heard nor seen*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the original *not* here in Enos 1:8 to *never before*, perhaps because Enos had already heard the voice of the Lord—that is, just a moment before. Of course, such a clarification in the reading relies upon a very fine distinction in timing. Perhaps Joseph Smith wanted to eliminate any hint of contradiction.

This emendation also seems to rely on identifying the speaker as God the Son rather than God the Father. Yet one can readily interpret this conversation as being between God the Father and Enos, which would eliminate any need to edit the text here. In this conversation (up through verse 18 of the book of Enos), the Lord continually refers to Christ as a distinct person, not only here in verse 8 but also in verse 15: “whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith believing that ye shall receive **in the name of Christ** ye shall receive it”. If the Son had been talking with Enos, we might expect him to have used the phraseology “in my name” in verse 15, as he does when he speaks to Alma near the end of the book of Mosiah:

Mosiah 26:14–15, 18, 20, 22, 24
 and it came to pass that
 after he had poured out his whole soul to **God**
 the **voice of the Lord** came to him saying
 blessed art thou Alma
 and blessed are they which were baptized in the waters of Mormon . . .
 yea blessed is this people which is willing to bear **my name**
 for **in my name** shall they be called . . .
 and thou shalt serve me and go forth **in my name** . . .
 and whosoever ye receive shall believe **in my name** . . .
 for behold **in my name** are they called

In other places in the Book of Mormon text, when Christ is clearly identified as the speaker, the phraseology is always “in my name” rather than “in the name of Christ”:

3 Nephi 11 – 3 Nephi 30	30 times
Mormon 9:24–25	2 times
Ether 4:15–18	3 times
Moroni 2:2	2 times
Moroni 7:26, 34	2 times

In a single passage in 2 Nephi 31, Nephi separately quotes the Father and the Son; the Father uses the phrase “in the name of my Beloved Son” while the Son uses “in my name”:

2 Nephi 31:11–12
 and the Father saith
 repent ye repent ye and be baptized
in the name of my Beloved Son
 and also the voice of the Son came unto me saying
 he that is baptized **in my name**
 to him will the Father give the Holy Ghost

This difference in usage thus argues that in the book of Enos, the Lord is God the Father rather than God the Son.

Ultimately, however, such a distinction between personages is not crucial to understanding the original reading in Enos 1:8. Even if the Son is the one speaking to Enos, we can readily interpret “not heard nor seen” as meaning ‘not heard nor seen **until now**’. The critical text will restore the earliest reading, especially since it appears to be intended.

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:8 the original text (“because of thy faith in Christ whom thou hast **not heard nor seen**”); in order to accept the earliest reading as the original text, it is not necessary to decide whether the speaker is God the Father or God the Son.

■ Enos 1:8

he shall manifest himself in
[NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *flesh*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the rather awkward “in flesh” in the printer’s manuscript; then he inserted the definite article *the*. This article probably occurred in the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here). The supralinear insertion is written with slightly heavier ink flow; perhaps Oliver made the correction when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

Otherwise the Book of Mormon text almost always reads “in **the** flesh” (22 times). In fact, there are five other occurrences that refer to Christ “manifesting himself in **the** flesh” (like Enos 1:8, all five are in the small plates of Nephi); thus the support for the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} here in Enos 1:8 is very strong. On the other hand, there is only one occurrence of “in flesh” in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 15:2
and because he dwelleth **in flesh**
he shall be called the Son of God

This reading is found in the printer’s manuscript; the original manuscript is not extant for the book of Mosiah. It is possible that the occurrence of “in flesh” in Mosiah 15:2 is an error for “in the flesh”, especially when we consider the two other uses of “in the flesh” with the verb *dwelt*:

Alma 31:26
O how long O Lord wilt thou suffer that
thy servants shall **dwelt** here below **in the flesh**
to behold such gross wickedness

3 Nephi 28:9
and again ye shall not have pain while ye shall **dwelt in the flesh**

For further discussion of the one exceptional case of “in flesh”, see Mosiah 15:2.

Summary: Maintain in Enos 1:8 the phrase “in **the** flesh”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ Enos 1:8

wherefore go to [*it* >]s NULL 1 | *it* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
thy faith hath made thee whole

Here in Enos 1:8, the original reading (“go to it”) appears to be intended; the nonspecific pronoun *it* that Joseph Smith removed in his editing for the 1837 edition will be restored in the critical text, along with the *it* (and the preceding *to*) that Joseph deleted from the original text in Jacob 5:72 (“the servants did go **to it** and labor with their might”). See the discussion there.

■ Enos 1:10

*and their transgressions will I bring down with sorrow
upon their [NULL > own 1 | own ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heads*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "upon their heads", but then he corrected the text by supralinearly inserting *own* (and without any change in the level of ink flow). Nearby fragments of the original manuscript indicate that there was room for *own* in the original manuscript.

Elsewhere in the text, we have a fairly equal number of occurrences of "upon one's **own** head" (seven times) and "upon one's head" (six times). Since either reading seems possible, Oliver Cowdery was probably correcting to the reading of the original manuscript here in Enos 1:10.

There is also evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the premodifier *own*:

Mosiah 10:11
therefore they depended
upon their [NULL > own 1 | own ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] strength

Alma 38:11
yea see that ye do not boast
in your [NULL >- own 0 | own 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] wisdom

Alma 52:1
Amalickiah was dead
in his [NULL >- own 0 | own 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] tent

In these examples from the manuscripts, Oliver caught his initial error and corrected it by supralinearly inserting the *own*.

Summary: Retain in Enos 1:10 Oliver Cowdery's immediate correction in \mathcal{D} to "upon their **own** heads".

■ Enos 1:13

*that it might be brought forth
[01 | at ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] some future day
unto the Lamanites*

Both manuscripts omit any preposition before the phrase "some future day". The 1830 typesetter added the preposition *at*. The question is whether there really needs to be a preposition in front of "some future day", especially since the sentence is in the passive and, as a result, "some future day" can hardly be misinterpreted as the direct object of "brought forth".

Elsewhere we have two examples of adverbial phrases containing the word *future*, and each is headed by a preposition:

1 Nephi 7:13
and ye shall know **at some future period**
that the word of the Lord shall be fulfilled

Moroni 1:4

that perhaps they may be of worth unto my brethren the Lamanites
in some future day

The second example suggests that the 1830 typesetter could have inserted the preposition *in* rather than *at* for Enos 1:13 (“that it might be brought forth **in** some future day unto the Lamanites”).

There are a few other adverbial phrases involving *some* and a period of time that are headed by a preposition:

Alma 9:17

and **at some period of time**
 they will be brought to believe in his word

Alma 46:40

and there were some who died with fevers
 which **at some seasons of the year** was very frequent in the land

Even so, English has some idiomatic adverbial phrases of the form “some <time period>” for which there is no preposition, as exemplified by the following instances in the Book of Mormon:

The Words of Mormon 1:2

but may God grant that he may survive them
 that he may write somewhat concerning them
 and somewhat concerning Christ
 that perhaps **some day** it may profit them

Helaman 11:24

there were a certain number of the dissenters from the people of Nephi
 which had **some years before** gone over unto the Lamanites

Of course, in both these examples the word *future* is not present.

The Oxford English Dictionary has 21 citations of “some future <period of time>”, but in each case there is a preceding preposition (19 with *at* and 2 with *on*):

at some future date	6 times
at some future time	6 times
at some future period	5 times
on some future day	2 times
at some future day	1 time
at some future season	1 time

Thus there is no evidence in the OED for the earliest usage in Enos 1:13.

Even so, the earliest reading in Enos 1:13 does not seem especially difficult. Although unexpected, this nonprepositional usage is possible and may very well be intended here. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading in Enos 1:13 (namely, “that it might be brought forth **some future day** unto the Lamanites”).

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:13 the original adverbial phrase without the preposition *at* (or *in*) since the adverbial phrase “some future day” can occur without a preposition.

■ Enos 1:14

for at the present

*our [struggleings 1 | struggles A | strugglings BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were vain
in restoring them to the true faith*

Instead of setting *strugglings*, the 1830 compositor set *struggles*, perhaps accidentally. The correct *strugglings* was restored in the 1837 edition by reference to \emptyset . In this same book of Enos, we find another instance of *strugglings*:

Enos 1:11

and I prayed unto him with many long **strugglings** for my brethren

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have one example of *strugglings* and three of *struggle(s)*:

Mosiah 7:18

notwithstanding our many **strugglings**
which have been in vain

Mosiah 7:18

yet I trust there remaineth an effectual **struggle** to be made

Alma 27:1

when those Lamanites which had gone to war against the Nephites
had found after their many **struggles** for to destroy them
that it was in vain to seek their destruction

Mormon 6:6

and knowing it to be the last **struggle** of my people

The first example from Mosiah 7:18 has *strugglings* and is nearly parallel to the reading in Enos 1:14—both refer to “strugglings being (in) vain”.

Summary: Retain *strugglings* in Enos 1:14, the earliest extant reading; the use of *strugglings* is consistent with the use of *strugglings* in Enos 1:11 and Mosiah 7:18.

■ Enos 1:14

and they swore in their wrath

In Early Modern English, the past-tense form for the verb *swear* was typically *sware*, but this has been replaced in modern English by *swore* (in part under the influence of the past participial form *sworn*). For instance, in the King James Bible there are only examples of *sware* (83 of them, including *swarest*), none of *swore*. In the Book of Mormon, there are six passages where we have to consider whether the original text read *sware* or *swore*:

Enos 1:14 (no extant textual variance)

and they [*swore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in their wrath

Mosiah 19:4 (no extant textual variance)

therefore he drew his sword
and [*swore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in his wrath

Alma 25:1

therefore they [*sware* 0 | *swore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] vengeance upon the Nephites

Ether 1:33

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

Ether 8:14

they all [*swear* 01DEFHIJKLMNOPS | *sware* ABCGRT] unto him

Ether 15:28

and he [*wore* >+ *swore* 1 | *swore* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in his wrath that he would slay Coriantumr

In all these instances (where extant), the scribe in the manuscripts is Oliver Cowdery. In two passages, he miswrote *sware* as *swear*:

	☉	☽
Ether 1:33	<not extant>	swear
Ether 8:14	swear	swear

For these two cases, the original text seems to have read *sware*. In a third case, Oliver actually wrote *sware* in the original manuscript, but he changed it to *swore* when he copied from ☉ into ☽:

	☉	☽
Alma 25:1	sware	swore

This change suggests that in two cases where ☽ reads *swore* and ☉ is not extant that ☉ might have read *sware*:

	☉	☽
Enos 1:14	<not extant>	swore
Mosiah 19:4	<not extant>	swore

In preparing the transcripts for the original manuscript (see volume 1 of the critical text), I assumed as much and proposed that ☉ read *sware* for Enos 1:14 (see line 20 on page 114 of ☉). But the sixth example provides indirect evidence that sometimes Oliver Cowdery wrote *swore* in ☉:

	☉	☽
Ether 15:28	<not extant>	wore >+ swore

Here Oliver initially misread the verb in ☉ when he copied from ☉ into ☽ and wrote *wore*. A little later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he corrected *wore* to *swore*. Most likely, ☉ read *swore*, which would explain why Oliver misread it as *wore*: he simply missed the initial *s*. If ☉ had read *sware*, it would have been less likely for him to have misread it as *wore*; such a misreading would require that he not only missed the initial *s* but also misread the *a* as an *o*.

This mixed evidence argues that in each case the reading should be determined by the earliest textual sources, with the understanding that *swear* is a misspelling for *sware* (obviously not *swore*). This decision gives us the following readings in the earliest text for the six cases of *sware/swore*:

Enos 1:14	swore
Mosiah 19:4	swore
Alma 25:1	sware
Ether 1:33	sware
Ether 8:14	sware
Ether 15:28	swore

In other words, the earliest text is evenly divided between *sware* and *swore*.

This variation for the past-tense form of *swear* is similar to that of the verb *bear*. The original text prefers the archaic *bare*, and Oliver Cowdery tended to spell *bare* as *bear* (given their identical pronunciation, /bɛr/). And like the case of *sware/swore*, the transmitted text has occasionally introduced the modern form, *bore*, in place of the archaic form, *bare*. One difference is that the earliest textual readings support a consistent use of *bare* in the original text in distinction to the competing use of both *sware* and *swore*. For a list of the original instances of *bare*, see under 1 Nephi 11:7. For a general discussion regarding both *swear/sware* and *bear/bare*, see SWEAR and BARE in volume 3. For a general discussion regarding *sware/swore* and *bare/bore*, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the archaic past-tense form *sware* in Alma 25:1 and Ether 1:33; also accept *sware* in Ether 8:14; in the other three cases where the original text could have read *sware* (Enos 1:14, Mosiah 19:4, and Ether 15:28), the earliest textual sources actually support *swore*.

Enos 1:17

and I Enos knew [that 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it would be according to the covenant which he had made

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the subordinate conjunction *that*. Elsewhere in the original text, we have ten occurrences of “knew that it”, including this nearby one:

Jacob 5:22

I **knew that it** was a poor spot of ground

The earliest text has two occurrences without the *that*:

3 Nephi 4:33

and they **knew it** was because of their repentance and their humility that they had been delivered from an everlasting destruction

3 Nephi 5:2

and because of the things which had come to pass already they **knew** [1A | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it must needs be that all things should come to pass according to that which had been spoken

For the example in 3 Nephi 5:2, the 1837 edition added the *that* to “they knew it must needs be”, probably because of the influence of the preceding “they knew **that** it must be expedient that Christ had come” that occurs earlier in the verse.

Since the *that* appears to be optional (although predominate) in “X knew (that) it”, in each case we let the earliest textual sources determine the original reading. Thus the original *that* will be restored in Enos 1:17, but the intrusive *that* will be removed from 3 Nephi 5:2. For further discussion of the use of the subordinate conjunction *that* after various verbs (including the verb *know*), see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:17 the original use of the subordinate conjunction *that*: “I Enos knew **that** it would be according to the covenant which he had made”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here).

■ Enos 1:18

*and the Lord said unto me
thy fathers have also **required** of me this thing
and it shall be done unto them according to their faith
for their faith was like unto thine*

Joanne Case has suggested (personal communication, 7 December 2003) that this passage should read “thy fathers have also **requested** of me this thing”. This clearly seems to be the meaning. One possibility is that there has been a visual misreading here since *required* and *requested* look alike. The original manuscript is not extant for this part of the text.

More interesting as a possibility is that the verb form *required* is actually correct but that it has the obsolete meaning ‘requested’. The Oxford English Dictionary shows that the verb *require* originally had the meaning ‘to ask or request’ (see the first three definitions listed under section I, all of which are identified as obsolete). The OED citations show this meaning continuing up into the 1600s, including one dating from 1613 in Shakespeare’s *King Henry VIII*. In this scene Cardinal Wolsey is speaking to the king but definitely not requiring anything of the king, only requesting:

King Henry VIII (act 2, scene 4, lines 144–146)
Most gracious sir,
In humblest manner I **require** your Highness
That it shall please you to declare . . .

There are also a number of instances in the King James Bible where the word *require* clearly has this now-archaic meaning of ‘request’, including the following examples:

Ezra 8:22
for I was ashamed to **require** of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen
to help us against the enemy in the way

Proverbs 30:7
two *things* have I **required** of thee
deny me *them* not before I die

Luke 23:23–24
and they were instant with loud voices
requiring that he might be crucified
and the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed
and Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they **required**

Some other Book of Mormon instances of *required* may also mean ‘requested’, as in Mosiah 18:27: “and he that hath but little / but little should be **required**”.

What is most striking about the Book of Mormon use of *require* with the meaning ‘request’ is that it provides an example of a word meaning that had apparently died out long before 1829. Yet there are quite a few examples of words with archaic meanings dating from the 1500s and 1600s that occur in the original text of the Book of Mormon and not just in quotations from the King James Bible. In fact, some of these archaic word uses are not found in the King James Bible (although this particular one is). For a list of examples, see under Mosiah 19:24. For a complete discussion of the archaic language in the original Book of Mormon text, see volume 3.

Summary: Retain the occurrence of the word form *required* in Enos 1:18, with the understanding that it means ‘requested’; this archaic meaning dates from Early Modern English but apparently became obsolete in the late 1600s.

■ Enos 1:20

*and I [bear 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | bare A] record
that the people of Nephi did seek diligently
to restore the Lamanites unto the true faith in God*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 14:29, this use of the verb form *bear* should be interpreted as a present-tense form. Enos is speaking directly to us, his readers; thus the present-tense *bear* is appropriate. The 1830 typesetter replaced *bear* with the past-tense *bare*, but the 1837 edition reverted to the original, correct *bear*. Also see the discussion under BEAR in volume 3.

■ Enos 1:20

*they became wild and ferocious and a bloodthirsty people
full of idolatry and filthiness
feeding upon beasts of prey
dwelling in tents
and wandering about in the wilderness with a short skin
[girted 1PS | girded A | girdle BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] about their loins*

The spelling *girted* (found in the current RLDS edition for this verse and in the manuscripts generally) is nonstandard since the main verb is *gird* and the past tense is *girded*, as here in the 1830 edition and elsewhere for eight other passages (in both the LDS and RLDS texts).

The introduction of *girdle* in the 1837 edition for Enos 1:20 appears to be a typo. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition. The error may have been influenced by the familiar language in the Gospels that refers to the clothing of John the Baptist:

Matthew 3:4
and the same John had his raiment of camel’s hair
and a leathern **girdle about his loins**

Mark 1:6

and John was clothed with camel's hair
and with a **girdle of a skin about his loins**

Note that the second of these biblical citations, like Enos 1:20, refers to "a skin".

Excluding six occurrences in Isaiah quotations, the word *girdle* appears only once in the original Book of Mormon text, and in that instance it also occurs with the verb *gird*:

Mosiah 10:8

and they were **girded** about with a leathern **girdle** about their loins

The usage in this particular instance has parallels in the King James Bible:

2 Kings 1:8

he *was* an hairy man and **girt** with a **girdle** of leather about his loins

Job 12:18

he looseth the bond of kings and **girdeth** their loins with a **girdle**

Ezekiel 23:15

girded with **girdles** upon their loins

The first of these biblical parallels is particularly close to the language of Mosiah 10:8, especially with the reference to a leather girdle in both cases. In Mosiah 10:8, the verb used is *gird*, which is what we find whenever the text refers to something being girded about one's loins:

1 Nephi 4:19

and I did **gird** on his armor about my loins

1 Nephi 4:21

for he beheld the garments
and also the sword **girded** about my loins

Enos 1:20 (original text)

with a short skin **girded** about their loins

Mosiah 10:8

and they were **girded** about with a leather girdle about their loins

Alma 3:5

and they were naked save it were a skin
which was **girded** about their loins
and also their armor which was **girded** about them

Alma 43:20

but they were naked save it were a skin
which was **girded** about their loins

Alma 46:13

and he fastened on his headplate and his breastplate and his shields
and **girded** on his armor about his loins

Alma 46:21

behold the people came running together
with their armors **girded** about their loins

3 Nephi 4:7

and they were **girded** about after the manner of robbers
and they had a lambskin about their loins

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore *girded* in place of *girdle* in Enos 1:20 (“with a short skin girded about their loins”).

■ Enos 1:20

and their skill was in the bow

and [1APS | in BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] the scimitar

and the ax

The 1837 edition added an *in* before the second of the conjoined elements in this clause but not before the third, which results in a fairly unusual construction for the Book of Mormon. This extra *in* appears to be a typo since other lists of weapons (bows, arrows, swords, scimitars, axes, clubs, slings, and stones) are basically invariant with respect to prepositional repetition. In virtually all other instances, the preposition (whether repeated or not) is *with*. And this preposition can occur before every conjoined noun phrase, as in the following example:

Mosiah 9:16

I did arm them **with** bows and **with** arrows
with swords and **with** scimitars and **with** clubs and **with** slings
and **with** all manner of weapons which we could invent

In the current text there are eight more examples like this one.

In three examples we have *with* occurring before each conjoined noun phrase except for a last noun phrase that generally refers to other kinds of weapons:

Alma 43:18

with swords and **with** scimitars
and all manner of weapons of war

Alma 57:14

with stones and **with** clubs
or whatsoever thing they could get into their hands

Alma 60:2

with swords and **with** scimitars
and all manner of weapons of war of every kind

Finally, in seven cases, we have the same lack of prepositional repetition that is found in the original text for Enos 1:20—namely, the preposition occurs in front of only the first noun phrase. In all cases but one, the conjunctive structure involves two conjuncts; and in two cases, the preposition is not *with* but either *from* or *by*:

1 Nephi 16:15	with our bows and our arrows and our stones and our slings
Alma 43:37	with their swords and their scimitars
Alma 49:2	from the arrows and the stones of the Lamanites
Alma 49:20	with their swords and their slings
Alma 49:22	by the stones and the arrows
Helaman 16:6	with their stones and their arrows
Helaman 16:6	with our stones and our arrows

The first example shows that there can be three or more conjuncts for which the preposition appears before only the first conjunct.

There is only one instance of potential irregularity; in this instance, the conjoined phrase “a bow and an arrow” apparently acts as a unit:

1 Nephi 16:23	wherefore I did arm myself
	with a bow and an arrow
	with a sling and with stones

In any event, the original structure for Enos 1:20 is consistent with one of the dominant kinds of coordination found in the Book of Mormon text; thus in Enos 1:20 the intrusive, repetitive *in* will be removed. For further discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original reading for Enos 1:20 by deleting the preposition *in* before “the scimitar”.

■ Enos 1:20

and their skill was in the bow

and the [*Simeter* 1 | *cimeter* AFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *cymeter* BCDEG]

and the ax

Both the current LDS and RLDS texts refer to *cimeters* in 11 different passages. The only textual question here is what standard English word might *cimeter* stand for. It is not immediately obvious from the textual history, given the considerable variation in the spelling for this word:

Enos 1:20	[<i>Simeter</i> 1 <i>cimeter</i> AFHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>cymeter</i> BCDEG]
Mosiah 9:16	[<i>simetres</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>cymeters</i> E]
Mosiah 10:8	[<i>simitres</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>cymeters</i> E]
Alma 2:12	[<i>simiters</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>cymeters</i> E]
Alma 27:29	[<i>simeter</i> > <i>simetar</i> 0 <i>Symatre</i> 1 <i>cimeter</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimeter</i> E]
Alma 43:18	[<i>simetres</i> 0 <i>simeters</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimitars</i> E]
Alma 43:20	[<i>simeters</i> 01 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimitars</i> E]
Alma 43:37	[<i>simeters</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimitars</i> E]
Alma 44:8	[<i>Simetar</i> 0 <i>simetre</i> 1 <i>cimeter</i> ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimitar</i> E]

Alma 60:2	[<i>Simeters</i> 0 <i>simitar</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>scimitars</i> E]
Helaman 1:14	[<i>simeters</i> 0 <i>Simitar</i> 1 <i>cimeters</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>cimiters</i> D <i>scimitars</i> E]

Virtually all the manuscript spellings of this word begin with *sim* (only one begins with *sym*). We get considerably more variation in the spelling of the second vowel (as either *e* or *i*) and the final syllabic *r* (as either *er*, *re*, or *ar*). In the following list of manuscript misspellings for this word, I ignore capitalization and list the plurals with the singulars:

	Œ	Ɔ
simeter	4	4
simetre	1	2
simetar	2	—
simiter	—	1
simitre	—	1
simitar	—	2
symatre	—	1

The 1849 LDS edition, for the last six examples (from Alma 43:18 on), has the spelling *scimitar*, which refers to ‘a short, curved, single-edged sword’ (the definition found in the Oxford English Dictionary). The OED indicates that the spelling *cimeter* was prevalent from the 17th through the 19th centuries. In the online version of the OED, there are four citations of *cimeter(s)*, which is the most prevalent nonstandard spelling of the word in the online OED. On the other hand, there are 30 citations in the online OED for the standard *scimitar(s)*. Both spellings are found in English sources from the 1500s on. The spelling *scimitar* is based on the Italian *scimitarra*, whereas *cimeter* is based on the French *cimeterre*.

The OED lists only the pronunciation /sɪmətə/, but Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary gives both /sɪmətə/ and /sɪmətər/ (in that order). The second pronunciation seems to be a spelling pronunciation. The two occurrences of the spelling *simetar* in the original manuscript could be interpreted as evidence that Joseph Smith might have sometimes pronounced the word as /sɪmətər/. Another possibility, perhaps more likely, is that the spelling *simetar* was due to the spelling of the word *similar*. The two other spellings in Œ, *simeter* and *simetre*, clearly support the pronunciation /sɪmətə/. It is probably the case that Joseph Smith consistently pronounced the word as /sɪmətə/, the pronunciation of his day.

In his 1828 dictionary Noah Webster, recognizing the extreme diversity for the spelling of this word, advocated the spelling *cimiter* (not *cimeter*) as the “most simple”. His dictionary lists the spelling *scimitar* but refers the reader to *cimiter*. This spelling occurs only once in the entire history of the Book of Mormon text, in the 1841 British edition for Helaman 1:14. The 1830 typesetter, on the other hand, selected the common spelling *cimeter*, which has more or less prevailed in the textual history. However, this spelling is undoubtedly confusing to modern-day readers who might not be able to recognize the word *cimeter* as a variant spelling of *scimitar*. The critical text will use the standard spelling of today, *scimitar*.

Summary: In order to facilitate the modern-day reader’s understanding, the critical text will replace the archaic spelling *cimeter* with the standard spelling *scimitar*.

■ Enos 1:21

*the people of Nephi did till the land
and raise all manner of grain and of fruit
and flocks of herds
and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind
and goats and wild goats and also much horses*

The expression “flocks of herds” is a difficult reading. A number of suggestions have been proposed for emending the text here. One by George Talbot (personal communication, 27 February 2003) proposes that *herds* is a mishearing for *birds*—that is, Oliver Cowdery misheard Joseph Smith’s dictation of “flocks of birds” as “flocks of herds”. One problem with this proposal is that the Book of Mormon otherwise never uses the word *bird*, only *fowl* (6 times). The King James Bible has examples of *bird* (54 times) and *fowl* (86 times), so the complete lack of *bird* in the Book of Mormon text is striking.

John Sorenson has suggested that the reading “flocks of herds” is correct but that it needs to be interpreted differently. The English word *herd* corresponds to the Hebrew *baqar*, but since *baqar* can also stand for ‘ox’ and ‘cattle’, this phrase could, for instance, be interpreted more specifically:

Hebrew *baqar* can be translated “ox,” “cattle,” or “herd,” hence it is plausible that Enos’s “flocks of herds” constitutes a Hebraism which could have been translated more clearly as “flocks of oxen” or “flocks of cattle.”

See page 42, John Sorenson, *Animals in the Book of Mormon: An Annotated Bibliography* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1992). One problem here, however, is that the following “and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind” would be redundant.

In the history of the English language, the words *flock* and *herd* have varied considerably with respect to what kinds of animals these terms could refer to. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the noun *flock* originally had a more general meaning than it does today: ‘a number of animals of one kind, feeding or traveling in a company; now chiefly applied to an assemblage of birds or of sheep or goats’. There are, for instance, citations in the OED referring to flocks of fish, swine, elephants, mites, lions, and camels! Originally, the noun *herd* also had a more general meaning: ‘a company of animals of any kind, feeding or traveling in company’ (OED), with citations referring to herds of wolves, boars, elephants, whales, porpoises, seals, swans, cranes, wrens, and gnats!

But historically even the word *cattle* has varied considerably in its referents. According to the OED, *cattle* originally applied to any kind of livestock: ‘live animals held as property, or reared to serve as food, or for the sake of their milk, skin, wool, etc.’ The OED indicates that the word has been used to refer to camels, horses, asses, mules, oxen, cows, calves, sheep, lambs, goats, and swine. More recently, *cattle* has referred to only the bovine genus. However, it has been extended to refer to fowls and bees. Consider, for instance, Thomas Carlyle’s “among all manner of bovine, swinish and feathered cattle” (dating from 1830).

All of this variation suggests that one could interpret “flocks of herds” as referring to some other type of animal (or animals) than those listed specifically in the following conjoined noun phrases (“and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind / and goats and wild goats and also

much horses”). The use of *cattle* here seems to imply a somewhat restricted use of the word since after “all manner of cattle of every kind” the text lists goats, wild goats, and horses, which one could interpret as not being considered cattle in this verse. Under this interpretation, flocks of herds could refer to flocks of sheep, which seems to be the only main type of animal missing from the list. Of course, this conclusion assumes that there is no redundancy in the list.

Normally, the Book of Mormon uses the words *flock(s)* and *herd(s)* without mentioning any specific types of animals. Besides Enos 1:21, there are only four passages where specific animals are listed with *flock(s)* and *herd(s)*:

3 Nephi 4:4
and having reserved for themselves provisions
and **horses** and **cattle** and **flocks** of every kind
that they might subsist for the space of seven years

3 Nephi 6:1
every man with his family
his **flocks** and his **herds**
his **horses** and his **cattle**

3 Nephi 20:16 (also 3 Nephi 21:12)
as a lion among the beasts of the forest
as a young lion among **the flocks of sheep**

But the two in 3 Nephi 20–21 quote Micah 5:8 and are not supported by language elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. The first two examples allow herds and flocks to refer to animals other than horses and cattle. It is therefore possible that “flocks of herds” in Enos 1:21 nonredundantly refers to flocks of sheep.

Instead of the phrase “flocks **of** herds”, what we expect, of course, is “flocks **and** herds”, the expression that the Book of Mormon text otherwise consistently uses (and always with *flocks* preceding *herds*):

2 Nephi 5:11	flocks and herds and animals of every kind
Mosiah 7:22	our flocks and our herds
Mosiah 21:16	and flocks and herds
Mosiah 22:2	and their flocks and their herds
Mosiah 22:6	their flocks and herds
Mosiah 22:8	our flocks and our herds
Mosiah 22:11	their flocks and their herds
Alma 1:29	flocks and herds and fatlings of every kind
Alma 3:2	their flocks and their herds
Alma 4:2	their flocks and herds
Alma 4:6	their many flocks and herds
Alma 7:27	your flocks and herds
Alma 27:14	all their flocks and herds
Alma 62:29	and flocks and herds of every kind

Helaman 6:12	many flocks and herds / yea many fatlings
Helaman 12:2	their flocks and their herds
3 Nephi 3:13	their flocks and their herds
3 Nephi 3:22	and their cattle and all their flocks and their herds
3 Nephi 4:3	their flocks and their herds
3 Nephi 6:1	his flocks and his herds / his horses and his cattle
Ether 6:4	their flocks and herds and whatsoever beasts or animal or fowl that they should carry with them
Ether 10:12	flocks and herds

All 22 of these Book of Mormon examples are supported by numerous examples of the expression “flocks and herds” in the biblical text, where *flocks* typically refers to sheep and goats and *herds* to cattle (see definition 1b under the noun *herd* in the OED). There are 36 occurrences in the King James Bible of conjoined *flock(s)* and *herd(s)*, with *flock(s)* usually occurring first (the Book of Mormon order). In every one of the biblical instances of conjoined *herd* and *flock*, there is an explicit conjunction (usually *and* but also *or* and *nor*). There are never any examples of “flocks **of** herds” (or “herds **of** flocks”).

This systematic evidence argues that the original text in Enos 1:21 read “all manner of grain and of fruit and flocks **and** herds and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind and goats and wild goats and also much horses”. One can argue that the source for the *of* instead of *and* was the multiple use of *of* throughout this passage: “**of** grain and **of** fruit . . . and flocks **of** all manner **of** cattle **of** every kind”. Note especially the immediately following occurrence of “flocks **of**”. The proposed replacement of *and* with *of* could readily have happened as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation since Joseph may have been dictating “and flocks **of** all manner **of** cattle **of** every kind” as Oliver was trying to write down the preceding “and flocks and herds”. It is also possible that such an error could have occurred as Oliver copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} (the original manuscript is not extant here).

But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), one virtue of the earliest text (“and flocks **of** herds and flocks of all manner of cattle”) is that it does not present such a bald-faced redundancy as does “and flocks **and** herds and flocks of all manner of cattle”. Given that it is possible to interpret “flocks of herds” as referring to flocks of sheep, it is probably safest to retain the earliest reading here in Enos 1:21. That reading may, of course, represent an early error in the transmission of the text, perhaps even a dittography. Thus far no proposed emendation has proved fully satisfactory.

Summary: Retain in Enos 1:21 the earliest reading “flocks **of** herds”, even though this reading is unique to the text; interpreting *herds* as referring to sheep (in distinction to cattle) seems to work better than introducing the excessive redundancy of the proposed emendation “flocks **and** herds and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind”.

■ Enos 1:21

*and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind
and goats and wild goats
and also [much 1A | many BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] horses*

The text has occasionally been edited to avoid singular-plural combinations such as *much* modifying a plural count noun. Here in Enos 1:21, an original *much horses* was edited to *many horses* in the 1837 edition. Similarly, two cases of *much people* have had the *much* edited to *many*, again in the 1837 edition:

Mosiah 29:7
yea and destroy the souls
of [*mtch* >jg *many* 1 | *much* A | *many* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

Ether 8:2
he did flatter [*much* >js *many* 1 | *much* A | *many* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

For the example in Mosiah 29:7, Hyrum Smith (the scribe in \mathfrak{P} for that passage) wrote *mtch* ‘much’. The 1830 typesetter crossed out *mtch* and supralinearly penciled in *many*; even so, he ended up typesetting *much*, with the result that for the printed editions, *many* showed up first in the 1837 edition.

Sometimes the *much* has been maintained and the plural count noun has been changed to the singular, especially when the noun can be considered noncount:

1 Nephi 16:35 (changed in the 1830 edition)
much [*afflictions* 01 | *affliction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
hunger thirst and fatigue

The Words of Mormon 1:16 (changed in the 1920 LDS edition)
much [*contentions* 1 | *contentions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *contention* RT]
and many dissensions

Alma 7:5 (changed in the 1852 LDS edition)
much [*afflictions* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *affliction* FIJLMNOQRT] and sorrow

Helaman 3:3 (changed in the 1841 and 1852 LDS editions)
much [*contentions* 1ABCEGHKPS | *contention* DFIJLMNOQRT]
and many dissensions

Yet in half the cases, the original “*much* <plural count noun>” has been retained, including instances of *much people* and *much afflictions*:

1 Nephi 18:6	<i>much</i> fruits and meat
1 Nephi 18:17	<i>much</i> threatenings
Alma 2:2	<i>much</i> people
Alma 7:5	so <i>much</i> afflictions and sorrow
Alma 10:4	<i>much</i> riches
Alma 63:6	<i>much</i> provisions
Alma 63:7	<i>much</i> provisions

The critical text will restore all those cases where an original “much <plural count noun>” has been removed from the text (usually by editing).

Summary: Restore the original *much horses* in Enos 1:21; instances of “much <plural count noun>” were fairly common in the original text.

■ Enos 1:22–23

and there were exceeding many prophets among us

and the people were a stiff-necked people

hard to understand

and there was nothing save it was exceeding harshness

preaching and prophesying of wars and contentions and destructions

and continually reminding them of death and of the duration of eternity

and the judgments and the power of God

and all these things stirring them up continually to keep them in the fear of the Lord

Here in Enos 1:22 the apparent meaning of “hard to understand” is that it was hard for this stiff-necked people to understand the prophets, not that it was hard for the prophets to understand this stiff-necked people. The prophets understood this people all too well. A non-elliptic use of “hard to understand” is found in 2 Nephi 25:1: “Isaiah spake many things which were hard for many of my people to understand”. The use of “hard to understand” in Enos 1:22 appears to be intended.

Summary: Maintain in Enos 1:22 the elliptic use of “hard to understand”, which means that it was hard for this stiff-necked people to understand the prophets and their preaching.

■ Enos 1:23

and there was nothing save it was exceeding harshness

preaching and prophesying of wars and contentions and destructions

*and continually reminding them **of** death*

and [of 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the duration of eternity

and the judgments and the power of God

In this example of conjunctive repetition, the 1830 typesetter removed the preposition *of* before the second conjoined noun phrase so that *of* is found in front of only the first noun phrase. The resulting structure conforms to one of the two general conjunctive patterns in the Book of Mormon—namely, the preposition occurs only in front of the first conjunct. The other general pattern repeats the preposition before each succeeding conjunct. For a comparison of the two possibilities, see the nearby discussion under Enos 1:20 concerning the preposition *in*. The earliest reading here in Enos 1:23 has the *of* before the first and second conjoined noun phrases but not the third (“the judgments and the power of God”). It is possible that the original text actually didn’t have the second *of*; we no longer have the original manuscript here. On the other hand, there are no other examples in the Book of Mormon text of a conjunctive nominal complement for “remind someone of”, so we are unable to refer to any parallel usage in this case.

Since the reading of the printer's manuscript seems to work well enough, the critical text will accept the extra *of* before the second conjoined noun phrase in Enos 1:23. For a complete discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:23 the repeated preposition *of*, the reading of the printer's manuscript: "reminding them of death and **of** the duration of eternity and the judgments and the power of God".

■ Enos 1:23

*and there **was** nothing save it was exceeding harshness
preaching and prophesying of wars and contentions and destructions
and continually reminding them of death
and of the duration of eternity
and the judgments and the power of God
and all these things stirring them up continually
to keep them in the fear of the Lord
I say there [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | is K] nothing
short of these things and exceeding great plainness of speech
would keep them from going down speedily to destruction*

In this passage, the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the past-tense *was* with the present-tense *is* in the second occurrence of "there was nothing". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original past-tense form.

This last sentence in this verse is particularly interesting in that it provides a clear example in the text of a syntactic construction that is apparently unacceptable in current American English, yet there are enough examples of this construction sprinkled throughout the text that we must conclude that it is fully intended—namely, the existential construction "there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>":

1 Nephi 18:20

and **there was** nothing save it were the power of God
which threatened them with destruction
could soften their hearts

Enos 1:23

I say **there was** nothing
short of these things and exceeding great plainness of speech
would keep them from going down speedily to destruction

Alma 3:20

now it came to pass . . .
that **there was** another army of the Lamanites
came in upon the people of Nephi

Alma 12:20

but **there was** one Antionah
who was a chief ruler among them
came forth and **said** unto him . . .

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 63:4

and it came to pass that . . .
there was a large company of men
 even to the amount of five thousand and four hundred men
 with their wives and their children
departed out of the land of Zarahemla
 into the land which was northward

Helaman 13:2

and it came to pass that in this year
there was one Samuel a Lamanite
came into the land of Zarahemla
 and **began** to preach unto the people

There is also an example of this construction for which the verb form is the subjunctive *were* rather than the indicative *was*:

Alma 42:16

now repentance could not come unto men
 except **there were** a punishment
 which also was as eternal as the life of the soul
should be affixed opposite to the plan of happiness
 which was as eternal also as the life of the soul

Semantically, of course, this instance of *there were* is singular in number and equivalent to *there was*; note that the subject is the delayed singular noun phrase, *a punishment*. Unfortunately, the 1830 typesetter complicated this particular example of “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>”: his punctuation for this passage (which has continued in all subsequent printed editions) reinterprets the syntax and thereby makes it difficult, if not impossible, to recognize that the passage contains an example of this construction. See Alma 42:16 for discussion.

What we expect in current American English for all these cases is a relative pronoun before the past-tense finite verb form:

□ *revised readings*

1 Nephi 18:20	there was nothing . . . which could soften their hearts
Enos 1:23	there was nothing . . . which would keep them from going down
Alma 3:20	there was another army . . . which came in upon the people of Nephi
Alma 12:20	there was one Antionah . . . who came forth and said unto him
Alma 42:16	except there were a punishment . . . which should be affixed
Alma 43:38	there was . . . a man who fell among the Nephites
Alma 63:4	there was a large company of men . . . who departed out of the land
Helaman 13:2	there was one Samuel a Lamanite who came into the land

Of course, the text has actual cases where the existential “there was something” is completed by a relative clause, as in the following example:

Mosiah 28:10
 for there was not any of his sons
 [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 would accept of the kingdom

On the other hand, all the examples where the relative pronoun seems to be missing involve *there was*; if the *be* verb is in the present tense or in the semantic plural (that is, for cases of indicative *there is*, *there are*, and *there were*), the corresponding construction always takes a relative pronoun, as in the following sampling:

2 Nephi 27:13
 and **there is** none other **which** shall view it
 save it be a few

Jarom 1:4
 and **there are** many among us
 [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have many revelations

Alma 1:22
 nevertheless **there were** many among them
who began to be proud and began to contend warmly with their adversaries

In other words, nowhere in the Book of Mormon text we do get constructions like the following hypothetical examples:

□ *revised readings*

2 Nephi 27:13	there is none other shall view it
Jarom 1:4	there are many among us have many revelations
Alma 1:22	there were many among them began to be proud

There is one place in the history of the text where editing has introduced an instance of “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>”. In this instance, the 1920 LDS edition deleted the relative pronoun *who* (originally *which*):

Alma 16:8
 and there was not one soul of them
 [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] had been lost
 that were taken captive

This example suggests that such usage was acceptable in the early part of the 20th century in the United States. For current speakers of American English, this usage seems unacceptable. (For further discussion of this example, see under Alma 16:8.)

Interestingly, this construction is still found in 20th century British speech, in both the present and past tense:

- Rosemary Edmond’s 1957 translation of *War and Peace*
 “Count! There is one God **judges** us.”
 [pages 1055 and 1057, Leo Tolstoy, *War and Peace*
 (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1957)]
- a geology lecture, University College London (28 October 1991)
 “so there was something **happened** at that boundary
 which is of significance although we don’t know what it is”
 [citation sentence 23 on page 179 in Sidney Greenbaum, *The Oxford
 English Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)]

We also have these two examples from the British National Corpus (www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk):
 “there is a whitebeam **grows** aslant the road” and “there is something **needs** to happen”. (I wish to thank Mark Davies for these examples.) There is also a 17th century example from Samuel Pepys’ diary (27 July 1663): “There was at a distance, under one of the trees on the common, a company **got together** that sung”.

The critical text will accept all the original instances in the Book of Mormon of the construction “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>”. There are too many of these in the original text to assume that they are the result of accidentally omitting the relative pronoun. Nor is there any manuscript variation to suggest that there might have been a tendency to omit, even momentarily, the relative pronoun and thus create such an unusual construction for modern American readers of the book.

Summary: Maintain in Enos 1:23 the past-tense *was* that occurs twice in the phrase “there **was** nothing”; also maintain the construction “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>”, found not only here but elsewhere in the text.

■ **Enos 1:24**

*and I saw wars between the Nephites and
 [the 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Lamanites*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally deleted the repeated *the* in the phrase “the Nephites and **the** Lamanites”. In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *the* to the RLDS text. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are no other cases of “the Nephites and Lamanites” (the common phraseology in modern English), only the fuller “the Nephites and the Lamanites” (13 times). Similarly for the opposite order, we have only “the Lamanites and the Nephites” (3 times). Thus the original text was perfectly consistent for this particular conjunctive phrase. For further discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

In modern English, of course, we do not normally repeat the definite article *the* in conjunctive phrases, thus the tendency to occasionally omit the repeated *the*. Besides this accidental omission in the 1830 edition, the 1840 edition has two similar losses of the repeated *the* in conjuncts involving “the Nephites” and “the Lamanites”:

Alma 22:27

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

Alma 43:3

and now I return to an account of the wars
between the Nephites and [*the* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] Lamanites

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:24 the definite article *the* before *Lamanites* (the reading in the printer’s manuscript); the original text consistently reads “the Nephites and **the** Lamanites”, never “the Nephites and Lamanites” (the phraseology that we expect in modern English).

■ Enos 1:26–27

*and [as 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQS | RT] I saw that I must soon go down to my grave
having been wrought upon by the power of God
that I must preach and prophesy unto this people
and declare the word according to the truth which is in Christ
and I have declared it in all my days
and have rejoiced in it above that of the world
and I soon go to the place of my rest . . .*

This complex initial subordinate clause is never completed; thus the committee for the 1920 LDS edition deleted the subordinate conjunction *as* so that the original sentence fragment was eliminated. The original text of the Book of Mormon had many examples of such complex constructions “getting out of control”, so to speak, and never being completed. Over time editors have striven to remove such infelicities—in this case, by deleting the *as*. For a list of examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:7.

Summary: Restore in Enos 1:26 the original subordinate conjunction *as*; although this change restores an incomplete initial subordinate clause, such complex fragments were fairly frequent in the earliest text and appear (for the most part) to belong in the original text.

Jarom

■ Jarom 1:5

*and now behold two hundred years **had** passed away
and the people of Nephi **had** waxed strong in the land
they [~~had~~ > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *observed*
to keep the law of Moses and the sabbath day holy unto the Lord
and they **profaned** not neither **did** they blaspheme
and the laws of the land **were** exceeding strict*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *had observed*, using the past perfect that is found in the two previous clauses. His crossout of the *had* appears to be virtually immediate since the level of ink flow is unchanged. His correction probably reflects the reading found in the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

The simple past tense also agrees with the two following clauses that are connected to it by *and*'s. The transition from the past perfect to the simple past tense in this passage agrees with the sharp transition that results when no *and* is found preceding “they observed”.

Summary: Maintain in Jarom 1:5 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“they observed to keep the law of Moses”), apparently the reading in \mathcal{C} .

■ Jarom 1:8

*making all manner of tools of every kind to till the ground
and weapons of war
yea the sharp pointed arrow
and the quiver and the dart and the javelin
and all [~~preperation~~ >- ~~preperations~~ 1 | ~~preparations~~ ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for war*

Oliver Cowdery’s correction here in the printer’s manuscript is not immediate (the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *s* is weaker). The correction comes at the end of the line in \mathcal{P} (see line 30 on page 112 of \mathcal{P}). Perhaps Oliver’s correction was the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (which is no longer extant here).

This plural phrase “preparations for war” is the dominant one in the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere in the text, there are seven occurrences of the expression “to make **preparations** for war” but none of “to make **preparation** for war”:

Alma 24:4	the Lamanites began to make preparations for war
Alma 24:6	they would not even make any preparations for war
Alma 24:20	their brethren the Lamanites made preparations for war
Alma 35:11	the Zoramites and the Lamanites began to make preparations for war
Alma 43:4	therefore they made preparations for war
Alma 50:1	Moroni did not stop making preparations for war
Alma 52:6	as if making preparations for war

In the first of these examples (Alma 24:4), the 1830 compositor accidentally set the singular *preparation*, but his copy-text, the printer's manuscript, read in the plural. The 1837 edition restored the correct plural. There is, it would appear, a tendency to replace the plural *preparations* with the singular *preparation*.

When we move beyond the specific instances of “to make preparations for war”, we find that there is one more example of the plural “preparations for war”:

Mosiah 20:8 even **all** their preparations for war did he discover

We notice that this example uses the quantifier *all* with the plural *preparations*, just as in the corrected text for Jarom 1:8 (“and **all** preparations for war”). On the other hand, there is only one example of the singular “preparation for war” in the text:

Alma 49:9
and it came to pass that
the Lamanites or the Amalickiahites were exceedingly astonished at their manner
of [*preperation* 1 | *preparation* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *preparations* N] for war

Here \mathcal{P} and all the printed editions except the 1906 LDS edition have the singular *preparation* (\mathcal{C} is not extant for the word). For discussion of this one case where the earliest text has the singular, see under Alma 49:9.

Summary: Maintain the plural *preparations* in Jarom 1:8, Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; elsewhere the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural *preparations* in the expression “to make preparation(s) for war”.

■ Jarom 1:9

*but the word of the Lord was verified
which he spake unto our [fathers 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | father L]
saying that inasmuch as ye will keep my commandments
ye shall prosper in the land*

Here in Jarom 1:9, the 1902 LDS missionary edition introduced the singular *father* in place of the correct plural, *fathers*. The small plates of Nephi specifically state that both Lehi and Nephi individually received this promise from the Lord (see 1 Nephi 2:19–20 for Nephi and 2 Nephi 1:9 for Lehi; for additional citations of this promise, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 1:20). Thus the plural

fathers is definitely correct. This plural usage is also supported by the same language (although negatively expressed) that Amaron wrote in the very next book in the small plates of Nephi:

Omni 1:6

yea he would not suffer that
the words should not be verified
which he spake unto our **fathers**
saying that inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
ye shall not prosper in the land

Summary: Maintain the plural *fathers* in Jarom 1:9, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the plural reading is supported by the language in Omni 1:6 as well as by earlier references to this promise from the Lord to both Lehi and Nephi (“our fathers”).

■ Jarom 1:10

and it came to pass that the prophets of the Lord did threaten the people of Nephi according to the word of [the Lord >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God that . . .

Here in \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “according to the word of the Lord God”; then later, most likely when proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} , Oliver crossed out the words *the Lord* (giving “according to the word of God”). The ink flow for the crossout is considerably heavier but probably does not represent editing since there are two similar corrections in heavier ink flow on the next page of \mathcal{P} and these two corrections (both supralinear insertions) are undoubtedly the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . For discussion of these two corrections, see the discussion under Omni 1:6.

Both expressions, “the word of the Lord” and “the word of God”, are found in the original Book of Mormon text, with 30 occurrences of the first and at least 90 of the second (the number depending on the analysis). Although there are no occurrences of the fuller expression “the word of the Lord God” in the Book of Mormon text, there are many examples of “the Lord God” (112 occurrences). Of these 112, only two read “**of the Lord God**”, and in both of these cases, *God* is postmodified by an adjective:

Mosiah 3:21	and faith on the name of the Lord God Omnipotent
3 Nephi 4:32	blessed be the name of the Lord God Almighty

It is highly unlikely that Oliver Cowdery would have been aware of this minor restriction on the use of “of the Lord God” (namely, its adjectival postmodification). Thus there would have been little motivation for Oliver to have deleted *the Lord* from the phrase “of the Lord God” in Jarom 1:10—except that the text didn’t read that way in \mathcal{C} . Oliver’s correction here appears to have restored the original reading as found in \mathcal{C} (no longer extant here).

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in Jarom 1:10: “according to the word of God”.

■ Jarom 1:10

if they did not keep the commandments

but should fall into [transgression 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | transgressions o]

they should be destroyed from off the face of the land

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally introduced the plural *transgressions*, perhaps because of the preceding plural *commandments*. This edition was never used as a copy-text, and thus the plural *transgressions* in this source was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition. Elsewhere, the original Book of Mormon text consistently has “to fall into **transgression**” (14 times), including this nearby one:

Enos 1:13 that my people the Nephites should fall into **transgression**

As in Jarom 1:10, there has been some tendency to replace the singular *transgression* with the plural *transgressions* in the expression “to fall into transgression”. For a list of examples, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 6:5.

There are two examples where *transgression(s)* is conjoined with *sin(s)*, but in these two cases there is always number agreement between the two nouns:

Alma 9:19 if it were possible that they could fall into **sins** and **transgressions**

Alma 24:30 and then have fallen away into **sin** and **transgression**

When no noun is conjoined with *transgression(s)*, we have examples of only the singular “to fall into transgression”.

Summary: Maintain in Jarom 1:10 the singular usage “to fall into transgression”.

■ Jarom 1:12

and it came to pass that by so doing

*they kept them from being destroyed **upon** the face of the land*

One wonders if there might be some mistake here since other instances in the text refer to being “destroyed **from off** (the face of) the land/earth” rather than being “destroyed **upon** (the face of) the land/earth”:

Jarom 1:10	they should be destroyed from off the face of the land
Mosiah 12:8	I will utterly destroy them from off the face of the earth
Alma 9:12	he will utterly destroy you from off the face of the earth
Alma 9:24	ye shall utterly be destroyed from off the face of the earth
Alma 37:22	they should be destroyed from off the face of the earth
Alma 37:25	I will destroy them from off the face of the earth
Alma 54:12	even until you are destroyed from off the face of the earth
Helaman 7:28	ye shall be destroyed from off the face of the earth
3 Nephi 4:4	to destroy the robbers from off the face of the land
Ether 11:12	the Lord would utterly destroy them from off the face of the earth

There are a number of places in the Book of Mormon text where the verb *destroy* refers to a continuing destruction, not a total one, as in the following example:

1 Nephi 17:31
 and it came to pass that
 according to his word he did **destroy** them
 and according to his word he did lead them
 and according to his word he did do all things for them

As the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness for 40 years, the Lord gradually killed off all the adults who had rejected the advice of Joshua and Caleb and rebelled against Moses (see Numbers 14:26–39). This destruction was gradual and spread out during the 40-year sojourn. Nor was this destruction ever total since the younger generation was preserved and allowed to enter the land of Canaan. Thus 1 Nephi 17:31 can state without contradiction that the Lord did both “destroy them” and “lead them”. By interpreting the verb *destroy* in Jarom 1:12 as referring to a continuing and incomplete destruction, we can maintain the earliest reading of “being destroyed **upon** the face of the land”.

Summary: Retain the unusual (but apparently intended) usage in Jarom 1:12: “by so doing they kept them from being destroyed **upon** the face of the land”.

■ Jarom 1:14

and I [Joram 1 | Jarom ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] do not write more

Here Oliver Cowdery spelled *Jarom* as *Joram*. The three other occurrences of the name are consistently spelled as *Jarom* (including the first one, found in the title of the book):

title of the book	The Book of Jarom
Jarom 1:1	Now behold I Jarom write a few words
Omni 1:1	I Omni being commanded by my father Jarom that . . .

Two of these correct spellings precede Jarom 1:14 in the text. Thus the spelling in \mathcal{D} of *Joram* is undoubtedly an error, a simple switching of the vowels, perhaps under the influence of the name *Jordan*. (It is doubtful that the considerably less familiar biblical name *Joram* led to this error.)

Summary: Retain the spelling *Jarom* since the first two spellings in \mathcal{D} of the name read that way (\mathcal{C} is not extant for any of the occurrences of the name).

■ Jarom 1:14

*but behold my brethren
 ye can go to the other plates of Nephi
 for behold upon them
 the [record 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | records RT] of our wars **are** engraven*

In this passage the editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the singular *record* to the plural *records*, probably because of the plural *are* that follows. Although the clause “the record of our

wars are engraven” leads to a grammatical difficulty, the plural *are* probably occurs in the original text because of the proximity of the plural noun *wars*. Such nonstandard usage occurred quite frequently in the original text. For a very similar example, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:23 regarding “a **record** of the Jews which **contain** the covenants of the Lord”. For additional examples, see the discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

An alternative grammatical revision for this passage would be to retain the singular *record* but change the plural *are* to the singular *is*: “for behold upon them the **record** of our wars **is** engraven”. Such a grammatical change, it turns out, is more consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. Whenever we have the phrase “record(s) of X”, where X refers to subject matter rather than to an individual or a people, we systematically get the singular *record*, never the plural *records*:

1 Nephi 1:1	I make a record of my proceedings in my days
3 Nephi 5:10	I have made my record of these things
3 Nephi 5:14	I . . . should make a record of these things which have been done
3 Nephi 5:15	a small record of that which hath taken place
3 Nephi 5:17	then do I make a record of the things which I have seen
Mormon 1:1	I Mormon make a record of the things which I have both seen and heard

This systematicity suggests that in grammatically revising Jarom 1:14 for the standard text, editors should consider retaining the singular *record* and changing the verb form to the singular *is*.

Summary: In Jarom 1:14 the critical text will maintain the nonstandard “upon them the **record** of our wars **are** engraven”; the more appropriate grammatical revision would be to change the plural *are* to *is* instead of changing the singular *record* to *records*.

■ Jarom 1:14

*but behold my brethren
ye can go to the other plates of Nephi
for behold upon them the record of our wars are engraven
according to the writings of the kings
or [that 1A | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which they caused to be written*

The 1837 edition here implemented a grammatical change that may have been made by Joseph Smith, although he did not mark it in the printer’s manuscript. The change replaced the singular *that* with the plural *those*, probably because the previous phrase has the plural *writings* (“the writings of the kings”, not “the writing of the kings”). The *that* in the original reading refers to the entire collection of the writings of the kings, as if the text read “or that **writing** which they caused to be written”. The 1837 grammatical revision treats the text as if it read “**those writings** which they caused to be written”).

Nowhere else in the text are there any examples like *those which* where the verb *write* occurs in the relative clause, but there are 11 other occurrences of *that which* with *write* in the relative clause. In other words, *those* never serves as the antecedent for *which* in any relative clause containing the verb *write*. We have the following list of possible antecedents for the relative pronoun *which*, given that the verb is *write* (for each antecedent, the first instance is referenced):

Jarom

things	39 times	1 Nephi 1:16
words	16 times	1 Nephi 19:24
that	12 times	1 Nephi 19:23
books	4 times	2 Nephi 29:11
prophecies	2 times	2 Nephi 4:2
scriptures	2 times	Alma 33:12
writing	2 times	Alma 10:2
account	1 time	Helaman 2:14
language	1 time	Ether 3:24
plates	1 time	1 Nephi 6:1
record	1 time	Alma 44:24
revelations	1 time	Ether 4:16
sayings	1 time	3 Nephi 16:4
the word of God	1 time	The Words of Mormon 1:11
the last	1 time	Omni 1:9

These examples suggest that if Jarom 1:14 were to be revised, it should read as either “**the things** which they caused to be written” or “**the words** which they caused to be written”. On the other hand, “**those** which they caused to be written” is definitely exceptional in comparison to these other examples involving the verb *write* in a relative clause. The original reading works perfectly well in Jarom 1:14 and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Jarom 1:14 the original reading “**that** which they caused to be written”, which causes no difficulty at all and is perfectly consistent with other usage in the text.

■ **Jarom 1:14**

*but behold my brethren
 ye can go to the other plates of Nephi
 for behold upon them the record of our wars are engraven
 according to the writings of the kings
 or that which they [caused 1ABDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | cause CG] to be written*

Here the 1840 edition replaced the past-tense *caused* with the present-tense *cause*, perhaps under the influence of the preceding present-tense verb phrase *are engraven*. This change was probably unintentional, although one can make sense out of the present-tense usage: a Nephite king would have been ruling when Jarom wrote this passage, and therefore it would not be inaccurate to say that the kings were still having their writings engraven upon the large plates of Nephi. The 1858 Wright edition maintained the present-tense *cause*, but the past-tense *caused* was restored in the 1874 RLDS edition. Similar passages in the text use the past-tense or past-participial *caused* in the phrase “caused to be written”:

2 Nephi 11:1	only these things have I caused to be written
Mosiah 2:9	these are the words which he spake and caused to be written
Mosiah 28:11	after having translated and caused to be written the records
Ether 4:16	my revelations which I have caused to be written by my servant John

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *caused* in Jarom 1:14 (“or that which they caused to be written”).

Omni

■ Omni 1:2

*and I have not kept the statutes and the commandments of the Lord
as I ought to have [had >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] done*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "have had done", then later crossed out the *had* with heavier, darker ink flow, probably when he was checking the printer's manuscript against the original. He made two supralinear insertions later on this page of \mathcal{P} using the same heavier, darker ink flow. See Omni 1:6 for discussion regarding these corrections.

It is possible that in verse 2 the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here) read "as I **had** ought to have done", which would mean that Oliver initially put the *had* in the wrong place but that in his correction he simply deleted the *had* rather than placing it before the *ought*. In the Book of Mormon text, the clear majority of examples of the modal verb *ought* originally read *had ought* (30 cases, with variation in word order as well as the possibility of occurring with *not*). But based on the earliest text, there are six cases of verbal *ought* for which there is no *had*:

Jacob 2:34	for ye have done these things which ye ought not to have done
Omni 1:2	as I ought to have done
Mosiah 29:36	telling them that these things ought not to be
Alma 1:3	and they ought not to labor with their own hands
Alma 16:18	crying that these things ought not so to be
Alma 19:5	and that he ought to be placed in the sepulchre

Only the last example is extant in \mathcal{C} , and there the text reads without any *had*. This last example also occurs without any *not*, just like the reading in Omni 1:2. The critical text will maintain the six instances of *ought* that occur without *had* in the earliest text, including here in Omni.

Summary: Retain the use of *ought* rather than *had ought* in Omni 1:2; although originally the majority of instances of *ought* in the Book of Mormon text occurred with *had*, a few did not.

■ Omni 1:6

*yea he would not suffer that the words
[NULL >+ should not be verified 1 | should not be verified ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which he spake unto our fathers saying
[NULL >+ that 1 | That AHJKLMNOPQS | that BCDEFGRT]
inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments / ye shall not prosper in the land*

In this passage, there are two supralinear insertions in the printer's manuscript. Both are written with heavier, darker ink and were clearly inserted later, probably while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

(For discussion of these and several other corrections resulting from proofing these pages of \mathcal{P} , see under Omni 1:17.) It would appear that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in \mathcal{P} , accidentally skipped over the text twice here in Omni 1:6. The first insertion, a verb phrase (“should not be verified”), appears to be necessary to make sense of the text. The second insertion, the subordinate conjunction *that*, is also consistent with usage elsewhere; in the expression “spake . . . saying <direct quote>”, *that* can optionally appear after the word *saying*. (See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:1; for further discussion of the optionality of *that*, see under THAT in volume 3.)

In fact, this whole passage in Omni 1:6 is a negative form of a nearly identical statement found in the previous book:

Jarom 1:9

but the word of the Lord **was verified**
 which he spake unto our fathers saying
that inasmuch as ye will keep my commandments
 ye shall prosper in the land

Thus the two insertions in Omni 1:6 are very likely readings from \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Retain in Omni 1:6 Oliver Cowdery’s two corrections in \mathcal{P} , which most probably are corrections to the reading in \mathcal{C} , no longer extant here.

■ Omni 1:9

and after this manner

we keep the [records >% record 1 | records ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

for it is according to the commandments of our fathers

In this passage Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *records* in \mathcal{P} , then erased the plural *s*. Enough of the *s* remained, however, that the 1830 typesetter read the word as still having its plural *s*. Thus all printed editions continue to have the plural *records*. Since Oliver erased the plural *s*, the change was immediate; the singular *record* undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here).

The phrase “keep the record(s)” can have two possible interpretations—either as physically taking care of the record(s) or as writing the record(s). In most instances, either interpretation is possible. And of course, the record keeper usually did both tasks. Oftentimes the singular *record* is used when the writer is referring to the writing of the history of a people. In the case of Omni 1:9, the writer seems to be referring to the small plates of Nephi, a single record that their forefathers (Nephi, Jacob, Enos, Jarom, and Omni) had commanded them to keep.

In the original text, when the text refers to “keeping the record(s)”, there are 13 occurrences of the singular *record* and 6 of the plural *records*:

1 Nephi 5:16	wherefore he and his fathers had kept the records
1 Nephi 6:1	for it is given in the record which has been kept by my father
2 Nephi 5:29	and I Nephi had kept the records upon my plates
Jacob 7:26	and the record of this people being kept on the other plates . . .
Omni 1:9	and after this manner we keep the record

Omni

Mosiah 24:6	but they taught them that they should keep their record
Mosiah 28:20	and also keep a record of the people
Alma 3:12	and it is they which have kept the records
Alma 37:2	and I also command you that ye shall keep a record of this people
Alma 44:24	according to the record of Helaman which he kept in his days
Alma 45:2	concerning those records which have been kept
Helaman 3:13	and now there are many records kept of the proceedings of this people
3 Nephi 1:2	concerning the plates of brass and all the records which had been kept
3 Nephi 1:3	and his son Nephi did keep the record in his stead
3 Nephi 8:1	it was a just man which did keep the record
3 Nephi 23:7	bring forth the record which ye have kept
4 Nephi 1:19	Nephi he that kept this last record . . . died
4 Nephi 1:21	and his son Amos kept the record in his stead
4 Nephi 1:47	and his brother Ammaron did keep the record in his stead

The example in 3 Nephi 1:3 of the singular *record* reads in the plural in the LDS text, but the earliest textual evidence supports the singular *record*. For discussion, see under 3 Nephi 1:3.

Summary: Restore in Omni 1:9 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} , the singular *record* (“and after this manner we keep the record”).

■ Omni 1:10

behold I Abinadom

[*I* >js NULL 1 | *I* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *am the son of Chemish*

Here in Omni 1:10, the earliest form of the text here has a repeated use of *I* in “I Abinadom I”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated the second *I*. There are no examples elsewhere in the text of “behold I <name> I <verb phrase>”, but there are 13 instances of “behold I <name> <verb phrase>”, including one later in the book of Omni:

1 Nephi 1:20	but behold I Nephi will shew unto you that . . .
1 Nephi 14:28	and behold I Nephi am forbidden that . . .
1 Nephi 22:27	and now behold I Nephi say unto you that . . .
2 Nephi 25:6	but behold I Nephi have not taught my children after the manner of the Jews
Jacob 3:1	but behold I Jacob would speak unto you that are pure in heart
Jacob 7:7	and now behold I Sherem declare unto you that . . .
Jarom 1:1	now behold I Jarom write a few words
Omni 1:23	behold I Amaleki was born in the days of Mosiah
Alma 60:34	and now behold I Moroni am constrained . . .
Helaman 13:5	behold I Samuel a Lamanite do speak the words of the Lord

Summary: Restore in Omni 1:10 the earliest reading “behold I Abinadom I am the son of Chemish”; although the repeated *I* may be the result of an early transmission error, this unique reading is understandable and may have been intended.

■ Omni 1:10

*and I with [mine 1ABCGHKPS | my DEFIJLMNOQRT] own sword
have taken the lives of many of the Lamanites*

Here the 1841 edition replaced the archaic use of *mine* before a vowel-initial word with *my*, the form that modern-day English speakers expect. A similar change occurred in the 1841 edition for two other cases involving *own*, and the second of these has persisted in the LDS text (just like here in Omni 1:10):

Mosiah 1:10

out of [*mine* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] own mouth

Ether 3:24

in [*mine* 1ABCGHKPS | *my* DEFIJLMNOQRT] own due time

There are a few other instances where the 1841 edition replaced *mine* with *my* in attributive position (that is, where it modifies a following noun):

2 Nephi 28:32

[*mine* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] arm is lengthened out

Alma 33:11

because of [*mine* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] afflictions

Alma 60:36

I close [*mine* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] epistle

In a couple of instances, the early RLDS editions have also shown this tendency to replace *mine* with *my*:

Jacob 5:47 (1892 RLDS edition)

have I slackened [*mine* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *my* KPS] hand

Moroni 1:3 (1874 RLDS edition)

for the safety of [*mine* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *my* HK] own life

But the vast majority of cases of *mine* in attributive position have remained (130 occurrences). Thus the sporadic changes in the 1841 edition do not seem to reflect any systematic attempt at editing but rather an accidental tendency for the compositor to set what modern English speakers expect before nouns.

When *own* follows *mine* or *my*, the Book of Mormon text prefers *mine* (47 to 7 in the original text). The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the reading is *mine* or *my* before vowel-initial and *h*-initial words. For a complete discussion, see POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Omni 1:10 (and Ether 3:24) the original reading *mine own*.

■ Omni 1:13

and it came to pass that he did

[NULL > *according* 1 | *according* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

as the Lord [NULL > *had* 1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *commanded him*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "he did as the Lord commanded him"; then he supralinearly inserted *according* and *had* (with the same level of ink flow), giving the final text: "he did **according** as the Lord **had** commanded him". There is nothing grammatically wrong with "he did as the Lord commanded him". Thus the corrected text undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript, which is no longer extant here.

The phraseology "according as" is unusual in modern-day English and may be considered somewhat redundant. Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon text contains 21 occurrences of this expression (and the King James Bible has 33). In fact, there are seven other occurrences of "according as" where the following clause contains the past perfect auxiliary *had*:

Alma 8:1

having established the order of the church

according as he **had** before done in the land of Zarahemla

Alma 19:7

therefore he went in to see the king

according as the queen **had** desired him

Alma 25:11

now this is what he meant that many should suffer death by fire

according as he **had** suffered

Alma 25:14 (with ellipsis of "buried their weapons of war")

and they did also bury their weapons of war

according as their brethren **had**

Helaman 9:37

they went and did even **according as** Nephi **had** said unto them

3 Nephi 1:15

the words which came unto Nephi was fulfilled

according as they **had** been spoken

Ether 2:21

the brother of Jared did so

according as the Lord **had** commanded

Thus there is nothing wrong with the corrected reading for Omni 1:13 in the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Retain in Omni 1:13 the expression "he did **according** as the Lord **had** commanded him", Oliver Cowdery's nearly immediate correction to the reading of the original manuscript.

■ Omni 1:17

nevertheless they had had

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

Here in Omni 1:17, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “they had had wars and serious contentions”. Considerably later, with heavier and darker ink flow (and with a duller quill), Oliver supralinearly inserted *many* before *wars*. Like many corrections Oliver made on pages 113 and 114 of \mathcal{P} , the ink flow is clearly different:

Omni 1:2 (line 16 on page 113 of \mathcal{P})

as I ought to have <had> done

Omni 1:6 (line 25 on page 113 of \mathcal{P})

should not be verified
that the words ^ which he spake unto our fathers

Omni 1:6 (line 25 on page 113 of \mathcal{P})

which he spake unto our fathers saying ^ inasmuch as
that

Omni 1:17 (line 21 on page 114 of \mathcal{P})

many
they had had ^ wars & serious contentions

Omni 1:17 (line 23 on page 114 of \mathcal{P})

& they denied the being of their Creator ^ Mosiah nor the People
&

Omni 1:23 (lines 35–36 on page 114 of \mathcal{P})

behold I Am{e|a}leki was born in the days of Mosiah

Omni 1:23 (line 36 on page 114 of \mathcal{P})

to see his death
& I have lieved ^ & Benjamin his Son

All these corrections appear to have been made while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . See the discussion under each case.

Elsewhere in the text, there are 30 places where *war(s)* and *contention(s)* are conjoined. And two of these have *much* or *many* modifying *war(s)*, as in Omni 1:17:

Omni 1:10

behold it came to pass that
I saw **much war** and contention between my people

Alma 62:44

for because of so **many wars** and contentions
it had become expedient that a regulation should be made again in the church

The critical text will therefore maintain the *many* that Oliver Cowdery later inserted before *wars* in Omni 1:17.

Summary: Retain Oliver Cowdery’s correction to the printer’s manuscript in Omni 1:17 (“**many** wars and serious contentions”).

■ Omni 1:17

and they denied the being of their Creator

[NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Mosiah nor the people of Mosiah could* [not >js NULL 1 | *not* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *understand them*

Here in the printer's manuscript for Omni 1:17, Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted the conjunction *and* (written as an ampersand), probably later as he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{S} (the inserted & is in heavier ink flow). See the previous discussion regarding the inserted *many* in this verse. The *and* here is expected.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the *not* that originally occurred in this verse ("and Mosiah nor the people of Mosiah could **not** understand them"). As discussed under 2 Nephi 23:17, the earliest text had three occurrences of the conjunctive *nor* within a subject noun phrase followed by a *not* in the associated verb phrase:

Omni 1:17	and Mosiah— nor the people of Mosiah— could not understand them
3 Nephi 1:25	yea that one jot— nor tittle—should not pass away
3 Nephi 12:18	one jot— nor one tittle—hath not passed away from the law

As shown by the use of dashes, the *nor*-phrase acts parenthetically. The critical text will maintain the original *not* in all three of these cases, including here in Omni 1:17.

Summary: Restore the original reading in Omni 1:17 (the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript): "**and** Mosiah—nor the people of Mosiah—could **not** understand them"; this construction is found two other times in the original text.

■ Omni 1:18

and it came to pass that after they were taught in the language of Mosiah Zarahemla gave a genealogy of his fathers according to his memory and they are written but not in these plates

One wonders here if the preposition *in* is an error for *on* or *upon*. Elsewhere the text prefers *on* and *upon* when referring to writing a record upon plates. (For discussion of the variation between *on* and *upon*, see under Mosiah 28:11.) In particular, whenever the specific verb is *write*, we get only the preposition *upon* (24 times). This consistency in usage supports the hypothesis that the *in* here in Omni 1:18 could be an error for *upon*. Of course, *on* is also a possibility. There is evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery occasionally replaced either *upon* or *on* with *in*. In each of the following cases, Oliver initially wrote the preposition *in* in \mathcal{P} but then caught his error and corrected it to either *on* or *upon*:

Alma 56:31	as if we were going to the city beyond [shore >% on 0 in >% on 1 in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the borders by the seashore
------------	---

Helaman 9:31

and ye shall find blood

[*in* >+ *upon* 1 | *upon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the skirts of his cloak

Despite this evidence suggesting an emendation for Omni 1:18, there is one passage that uses the preposition *within* to refer to the contents of the plates:

Mosiah 8:19

doubtless a great mystery is contained **within** these plates

Since here the preposition *within* is semantically equivalent to *in*, the use of *in* in Omni 1:18 is acceptable. Zarahemla’s genealogy was, it appears, written in some plates but not in the small plates of Nephi. The earliest reading in Omni 1:18 (“they are written but not **in** these plates”) is therefore possible; the critical text will maintain the preposition *in* in Omni 1:18.

Summary: Maintain the preposition *in* in Omni 1:18 since the use of *within* in Mosiah 8:19 implies that one can refer to what is “in the plates”; elsewhere the text consistently uses the prepositions *on* and *upon* to refer to what is “on the plates”.

■ **Omni 1:22**

and the severity of the Lord fell upon them

according to his judgments

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

Here Joseph Smith changed the singular *is* to the plural *are* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Another possibility would have been to change the plural *judgments* to the singular (“according to his **judgment** which is just”). It is even possible that the original manuscript read *judgment* and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the plural *s* while copying (☉ is not extant here). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have more occurrences of *his judgments* (six times) than *his judgment* (two times)—and either the singular *judgment* or the plural *judgments* can occur with the predicate adjective *just*:

Mosiah 3:18 and his judgment is just

Mosiah 16:1 his judgments are just

Alma 12:15 all his judgments are just

Here in Omni 1:22 the predicate adjective *just* occurs in a relative clause. In this part of the small plates of Nephi, there are two similar instances of subject-verb disagreement. In both cases, there is a plural antecedent, the relative pronoun is *which*, and the verb is the singular *is*:

Omni 1:25

and believe . . . in **all things**

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

The Words of Mormon 1:7

but the Lord knoweth **all things**

which [*is* >*js are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to come

Thus the use of the singular *is* in a relative clause can occur with an immediately preceding plural antecedent (such as *judgments* in Omni 1:22 and *all things* in Omni 1:25 and the Words of Mormon 1:7). The critical text will restore such instances of subject-verb disagreement. For further discussion, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 as well as under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the singular *is* in Omni 1:22, Omni 2:25, and the Words of Mormon 1:7; these examples show that in a relative clause this singular verb form can be associated with a plural antecedent.

■ Omni 1:23

*behold I [Ameleki >+ Amaleki 1 | Amaleki ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was born
in the days of Mosiah
and I have lived [NULL >+ to see his death 1 | to see his death ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and Benjamin his son reigneth in his stead*

As discussed under Omni 1:17, Oliver Cowdery made several corrections to the printer's manuscript with heavier and darker ink flow for this part of the text. Here in verse 23, Oliver corrected his initial spelling *Ameleki* to *Amaleki*. Elsewhere, Oliver consistently wrote the correct spelling, *Amaleki* (twice in this book, earlier in verse 12 and later in verse 30, as well as twice in the Words of Mormon, in verses 3 and 10). Undoubtedly, the original manuscript (no longer extant for any of the book of Omni) read *Amaleki*, and here in Omni 1:23 Oliver corrected \mathcal{P} to agree with \mathcal{C} .

Similarly, Oliver Cowdery omitted the infinitive clause "to see his death" when he initially copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Obviously, the clause "and I have lived" is incomplete without this infinitival complement.

Summary: Maintain in Omni 1:23 the corrected readings in \mathcal{P} : the spelling *Amaleki* and the inserted infinitive clause "to see his death"; these readings undoubtedly reflect the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ Omni 1:25

*wherefore I shall deliver up these plates unto him
exhorting all men to come unto God the Holy One of Israel
and believe in prophesying
and [in 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] revelations
and in the ministering of angels
and in the gift of speaking with tongues
and in the gift of interpreting languages
[& 1 | A| and BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in all things which is good*

In this passage there have been two cases of loss in parallelism: the preposition *in* (in the 1888 RLDS edition) and the conjunction *and* (in the 1830 edition). The current LDS and RLDS editions maintain in this verse the original sequence of five occurrences of *and in*. The text has several other examples of this repetition of *and in*, including the following nearby instances in the last part of the small plates of Nephi:

2 Nephi 29:11

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

Jacob 4:10

he counseleth in wisdom **and in** justice **and in** great mercy
over all his works

Summary: Maintain the repetitive use of *and in* in Omni 1:25.

■ **Omni 1:25**

and believe in prophesying

and in revelations

and in the [ministering 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | ministerings o] of angels

and in the gift of speaking with tongues

and in the gift of interpreting languages

Here the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally replaced the singular gerundive *ministering* with the plural *ministerings*, perhaps because of the preceding plural *revelations* or the following *angels*. Elsewhere the text has two examples of “the ministering of angels” (Jacob 7:17 and Moroni 7:25) but none of “the ministerings of angels”.

Summary: Maintain the singular *ministering* in Omni 1:25; the text consistently reads “the ministering of angels”.

■ **Omni 1:25**

for there is nothing which is good

save it [come > comes 1 | comes ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

from [God > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord

Here we have two virtually immediate corrections in the printer’s manuscript. The level of ink flow is unchanged, unlike most of the corrections that occurred in this part of the text (when Oliver Cowdery later proofed \mathfrak{D} against \mathfrak{G} ; see the discussion under Omni 1:17). Here in verse 25 Oliver initially wrote “save it come from God”—that is, he wrote the subjunctive verb form *come* rather than the indicative *comes*, and he also wrote *God* instead of *the Lord*. Almost immediately Oliver inserted the *s* ending for *come* and crossed out *God* and then wrote inline the correct *the Lord*. The phrase “God the Lord” is not found in the Book of Mormon at all, although it is found seven times in the King James Old Testament.

As discussed under 2 Nephi 9:20, the Book of Mormon text has examples of both the subjunctive and the indicative in subordinate clauses headed by *save*. In each instance, the critical

text will follow the earliest textual sources. Thus the indicative *comes*, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , will be accepted here. For additional discussion, see under MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Omni 1:25 the two virtually immediate corrections that Oliver Cowdery made in “save it **comes** from **the Lord**”.

■ **Omni 1:26**

yea come unto him
and offer your whole souls as an offering unto him
and continue in fasting and [proping 1 | praying ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and endure to the end

The printer’s manuscript has the inexplicable *proping*. The 1830 typesetter interpreted this word as *praying*. There are no other scriptural examples of “fasting and **praying**”; instead, the expected phrase is “fasting and **prayer**” (or some variant of it):

Alma 6:6	and join in fasting and mighty prayer
Alma 17:3	they had given themselves to much prayer and fasting
Alma 28:6	and a time of much fasting and prayer
Alma 30:2	after the days of fasting and mourning and prayer
3 Nephi 27:1	and were united in mighty prayer and fasting
4 Nephi 1:12	continuing in fasting and prayer

The last example (4 Nephi 1:12) is equivalent in phraseology to Omni 1:26 except for the word *prayer*. Similar conjuncts of *fasting* and *prayer* are found in the King James Bible:

Matthew 17:21	howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting
Mark 9:29	this kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting
Luke 2:37	but served <i>God</i> with fastings and prayers night and day
I Corinthians 7:5	that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer

Thus one should consider the possibility that the original text here in Omni 1:26 read “fasting and prayer”.

On the other hand, the fact that *proping* ends in *ing* argues that in the original manuscript the word probably ended in *ing*. It would have been very easy for Oliver Cowdery to have mis-written *ay* as *op*. Further, the Book of Mormon text does have examples that conjoin the verbs *fast* and *pray*:

Mosiah 27:22	and they began to fast and to pray to the Lord their God
Mosiah 27:23	after they had fasted and prayed for the space of two days and two nights
Alma 5:46	behold I have fasted and prayed many days
Alma 17:9	and they fasted much and prayed much
Alma 45:1	and they did fast much and pray much
Helaman 3:35	nevertheless they did fast and pray oft
Moroni 6:5	and the church did meet together oft to fast and to pray

And finally, “to continue in” can take either verbal complements ending in *-ing* or fully nominal complements:

Alma 7:3	and that ye had continued in the supplicating of his grace
Alma 31:10	to continue in prayer and supplication to God daily
Alma 38:2	I hope that you will continue in keeping his commandments

Although the 1830 reading “continue in fasting and praying” is unique, it seems intended here. The verbal *praying* seems to be the closest actual word to what Oliver Cowdery wrote in *Ø* (*proping*). No actual English word beginning with *pro* (like *prophesying*) even seems possible in this context, so the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation seems the most plausible emendation.

Summary: Accept in Omni 1:26 the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation of the impossible *proping* as the word *praying*.

■ **Omni 1:26**

and as the Lord liveth ye [will 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | shall > will F] be saved

In setting the type for the 1852 LDS edition, the compositor accidentally misread the *will* of his copy-text as *shall*. In the second printing, the original *will* was restored, perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition. Either *will* or *shall* is acceptable in this context, although there are many more instances of “shall be saved” (21 of them). But there are two additional examples with the reading “will be saved”:

1 Nephi 8:3	and also many of their seed will be saved
Alma 9:17	and many of them will be saved

Summary: Retain the modal verb *will* in Omni 1:26 (“ye will be saved”).

■ **Omni 1:28**

*and their leader being a strong and [a 1ABCDEGPS | FHIJKLMNOQRT] mighty man
and a stiff-necked man
wherefore he caused a contention among them*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated indefinite article before *mighty man* here in Omni 1:28. The resulting reading has continued in the LDS text since then. The Book of Mormon text has numerous examples of the repeated indefinite article with conjoined adjectives, such as “a great and a terrible gulf” in 1 Nephi 12:18 (see the discussion under that passage). For a general discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Such repetition of the indefinite article *a* is not required, but it is a prominent characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere, there are two similar instances of “strong and mighty”, one of which repeats the *a*:

Mosiah 7:3 he being a strong and **mighty** man and a descendant of Zarahemla
Alma 48:11 and Moroni was a strong and **a mighty** man

In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the indefinite article is repeated.

Summary: Restore the repeated indefinite article *a* in Omni 1:28 (“a strong and a mighty man”).

■ **Omni 1:30**

and I am about to [lay >js lie 1 | lay A | lie BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] down in my grave

English grammar requires the verb *lie*, not *lay*, when the verb is intransitive. Here in Omni 1:30, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition follows this prescriptive rule. For a second example where Joseph removed such nonstandard usage from the text, see under Alma 24:23. And in one passage, the current LDS text retains the nonstandard use of *have laid* instead of the standard *have lain* (see 2 Nephi 9:7). For a complete discussion, see LAY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the intransitive use of the verb *lay* (in place of the prescriptive *lie*) in Omni 1:30; such nonstandard usage is frequent in the original Book of Mormon text.

The Words of Mormon

The Words of Mormon

■ The Words of Mormon 1:3

*and I found these plates
which contained [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the GHK] small account of the prophets
from Jacob down to the reign of this king Benjamin*

The 1858 Wright edition replaced the determiner *this* with *the*. The first two RLDS editions also followed this reading, but the original reading was restored in the third RLDS edition (1908), probably by reference to the printer's manuscript. The change may have been an attempt, perhaps unconscious, to avoid a sequence of demonstrative pronouns close together (“**these** plates . . . **this** small account . . . **this** king Benjamin”). The critical text will maintain the earliest reading, “this small account”.

Summary: Retain the demonstrative *this* in the Words of Mormon 1:3 (“this small account”).

■ The Words of Mormon 1:4

*yea and I also know that
as many things [NULL > as 1 | as ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] have been prophesied
concerning us down to this day
has been fulfilled*

Here Oliver Cowdery's correction in the printer's manuscript seems to be a virtually immediate correction based on the original manuscript (no longer extant here), especially since the ink flow is the same. The *as* also seems necessary. And as we might suspect, other passages in the text have this same kind of construction, namely “as many <noun phrase> as”:

2 Nephi 27:14
and in the mouth of **as many witnesses as** seemeth him good
will he establish his word

Alma 54:3
therefore Moroni resolved upon a stratagem to obtain
as many prisoners of the Nephites from the Lamanites **as** it were possible

Alma 57:9
but **as many times as** they attempted this
their blood was spilt

Alma 61:5

and I have fled to the land of Gideon
with **as many men as** it were possible that I could get

Summary: Retain in the Words of Mormon 1:4 Oliver Cowdery’s nearly immediate correction in \mathfrak{D} where he inserted the second *as* in “as many things **as** have been prophesied” (undoubtedly the original reading in \mathfrak{C} , no longer extant here).

■ The Words of Mormon 1:4–6

*and the things which **are** upon these plates pleasing me
because of the prophecies of the coming of Christ
and my fathers knowing that many of them **have** been fulfilled
—yea and I also **know** that as many things as **have** been prophesied
concerning us down to this day **has** been fulfilled
and as many as go beyond this day **must** surely **come** to pass—
wherefore I [*chosed* >% *chose* 1 | *chose* ABCDEGHKPRST | *choose* FIJLMNOQ] these things
to finish my record upon them
which remainder of my record I **shall take** from the plates of Nephi
and I **cannot write** a hundredth part of the things of my people
but behold I **shall take** these plates
which **contain** these prophesyings and revelations
and **put** them with the remainder of my record
for they **are** choice unto me*

Here in verse 5 the current LDS and RLDS texts have the past-tense form *chose*. But Mormon’s use of the present tense throughout this passage (marked above in bold) makes it more likely that the intended verb form is the present-tense *choose* (which was introduced into the 1852 LDS edition and continued in the LDS text up to the 1920 edition).

Oliver Cowdery almost always spelled *choose* as *chose*; the spelling is *chose* for every extant example in the original manuscript and for every example in the printer’s manuscript until the last example (in Ether 6:24), where for the first time Oliver wrote the correct spelling *choose* for the base form of the verb:

- Oliver Cowdery’s spellings of the base form *choose* in \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{D} (the three extant cases in \mathfrak{C} are each marked with an asterisk)

2 Nephi 2:27	and they are free to chose liberty
2 Nephi 2:27	or to chose captivity and death
2 Nephi 2:28	and chose eternal life
2 Nephi 2:29	and not chose eternal death
2 Nephi 10:23	to chose this way of everlasting death
2 Nephi 17:15	and to chose the good
2 Nephi 17:16	to refuse the evil and chose the good
* 2 Nephi 24:1	and will yet chose Israel
2 Nephi 26:10	they yieldeth unto the devil and chose works of darkness
* Alma 30:8	chose ye this day

Helaman 13:29	how long will ye chose darkness
* Helaman 14:31	ye might chose life or death
Ether 6:24	choose ye out from among our sons a king

(In volume 1 of the critical text, the transcript for Alma 30:8 in \mathcal{O} incorrectly reads **ch[o|u]use**; this word should have been transcribed as **ch[o|u]se**; that is, one can read Alma 30:8 as either *chose* or *chuse*. It appears that *chose* was what Oliver intended to spell.)

- Oliver Cowdery’s spellings of the past-tense form *chose* in \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} (the two extant cases in \mathcal{O} are each marked with an asterisk)

* Alma 40:13	they chose evil works
Helaman 5:2	and they which chose evil were more numerous
Helaman 5:2	than they which chose good
Ether 6:25	they chose even the first born
* Ether 6:26	they chose all the brothers of Pagag

For one of the past-tense cases (Alma 40:13), there has been some difficulty in the editions in deciding whether the correct reading should be *chose* or *choose*. For discussion, see under that passage.

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} as well as John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) had no difficulty with the spellings *choose* and *chose*, although in two cases there are errors in \mathcal{P} that seem to reflect Oliver Cowdery’s misspelling in \mathcal{O} of *choose* as *chose* (marked below with an \times):

- Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ’s spellings of the base form *choose* (none of these are extant in \mathcal{O})

Mosiah 29:25	choose you by the voice of this people judges
Mosiah 29:27	the voice of the people doth choose iniquity
\times Alma 10:19	the voice of this people should cause iniquity
\times Alma 13:3	being left to Ch{o<%se%> oos}e good or evil
Alma 13:10	they chooseing to repent and work righteousness

- Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ’s spellings of the past-tense form *chose* (none of these are extant in \mathcal{O})

Mormon 3:18	by the twelve whom Jesus chose to be his disciples
Mormon 3:19	by the twelve whom Jesus chose in this land
Mormon 3:19	by the other twelve whom Jesus chose in the land of Jerusalem

In Alma 13:3, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} originally wrote *Chose* in \mathcal{P} , then by erasure corrected it to *Choose*. Oliver had probably written *chose* or *Chose* in \mathcal{O} (which therefore led scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} to initially write *Chose* rather than the correct *choose*). Oliver was the scribe for \mathcal{O} here since nearby fragments of \mathcal{O} are in his hand. And in Alma 10:19, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} misread, it would appear, Oliver’s spelling *chose* in \mathcal{O} as *cause*. The language in this passage is based on king Mosiah’s statement in Mosiah 29:27: “and if the time cometh that the voice of the people doth **choose** iniquity then is the time that the judgments of God will come upon you”. Oliver’s error in Alma 10:19 may have been influenced by the preceding use of *cause* in the same verse: “**causing** that this people should

be governed by their own voices”. Both *cause* and *chose* are of the same length, which probably facilitated the visual error. This misreading would have been less likely if Oliver had spelled the present-tense form correctly in \mathcal{O} with the longer *choose*. John Gilbert emended *cause* to the correct *choose* in \mathcal{P} (by crossing out *cause* and supralinearly inserting *choose*, all in pencil). Thus these two errors by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} suggest that in both these cases Oliver wrote *chose*, not *choose*, in \mathcal{O} .

Here in the Words of Mormon 1:5, when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery himself apparently interpreted the verb as being in the past tense since he initially wrote *chosed* in \mathcal{P} . He immediately erased the final *d* to give *chose*. The spelling *chosed* could stand for either of two nonstandard past-tense forms, *choosed* or *chosed*, given that Oliver would have spelled both *choose* and *chose* in \mathcal{O} as *chose*. Nonetheless, the fact that Oliver did not generally distinguish between *choose* and *chose* in his manuscript spellings means that for each case of the spelling *chose* we have to determine whether or not the intended reading is in the past tense. In the Words of Mormon 1:5, the present-tense *choose* is more consistent with the use of the present-tense forms throughout verses 4–6. Related to this present-tense usage is the fact that Mormon consistently refers to the small plates of Nephi as *these plates*, beginning in verse 3:

The Words of Mormon 1:3–4

and now I speak somewhat concerning that which I have written
for after that I had made an abridgment from the plates of Nephi
down to the reign of this king Benjamin of which Amaleki spake
I searched among the records which had been delivered into my hands
and I found **these plates** which contained this small account of the prophets
from Jacob down to the reign of this king Benjamin
and also many of the words of Nephi
and the things which are upon these plates pleasing me . . .

Then in verse 6, Mormon refers once more to *these plates* and says he is going to include them in his record:

The Words of Mormon 1:6

but behold I shall take **these plates**
which contain these prophesyings and revelations
and put them with the remainder of my record

The present-tense usage here in verse 6 suggests that just before, in verse 5, Mormon is saying that he is now choosing to include these things as part of his record. The critical text will therefore accept the present-tense *choose* in verse 5.

In all cases except for here in the Words of Mormon 1:5, the 1830 compositor was able to determine the correct choice for Oliver’s spelling *chose*: he correctly set *choose* 12 times and *chose* 5 times. (In constructing these lists, I have ignored the spelling for the past participle, *chosen*. It is always spelled correctly in the text, 38 times, in both the manuscripts and all printed editions.)

Summary: Replace the past-tense *chose* in the Words of Mormon 1:5 with the present-tense *choose* since the context implies the present tense.

■ The Words of Mormon 1:5

and I cannot write [a 1A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hundredth part of the things of my people

The 1837 edition replaced the indefinite article *a* with the definite article *the*. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, and it could well be a typo in the 1837 edition since elsewhere “a(n) hundredth part” is the normal phrase in the Book of Mormon, although there is one occurrence of “the hundredth part”:

Jacob 3:13	a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people
Helaman 3:14	a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people
3 Nephi 5:8	a hundredth part of what was done among so many people
3 Nephi 26:6	an hundredth part of the things which Jesus did truly teach unto the people
Ether 15:33	the hundredth part I have not written

Summary: Restore “a hundredth part” in the Words of Mormon 1:5 since this phrase represents the earliest reading; “a(n) hundredth part” is considerably more frequent in the text than “the hundredth part”.

■ The Words of Mormon 1:7

*and I do this for a wise purpose
for thus **it whispereth me**
according to the workings of the Spirit of the Lord which is in me*

Ross Geddes has pointed out (personal communication, 12 September 2004) that the phraseology “it whispereth me” seems unusual. This construction, however, fits into a common pattern of verb construction where the verb refers to mental processes:

it grieveth me	2 Nephi 32:8, Jacob 2:7, Jacob 5 (eight times), Moroni 8:4
it sufficeth me	1 Nephi 6:2, 2 Nephi 5:4, 2 Nephi 5:34, Alma 40:5, Alma 56:5, Ether 3:17
it supposeth me	Jacob 2:8, the Words of Mormon 1:2, Alma 54:11 (two times)
it sorroweth me	3 Nephi 27:32
it seemeth me	Moroni 9:5

The King James Bible has two examples of “it repenteth me” (Genesis 6:7 and 1 Samuel 15:11) and one of “it grieveth me” (Ruth 1:13). The verb *whisper* in the expression “it whispereth me” can be considered as one of these verbs involving the mind since the whispering of the Spirit leads to an inspired thought in the mind.

Summary: Accept the phraseology “it whispereth me” in the Words of Mormon 1:7; similar usage is found elsewhere in the text.

■ The Words of Mormon 1:12

he had somewhat [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | of RT] contentions among his own people

The committee for the 1920 LDS edition added the preposition *of* to this passage. This change reinterprets *somewhat* as a noun rather than as an adverb with the meaning ‘to some extent’. Near the end of the Book of Mormon, there is a second example of where the 1920 edition added the preposition *of* after *somewhat*:

Moroni 9:1
 but I write somewhat
 [1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | of RT] that which is grievous

The earliest reading for both the Words of Mormon 1:12 and Moroni 9:1 must not be especially egregious since the RLDS text has retained the original, more unusual phraseology. Moreover, there is one other example, in Moroni 9:24, where *somewhat* is directly followed by a noun phrase: “wherefore write somewhat a few things”. In this instance, insertion of an *of* would be less compelling; one might expect *concerning* rather than *of* to follow *somewhat*. The text has 11 examples of “somewhat concerning”. Even so, the adverbial use of *somewhat* in Moroni 9:24 seems acceptable enough and most probably read without *concerning* in the original text.

The text also has two examples where *of* is found after *somewhat* and before a noun phrase, but in these instances the *of* heads a prepositional phrase that complements the verb; in these two cases, *somewhat* acts as an adverb:

1 Nephi 10:1 (“to speak of something”)
 I must **speak** somewhat **of** the things of my father and also of my brethren
 Mormon 1:15 (“to be of a sober mind”)
 and I being fifteen years of age and **being** somewhat **of** a sober mind
 therefore I was visited of the Lord

Thus are no examples in the earliest text of *somewhat* being immediately followed by *of* unless the *of* serves to complement the verb. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest readings without the *of* in the Words of Mormon 1:12 and in Moroni 9:1.

Summary: Remove the *of* that the 1920 LDS edition added in the Words of Mormon 1:12 since in the original text *somewhat* can serve as an adverbial with the meaning ‘to some extent’.

■ The Words of Mormon 1:14

*and in the strength of the Lord they did contend against their enemies
 until they had slain many [thousand >+ thousands 1 | thousands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of the Lamanites*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *thousand*; then later (probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}) he inserted a plural *s* at the end of *thousand* (the correction is with heavier ink flow). It is very probable that the original manuscript read *thousands* since we know Oliver frequently added and deleted final *s*’s in his copy work (see, for instance, the discussion regarding *borders* and *shore* under 1 Nephi 2:5).

Elsewhere in the original text, the partially singular *many thousand* occurs only when it is immediately followed by a noun phrase:

Alma 28:10	many thousand lives
Helaman 8:18	a great many thousand years
3 Nephi 3:24	a great many thousand people

None of these cases are followed by an *of*-initial prepositional phrase. On the other hand, instances of the fully plural *many thousands* preceding a noun phrase always have the preposition *of*:

Alma 26:13	how many thousands of our brethren
Alma 28:12	many thousands of others
Alma 37:9	so many thousands of the Lamanites
Alma 37:10	many thousands of them
Alma 37:10	many thousands of our stiff-necked brethren the Nephites
Alma 37:19	many thousands of the Lamanites

These complementary patterns suggest that “many thousands of the Lamanites” is the correct reading for the Words of Mormon 1:14. If *many thousand* were correct, the connecting *of the* would have been omitted (giving “many thousand Lamanites”). Or perhaps a noun like *men* could have originally occurred between “many thousand” and “of the Lamanites”, although the phrase “men of the Lamanites” is rare and occurs only in Alma 62:15: “a large body of men of the Lamanites”.

Summary: Retain “many thousands of the Lamanites” in the Words of Mormon 1:14, which is Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in the printer’s manuscript and the probable reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

■ The Words of Mormon 1:15

and it came to pass that

after there had been false [*Christs* 1AEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *christs* BCD]

and their mouths had been shut

As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:19, the editions have typically capitalized common nouns usually reserved for deity, even when the referent is not actually deity (as here in the Words of Mormon 1:15). Interestingly, both the 1837 and 1840 editions (which were edited by Joseph Smith) set the lowercase spelling *christs* for this passage, but beginning with the 1849 LDS edition, all printed editions have had the uppercase spelling *Christs*. The RLDS textual tradition, beginning with the 1858 Wright edition, has also had *Christs*. The critical text will maintain the capitalization of words like *Messiah*, *Savior*, and *Christ*, even when they refer to false claims of deity (as here in the Words of Mormon 1:15).

Elsewhere there are five instances where nonbelievers refer to their lack of belief in “a Christ”:

Jacob 7:9	if there should be a Christ
Alma 30:13	why do ye look for a Christ

Alma 30:15	ye cannot know that there shall be a Christ
Alma 30:26	ye do not know that there shall be a Christ
Helaman 16:18	it is not reasonable that such a being as a Christ shall come

The printed editions have capitalized all these instances of *Christ*.

Summary: Retain the capitalization of *Christ* even when it refers to false Christs (here in the Words of Mormon 1:15).

■ **The Words of Mormon 1:15**

*and it came to pass that
after there had been false Christs
and their mouths had been shut
and they punished according to their crimes . . .*

Stan Larson has suggested that in this passage the words *had been* may have been accidentally lost (see footnote 19 on page 568 of his article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 [1978]: 563–569). Such an emendation would increase the parallelism with the preceding “there **had been** false Christs and their mouths **had been** shut”.

Other examples in the text involving *had been* show that in conjoined verb phrases, ellipsis of the helping verbs occurs most of the time:

1 Nephi 15:1 (ellipsis of *had*)

I Nephi **had been carried away** in the spirit and **seen** all these things

Mosiah 24:21 (ellipsis of *had*)

he **had been** merciful unto them and **eased** their burdens

Alma 15:1 (ellipsis of *had been*)

all the people . . . who **had been cast out** and **stoned**

Alma 22:30 (no ellipsis in the original text)

the land which **had been peopled**
and [*had* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **been destroyed**

Alma 48:8 (ellipsis of *had been*)

he **had been strengthening** the armies of the Nephites and **erecting** small forts

Alma 62:9 (ellipsis of *had been*)

those kingmen which **had been taken** and **cast** into prison

3 Nephi 7:19 (ellipsis of *had been*)

he **had been stoned** and **suffered** death by the people

3 Nephi 7:22 (no ellipsis)

they **had been wrought upon** by the Spirit of God and **had been healed**

There is one example showing a conjoining of *had been* with *was* (or *were* since the 1837 edition):

Helaman 9:9
the murderers **had been taken**
and [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cast into prison

This example suggests an alternative emendation for the Words of Mormon 1:15: “and their mouths had been shut and they **were** punished according to their crimes”.

One important difference, however, in the Words of Mormon 1:15 is that the conjunctive element is a conjoined clause and not a predicate; specifically, there is a subject *they* in the conjoined clause, unlike all the other examples listed above. This kind of ellipsis is referred to as gapping, and one particular type of gapping involves the omission of helping verbs. Gapping is discussed, for instance, on pages 974–975 in Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London: Longman, 1985). They provide the following example (in note *a*) of what is referred to as a rather rare kind of gapping: “the fortress **had been attacked** and its commander **killed**”. This example precisely patterns the reading in the Words of Mormon 1:15, “their mouths **had been shut** and they **punished**.” Since gapping is grammatical in English, the critical text will allow it in the Book of Mormon, despite its rarity. Of course, the possibility remains that the gapping here in the Words of Mormon 1:15 is actually due to an error in the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of gapping in the Words of Mormon 1:15: “and their mouths had been shut and **they punished** according to their crimes”.

■ **The Words of Mormon 1:16**

and after there had been false prophets
and false [*preachers & teachers* 1 | *preachers and teachers* ABCDEGHKPRST |
teachers and preachers FIJLMNOQ] *among the people . . .*

In this passage the 1852 LDS edition accidentally switched the order of “preachers and teachers” to “teachers and preachers”. The 1920 edition restored the original word order to the LDS text, undoubtedly by reference to the early editions. This is the only example in the entire text where *preacher(s)* and *teacher(s)* are conjoined, so we must therefore rely wholly upon the earliest textual sources in establishing the word order here.

Summary: Retain the original word order “preachers and teachers” in the Words of Mormon 1:16.

■ **The Words of Mormon 1:16**

and after there having been
much [*contentions* 1 | *contentions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *contention* RT]
and many dissensions away unto the Lamanites
behold it came to pass that . . .

As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:35, the determiner *much* can occur with plural nouns. There is, for instance, one example of *much afflictions* in the current LDS text (in Alma 7:5) as well as two

in the original text that have been edited to *much affliction*. There are also examples in the text of the expected *much affliction* (four of them in the original text) as well as the systematically plural *many afflictions* (eight of these).

Similarly, we get variation in the original Book of Mormon text with respect to *contention(s)*, with three occurrences of *much contention*, two of *much contentions*, and one of *many contentions*:

The Words of Mormon 1:16 (*much contention* in the LDS text since 1920)
there having been **much contentions** and many dissensions

Mosiah 29:21
save it be through **much contention** and the shedding of much blood

Helaman 1:18
because of so **much contention** and so much difficulty in the government

Helaman 3:2
neither was there **much contention** in the forty and fifth year

Helaman 3:3 (*much contention* in the LDS text since 1852)
and it came to pass in the forty and sixth year
there were **much contentions** and many dissensions

3 Nephi 2:18
because of the wickedness of the people of Nephi
and their **many contentions** and dissensions

For additional examples of *much* occurring with plural nouns, see the discussion under Enos 1:21. The critical text will maintain each instance of the nonstandard “much <plural noun>” whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the original *much contentions* in the Words of Mormon 1:16.

■ The Words of Mormon 1:17–18

*for behold king Benjamin was a holy man
and he did reign over his people in righteousness
and there were many holy men in the land
and they did speak the word of God with power and with authority
and they did use much sharpness because of the stiffneckness of the people
wherefore with the help of these
king Benjamin by laboring with all the might of his body and the faculty of his whole soul
and also the prophets
[wherefore they >js NULL 1| wherefore they A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
did once more establish peace in the land*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 5:21, Joseph Smith sometimes removed repetitions of *wherefore*'s and *therefore*'s from the text. The original text permits such repetitions whenever there is an intervening parenthetical statement; the repetition of the *wherefore* or *therefore* helps bring the reader back to the original subject. In this instance, we have an intervening participial clause (“by laboring

with all the might of his body and the faculty of his whole soul”). The critical text will restore such repetitions whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

In this particular example, Joseph Smith also deleted the subject pronoun *they* that refers to both king Benjamin and the prophets who helped him. In the original text, the participial clause has two subjects, the noun phrase “king Benjamin” at the beginning and the delayed noun phrase “also the prophets” conjoined at the end. The Hebrew-like use of delayed conjoined subjects is found quite often in the original text. For a list of examples, see under 1 Nephi 3:28; also see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. Here in the Words of Mormon 1:18, Joseph’s editing rearranged the syntax so that now both “king Benjamin” and “also the prophets” act together as the subject for the following predicate (“did once more establish peace in the land”).

Summary: Restore the repeated *wherefore* and the subject pronoun *they* in the Words of Mormon 1:18 (such repetition is common in the original text); the original text here also contains an instance of the delayed conjoined subject, a Hebrew-like construction.

Mosiah

Mosiah 1

■ Mosiah 1:2

*and that they might know concerning the prophecies
which had been spoken by the mouths of their fathers
which was **delivered them** by the hand of the Lord*

One wonders here if there might be a preposition missing before the indirect object *them*, perhaps *unto* or *to*. Elsewhere in the text there are seven examples of the verb *deliver* where an immediately following pronominal indirect object takes either the preposition *unto* or *to*:

1 Nephi 3:20	which have been delivered unto them by the Spirit
Jacob 4:14	and delivered unto them many things
Mosiah 2:31	which shall be delivered unto you by him
Mosiah 4:1	which had been delivered unto him by the angel of the Lord
Mosiah 25:21	according as it was delivered to him by the mouth of Alma
Mosiah 28:11	which was delivered to him by the hand of Limhi
Alma 16:6	and there the Lord will deliver unto thee thy brethren

Yet there is one other example in the text where the verb *deliver* takes an immediately following pronominal indirect object without any preposition:

2 Nephi 27:24	the words that shall be delivered him
---------------	--

This usage is quite common in the King James Bible:

Genesis 42:34	so will I deliver you your brother
Leviticus 6:2	that which was delivered him to keep
Leviticus 6:4	or that which was delivered him to keep
Leviticus 26:26	and they shall deliver you your bread again by weight
Deuteronomy 24:13	thou shalt deliver him the pledge again
Judges 20:13	now therefore deliver us the men
2 Samuel 3:14	deliver me my wife Michal
1 Kings 20:5	thou shalt deliver me thy silver and thy gold
2 Kings 18:23	and I will deliver thee two thousand horses
2 Kings 22:10	Hilkiah the priest hath delivered me a book
Luke 19:13	and he called his ten servants and delivered them ten pounds
Acts 16:4	they delivered them the decrees for to keep
Romans 6:17	that form of doctrine which was delivered you

The critical text will therefore retain the two cases where the pronominal indirect object takes no preposition, here in Mosiah 1:2 as well as in 2 Nephi 27:24.

Summary: Retain the two readings where no preposition precedes a pronominal indirect object after the verb *deliver*: “the words that shall be delivered him” in 2 Nephi 27:24 and “which was delivered them by the hand of the Lord” in Mosiah 1:2; such usage without a preposition is fairly common in the King James Bible.

■ **Mosiah 1:3**

*I would that ye should remember that
were it not for these plates which contain these records
and [the > these 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commandments
we must have suffered in ignorance*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “these records and **the** commandments”, but then virtually immediately he corrected the text to read “these records and **these** commandments” (the *se* was squeezed in between the *the* and *commandments* without any change in the level of ink flow). Since either reading is possible, there is no motivation here for editing; the original manuscript undoubtedly read *these commandments*. Similar repetitive use of *these* is found elsewhere in the text, as in the following example from the small plates of Nephi:

The Words of Mormon 1:6
but behold I shall take **these** plates
which contain **these** prophesyings and revelations
and put them with the remainder of my record

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 1:3 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : “these records and **these** commandments”.

■ **Mosiah 1:3**

*we must have suffered in ignorance
[even 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] at this present time
not knowing the mysteries of God*

The 1841 British edition accidentally dropped the word *even* from this passage. The subsequent 1849 LDS edition restored it. The word *even* is similarly used in the very next verse: “even down to this present time” (Mosiah 1:4). King Benjamin also uses the expression “even at this time” three times in his final discourse to the people (but without the word *present*):

Mosiah 2:30 for **even** at this time my whole frame doth tremble exceedingly
Mosiah 3:22 and **even** at this time when thou shalt have taught thy people . . .
Mosiah 4:20 and behold **even** at this time ye have been calling on his name

Thus the use of *even* in Mosiah 1:3 is quite appropriate.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 1:3 the use of *even* in the phrase “even at this present time”.

■ Mosiah 1:4

*and so fulfilling the commandments of [the Lord > God 1 | God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
even down to this present time*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the commandments of the Lord” here in \mathcal{P} but soon thereafter crossed out *the Lord* and supralinearly inserted *God* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Elsewhere the text has examples of both “the commandments of the Lord” and “the commandments of God”, with the first dominating in the small plates of Nephi and the second elsewhere in the text. As might be suspected, the scribes sometimes mixed these up. Here I list several examples where the scribe initially made an error as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 3:21 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

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

Mosiah 29:11 (Hyrum Smith, scribe 3 of \mathcal{P})

for we will appoint wise men to be judges
that will judge this people according to the commandments
of [*the Lord* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God

Alma 30:3 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and the people did observe to keep the commandments
of [*the Lord* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *God* > *the Lord* 1]

Errors can occur in both directions, although the stronger tendency has been to write “the commandments of the Lord” (three out of the four cases). The critical text will, in each instance, follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether we have “the commandments of the Lord” or “the commandments of God”.

Summary: Accept the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Mosiah 1:4: “fulfilling the commandments of God”.

■ Mosiah 1:5

*were it not for these things which have been kept and preserved
by the hand of [the Lord > God 1 | God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As in the previous verse, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the Lord* instead of *God* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . His correction is just like the one in verse 4 (supralinear and without any change in the level of ink flow). Here the phraseology involves “the hand of X”. In the text there are examples of both “the hand of the Lord” and “the hand of God”, with the first clearly dominating (25 to 5). In each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine which of the two readings is correct.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 1:5 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “by the hand of God”.

■ Mosiah 1:5

because of the [*tradition* >+ *traditions* 1 | *traditions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of their fathers
which are not correct

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *tradition*, then later added the plural *s*. The ink flow for the *s* is considerably heavier and darker, just like the *s* that he inserted at the end of the word *thousand* on the previous page of \mathcal{P} (see the discussion under the Words of Mormon 1:14). Throughout this part of \mathcal{P} , Oliver used the same heavier flowing and darker ink to correct \mathcal{P} . See, for instance, the discussion regarding the two supralinear insertions in Omni 1:6, three manuscript pages earlier (on page 113 of \mathcal{P}). The first of those two corrections clearly indicates a correction to \mathcal{O} . Thus the scribal evidence in this part of \mathcal{P} suggests that here in Mosiah 1:5 Oliver was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} when he added the *s* to *tradition*. The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} since it appears to be due to proofing, although the possibility of editing cannot be ruled out.

The use of the plural *are* in the following relative clause could be used to argue that the plural is correct (“the **traditions** of their fathers which **are** not correct”). Even so, the immediately preceding plural *fathers* (in the prepositional phrase “of the fathers”) could have led to the choice of the plural *are*. For an example of such a proximity effect, see Jarom 1:14, where the earliest text read “the record of our **wars are** engraven”. Another example is found in the Words of Mormon 1:4, which originally read “as many things as have been prophesied concerning us down to this **day has** been fulfilled”. See SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3 for additional discussion of cases where the relative clause has a plural verb form that agrees with a closer plural noun rather than with the relative pronoun’s singular antecedent.

In the Book of Mormon text, there are two other cases of the phrase “tradition(s) of one’s fathers” that involve variation; both of these can be interpreted as cases where the immediate proximity of the preceding *fathers* may have influenced the verb form in a following relative clause:

Alma 21:17

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

Alma 30:16

and this derangement of your minds comes because of
the [*traditions* >% *tradition* 0 | *tradition* 1ABDEPS | *traditions* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]
of your fathers
which [*leads* 0 | *lead* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST] you away
into a belief of things which are not so

In the first example, the incongruity between the singular *tradition* and the plural *were* has been corrected in the LDS text, beginning with the 1852 edition. In the second example, the original manuscript initially had the plural *traditions*, but Oliver Cowdery immediately erased the plural *s*, thus producing the singular *tradition*. This singular agrees, in the original manuscript, with the third person singular form *leads* in the following relative clause. Interestingly, in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver replaced *leads* with *lead*, probably because of the preceding *fathers* (“the tradition of your **fathers** which **lead** you away”). Another possibility for this second case, pointed out

by David Calabro (personal communication), is that Oliver’s *lead* in \mathcal{P} may have actually stood for the past-tense form *led*, especially since Oliver tended to spell *led* as *lead* in both manuscripts (33 out of 40 times in extant portions of \mathcal{C} ; 59 out of 92 times in \mathcal{P}). See Alma 21:17 and Alma 30:16 for discussion of these two Alma passages involving variation; also see the discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

There are also four other examples in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery varied the number for the word *tradition*. All of these cases are extant in \mathcal{C} and involve manuscript corrections. In one case, the correction is in \mathcal{C} itself; in the three other cases, \mathcal{C} confirms that the correction in \mathcal{P} was based on the reading in \mathcal{C} :

Alma 19:14
 because of their iniquities
 and their [*traditions* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *tradition* > *traditions* 1]

Alma 31:16
 and we do not believe
 in the [*tradition* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *traditions* > *tradition* 1]
 of our brethren

Alma 47:36
 drinking in
 with the [*tradition* > *traditions* 0 | *traditions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 of the Lamanites

Alma 56:4
 now I need not rehearse unto you concerning
 their [*traditions* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *tradition* > *traditions* 1]
 or their unbelief

Elsewhere in the text—and without variation in the manuscripts and the printed editions—there are a good many cases of both “the **tradition** of one’s fathers” (9 occurrences) and “the **traditions** of one’s fathers” (16 occurrences). So either reading is possible. In the seven cases involving textual variation, the safest solution is to rely on the evidence from the earliest textual sources, even if in one case it leads to subject-verb disagreement (namely, in Alma 21:17: “the tradition of their **fathers** which **were** not correct”).

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 1:5 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“the **traditions** of their fathers which are not correct”); although the plural *s* for *traditions* is in heavier and darker ink, it looks the same as other corrections in this part of \mathcal{P} that appear to be based on \mathcal{C} and not due to editing.

■ Mosiah 1:6

*and behold also the plates of Nephi
 which contain the [record > records 1 | records ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 and the sayings of our fathers*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *record*, then inserted the plural *s*. The level of ink flow is unchanged, which suggests that the change is nearly immediate and is a correction to the

reading of the original manuscript. The use of the plural *records* is supported by the plural usage in a nearby verse:

Mosiah 1:3
 were it not for these plates
 which contain these **records** and these commandments
 we must have suffered in ignorance

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 1:6 the plural *records* since it appears to be a virtually immediate correction to the original manuscript.

■ **Mosiah 1:9**

he must [very 1 | very ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] soon go the way of all the earth

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the word *very* here in Mosiah 1:9. The subsequent RLDS edition (1908) restored it. Several references to soon going out of this life occur elsewhere in the text:

Jacob 7:27	I must soon go down to my grave
Enos 1:26	I must soon go down to my grave
Enos 1:27	and I soon go to the place of my rest
Ether 6:19	he must soon go down to the grave
Moroni 10:34	I soon go to rest in the paradise of God

In none of these does the adverb *very* appear with *soon*, which could explain why the 1892 edition accidentally lost the *very* in Mosiah 1:9 (especially since the first three of them are found close-by, in the last part of the small plates of Nephi).

There is, of course, nothing wrong with *very soon* occurring in the text, as it does in two other passages:

Alma 5:50	and also the King of heaven shall very soon shine forth
Alma 45:13	behold the time very soon cometh that . . .

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 1:9 the reading of the earliest text, *very soon*.

■ **Mosiah 1:10**

my son I would that ye should make a proclamation throughout all this land among all this people or the people of Zarahemla and the people of Mosiah which dwell in [this 1PS | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] land

Here the 1830 compositor replaced *this land* with *the land*, perhaps because *this* already occurred twice in this sentence (“throughout all **this** land among all **this** people”). Most likely, the replacement of *this* with *the* was simply an accident. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *this land* to the RLDS text. There is no reason why the more specific reading with *this*, the earliest

reading, should be rejected. For discussion of two other cases where an original *this land* was accidentally replaced by *the land*, see 2 Nephi 1:8 and Helaman 14:20.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 1:10 *this land*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest source here).

■ **Mosiah 1:10**

*for on the morrow I shall proclaim unto this my people
out of [mine 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | my D] own mouth
that thou art a king*

As discussed under Omni 1:10, there has been some tendency in the 1841 British edition to replace the archaic use of *mine* with *my* when followed by *own*. In this particular instance, the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *mine*.

Summary: Maintain the use of *mine* before *own* in Mosiah 1:10 (“out of mine own mouth”, the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ **Mosiah 1:16**

*and moreover he also gave him charge
concerning the records which were engraven on the plates of brass
and also the plates of Nephi
and also the sword of Laban
and **the ball or director** which led our fathers through the wilderness*

It is possible that the original manuscript read “the ball or **the** director” and that the second *the* was accidentally deleted by Oliver Cowdery while copying. Earlier in his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver deleted the repeated *the* in a similar conjunctive noun phrase:

2 Nephi 5:12
and I Nephi had also brought the records
which were engraven upon the plates of brass
and also the ball or [*the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] compass

On the other hand, Alma 37:38 reads “a ball or director” rather than “a ball or **a** director” (that is, without repetition of the article, here the indefinite *a*). And in that instance, the original manuscript is extant and reads without the *a*. Consequently, repetition of the article is probably not necessary for “the ball or director” in Mosiah 1:6. In each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether articles should be repeated for nominal conjuncts. For further discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 1:16 the phraseology “the ball or director” (that is, without any repeated *the*), in accord with the reading of the earliest textual source (here the printer’s manuscript).

■ **Mosiah 1:18**

Mosiah went and did as his father had commanded him and proclaimed unto all the people which were in the land of [Zarahemla 1AEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | Zerahemla BCD] that thereby they might gather themselves together

Zarahemla is the correct spelling for this name; there are 40 fully extant spellings of the name in the original manuscript, and each one reads without variation as *Zarahemla*. In addition, the name is consistently spelled *Zarahemla* in the printer's manuscript (151 times), being initially miswritten only once as *Zarrahemla* by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} (in 4 Nephi 1:8) but then immediately corrected by him to *Zarahemla*. (Two of the 151 instances of *Zarahemla* in \mathcal{P} were the result of momentary errors in copying and were crossed out; the actual text itself has 149 occurrences of the name *Zarahemla*.)

The only misspellings of this name are found in the printed editions. And only one particular misspelling of *Zarahemla* has ever persisted to any degree: namely, the phonetically identical misspelling *Zerahemla* here in Mosiah 1:18. This spelling with *e* rather than *a* for the first vowel was accidentally set in the 1837 edition and copied into the 1840 Cincinnati/Nauvoo edition as well as into the 1841 British edition, both of which were set from copies of the 1837 edition. Later, in the next chapter of Mosiah, the same misspelling occurred once more in the 1837 edition, but in this second case the error was copied only into the 1841 British edition:

Mosiah 2:4
 who had established peace
 in the land of [*Zarahemla* 1ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Zerahemla* BD]

Other misspellings of *Zarahemla* in the editions are simple typos that have occurred randomly and never persisted:

Zarahel ma	Omni 1:19	1911
Zarahel mla	Mosiah 8:5	1841
Zaraheml ah	Mosiah 8:7	1840
Zarare mla	Alma 58:4	1911

Summary: All the manuscript evidence supports *Zarahemla* as the correct spelling for this name.

Mosiah 2

■ Mosiah 2:1–2

*the people gathered themselves together throughout all the land
that they might go up to the temple to hear the words
which king Benjamin should speak unto them
and there [were 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | was G] a great number
even so many that they did not number them*

The 1858 Wright edition replaced the plural *were* with the singular *was*, probably because the following delayed subject was in the singular (“a great number”). The 1874 RLDS edition did not follow this grammatical emendation, but continued with the *were* of the 1840 edition. Of course, “a great number” implies ‘a great number of people’, for which the plural is acceptable. Elsewhere in the text we find examples of both singular and plural verb forms for the construction “there was/were a number (of X)”:

Omni 1:27

for there **was** a large number
which were desirous to possess the land of their inheritance

Mosiah 18:7

and it came to pass after many days
there **were** a goodly number gathered together to the place of Mormon
to hear the words of Alma

Mosiah 20:2

and it came to pass that
there **was** one day a small number of them gathered together
to sing and to dance

Mosiah 21:17

now there **was** a great number of women
more than there **was** of men

Helaman 11:24

there **were** a certain number of the dissenters from the people of Nephi
which had some years before gone over unto the Lamanites
and took upon themselves the name of Lamanites

None of these examples are extant in \mathcal{C} . In each case, there has never been any variation in the textual history for the number of the *be* verb. We consequently follow the earliest reading in each case, thus retaining the original *were* in Mosiah 2:2.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 2:2 the original *were* (“there were a great number”), the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Mosiah 2:4**

*and also a just man to be their king
who had established peace in the land of Zarahemla
and who had taught them to keep the commandments of God
that [thereby 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] they might rejoice
and be filled with love towards God and all men*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the word *thereby* in this passage. This word was the very first word on this page of the printer’s manuscript (line 1 on page 119 of \mathcal{P}) and may have been lost because the following word (*they*) is orthographically similar. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading to the RLDS text.

In the Book of Mormon text, the phrase “that thereby” very commonly introduces a resultive clause (36 times), especially in the book of Mosiah (22 times). There is no grammatical motivation for deleting the *thereby* in Mosiah 2:4.

The tendency to omit the *thereby* is also found later on in the text. In this later instance, Oliver Cowdery initially dropped the *thereby* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} :

Ether 6:4

*and it came to pass that when they had prepared all manner of food
that [they > thereby 1 | thereby ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
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*

Notice that once again the following visually similar *they* seems to have led to the loss of the *thereby*, at least momentarily.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 2:4 the word *thereby*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

■ **Mosiah 2:11**

*yet [as 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] I have been chosen by this people
and was consecrated by my father
and was suffered by the hand of the Lord that
I should be a ruler and a king over this people
and have been kept and preserved by his matchless power to serve thee
with all the might mind and strength which the Lord hath granted unto me*

In this passage the earliest text has an initial subordinate conjunction (*as*) that is never completed by a main clause. The committee for the 1920 LDS edition removed the *as*, thus making the subordinate clause into an independent one. Yet interestingly, the following text (verses 12–14) has an incomplete *as*-clause that has never been edited:

Mosiah 2:12–14

I say unto you that
 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 manner of riches of you
 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
 and have taught you that ye should keep the commandments of the Lord
 in all things which he hath commanded you
 and even I myself have labored with mine own hands
 that I might serve you
 and that ye should not be laden with taxes
 and that there should nothing come upon you
 which was grievous to be borne
 and of all these things which I have spoken
 ye yourselves are witnesses this day

As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:7, there has been a strong tendency to editorially delete the subordinate conjunction *as* in order to remove incomplete sentences from the text. The critical text will restore virtually all such instances, providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources. Also see the discussion regarding this usage in Enos 1:26–27.

Summary: Restore the original subordinate conjunction *as* in Mosiah 2:11, even though the resulting text remains incomplete; a similar incomplete *as*-clause is found in the next verse (Mosiah 2:12), but this *as* has never been editorially removed from the text.

■ Mosiah 2:11

*yet as I have been chosen by this people
 and [was 1APS| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] consecrated by my father
 and was suffered by the hand of the Lord that I should be a ruler and a king over this people
 and have been kept and preserved by his matchless power . . .*

In the 1837 edition, the auxiliary verb *was* that occurs before *consecrated* was omitted, yet the *was* that occurs before *suffered* in the following conjoined predicate was retained. The deletion of the first *was* was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, so it is possible that the omission of the *was* from “was consecrated” was unintended. In particular, it seems strange for king Benjamin to state that “I have been . . . consecrated by my father” when his father (the first king Mosiah) had been dead for many years. The use of *was* guarantees a simple past-tense interpretation for king Benjamin’s consecration as king. The larger passage here shows some variability in how the passive is expressed for the four conjoined predicates: the first and last instances are in the present perfect (“have been chosen” and “have been kept and preserved”), but the two intervening instances are in the past tense (“was consecrated” and “was suffered”). The 1908 RLDS

edition restored the original reading to the RLDS text. The critical text will, of course, follow the earliest reading since there is nothing inappropriate about it.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 2:11 the original use of the past-tense *was* in “as I have been chosen by this people and **was** consecrated by my father”.

■ **Mosiah 2:11**

*to serve [thee 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | you RT] with all the might mind and strength
which the Lord hath granted unto me*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 3:29, the original text of the Book of Mormon occasionally used the historical second person singular pronoun *thou* or *thee* to refer to more than one person. All such instances have been edited to the plural pronoun *ye* or *you*. Here in Mosiah 2:11–12, the surrounding text uses the pronoun *you*: “but I am like as **yourselves** . . . I say unto **you** that as I have been suffered to spend my days in **your** service”). In this particular instance, the change to *you* was made in the 1920 LDS edition.

For three more examples in this chapter of the plural use of *thou* and its editing to *ye*, see verses 25–26; for these three other cases, the grammatical emendation was made in the 1837 edition. For a complete list, see THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the biblically styled pronoun *thee* in Mosiah 2:11, even though the referent here is plural; the original text of the Book of Mormon occasionally used *thou* and *thee* for plural referents.

■ **Mosiah 2:12–13**

*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
neither have I suffered that ye should be confined in dungeons
nor that ye should make slaves one of another
[or 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | nor RT] that ye should murder or plunder or steal
or commit adultery
[or even I have not ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | Or even I have not PS | nor even have I RT] suffered
that ye should commit any manner of wickedness*

In this passage there are three places where grammatical changes involving negation have been made. In the first case, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) edited the multiple negative in “**nor no** manner of riches” to “**nor any** manner of riches”. In the two other cases, the 1920 LDS edition replaced the conjunction *or* with *nor*. For these later two changes, the apparent motivation was to make each of three conjoined clauses begin with the same negative conjunction, *nor*. Since the first conjoined clause already began with *nor* (“nor that ye should make slaves one of another”), the two subsequent clause-initial *or*’s were changed to *nor*’s. Notice that the 1920 edition retained the use of *or* in the second conjoined clause (“murder or plunder or steal or

commit adultery”); here the *or* is used to connect a list of verbs rather than clauses. The resulting phraseology is quite systematic. We should finally note that in the last case the introduction of *nor* forced the editors to remove a following *not* (since that would have created a multiple negative). The editors also changed the word order in the last instance, thus ending up with “nor even have I suffered” instead of the original “or even I have not suffered”. For another example where editing of a negative led to a switch in the word order, see 2 Nephi 33:9.

The edited Book of Mormon text has clearly moved towards removing multiple negatives and increasing the use of the correlative *neither-nor* construction. The critical text will, of course, restore the earlier instances of negation since they were clearly intended in the original text. Multiple negatives have existed in English since its earliest recorded history, and they continue, of course, in nonstandard speech. For a complete discussion of the editing of negatives in the standard text, see NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 2:12–13 the original instance of the double negative (“nor no”) and the two instances of correlative *neither-or*; in the last instance, the *not* and the original word order should also be restored (“or even I have not suffered”).

■ Mosiah 2:13

*neither have I suffered that ye should be confined in dungeons
nor that ye should make slaves
one [with >+ of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] another*

Here Oliver Cowdery wrote “one with another”; then considerably later the preposition *with* was changed to *of* (see line 29 on page 119 of \mathcal{P}). The supralinearly inserted *of* was written with heavier and darker ink flow. The *of* does not look like Oliver Cowdery’s normal *of*, especially the formation of the descender for the *f*, but the *o* itself as well as the crossout and the insert mark looks like Oliver’s. Unlike most of his supralinear corrections, the ink strokes for the *of* are wobbly. Clearly, the correction was not immediate.

A similar correction is found a few lines later; there the word *be* was supralinearly inserted with somewhat heavier and darker ink flow:

Mosiah 2:14 (line 34 on page 119 of \mathcal{P})

there should nothing come upon you which was grievous to ^{be} ^ bourne

Once more, the strokes of the inserted word are wobbly. And two pages later, in Mosiah 2:32, we have another supralinearly inserted *of* (in line 12 on page 121 of \mathcal{P}) that is very much like the *of* here in verse 13 except there is no wobbling (the ink flow is still heavier but now not as dark). For this latter *of*, the *o* again looks like Oliver’s, but once more the descender for the *f* is different than normal (see the discussion under Mosiah 2:32).

All three of these distinctive changes could be due to later proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . Theoretically, the changes could be due to editing. And Oliver Cowdery may be the scribe, but we cannot be sure. I have already discussed a number of cases in this part of \mathcal{P} where Oliver Cowdery seems to

have proofed \mathcal{P} somewhat later. In particular, we have the following supralinear corrections in \mathcal{P} , all in heavier and darker ink flow and, in these cases, clearly in Oliver’s hand:

Omni 1:6	should not be verrified	line 25, page 113
Omni 1:6	that	line 25, page 113
Omni 1:17	many	line 21, page 114
Omni 1:17	&	line 23, page 114
Omni 1:23	to see his death	line 36, page 114

Some of these corrections in \mathcal{P} appear to be due to proofing rather than editing. But that does not mean that some of these cannot be due to editing. See the discussion under the book of Omni for each of these supralinear insertions.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, the phrase “one with another” is used only in reciprocal situations (that is, in situations where the relationship between the individuals goes in both directions). There are 29 occurrences of the phrase, as in the expression “to contend one with another”. On the other hand, the relationship in “one of another” can be considered nonreciprocal in Mosiah 2:13: one person is the slave while the other is the master. From this perspective, *of* is the easier reading here in Mosiah 2:13. But except for this one case of “one of another”, there are no examples of that phrase in the Book of Mormon. It is possible that Oliver Cowdery originally wrote “one with another” in \mathcal{P} simply because of its considerably higher frequency. Since “one with another” seems to be a scribal error here in Mosiah 2:13, the critical text will accept the later correction in \mathcal{P} as the original reading.

One other possibility is that the original text may have read “nor that ye should make slaves **of one another**” (that is, the *of* precedes *one* rather than follows it). If we accept this reading as the original, then we would have to conclude that Oliver Cowdery was correct to change *with* to *of* but wrong when he inserted the *of* in the same place where the *with* had been. It turns out, however, that there are no examples of the phrase “of one another” in the entire Book of Mormon text. Given the lack of evidence for this alternative word order (“of one another”), we should continue to rely on the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} . Moreover, *one another* has a reciprocal meaning; as already noted, slavery is not a reciprocal relationship.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 2:13 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“nor that ye should make slaves one **of** another”), thus maintaining the semantic distinction between “one with another” and “one of another”.

■ Mosiah 2:14

and that there should nothing come upon you

which was [grievious 1B | grievous ACEFGHIJKNOPQRST | grevious DLM] to be borne

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the original Book of Mormon text seems to have consistently used the dialectal form *grievious* rather than the standard *grievous*. The critical text will accept the nonstandard pronunciation of the word.

■ Mosiah 2:15–16

but I tell you these things that ye may know that
 I can answer a [clear > clean 1 | clear ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] conscience
 before God this day
 behold I say unto you that
 because I said unto you that I had spent my days in your service
 I do not desire to boast
 for I have only been in the service of God

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “a clear conscience”, which is what we expect. He virtually immediately overwrote the final *r* of *clear* with an *n* (there is no change in the level of ink flow), thus ending up with “a clean conscience”, which is also possible (but not what we expect). Although the original manuscript is not extant for the book of Mosiah, Oliver may have intended to write *clear* in \mathcal{O} , but as is typical of his hand, his *r* may have looked like an *n*. In the same way, *even* was sometimes mixed up with *ever* in the manuscripts, as in the two following examples where Oliver initially miswrote *ever* as *even* in \mathcal{P} :

Mosiah 13:33

yea and even all the prophets which have prophesied
 [even >+ ever 1 | ever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] since the world began

Alma 53:12

and for this cause they were brought down into the land of Zarahemla
 and they [ever 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | even > ever 1] had been protected
 by the Nephites

Similarly, one could argue, when Oliver came to copy Mosiah 2:15 from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote the expected *clear*; but then, looking more closely at \mathcal{O} , he determined that he had actually written the word there as *clean* (even though *clear* had been his original intention, no longer remembered). The 1830 compositor rejected the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (*clean*) and set *clear*. All the subsequent printed editions have retained the expected reading, “a clear conscience”.

There is some evidence in the printer’s manuscript to support “a clear conscience” over “a clean conscience”. There is only one example, yet it is found in this same chapter (and as part of king Benjamin’s discourse to his people):

Mosiah 2:27

therefore **as I said unto you** that I had served you
 walking with **a clear conscience** before God . . .

Here king Benjamin refers to having already said that he had served them “walking with a clear conscience before God”, a specific reference to the language previously expressed in verses 15 and 16. Such a connection argues that the use of *clear* is indeed the correct reading in verse 15—or at least that both should read the same, either as *clear* or as *clean*. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that one could argue that the *clear* in verse 27 is actually an error for *clean*—in other words, both verses 15 and 27 originally read “a clean conscience” and that Oliver wrote the first one down in \mathcal{O} as *clean* (correctly) but the second one as *clear* (incorrectly). When he came

to copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , his tendency to write *clear* showed up both times (but he corrected only the first one).

The tendency for Oliver Cowdery to write *clear* over *clean* may be due to the fact that “a clear conscience” was the expected expression of his time. The online Oxford English Dictionary lists eight occurrences of “a clear conscience”, with the following six citations within the same general time period of the Book of Mormon translation:

Vicesimus Knox (1792)

The un-prevaricating dictates of **a clear conscience**.

William Cobbett (1818)

It was the produce of an honest heart, **a clear conscience**, and a manly mind.

Walter Scott (1825)

Better is an empty stomach . . . with **a clear conscience**,
than a fatted ox with iniquity and word-breaking.

Thomas Carlyle (1831)

I can sit down with **a clear conscience** and talk heartily and heartsomely.

John Henry Newman (1851)

Absolution for a week! then it seems, she has discounted, if I may so speak,
her prospective confessions, and may lie, thief, drink, and swear
for a whole seven days with **a clear conscience**.

George Trevelyan (1864)

It is a fine thing to see a homely old pro-consul retiring
from the government of a region as large as France and Austria together,
with **a clear conscience** and a sound digestion.

On the other hand, the online OED also lists one occurrence of “a clean conscience”, a citation from Early Modern English under the noun *uphold*:

John Knox (1559)

So is the testimonye of **a clean conscience** to me a stay and vphold.

One could argue that Oliver accidentally replaced the original two instances of “a clean conscience” (perhaps more appropriate for the biblical style of the Book of Mormon) with the expression “a clear conscience”, the phraseology that he himself expected.

From a semantic perspective, either reading will work. In support of *clear*, we first note that elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text the word *conscience* is found in only three places: Mosiah 4:3 (“peace of conscience”), Alma 29:5 (“joy or remorse of conscience”), and Alma 42:18 (“remorse of conscience”). All these other instances of *conscience* refer to one’s state of mind and are therefore either consistent with or in direct contrast to “a clear conscience”. One’s mind can be clean as well as clear, but with a difference in meaning. One could therefore argue that the phrase “a clean conscience” is unexpected here in Mosiah 2 since king Benjamin is not discussing his own personal sins, but the sins of his people and his own responsibility towards them. He has done everything he can for his people, and he is therefore blameless for their sins:

Mosiah 2:27–28

even so I at this time have caused
 that ye should assemble yourselves together
that I might be found blameless
and that your blood should not come upon me
 when I shall stand to be judged of God of the things
 whereof he hath commanded me concerning you
 I say unto you that I have caused
 that ye should assemble yourselves together
that I might rid my garments of your blood
 at this period of time when I am about to go down to my grave

On the other hand, one could argue that king Benjamin’s language in Mosiah 2:27–28 actually implies that by his preaching he had made himself clean of the people’s guilt (“that your blood should not come upon me” and “that I might rid my garments of your blood”). Earlier, Jacob expressed the same idea—and more than once—when he referred to his need to be clean of the people’s guilt by ridding his garments and his soul of their iniquities and blood:

2 Nephi 9:44

O my beloved brethren remember my words
 behold **I take off my garments and I shake them before you**
 I pray the God of my salvation that he view me with his all-searching eye
 wherefore ye shall know at the last day
 when all men shall be judged of their works
 that the God of Israel did witness that
I shook your iniquities from my soul
 and that **I stand with brightness** before him
 and **am rid of your blood**

Jacob 1:19

and we did magnify our office unto the Lord
 taking upon us the responsibility
answering the sins of the people upon our own heads
 if we did not teach them the word of God with all diligence
 wherefore by laboring with our mights
their blood might not come upon our garments
otherwise their blood would come upon our garments
and we would not be found spotless at the last day

In these passages, Jacob does not explicitly use the word *clean* but it is clearly implied by his use of words like *brightness* and *spotless*. These passages provide some support for the argument that king Benjamin could refer to his conscience as being clean.

It is thus very difficult to decide the original reading for Mosiah 2:15 and Mosiah 2:27. We can be confident that both passages read identically, either as “a clear conscience” or as “a clean conscience”. Manuscript evidence, historical evidence, and internal evidence can all be used to support either *clear* or *clean*. Probably the safest decision is to follow the consistent reading of the printed editions; Oliver Cowdery’s manuscript readings, on the other hand, are inconsistent. But it should

be understood that “a clean conscience” works about as well as “a clear conscience”, and that the original text may have actually read “a clean conscience” in Mosiah 2:15 and Mosiah 2:27.

One further question arises in Mosiah 2:15—namely, the use of the verb *answer* without any preposition before “a clear conscience”. In modern English, we expect the phraseology “I can answer **with** a clear conscience before God”. One wonders here whether *with* wasn’t lost in the early transmission of the text. Nonetheless, there are examples in the text where the verb *answer* seems to be missing an expected preposition:

Jacob 1:19

answering the sins of the people upon our own heads
if we did not teach them the word of God with all diligence

Mosiah 29:30

if these people commit **sins and iniquities**
they shall be answered upon their own heads

For these two instances, modern English speakers expect the preposition *for* (“answering **for** the sins of the people” and “sins and iniquities / they shall be answered **for**”). Yet usage without the preposition *for* is found in Early Modern English, as in the following example from Christopher Marlowe (1590): “We were best look that your devil can answer the stealing of this same cup.” Such usage without the preposition *for* is now archaic in English; in fact, the OED uses the prepositional verb *answer for* to define the now-archaic meaning for such transitive uses of the verb *answer*: ‘to make a defense against a charge, hence to give a satisfactory **answer for**, to justify’ (see definition 4 under the verb *answer*). Of course, in Mosiah 2:15, king Benjamin says that he is answering a clear conscience, which is quite different from answering **for** sins and iniquities (as in Jacob 1:19 and Mosiah 29:30). Clearly, the meaning in Mosiah 2:15 is that the king is answering **with** a clear conscience, even if the preposition *with* is not expressed. But since the transitive verb *answer* can occur without an expected preposition (although in a different sense), the critical text will maintain in Mosiah 2:15 the reading without the preposition: “I can answer a clear conscience before God”. The reading is fairly transparent, has never been emended in any edition to read “**with** a clear conscience”, and could be intended.

Summary: Maintain the phrase “a clear conscience” in Mosiah 2:15 and Mosiah 2:27, the consistent reading in all the printed editions; the evidence suggests, however, that both “a clear conscience” and “a clean conscience” are equally probable readings for the original text; also maintain in Mosiah 2:15 the use of the verb *answer* without the preposition *with* since such usage could be intentional.

■ Mosiah 2:19

if I [who 1A | whom BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye call your king
who has spent his days in your service . . .

The earliest text here has the subject form *who* even though the object form *whom* is standard (note in verse 18 the object form *me* in the clause “ye have called **me** your king”). Here in verse 19, the standard *whom* was introduced into the text in the 1837 edition.

The original use of the subject form *who* may have been influenced by the *who* that occurs in the immediately following relative clause (“who has spent his days in your service”). Nearby in king Benjamin’s discourse, we have only the standard “I whom” for the very same relative clause:

Mosiah 2:18

and if **I whom ye call your king** do labor to serve you
then had not ye ought to labor to serve one another

Mosiah 2:26

and I even **I whom ye call your king** am no better than ye yourselves are

These two examples suggest that the *who* in verse 19 is an error for *whom*.

Even so, the original text does have other cases where the earliest text has a nonstandard use of *who* in place of the standard *whom*:

Alma 3:27

for every man receiveth wages of him
[*who* >js *whom* 1 | *who* A | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he listeth to obey

Alma 27:4

now when Ammon and his brethren saw this work of destruction among those
[*who* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | *whom* CGHKRT] they so dearly beloved . . .

These examples from the earliest text suggest that the occasional nonstandard use of *who* should be accepted in the critical text, even though such instances could be due to grammatical error on the part of either Joseph Smith or his scribes. For further discussion, see under PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Accept the original nonstandard use of *who* in Mosiah 2:19 (“if I who ye call your king”).

■ Mosiah 2:20–21

I say unto you my brethren

that if you should render all the thanks and praise

which your whole [souls hath >js souls have 1 | souls hath A | souls has BDEFIJLM |

souls have CGHKPS | soul has NOQRT] *power to possess . . .*

I say if ye should serve him

with all your whole [soul 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | souls FIJLMNOQRT]

and yet ye would be unprofitable servants

In this passage, we have two instances of “X’s whole soul(s)”, with both occurring in a plural context. In the first instance, the earliest reading is “your whole souls **hath** power”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the third person singular *hath* to the plural *have* (thus giving the standard “your whole souls **have** power”). But in the actual 1837 edition, this phrase was set as “your whole souls **has** power”, a clearly unacceptable reading. The 1840 edition finally implemented the standard “your whole souls **have** power”, which has been retained in the RLDS textual tradition. On the other hand, the incorrect “your whole souls has power” was retained in

the LDS text until the 1906 edition. There the text was corrected to the singular “your whole **soul** has power”. In other words, the singular *has* was kept and the subject noun *souls* was edited to the singular.

In the second instance of “X’s whole soul(s)”, the earliest text read in the singular: “with all your whole soul”. This reading was maintained in the early editions and has continued throughout the RLDS textual tradition. But in the 1852 LDS edition, the singular was changed to the plural (“with all your whole **souls**”), perhaps because of the plural context and because at that time in the LDS text the instance of “X’s whole soul(s)” in the previous verse still read in the plural (“your whole **souls** has power”). Here in verse 21, the plural reading has continued in the LDS text. Ultimately, the LDS text ended up reversing the number for both occurrences of “X’s whole soul(s)” in Mosiah 2:20–21.

The original use of the plural *souls* in verse 20 (the first instance) is perfectly acceptable. Elsewhere in the text, there are two occurrences in a plural context of “X’s whole soul(s)”; one has the singular *soul* and the other the plural *souls*:

2 Nephi 25:29

wherefore ye must bow down before him
and worship him with all your might mind and strength
and **your whole soul**

Omni 1:26

and now my beloved brethren
I would that ye should come unto Christ which is the Holy One of Israel
and partake of his salvation and the power of his redemption
yea come unto him and offer **your whole souls** as an offering unto him

The second of these (Omni 1:26) thus directly supports the original plural reading in Mosiah 2:20. And actually the first one (2 Nephi 25:29), with its singular reading, supports the original singular reading in Mosiah 2:21. Note that in the larger conjunctive structure for 2 Nephi 25:29, we have “with all your might mind and strength and your whole soul”, with its use of *all* at the beginning of the first nominal conjunct. Admittedly, the use of both *all* and *whole* in “with all your whole soul” in Mosiah 2:21 is somewhat redundant, but that redundancy is not alleviated by the use of the plural form “with all your whole souls”.

The critical text will therefore retain the earliest readings for “X’s whole soul(s)” in Mosiah 2:20–21: namely, plural *souls* in verse 20 and singular *soul* in verse 21. In addition, the first instance will retain the use of the biblical *hath*, which frequently occurred with third person plural subjects in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Restore “your whole souls hath power” in Mosiah 2:20 and “with all your whole soul” in Mosiah 2:21; these original readings can, in each case, be supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ Mosiah 2:21

*I say unto you that if ye should serve him
 who [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] created you from the beginning
 and [art 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | art > is M | is NOQRT] preserving you from day to day . . .*

The original use of *art* here in Mosiah 2:21 seems to be intended. The original Book of Mormon text sometimes used biblically styled inflectional endings in nonstandard ways. One prominent example of this is the original use of the *-(e)th* ending with first person singular verbs, in particular the occurrence of “I saith” in the historical present tense (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:3). Of course, the correct verb form in Early Modern English for *art* here in Mosiah 2:21 would be *is*. The 1906 LDS large-print edition introduced this emendation, and it has continued in the LDS text. The RLDS text has retained the original nonstandard use of *art* in this verse.

Here the biblically styled *art* is conjoined with a preceding use of *hath* (“who **hath** created you from the beginning”). A similar example of this kind of combination in the biblical style is found later in the text:

Alma 5:37
 notwithstanding a shepherd **hath** called after you
 and [art 1ABCEFGHIJKLPS | are D | art > is M | is NOQRT] still calling after you

In both Mosiah 2:21 and Alma 5:37, we can be fairly confident that the *art* is not a mistake for *are*. Modern English speakers expect *are* only with plural subjects, so it is doubtful that the use of *art* in these two passages is an error for *are*. Note, by the way, that in Alma 5:37 the 1841 edition reads *are* instead of *art*, but this is probably a simple typo rather than an attempt at editing the text. The following 1849 LDS edition restored the original *art*. (As with Mosiah 2:21, the 1906 LDS edition made the correct grammatical emendation to *is* in Alma 5:37.) Of course, this 1841 example of *are* does show that there are cases where *art* and *are* have been accidentally mixed up. For a discussion of such mix-ups in the manuscripts, see Mosiah 2:24 below.

Summary: Restore the original use of *art* in Mosiah 2:21 and Alma 5:37; in both cases *art* is conjoined with a preceding *hath* and represents instances of the biblically styled language of the original Book of Mormon text.

■ Mosiah 2:21

*I say if ye should serve him with all your whole soul
 [& >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] yet ye would be unprofitable servants*

Here we have an example of the Hebraistic use of *and* to separate a main clause from its preceding subordinate clause. For another example involving an *if*-clause, see 1 Nephi 17:50. And for a complete list, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. As with most examples of this Hebrew-like construction, Joseph Smith removed the *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 2:21 the original *and* that connected the subordinate *if*-clause to the following main clause; such Hebrew-like constructions were apparently part of the original text.

■ Mosiah 2:24

and ye are still indebted unto him
and [are / art 1 | are ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and will be forever and ever

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote the word *are* but then crossed the *e*, ending up with *art*. When we compare this *art* with nearby instances of *art* (see, for instance, the one in Mosiah 2:21, discussed above), we find that for a true *t* there is virtually no loop. But for this case of *art* in Mosiah 2:24, the ascender for what appears to be a *t* is actually a rather large *e* that Oliver accidentally crossed.

As noted in the discussion of Mosiah 2:21, the biblically styled *art* occurs as a conjoined predicate but only when there is a preceding predicate that contains another biblically styled form (such as *hath*). Here in Mosiah 2:24, the initial predicate begins with the normal verb form *are*. There is no independent evidence anywhere in the text for the conjoining of predicates where one of the verbs is *are* and the other is *art*. Thus the 1830 compositor was probably correct to interpret this *art* in Mosiah 2:24 as a mistake for *are*.

There is independent evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *art* in place of *are*, as in the following example in \mathcal{G} where Oliver initially wrote *art*, then later with somewhat heavier ink crossed out the *art* and supralinearly inserted the correct *are*:

Alma 37:11
 now these mysteries [*art* >+ *are* 0 | *are* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 not yet fully made known unto me

The correction to *are* was probably made when Oliver read back his copy to Joseph Smith.

It appears that in two other places Oliver intended to write *are* but ended up crossing the *e* to create *art*, just as in Mosiah 2:24. In these two instances, the error was transmitted into the 1830 edition (and subsequently removed from the text in the editing for the 1837 edition):

Alma 27:12
 and blessed [*are* / *art* 0 | *art* >js *are* 1 | *art* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 this people in this generation

Alma 32:15
 the same shall be blessed yea much more blessed
 than they who [*are* / *art* 1 | *art* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] compelled
 to be humble

See under each of these passages for further discussion.

Summary: Maintain the conjoined *are* in Mosiah 2:24 (“and ye are still indebted unto him and **are** and will be forever and ever”); the *art* that is found in the printer's manuscript appears to be an *are* for which the *e* was accidentally crossed.

■ Mosiah 2:25–26

*ye cannot say that
[thou art 1A | ye are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] even as much as the dust of the earth
yet [thou wast 1A | ye were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] created of the dust of the earth . . .
and [thou beholdest 1A | ye behold BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that I am old*

The original text of the Book of Mormon occasionally used the biblically styled second person pronoun *thou* in plural contexts. Here we have three cases of this nonstandard use of *thou*. For another nearby example, see Mosiah 2:11. For the three instances here in Mosiah 2:25–26, the 1837 edition replaced the nonstandard *thou* with *ye* (and also changed the verb to the appropriate second person plural verb form: *are*, *were*, and *behold*). The critical text will, of course, restore the original nonstandard usage. For another example, see 1 Nephi 3:29. Also see the complete list under THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 2:25–26 the repeated use of *thou* (and the associated verb forms *art*, *wast*, and *beholdest*) in this plural context; the multiple use of *thou* in this passage is clearly intended, even though it is nonstandard.

■ Mosiah 2:26

*and I even I whom [ye 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPQRST | he INO] call your king
am no better than ye yourselves are*

The 1879 LDS edition accidentally replaced the pronoun *ye* with *he*, an obvious typo. Three nearby occurrences of the same basic clause have the pronoun *ye*:

Mosiah 2:18	behold ye have called me your king
Mosiah 2:18	and if I whom ye call your king . . .
Mosiah 2:19	and behold also if I who ye call your king . . .

What is rather striking about this error in Mosiah 2:26 is that this very problematic typo was maintained in two subsequent LDS editions (the 1906 large-print edition and the 1907 vest-pocket edition).

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 2:26 the use of the second person plural pronoun *ye* (“and I even I whom **ye** call your king am no better than ye yourselves are”).

■ Mosiah 2:32

*beware lest there shall arise contentions among you
and ye list to obey the evil spirit
which was spoken [NULL >+ of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by my father Mosiah*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “which was spoken by my father Mosiah”. After some time had elapsed, the *of* was supralinearly inserted (the correction is in somewhat heavier ink flow). The descender for the *f* in *of* makes the *f* look different from Oliver Cowdery’s usual *f*, but otherwise the word *of* does appear to be his, especially the *o*. In fact, the *of*

here looks quite a bit like the *of* supralinearly inserted in Mosiah 2:13 (see the discussion there). The *of* here in Mosiah 2:32 was probably inserted when \mathcal{P} was proofed against \mathcal{C} . The scribe for the *of* may be Oliver Cowdery, but we cannot be sure.

Typically, the preference in the Book of Mormon text is for the preposition *of* to come at the beginning of the relative clause when the verb is *speak*. But here in Mosiah 2:32, the placement of the *of* seems quite appropriate. Moreover, the text has a large number of examples with the phraseology “to be spoken of by X”, most of which occur in relative clauses:

2 Nephi 25:18	there is save one Messiah spoken of by the prophets
Mosiah 4:14	the evil spirit which hath been spoken of by our fathers
Mosiah 27:30	that which had been spoken of by our fathers
Alma 12:24	the death which has been spoken of by Amulek
Alma 12:24	that endless state which has been spoken of by us
Alma 33:19	he was spoken of by Moses
Helaman 15:11	the time shall come which hath been spoken of by our fathers
3 Nephi 2:7	the sign was given which was spoken of by the prophets

In fact, the relative clause in Mosiah 4:14 is very similar in language to the relative clause here in Mosiah 2:32. Indeed, both come from king Benjamin’s discourse. Thus the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Mosiah 2:32 appears to be the original reading.

There are some examples of “spoken by” where the preposition *of* comes at the beginning of the relative clause, as in Alma 5:21: “him **of** whom it hath been **spoken by** our fathers”. Thus one could propose that the original text in Mosiah 2:32 actually read “the evil spirit **of** which was **spoken by** my father”. But since the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} works perfectly fine and is supported by usage elsewhere in the text, the critical text will accept that reading. (For a complete discussion regarding the placement of the preposition in relative clauses, see RELATIVE CLAUSES in volume 3.)

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 2:32 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , with the placement of the preposition *of* immediately after the main verb (“the evil spirit which was **spoken of by** my father”).

■ Mosiah 2:33

for behold there is a woe pronounced upon him

[*that* > *who* 1 | *who* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *listeth to obey that spirit*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the relative pronoun *that* here in \mathcal{P} ; then he virtually immediately changed it to *who* by crossing out the *that* and supralinearly inserting the *who* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are three occurrences of *upon him that* (where *that* is a relative pronoun, not a conjunction), but there are no other occurrences of *upon him who*. More generally, there are 17 other occurrences of *him who* in the original Book of Mormon text (I include here only cases of restrictive *who*), plus 55 occurrences of *him that* (a good many of these are in quotes from the King James Bible). Thus there appears to have been no motivation for Oliver to edit the text here in \mathcal{P} from *that* to *who* except to make it agree with \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 2:33 the relative pronoun *who* in “upon him who listeth to obey”, Oliver Cowdery’s almost immediate correction in the printer’s manuscript.

■ Mosiah 2:34

*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*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the subject-verb disagreement in this passage (“there **are** not **one** among you”) by replacing the singular *one* with the word *any* (which permits the plural *are*). An alternative grammatical emendation would have been to replace the *are* with *is* (“there **is** not **one** among you”).

This is the only example where *one* has been changed to *any* (or vice versa) in the history of the text. Elsewhere, the text has examples of both *one among* and *any among*, including the following cases where either *one* or *any* will work:

Alma 5:29	is there one among you who is not stripped of envy
Alma 5:30	is there one among you that doth make a mock of his brother
Alma 60:27	if there be any among you that hath a desire for freedom
Moroni 10:25	if there be one among you that doeth good

Each of these instances has an existential *there*, and in three out of the four cases the delayed subject is *one*, which argues that the use of *one* in Mosiah 2:34 is expected (although not required). The less intrusive grammatical emendation for Mosiah 2:34 would therefore be to replace *are* with *is*. The critical text will, of course, retain the nonstandard usage, “there **are** not **one** among you”. For additional discussion of such issues regarding number, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Retain the original case of subject-verb disagreement in Mosiah 2:34: “there **are** not **one** among you” (the earliest extant reading).

■ Mosiah 2:35

*and behold also they [spoke > spake 1 | spake ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that which was commanded them of the Lord*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *spoke* here in Mosiah 2:35, the expected past-tense form for *speak* in modern English, but he immediately corrected it to the archaic *spake* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). As discussed under 1 Nephi 12:19, there were apparently no examples of *spoke*, only *spake*, in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ Mosiah 2:36

*that it may have no place in you to guide you
[in 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | into D]
wisdom’s [paths 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | path s]*

We have two cases here of minor variation. The 1841 British edition replaced the preposition *in* with *into*, and the 1953 RLDS edition replaced the plural *paths* with the singular *path*.

The preposition *into* is not impossible. In fact, there are two instances in the text referring to going **into** a path:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 Nephi 8:28 | and they fell away into forbidden paths |
| 2 Nephi 31:19 | after that ye have got into this straight and narrow path |

On the other hand, most instances refer to being **in** a path (15 times, counting Mosiah 2:36). We have the following instances where *path* is in the plural:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 1 Nephi 16:5 | that they would walk in the paths of righteousness |
| 2 Nephi 12:3 | and we will walk in his paths (quoting Isaiah 2:3) |
| Alma 7:9 | and walk in his paths which are straight |
| Alma 7:19 | ye are in the paths of righteousness |
| Alma 7:20 | he cannot walk in crooked paths |
| Helaman 12:5 | how slow to walk in wisdom's paths |

The last example uses the exact same noun phrase (“in wisdom’s paths”) as Mosiah 2:36 does. Interestingly, for this example in Helaman 12:5, the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced “in wisdom’s paths” with “in wisdom’s path”—but the 1953 RLDS edition did not. Perhaps this sporadic replacement of *paths* with *path* is influenced by the idea that there is only one path of wisdom. In any event, the change to the singular *path* is not consistently applied. The two original instances of “in wisdom’s paths” support each other in the choice of the preposition *in* and in the use of the plural *paths*.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 2:36 the earliest reading, “in wisdom’s paths”; the same phraseology is found in Helaman 12:5.

■ Mosiah 2:37

*I say unto you that
the man that doeth [these things > this 1 | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the same cometh out in open rebellion against God*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *these things*; then almost immediately he corrected this phrase to *this* by crossing out the final *e* of *these* and the following *things* and then overwriting the first *e* in *these* with an *i* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). One possible source for this scribal error is in the previous verse, where it reads “after ye have known and have been taught all **these things**” (Mosiah 2:36). There would have been no motivation to emend *these things* to *this* in the next verse except that the original manuscript read *this*.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 2:37 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction, the word *this* (most probably the reading of the original manuscript).

■ Mosiah 2:38

therefore if that man
 [repent > repenteth 1 | repenteth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not
 and remaineth and dieth an enemy to God
 the demands of divine justice doth awaken his immortal soul
 to a lively sense of his own guilt

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *repent* in the printer's manuscript; then almost immediately he added the *eth* (the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *eth* is unchanged). The two following verbs in the *if*-clause also take the *-(e)th* ending (*remaineth* and *dieth*), so this scribal correction is consistent.

The question here is whether the verb in the *if*-clause should be in the indicative (which is marked by the inflectional ending *-eth*) or in the subjunctive (which takes no inflectional ending). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are a few cases where an *if*-clause contains the verb *repent* and a third person singular subject. In such cases, the indicative *-(e)th* ending for the verb *repent* is favored:

Mosiah 26:29

and if he **confess** his sins before thee and me
 and **repenteth** in the sincerity of his heart

3 Nephi 18:30–31

and if it so be that he **repenteth** and is baptized in my name
 then shall ye receive him and shall minister unto him of my flesh and blood
 but if he [*repenteth* >js *repent* 1 | *repenteth* A | *repent* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not
 he shall not be numbered among my people

In 3 Nephi 18:31, the text originally had *repenteth* but this indicative form was changed to the subjunctive *repent* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. However, the immediately preceding verse retained the original *repenteth*. Parallelism suggests that this 1837 change in 3 Nephi 18:31 should be reversed and that the original *repenteth* should be restored.

The example from Mosiah 26:29 (cited above) shows a mixture of the indicative and the subjunctive verb forms, with the subjunctive coming first (“if he confess . . . and repenteth”). A similar example of mixture in mood is found later on in the text; in this second case, we have two instances of the verb *be* in an *if*-clause, the first verb in the subjunctive and the second one in the indicative:

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
 verily I say unto you
 they have joy in their works for a season

This overall variability implies that we should allow the earliest textual sources to determine whether the verb takes the subjunctive or the indicative in a conditional clause. Here in Mosiah 2:38, Oliver Cowdery's correction is virtually immediate, so we accept the indicative reading

(“if that man repenteth not”) as the original one. For additional discussion, see 2 Nephi 9:20; also see MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 2:38 Oliver Cowdery’s almost immediately corrected reading, the indicative *repenteth* in the *if*-clause (“if that man repenteth not”).

■ **Mosiah 2:38**

*which doth cause him to shrink from the presence of the Lord
and doth fill his breast with guilt and pain and anguish
which is like an unquenchable fire
whose [flames 1ABCDEGHKPS | flame FIJLMNOQRT] ascendeth up forever and ever*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 9:16, the original phraseology (“flames ascendeth”) will be restored in the critical text. In the original text, the plural *flames* consistently takes the verb form *ascendeth* rather than the grammatically correct plural verb form *ascend*.

■ **Mosiah 2:40**

*for I have spoken [plain 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | plainly RT] unto you
that ye might understand*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 25:20, when the verb is *speak*, the bare adverbial form *plain* occurs in the original text about as frequently as the standard adverbial form *plainly*. The critical text will restore all instances of “to speak plain” whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources (as here in Mosiah 2:40).

■ **Mosiah 2:41**

*I would desire that ye should consider
on the [blest > blessed 1 | blessed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] and happy state
of those that keep the commandments of God*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 14:2, the critical text will use the standard spelling *blessed* rather than *blest* (Oliver Cowdery’s initial spelling in \mathfrak{D} for the word here in Mosiah 2:41). The word may have been pronounced as either /blɛst/ or /blɛsəd/.

■ **Mosiah 2:41**

*and if they hold out faithful to the end
they are received into [the > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] heaven*

Here in Mosiah 2:41, Oliver Cowdery started to write either “into the heaven” or “into the kingdom of heaven”. He initially wrote *into the k* in \mathfrak{D} ; then he immediately crossed out *the k* (the level of ink flow is unchanged) and wrote inline the word *heaven*:

Mosiah 2:41 (line 5 on page 122 of \mathcal{P})

they are received into <the k> heaven that thereby they may dwell . . .

The *k* may have stood for the first letter of *kingdom* or as a miswritten form of *h*. (Sometimes Oliver Cowdery's *h*'s look like *k*'s; see, for instance, the discussion under 3 Nephi 19:4 regarding the misspelling of the name *Kumenonhi* as *Kumenonki*.) For further discussion of the phraseology "in the heaven", see under 1 Nephi 12:6.

Summary: The critical text will maintain the immediately corrected reading in Mosiah 2:41: "they are received **into heaven**".

Mosiah 3

■ Mosiah 3:1

*I would **call your attention**
for I have somewhat more to speak unto you*

In today's English, we expect "call one's attention **to something**". The use here without any prepositional phrase seems to be intended since it is found a second time later on in king Benjamin's discourse:

Mosiah 4:4
I would again **call your attention**
that ye may hear and understand the remainder of my words

One possibility is that king Benjamin's phrase "I would call your attention" means 'I would have you pay attention'.

The online Oxford English Dictionary has 69 occurrences of "call one's attention", of which all but two are complemented by a prepositional phrase headed by *to*. One of these two exceptions (found under *robustness*) has the meaning 'to be noticed':

George James (1838)
His arms were not such as would have **called attention** from their robustness.

In the other example (see definition 2b under *silentiary*), the phrase is equivalent to "call **to attention**" and means 'to command silence':

Frederic Seebohm (1883)
The columns . . . are sometimes cased in metal, and the silentiary,
to **call attention**, strikes one of them with his staff.

King Benjamin's use of "call one's attention" appears to be different from either of these two examples.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 3:1 and Mosiah 4:4 the two occurrences of "I would call your attention"; although there is no complementary prepositional phrase in this expression, such usage appears to be intended and seems to mean 'I would have you pay attention'.

■ Mosiah 3:2

and behold he stood before [*me* 1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G]

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally skipped the pronoun *me* here. The 1874 RLDS edition restored the *me* (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). We expect, of course, an object for the preposition *before*. For discussion of a similar case where a pronominal object was accidentally dropped after its preposition, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:20 regarding the apparent loss of *me* after *against* in the original manuscript.

Summary: Maintain the prepositional phrase *before me* in Mosiah 3:2.

■ Mosiah 3:3

awake and hear the words which I shall tell **thee**

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

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the* for *thee* in \mathcal{P} ; then almost immediately he corrected it to *thee* by inserting the extra *e*. The 1830 compositor interpreted the corrected *thee* as a mistake for *the* and therefore set “**the** glad tidings of great joy” and inserted the pronoun *you*, despite the fact that in this part of his message the angel uses only the pronoun *thou* (and its forms *thee* and *thy*) in speaking to king Benjamin:

Mosiah 3:3–4

awake and hear the words which I shall tell **thee**
for behold I am come to declare unto **thee** glad tidings of great joy
for the Lord hath heard **thy** prayers
and hath judged of **thy** righteousness
and hath sent me to declare unto **thee**
that **thou** mayest rejoice
and that **thou** mayest declare unto **thy** people
that they may also be filled with joy

The 1908 RLDS edition restored the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} to the RLDS text (“to declare unto **thee** glad tidings of great joy”). The critical text will also maintain this reading.

The use of the definite article *the* before “glad tidings of great joy” is unexpected. In the Book of Mormon text, we have three other examples of *glad tidings* followed by an *of* prepositional phrase:

Alma 13:22	that they may have glad tidings of great joy
Alma 39:15	he cometh to declare glad tidings of salvation unto his people
Helaman 16:14	and did declare unto them glad tidings of great joy

Two of these read as “glad tidings of great joy” (identically to Mosiah 3:3). Similar usage is found when *good tidings* is followed by an *of* prepositional phrase:

Mosiah 12:21	that bringeth good tidings of good
Mosiah 15:14	that hath brought good tidings of good
Mosiah 27:37	they did publish good tidings of good
3 Nephi 20:40	that bringeth good tidings unto them of good

All four of these examples are either citing or paraphrasing Isaiah 52:7 (“that bringeth good tidings of good”). And of course, we have the familiar King James usage of Luke 2:10 (“I bring you good tidings of great joy”), which has almost the same noun phraseology as Mosiah 3:3 (“to declare unto thee glad tidings of great joy”).

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 3:3 the corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript (“I am come to declare unto **thee** glad tidings of great joy”); in other words, the critical text will change *you* back to *thee* and delete the intrusive definite article *the*.

■ **Mosiah 3:4**

and that thou mayest declare unto thy people

that they [also may > may also 1 | may also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be filled with joy

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *also may*; then almost immediately he corrected the word order to *may also* by crossing out the original *also* and supralinearly inserting it after the modal *may* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript undoubtedly read *may also*. For a list of examples where the placement of *also* has varied in the history of the text, see under 2 Nephi 21:13.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are three occurrences of *may also* and one of *also may*:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Alma 5:62 | that ye also may be partakers of the fruit of the tree of life |
| Alma 13:13 | that ye may also enter into that rest |
| Alma 60:24 | and that we may also recover the remainder of our possessions |
| Ether 12:9 | wherefore ye may also have hope |

Theoretically, the *also* in each of these cases could refer to the following main verb, which would mean that there is a contrast with some preceding but different verb. But in fact, the *also* actually refers in each case to the immediately preceding subject pronoun. For each passage, the preceding text refers to some different individual(s) for which the same verb (or a semantically equivalent verb) is stated or, in one case, implied:

Mosiah 3:4

for the Lord hath heard thy prayers and hath judged of thy righteousness
and hath sent me to declare unto thee that **thou mayest rejoice**
and that thou mayest declare unto thy people that **they may also be filled with joy**

Alma 5:62

I speak by way of command unto **you that belong to the church**
and unto those which do not belong to the church
I speak by way of invitation saying
come and be baptized unto repentance
that **ye also may be partakers of the fruit of the tree of life**

[By implication, church members are partakers of the fruit
of the tree of life.]

Alma 13:12–13

and there were **many**—an exceeding great many—
 which were made pure and **entered into the rest of the Lord their God**
 and now my brethren I would that ye should humble yourselves before God
 and bring forth fruit meet for repentance
 that **ye may also enter into that rest**

Alma 60:24

and now except ye do repent of that which ye have done
 and begin to be up and doing
 and send forth food and men unto us and also unto Helaman
 that he may support **those parts of our country which he hath retained**
 and that **we may also recover the remainder of our possessions** in these parts
 [Here the original *retained* means ‘recovered’; the word *possessions* refers
 to “the lands of their possessions” (see Alma 58:3).]

Ether 12:8–9

but because of the faith of men
 he has shewn himself unto the world
 and glorified the name of the Father
 and prepared a way that thereby others might be partakers of the heavenly gift
 that **they might hope** for those things which they have not seen
 wherefore **ye may also have hope**

These examples show that the placement of *also* either before or after the modal verb *may* does not crucially determine whether the *also* refers to the preceding subject or to the following verb. Furthermore, since either order is possible, we let the earliest textual sources determine the placement of the *also*.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 3:4 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading which placed *also* after the modal verb *may* (“that they **may also** be filled with joy”); the *also* here refers to the preceding subject pronoun *they*.

■ Mosiah 3:7

so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness
and [NULL > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations of his people

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the wickedness and abominations of his people” in ∅. Then almost immediately he supralinearly added the definite article *the* before *abominations* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Elsewhere, the text has ten occurrences of “**the** wickedness and abomination(s)” (that is, without the repeated definite article). In only one other place is there evidence for the reading “**the** wickedness and **the** abomination(s)”:

Helaman 13:16

yea and woe be unto all the cities which are in the land round about
 which is possessed by the Nephites
 because of the wickedness and [*the* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
 which is in them

It appears that in Helaman 13:16 the 1830 edition accidentally omitted the *the* before *abominations* (for further discussion, see the analysis of that passage). The overall tendency in the history of the text has been to accidentally omit the repeated determiner. The example here in \mathcal{P} for Mosiah 3:7 provides one more example of this tendency. For a complete analysis of the repetition of determiners in conjunctive structures, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

We get more variability with respect to conjuncts of *wickedness* and *abomination(s)* when the determiner is a possessive pronoun. We have the following statistics based on the earliest extant readings:

their wickedness and abomination(s)	12 times
their wickedness and their abomination(s)	8 times
your wickedness and abomination(s)	3 times
your wickedness and your abomination(s)	0 times
his wickedness and abomination(s)	0 times
his wickedness and his abomination(s)	1 time

This variability suggests that we should rely on the earliest textual sources in determining whether the definite article *the* should be repeated in “the wickedness and (the) abomination(s)”. Since the supralinear correction appears to be virtually immediate in Mosiah 3:7, the critical text will accept the reading with the repeated *the*.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 3:7 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} (“the wickedness and **the** abominations of his people”); the nearly immediate correction appears to be based on the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant for the book of Mosiah.

■ Mosiah 3:8

and he shall be called

Jesus Christ the Son of God

the Father of heaven and [of 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth

the Creator of all things from the beginning

Here the angel is speaking to king Benjamin and gives an extended title for Jesus Christ. But in typesetting the 1830 edition, the compositor made a slight change in the phraseology when he accidentally omitted the repeated preposition *of* in the phrase “the Father of heaven and **of** earth”. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the *of* is always repeated in the specific phrase “the Father of heaven and (of) earth”:

2 Nephi 25:12

yea even the Father **of** heaven and **of** earth
shall manifest himself unto them in the flesh

Helaman 14:12

and also that ye might know of the coming of
Jesus Christ the Son of God
the Father **of** heaven and **of** earth
the Creator of all things from the beginning

Helaman 16:18

if so and he be the Son of God
 the Father **of** heaven and **of** earth
 as it hath been spoken
 why will he not shew himself unto us

The second example (Helaman 14:12) is striking in that its phraseology, beginning with the name *Jesus Christ*, agrees word for word with the original text in Mosiah 3:8: “Jesus Christ / the Son of God / the Father **of** heaven and **of** earth / the Creator of all things from the beginning”. In this second example, the speaker is Samuel the Lamanite.

This identity in phraseology was first claimed by John W. Welch on page 22 in *Reexploring the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City and Provo, Utah: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1992), despite the fact that in the current LDS and RLDS texts the identity is not complete since the repeated *of* is missing from Mosiah 3:8. The critical text will restore the repeated *of*; and thus the extended title that both king Benjamin and Samuel the Lamanite used to refer to Christ will read precisely the same. For further discussion regarding the repetition of the preposition *of* in conjoined structures, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 3:8 the earliest reading with its repeated *of* in the phrase “the Father of heaven and **of** earth”; this emendation makes the extended title for Christ agree precisely with the same 21 words in Helaman 14:12.

■ **Mosiah 3:9**

and even after all this
they shall consider him [as 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a man

The 1830 typesetter omitted the *as*, either by accident or because he thought it sounded better without the *as*. There are two cases that support the lack of *as*:

2 Nephi 9:42

and save they shall cast these things away
 and consider themselves fools before God . . .

Mosiah 21:33

and Ammon declined doing this thing
 considering himself an unworthy servant

Nonetheless, there is one example where *consider* is used with *as*:

Helaman 14:16

for all mankind by the fall of Adam
 being cut off from the presence of the Lord
 are considered **as** dead
 both as to things temporal and to things spiritual

Thus either usage, with or without *as*, is possible. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *as* occurs with “to consider X (as) Y”. Here in Mosiah 3:9, the *as* will be restored.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 3:9 the *as* in “they shall consider him **as** a man”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (here the earliest extant source).

■ **Mosiah 3:11**

*for **behold and** also his blood atoneth for the sins of those who have fallen by the transgression of Adam*

There seems to be an extra *and* between *behold* and the rest of the sentence here in Mosiah 3:11. The construction “behold and” occurs elsewhere in the text, but the other examples are always followed by the imperative:

Mosiah 15:26

but **behold and** fear and tremble before God
for ye had ought to tremble

Mosiah 20:19

and now **behold and** tell the king of these things
that he may tell his people
that they may be pacified towards us

Alma 5:52

behold and remember the Holy One hath spoken it

Mosiah 3:11 is different in that the initial *behold* is conjoined with a sentence that has an explicit subject and an indicative verb form, *atoneth*.

There is one instance in the printer’s manuscript when Oliver Cowdery initially added an *and* after *behold*:

1 Nephi 15:12

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *And* PS] behold
[*are* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | & >% *are* 1] we not broken off
from the house of Israel

Here Oliver immediately caught his error, erased the ampersand he had written after *behold*, and wrote *are*. In this instance, the source of his error was probably the preceding ampersand that came before *behold*. On the other hand, in Mosiah 3:11 the word preceding *behold* is the conjunction *for*, not *and*.

Although the usage is quite strange for this passage and could represent an early error in the text, the critical text will retain the original reading since it is not altogether impossible. Note that no printed edition has ever edited out the extra *and*.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 3:11 the unusual phraseology “for behold **and** also his blood atoneth”, the reading in all the (extant) textual sources.

■ Mosiah 3:11

*for behold and also his blood atoneth for the sins of those
who have fallen by the transgression of Adam*

who hath died not knowing the will of God concerning them

[& >+ or 1 | or ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **who** have ignorantly sinned

Here Oliver Cowdery originally wrote an ampersand in the printer's manuscript; then somewhat later he edited this *and* to *or*, probably while proofing against the original manuscript. The ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *or* is heavier, which argues that the change was not immediate.

The use of *and* implies that there is only one condition here, with the result that not knowing the will of God leads to sinning ignorantly (this is a possible interpretation). Actually, the use of *or* could also imply the same meaning for both relative clause conjuncts since in the Book of Mormon the conjunction *or* is frequently used to correct or explain the preceding text. On the other hand, the conjunction *or* may introduce an alternative condition. One could interpret this passage as first referring to those who never knew the will of God at all and second to those who knew something of right and wrong but who never received any specific commandments from the Lord, so they “ignorantly sinned”.

Either conjunction (*and*, *or*) seems acceptable; since there appears to be no motivation for replacing one with the other, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} is probably just a correction based on \mathcal{O} (no longer extant here). There are a number of other passages where relative clauses are conjoined with an *or* (here cited according to the original text):

Mosiah 4:7

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

Mosiah 4:14

the devil **which** is the master of sin
or which is the evil spirit which hath been spoken of by our fathers

Mosiah 13:12

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 1:30

they did not send away any **which** was naked
or that was hungry
or that was athirst
or that was sick
or that had not been nourished

Alma 5:30

is there one among you **that** doth make a mock of his brother
or that heapeth upon him persecutions

Alma 24:29

now among those which joined the people of the Lord
there were none **which** were Amlicites or Amulonites
or which were after the order of Nehor
but they were actual descendants of Laman and Lemuel

Alma 40:16

and behold again it hath been spoken
that there is a first resurrection
a resurrection of all those **which** have been
or which are
or which shall be down to the resurrection of Christ
from the dead

3 Nephi 17:7

have ye any **that** are lame or blind or halt or maimed or leprous
or that are withered
or that are deaf
or that are afflicted in any manner

Note that the first two examples listed above are a part of king Benjamin’s address; thus the occurrence of *or who* earlier in Mosiah 3:11 is consistent with this usage.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 3:11 the conjunction *or* in “who hath died not knowing the will of God concerning them **or** who have ignorantly sinned”; Oliver Cowdery’s correction here in \mathcal{P} was probably based on the reading in \mathcal{C} , no longer extant here.

■ **Mosiah 3:13**

*and the Lord God hath sent his holy prophets
among all the children of men to declare these things to every
[Nation & Kindred > Kindred Nation & 1 | kindred nation and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] tongue*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write the more frequent Book of Mormon expression in which *nation* precedes *kindred*. (There are seven occurrences of the phrase “every nation kindred tongue and people” in the Book of Mormon text; see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:18.) In this instance, Oliver immediately corrected his error by crossing out “& Kindred”, supralinearly inserting *Kindred* before *Nation*, and then supralinearly rewriting the ampersand that he had originally crossed out:

Mosiah 3:13 (line 36 on page 122 of \mathcal{P})

Kindred &
these things to every ^ Nation <^ Kindred> tongue that thereby

The level of ink flow for the correction is unchanged.

We should not assume that the occurrence of the *and* between *nation* and *kindred* was due to the now-familiar language of the book of Revelation:

Revelation 14:6 (King James Bible)

and I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven
 having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth
 and to every **nation and kindred** and tongue and people

Rather, Oliver Cowdery's initial *and* between *nation* and *kindred* was probably due to the fact that in Mosiah 3:13 the word *nation* was followed by an *and* in his copy-text, the original manuscript (reading presumably as "to every Kindred **Nation &** tongue").

The conjoined phraseology with the order "kindred(s) / nation(s) / tongue(s)" occurs only one other time in the Book of Mormon, but unlike Mosiah 3:13 this other example includes the word *people* in the conjunctive noun phrase:

3 Nephi 26:4

and even unto the great and last day
 when all people and all kindreds and all nations and tongues
 shall stand before God

And unlike the normal word order, *people* comes first in this other passage. The fact that *people* is missing from Mosiah 3:13 and that the word order differs from the most frequent order in the text suggests that the corrected reading in \wp ("to every kindred nation and tongue") is the original reading, or at least the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 3:13 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in \wp ("to every kindred nation and tongue"); the uniqueness of the corrected reading argues that \wp read this same way.

■ **Mosiah 3:19**

for the natural man is an enemy [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | of N] God

The 1906 LDS edition replaced the preposition *to* with *of* here in Mosiah 3:19 (giving "an enemy **of** God" rather than the original "an enemy **to** God"). Subsequent LDS editions have continued with the original *to*. The text clearly prefers the preposition *to* after *an enemy* (nine times), including the first four cases listed below where king Benjamin himself is the speaker:

Mosiah 2:37	and becometh an enemy to all righteousness
Mosiah 2:38	and dieth an enemy to God
Mosiah 3:19	for the natural man is an enemy to God
Mosiah 4:14	he being an enemy to all righteousness
Mosiah 16:5	being an enemy to God
Mosiah 16:5	and also is the devil an enemy to God
Mosiah 19:4	and he being a strong man and an enemy to the king
Alma 22:34	as the Lamanites were an enemy to them
Alma 34:23	against the devil which is an enemy to all righteousness

For the second example in Mosiah 16:5, the 1841 British edition replaced *to* with *of* (just like the 1906 LDS edition did in Mosiah 3:19). This second instance of the change to *of* continued in the LDS text until the 1920 edition. See the discussion under Mosiah 16:5.

There is also one example with the preposition *unto*: “for the devil is an enemy **unto** God” (Moroni 7:12), but there are no instances where *of* is used after *an enemy*. On the other hand, if the indefinite article *an* is replaced by the definite article *the*, we get only the preposition *of*:

2 Nephi 4:28	and give place no more for the enemy of my soul
Mosiah 27:9	for the enemy of God to exercise his power over them
Moroni 9:6	that we may conquer the enemy of all righteousness

Thus the earliest text consistently distinguishes between “**an** enemy (un)**to** X” and “**the** enemy **of** X”. The critical text will maintain this distinction.

Summary: Maintain the phrase “an enemy to God” wherever it is supported in the earliest text, including here in Mosiah 3:19.

■ Mosiah 3:19

*for the natural man is an enemy to God
and has been from the fall of Adam and will be forever and ever
[but if 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | But if PS | unless RT] he yieldeth
to the enticings of the Holy Spirit and putteth off the natural man
and becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord
and becometh as a child: submissive meek humble patient full of love
willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him
even as a child doth submit to his father*

The conjunctive *but if*, in current English, leads to a sentence fragment since there is no independent clause that follows the dependent *if*-clause. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition substituted *unless* for *but if*, which then makes the following clause dependent upon the preceding independent clause. The use of incomplete subordinate clauses is common to the original Book of Mormon text. Many of these fragments have been eliminated by editing (as here), but some examples still remain. See, for instance, Enos 1:1–2 and the reference to it in the discussion under Enos 1:3.

Historically, the conjunctive *but if* meant ‘unless’, but this meaning is now obsolete (see definition 10b under *but* in the Oxford English Dictionary). This meaning for *but if* was especially prevalent from the 14th through the 16th century. The OED lists citations from 1200 to 1596, with the following example from the late 1500s:

Philip Sidney (1580)
He did not like that maides should once stir out of their fathers houses,
but if it were to milke a cow.

In the King James Bible and in Shakespeare’s works, the occurrences of *but if* appear to have only our modern sense, not the archaic sense of ‘unless’; nor is this obsolete sense of *but if* found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. As noted in the discussion regarding the verb *require* in Enos 1:18 (where the meaning is ‘request’), the original text of the Book of Mormon seems to have had a number of archaic word uses, usually inconsistently applied, that date back to the 1500s and 1600s. The unique use of *but if* may be one more example of such usage, despite the fact that it is found only once in the text with the apparent meaning of ‘unless’. For a list of other examples

like *require* and *but if*, see the discussion regarding *ceremony* in Mosiah 19:24. For a complete discussion of the archaic vocabulary in the original text, see volume 3.

David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that this particular *if*-clause could actually be interpreted as a Hebraism. There are some examples in the original text where a conditional clause lacks its expected main clause and must therefore be supplied by the reader; for two examples, see 1 Nephi 19:20–21 and Alma 30:39. Also see the discussion in volume 3 under HEBRAISMS regarding this possibility. Note that the Hebraistic interpretation assumes that the earliest reading in Mosiah 3:19 represents the original text. Similarly, the argument that *but if* means ‘unless’ (in accord with earlier English) also accepts the earliest reading without emendation.

Summary: Restore the original *but if* in Mosiah 3:19; the resulting sentence fragment (from the point of view of modern English) can be accepted since the original text had similar examples of incomplete subordinate clauses, including some that are Hebraistic in nature; an alternative way to interpret *but if* is as an archaic conjunction with the meaning ‘unless’.

■ Mosiah 3:19

*but if he [yieldeth >js yields 1 | yieldeth A | yields BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to the enticings of the Holy Spirit
and putteth off the natural man
and becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord
and becometh as a child . . .*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed *yieldeth* to *yields*. However, he did not change the subsequent three verbs that retain their original *-(e)th* ending (*putteth* and two occurrences of *becometh*). This kind of editing has often been inconsistently applied to the text; in this instance the original parallelism in the inflectional ending has been partially obscured. The critical text will restore all cases of the biblically styled *-(e)th* ending whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 3:19 the original *yieldeth*, which makes this sentence fully consistent in having the inflectional *-(e)th* ending for each of its conjoined verbs.

■ Mosiah 3:19

*for the natural man is an enemy to God
and has been from the fall of Adam and will be forever and ever
but if he yieldeth to the enticings of the Holy Spirit
and putteth off the natural man
and [he > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] becometh a saint
through the atonement of Christ the Lord
and becometh as a child . . .*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the pronoun *he* before the first occurrence of *becometh*; then almost immediately he crossed the *he* out (the ink flow for the

crossout appears to be unchanged). This scribal correction undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript. The pronoun *he* would be intrusive here since both the immediately preceding and following clauses lack the implied subject pronoun *he* (“and putteth off the natural man . . . and becometh as a child”).

All of the conjoined predicates in this *if*-clause specify what one must do to cease being an enemy to God. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that Oliver Cowdery’s intrusive *he* could be interpreted as creating a Hebraistic result clause for a now shortened *if*-clause:

Mosiah 3:19 (initial reading in \mathcal{P})
 but if he yieldeth to the enticings of the Holy Spirit
 and putteth off the natural man
and he becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord
 and becometh as a child . . .

With this reading, we could interpret the *and* before the intrusive *he* as a Hebrew-like connector following an *if*-clause and therefore equivalent to ‘then’. In other words, one could argue that the initial text that Oliver wrote means that by yielding to the enticings of the Spirit and by putting off the natural man, one becomes a saint through the atonement of Christ and also becomes as a child. Such an interpretation, it should be pointed out, would resolve the difficulties of the incomplete *if*-clause in this passage (see the previous discussion regarding the occurrence of *but if* in this verse). But Calabro also points out the problem with such an interpretation: in the previous verse, the text clearly states that becoming as a child is one of the conditions that one must meet in order to avoid damnation:

Mosiah 3:18
 but men drinketh damnation to their own souls
 except they humble themselves and **become as little children**
 and believeth that salvation was and is and is to come
 in and through the atoning blood of Christ the Lord Omnipotent

This preceding passage therefore argues that Oliver’s initial *he* in the following verse was indeed a scribal error, thus its virtually immediate deletion.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 3:19 Oliver Cowdery’s deletion of the pronoun *he* that he seems to have accidentally inserted in the middle of a series of conjoined predicates.

Mosiah 4

■ Mosiah 4:1

and behold they had [fell >js fallen 1 | fell A | fallen BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to the earth for the fear of the Lord had come upon them

Usually the earliest textual sources have the standard past participle *fallen*. But here in Mosiah 4:1, the earliest text has *fell* (“they had fell”). The use of the simple past-tense form for the past participle occurs fairly often in the earliest text (for a general discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3). Besides here in Mosiah 4:1, we have the following instances of past participial *fell*:

Alma 17:15

and the curse of God

had [*fell* >js *fallen* 1 | *fell* A | *fallen* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them because of the traditions of their fathers

Alma 19:24

when the multitude beheld that

the man had [*fell* >js *fallen* 1 | *fell* A | *fallen* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dead . . .

Alma 31:9

but they had [*fell* 0A | *fell* >js *fallen* 1 | *fallen* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into great errors

Alma 47:26

and he has [*fell* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | *fell* > *fallen* M | *fallen* OQRST]

Except for the last instance, Joseph Smith replaced all of these cases of *fell* with *fallen* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The last one was changed (in the LDS text) in the third printing of the 1905 LDS missionary edition (in 1907). The RLDS text made the change in the 1953 RLDS edition.

There is one case in the original manuscript (Alma 56:51) where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *fell* (spelled as *fel*) as the very last word on a manuscript page (at the end of line 35 on page 346' of C); then he crossed out the *fel* and wrote the correct *fallen* as the first word on the next manuscript page (at the beginning of line 1 on page 347' of C). It is worth noting, however, that the *e* of *fel* is not fully legible and thus the final word may have simply been *fal*—that is, Oliver started to write *fallen* but found that he didn't have enough room to write the whole word, so he crossed out the *fal* that he had written and wrote the entire *fallen* on the next manuscript page.

In any event, there are five cases where the earliest textual sources support the perfect form “have fell”. In 63 cases (including the case of Alma 56:51) the earliest textual sources support “have fallen”. There is no variation for the past participle *fallen* when the helping verb is the passive *be* or

the archaic perfective *be* (for verbs involving change), or when we have an adjectival past participle. Although the five cases of perfective “have fell” could be due to dialectal overlay, the critical text will accept them as original.

Summary: Maintain the five cases of original “have fell”, including here in Mosiah 4:1 (“they **had fell** to the earth”).

■ **Mosiah 4:2**

*and they had viewed themselves
in their own carnal [states >% state 1 | state ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
even less than the dust of the earth*

Oliver Cowdery immediately corrected *states* to *state* by erasing the final *s*. His correction is undoubtedly based on the reading of the original manuscript. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have only the singular *state*, which is what we expect in English. In particular, there are four additional cases where *carnal* modifies *state*, and each is in the singular even though the context always refers to more than one person:

Mosiah 26:4	even in their carnal and sinful state
Mosiah 27:25	changed from their carnal and fallen state
Alma 22:13	laying the fall of man before him and their carnal state
Alma 41:11	all men that are . . . in a carnal state

Summary: Retain the singular *state* in Mosiah 4:2, in accord with Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction in \mathcal{P} and in agreement with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 4:4**

*I would again call your attention
that ye may hear and understand
the remainder of my [word > words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which I shall speak unto you*

Here Oliver Cowdery corrected *word* to *words* by inserting an *s*; the level of ink flow remains unchanged, so the correction appears to have been nearly immediate. Similar plural usage is found, for instance, in 2 Nephi 9:54: “on the morrow I will declare unto you the remainder of my **words**”. More generally, the Book of Mormon text usually uses the plural *words* when referring to the word(s) of a person; for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 16:24. Here in Mosiah 4:4 the virtual immediacy of the correction in \mathcal{P} suggests that the plural *words* was the reading of the original manuscript.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 4:4 the plural *words* in “the remainder of my words” (the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}).

■ Mosiah 4:5–6

for behold [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time hath awakened you
 to a sense of your nothingness and your worthless and fallen state
 I say unto you [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 if ye have come to a knowledge of the goodness of God . . .

In this passage Joseph Smith twice deleted the conjunction *that* in the context of an immediately following *if*. In the first case, the text originally read “behold that if”, which is quite awkward for modern English readers. Even so, there is evidence that the original text of the Book of Mormon allowed *that* to follow *behold*, as in Moroni 8:22: “for behold **that** all little children are alive in Christ”. For another example, see the discussion under Jacob 5:24.

There is less-prescriptive motivation for deleting the *that* that follows “I say unto you” in Mosiah 4:6. The original text had 14 occurrences of “I say unto you that if”, including four more from king Benjamin:

Mosiah 1:13	yea and moreover I say unto you that if this highly favored people
Mosiah 1:14	for I say unto you that if he had not extended his arm
Mosiah 2:21	I say unto you that if ye should serve him who hath created you
Mosiah 4:12	and behold I say unto you that if ye do this

In all 13 of the other occurrences of the phrase “I say unto you that if”, Joseph Smith left the *that* in the text. The critical text will, of course, restore the *that* here in Mosiah 4:6 (as well as the more difficult one following *behold* in the previous verse). For a complete discussion of the omission of the subordinate conjunction *that* for various verbs, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the two instances of the subordinate conjunction *that* in Mosiah 4:5–6: “for behold **that** if the knowledge . . . I say unto you **that** if ye have come to a knowledge”.

■ Mosiah 4:5–6

if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time
 hath awakened you to a sense of your nothingness
 and your [worthlessness > worthless 1 | worthless ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | worthless CGHK]
 and fallen state
 I say unto you that . . .

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *worthlessness*, then deleted the nominalizing ending *-ness*. However, the 1840 edition restored the reading *worthlessness*. Since we know that Joseph Smith used the original manuscript to restore a few readings for that edition, it is possible that Ⓞ read *worthlessness* here. Nonetheless, Oliver Cowdery’s crossout in Ⓟ of the *-ness* ending appears to have been virtually immediate (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Oliver’s writing of *worthlessness* may have simply been a copying error prompted by the preceding *nothingness*. In fact, the appearance of *worthlessness* in the 1840 edition could also be attributed to a similar error by the 1840 typesetter. This 1840 reading was maintained in the RLDS textual tradition until the third RLDS edition in 1908 (which restored *worthless*, the corrected reading in Ⓟ).

The reading with *worthlessness* is strange in terms of coordination since it allows the pronominal adjective *your* to appear before the first and second conjunctive noun phrases (“your nothingness” and “your worthlessness”) but not before the third noun phrase (“and fallen state”). Book of Mormon coordinate structures usually have a determiner before only the first of several conjuncts or before each of the conjuncts. Under the reading *worthless*, there are only two conjuncts (“your nothingness” and “your worthless and fallen state”), with the result that *your* precedes both of the conjuncts (as expected).

Expressions with two adjectives conjoined before the noun *state* (like “your worthless and fallen state”) are found elsewhere in the text (especially in the book of Mosiah). Virtually all of them do not repeat the determiner (or the preposition), just like the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Mosiah 4:5:

2 Nephi 25:17	from their lost and fallen state
Mosiah 2:41	on the blessed and happy state
Mosiah 16:4	from their lost and fallen state
Mosiah 25:11	of their sinful and polluted state
Mosiah 26:4	in their carnal and sinful state
Mosiah 27:25	from their carnal and fallen state
Alma 26:17	from our awful sinful and polluted state

These examples, all without repetition of the determiner (or the preposition), support the corrected reading in Mosiah 4:5 (“your worthless and fallen state”). It should be noted that the only example with repetition repeats not only the determiner but also the preposition:

1 Nephi 10:6	in a lost and in a fallen state
--------------	---

The critical text will accept the corrected reading “your worthless and fallen state” in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 4:5 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathcal{P} of *worthlessness* to *worthless*; the expression “your worthless and fallen state” is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ Mosiah 4:7

I say that this is the man

[*that* 1ABDE | *who* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* > *who* F] *receiveth salvation*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not normally replace the restrictive relative pronoun *that* with *who*, but for this example in the 1840 edition it appears that he did. (It is, of course, possible that the replacement was made by the 1840 typesetter.) There are two more instances of the replacement of *that* with *who* later on in this chapter (which suggests that these changes in the 1840 edition were intentional):

Mosiah 4:24

and again I say unto the poor

ye [*that* 1ABDE | *who* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* > *who* F] have not

and yet hath sufficient that ye remain from day to day

I mean all you [*that* 1ABDE | *who* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* > *who* F] deny

the beggar because ye have not . . .

All three of these changes in Mosiah 4 were also made in the stereotyped plates for the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition (undoubtedly by reference to the 1840 edition). The critical text will restore the original *that* in all three of these instances. For a complete list of the cases where the relative pronoun *that* has been changed to *who(m)* or *which*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4 the relative pronoun *that* in the three cases where *who* replaced *that* in the 1840 edition (in Mosiah 4:7 and twice in Mosiah 4:24).

■ **Mosiah 4:7**

*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 >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *is*

or [*which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *ever shall be
even unto the end of the world*

Joseph Smith changed the second and third occurrences of *which* to *who* but left the first one unchanged. The critical text will restore all the original uses of *which*. For a complete discussion regarding the consistency of Joseph’s editing of *which* to *who(m)*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:7 the two instances of *which* that Joseph Smith edited to *who*.

■ **Mosiah 4:7**

*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 >js were 1 | was A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ever since the fall of Adam
or which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
or which ever shall be even unto the end of the world*

The noun *mankind* is consistently treated as a plural in the current text of the Book of Mormon, but in two passages the subject noun *mankind* took singular verb forms in the original text, twice here in Mosiah 4:7 and once in 1 Nephi 10:6: “wherefore all mankind **was** in a lost and in a fallen state”. In all three cases, Joseph Smith edited the singular *be* verb to the appropriate plural form, either *were* or *are* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:6). All other instances of *mankind* take plural verb forms:

Mosiah 16:4	thus all mankind were lost
Alma 19:13	and he shall redeem all mankind who believe on his name
Alma 42:14	all mankind were fallen
Helaman 14:16	for all mankind . . . are considered as dead

The critical text will restore the three instances where the word *mankind* originally took a singular verb form. For further discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:7 the two cases where *mankind* originally took singular forms of the verb *be* (“which ever **was** . . . or which **is** or which ever shall be”).

■ Mosiah 4:7

*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 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] since the fall of Adam
or which is or which **ever** shall be **even** unto the end of the world*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition deleted the second *ever* in the apparently redundant “which **ever** were **ever** since the fall of Adam”, giving “which ever were since the fall of Adam”. (The text has read *were* instead of the original *was ever* since the 1837 edition.) Another possible emendation would have been to delete the first *ever*, giving “which were **ever** since the fall of Adam”. The last relative clause in this sentence supports maintaining the *ever* before the *be* verb (“or which **ever** shall be”). Of course, the redundancy is only mild here in Mosiah 4:7 and can actually be accepted in the original text if we treat the phrase “ever since the fall of Adam” as parenthetical: “which ever was (ever since the fall of Adam) or which is or which ever shall be”.

Another possibility is that the second *ever* was actually the word *even* (“which **ever** was **even** since the fall of Adam”), which would then parallel (in part) the final part of this passage (“which **ever** shall be **even** unto the end of the world”). Confusion between *even* and *ever* is possible since Oliver Cowdery’s *n*’s and *r*’s are often identical in form (see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16 where two manuscript examples of mixing up *even* and *ever* are listed).

Nevertheless, the text normally has *ever since* rather than *even since*—and always in passages referring to the beginning of the world (each marked below with an asterisk):

- * Mosiah 13:33
for behold did not Moses prophesy unto them
concerning the coming of the Messiah
and that God should redeem his people
yea and even all the prophets which have prophesied
[*even* >+ *ever* 1 | *ever* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] **since** the world began
- * Mosiah 15:13
yea and are not the prophets
—every one that has opened his mouth to prophesy
that has not fallen into transgression—
I mean all the holy prophets **ever since** the world began . . .
- * Mosiah 15:26
yea even all those that have perished in their sins **ever since** the world began
- * Alma 7:25
that ye may at last be brought to sit down with Abraham Isaac and Jacob
and the holy prophets which have been **ever since** the world began
- Alma 53:10
and they had been brought down into the land of Zarahemla
and had **ever since** been protected by the Nephites
- 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

Note that in Mosiah 13:33 Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *even since* in \mathcal{P} but later corrected this to *ever since* (the level of ink flow is slightly heavier). In the current text, there is, in fact, only one occurrence of *even since*:

Helaman 8:19

and now I would that ye should know that **even since** the days of Abraham there hath been many prophets that hath testified these things

It is quite possible that this single remaining example of *even since* is an error for *ever since*. For discussion, see under Helaman 8:19.

The critical text will accept the repeated *ever* here in Mosiah 4:7 since the mild redundancy is not egregious. Note that the RLDS text has maintained both occurrences of *ever* in the relative clause “which **ever** were **ever** since the fall of Adam”.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:7 the repeated occurrence of the adverb *ever* (“which **ever** was **ever** since the fall of Adam”); the original redundancy is not all that difficult.

■ Mosiah 4:8

*and there is none other salvation save this which hath been spoken of
neither [is 1ABDEP | are CGHIJKLMNOQRST | is > are F] there
any [conditions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | condition > conditions F]
whereby man can be saved except the **conditions** which I have told you*

The earliest text here reads “neither is there any conditions”. Two possible emendations have occurred in the history of the text: “neither is there any **condition**” (the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition) and “neither **are** there any conditions” (the 1840 edition). The last emendation undoubtedly represents the intended meaning of the original since the following text also has the plural *conditions* (“except the **conditions** which I have told you”). For further discussion of this type of disagreement, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 as well as under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:8 the earliest reading, “neither **is** there any **conditions**”.

■ Mosiah 4:9

*believe that man doth not comprehend
all [the 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOQRT | KPS] things which the Lord can comprehend*

The 1892 RLDS edition omitted the definite article *the* in the phrase “all the things”. This shortened reading has been followed in all subsequent RLDS editions. Elsewhere in the text there are 22 occurrences of “all things which”—that is, cases where *all things* is postmodified by a relative clause headed by *which*. On the other hand, the earliest text has 9 additional occurrences of “all **the** things which”. In general, either reading will work. The critical text will in each of these cases follow the earliest textual sources in determining the correct reading for the phrase “all (the) things”.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 4:9 the definite article in the phrase “all the things” since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources for this passage.

■ **Mosiah 4:10**

*and now if you believe [NULL > all 1 | all ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] these things
see that ye do them*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “these things” in \mathcal{P} , but then almost immediately he corrected it to “all these things” by supralinearly inserting the *all* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Either reading seems reasonable, so here Oliver was probably correcting to the reading in \mathcal{C} rather than editing the text. Elsewhere the text has numerous instances of both “these things” and “all these things”.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 4:10 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “if you believe **all** these things”.

■ **Mosiah 4:11**

*and humble yourselves
even in the [debths 1 | depths ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | depth D] of humility*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the plural *depths* with the singular *depth*. The correct *depths* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). Elsewhere the original text has only the plural usage, “the depths of humility” (five more times). For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:32 and Alma 62:41.

Summary: Maintain the plural “the depths of humility”, here in Mosiah 4:11 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 4:11**

*and humble yourselves even in the depths of humility
calling on the name of the Lord daily
and standing steadfastly in the faith of that which is to come
which was **spoken by** the mouth of the angel*

One wonders here if the final relative clause originally read “which was spoken **of** by the mouth of the angel”. In Mosiah 2:32, we have an example where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the preposition *of* in a similar relative clause:

Mosiah 2:32
beware lest there shall arise contentions among you
and ye list to obey the evil spirit
which was spoken [NULL >+ of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
by my father Mosiah

This example clearly shows that Oliver sometimes omitted the *of* from the phrase “to be spoken **of** by X” (see Mosiah 2:32 for discussion). As further support for emending Mosiah 4:11, one could refer to one more example of this phraseology in king Benjamin’s discourse:

Mosiah 4:14

neither will you suffer that they transgress the laws of God
and fight and quarrel one with another
and serve the devil which is the master of sin
or which is the evil spirit which hath been spoken **of** by our fathers
he being an enemy to all righteousness

If Mosiah 4:11 is to be emended by inserting *of*, there remains the question of whether the *of* should come between *spoken* and *by* or at the beginning of the relative clause (as in “**of** which was spoken by the mouth of the angel”). Although the use of *of* at the beginning of the relative clause seems awkward, there is evidence for the initial placement of *of* in relative clauses involving passive forms of the verb *speak* followed by an agentive prepositional phrase:

Alma 40:22

the restoration of those things
of which have been **spoken by** the mouths of the prophets

Alma 40:24

and now my son this is the restoration
[NULL >+ *of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

Note especially the second example; there Oliver Cowdery, when he first took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for this passage, omitted the *of* that occurred at the beginning of the relative clause. Also note that the agent phrases in both these examples specifically refer to that which has been spoken “by the **mouths** of the prophets”, which is similar to the language in Mosiah 4:11 (“by the **mouth** of the angel”); that is, all three involve the noun *mouth*. These two examples from Alma 40 thus support the placement of the *of* at the beginning of the relative clause in Mosiah 4:11.

Despite these arguments for emending the final relative clause in Mosiah 4:11, there is evidence that the earliest reading may be correct if we interpret the text as stating that the mouth of the angel spoke **something** rather than **of something**. The verb *speak* does not require the preposition *of*, as in the following passages:

3 Nephi 1:13

and on the morrow come I into the world
to shew unto the world that I will fulfill
all that which I have caused to be **spoken by** the mouth of my holy prophets

Ether 1:39

and it came to pass that the brother of Jared did cry unto the Lord
according to that which had been **spoken by** the mouth of Jared

Notice how both of these passages refer to something being spoken by the **mouth** of someone, just as in Mosiah 4:11. And in all three cases, there is no *of* for the verb *speak* in the earliest textual sources. Thus the original text in Mosiah 4:11 is perfectly interpretable if we consider the text as referring to the mouth of the angel as having spoken “that which is to come”. The critical text

will therefore accept the earliest reading for Mosiah 4:11 and not emend the text by adding an *of* in the relative clause.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 4:11 the current reading “that which is to come which was spoken by the mouth of the angel”; the final relative clause does not need an *of* for the verb *speak*.

■ **Mosiah 4:12**

and ye shall grow in the knowledge

[NULL > *of the glory* 1 | *of the glory* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of him that created you*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the knowledge of him” here in \mathcal{P} , then inserted with the same level of ink flow the additional words *of the glory*, thus giving “in the knowledge of the glory of him”. Since either reading is possible, the original manuscript probably had the phrase “of the glory”. Oliver’s eye probably just skipped from the first *of* to the second one (“**of the glory of him**”) as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . This same phraseology (“the knowledge of the glory of God”) is found near the beginning of the preceding verse (Mosiah 4:11). Eight manuscript lines separate these two instances of “the knowledge of the glory of X”, so it is probable that Oliver did not notice the identity in phraseology and was therefore not prompted by the first instance to consciously emend the second one.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 4:12 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading: “the knowledge **of the glory of him**” (which was probably the reading of the original manuscript).

■ **Mosiah 4:12**

and ye shall grow in the knowledge of the glory of him

[*who* >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *created you*

This passage involves a manuscript change of *who* to *that*. Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *who* in \mathcal{P} , then somewhat later edited the *who* to *that*. The level of ink flow is slightly heavier, which suggests that Oliver could have made the change while proofing the printer’s manuscript against the original manuscript. Another possibility is that the correction was virtually immediate and that Oliver redipped his quill just before correcting the *who* to *that*.

According to the earliest textual sources, the original text had 12 examples of “of him who” and 12 of “of him that” (where *that* is a relative pronoun), thus showing that both expressions “of him who” and “of him that” are possible. (I exclude Mosiah 4:12 from these statistics.) Although seven instances of “of him that” are found in quotations from Isaiah, the remainder are found within the normal Book of Mormon text. Four of these nonbiblical instances of “of him that” involve no variation at all with respect to the relative pronoun:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 2 Nephi 1:10 | the judgments of him that is just |
| 2 Nephi 5:23 | the seed of him that mixeth with their seed |
| 2 Nephi 9:45 | the chains of him that would bind you fast |
| Ether 9:8 | the brother of him that suffered death |

One instance has involved a change from *that* to *who*, the opposite of the manuscript change here in Mosiah 4:12:

Helaman 12:18

let it be accursed because of the iniquity of him
 [*that* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hath hid it up

For additional examples of the occasional tendency to change *that* to *who* (but in the 1840 edition), see the discussion under Mosiah 4:7. Also see under WHICH in volume 3 for a complete list of this particular change. The critical text will accept the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} for Mosiah 4:12 since the change itself does not seem to be motivated by any grammatical consideration.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 4:12 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , which replaced “of him **who**” with “of him **that**” (the probable reading of the original manuscript).

■ **Mosiah 4:14**

*neither will [ye >+ you 1 | ye ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] suffer
 that they transgress the laws of God*

Normally, the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural pronoun form *ye* in subject position, but there are cases where the original text has *you* (which is what we expect in modern English). There has been some tendency in the text to replace *ye* with *you*, but here in Mosiah 4:14 Oliver Cowdery corrected a *ye* to *you* in \mathcal{P} . The correction comes at the end of a manuscript line. Oliver initially wrote *ye* and then overwrote the *e* with an *o*; but then he decided that there wasn’t enough room for the final *u*, so he crossed out what he had written and supralinearly inserted *you* right above the crossed-out *ye/yo*. He even had trouble with his supralinear *you*: he first wrote *yu* and then inserted the *o* between the *y* and the *u*. Oliver redipped his quill before supralinearly inserting the *you* since the level of ink flow is slightly heavier for the *you* as well as for the crossout and the insert mark in this correction. All in all, the correction of *ye* to *you* looks fairly immediate.

Despite all these efforts of Oliver’s to write the correct *you*, the 1830 compositor set *ye*, the standard biblical subject form for the second person plural pronoun; this *ye* has continued in all of the subsequently printed editions. Elsewhere in king Benjamin’s discourse, there are examples of *you* serving as the subject pronoun in place of the expected biblical *ye*, including two more in this chapter of Mosiah:

Mosiah 4:10 and now if **you** believe all these things / see that **ye** do them
 Mosiah 4:21 on whom **you** are dependent for your lives and for all that **ye** have

Note that in both these instances there are nearby instances of *ye*. Overall, the biblical form *ye* dominates the text; for instance, in the original text for king Benjamin’s discourse there are 122 examples of *ye* but only 10 of *you*. For a complete discussion of the variation between *ye* and *you* in subject position, see YE in volume 3.

Summary: Follow Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *ye* to *you* in Mosiah 4:14 since *you* most probably represents the reading of the original manuscript and not editing on Oliver’s part; maintain the subject *you* in those cases where the earliest textual evidence supports it.

■ Mosiah 4:14

*neither will you suffer that they transgress the laws of God
and fight and quarrel one with another
and [save >p serve 1 | serve ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the devil*

The original reading of the printer’s manuscript reads “save the devil”, an obvious scribal error for “serve the devil”. Oliver Cowdery corrected this error in pencil, which shows that this correction occurred considerably later and probably not when he proofed the printer’s manuscript against the original manuscript. Both *save* and *serve* are orthographically similar, which argues that the incorrect *save* entered the text as Oliver was copying from \mathfrak{S} into \mathfrak{P} . We do not have the original manuscript here, but it seems most likely that it read *serve*. The penciled correction suggests that Oliver made the change while at the 1830 printer’s shop, where pencil rather than ink was normally used to edit the copy-text. Such an emendation at the press would mean that Oliver did not refer to the original manuscript to make this correction—nor did he need to.

Summary: Retain Oliver Cowdery’s emendation of the impossible “save the devil” to “serve the devil”; *save* is orthographically similar to *serve* and probably represents a visual error that entered the text (but did not remain long) as Oliver copied from \mathfrak{S} into \mathfrak{P} .

■ Mosiah 4:14

*and serve the devil
[which 1A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is the master of sin
or [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is the evil spirit
which hath been spoken of by our fathers
he being an enemy to all righteousness*

The question here is whether the third *which*, referring to the evil spirit, should have also been edited to *who* (just as two preceding instances of *which* were). Generally, in the current Book of Mormon text the noun *devil* takes the relative pronoun *who* (six times)—although in the earliest text, five of these instances of *who* read as *which*. The text has only two examples of *evil spirit* followed by a relative pronoun, and that pronoun is *which* in both the original and the current text:

Mosiah 2:32	the evil spirit which was spoken of by my father Mosiah
Mosiah 4:14	the evil spirit which hath been spoken of by our fathers

Thus Joseph Smith’s editing is consistent in leaving the *which* unedited when the antecedent is *the evil spirit* (although there are only these two examples). The critical text here will, of course, maintain all the instances of original *which*, both with *devil* and *evil spirit* (as well as with *master of sin*, which occurs only once in the text—here in Mosiah 4:14). For a complete discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Retain the relative pronoun *which* that refers to “the evil spirit” in Mosiah 4:14 as well as in Mosiah 2:32; the critical text will consistently restore all instances of original *which*.

■ Mosiah 4:18

*whosoever [doth > doeth 1 | doeth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] this
the same hath great cause to repent*

Except for one possible exception, the Book of Mormon text systematically distinguishes between *doeth* and *doth*. The first, *doeth*, is used for the main verb *do*, and the second, *doth*, for the helping verb *do*, as in “the man that **doeth** this” (Mosiah 2:37) versus “as a child **doth submit** to his father” (Mosiah 3:19). The one passage where there is some question as to whether the verb form should be *doeth* or *doth* is found in Alma 3:19 (see the discussion there).

Here in Mosiah 4:18, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *doth* rather than the correct *doeth*. Almost immediately he corrected *doth* to *doeth* by supralinearly inserting the *e* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Later on in the book of Alma, the same initial error was made in \mathcal{P} , although by a different scribe (in this case, the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P}):

Alma 5:36

*or whosoever [doth > doeth 1 | doeth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not
the works of righteousness
the same hath cause to wail and mourn*

Once more, the correction is virtually immediate.

In general, the critical text will follow the earliest textual reading in determining whether the third person singular present tense form for the verb *do* should be *doth* or *doeth*. Except for the one possible case of Alma 3:19, such a procedure makes the text fully regular in distinguishing between *doeth* and *doth*. Here in Mosiah 4:18, it appears that the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} represents the original reading. For a complete discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 4:18 the corrected *doeth* rather than the initially written *doth*; the correction is virtually immediate and appears to be the reading of the original manuscript.

■ Mosiah 4:20

*he [hath 1A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] poured out his Spirit upon you
and [NULL >+ hath 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] caused that
your hearts should be filled with joy
and [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] caused that
your mouths should be stopped*

In this conjoining of predicates, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *hath* before the second predicate (thus initially writing “and caused that your hearts should be filled with joy”). Almost immediately Oliver inserted the *hath* supralinearly, although he ran out of ink while doing so, and so he redipped his quill and overwrote the weakly written *ath* of the inserted *hath* with heavier ink flow. When Oliver came to the third predicate, he included the *hath* (thus “and **hath** caused that your mouths should be stopped”). The occurrence of the *hath* in the third predicate supports the occurrence of a parallel *hath* in the preceding predicate.

Mosiah 4

Other examples in king Benjamin's discourse show that there is a preference for the text to repeat the perfect auxiliary *have* in conjoined predicates:

Mosiah 2:20

if you should render all the thanks and praise . . .
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 . . .

Mosiah 2:30

but the Lord God doth support me
and hath suffered me that I should speak unto you
and hath commanded me that I should declare unto you this day that . . .

Mosiah 2:31

as ye have kept my commandments
and also the commandments of my father
and have prospered
and have been kept from falling into the hands of your enemies . . .

Mosiah 3:4

for the Lord hath heard thy prayers
and hath judged of thy righteousness
and hath sent me to declare unto thee that . . .

Mosiah 4:11

or if ye have known of his goodness
and have tasted of his love
and have received a remission of your sins

Thus there is considerable support for multiple repetition of the *hath* in Mosiah 4:20.

Here in Mosiah 4:20, the 1837 edition replaced all three instances of *hath* with *has*, the verb form that we expect in modern English. (Only the third instance of the change was actually marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of \mathcal{P} for that edition.) Such editing, of course, is irrelevant to the issue of whether the perfect auxiliary verb should be repeated in this conjunctive structure.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 4:20 Oliver Cowdery's supralinearly inserted *hath* in the conjoined predicate "and **hath** caused that your hearts should be filled with joy"; such repetition is characteristic of the language in king Benjamin's discourse.

■ **Mosiah 4:22**

and yet ye put up no petition
[*or repenteth not* >]s *nor repent* 1 | *or repenteth not* A | *nor repent* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the thing which thou hast done

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith here replaced the conjunction *or* and its associated negative *not* with the conjunction *nor*. A similar example of this kind of editing is found in

Mosiah 2:13; there the 1920 LDS edition replaced a case of *or* with *nor* and removed a following *not* (and also changed the word order), as follows:

- *original text* (according to the printer's manuscript and most editions)
 or even **I have not** suffered that ye should commit any manner of wickedness
- *revised text* (the LDS text since 1920)
 nor even **have I** suffered that ye should commit any manner of wickedness

In this case, just like in Mosiah 4:22, there is a preceding negative clause (see the discussion under Mosiah 2:13). There are two other examples (both in the book of Mosiah) where a negative clause is followed by the conjunction *or* and an associated *not*:

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

Mosiah 23:7

ye shall **not** esteem one flesh above another
or one man shall **not** think himself above another

To be consistent with the editing in Mosiah 2:13 and Mosiah 4:22, the above two passages could have been edited (but have not been) to the following:

Mosiah 1:5 (possible grammatical revision)

and we should have been like unto our brethren the Lamanites
 which know nothing concerning these things
nor do even believe them when they are taught them

Mosiah 23:7 (possible grammatical revision)

ye shall not esteem one flesh above another
nor shall one man think himself above another

In each of these hypothetical revisions, the *or* is replaced by *nor*, the *not* is deleted, and the helping verb is moved closer to the *nor*. The critical text will, of course, retain the two unedited instances of “or . . . not” as well as restore the two that originally occurred in Mosiah 2:13 and Mosiah 4:22. For a complete discussion regarding negation in the original text, see NEGATION in volume 3.

Also in his editing of this passage, Joseph Smith removed the *-eth* inflectional ending from *repenteth* since the subject for this verb is the second person plural *ye* rather than a third person singular. In the original Book of Mormon text, the *-(e)th* ending stands more for the biblical style than for the actual third person singular present-tense ending. For some discussion regarding the occasional use of the inflection ending *-(e)th* with the second person plural *ye*, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *-eth* inflection here in Mosiah 4:22 (“or repenteth not”).

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:22 the original reading: “and yet ye put up no petition **or repenteth not** of the thing which thou hast done”; the original text allows for “or . . . not” to follow a negative clause as well as for a verb to take the *-(e)th* inflectional ending even when the subject is *ye*.

■ Mosiah 4:27

*for it is not requisite that a man should run faster
than [what >js NULL 1 | what A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he hath strength*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the word *what* that heads a comparative nominal clause. There are two other passages where *what* heads a comparative nominal clause, but in these cases the usage is different:

Alma 39:1

I have somewhat more to say unto thee
than **what** I said unto thy brother

Alma 55:2

for I will not grant unto him that he shall have any more power
than **what** he hath gat

In both these cases, the *what* serves as the direct object for the verb in the relative clause (“what I said” and “what he hath gat”). In Mosiah 4:27, on the other hand, there is already a direct object for the verb in the relative clause (namely, *strength*), thus the strangeness of the original phraseology (“than what he hath strength”). Nonetheless, the critical text will restore the *what* in Mosiah 4:27 since it appears to be intended. For another example of a passage where Joseph Smith deleted a strange-sounding complement after *than*, see under Mormon 9:31.

Summary: Restore the *what* that Joseph Smith deleted from the comparative nominal clause in Mosiah 4:27 (“it is not requisite that a man should run faster than **what** he hath strength”).

■ Mosiah 4:28

*and I would that ye should remember that whosoever among you
[that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] borroweth of his neighbor
should return the thing that he borroweth*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 11:8, the critical text will restore here in Mosiah 4:28 the relative pronoun that was deleted in the 1920 LDS edition. As pointed out in that discussion, there are three passages that support the use of a relative pronoun (such as *that*, *which*, or *who*) in *wh*-clauses headed by *whoso(ever)*. The edited phraseology here in Mosiah 4:28 is somewhat awkward to read, although it does agree with the usage in 3 Nephi 18:13 (“but **whoso** among you **shall do** more or less than these are not built upon my rock”). We can also find such usage in the King James Bible:

Acts 13:26

and **whosoever** among you **feareth** God
to you is the word of this salvation sent

A less awkward reading for 3 Nephi 18:13 would be “whoso among you **that** shall do more or less than these” and for Acts 13:26 “whosoever among you **that** feareth God”. The Book of Mormon text generally favors the inclusion of the relative pronoun in these *wh*-clauses, in accord with modern English usage.

Summary: Restore the original reading of the text in Mosiah 4:28 (“whosoever among you **that** borroweth of his neighbor”); the editing in the 1920 LDS edition introduced a rather awkward and now archaic type of *wh*-clause (“whosoever among you borroweth of his neighbor”).

■ **Mosiah 4:30**

*but this much I can tell you
that if ye do not watch yourselves
and your thoughts and your words and your deeds
and observe [to keep 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the commandments of God
and continue in the faith of what ye have heard concerning the coming of our Lord
even unto the end of your lives
ye must perish*

The 1837 edition dropped the infinitival phrase *to keep*. This change is probably a typo rather than the result of conscious editing; Joseph Smith did not mark it in the printer’s manuscript. Nor is this change consistent with ten other passages in the text for which the verb *observe* is followed by *commandments*. In each of these cases, we have “observe **to keep** the commandment(s)”, never “observe the commandment(s)”:

2 Nephi 5:10

and we did **observe to keep** the judgments and the statutes
and **the commandments** of the Lord in all things
according to the law of Moses

Jacob 3:6

and now **this commandment** they **observe to keep**
wherefore because of this observance in keeping this commandment
the Lord God will not destroy them

Alma 25:14

and they did walk in the ways of the Lord
and did **observe to keep his commandments**

Alma 30:3

yea and the people did **observe to keep the commandments** of the Lord

Alma 31:9

for they would not **observe to keep the commandments** of God
and his statutes according to the law of Moses

Alma 58:40

yea they do **observe to keep** his statutes and his judgments
and **his commandments** continually

Alma 63:2

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

Helaman 3:20

yea he did **observe to keep** the statutes and the judgments
and **the commandments** of God

Helaman 13:1

while the Lamanites did **observe strictly to keep the commandments** of God

Helaman 15:5

and they do **observe to keep his commandments**
and his statutes and his judgments
according to the law of Moses

(Also note in Jacob 3:6 the nominalized form of this expression: “because of this observance **in keeping** this commandment”). The consistency of this phraseology elsewhere in the text (as well as the fact that *to keep* was omitted only here in Mosiah 4:30) suggests that the 1837 loss of *to keep* in this passage was unintentional.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 4:30 the original phraseology: “and observe **to keep** the commandments of God”); this reading is consistent with all other occurrences of this phraseology in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Mosiah 4:30

*and now [re >% O 1 | O ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] man
remember and perish not*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially started to write “and now remember” in Ø. He had already written *& now re* when he stopped, erased the *re*, supralinearly inserted the exclamative *O*, and then continued by writing *man* inline. In other words, if Oliver hadn’t caught his error, he would have skipped the vocative *O man*. The fact that the *re* was erased and that *man* was written inline shows that the correction was immediate. Undoubtedly, the original manuscript read “and now **O man** remember and perish not”.

The vocative *O man* is used once more by king Benjamin in Mosiah 4:18 (“but I say unto you **O man**: whosoever doeth this the same hath great cause to repent”) as well as once by Nephi in 1 Nephi 10:20 (“therefore remember **O man**: for all thy doings thou shalt be brought into judgment”).

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction that restored the vocative expression *O man* in Mosiah 4:30.

Mosiah 5

■ Mosiah 5:2

*and also we know of their surety and truth
because of the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent which hath wrought
a mighty [chance >p change 1 | change ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in us or in our hearts*

Here we have a second example of an obvious error in the printer's manuscript that Oliver Cowdery corrected in pencil. On the previous page in \mathcal{P} , he emended in pencil the word *save* to *serve* in the expression "serve the devil" (see the discussion under Mosiah 4:14). Oliver probably made both these changes while he was in the printer's shop. Here in Mosiah 5:2, the original text undoubtedly read *change*. Oliver probably misread or simply miswrote *change* as *chance* as he was copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , although it is also possible that the scribe in \mathcal{O} could have made the error. There is independent evidence that Oliver could miswrite *change* as *chance*:

Jacob 5:59
and this I do that perhaps the roots thereof may take strength
because of their goodness and because of
the [*chance > change 1 | change ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] of the branches

In this instance, Oliver caught his copying error in \mathcal{P} and immediately corrected it by overwriting the *c* with a *g* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). On the other hand, the error here in Mosiah 5:2 was apparently caught only later in Grandin's printing shop.

The term *mighty change* occurs three other times in the Book of Mormon text (all in Alma 5), and the language is very similar; all refer to a mighty change in one's heart, and the first two use the archaic verb form *wrought*, just like in Mosiah 5:2:

Alma 5:12 there was a mighty change **wrought** in his heart
Alma 5:13 and a mighty change was also **wrought** in their hearts
Alma 5:14 have ye experienced this mighty change in your hearts

Thus Oliver Cowdery's emended reading in Mosiah 5:2 is undoubtedly correct. He was justified in making the change without consulting the original manuscript.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's emendation of *chance* to *change* in the printer's manuscript; usage elsewhere fully supports the phraseology "which hath wrought a mighty **change** . . . in our hearts".

■ **Mosiah 5:3**

*and we ourselves also [Know > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
through the infinite goodness of God and the manifestations of his Spirit
have great views of that which is to come*

The source for Oliver Cowdery initially writing the word *know* in the printer’s manuscript is undoubtedly the clause “**and also we know** of their surety and truth” that is found in the preceding verse (Mosiah 5:2). Oliver’s crossout of *know* here in verse 3 appears to be virtually immediate; there is no change in the level of ink flow, and the immediately following text was written inline. And, of course, the actual verb for this sentence (*have*) occurs after the long prepositional phrase (“through the infinite goodness of God and the manifestations of his Spirit”); thus the use of *know* earlier in the sentence is impossible.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 5:3 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathcal{P} (his crossout of the verb *know*).

■ **Mosiah 5:4**

*and it is the faith which we have had on the things which our king hath spoken unto us
[& 1 | and ABDEPS | that CGHIJKLMNOPQRT | and > that F] hath brought us to this great knowledge
whereby we do rejoice with such exceeding great joy*

Here the 1840 edition changed the conjunction *and* to *that*. The second printing of the 1852 LDS edition adopted the 1840 reading, which has subsequently remained in the LDS text. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *and* to the RLDS text since the change was not marked in the printer’s manuscript.

The problem in interpreting the earliest reading is that the reader needs to determine the subject for the conjoined predicate “hath brought us to this great knowledge”. There are three possibilities:

- (1) **our king**
- (2) **the things** which our king hath spoken unto us
- (3) **the faith** which we have had on the things which our king hath spoken unto us

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are a number of examples where individuals or written records bring people to knowledge, but there is no example of a passage explicitly stating that faith brings one to knowledge (although it is undoubtedly true):

- *an individual or individuals*

Mosiah 23:10

nevertheless after much tribulation the Lord did hear my cries
and did answer my prayers and hath made **me** an instrument in his hands
in **bringing** so many of you to a **knowledge** of his truth

Mosiah 27:36

and thus **they** were instruments in the hands of God
in **bringing** many to the **knowledge** of the truth
yea to the **knowledge** of their Redeemer

Mosiah 28:2

that perhaps **they** might **bring** them to the **knowledge** of the Lord their God
and convince them of the iniquity of their fathers

Alma 17:4

and **they** had been teaching the word of God
for the space of fourteen years among the Lamanites
having had much success in **bringing** many to the **knowledge** of the truth

Alma 17:9

and they fasted much and prayed much
that the Lord would grant unto them a portion of his Spirit
to go with them and abide with them
that **they** might be an instrument in the hands of God
to **bring**—if it were possible—their brethren the Lamanites
to the **knowledge** of the truth

Alma 21:17

and it came to pass that the Lord began to bless them
insomuch that **they brought** many to the **knowledge** of the truth

Alma 26:24

do ye suppose that **ye** can **bring** the Lamanites
to the **knowledge** of the truth

Helaman 9:41

and even **he** hath **brought** unto our **knowledge**
the true murderer of our chief judge

Helaman 15:6

and they are striving with unwearied diligence
that **they** may **bring** the remainder of their brethren
to the **knowledge** of the truth

3 Nephi 5:23

and surely shall **he** again **bring** a remnant of the seed of Joseph
to the **knowledge** of the Lord their God

□ *written records*

2 Nephi 3:7 (referring to the Book of Mormon)

and unto him will I give commandment
that he shall do a **work** for the fruit of thy loins his brethren
which shall be of great worth unto them
even to the **bringing** of them to the **knowledge** of the covenants
which I have made with thy fathers

2 Nephi 3:12 (referring to the Book of Mormon and the Bible)
wherefore the fruit of thy loins shall write
and the fruit of the loins of Judah shall write
and **that which shall be written** by the fruit of thy loins
and also **that which shall be written** by the fruit of the loins of Judah
shall grow together unto the confounding of false doctrines
and laying down of contentions
and establishing peace among the fruit of thy loins
and **bringing** them to the **knowledge** of their fathers in the latter days

Alma 37:8–10 (referring to the plates of brass and the Nephite records)
and now it hath hitherto been wisdom in God
that **these things** should be preserved
for behold **they** have enlarged the memory of this people
yea and convinced many of the error of their ways
and **brought** them to the **knowledge** of their God
unto the salvation of their souls
yea I say unto you
were it not for **these things** that **these records** do contain
which are on **these plates**
Ammon and his brethren could not have convinced so many thousands
of the Lamanites of the incorrect tradition of their fathers
yea **these records** and **their words** brought them unto repentance
that is / **they brought** them to the **knowledge** of the Lord their God
and to rejoice in Jesus Christ their Redeemer
and who knoweth but what **they** will be the means of **bringing**
many thousands of them
yea and also many thousands of our stiff-necked brethren the Nephites
which are now hardening their hearts in sins and iniquities
to the **knowledge** of their Redeemer

Thus usage elsewhere in the text argues that the most reasonable subject for “hath brought us to this great knowledge” in Mosiah 5:4 is either the king or the things which he had spoken unto them. (There are also ten passive examples for which it is not explicitly stated who or what is bringing the knowledge, as in Mosiah 27:14: “that thou mightest be brought to the knowledge of the truth”.)

Selecting *our king* as the subject of “hath brought us to this great knowledge” causes a grammatical difficulty: namely, the resulting relative clause “which our king . . . hath brought us to this great knowledge” has two direct objects, *which* and *us*. On the other hand, if the subject is *the things*, we end up conjoining two relative clauses for which the second relative pronoun is ellipted: “the things **which** our king hath spoken unto us and [**which**] hath brought us to this great knowledge”. Elsewhere in the text there are numerous passages where a subject relative pronoun occurs at the head of the conjunctive construction and each subsequent ellipted relative pronoun, if expressed, would represent the subject in the conjoined relative clause. Here are some examples where the conjoined predicates begin with the perfect auxiliary *have* (as in Mosiah 5:4):

1 Nephi 15:30

and the brightness thereof was like unto the brightness of a flaming fire
which ascendeth up unto God forever and ever
and hath no end

Mosiah 2:20

if you should render all the thanks and praise . . . 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

Alma 26:36

yea blessed is the name of my God who hath been mindful of this people
which are a branch of the tree of Israel
and hath been lost from its body in a strange land

The one significant difference between these examples and the earliest reading in Mosiah 5:4 is that the initial *which* in Mosiah 5:4 is an object relative pronoun (“**which** our king hath spoken unto us”) but the ellipted one is a subject relative pronoun (“and [**which**] hath brought us to this great knowledge”). Such a construction does seem rather unusual, although not impossible.

Of course, the Book of Mormon text also has specific examples where the relative pronoun is repeated, as in the following two examples from the book of Mosiah:

Mosiah 12:20

what meaneth the words
which are written **and which** have been taught by our fathers
saying . . .

Mosiah 21:26

nevertheless they did find a land which had been peopled
yea a land which was covered with dry bones
yea a land **which** had been peopled **and which** had been destroyed

Such examples suggest a possible emendation to Mosiah 5:4, that of adding the relative pronoun *which* after the original *and*:

Mosiah 5:4 (possible emendation)

and it is the faith which we have had on the things
which our king hath spoken unto us
and **which** hath brought us to this great knowledge
whereby we do rejoice with such exceeding great joy

Of course, this emendation is ambiguous since it allows the possibility that this additional *which* could refer to *the faith* as well as to *the things* (in the original Book of Mormon text *hath* can be used with plural subjects). And in accord with the original language of the Book of Mormon, the relative pronoun *which* could also refer to *the king*. We should also note that this conjectural emendation assumes that at some point in the early transmission of the text the repeated relative

pronoun *which* was accidentally omitted. Nonetheless, there is no textual evidence in the manuscripts or in the transmission of the text for the accidental omission of a repeated relative pronoun.

The 1840 change from *and* to *that* can be viewed as an attempt to assign the predicate “hath brought us to this great knowledge” to *the faith*—that is, “it is the faith . . . that hath brought us to this great knowledge”. Usage elsewhere in the text, however, argues that it is actually the *whereby*-clause at the end that serves to complete the initial clause “it is the faith”. In the earliest reading (the one with the *and* rather than the *that*), the *whereby*-clause completes the sentence. This kind of construction (namely, an existential *be*-clause completed by a *whereby*-clause) occurs ten times in the Book of Mormon text (here I include the example from Mosiah 5:4, with its earliest reading):

2 Nephi 25:20

there is none other name given under heaven
save it be this Jesus Christ of which I have spoken
whereby man can be saved

2 Nephi 31:21

and **there is** none other way nor name given under heaven
whereby man can be saved in the kingdom of God

Mosiah 3:17

there shall be no other name given nor no other way nor means
whereby salvation can come unto the children of men
only in and through the name of Christ the Lord Omnipotent

Mosiah 4:8 (two occurrences)

and **this is** the means **whereby** salvation cometh
and there is none other salvation save this which hath been spoken of
neither **is there** any conditions **whereby** man can be saved
except the conditions which I have told you

Mosiah 5:4

and **it is** the faith which we have had on the things
which our king hath spoken unto us
and hath brought us to this great knowledge
whereby we do rejoice with such exceeding great joy

Mosiah 5:8 (two occurrences)

and **there is** no other head **whereby** ye can be made free
there is no other name given **whereby** salvation cometh

Alma 38:9

there is no other way nor means **whereby** man can be saved
only in and through Christ

Helaman 5:9

yea remember that **there is** no other way nor means
whereby man can be saved
only through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ which shall come

Most of these existential clauses are negatives; in fact, the negative ones occur only with the existential *there*. The two positive ones do not use the existential *there*: “**this is** the means whereby salvation cometh” (Mosiah 4:8) and “**it is** the faith . . . whereby we do rejoice with such exceeding great joy” (Mosiah 5:4). The use of an existential clause completed by a *whereby*-clause seems to be a characteristic of king Benjamin’s style (since six out of the ten occurrences in the Book of Mormon come from him, counting the one in Mosiah 5:4).

Ultimately, the most reasonable interpretation is that the conjoined predicate “and hath brought us to this great knowledge” refers to *the things*. This predicate does not appear to refer to *our king* since the resulting construction would then end up with two direct objects for the verb *bring*. Two facts argue against interpreting the conjoined predicate as referring to *the faith*: (1) usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon provides no examples of faith bringing knowledge, but there are quite a few passages that refer to either individuals or scriptures bringing knowledge; and (2) the *whereby*-clause at the end of the verse serves to complete the initial existential reference to faith.

In order to facilitate the reading of this passage, the standard text could insert the relative pronoun *which* at the beginning of the conjoined predicate (thus minimally revising the text to read “the things which our king hath spoken unto us and **which** hath brought us to this great knowledge”). The critical text will, on the other hand, maintain the earliest reading: “the things which our king hath spoken unto us **and** hath brought us to this great knowledge”, with the understanding that the conjoined predicate refers to *the things*, not *the faith* or *the king*. Although this is a difficult reading and may be unique to the text, it is not impossible and may therefore represent the original text.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 5:4 the conjoined predicate “**and** hath brought us to this great knowledge” (the earliest reading in the text); this predicate appears to refer to *the things*.

■ Mosiah 5:6

ye have spoken the words

[*which* > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I desired*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the words **which** I desired”, then corrected it to “the words **that** I desired”. His correction was virtually immediate since the level of ink flow is unchanged. At the beginning of this verse, there is an occurrence of “the words which”:

Mosiah 5:6

and now these are the words **which** king Benjamin desired of them

This preceding instance is undoubtedly the source for Oliver initially writing that same phrase later on in the verse. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are 132 occurrences of “the words which” and 4 of “the words that” (2 Nephi 27:24, Mosiah 29:4, Alma 12:2, and Alma 15:7). So “the words that” is possible, although infrequent. For further discussion of the variation between the relative pronouns *which* and *that*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 5:6 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathcal{D} , “the words **that** I desired”.

■ **Mosiah 5:10**

*and now it shall come to pass that
whosoever shall not take upon [them 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | him RT] the name of Christ
must be called by some other name*

Here in Mosiah 5:10 the printer’s manuscript reads *them*; the original manuscript is not extant. There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes had difficulty distinguishing between *them* and *him* (pronounced identically as /əm/ in unstressed contexts) as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. For some examples and discussion, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19. So if *them* is an error here in Mosiah 5:10, it probably occurred as Oliver wrote the text down in the original manuscript.

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended the *them* here in Mosiah 5:10 to *him*. This change seems wholly appropriate given the exclusive use of the third person singular pronoun elsewhere in this passage:

Mosiah 5:9–10 (the earliest text)
and it shall come to pass that
whosoever doeth this shall be found at the right hand of God
for **he** shall know the name by which **he** is called
for **he** shall be called by the name of Christ
and now it shall come to pass that
whosoever shall not take upon **them** the name of Christ
must be called by some other name
therefore **he** findeth **himself** on the left hand of God

Thus consistency would argue here that the *them* is an error for *him*.

Nonetheless, in the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:48, it is pointed out that there is also considerable evidence of switching between singular and plural generic pronouns in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following examples from the original text which do not involve the pronoun forms *him* and *them*:

Alma 12:34–35
therefore **whosoever** repenteth and hardeneth not **his** heart
he shall have claim on mercy through mine only begotten Son
unto a remission of **their** sins
and **these** shall enter into my rest
and **whosoever** will harden **his** heart and will do iniquity
behold I swear in my wrath that
they shall not enter into my rest

Alma 36:3
for I do know that **whomsoever** shall put **his** trust in God
shall be supported in **their** trials and **their** troubles and **their** afflictions

The example from Alma 12:34–35 is particularly significant since it switches from the singular to the plural and then back to the singular, just like the earliest text in Mosiah 5:9–10. It should also be noted that in Mosiah 5:9–10 there is never any switch in the generic number within a given sentence (although this does not hold for the two Alma passages). The critical text will restore the earliest text in Mosiah 5:10 even though there is a distinct possibility that the *them* is a mis-hearing for *him*.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 5:10 the pronoun *them*, the reading of the earliest text (here the printer's manuscript); although it is possible that the *them* is an error for the phonetically identical *him* (in unstressed contexts), the Book of Mormon text does permit switches in number for the generic pronoun.

Mosiah 6

■ Mosiah 6:2

*and it came to pass that there was not one soul
[save >+ except 1 | except ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it were little children
but what had entered into the covenant and had taken upon them the name of Christ*

Here Oliver Cowdery first wrote “save it were” in \mathcal{P} ; then somewhat later, with heavier ink, the word *save* was corrected to *except*. The supralinearly inserted *except* looks somewhat like Oliver’s hand, but it is cramped and awkwardly written. The correction may have been made when \mathcal{P} was proofed against \mathcal{C} .

Elsewhere in the original text, there are 77 occurrences of “save it were” and 14 of “except it were”. Thus either reading is acceptable, which means that there would have been little motivation for editing the text here. It is true that the two preceding instances in the book of Mosiah read “except it were” (in Mosiah 1:4 and Mosiah 3:15), but it is doubtful that these two instances were the source for making the change. A somewhat more likely possibility for the source of the correction in Mosiah 6:2 is the occurrence of the word *except* rather than *save* in a very similar passage near the beginning of king Benjamin’s discourse:

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

Yet it seems rather unlikely that the corrector in Mosiah 6:2 would have hunted back six manuscript pages to recover the *except* in Mosiah 2:34, especially since *save* works perfectly well in Mosiah 6:2. The correction is much like several other corrections found earlier in the book of Mosiah that are awkwardly inserted and with heavier ink flow. These corrections may not have been made by Oliver Cowdery, but they all seem to be the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . (See the discussion regarding the change of *with* to *of* in Mosiah 2:13 and the insertion of *of* in Mosiah 2:32.) Thus the most reasonable assumption here in Mosiah 6:2 is that the correction in the printer’s manuscript represents the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant for any of the book of Mosiah.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 6:2 “except it were”, a later correction in \mathcal{P} that is probably the result of proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

■ Mosiah 6:2

*and it came to pass that there was not one soul
except it were little children
but [what 1ABCDEFGHIJKLOPS | what > who M | N | who QRT] had entered into the covenant
and had taken upon them the name of Christ*

For the third printing of the 1905 LDS missionary edition (in 1907), the relative pronoun *what* in this verse was changed to *who*. This reading has been maintained in subsequent LDS editions. On the other hand, the earlier 1906 LDS large-print edition simply deleted the *what* (giving “there was not one soul . . . but had entered into the covenant”). Despite this editing in Mosiah 6:2, a similar passage that uses *but what* in the same way has been left unedited:

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 original use of *what* in both Mosiah 2:34 and Mosiah 6:2 is clearly intended and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

A related use of *but what* occurs quite often as the head of a sentential complement in negative and nonassertive predicates, ones for which the verb is almost always *know*:

Mosiah 29:7	and who knoweth but what my son . . . should turn to be angry
Alma 24:26	therefore we have no reason to doubt but what they are saved
Alma 37:10	and who knoweth but what they will be the means of . . .
Alma 46:27	and now who knoweth but what the remnant of the seed of Joseph . . .
Alma 58:35	behold we do not know but what ye are unsuccessful
Alma 60:18	for we know not but what ye yourselves are a seeking for authority
Alma 60:18	we know not but what ye are also traitors to your country
3 Nephi 18:32	for ye know not but what they will return and repent

There is also one case of *but that*:

Alma 54:21	we know not but that he hath made us as well as you
------------	--

And there are also several cases where *but* occurs without *what* or *that*:

1 Nephi 17:43	and I know not but they are at this day about to be destroyed
Alma 56:43	behold we know not but they have halted for the purpose that . . .
Ether 1:38	and who knoweth but the Lord will carry us forth into a land . . .

For discussion regarding this last type, see under 1 Nephi 17:43.

Summary: Maintain the original use of *but what* in Mosiah 6:2 since such usage is intended (as exemplified by its earlier, unedited occurrence in Mosiah 2:34).

■ Mosiah 6:3

*when king Benjamin had made an end
of all these [sayings > things 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *sayings* here in Mosiah 6:3; then almost immediately he corrected *sayings* to *things* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript probably read “all these things”. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the use of *things* is more appropriate here than *sayings* since the preceding text refers not only to king Benjamin finishing his speaking to the people (verse 1) but also to his writing down the names of all who had covenanted to keep God’s commandments and taken upon themselves the name of Christ (verses 1–2).

Usually the Book of Mormon text uses a gerundive verb form in the expression “make an end of X” (30 times), where X refers to some means of communicating (prophesying, speaking, teaching, reading, praying, or abridging). When the X is a plural count noun, the plural noun is almost always *sayings* (7 times):

2 Nephi 30:18	I must make an end of my sayings
Mosiah 1:15	after king Benjamin had made an end of these sayings to his son
Mosiah 13:25	after Abinadi had made an end of these sayings
Alma 24:17	when the king had made an end of these sayings
3 Nephi 10:19	therefore for this time I make an end of my sayings
3 Nephi 18:36	when Jesus had made an end of these sayings
3 Nephi 26:12	and now I Mormon make an end of my sayings

In Mosiah 13:25, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *things* in \wp , but then he virtually immediately corrected *things* to *sayings*. Thus there is additional evidence that Oliver tended to mix up *things* and *sayings* in the expression “make an end of X”, although here in Mosiah 6:3 the error was in the opposite direction.

Besides the plural count nouns *things* and *sayings*, we also have the possibility of *words* in the expression “make an end of X”; there is only one example in the text:

Alma 35:1	after Amulek had made an end of these words
-----------	---

As discussed under 2 Nephi 33:4, both *words* and *things* are used to refer to one’s speech. For examples of mix-ups between *words* and *things*, see under 1 Nephi 3:28.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 6:3 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \wp : “when king Benjamin had made an end of all these **things**” (which makes sense given the preceding text); the plural count nouns *sayings*, *words*, and *things* are occasionally mixed up in the textual history, if only momentarily.

■ Mosiah 6:4

*and he began to reign in the thirtieth year of his age
making in the whole **about** four hundred and seventy-six years
from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem*

In this verse we have what appears to be an inappropriate use of the adverb *about* (under the assumption that it means ‘approximately’). For most readers the number 476 is already quite

specific, so the use of *about* seems strange, especially since it is preceded by the phrase “making in the whole”. In other places in the text, “making in the whole” is never used with the word *about*:

Mosiah 29:46

and it came to pass that Mosiah died also
in the thirty and third year of his reign
being sixty and three years old
making in the whole five hundred and nine years
from the time Lehi left Jerusalem

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

One could, I suppose, interpret “about four hundred and seventy-six years” in Mosiah 6:4 as meaning that the numbering is accurate down to the nearest year. In other words, it is not precisely 476 years to the day. Of course, we would normally assume the same lack of preciseness for the two other instances of “making in the whole”, yet they do not use *about*.

As an approximator, *about* is often used in dealing with a person’s age, as in the following two cases from Mormon’s own history:

Mormon 1:2 I being **about** ten years of age

Mormon 1:3 therefore when ye are **about** twenty and four years old

More generally, if the period of time is relatively short, *about* can reasonably occur:

3 Nephi 8:19 for behold they did last for **about** the space of three hours

Mormon 1:12 and peace did remain for the space of **about** four years

Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon shows that the adverb *about* can be used when counting people. In the following examples, the number is definitely specific:

Mosiah 18:16

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

Ether 6:16

and the friends of Jared and his brother were in number
about twenty and two souls

In the first example, one could interpret the *about* as implying that although a specific count was made, it wasn’t checked for accuracy. But it seems doubtful that such an approximation could be intended in the second example.

Of course, in most instances the numbers are definitely general rather than specific, so *about* is perfectly acceptable:

Mosiah 18:35 and they were in number **about** four hundred and fifty souls

Alma 4:5 there was **about** three thousand five hundred souls that . . .

Mosiah 6

Alma 49:24	there were about fifty which were wounded
Alma 62:17	and they were in number about four thousand which . . .
Helaman 5:49	and there were about three hundred souls which . . .
3 Nephi 17:25	and they were in number about two thousand and five hundred souls

Similar usage can be found in the King James Bible—for instance, in Joshua 7:4 (“so there went up thither of the people **about** three thousand men”) and Acts 2:41 (“and that same day there were added *unto them* **about** three thousand souls”). But there are two biblical passages where *about* occurs with a specific number:

Joshua 7:5	and the men of Ai smote of them about thirty and six men
Acts 19:7	and all the men were about twelve

Of course, one could argue that the number 12 may have acted like the English word *dozen*, given the common use of 12 in referring to the 12 tribes of Israel and the 12 apostles. But the number 36 is not a general number; in fact, 36 is used in only one other passage in the biblical text, yet there it refers to a general count of 36,000 beef cattle: “thirty and six thousand beeves” (or similarly) in Numbers 31:38, 44. Thus the example from Joshua 7:5 shows that in the King James text there is at least one example where *about* modifies a specific number.

In the Book of Mormon, the use of *about*, even when the number is quite specific, seems to be intentional rather than an error. The critical text will retain this usage, despite its unusualness for readers.

Summary: The Book of Mormon text allows *about* to modify specific numbers; such usage in Mosiah 6:4, Mosiah 18:16, and Ether 6:16 appears to be intended.

■ Mosiah 6:7

that thereby he might not become

[*burthensome* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *burthensome* > *burdensome* M | *burdensome* NOQRT]

to his people

As discussed under Jacob 2:23, the earliest Book of Mormon text had three occurrences of the archaic *burthen*. These have all been edited to *burden* in the LDS text but not in the RLDS text. Here in Mosiah 6:7 the change from *burthensome* to *burdensome* was first made in the 1906 large-print edition and then in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 missionary edition and the 1907 vest-pocket edition. The critical text will, of course, restore the archaic *burthen* wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 6:7 the archaic form *burthen* (“that thereby he might not become **burthensome** to his people”).

Mosiah 7

■ Mosiah 7:1

*And now it came to pass that
after king Mosiah had had continual peace for the space of three years
he was desirous to know concerning the people
which went up to dwell in the land of Lehi-Nephi or in the city of Lehi-Nephi
for his people had heard nothing from them
from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
therefore they wearied him with their **teasings***

The common modern-day meaning of the verb *tease* is inappropriate here in Mosiah 7:1 since there seems to be no jesting in these teasings. In addition, as pointed out by David Eddington (personal communication, 12 July 2004), one might wonder if the use of the plural here isn't an error for the singular *teasing*.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the earlier meaning of *tease* did not imply jesting, thus the OED definition 'to worry or irritate by persistent action which vexes or annoys' (see definition 2 under the verb *tease*). Further, there is the following citation (found under the verbal noun *teasing*) that shows plural usage with the same basic phraseology as in Mosiah 7:1:

Jonathan Swift (1731)
Sir Robert weary'd by Will Pulteney's teasings.

Summary: Maintain the plural use of *teasings* in Mosiah 7:1; both the meaning and the plural form can be supported from earlier usage in English.

■ Mosiah 7:8

*and it came to pass
when they had been in [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the D] prison two days
they were again brought before the king*

The 1841 British edition accidentally added a *the* before *prison*, as if this prison had already been mentioned. The following LDS edition (1849) removed this intrusive *the*. As expected in English, the text generally refers to someone being "in prison" or being cast "into prison" unless events within a specific prison are being told. So when Alma and Amulek are cast into prison at Ammonihah (Alma 14:18–29), the narrative describes the events that occurred "in **the** prison", similarly for

Nephi and Lehi when they were in the prison at the city of Nephi-Lehi (Helaman 5:21–44, Ether 12:13). And finally, there is a brief reference to getting Shule out of Noah’s prison in Ether 7:18.

Summary: Maintain the use of *prison* without any determiner unless a specific prison is being referred to.

■ **Mosiah 7:13**

ye would not have suffered that

I should have [wore 1ABCDEFGHIJLP | worn HKNOQRST | wore > worn M] these bands

The original Book of Mormon text frequently used the simple past-tense form of the verb for the past participle. Here in Mosiah 7:13 the earliest text read “I should have **wore** these bands” rather than the standard “I should have **worn** these bands”. The standard participial form *worn* was adopted by the RLDS text in 1874; it first entered the LDS text in the 1906 large-print edition. The verb *wear* is rather infrequent in the Book of Mormon text, and there are no other examples in the text of either the simple past tense or the past participle for the verb *wear*. (I exclude from consideration the adjectival use of *worn* in Alma 20:29: “and their skins were **worn** exceedingly”.) For a complete discussion of other verbs that originally took the simple past-tense form for the past participle, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, accept the use of the simple past-tense form *wore* as the past participle for *wear* in Mosiah 7:13; such usage is characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mosiah 7:15**

for behold we are in bondage to the Lamanites and are taxed with a tax

which is [grievous 1 | grievous ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | grievous L] to be borne

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the original text consistently read *grievous* instead of the standard *grievous*.

■ **Mosiah 7:16**

that thereby they might eat and drink and rest themselves

from the [labour > labours 1 | labors ABCDEFGHJKOPRST | labours ILMNQ] of their journey

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *labour*, then changed it to the plural *labours* by inserting an *s* inline at the end of *labour*. This correction was probably almost immediate since the level of ink flow remains unchanged. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have six occurrences of “labors of” but none of “labor of” (including cases where *labors* is conjoined with a following noun); most of these occurrences are found in the phrase “to glut (oneself) upon the labors of someone else” (or its equivalent):

2 Nephi 29:4	the travails and the labors and the pains of the Jews
Mosiah 9:12	that they might glut themselves with the labors of our hands
Alma 30:27	that ye may glut yourselves with the labors of their hands
Alma 30:31	for the sake of glutting in the labors of the people
Alma 30:32	we do not glut ourselves upon the labors of this people
Alma 51:33	which was caused by the labors and heat of the day

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 7:16 the plural *labors* in “the labors of their journey”; Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{P} is nearly immediate and is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 7:18**

and it came to pass that when they had gathered themselves together that he spake unto them in this wise saying . . .

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon we have only “**on** this wise” (eight times). Moreover, there are seven occurrences of “on this wise” in the King James Bible but no occurrences at all of “in this wise”. Manuscript evidence provides examples of mix-ups between the prepositions *in* and *on*:

1 Nephi 22:8 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *on* in \mathcal{P} instead of *in*)
 wherefore it is likened unto the being nursed by the Gentiles
 and being carried [*in* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *on* > *in* 1] their arms
 and upon their shoulders

Alma 56:31 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *in* in \mathcal{P} instead of *on*)
 and we were to march near the city Antiparah
 as if we were going to the city beyond
 [*shore* >% *on* 0 | *in* >% *on* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the borders
 by the seashore

(For another possible example, see under Alma 50:15.) These examples show that the substitution of *in* for *on* is possible; therefore it is also possible that in Mosiah 7:18 the original text read “on this wise”, which would mean that originally the Book of Mormon text was wholly consistent in its use of “on this wise”.

Yet there is some evidence to support the possibility of “in this wise” in Mosiah 7:18. Although the King James Bible has only the archaic “on this wise”, there are examples where *in* is used with *wise*; in the following list, I cite one example for each of three types:

in any wise	12 times	I will not deny thee in any wise (Mark 14:31)
in no wise	11 times	he shall in no wise lose his reward (Matthew 10:42)
in like wise	1 time	I in like wise will tell you (Matthew 21:24)

In fact, there are also 11 occurrences of “in no wise” in the Book of Mormon text (all of which have the spelling *nowise* rather than *no wise* in the current LDS text). The use of “in this wise” is therefore not that difficult, and it conforms with the direction the language has taken ever since the 1300s: the Oxford English Dictionary states that originally in English the preposition *on* was used with *wise*, but that beginning in the 14th century *in* started to be used and that since the 16th century the use of *on* has been archaic (see definition 2a under section II of the noun *wise*).

The online OED cites considerably more examples of “in this wise” than “on this wise”, with the following distribution in the statistics:

	<i>in this wise</i>	<i>on this wise</i>
1300s	18	1
1400s	11	5
1500s	14	9
1600s	2	1
1700s	0	0
1800s	5	2
1900s	1	0

From these statistics it appears that not only “on this wise” but also “in this wise” fell out of common use in the 1600s, but in the 1800s there was some minor rejuvenation of both phrases, perhaps in imitation of the biblical King James style. In today’s English, the preferred phrase is clearly “in this **way**”.

Thus the unique reading “in this wise” in the earliest text for Mosiah 7:18 is acceptable, even though it could represent an error in the early transmission of the text. The critical text will allow for unique readings when they can be supported by usage in the English language.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 7:18 the use of “in this wise”, the reading in all the (extant) textual sources; the reading with *in* is possible, even though elsewhere the text has instances of only “on this wise”; the single use of *in* for this phrase here in Mosiah 7:18 could represent an error.

■ **Mosiah 7:18**

he spake unto them in this wise saying

O [NULL > *ye* 1 | *ye* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *my people*

lift up your heads and be comforted

Here Oliver Cowdery apparently missed the pronoun *ye* when he initially wrote this passage, but then almost immediately he added it (the level of ink flow is unchanged). The more common expression is without the *ye*:

2 Nephi 13:12	O my people they which lead thee cause thee to err
2 Nephi 20:24	O my people that dwellest in Zion / be not afraid of the Assyrian
2 Nephi 25:4	wherefore hearken O my people which are of the house of Israel
Mosiah 2:32	but O my people beware lest there shall arise contentions among you

(It should be noted that the first two of these are from Isaiah quotations.) There is one other occurrence of “O *ye* my people”:

Mosiah 29:5 behold **O ye my people** or my brethren

Oliver’s correction in Mosiah 7:18 is not due to editing since the *ye* is not particularly expected.

Summary: Maintain Oliver Cowdery’s *ye* in Mosiah 7:18, the corrected reading in \mathfrak{D} and most probably the original reading in \mathfrak{C} .

■ Mosiah 7:18

*for behold the time is at hand or is not far distant
when we shall no longer be in subjection to our enemies
notwithstanding our many strugglings which have been in vain
yet I trust there remaineth an **effectual** struggle to be made*

King Limhi is here saying that after his people’s earlier, but unsuccessful, strugglings (or struggles) to escape from the Lamanites, there remains one more struggle to be made—and he believes that this struggle will succeed, unlike their previous ones. The word *effectual* is now unusual in commonly spoken English (although there are some uses in more recent times in the law and in economics, according to the Oxford English Dictionary). The OED explains that earlier the adjective *effectual* had a more general application and could be used to refer to anything ‘that produces its intended effect’ (see definition 1), as in the following citations:

William Caxton (1489)

To bryng the matere to a conclusion effectuell.

Edmund Burke (1794)

We must endeavour to make our complaints rather effectual than loud.

Thus there is no error in the use of *effectual* in Mosiah 7:18, even though the phraseology may seem odd to most modern readers. It is doubtful that the word is an error for the alternative adjective *effective*.

Summary: Maintain the use of the word *effectual* in Mosiah 7:18; its nontechnical use in the noun phrase “an effectual struggle” can be supported from earlier usage in English.

■ Mosiah 7:20

*and again that same God [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brought
our fathers out of the land of Jerusalem
and [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] kept and preserved his people
even until now
and behold it is because of our iniquities and abominations
that [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | NULL > he M | he QRT] **has** brought us into bondage*

For the third printing of the 1905 LDS Chicago edition (in 1907), the pronoun *he* was added to the last clause of this passage. All subsequent LDS editions, from 1911 on, have followed this reading with the *he*. The selection of *he* is consistent with the verb form *has*, which is found in all the (extant) textual sources. The editing here suggests the possibility that *he* might have been accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text.

In the original Book of Mormon text *has* is normally restricted to third person singular subjects. Yet there are a few cases in the original text where *has* clearly took a plural subject; as might be expected, all of these plural uses of *has* have been edited to *have*:

The Words of Mormon 1:4

and I also know that as **many things** as have been prophesied
concerning us down to this day
[*has* >js *have* 1 | *has* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been fulfilled

Mosiah 8:17

but a seer can know of **things**
which [*has* >js *have* 1 | *has* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *are* RT] passed

Alma 57:36

yea and I trust that **the souls of them**
which [*has* 01A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been slain
have entered into the rest of their God

Moroni 8:5

for if I have learned the truth
there [*has* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO | *have* RST] been **disputations** among you
concerning the baptism of your little children

Moroni 10:1

more than **four hundred and twenty years**
[*has* 1A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] passed away
since the sign was given of the coming of Christ

In fact, the original use of the singular *has* in Mosiah 7:20 is not particularly difficult since there already is a preceding singular *it is* in the sentence (“and behold **it is** because of our iniquities and abominations that **has** brought us into bondage”).

What really causes difficulty in this passage is the phrase *because of*; speakers of modern English expect the passage to read “and behold it is our iniquities and abominations that has brought us into bondage”—that is, we would prefer for this sentence to read without the phrase *because of*. Yet the current Book of Mormon text actually has a second example of this usage:

Alma 9:16

for **it is because of** the traditions of their fathers
that causeth them to remain in their state of ignorance

The expected phraseology in English would be “for it is the traditions of their fathers that causeth them to remain in their state of ignorance”. The existence of this second example with *because of* argues that the earliest reading in Mosiah 7:20 is indeed intended and should therefore be accepted as the correct reading.

The addition of *he* into the LDS text has also created an exception in the text. In all other passages discussing people being brought into bondage, where the verb is *bring*, the agent (if identified) is always a human agent, not God. In other words, God himself does not “bring people into bondage”; rather, others do, or people may “bring themselves into bondage” by their own actions:

Mosiah 7:22	and all this he done for the sole purpose of bringing this people into subjection or into bondage
Mosiah 9:10	now it was the cunning and the craftiness of king Laman to bring my people into bondage

Mosiah 7

Mosiah 9:11	they could not overpower them and bring them into bondage
Mosiah 9:12	therefore they were desirous to bring us into bondage
Mosiah 11:21	yea and they shall be brought into bondage
Mosiah 11:23	they shall be brought into bondage
Mosiah 12:2	this generation because of their iniquities shall be brought into bondage
Mosiah 23:23	they were brought into bondage
Mosiah 29:18	and also because of their iniquities they were brought into bondage
Alma 5:5	they were brought into bondage by the hands of the Lamanites
Alma 43:8	and also that he might gain power over the Nephites by bringing them into bondage
Alma 43:29	it was their intention . . . to subject them and bring them into bondage
Alma 44:2	neither do we desire to bring any one to the yoke of bondage
Alma 44:7	yea we will see who shall be brought into bondage
Alma 48:4	for he was determined . . . to overpower the Nephites and to bring them into bondage

The Lord or his prophets, on the other hand, can “bring people **out of** bondage”:

1 Nephi 17:25	wherefore ye know that it must needs be a good thing for them that they should be brought out of bondage
Mosiah 12:34	I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt / out of the house of bondage
Alma 9:22	having been delivered of God . . . by the hand of the Lord . . . having been brought out of bondage time after time

These same restrictions on the use of the specific phrase “bring into bondage” hold in the King James Bible: the Lord never “brings people **into** bondage”, but he can, of course, “bring them **out of** bondage” (note, for instance, that Mosiah 12:34, cited above, is quoting Exodus 20:2). Thus the emended LDS text in Mosiah 7:20 is inconsistent with all other usage in the Book of Mormon and the biblical text. This systematicity in the text supports restoring the original reading in Mosiah 7:20 (“and behold it is because of our iniquities and abominations that has brought us into bondage”); in other words, the people were brought into bondage because of their own evil deeds.

Summary: Restore the earliest reading in Mosiah 7:20: “it is because of our iniquities and abominations that has brought us into bondage”; this construction is supported by the reading in Alma 9:16; the addition of *he* in the LDS text creates an exceptional reading; elsewhere the Book of Mormon text never specifically states that the Lord himself “brings people into bondage”.

■ **Mosiah 7:21**

[*Zenith* >+ *Zeniff* 1 | *Zeniff* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
who was made king over this people

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Zenith*, an English word, in place of *Zeniff*. Later he overwrote the *th* with *ff*; his correction to *Zenith* is with heavier ink flow. This is the third occurrence of the name in the text; all others are spelled *Zeniff* without variation. Oliver’s correction here in \mathfrak{P} could be the result of either editing or proofing \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{O} , no longer extant here.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Zeniff* throughout the text; the initial occurrence of *Zenith* in Mosiah 7:21 was a simple scribal error.

■ **Mosiah 7:23**

and now is [*not this* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *this not* J] *grievous to be borne*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition switched the word order in this passage so that the negative *not* came after the subject *this* rather than before it. Elsewhere there are four examples of the word order “is not this” but none of “is this not”. In fact, one of these examples occurs later in this same verse: “and **is not this** our afflictions great” (Mosiah 7:23). This second instance was left unchanged in the 1888 edition, so the change in the first instance was probably unintended.

Summary: Maintain the word order “is not this” both times in Mosiah 7:23 (and elsewhere in the text); the alternative word order, “is this not”, occurs nowhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 7:23**

and now is not this [*grievous* 1 | *grievous* ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *grievous* L] *to be borne*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:25, the original text consistently read *grievous* instead of the standard *grievous*.

■ **Mosiah 7:23**

[NULL >+ & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *is not this our afflictions great*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in \mathfrak{P} “is not this” without any preceding connector; then somewhat later (probably while proofing \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{O}), he supralinearly inserted an ampersand with heavier ink flow before “is not this”. Since for speakers of modern English the text could work either with or without the *and*, there seems to be little motivation for Oliver to have consciously edited the text here. Still, the Book of Mormon style prefers conjunctive transitions. For instance, no sentence ever begins with “is not this”. Instead, some kind of connector precedes this kind of question:

Jacob 5:48	behold I say is not this the cause
Mosiah 7:23	and now is not this grievous to be borne
Alma 18:2	behold is not this the Great Spirit
Alma 32:35	O then is not this real

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 7:23 Oliver Cowdery’s *and* that he inserted in \mathcal{P} ; this *and* is most probably a correction to the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Mosiah 7:23**

and is not this

our [afflictions >]s affliction 1 | afflictions A | affliction BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] great

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited “this our afflictions” to the singular “this our affliction”. Given the singular *is* as well as the *this*, we expect the singular *affliction*. There is also evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally wrote the plural *afflictions* instead of the correct singular:

- 1 Nephi 17:1 (initial error in \mathcal{P} , corrected immediately)
 - and we did travel and wade through
 - much [affliction 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | afflictions >% affliction 1]
 - in the wilderness
- 1 Nephi 20:10 (initial error in \mathcal{C} , corrected immediately)
 - I have chosen thee in the furnace
 - of [afflictions >% affliction 0 | affliction 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
- Mosiah 9:3 (initial error in \mathcal{P} , corrected nearly immediately)
 - but we were smitten with famine
 - and sore [afflictions > affliction 1 | afflictions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

So it is quite possible that the earliest reading in Mosiah 7:23, “this our afflictions”, is an error for “this our affliction”.

Elsewhere the current LDS text uses singular nouns when immediately preceded by *this* and a possessive pronoun:

this my people	Mosiah 1:10 (plus seven more occurrences)
this my joy	Mormon 2:13
this thy people	Ether 3:3
this our faith	Alma 44:3
this our weakness	Alma 56:19
this our desire	Alma 56:23
this our march	Alma 58:27
this your way of sin	Helaman 9:21
this their great fear	Alma 27:23
this their time of affliction	Alma 55:31
this their great wickedness	Helaman 4:13
this their humility	Helaman 11:11

For most of these cases, the singular noun is expected even if the *this* were not there. In two cases, the singular occurs in the earliest textual sources (“this our weakness” in Alma 56:19 and “this our desire” in Alma 56:23). But in two of the above cases (marked in bold), the earliest text actually reads in the plural:

Alma 55:31 (changed to singular *time* in the 1852 LDS edition)
 but behold the Nephites were not slow to remember the Lord their God
 in this their [*times* 01ABCDEFGHIKPS | *time* FIJLMNOQRT] of affliction

Helaman 9:21 (changed to singular *way* in the 1837 edition)
 do ye know how long the Lord your God will suffer you that
 ye shall go on in this your [*ways* 1A | *way* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of sin

These two examples show that the plural is possible. The critical text will therefore restore the plural “this our afflictions” in Mosiah 7:23.

Summary: Restore the plural *afflictions* in Mosiah 7:23 (“this our afflictions”); two other instances of this type of plural construction can be found in the earliest text.

■ Mosiah 7:23

*now behold **how great reason** have we to mourn*

In the discussion of the title page as well as 1 Nephi 7:11, I noted that the first two occurrences of the biblically styled “how great things” were edited by Joseph Smith to the standard “what great things”, but six later instances of “how great things” were left unchanged. Here in Mosiah 7:23 we have the similar phraseology “how great reason”, which has also been left unchanged. There are two other examples that have also never been edited:

Alma 26:1 behold I say unto you **how great reason** have we to rejoice
 Alma 39:11 behold O my son **how great iniquity** ye brought upon the Zoramites

So there are three more instances of the archaic exclamatory “how great <noun>” that have never been edited.

It should be noted that the expected exclamatory phraseology “what great <noun>” does occur in the earliest text, but not as often:

Mosiah 29:17
 for behold how much iniquity doth one king cause to be committed
 yea and **what great destruction**

Mosiah 29:18
 behold **what great destruction** did come upon them

Summary: Maintain the archaic phraseology “how great <noun>” wherever it is found in the earliest textual sources.

■ Mosiah 7:23

now behold how great reason [have we 1ABCDGHKPS | we have EFIJLMNOQRT] to mourn

The 1849 LDS edition introduced a switch in the word order here in Mosiah 7:23. This change, apparently a typo, has continued in all subsequent LDS editions. We expect (even in modern-day English) the inverted word order in exclamatory statements beginning with a question word like *how*, as in the following sampling from the text:

2 Nephi 31:5	how much more need have we being unholy to be baptized
Alma 26:1	how great reason have we to rejoice
Alma 26:13	how many thousands of our brethren hath he loosed from the pains of hell
3 Nephi 10:4	how oft have I gathered you

But the text also has a couple of exclamatory cases where *how* is followed by the noninverted order rather than the expected inverted one:

Alma 9:8	how soon ye have forgotten the commandments of God
Alma 39:11	how great iniquity ye brought upon the Zoramites

This variability suggests that in each case of this type we should follow the earliest textual sources. Thus in Mosiah 7:23 the original inverted order *have we* should be restored.

Summary: Restore the expected inverted order *have we* in the rhetorical exclamation in Mosiah 7:23 (“how great reason have we to mourn”).

■ Mosiah 7:25

for if this people had not fallen

into [transgression 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | transgressions s]

the Lord would not have suffered that . . .

Since the 1953 edition, the RLDS text has here read *transgressions* rather than the singular *transgression*. This difference is probably a typo since the 1953 edition otherwise set every instance of “fall into transgression” in the singular. In all, there are 15 instances in the original text of “to fall into **transgression**” but none of “to fall into **transgressions**”, as in these two other examples from king Benjamin:

Mosiah 1:13	if this highly favored people of the Lord should fall into transgression
Mosiah 2:40	I pray that ye should awake to a remembrance of the awful situation of those that have fallen into transgression

For further discussion, see under Jarom 1:10 and 3 Nephi 6:5. The critical text will maintain the singular *transgression* in Mosiah 7:25.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 7:25 the singular *transgression* in “if this people had not fallen into transgression”.

■ **Mosiah 7:27**

and it should be the image after which man was created
 [in 1ACFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | to BDE] *the beginning*

The 1837 edition replaced the preposition *in* with *to*, which clearly created a difficult reading. The phrase “to the beginning” appears nowhere else in the text, while there are six other occurrences of “in the beginning”. The 1840 edition restored the correct *in*, but the 1841 and 1849 British editions continued with the impossible *to*. Finally, the 1852 LDS edition restored the correct *in* to the LDS text. What is amazing here is how such a difficult reading continued in the printed editions even when it was clearly a mistake.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 7:27 the preposition *in* that occurs in the phrase “in the beginning”.

■ **Mosiah 7:29**

for behold the Lord [hath >js has 1 | hath AEFIJLMNOQRT | has BCDGHKPS] said . . .

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited *hath* to *has*, but the 1849 LDS edition restored the original *hath* (probably accidentally), with the result that all subsequent LDS editions have had *hath* in this passage. Virtually all other instances of Joseph changing *hath* to *has* have been retained in the text unless the *has* itself was a grammatical error and was later replaced (usually by the plural *have*). The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the reading should be *hath* or *has*. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 7:29 the original *hath*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Mosiah 7:29–31**

for behold the Lord hath said
I will not succor my people in the day of their transgression
but I will hedge up their ways that they prosper not
and their doings shall be as a stumbling block before them

and again he [sayeth >js said 1 | saith ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
if my people shall sow filthiness
they shall reap the chaff thereof in the whirlwind
and the effects thereof is poison

and again he [sayeth >js said 1 | saith ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
if my people shall sow filthiness
they shall reap the east wind
which bringeth immediate destruction

For these three verses, Limhi is quoting the Lord, perhaps according to the words of Abinadi. Note, for instance, the similar language in Abinadi’s warning to the people of king Noah:

Mosiah 12:6–7

and it shall come to pass that
 I will send forth hail among them and it shall smite them
 and they shall also be smitten with the east wind
 and insects shall pester their land also and devour their grain
 and they shall be smitten with a great pestilence

Here in Mosiah 7:29–31, Limhi uses the pronoun *he* for the second and third cases, but the use of *again* as well as the repetition of *my people* shows that the pronoun *he* refers to the Lord (not Abinadi or even Limhi). In the first case, Limhi uses the present perfect (*hath said*), which implies that the Lord said this sometime in the past (perhaps through Abinadi, although not necessarily so). In the second and third cases, the original text has the present-tense use of *saith*. One could interpret these two cases of *saith* as instances of the historical present, which is apparently how Joseph Smith interpreted them when he decided to edit them to *said* for the 1837 edition. In other words, his editing in \mathcal{P} implies that each of the three quotations specifically refers to something the Lord had stated at some precise time in the past. However, this editing of Joseph's was not implemented in the 1837 edition, probably because it was decided to interpret the two present-tense forms of *saith* as referring to eternally true statements from the Lord.

The critical text will here follow the earliest textual reading and does not need to decide between the two possible interpretations. Instead, for both instances here in Mosiah 7:30–31, the original present-tense form *saith* will be maintained. This problem in interpreting present-tense forms is a persistent one in the text. For two similar examples where the present-tense form can be interpreted either as the historical present or as the eternal present, see under 2 Nephi 31:10–11; for more examples, plus a general discussion, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain both cases of the present-tense *saith* in Mosiah 7:30–31.

■ Mosiah 7:30

and the [effects 1ABDEFIJLMNPS | effect CGHKOQRT] thereof is poison

The 1840 edition replaced the plural *effects* with the singular *effect*, in agreement with the following singular verb form *is*. This reading was followed in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 edition. The original plural *effects* was restored in that edition since the printer's manuscript reads in the plural. Joseph Smith did not make that change in his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, so the plural *effects* was left unmarked in \mathcal{P} . The singular *effect* first appeared in the LDS text in the 1907 vest-pocket edition; all subsequent LDS editions have followed the singular reading. Another possibility would have been to change *is* to *are* and to leave *effects* in the plural.

In the current text, there is only the singular *effect*. There is one other passage where an original plural *effects* has been edited to the singular:

Alma 30:16

but behold **it is** the [effects 01A | effect BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of a frenzied mind

In this second case, the original manuscript is extant and reads in the plural, despite the occurrence of the singular subject and verb, *it is*. Note, by the way, that in Alma 30:16 the *is* could not

have been changed to the plural *are* without also changing the subject *it* to *they*. Also note that the RLDS text did not restore the original plural *effects* in Alma 30:16, yet *Ø* itself reads in the plural and was not corrected in *Ø* to *effect*. In any event, this second example argues that the use of “effects is” in Mosiah 7:30 is intended; the critical text will restore *effects* as the original reading.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 7:30 the original use of the plural *effects* in “the **effects** thereof **is** poison”; similarly, Alma 30:16 originally read “**it is** the **effects** of a frenzied mind”.

■ **Mosiah 7:30–31**

*if my people shall [sow 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | show O] filthiness
they shall reap the chaff thereof in the whirlwind . . .*

*if my people shall **sow** filthiness
they shall reap the east wind*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition, perhaps caused by the *sh* in the immediately preceding *shall* that the typesetter would have just set (thus “**shall show**”). Note that the error was not made in the next verse, which reads “shall sow” in all the (extant) textual sources, including the 1907 edition. The typo in verse 30 is, of course, not totally impossible; the people could show (or exhibit) filthiness, although *show* is clearly unexpected in the larger passage that refers to sowing and reaping.

Summary: Maintain the phraseology “if my people shall **sow** filthiness”, which occurs twice in Mosiah 7:30–31.

■ **Mosiah 7:33**

*but if ye will turn to the Lord with full purpose of heart and put your trust in him
and serve him with all diligence of mind*

[& >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *if ye do this
he will—according to his own will and pleasure—deliver you out of bondage*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated what could be considered an intrusive *and* before the second *if*-clause. This second *if*-clause (“if ye do this”) summarizes the content of the first (and rather long) *if*-clause. Given the extra *and*, the first *if*-clause is incomplete and appears fragmented. Nonetheless, there is at least one other example in the text where an initial long *if*-clause is followed by a shorter *if*-clause that restates the first *if*-clause and is at the same time separated from that first *if*-clause by an *and*:

Moroni 7:35

and now my beloved brethren
if this be the case that these things are true which I have spoken unto you
—and God will shew unto you with power and great glory at the last day
that they are true—
and if they are true
hath the day of miracles ceased

In this instance, we have a long intervening parenthetical statement (“and God will shew unto you with power and great glory at the last day that they are true”), which leads to starting over with a summarizing *if*-clause, yet with an intervening *and*, just like originally in Mosiah 7:33. Consequently, we should probably assume that the extra *and*’s in Mosiah 7:33 and Moroni 7:35 are not errors but instead are actually intended.

Summary: Restore the *and* that originally preceded the summarizing *if*-clause in Mosiah 7:33; for a similar example, which has never been edited, see Moroni 7:35.

■ **Mosiah 7:33**

and if ye do this

he will according to his own [word > will 1 | will ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and pleasure*

deliver you out of bondage

The phrase “according to his own word” is fairly expected, thus explaining why Oliver Cowdery accidentally first wrote *word* in \mathcal{P} rather than the visually similar *will*. The phrase “according to his word” shows up 15 times in the original Book of Mormon text, although there are no specific occurrences of “according to his own word”. Here in Mosiah 7:33, Oliver’s correction of *word* to *will* is virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *will*).

Elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text, there are at least six passages containing the phrase “will and pleasure” but none of “word and pleasure”. In fact, five of these occurrences take the specific phraseology “according to his will and pleasure”, although none of these other occurrences have the word *own* (as in “according to his **own** will and pleasure”). In any event, the use of *will* in Mosiah 7:33 is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 7:33 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction of *word* to *will*, undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript.

Mosiah 8

■ Mosiah 8:7

[I >js NULL 1 | I A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **being** *grieved for the afflictions of my people*
I *caused that forty and three of my people should take a journey into the wilderness*

The original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes allowed the subject to be repeated as a pronoun when there was an intervening participial clause, as here in Mosiah 8:7. Similar examples of repetition for which the sentence-initial subject is followed by *being* can be found in the current text:

1 Nephi 18:17

and **my parents being** stricken in years
and having suffered much grief because of their children
they were brought down yea even upon their sickbeds

Alma 18:22

now **Ammon being** wise yet harmless
he saith unto Lamoni . . .

Alma 52:33

and it came to pass that **Jacob being** their leader
being also a Zoramite and having an unconquerable spirit
he led the Lamanites forth to battle with exceeding fury against Moroni

The original text in Mosiah 8:7, with its repeated subject *I*, is clearly possible and will be restored in the critical text.

There are, of course, other possibilities. For instance, when the participial clause is not too long, the subject is frequently not repeated, as in these two nearby examples:

Mosiah 9:2

but **he being** an austere and a bloodthirsty man
commanded that I should be slain

Mosiah 9:3

and yet **I being** overzealous to inherit the land of our fathers
collected as many as were desirous to go up to possess the land

On the other hand, there can be a connective *wherefore* or *therefore* before the repeated subject, as in these two nearby examples:

Omni 1:28

and **their leader being** a strong and a mighty man and a stiff-necked man
wherefore he caused a contention among them

Mosiah 19:4

and **he being** a strong man and an enemy to the king
therefore he drew his sword

Thus variation is possible—and one of the possibilities is to pronominally repeat the subject without any connective *wherefore* or *therefore*.

Summary: Restore the repeated subject *I* in Mosiah 8:7; pronominal repetition of the subject without any connective sometimes occurs after an intervening participial clause.

■ **Mosiah 8:8**

having discovered a land which was covered with bones of men and of beasts
 [.&C. 1|&c. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ|etc. JPS| RT]
and was also covered with ruins of buildings of every kind

The 1920 LDS edition removed the original *etc.* from the text here, probably because the reader expects only the bones of men and of beasts to be the result of warfare. Theoretically, there could have also been the bones of other vertebrates (such as birds, reptiles, and fish). Perhaps the original use of *etc.* implies that king Limhi’s search party simply noticed that there were all sorts of bones, both human bones (“bones of men”) and nonhuman bones (“bones . . . of beasts etc.”). Another possibility, as noted by David Calabro (personal communication), is that the *etc.* refers to other objects that would have been found on the Jaredite battlefields, such as the breastplates and rusted sword blades mentioned nearby in verses 10–11. The critical text will restore the original *etc.* here in Mosiah 8:8 since it was clearly intended.

Summary: Restore the original *etc.* in Mosiah 8:8 since its use here is obviously intended.

■ **Mosiah 8:9**

and for a testimony that the things
that they [had > have 1|have ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|had RT] said
[were > is >js are 1|is A|are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] true
*they **have** brought twenty-four plates which **are** filled with engravings*

Oliver Cowdery initially copied this passage into \mathcal{P} so that the first two verbs were in the past tense (“the things that they **had** said **were** true”). Almost immediately he corrected these verbs to the present tense: “the things that they **have** said **is** true”. The two supralinearly inserted present-tense verb forms were written without any change in the level of ink flow. The use of the present-tense perfect *have* in “they **have** said” agrees with the usage in the following main clause (“they **have** brought twenty-four plates”). Similarly, the present-tense *is* (in “the things . . . **is** true”) agrees in tense with the *are* in the last clause (“which **are** filled with engravings”). The present-tense usage is clearly appropriate since king Limhi is referring to the search party that returned “not many days before the coming of Ammon” (Mosiah 21:26).

Of course, the singular *is* in Mosiah 8:9 is nonstandard and was grammatically edited to *are* for the 1837 edition. Notice that Oliver Cowdery’s original past-tense *were* was in the plural, so if

he had simply been editing the text from the past tense to the present tense, he probably would have written *are* (“the things that they have said **are** true”). The fact that he corrected *were* to *is* rather than to *are* is strong evidence that the original manuscript read *is* instead of *are*—and that it was indeed in the present tense. For further discussion of nonstandard cases of subject-verb agreement in the text, see under 1 Nephi 4:4; also see the complete listing under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3. The critical text will restore all such cases of subject-verb disagreement whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

The 1920 LDS edition restored Oliver Cowdery’s initial use of the past-tense perfect *had* in one of the two cases, thus creating an odd mix of the present and past tenses: “the things that they **had** said **are** true”. But this change appears to be a typo since it is not marked in the 1911 Book of Mormon used by the 1920 committee for indicating textual changes to be made in the 1920 edition. The textual changes in the 1920 edition that are not marked in the committee copy are often typos. (For a complete list and analysis, see the discussion regarding the 1920 LDS edition in volume 3.)

Summary: Maintain the original present-tense verb forms in Mosiah 8:9: “and for a testimony that the things that they **have** said **is** true they **have** brought twenty-four plates which **are** filled with engravings”; the nonstandard use of the singular *is* is apparently the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ Mosiah 8:11–12

*and there is no one [NULL > in the land 1 | in the land ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that is able to interpret the language or the engravings that are on the plates
therefore I said unto thee
canst thou translate
and I say unto thee again
knowest thou of any one that can translate*

Oliver Cowdery’s supralinear insertion “in the land” appears to be virtually immediate (there is no change in the quill or the level of ink flow). One could view this insertion as the result of editing since Limhi immediately afterwards asks whether Ammon or anyone he knows can translate these plates—that is, Limhi’s statement that “there is no one that is able to interpret the language or the engravings” (as initially written) is immediately contradicted by his subsequent questions (“canst thou translate . . . knowest thou of any one that can translate”). However, if Limhi already knows that no one in his own land can translate these records (he presumably tried to find someone), then some kind of postmodification like “in the land” is expected here in Mosiah 8:11. Thus the inserted phrase “in the land” could theoretically be due to editing. On the other hand, the immediacy of the correction in \mathfrak{D} argues that \mathfrak{C} itself read “in the land”.

It should also be noted that in English we actually expect something more like “in **this** land” rather than the less specific “in **the** land”. Yet the Book of Mormon text frequently uses “in **the** land” where modern readers might expect “in **this** land” or “in **that** land”, as in these additional examples from the book of Mosiah:

Mosiah 10:18

yea and we have suffered this many years **in the land**

Mosiah 21:33

king Limhi and many of his people was desirous to be baptized
but there was none **in the land** that had authority from God

Mosiah 25:7

and now when Mosiah had made an end of reading the records
his people which tarried **in the land** was struck with wonder and amazement

If Oliver Cowdery had decided to edit this passage in Mosiah 8:11, chances are he would have inserted “in **this** land” rather than “in **the** land”. Of course, the expected “in **this** land” and “in **that** land” do occur in the Book of Mormon, as in the following examples:

Mosiah 29:32

and now I desire that this unequality should be no more **in this land**

Alma 20:1

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

But more often, the Book of Mormon text simply reads “in **the** land”.

Summary: Maintain the phrase “in the land” in Mosiah 8:11, Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in the printer’s manuscript and most probably the reading of the original manuscript.

■ Mosiah 8:12

*for I am [desireable > desireous 1 | desirous ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that these records should be translated into our language*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *desireable* in \mathfrak{P} , then virtually immediately corrected it to *desireous* by crossing out the *able* and supralinearly inserting *ous* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The two words are, of course, orthographically similar and subject to confusion during copying. The context definitely supports the reading *desirous* since in English we expect *desirable* to refer to what people desire. Here king Limhi clearly does not intend to say that he himself is desirable. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} , *desirous*, especially given the immediacy of the correction.

Another example of possible confusion between these two words is in 1 Nephi 8:12. There scribe 3 of the original manuscript wrote *desirus* in the phrase “for I knew that it was **desirous** above all other fruit”. For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the *desireous* in \mathfrak{P} to *desireable*, which makes better sense in modern English, although in earlier English *desirous* had the meaning ‘desirable’ (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:12; also see definition 5 under *desirous* in the Oxford English Dictionary).

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 8:12 the contextually appropriate *desirous*, Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in \mathfrak{P} .

■ Mosiah 8:13

*and no man can look in them except he be commanded
lest he should look for **that** he had not ought and he should perish*

One wonders here if the relative pronoun *which* is missing from this passage. We expect something like “lest he should look for **that which** he had not ought”. (Here I ignore the difficulty of the archaic “had not ought”, which Joseph Smith later edited to “ought not”; for discussion of this change, see under OUGHT in volume 3 as well as under 1 Nephi 15:3.)

Elsewhere in the original text, there were 175 occurrences of *that which*. One of these was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition (see the discussion regarding “than **that which** we have been” in Mormon 9:31), so the current text has 174 occurrences of *that which*. Of these instances, 12 occur as the object for the preposition *for*; except for here in Mosiah 8:13, there are no instances of the preposition *for* taking a *that*-initial relative clause as its object. There is one instance of *for that which* where the printer’s manuscript initially lacked the *which*:

3 Nephi 27:32
for they will sell me for silver and for gold
and for that [1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] moth
[§2 NULL > §1 *which* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] doth corrupt
and which thieves can break through and steal

The original scribe here in \mathcal{P} was the unknown scribe 2. Later, Oliver Cowdery proofed this part of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} and restored the *which*, but he inserted it in the wrong place (after the word *moth* rather than before it). Clearly, the text does not intend to say that Christ will be sold “for that moth which doth corrupt” (the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}). Rather, Christ will be sold “for that which moth doth corrupt” (the 1830 reading). This passage in 3 Nephi is based in part on the language of the Sermon on the Mount (quoted in 3 Nephi 13:19):

Matthew 6:19 (King James Bible)
lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth
where moth and rust doth corrupt
and where thieves break through and steal

The important point about the text in 3 Nephi 27:32 is that the original scribe in \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted the relative pronoun *which*. Such an error supports the possibility that in Mosiah 8:13 the scribe of \mathcal{P} (here Oliver Cowdery) could have accidentally omitted the *which* after *that*.

On the other hand, in support of the reading in Mosiah 8:13 without the *which*, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the King James Bible has a number of examples where *that* occurs instead of the expected *that which*:

Matthew 13:12
but whosoever hath not
from him shall be taken away even **that** he hath

Luke 19:26
and from him that hath not
even **that** he hath shall be taken away from him

2 Corinthians 5:10

that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body
according to **that** he hath done
whether *it be* good or bad

2 Corinthians 8:12

for if there be first a willing mind
it is accepted according to **that** a man hath
and not according to **that** he hath not

There are, of course, examples of the expected *that which* in the King James Bible, such as the following parallel to Matthew 13:12 and Luke 19:26 (both cited above):

Matthew 25:29

but from him that hath not
shall be taken away even **that which** he hath

Calabro also observes that in the following Book of Mormon passage the *that* could be interpreted as equivalent to *that which* rather than the subordinate conjunction *that*:

2 Nephi 31:4

wherefore I would that ye should remember **that** I have spoken unto you
concerning that prophet which the Lord shewed unto me
that should baptize the Lamb of God
which should take away the sin of the world

In other words, Nephi wants his readers to remember what he has spoken, not that he has spoken. Thus there is evidence from the King James Bible as well as from 2 Nephi 31:4 to support the invariant *that* in Mosiah 8:13 (“lest he should look for **that** he had not ought”). The critical text will leave the current reading in Mosiah 8:13 unchanged, despite its difficulty for modern readers.

Paul Huntzinger (personal communication, 12 April 2004) wonders if there isn’t some additional error with respect to the use of the phrase “had not ought” (“ought not” in the current text). Normally, we would expect an infinitive clause after “had not ought” (or “ought not”). In this instance, the verb is ellipted, yet it is recoverable from the preceding text (“lest he should **look for** that which he had not ought”). The infinitival marker *to* is also lacking in the ellipsis; a more expected reading here would be “lest he should look for that which he had not ought **to**”. Virtually every other example in the text of *ought* is followed by an infinitive clause headed by *to*, but there is one exception:

1 Nephi 15:3 (original reading; *had ought* was later edited to *ought*)

therefore they did not look unto the Lord as they had ought

This second passage provides another example of ellipsis where the verb is recoverable from the preceding text (“they did not **look unto** the Lord as they had ought”). And once more, there is no *to* following the clause-final *ought*, which shows that the original reading in Mosiah 8:13 without a *to* following “had not ought” is perfectly acceptable whenever the infinitive clause is ellipted.

Summary: Retain the reading in Mosiah 8:13 that lacks the relative pronoun after *that* (“lest he should look for **that** he had not ought”); such usage can be found in the King James Bible as well as in 2 Nephi 31:4 (under one interpretation of the text); in addition, there is no need to add an infinitival *to* after the modal verb *ought* in Mosiah 8:13 (or in 1 Nephi 15:3).

■ **Mosiah 8:16–17**

*and a gift which is greater can no man have
except he should possess the power of **God***

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| □ NULL | 1* |
| □ <i>which no man can
yet a man may have great power
given him from God</i> | 1 ^c ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |

but a seer can know of things which has passed

Here we have a long omission due to Oliver Cowdery’s eye skipping down a whole line of \mathcal{O} as he was copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} ; the skip goes from the first *God* to the second one. The insertion is so long that in \mathcal{P} the last part of the correction (“given him from God”) was supralinearly inserted above the preceding line of \mathcal{P} (see lines 29–30 on page 131 of \mathcal{P}). The correction was written with a duller quill and with heavier ink flow, which implies that the correction was made later, most probably when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

David Calabro (personal communication) wonders if this supralinear insertion in \mathcal{P} might not be due to editing on the part of Oliver Cowdery; perhaps Oliver was concerned about the implication that a man might possess the full power of God, so he decided to emend the text by adding these words. Yet we find no other place in the manuscripts where Oliver ever made a doctrinally significant emendation to the text, nor any one that is as long as this one. Whenever Oliver decided to edit the text, his emendation was only a minor revision in the phraseology; and if he added any words, they were always few in number. Consider the following instances where Oliver consciously emended the original manuscript:

- 1 Nephi 3:16
because of the commandment >
because of the commandment **of the Lord**
- 1 Nephi 11:6
because thou believest in the Son of the Most High >
because thou believest in the Son of the Most High **God**
- 1 Nephi 11:36
the great and spacious building was the pride of the world >
the great and spacious building was the pride of the world **and it fell**
- 1 Nephi 12:4
and I saw the earth **that it rent** the rocks >
and I saw the earth **and** the rocks **that they rent**

1 Nephi 19:23

which were in the books of Moses >
 which were **written** in the books of Moses

1 Nephi 20:11

for **how should I** suffer my name to be polluted >
 for **I will not** suffer my name to be polluted

2 Nephi 1:20

but inasmuch as ye will not keep **his** commandments
 ye shall be cut off from **his** presence >
 but inasmuch as ye will not keep **my** commandments
 ye shall be cut off from **my** presence

Jacob 7:1

And now it came to pass that some years had passed away >
 And now it came to pass that **after** some years had passed away

None of these emendations even remotely resemble the long insertion that Oliver produced in the printer's manuscript for Mosiah 8:16. Thus the more reasonable assumption is that the original manuscript for Mosiah 8:16 had the entire line of text and that Oliver accidentally omitted it when he initially copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . In other words, it was Ammon himself who provided this clarification as he explained the role of a seer to king Limhi.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 8:16 the entire line of \mathcal{O} that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted when he initially copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} ; it is highly unlikely that this addition is the result of Oliver's editing of the text.

■ **Mosiah 8:17**

but a seer can know of things

*which [has >js have 1 | has A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | are RT] **past***

and also of things which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to come

The earliest text here in Mosiah 8:17 reads “a seer can know of things which **has past**”. The spelling *past* has occurred in every textual source; even though the original manuscript is not extant here, the word was probably spelled there too as *past*. Nonetheless, this spelling is merely phonetic. The correct spelling should be *passed*, given that it occurs as the past participle for the perfect auxiliary *have*. The earliest form for the auxiliary is the singular *has*, which is nonstandard since the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is the plural *things*. The singular form is undoubtedly intended here. Notice that for the following clause the verb for the relative clause again takes a nonstandard singular form, namely *is* (“and also of things which **is** to come”). Here the use of *has* is unusual for the original text; *hath* would be more expected. But as explained under Mosiah 7:20, there are a few cases in the earliest text where a plural subject took the singular form *has*. As would be expected, here in Mosiah 8:17 Joseph Smith edited the *has* to the standard *have* for the 1837 edition. But he left the spelling *past*, which should have been edited to *passed*.

The 1920 LDS edition removed the contradiction, not by changing the spelling of *past* but by replacing the perfect auxiliary with the plural present-tense form of the *be* verb, namely *are*. This change guaranteed that the LDS text would interpret the spelling *past* as an adjective rather than as the past participle of the verb *pass*.

Usage elsewhere in the text supports the contrast between things which **have passed** and things which **are to come**:

3 Nephi 15:7 (original text)
 and because I said unto you
 that old things **hath passed** away
 I do not destroy that which hath been spoken
 concerning things which **is to come**

Basically, we expect the form *passed* in the perfect (that is, when the finite verb is the auxiliary *have*) and the form *past* when the finite verb is the linking verb *be*.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that the original *has* in Mosiah 8:17 could be an error for *is*:

Mosiah 8:17 (proposed original text)
 but a seer can know of things which **is past**
 and also of things which **is to come**

Calabro notes the increased parallelism resulting from this emendation:

of things which is past
 and also **of things which is** to come

Further, in unstressed position, the *h* of *has* would typically be dropped and the vowels of *has* and *is* would tend to be reduced to a schwa, thus creating a phonetically similar /əz/. In other words, Calabro proposes that Joseph Smith dictated “of things which **is** past” but Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted the /əz/ as *has*.

There are two objections to such a proposal. First, the parallel passage from 3 Nephi 15:7 (cited above) reads in the original text as “old things **hath** passed away”—that is, the helping verb is *have*, not *be*, despite the fact that later in 3 Nephi 15:7 we have “concerning things which **is** to come”. In other words, the only passage that is parallel to Mosiah 8:17 has *have* and *be*, not two cases of *be*. Second, there are no instances in the manuscripts of any of the scribes ever mixing up *has* and *is*, even momentarily. Thus there is no independent support for emending Mosiah 8:17 to read “a seer can know of things which **is** past”.

In most instances, the printed text has correctly distinguished between the two words *passed* and *past*, but there are a few exceptions. All of the problematic cases can be traced back to the manuscripts and probably arose when the scribe for \mathcal{O} originally took down Joseph Smith’s dictation (given that both *passed* and *past* are pronounced identically as /pæst/). In the following analysis, I set out the different cases and indicate how the scribes spelled the two words *passed* and *past*. For the original manuscript, the statistics are always less than the expected number since only 28 percent of \mathcal{O} is extant. I also cite the relevant textual variation for all those cases that involve variation (or potential variation):

(1) the simple past tense for *pass* (20 cases of *passed*)

□ original manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *passed* (2 times)

scribe 3 of \mathfrak{C} *past* (1 time)

□ printer's manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *passed* (15 times)

scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} *passed* (5 times)

1 Nephi 12:5

I saw the vapor of darkness

that it [*past* 0 | *passed* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] from off the face of the earth

[Scribe 3 of \mathfrak{C} misspelled *passed* as *past*.]

(2) the perfective use of the past participle for *pass* (66 cases of *passed*)

□ original manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *passed* (7 times), *past* > *passed* (1 time),

passed (1 time)

□ printer's manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *passed* (40 times), *past* (1 time)

scribe 2 of \mathfrak{P} *passed* (24 times), *past* (1 time)

2 Nephi 20:28

he is **passed** to Migron

[This passage quotes from the King James version of Isaiah 10:28; this is the only place in the Book of Mormon where *passed* takes the archaic *be* as the perfective auxiliary rather than the *have* of modern English (all 65 other examples of the perfective *passed* take the auxiliary verb *have*); here in 2 Nephi 20:28 *passed* is correctly spelled in \mathfrak{P} (by Oliver Cowdery) and in all the printed editions; \mathfrak{C} is not extant.]

Mosiah 8:17

but a seer can know of things which has **past**

[Here the spelling is *past* in all extant sources and was probably spelled *past* in \mathfrak{C} too, no longer extant here.]

Alma 43:35

as the Lamanites had [*past* >% *passed* 0 | *passed* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
the hill Riplah

[Here in \mathfrak{C} , Oliver Cowdery initially spelled *passed* as *past*; then he immediately corrected the spelling to *passed*—that is, *passed*.]

Alma 57:12

not many days had [*passed* 0 | *passed* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] away

[Here in \mathfrak{C} , Oliver Cowdery spelled *passed* as *passed*, with only one *s*, just as he did in Alma 43:35.]

Mormon 9:15

have all these things [*past* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *passed* RT]
of which I have spoken

[This passage is not extant in \mathcal{C} ; the spelling in \mathcal{D} (by scribe 2) and in the 1830 edition is *past*, which implies that this word was probably spelled as *past* in \mathcal{C} too; the spelling was correctly emended to *passed* in the 1920 LDS edition.]

(3) the adjectival *past* (6 cases)

□ original manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *past* (1 time)

□ printer's manuscript

Oliver Cowdery *past* (4 times), *passed* (1 time)

scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} *passed* (1 time)

Helaman 13:38

your days of probation is [*passed* 1 | *past* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[\mathcal{C} is not extant; *past* was spelled as *passed* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{D} but correctly as *past* by the 1830 typesetter.]

Mormon 2:15

the day of grace was [*passed* 1EFIJLMNOQRT | *past* ABCDGHKPS] with them

[\mathcal{C} is not extant; *past* was spelled as *passed* by scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} but correctly as *past* by the 1830 typesetter; the 1849 LDS edition reintroduced the incorrect spelling *passed* into the LDS text.]

In all six cases of the adjectival *past*, the verb is the linking verb *be*. Two cases (listed just above) show variation; the four other cases show no variation in the spelling:

1 Nephi 17:45	but ye were past feeling
3 Nephi 1:5	the time was past for the words to be fulfilled
3 Nephi 1:6	behold the time is past
Moroni 9:20	they are without principle and past feeling

In the first and last cases, the adjectival *past* acts prepositionally in the phrase “past feeling”.

The critical text will follow the basic distinctions as outlined above. As far as Mosiah 8:17 is concerned, *past* should be spelled *passed*; in addition, the original perfect auxiliary *have* should be restored: the plural *have* in the standard text but the singular *has* (the earliest reading) in the critical text. The above analysis also indicates that Mormon 2:15 should be changed in the LDS text to *past* (“the day of grace was **past** with them”) and Mormon 9:15 should be changed in the RLDS text to *passed* (“have all these things **passed** of which I have spoken”). For further discussion of these last two cases, see those passages.

This problem of *past* versus *passed* was first brought to my attention by Paul Thomas (in particular, with regard to the current LDS reading in Mormon 2:15).

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 8:17 the original perfect auxiliary *has* and emend the spelling *past* to *passed* (“a seer can know of things which **has passed**”).

Mosiah 9

■ Mosiah 9:1–2

*I Zeniff **having** been taught in all the language of the Nephites
and **having** had a knowledge of the land of Nephi or of the land of our fathers' first inheritance
and [I >]s NULL 1 | I A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **having** been sent as a spy
among the Lamanites
that I might spy out their forces
that our army might come upon them and destroy them
but when I saw that which was good among them
I was desirous that they should not be destroyed
therefore I contended with my brethren in the wilderness*

Ultimately, this complex sentence never achieves closure. Such incomplete sentences were rather common in the original text, and some of them can be found in the current text (see, for instance, the discussion under Enos 1:3). In addition, this passage in Mosiah originally had two occurrences of “I having”; in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the repeated subject pronoun *I* so that there would only be the initial “I Zeniff having” followed by two instances of “and having”. The repeated “I having” of the original text seems somewhat unusual, especially since elsewhere in the text conjoined participial clauses involving *having* do not typically repeat the subject, as in the following well-known example from the beginning of the Book of Mormon:

1 Nephi 1:1

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

Despite examples like this, there is one long example, again of an incomplete sentence, where a pronominal form of the original subject is repeated once (marked below with an arrow) within a series of many occurrences of the present participle *having*:

Alma 9:19–22 (earliest extant text)

*he would rather suffer that the Lamanites might destroy all this people
which is called the people of Nephi
if it were possible that **they** could fall into sins and transgressions
after **having** had so much light and so much knowledge given unto them
of the Lord their God*

yea after **having** been such a highly favored people of the Lord
 yea after **having** been favored above every other nation kindred tongue or people
 after **having** had all things made known unto them . . .
having been visited by the Spirit of God
having conversed with angels
 and **having** been spoken unto by the voice of the Lord
 and **having** the spirit of prophecy and the spirit of revelation and also many gifts . . .
 yea and after **having** been delivered of God out of the land of Jerusalem
 by the hand of the Lord
having been saved from famine and from sicknesses
 and all manner of diseases of every kind
 → and **they having** been waxed strong in battle
 that they might not be destroyed
having been brought out of bondage time after time
 and **having** been kept and preserved until now . . .

(There is some question here whether the clause marked with the arrow, “they having **been** waxed strong in battle”, is an error for “they having waxed strong in battle”. For discussion, see under Alma 9:22.) This example from the book of Alma shows that the original reading in Mosiah 9:1 is clearly possible.

It is also worth noting that in Mosiah 9:1 the first two participial clauses are more closely associated with each other in that they both describe Zeniff’s knowledge. One could argue that the subject *I* is not repeated at first because both participial clauses refer to Zeniff’s qualifications. The third *having*-clause, however, refers to Zeniff having been sent out as a spy. Since this clause is more germane to the story, it is distinguished from the first two *having*-clauses by repeating the subject *I*. Given this relationship, the removal of the *I* is not necessary. Of course, the removal of the original *I* in Mosiah 9:1 does not correct the fragmented opening to Zeniff’s record. In any event, the critical text will restore the repeated *I* in Mosiah 9:1.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 9:1 the original *I* that occurred at the beginning of the last *having*-clause in this incomplete opening statement from Zeniff’s history.

■ **Mosiah 9:1**

*that I might spy [out 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPQRST | our INO] their forces
 that our army might come upon them and destroy them*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1879 LDS edition (“that I might spy **our their** forces”). Even so, this reading was copied twice into two subsequent LDS editions, the 1906 large-print edition and the 1907 vest-pocket edition. There is only one other occurrence in the text of the verb *spy* and this too has the adverbial *out*: “to spy out in what part of the city the Lamanites did camp with their army” (Alma 62:20). The replacement of *out* with *our* here in Mosiah 9:1 may have been influenced by the use of *our* in the following clause (“that **our** army might come upon them and destroy them”).

Summary: Maintain the original use of the phrasal verb “to spy out” in Mosiah 9:1.

■ Mosiah 9:2

*for father fought against father and brother against brother
until the [greatest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | greater RT] number of our army
was destroyed in the wilderness*

In the 1920 LDS edition, the superlative *greatest* was replaced by the comparative *greater*, giving “the greater number of our army”. Logically, there is no difference between the use of the superlative and the comparative, but in standard English the comparative is preferred since there are only two possibilities for the men in the army: they are either dead or alive.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text allows for either the superlative *greatest* or the comparative *greater* with the word *number*:

Alma 24:28

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

Alma 48:9

and in their weakest fortifications
he did place the **greater** number of men

Alma 57:33

they did in a body run upon our swords
in the which the **greater** number of them were slain

The two occurrences of *greatest* in Alma 24:28 have not been edited to *greater*. Thus the occasional use of the superlative *greatest* number does appear to be intentional, and it will therefore be maintained in Mosiah 9:2 and twice in Alma 24:28. For additional discussion of the competition between the superlative and comparative forms, especially with respect to *elder* versus *eldest* and *younger* versus *youngest*, see under 1 Nephi 16:7.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 9:2 the original phraseology “the **greatest** number of our army”; the Book of Mormon text allows the superlative to be used when comparing only two things.

■ Mosiah 9:2

*for father fought against father and brother against brother
until the greatest number of our army
was [slain > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[destroid 1 | destroyed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in the wilderness*

Here in Mosiah 9:2, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote that “the greatest number of our army was **slain**”. He immediately corrected his error, crossing out the word *slain* and writing the correct *destroyed* (spelled by him as *destroid*) immediately afterwards (that is, inline). As expected, the correction shows no change in the level of ink flow. Oliver’s initial error was probably due to the occurrence of *slain* earlier in the verse (“but he being an austere and a bloodthirsty man commanded that I should be **slain**”).

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text uses *slain* rather than *destroyed* in collocations with the word *number*:

Mosiah 21:17	because of the greatness of their number that had been slain
Alma 3:1	the number of the slain were not numbered
Alma 19:21	because of the number which he had slain of their brethren
Alma 24:26	more than the number which had been slain
Alma 52:40	more than the number of those which had been slain
Alma 56:10	having slain a vast number of our men
Alma 57:33	the greater number of them were slain
Alma 62:17	they were in number about four thousand which had not been slain
Helaman 1:25	the greatness of the number of the Nephites which were slain
Helaman 1:30	among the number which were slain

But with the word *army*, we can have either *destroyed* or *slew* (*slain* in the standard text):

Alma 56:19	they might have perhaps destroyed our little army
Ether 8:6	when they had slew the army of Jared

Thus the use of *destroyed* in Mosiah 9:2 (which has both *number* and *army*) is perfectly acceptable.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 9:2 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , with its use of *destroyed* rather than *slain* (“until the greatest number of our army was destroyed”).

■ Mosiah 9:3

*and yet I being overzealous to inherit the land of our fathers
collected as many as were desirous to go up
to [NULL > possess 1 | possess ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | posses D] the land*

In this part of \mathcal{P} , there are quite a few examples where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote what he expected rather than what the original manuscript actually read. For instance, in verse 2 (discussed above), Oliver first wrote the expected *slain* instead of the correct *destroyed*. Some of these errors were caught before being fully written. As an example, here in verse 3, Oliver started to write “the land of our fathers’ first inheritance”, but he caught his error after writing the extra *first* and crossed it out:

Mosiah 9:3
and yet I being overzealous to inherit
the land of our fathers [*first* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In this instance, Oliver was probably influenced by the preceding language in verse 1: “and having had a knowledge of the land of Nephi or of the land of our **fathers’ first inheritance**”. In verse 3, the proximity of the verb *inherit* probably caused Oliver to expect the fuller expression that ends in “first inheritance”.

A similar example of an inconsequential error due to expected language is found in verse 4:

Mosiah 9:4
 we pitched our tents in the place
 [*called* > *where* 1 | *where* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our brethren were slain

The context implies that the place could be named; and if so, the word *place* would be followed by a passive form of the verb *call*, as in these examples elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 16:34	in the place which was called Nahom
Mosiah 18:4	to a place which was called Mormon
Alma 17:26	to the place of water which was called the waters of Sebus
Alma 47:5	to the place which was called Oneidah
Ether 9:3	to a place which was called Ablom
Ether 15:10	in a place which was called Ogath

In Mosiah 9:4, Oliver started to write the shorter “the place called X” instead of the fuller Book of Mormon expression “the place **which was** called X”. In any event, Oliver caught his error here in \mathcal{D} , crossed out the *called* and supralinearly inserted *where*, and then continued inline with “our brethren were slain”.

These two errors in verses 3–4 were caught before being completed (“the land of our fathers **first**” and “in the place **called**”). But here in verse 3, there is one initial error that is more substantive. In this case, Oliver initially wrote “as many as were desirous to go **up to** the land”, but then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the verb *possess* (the level of ink flow is unchanged, just as with the other corrections here at the beginning of Mosiah 9). The expression “to go **up to** the land” is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon than “to go **up to possess** the land” (15 to 1). In other words, the reading here in Mosiah 9:3 with the verb *possess* is unique (although there is a related example of “to go up to **dwell** in the land” in Mosiah 7:1). In fact, the immediately following predicate in Mosiah 9:3 contains an example of the expected expression: “and started again on our journey into the wilderness to go **up to** the land”. Undoubtedly, the original manuscript had the verb *possess* in the preceding predicate since there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have edited the text by adding the word *possess*.

For two more substantive instances of Oliver Cowdery having difficulty with copying from \mathcal{C} into this part of \mathcal{D} , see the discussion regarding *us* instead of *them* in verse 11 and the phrase “all manner of weapons” in verse 16.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 9:3 Oliver Cowdery’s insertion in \mathcal{D} of the verb *possess* (“to go up to possess the land”).

■ Mosiah 9:3

but we were smitten with famine and sore
 [*afflictions* > *affliction* 1 | *afflictions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially started to write an *s* at the end of *affliction*, with the loop at the top of the *s* just starting, when he suddenly aborted his partially

begun *s* but without either crossing it out or erasing it. This aborted *s* definitely suggests that Oliver initially intended to write the plural *afflictions* in \mathcal{P} , but then he changed his mind in favor of the singular *affliction*. The 1830 typesetter, however, interpreted the partially begun *s* in \mathcal{P} as a bona fide *s*; thus the 1830 edition and all subsequent editions read with the plural *afflictions*. Most probably, the original manuscript (not extant here) read in the singular, yet even that might have been an error since Oliver sometimes failed to add the plural *s* as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation, as in the following example from \mathcal{C} where Oliver initially wrote down the singular instead of the correct plural *afflictions*:

1 Nephi 16:35
 and it came to pass that the daughters of Ishmael did mourn exceedingly
 because of the loss of their father
 and because of their [*affliction* > *afflictions* 0 |
afflictions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in the wilderness

Here in the book of Mosiah there are some other examples of *affliction(s)* conjoined with *famine* or modified by *sore*:

Mosiah 1:17
 and therefore they were smitten with **famine** and **sore afflictions**

Mosiah 7:28
 therefore who wondereth that they are in bondage
 and that they are smitten with **sore afflictions**

Mosiah 12:4
 I will smite this my people with **sore afflictions**
 yea with **famine** and with pestilence

These examples show that except for the one example here in Mosiah 9:3, the book of Mosiah favors the plural *afflictions*. But elsewhere the text favors the singular *affliction* in the immediate context of *sore* or *famine* (providing there is a choice in number):

Alma 53:7
 but he did employ his men in preparing for war . . .
 yea and also delivering their women and their children
 from **famine** and **affliction**

Alma 61:4
 and they have led away the hearts of many people
 which will be the cause of **sore affliction** among us

Alma 62:39
 and thus they had had wars and bloodsheds and **famine** and **affliction**
 for the space of many years

So for the whole text, we get variation for *affliction(s)*. This variation argues that in each case the earliest textual sources should determine the number for *affliction*. Therefore, the critical text will accept the singular *affliction* in Mosiah 9:3. For further discussion regarding the variation in number for *affliction*, see under 1 Nephi 16:35.

Summary: Restore the singular *affliction* in Mosiah 9:3 since the plural *s* was aborted by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathfrak{O} into \mathfrak{P} ; here \mathfrak{O} most probably read in the singular; usage elsewhere in the text allows for variability in the number for *affliction*.

■ **Mosiah 9:4**

*nevertheless after [many days 1 | many days' ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
wandering in the wilderness
we pitched our tents in the place where our brethren were slain*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads “after many days wandering in the wilderness”. The 1830 typesetter interpreted *many days* as a possessive noun phrase and the following *wandering* as a gerund, and thus he added an apostrophe to the end of *many days*. Such a reading is theoretically possible. This kind of gerundive construction does occur in the Book of Mormon text, although rarely for full noun phrases; there is only one clear example in the original text—namely, “all mankind’s becoming carnal” in Mosiah 16:3 (for discussion, see under that passage).

Here in Mosiah 9:4, it seems more natural to treat *many days* as the object of the preposition *after* and the phrase “wandering in the wilderness” as a participial clause that adds additional information, but nonrestrictively. For this interpretation, the apostrophe would be incorrect. Elsewhere the text has four examples of “after many days”; in each of these cases, *many days* is the object of the preposition *after*:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Jacob 5:6 | after many days it began to put forth somewhat a little
young and tender branches |
| Mosiah 18:7 | after many days there were a goodly number gathered together |
| Mosiah 21:2 | after many days the Lamanites began again to be stirred up in anger |
| Alma 16:11 | after many days their dead bodies were heaped up
upon the face of the earth |

In none of these cases is there any following participial clause.

Another possibility would be to interpret *many days* in Mosiah 9:4 as an adverbial noun phrase, which would mean that the *after*-phrase here is equivalent to “after wandering many days in the wilderness”. There is one reading in the text that provides some support for an adverbial interpretation:

Mosiah 22:13
and after being many days in the wilderness
they arrived in the land of Zarahemla

But this example does not follow the word order of Mosiah 9:4 (that is, it does not read “after many days being in the wilderness”).

The most natural interpretation for Mosiah 9:4 is to consider the phrase “wandering in the wilderness” as a participial clause acting nonrestrictively. Under such a reading, the apostrophe should be removed from the end of *many days* since this phrase would be acting as the object of the preposition *after*.

Summary: Remove in Mosiah 9:4 the apostrophe that the 1830 typesetter placed at the end of *many days*; the phrase “wandering in the wilderness” seems most naturally to be a present participial clause that provides additional information about the prepositional object *many days*.

■ **Mosiah 9:4**

*we pitched our tents in the place where our brethren were slain
which was near **to** the land of our fathers*

Normally in the Book of Mormon, the preposition *near* is directly followed by its noun phrase complement—that is, without any additional preposition. For instance, there are three occurrences of “near the land” (Helaman 4:5, Mormon 2:17, and Ether 7:6). But here in Mosiah 9:4 we get “near **to** the land”. Usage elsewhere shows that *near* followed by another preposition is possible, although not overly common:

1 Nephi 4:7

and as I came **near unto** the house of Laban
I beheld a man

1 Nephi 20:16 (quoting Isaiah 48:16)

come ye **near unto** me

2 Nephi 27:25 (quoting Isaiah 29:13, which reads “draw **near me**”)

forasmuch as this people draw **near unto** me with their mouth . . .

Alma 58:13

and we did pitch our tents by the wilderness side
which was **near to** the city

Helaman 5:25

neither durst they come **near unto** them

Helaman 7:10

therefore as Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower
which was in his garden
which tower was also **near unto** the garden gate
which led by the highway

3 Nephi 24:5 (quoting Malachi 3:5, which reads “near **to** you”)

and I will come **near to** you to judgment

Ether 15:8

and Shiz also pitched his tents **near unto** them

Note that the examples in Alma 58:13 and Ether 15:8, like Mosiah 9:4, refer to pitching tents—and the prepositional expression is the same *near to* in Alma 58:13 (but *near unto* in Ether 15:8).

Summary: Accept the use of “near to X” in Mosiah 9:4; usage throughout the text shows that additional prepositions like *to* and *unto* can occur with *near*.

■ Mosiah 9:7

*and he also commanded that
his people should depart out of [that 1PS | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] land
and I and my people went into **the land** that we might possess it*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed *that land* to *the land*, perhaps accidentally. A possible source for this change is the occurrence of *the land* in the next clause. In the context of the verb *depart*, the Book of Mormon text otherwise refers to only “**the** land”; that is, elsewhere we have examples of “depart out of **the** land” (18 times), but never of “depart out of **that** land”. This frequency is statistically consistent with other contexts in the original text: *that land* is occasionally found (8 times), but *the land* is highly frequent (over a thousand times). In fact, for one of these other cases of *that land*, the 1830 typesetter made the same error of replacing *that land* with *the land*:

Alma 57:29

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

Note that in this second instance Oliver Cowdery himself initially wrote “to **the** land” in Ø, but then he caught his error and corrected the text to read “to **that** land”. Also note that in Mosiah 9:7, but not in Alma 57:29, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *that* of the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 9:7 *that land*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“and he also commanded that his people should depart out of that land”).

■ Mosiah 9:10

*now it was the cunning and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | O] craftiness of king Laman
to bring my people into bondage
that he yielded up the land that we might possess it*

Here the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally omitted the repeated definite article *the* from the conjoined noun phrase “the cunning and **the** craftiness of king Laman”. This edition was not used as a copy-text for any subsequent edition; thus the correct reading has been maintained in the LDS text. Of course, this tendency to omit the repeated determiner is common in the history of the text. For a list of examples, see the discussion in volume 3 under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION.

There are two other instances of conjoined *cunning* and *craftiness* in the text, both of which refer to king Laman:

Mosiah 7:21

therefore being deceived by **the cunning and craftiness** of king Laman

Mosiah 10:18

for this very cause hath king Laman
by **his cunning and lying craftiness** and his fair promises
hath deceived me

In these two instances, the determiner (either *the* or *his*) is not repeated for the second conjunct *craftiness*, although in Mosiah 10:18 the *his* is repeated for a third conjunct (“and **his** fair promises”). But Mosiah 9:10 shows that in the original text the determiner can be repeated when *cunning* and *craftiness* are conjoined. Since variation is possible, we follow the earliest textual sources for each instance of this conjunctive noun phrase.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in Mosiah 9:10: “the cunning and **the** craftiness of king Laman”.

■ **Mosiah 9:11**

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

In copying this passage from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and they could not overpower **us**”. He was undoubtedly influenced by the preceding use in this passage of the first person (“after **we** had dwelt in the land” and “lest by any means **my** people should wax strong”). Almost immediately Oliver caught his error here, crossed out the *us*, and supralinearly inserted *them* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Undoubtedly, the original manuscript here read *them*, not *us*. Moreover, the following conjoined predicate also uses the third person pronoun *them* (“and bring **them** into bondage”). A similar kind of confusion in pronoun usage is found later on in this same book:

Mosiah 19:7

and now the king cried out in the anguish of his soul saying
Gideon spare **me** for the Lamanites are upon **us**
and they will destroy [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *them* > *us* M | *us* NOQRT]
yea they will destroy **my people**

Once more, the original text uses the third person pronoun *them* for “my people”, not the *us* that one might expect given the preceding use of the first person (“spare **me** for the Lamanites are upon **us**”). In this instance, the change to *us* was made in the 1906 LDS edition, and this *us* has been retained in the LDS text. For discussion, see under Mosiah 19:7.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 9:11 the third person pronoun *them* that is used to refer to “my people”; a similar example occurs in Mosiah 19:7.

■ **Mosiah 9:14**

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

The preposition *of* in the phrase “to take of their flocks” is difficult for modern readers, which may explain why the *of* was changed to *off* in the 1837 edition. Another possible change would

have been to simply delete the *of*: “and began to slay them and to take their flocks”. (For an example of where the *of* was deleted, see under Mosiah 21:21.) Yet the use of *of* here in Mosiah 9:14 is correct. Originally in English, the preposition *of* and the adverb *off* were the same word; its meaning was essentially the same as the modern word *from*. Here in Mosiah 9:14, the *of* implies a partitive sense: not all their flocks were taken, only some of them. Of course, the verb *began* implies the same partitive sense.

The 1837 reading “to take **off** their flocks” does seem rather odd, which suggests that the 1837 change to *off* may have been accidental (it was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript). Even if we interpret *take off* as meaning ‘to remove’, the language still seems strange. Elsewhere, the text has examples of “to take **off** X” with the meaning ‘to remove X’, but in these other cases the phrasal verb *take off* refers to removing something from off a person:

2 Nephi 9:44	I take off my garments and I shake them before you
Alma 30:56	the curse was not taken off of Korihor
Alma 44:12	he also smote Zerahemnah that he took off his scalp

On the other hand, there are quite a few examples of “to take **of** X”. All of these have a partitive sense and thus agree in this respect with the original reading of Mosiah 9:14:

1 Nephi 16:7	also my brethren took of the daughters of Ishmael to wife
Jacob 5:20	take of the fruit thereof
Jacob 5:52	let us take of the branches of these which I have planted in the nithermost parts of my vineyard
Jacob 5:54	I will take of the branches of this tree
Jacob 5:56	they also took of the natural trees which had become wild
Mosiah 2:3	they also took of the firstlings of their flocks
Mosiah 23:1	they gathered together their flocks and took of their grain and departed into the wilderness
Alma 42:3	lest he should put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life
Alma 55:8	we have took of their wine
Alma 55:11	let us take of the wine
Alma 55:13	they did take of the wine freely
Alma 55:13	they took of it more freely
3 Nephi 18:3	he took of the bread and brake and blessed it
3 Nephi 18:8	that they should take of the wine of the cup and drink of it

Thus the evidence is overwhelming that the original *of* is the correct reading in Mosiah 9:14. Based on the reading in \mathcal{P} , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the preposition *of* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Restore the original partitive preposition *of* in Mosiah 9:14: “and began to slay them and to take **of** their flocks”.

■ Mosiah 9:16

and it came to pass that I did arm them with bows . . .

and with all manner of weapons

[*of war > which 1 | which ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *we could invent*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in \mathcal{D} “with all manner of weapons **of war**”, probably because he expected *weapons of war* rather than *weapons* alone. Oliver corrected his error by crossing out the prepositional phrase *of war* and supralinearly inserting *which*. There is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction. As noted in the discussion under Mosiah 9:3, in this part of the printer’s manuscript, Oliver frequently wrote (at least initially) what he expected rather than what his copy-text (the original manuscript) read.

Elsewhere the text has 46 occurrences of “weapons of war” but only 4 instances where *weapons* occurs without any prepositional postmodification. In a nearby passage, we have instances of both cases:

Mosiah 10:1

and I caused that there should be **weapons of war** made of every kind
that thereby I might have **weapons** for my people

In Mosiah 9:16, the original manuscript undoubtedly read simply as “all manner of weapons”—that is, without the expected *of war*. There would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have crossed out *of war* except that the original manuscript read without it. This specific reading without *of war* (that is, “all manner of weapons”) is unique to the text and differs from six occurrences of “all manner of weapons **of war**” elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 9:16 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} which lacks the normally expected prepositional postmodifier *of war*: “and with all manner of weapons which we could invent”).

■ Mosiah 9:19

and I myself with mine own hands did help

[1PS | *to ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT*] *bury their dead*

In English, the phrase “help (to) do something” can occur with or without the infinitival marker *to*. Here in Mosiah 9:19, the 1830 typesetter added the *to* before *bury*, but this was unnecessary since the reading “did help bury” is perfectly fine—in fact, this reading is much more natural in modern English than the current reading “did help to bury”, especially if the archaic use of the *do* verb is removed (compare “I helped bury him” with “I helped **to** bury him”). In accord with the reading in \mathcal{D} , the RLDS text has restored the original reading (from the 1908 edition on).

There is one other place in the Book of Mormon text where the verb *help* is followed by an infinitive clause; for this particular example, there is a series of conjoined infinitive clauses:

Ether 8:16

and they were kept up by the power of the devil
to administer these oaths unto the people to keep them in darkness
to **help** such as sought power **to** gain power
and **to** murder and **to** plunder and **to** lie
and **to** commit all manner of wickedness and whoredoms

Also in this example, the infinitival subject is explicitly stated (“such as sought power”), which helps facilitate the use of the infinitival *to*. In the King James Bible, we have two examples of *help* followed by an infinitive clause, and in both cases the infinitival *to* is there:

Deuteronomy 22:4 thou shalt surely **help** him **to** lift *them* up again
2 Chronicles 20:23 every one **helped to** destroy another

One could argue from these few examples that the original text for Mosiah 9:19 read “did help **to** bury their dead” and that the infinitival *to* was accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text. But the earliest reading without the *to* is perfectly fine; moreover, one opposing example with *to* (in Ether 8:16) is insufficient to emend the other example for which the *to* is lacking. The critical text will accept the earliest extant reading in Mosiah 9:19 as the original reading.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 9:19 the earliest reading, the one without the infinitival marker *to* (“and I myself with mine own hands did help bury their dead”).

Mosiah 10

■ Mosiah 10:2

*and I [sat 1 | set ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] guards round about the land
that the Lamanites might not come upon us again unawares and destroy us*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:1, the original text sometimes uses the verb *sit* transitively. Here in the printer's manuscript, we have the past-tense *sat* instead of the standard *set*. The 1830 typesetter replaced the original *sat* with *set*. The critical text will restore the nonstandard uses, providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion of the variation between the verbs *sit* and *set*, see SIT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard past-tense form *sat* in Mosiah 10:2.

■ Mosiah 10:4

*and I did cause
[the > that 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the men should till the ground*

Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the subordinate conjunction *that* here in Mosiah 10:4, but he immediately corrected the *the* that he first wrote by overwriting the *e* with *a* and then continuing inline by writing the final *t* for the word *that*. Perhaps he expected the text to read “and I did cause the men that they should till the ground”. Either reading is possible in the Book of Mormon text, as explained under 1 Nephi 17:46. The critical text will continue with the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 10:4 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “and I did cause **that** the men should till the ground”.

■ 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*

It appears that this passage contains a dittography of *and work*. We do not have the original manuscript for any part of Mosiah, so we cannot even use spacing considerations between extant fragments to argue for the accidental repetition of *and work*. But a strikingly parallel passage in the book of Helaman argues that the additional *and work* in Mosiah 10:5 is probably an error:

Helaman 6:13

behold their women did toil and spin
and did make all manner of cloth of fine-twined linen
and cloth of every kind to clothe their nakedness

In Mosiah 10:5, Oliver Cowdery probably miscopied the original manuscript by accidentally repeating *and work*. Elsewhere in the printer’s manuscript, there is evidence of dittographies for which the repetition includes an initial *and* followed by one or two other words. In each of the following examples from the printer’s manuscript, Oliver caught his dittography as he was copying the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 11:7 (line 12, page 16 of \mathcal{P})

<& behold> & behold this thing shall be given unto thee

1 Nephi 13:14 (line 17, page 20 of \mathcal{P})

& I beheld <& I beheld> the wrath of God

Mosiah 19:2 (line 36, page 146 of \mathcal{P})

& there began <& there began> to be a division

In three other passages, there appear to be similar instances of dittography that were not caught (in each case the proposed dittography is set in bold):

2 Nephi 28:23

yea they are grasped with death and hell and **death and hell and** the devil

Helaman 1:29

and thus he did **and he did** head them

Ether 2:13

and they dwelt in tents **and dwelt in tents** upon the seashore

See each of these three passages for discussion.

The first occurrence of *and work* in Mosiah 10:5 definitely seems strange. First of all, it basically repeats the meaning of the preceding verb *toil* (“and toil and work”), yet nowhere else in the text do we have the two verbs *toil* and *work* used together in such a redundant way. Moreover, there are no other examples in the text of people working without some kind of complement to the verb *work* (either nominal, verbal, or adverbial). There are, for instance, references to working “all manner of fine work” (Mosiah 11:10 and Ether 10:23), working “all manner of cloth” (Ether 10:24), and working “all manner of work of exceeding curious workmanship” (Ether 10:27)—besides the example of working “all manner of fine linen / yea and cloth of every kind” (here in Mosiah 10:5). Internal evidence therefore suggests that the repeated *and work* in Mosiah 10:5 is probably an error and should be deleted.

This proposed conjectural emendation was first recommended in material submitted by me to the LDS Church Scriptures Committee on 2 July 1996. Independently, John A. Tvedtnes has suggested the same emendation; see page 8 of *The Most Correct Book: Insights from a Book of Mormon Scholar* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Cornerstone, 1999).

Summary: Remove the probable dittography *and work* in Mosiah 10:5, giving “and I did cause that the women should spin and toil and work all manner of fine linen”; such a reading is consistent with the reading in Helaman 6:13.

■ **Mosiah 10:6**

and he began to stir his people up

in [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a HK] rebellion against my people

The 1874 RLDS edition added the indefinite article *a* here before *rebellion*, although the preferred expression in modern English is without the *a* (“in rebellion”). This intrusive *a* here in Mosiah 10:6 was probably unintentional; it was removed from the RLDS text in the 1908 edition. There is one other example of *rebellion* occurring with “to stir up”; here the preposition is *to* rather than *in*, and in this case the indefinite article *a* is found in the earliest text:

Mosiah 18:33

and now the king saith that

Alma was a stirring up the people

to [*a* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] rebellion against him

The 1837 edition removed the *a* from this expression, thus creating “to rebellion”, which is parallel to the phrase “in rebellion”. For discussion of this other example, see under Mosiah 18:33.

Elsewhere the earliest text consistently has the phrase “in rebellion”—that is, without any indefinite article. All the other examples are found in the expression “to rise/raise up in rebellion”:

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

Douglas Stringer points out (personal communication, 2 November 2003) a potential problem here in Mosiah 10:6 with the use of the word *rebellion*: the people of Zeniff did not rule over the Lamanites, so it seems strange that the text would refer to the Lamanites as rebelling against the people of Zeniff. But the Oxford English Dictionary gives examples of the verb *rebel* being used by extension and figuratively (under definition 1c of the verb *rebel*) to mean ‘to offer resistance, exhibit opposition, to feel or manifest repugnance’. There are citations beginning with Geoffrey Chaucer (1386) and ending with the following examples in the 1800s:

Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1859)

Amorous adulation, till the maid Rebell’d against it.

John Green (1874)

The temper of the whole people rebelled against so lawless a usurpation.

In other words, Mosiah 10:6 means ‘he began to stir his people up in **opposition** against my people’. Similarly, many of the references in 1 Nephi and 2 Nephi to Laman and Lemuel rebelling against Nephi may be interpreted as these brothers being in opposition to Nephi, as in the 1 Nephi preface: “Nephi’s brethren rebelleth against him”; the use of the verb *rebel* here does not necessarily mean that they were fighting against constituted authority, only that they opposed Nephi.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 10:6 the original phraseology which lacks the indefinite article *a* before *rebellion* (“to stir his people up in rebellion against my people”).

■ Mosiah 10:7

round about the land of [Shemlon 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | Shemlom D]

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally spelled *Shemlon* as *Shemlom*. This error was not continued in the subsequent 1849 LDS edition. This is the first occurrence of the place-name *Shemlon* in the text. All other occurrences of *Shemlon* (five of them) are invariant throughout the textual history.

The error *Shemlom* was probably influenced by preceding occurrences of the place-name *Shilom* (there are seven preceding occurrences of *Shilom*, from Mosiah 7:5 through Mosiah 9:14). David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that many other Book of Mormon names end in *-om*, including three more place-names: *Nahom* (1 Nephi 16:34), *Shimnilom* (Alma 23:12), and *Ablom* (Ether 9:3).

Another possible explanation is that this change of a final *n* to an *m* was due to the influence of the preceding labial *m* within the name *Shemlon* itself. Another name that may have been influenced by such an assimilatory tendency is the name *Shiblon*, which has sometimes been replaced by *Shiblom* in the text. The preceding labial in this case is the stop *b*. We have two explicit instances of this error in the manuscripts, both initially made by Oliver Cowdery and immediately corrected by him (by means of erasure):

Alma 38:5 (initial error in \mathfrak{O})
and now my son [*Shiblom* >% *Shiblon* 0 | *Shiblon* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 49:30 (initial error in \mathfrak{P})
which was declared unto them by Helaman
and [*Shiblon* 0ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Shiblom* >% *Shiblon* 1]

These initial errors in the manuscripts have some bearing on the question of whether this name should read *Shiblon* or *Shiblom* in the book of Ether. For discussion of that issue, see under Ether 1:11–12.

Summary: Maintain *Shemlon*, the consistent manuscript spelling for this place-name.

■ Mosiah 10:7

that I might discover

their [preperations 1 | preparations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | preparation s]

The 1953 RLDS edition here replaced the plural *preparations* with the singular *preparation*, perhaps unintentionally since elsewhere the 1953 edition left unchanged the number for the word *preparation(s)*. In most instances, the earliest text has the plural *preparations*, but in a few instances the earliest text reads in the singular. For the specific phrase “to make preparation(s) for war”, the earliest sources all read in the plural (eight times); see the list under Jarom 1:8. This same plural usage is found in examples where the text reads “to make preparation(s)” without any postmodifying “for war” (nine times):

Alma 51:24	the people of the city of Lehi . . . made preparations
Alma 52:17	Teancum made preparations to make an attackt
Alma 55:33	it was expedient for Moroni to make preparations to attackt
Alma 57:3	we began to make preparations to go against the city of Antiparah
Alma 58:15	they began to make preparations to come out against us to battle
Alma 58:16	they were making preparations to come out against us
Alma 59:5	while Moroni was thus making preparations to go against the Lamanites to battle
Mormon 2:4	we did . . . make preparations to defend ourselves against the Lamanites
Mormon 4:6	the Lamanites did make preparations to come against the city Teancum

Thus with the verb *make* we always get *preparations* (17 times in all). In the remaining cases (when the verb for *preparation(s)* is not *make*), the usage between singular and plural is evenly mixed (with three in the singular and three in the plural):

Mosiah 10:7	that I might discover their preparations
Mosiah 20:8	even all their preparations for war did he discover
Alma 24:5	now when Ammon . . . saw the preparations of the Lamanites to destroy their brethren
Alma 32:6	they were in a preparation to hear the word
Alma 47:7	they had gathered themselves together . . . in preparation to battle
Alma 49:9	the Amalickiahites . . . were exceedingly astonished at their manner of preparation for war

Of course, in the case of Alma 32:6, the singular *preparation* is required since it is preceded by the indefinite article *a*.

In all, there are 23 instances of *preparation(s)* in the text, of which six show textual variation in number: Jarom 1:8, Mosiah 10:7, Alma 24:4, Alma 49:9, Mormon 2:4, and Mormon 4:6. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual evidence in determining whether *preparation* should be in the singular or plural.

Summary: Maintain the plural *preparations* in Mosiah 10:7, the reading of the earliest textual sources (“that I might discover their preparations”).

■ **Mosiah 10:7–8**

*but [I having >js I had 1 | I having A | I had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sent my spies out
 round about the land of Shemlon
 that I might discover their preparations
 that I might guard against them
 that they might not come upon my people and destroy them
 and it came to pass that they came up upon the north of the land of Shilom*

Here the original text has an initial participial clause that is incomplete. The nonfinite verb form *having* was changed to the finite *had* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, thus making the initial clause complete. On the other hand, the similar incomplete participial clause at the beginning of Zeniff’s record has never been edited to make that clause finite:

Mosiah 9:1–2

I Zeniff **having** been taught in all the language of the Nephites
 and **having** had a knowledge of the land of Nephi
 or of the land of our fathers’ first inheritance
 and I **having** been sent as a spy among the Lamanites
 that I might spy out their forces
 that our army might come upon them and destroy them
 but when I saw that which was good among them
 I was desirous that they should not be destroyed
 therefore I contended with my brethren in the wilderness

Removing the participial clause in Mosiah 9:1 would have required changing three occurrences of *having*, while here in Mosiah 10:7 it was necessary to change only a single *having*. In any event, the original Book of Mormon text has examples of incomplete participial clauses. For a third example, see the discussion regarding Alma 9:19–22 under Mosiah 9:1–2.

Summary: Restore the original participial clause in Mosiah 10:7; such usage is fairly common in the text, even when the clause is left incomplete.

■ **Mosiah 10:8**

*and they were girded [about >js NULL 1 | about A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 with a leathern girdle **about** their loins*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the redundant *about* here in Mosiah 10:8, although the redundancy is not particularly offensive. As discussed under Jacob 7:8, the original Book of Mormon text (as well as the King James Bible itself) has a number of examples where the adverb for a phrasal verb occurs twice:

Alma 55:16	and cast in the weapons of war in unto the prisoners
Alma 62:6	which had driven out the freemen out of the land of Zarahemla
3 Nephi 14:4	let me pull out the mote out of thine eye
3 Nephi 14:5	first cast out the beam out of thine own eye
3 Nephi 14:5	to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye

The last three examples quote Matthew 7:4–5, which has the repeated *out* in the King James translation. The editing tendency in the Book of Mormon has been to remove these redundancies (see the discussion under each example); the critical text will restore in each case the repeated adverb.

Summary: Restore the original repeated adverb *about* in Mosiah 10:8: “they were girded **about** with a leathern girdle **about** their loins”.

■ **Mosiah 10:11**

therefore they depended upon

their [NULL > *own* 1 | *own* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *strength*

Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the word *own* here in \mathcal{P} but soon inserted it supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The Book of Mormon text often uses *own* when referring to one’s strength, especially when the verb is *depend* or *boast*:

Mosiah 10:11	they depended upon their own strength
Mosiah 11:19	they did boast in their own strength
Alma 26:11	I do not boast in my own strength
Helaman 4:13	and their boastings in their own strength
Helaman 4:13	they were left in their own strength
Helaman 16:15	and began to depend upon their own strength
Mormon 3:9	they began to boast in their own strength
Mormon 4:8	they did again boast of their own strength

In the case of Mormon 3:9, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} originally wrote the text without the *own*, but then almost immediately he added it supralinearly. Similarly, in Mormon 4:8 the 1830 typesetter seems to have omitted the *own*. There is clearly a tendency to omit the *own*. For additional examples of omitting *own* in other prepositional phrases, see the list under Enos 1:10. Despite this evidence, sometimes there are instances in the earliest text where *own* is not used with *strength* when it could have been, as in these two examples:

Alma 30:17	every man conquered according to his strength
Alma 39:2	thou didst go on unto boasting in thy strength

In each instance, we therefore follow the evidence of the earliest textual sources. Here in Mosiah 10:11, the critical text will accept the reading “they depended upon their **own** strength” since the correction in \mathcal{P} appears to be virtually immediate.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 10:11 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “they depended upon their **own** strength”.

■ **Mosiah 10:12**

they were a wild and ferocious and a bloodthirsty people

It is possible that the original text here read “they were a wild and a ferocious and a bloodthirsty people” —that is, with the indefinite article *a* before each adjective, not before just the first and

last adjectives. An *a* could have been readily lost from before *ferocious* as the scribe took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or as the text was copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Nonetheless, this reading in Mosiah 10:12 may be intended, given that the earliest reading for 1 Nephi 12:23 appears to be “a dark and loathsome and a filthy people” (the corrected reading in \mathcal{O})—that is, we have a second example without the *a* before the middle adjective. For a complete discussion, see under 1 Nephi 12:23. In cases such as these, the critical text will follow the earliest textual evidence.

Summary: As with 1 Nephi 12:23, the critical text will maintain in Mosiah 10:12 the earliest reading, for which the indefinite article is missing before the middle adjective (“a wild and ferocious and a bloodthirsty people”).

■ **Mosiah 10:12–13**

*they were a wild and ferocious and a bloodthirsty people
believing in the tradition of their fathers which is this:*

- (1) *believing **that** they were driven out of the land of Jerusalem
because of the iniquities of their fathers*
- (2) *and **that** they were wronged in the wilderness by their brethren*
- (3) *and they were also wronged while crossing the sea*
- (4) *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

One wonders here if the subordinate conjunction *that* might be missing from this list of traditional Lamanite beliefs—namely, for the third belief in the list (identified as 3 above). In other words, the original text may have read “and **that** they were also wronged while crossing the sea”. Note further that the final belief in the list has the *that*: “and again **that** they were wronged while in the land of their first inheritance” (identified as 4 above).

Typically the Book of Mormon text repeats the *that* in such conjoined clauses, as in the following two examples for which the verb is *believe* (just as in Mosiah 10:12–13):

Alma 31:15

and we believe
that thou art holy
and **that** thou wast a spirit
and **that** thou art a spirit
and **that** thou wilt be a spirit forever

Alma 33:22

and begin to believe in the Son of God
that he will come to redeem his people
and **that** he shall suffer and die to atone for their sins
and **that** he shall rise again from the dead

Such examples suggest that Mosiah 10:12–13 could be emended by placing a *that* before the third belief in the list. Yet there are examples for which not every conjoined clause has the *that*, as in the following two examples where the *that* is missing from the final clause (here I mark each case of the missing *that* with an arrow):

2 Nephi 29:7

know ye not

that I the Lord your God have created all menand **that** I remember they which are upon the isles of the seaand **that** I rule in the heavens above and in the earth beneath

→ and I bring forth my word unto the children of men

Mormon 7:5

know ye that ye must come to the knowledge of your fathers

and repent of all your sins and iniquities

and believe in Jesus Christ

that he is the Son of Godand **that** he was slain by the Jews

→ and by the power of the Father he hath risen again

The list of clauses in Mosiah 10:12–13 has two properties not found with other cases of conjoined *that*-clauses. First, there is the use of *also* in the third clause, the one without the *that*: “and they were **also** wronged while crossing the sea”. It is as if king Zeniff initially intended to list only the first two perceived wrongs (identified as 1 and 2) but then decided to add a third wrong. Then, after adding this third one, Zeniff was motivated to add a fourth wrong to the list, which is identified by the use of *again* before the *that*: “and again **that** they were wronged while in the land of their first inheritance”. The use of both *also* and *again* makes this list different from all other cases of conjoined *that*-clauses (including the others listed above): namely, the conjoined clauses here in Mosiah 10:12–13 are unique not only with respect to the missing *that* before a nonfinal clause but also with respect to the use of *also* and *again*. Since the reading here varies in more than one way from all other examples, the critical text will accept the earliest reading in Mosiah 10:12–13. Even so, we should keep in mind that it is quite possible for an original *that* to have been accidentally lost from the third clause in the list.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 10:12–13 the missing *that* before the third clause in king Zeniff’s list of perceived wrongs (“and they were also wronged while crossing the sea”); both the third and the fourth clauses show other unique elements—namely, the use of *also* and *again*.

■ Mosiah 10:12–13

and they were also wronged while crossing the sea

and again that they were wronged

[NULL > *while* 1 | *while* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in the land*

of [*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *first inheritance*

after they had crossed the sea

Here we have two virtually immediate corrections in \mathcal{P} . Initially, Oliver Cowdery omitted the second *while* in this passage and wrote *the* instead of *their* in the phrase “in the land of **their** first inheritance”. Almost immediately, Oliver inserted the *while* and corrected the *the* to *their*. The first correction is supralinear; for the second, Oliver inserted the *ir* inline between the *the* and the following *first*. For both corrections, there is no change in the level of ink flow.

With respect to the first correction, the *while* is not required; the text could have read “they were wronged in the land of their first inheritance”. Thus it is unlikely that the correction in \mathcal{P} was the result of an attempt to remove a difficult reading. One could claim that the introduction of the *while* was due to the *while* in the preceding clause in verse 12: “and they were also wronged **while** crossing the sea”. But the virtual immediacy of the correction argues for the occurrence of the second *while* in the original manuscript. The correction was simply the result of making sure \mathcal{P} followed the reading in \mathcal{C} .

With respect to the second correction in \mathcal{P} , the *the* before *first inheritance* seems to be wrong. Elsewhere, every instance of *first inheritance* is preceded by a possessive modifier:

1 Nephi 22:12	the lands of their first inheritance
Mosiah 9:1	the land of our fathers ’ first inheritance
Alma 22:28	the place of their fathers ’ first inheritance
Alma 54:12	the land of our first inheritance
Alma 54:13	the lands of our first inheritance
Ether 7:16	the land of their first inheritance

Although the correction in Mosiah 10:13 of *the* to *their* could be due to editing, it seems more reasonable to assume that Oliver was correcting \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{C} , especially since there is no change in the level of ink flow.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 10:13 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “**while** in the land of **their** first inheritance”.

■ **Mosiah 10:14**

*and his brethren [was >- were 1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wroth with him
because they understood not the dealings of the Lord
they [was >- were 1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] also wroth with him upon the waters
because they hardened their hearts against the Lord*

Here in Mosiah 10:14 we have two instances in the printer’s manuscript where Oliver Cowdery later corrected the nonstandard *was* to *were*. The ink flow for both corrections is uneven and weak in some places; perhaps the ink in the quill had started to dry out. Moreover, the writing for each supralinear *were* appears to be cramped. These two corrections are clearly quite different from the two virtually immediate corrections made by Oliver in verse 13 (see the preceding discussion). It is quite possible that these two changes of *was* to *were* were due to editing on Oliver’s part. One motivation for the *were* could have come from the occurrence of the grammatically correct “again they **were** wroth” found twice in the immediately following text:

Mosiah 10:15–16

and again they **were** wroth with him when they had arriven to the promised land
because they said that he had taken the ruling of the people out of their hands
and they sought to kill him
and again they **were** wroth with him
because he departed into the wilderness as the Lord had commanded him
and took the records which were engraven on the plates of brass

In other words, the occurrence of “was wroth” twice in verse 14 could represent the original text. On the other hand, the double occurrence of “was wroth” may simply be due to dialectal overlay, the result of either Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith accidentally replacing an original *were* with *was* during the early transmission of the text.

In sentences of the form “<plural subject> was/were wroth”, the earliest text prefers the plural *were* (nine times), but there are four cases where the nonstandard *was* shows up. Besides the two cases in Mosiah 10:14, we have the following:

- 1 Nephi 4:4 (both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P}^* read *was*)
they [*was* 0 | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] yet wroth
- Helaman 1:7 (\mathcal{P} reads *was*; \mathcal{O} is not extant for the *was*)
but behold Paanchi and that part of the people
that were desirous that he should be their governor
was exceeding wroth

In the second example, the *was* has never been edited to *were*. In this instance, the proximity of the immediately preceding singular *governor* may be the reason for the singular *was*; note that in the preceding relative clause the verb form is *were* (“and that part of the people that **were** desirous that he should be their governor”). David Calabro suggests (personal communication) another possibility for the persistence of the *was* in Helaman 1:7: the *was* refers to Paanchi alone since the conjoined noun phrase (“and that part of the people that were desirous that he should be their governor”) can be considered parenthetical. Note, for instance, that the 1830 typesetter placed commas around this long noun phrase—and these commas have persisted in the standard LDS and RLDS texts:

- Helaman 1:7
but behold Paanchi
[01CG | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and that part of the people that were desirous that he should be their governor
[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
was exceeding wroth

Also note that the pronoun usage in the following sentence of this verse supports treating Paanchi separately from the people that supported him: “therefore **he** was about to flatter away **those people** to rise up in rebellion against their brethren”. See SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3 for a complete discussion of the factors that affect the choice between *was* and *were*.

In the analysis of “they was yet wroth” in 1 Nephi 4:4, the evidence showed that nonstandard cases of subject-verb agreement should be maintained in the critical text whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources. Here in Mosiah 10:14, the original manuscript is not extant, so we cannot be sure whether the text read “was wroth” or “were wroth” in \mathcal{O} . As noted above, Oliver Cowdery’s two corrections of *was* to *were* may have been the result of either proofing or editing. Two questions therefore need to be answered:

- (1) Is there any independent manuscript evidence that Oliver tended to accidentally write *was* instead of *were*?

- (2) Is there any independent manuscript evidence that Oliver tended to grammatically emend nonstandard instances of *was* to *were*?

It turns out that the evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts is fairly conclusive: Oliver frequently wrote *was* accidentally instead of *were*, but nowhere else did he ever edit a nonstandard *was* to *were*. In fact, in a number of cases he accidentally wrote the standard *were*, then corrected it virtually immediately to the nonstandard *was*.

Consider the many cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote an incorrect *was* and then corrected it to the correct *were*. I first list eight cases where the change is restricted to a single manuscript and there is no change at all in the level of ink flow:

- correction in \mathcal{O}

Alma 36:2	they [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> >+ <i>were</i> 1] in bondage
Alma 48:21	they [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] compelled
Alma 48:23	they [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] sorry
Alma 52:31	all of whom [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] fresh

- correction in \mathcal{P} (\mathcal{O} is extant)

Alma 51:19	there [NULL > <i>were</i> 0 <i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] four thousand
Alma 63:12	save it [<i>were</i> 0 <i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] those parts

- correction in \mathcal{P} (\mathcal{O} is not extant)

Alma 17:36	they [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] angry
3 Nephi 7:22	and as many as . . . [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] healed

Next I list four cases where there is an increase in the level of ink flow and the change is limited to a single manuscript:

- correction in \mathcal{O}

Alma 46:4	those people . . . [<i>was</i> >+ <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] also desirous
Alma 50:28	the people of Morionton which [<i>was</i> >+ <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] led
Alma 62:49	neither [<i>was</i> >+ <i>were</i> 0 <i>were</i> 1] they slow

- correction in \mathcal{P} (\mathcal{O} is extant)

Alma 49:24	many of which [<i>were</i> 0 <i>was</i> >+ <i>were</i> 1] very severe
------------	--

In each of these four cases, it should be noted, the level of ink flow is only slightly or somewhat heavier than the original inline text. These corrections appear to have involved a redipping of the quill and were probably done at about the same time as the original writing.

Finally, I list two places in the text where both manuscripts show the same correction of *was* to *were*; these examples provide four more instances of correcting *was* to *were*:

- same correction in both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P}

Alma 43:47	for this cause [<i>was</i> >+ <i>were</i> 0 <i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] the Nephites contending
Alma 46:33	the remainder [<i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 0 <i>was</i> > <i>were</i> 1] delivered up

In the first passage, the ink flow for the correction in \mathcal{O} is somewhat heavier, but in \mathcal{P} the ink flow is unchanged. One could argue that this is a case of editing—that is, Oliver first corrected \mathcal{P} (where the change was virtually immediate); then he redipped his quill and corrected \mathcal{O} to agree with \mathcal{P} . But such a scenario is not supported by the second passage: there both corrections appear to be virtually immediate (the ink flow is unchanged for both corrections), which argues that Oliver could make the same initial error in both manuscripts. It should also be noted that the change in level of ink flow in \mathcal{O} for Alma 43:47 is only somewhat heavier, which once more implies that it was during the original dictation process that Oliver redipped his pen and corrected the *was* to *were*.

All in all, we have a total of 16 instances elsewhere in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *was* in place of the correct *were*. Such evidence strongly supports the hypothesis that the two corrections in Mosiah 10:14 are also the result of Oliver initially writing *was* instead of the correct *were*. For these two cases, Oliver’s corrections occurred later (the ink in the quill had started to dry out); perhaps the corrections were made when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

Besides all of these cases showing Oliver Cowdery’s natural tendency to replace *were* with *was*, there are six cases where Oliver initially wrote a standard *were* but then either immediately or virtually immediately corrected the text to the nonstandard *was*. These six examples rule out any sort of editing of *was* to standard *were*. Editing in the printed editions has removed these cases of nonstandard *was* from the text:

1 Nephi 18:25 (editing in the 1830 edition)

there [*was* 0 | *were* >% *was* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] beasts
in the forests of every kind

Mosiah 25:7 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)

his people which tarried in the land
[*were* > *was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] struck
with wonder and amazement

Alma 29:7 (editing for the 1920 LDS edition)

why should I desire that
I [*were* > *was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *were* RT] an angel

Alma 56:28 (editing for the 1920 LDS edition)

and also there [*were* > *was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *were* RT] sent
two thousand men unto us

Alma 58:17 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)

now Gid and his men
[*was* 0A | *were* > *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
on the right

Helaman 5:44 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)

and Nephi and Lehi
[*were* > *was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the midst of them

In summary, the manuscript evidence overwhelmingly supports the hypothesis that Oliver Cowdery frequently miswrote *was* in place of the correct *were* but that he did not edit nonstandard *was* to *were*. In fact, he sometimes miswrote the standard *were* in place of the nonstandard (but textually correct) *was*. In all of these latter cases, Oliver persistently corrected the *were* to the nonstandard *was* since this was what Joseph Smith had dictated to him (in the case of \mathcal{O}) or since this was what the original manuscript read (in the case of \mathcal{P}). In other words, Oliver consistently attempted to write down the text as he had received it, at least with respect to the question of *was* versus *were*. Consequently, the most probable solution to the question of *was* versus *were* in Mosiah 10:14 is to assume that the two corrections of *was* to *were* represent proofing against \mathcal{O} , not editing. The corrections occurred somewhat later, at a time when the ink in the quill had begun to dry out. Thus the two instances of initial *was* in Mosiah 10:14 can be added to the list of cases where Oliver accidentally miswrote *were* as *was*.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 10:14 the two corrections in \mathcal{P} of nonstandard *was* to *were* (“his brethren **were** wroth . . . they **were** also wroth”); each case of supralinear *were* appears to have been inserted later, probably when Oliver Cowdery proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} .

■ Mosiah 10:14–16

- (1) *and his brethren were **wroth** with him
because they understood not the dealings of the Lord*
- (2) *they were also [wrath > wroth 1 | wroth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with him upon the waters
because they hardened their hearts against the Lord*
- (3) *and again they were [wrath 1 | wroth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with him
when they had arriven to the promised land
because they said that he had taken the ruling of the people out of their hands
and they sought to kill him*
- (4) *and again they were **wroth** with him
because he departed into the wilderness as the Lord had commanded him
and took the records which were engraven on the plates of brass*

Here in this passage, Oliver Cowdery wrote *wrath* for *wroth* two out of four times (numbered as 2 and 3 above). In the first and fourth cases, he wrote the correct *wroth*. In the second case, Oliver caught his error almost immediately and corrected the *a* to an *o* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). The probable source for this error is the lexical competition in standard English between the noun *wrath* and the adjective *wroth*. Nonetheless, the Oxford English Dictionary points out that *wrath* has existed as a variant, although infrequent, of the adjective *wroth* and seems to have developed by association with the noun *wrath*. A number of citations from 1535 through 1862 are found in the OED under the adjective *wrath*, including the following:

William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1590)

for Oberon is passing fell and **wrath**
because that she as her attendant hath
a lovely boy stolen from an Indian king

[*wrath* rhymes with *hath*]

Douay Bible, Genesis 40:2 (1609)

Pharao being **wrath** against them . . . sent them into the prison.

John Milton (1629)

Th'old Dragon under ground . . . **wrath** to see his Kingdom fail.

William Makepeace Thackeray (1860)

Lovel, seldom angry, was violently **wrath** with his brother-in-law.

Thus we have to at least consider the possibility that the occasional use of *wrath* in place of *wroth* in the Book of Mormon text is either original to the text or at least due to dialectal overlay.

In all, the standard Book of Mormon text has 44 occurrences of the noun *wrath* and 24 of the adjective *wroth*. In one other place, we get a mix-up between *wrath* and *wroth*, but in this instance the confusion is in the other direction and is due to a different scribe (the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P}):

3 Nephi 22:8 (quoting Isaiah 54:8)

in a little [*wroth* > *wrath* 1 | *wrath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

I hid my face from thee for a moment

In this instance, the manuscript correction (like that in Mosiah 10:14) simply involves rewriting the vowel. In all other cases, the scribes consistently wrote the *a* vowel for the noun *wrath* and the *o* vowel for the adjective *wroth*. This variation for only three cases of *wroth* and *wrath* suggests that the confusion is probably the result of a momentary problem in lexical retrieval on the part of the individual scribe rather than the result of actual dialectal variation. The manuscript corrections made by Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} are virtually immediate; and the one case of adjectival *wrath* that Oliver missed correcting (numbered above as 3) is probably the result of this lexical confusion rather than the result of a dialectal pronunciation of the adjective *wroth* as *wrath*. The critical text will therefore accept *wroth* for all four instances of the adjective in Mosiah 10:14–16. Similarly, *wrath* will be accepted in 3 Nephi 22:8.

Summary: The two manuscript occurrences of *wrath* in Mosiah 10:14–15 should be interpreted as a simple scribal error for *wroth* based on lexical competition between the noun *wrath* and the adjective *wroth* rather than on actual dialectal variation.

■ Mosiah 10:15

when they had [*ariven* 1 | *arriven* ABDEFIJLMNQ | *arrived* CGHKOPRST]

[*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] the promised land

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the preposition here from *to* to *in*. The critical text will follow the original preposition *to*. The same change was made in 1 Nephi 17:14; see that passage for a complete discussion of this change. Here in Mosiah 10:15, the original past participial form *ariven* was first emended to the standard *arrived* in the 1840 edition. For additional discussion regarding *ariven*, see under 1 Nephi 17:14 as well as under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest text, restore in Mosiah 10:15 the preposition *to* and the past participial form *ariven* (“they had **ariven to** the promised land”).

■ Mosiah 10:17

therefore they have an eternal hatred
 [towards 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | toward D] *the children of Nephi*

Here the 1841 British edition has *toward* rather *towards*, but this occurrence of *toward* did not persist in the text. The critical text will here follow the earliest reading, *towards*. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:22.

■ Mosiah 10:18

for this very cause hath king Laman
by his cunning [NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] lying craftiness
and his fair promises
hath deceived me

The supralinearly inserted ampersand between *cunning* and *lying* appears to be a virtually immediate correction. There is no change in the level of ink flow. Moreover, the *and* seems necessary if *cunning* is to be interpreted as a noun. But even with the *and*, it is possible to interpret *cunning* as an adjective, especially since the possessive pronoun *his* is not repeated before the following *lying* (“his cunning and lying craftiness”). The word *cunning* would definitely be an adjective if the *and* were missing from the original text (“his cunning lying craftiness”). On the other hand, if the *his* were repeated, the interpretation of *cunning* as a noun would be virtually certain (“his cunning and **his** lying craftiness”). Thus the corrected text in \mathcal{P} allows for *cunning* to be either a noun or an adjective, although the fact that the *his* is repeated for the third conjunct (“and his fair promises”) but not for the second does suggest that *cunning* here in Mosiah 10:18 may be an adjective rather than a noun. Of course, the critical text itself does not need to disambiguate the reading here, but for translation purposes the distinction may be necessary.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text is nearly evenly divided in its use of the adjective *cunning* and the noun *cunning*. There are 12 occurrences of the adjective where *cunning* directly modifies a noun, as in 1 Nephi 16:38: “he worketh many things by his **cunning arts**”. On the other hand, there are 11 firm occurrences of the noun *cunning*, of which six are conjoined with other nouns:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Mosiah 7:21 | being deceived by the cunning and craftiness of king Laman |
| Mosiah 9:10 | now it was the cunning and the craftiness of king Laman |
| Alma 10:15 | these lawyers were learned in all the arts and cunning
of the people |
| Alma 20:13 | that they may by their cunning and their lyings deceive us |
| Helaman 3:29 | all the cunning and the snares and the wiles of the devil |
| Helaman 16:21 | by the cunning and the mysterious arts of the evil one |

Note, in particular, that the first two listed here (from the book of Mosiah) refer to king Laman, the same person being referred to here in Mosiah 10:18. And both also conjoin *cunning* with *craftiness*, just like in Mosiah 10:18. Also note that the first one conjoins *cunning* and *craftiness* without any repetition of the determiner *the*. Thus in Mosiah 10:18, the lack of the determiner *his* before *lying craftiness* does not mean that *cunning* cannot be a noun. In fact, the similar instances of *cunning* listed above argue that in Mosiah 10:18 *cunning* should be interpreted as

a noun rather than as an adjective, despite the fact that the determiner *his* is not repeated before *lying craftiness*.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 10:18 the *and* that separates *cunning* from the following noun phrase, *lying craftiness*; here *cunning* is most likely a noun rather than an adjective.

■ **Mosiah 10:18**

for this very cause

[*hath* >]s *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *king Laman*

by his cunning and lying craftiness and his fair promises

[*hath* >]s NULL 1 | *hath* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *deceived me*

The auxiliary verb *hath* is repeated here in Mosiah 10:18. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the second *hath*. (He also grammatically emended the first *hath* to *has*, but this change is irrelevant to the discussion here.) The repetition of the finite verb is helpful since there is a long intervening prepositional phrase between the subject *king Laman* and the main verb *deceive*. If the prepositional phrase were not there, we would naturally expect “for this very cause *hath* king Laman *deceived* me”—that is, without the repeated *hath*. The repetition appears to be intended here, just as it is in the following passage:

Helaman 9:11

and thus [*were also* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | O | *also* QRT] those judges

which were at the garden of Nephi and heard his words

were also gathered together at the burial

In this case the original text repeats both the auxiliary verb *were* and the adverb *also*. The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition removed the entire redundancy by deleting the first occurrence of *were also*. The 1911 LDS edition deleted only the verb *were*, leaving a partially redundant reading with *also* to continue in the LDS text. Of course, the original text here intentionally repeats *were also* because of the long intervening relative clause (“which were at the garden of Nephi and heard his words”). Such repetitions help the reader recover what has been initially stated. The critical text will restore such redundancies as the repeated *hath* in Mosiah 10:18 and the repeated *were also* in Helaman 9:11.

Summary: Restore the redundant *hath* in Mosiah 10:18 (“for this very cause *hath* king Laman by his cunning and lying craftiness and his fair promises **hath** *deceived* me”); a similar redundancy is found in Helaman 9:11.

■ **Mosiah 10:18**

yea and we have suffered [*this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *these* RT] *many years in the land*

The phrase “this many years” is unusual in modern English, although it is not impossible; normally, we expect the plural *these* instead of the singular *this* for the plural *many years*. Here in Mosiah 10:18, the number for the demonstrative modifier was changed in the 1920 LDS edition. Elsewhere, there is one passage that contains two occurrences of the more expected “these many years”:

1 Nephi 17:20–21

and we have wandered in the wilderness for **these** many years . . .
 behold **these** many years we have suffered in the wilderness

But interestingly, there is one more example in the earliest text of “this many years”:

Ether 3:3

and for [*this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *these* RT] many years
 we have been in the wilderness

And once more, the 1920 LDS edition made the change from *this* to *these*. The earliest text is evenly divided in its use of “this many years” and “these many years”.

The phraseology “this many years” can be found earlier in English, as in the following example from the online Oxford English Dictionary (see definition 7 under the noun *stand*):

Richard Flecknoe (1664)

We began before them, and if since they seem to have out-stript us,
 ’tis because our Stage ha’s stood at a stand **this many years**.

In addition, 30 examples of “this many years” can be found on *Literature Online* (available at <lion.chadwyck.com>), with the citations clumping within two time periods: 18 citations from 1605 through 1717 and 12 more from 1815 through 1883. It is clear that there is nothing inappropriate about the use of the phrase “this many years”, despite its conflict in number. The critical text will therefore accept the use of “this many years” in the Book of Mormon text whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 10:18 (as well as in Ether 3:3) the original use of “this many years”, the earliest reading.

■ **Mosiah 10:19**

I did stimulate them to go to battle

with their [mights >% might 1 | might ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *mights*, then immediately erased the plural *s*. In the original text, there are instances in plural contexts of both the singular *might* (7 occurrences) and the plural *mights* (12 occurrences). Except for one example in Jacob 5:72, all the instances of *mights* have been edited in the LDS text to the singular *might*. Here in Mosiah 10:19, we apparently have one of the original singular cases. The original manuscript is not extant here, but Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction (by erasure) in \mathcal{P} implies that \mathcal{O} read in the singular. A similar example showing Oliver’s tendency to write *mights* instead of *might* is found near the end of the book of Alma:

Alma 58:13

and thus we did go forth
 with all our [*might* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT | *mights* >% *might* 1]
 against the Lamanites

In that instance, \mathcal{C} is extant and reads in the singular. Here in Mosiah 10:19, Oliver appears to have made the same kind of initial error in \mathcal{P} . For a complete discussion of *might(s)*, plus a list of all the cases, see under Jacob 1:19.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 10:19 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , the singular *might* (“I did stimulate them to go to battle with their **might**”); Oliver Cowdery’s correction is immediate, which implies that \mathcal{C} also read in the singular.

■ **Mosiah 10:20–21**

*and it came to pass that we did drive them
[again 1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] out of our land . . .
and it came to pass that we returned **again** to our own land
and my people [NULL >+ again 1 | again ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] began to tend their flocks
and to till their ground*

There are three occurrences of *again* in this last part of Mosiah 10. In two cases, there has been a minor tendency to omit the *again*, possibly because there are so many *again*’s in this passage. In verse 20, the 1858 Wright edition accidentally skipped the *again*, but this error was not transmitted into the RLDS text. And in verse 21, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the final *again*, but later he added it. His supralinear *again* is in heavier ink, with the ink more evenly flowing than the inline text; this difference in ink flow suggests that Oliver’s correction was done later, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

One could argue that the manuscript insertion of the final *again* could have been the result of editing since Zeniff’s people had been tending their flocks and tilling their ground earlier (as described in Mosiah 9:14: “my people were watering and feeding their flocks and tilling their lands”). References to “beginning again” are found elsewhere in the text, with 15 occurrences of *began again* (the expected word order in English) and 4 additional occurrences of the more unusual word order, *again began* (the word order in Mosiah 10:21):

1 Nephi 3:31	Laman and Lemuel again began to murmur
Mosiah 10:1	we again began to establish the kingdom
Mosiah 10:1	and we again began to possess the land in peace
Alma 31:1	his heart again began to sicken

Note that two of the examples of *again began* are found in this same chapter of Mosiah. Thus the corrected reading in Mosiah 10:21, with its unusual word order, agrees with Zeniff’s language earlier in the chapter. The most reasonable explanation for the final *again* in Mosiah 10:21 is that this *again* was a part of the original text.

Summary: Maintain the three occurrences of *again* in Mosiah 10:20–21, including the final one (which Oliver Cowdery inserted later, probably when he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C}).

Mosiah 11

■ Mosiah 11:2

and he had many wives and concubines

[1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[& 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*he* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] *did cause his people to commit sin*
and do that which was abominable in the sight of the Lord

Here the 1840 edition dropped the subject pronoun *he*. However, the sentence-initial capitalization of the *and* in that edition (in fact, in all the editions) clearly shows that the 1840 loss of the *he* was an accident. The 1837 edition, which served as the copy-text for the 1840 edition, was set as follows:

Mosiah 11:2 (1837 edition, line for line)

desires of his own heart. And he had many wives
and concubines. And he did cause his people to com-

The compositor for the 1840 edition set the following:

Mosiah 11:2 (1840 edition, line for line)

heart. And he had many wives and concubines. And
did cause his people to commit sin, and do that which was

The *he* dropped out of the 1840 edition because *And* was set at the end of the line, which led the compositor to divert his eye from the text he was setting. When he started the typesetting for the next line, he apparently thought he had just set the *he* at the end of line; thus he ended up omitting the *he*. We may therefore conclude from the accidentals that the omission of the *he* was not due to Joseph Smith's editing. Amazingly, the resulting sentence fragment, with its capitalized *And* and preceding period, has remained in the RLDS text. One would have expected the accidentals to have been adjusted so that the text would have read as follows:

Mosiah 11:2 (the RLDS text, but with revised accidentals)

And he had many wives and **concubines, and** did cause his people
to commit sin, and do that which was abominable in the sight of the Lord.

Of course, the correct text has the subject pronoun *he* (“and he had many wives and concubines and **he** did cause his people to commit sin”).

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 11:2 the subject pronoun *he* (“and **he** did cause his people to commit sin”) which was accidentally lost during the typesetting for the 1840 edition.

■ Mosiah 11:3

and he laid a tax of one fifth part of all they possessed

[1 |; ABCDGHKPS | : EFIJLMNOQ | , RT]

[& > % a 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *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 [a > also 1 | also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a fifth part of all their grain

This list of taxable items was difficult to copy. Oliver Cowdery’s first error was to write an ampersand after “one fifth part of all they possessed”, but then he erased the ampersand, undoubtedly because the original manuscript had no *and* here. This lack of *and* results from the fact that the phrase “a fifth part of their gold” is the first item in a following list. Earlier, in LDS editions from 1849 through 1911, there was a colon after the initial “one fifth part of all they possessed”. The use of a colon clearly shows that the following text contains a list of items that would be taxed at this rate of one fifth. The 1920 LDS edition replaced the colon by a comma, which obscures the difference between the general statement and the following list.

Interestingly, there is a characteristic difference between the general statement and all the items in the list—namely, the use of *one* in the general statement (“**one** fifth part”) but the indefinite article *a* in the list (“**a** fifth part”):

Mosiah 11:3

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

Oliver Cowdery’s second error in this passage was to initially omit the *also* that precedes the final item in the list. But he immediately corrected this error by partially overwriting the *a* that he had initially written and then by continuing to write the remainder of the word *also* without raising his quill. There is no change in the level of ink flow, nor is the additional *lso* inserted in any way; instead, it forms an unbroken continuation of Oliver’s inline writing. Thus the *also* was undoubtedly in the original manuscript.

Summary: The punctuation in the standard text for Mosiah 11:3 should make a clear distinction between “one fifth part of all they possessed” and the following list of items that were taxed at this rate; in addition, the last item in the list is preceded by the word *also*.

■ Mosiah 11:6

yea and thus [were they 1A | they were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] supported in their laziness

The 1837 edition switched the word order after the connective adverb *thus*, from “thus were they” to “thus they were”. However, Joseph Smith did not mark this change in the printer’s manuscript. Nor is there any evidence elsewhere for Joseph Smith (or anyone else) reversing the word order

for this particular phrase. The text definitely prefers the noninverted order “thus they were” (with 17 examples). But there are two other examples of the inverted order “thus were they”:

Mosiah 18:8

behold here is the waters of Mormon
for thus **were they** called

Alma 49:20

and thus **were they** prepared to defend themselves against the Lamanites

Interestingly, the second of these examples contrasts with an instance of the noninverted word order in the same verse:

Alma 49:20

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
and thus **were they** prepared to defend themselves against the Lamanites

There is nothing inappropriate about the inverted word order “thus were they”. The critical text will restore the original reading in Mosiah 11:6.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 11:6 the original word order “thus were they”; the inverted word order is clearly possible, although it is less frequent in the text than the noninverted word order “thus they were”.

■ Mosiah 11:9

*and he also built him a spacious palace
and a throne in the midst thereof
all of which was of fine wood
and was ornamented **with** gold and silver and **with** precious things*

Here in Mosiah 11:9, one may wonder if the preposition *with* was accidentally omitted before the conjunct *silver* during the early transmission of the text. There is considerable evidence that the preposition is almost always repeated in conjuncts of *gold* and *silver* (for discussion, see under Jacob 2:12). On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that for the specific preposition *with*, repetition is not that consistent (for discussion, see under 2 Nephi 27:2). Thus it is probably safest in Mosiah 11:9 to assume that the earliest extant reading is the original reading. Generally speaking, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources for each potential case of prepositional repetition. For a complete discussion regarding the tendency to accidentally omit the repeated preposition, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 11:9 the earliest reading which lacks the repeated *with* for *silver* (“and was ornamented with gold and silver and with precious things”); usage elsewhere argues that such a reading is possible, although it is also possible that *with* was accidentally omitted here in the early transmission of the text.

■ Mosiah 11:10

and he also caused that
his [workman 1 | workmen ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should work all manner of fine work
within the walls of the temple

The singular *workman*, the reading of the printer's manuscript, is an obvious error, and the 1830 typesetter was clearly justified in emending the text to the plural *workmen*. Both the singular and plural are identical in pronunciation, so it is quite possible the original manuscript also (incorrectly) read *workman* here. The context definitely suggests that king Noah would have had many workmen, not just one.

Occasionally in the history of the text there have been mix-ups in the number for the compound morpheme *-man*. There is, for instance, one case in the original manuscript where Oliver Cowdery wrote down *workmanship* as *workmanship*:

1 Nephi 18:4
and it came to pass that after I had finished the ship
according to the word of the Lord
my brethren beheld that it was good
and that the [workmanship 0 | workmanship 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thereof
was exceeding fine

In this case the error in \mathcal{O} may be due to phonetic identity, just as it may be in Mosiah 11:10 for the spelling *workman*. Elsewhere in the text, Oliver consistently wrote *workmanship* (4 times in extant portions of \mathcal{O} , 11 times in \mathcal{P}). There is one other case of the plural *workmen* in the text, and in this case Oliver got the spelling correct in \mathcal{P} :

Helaman 6:11 (\mathcal{O} is not extant)
and there was also curious **workmen**
which did work all kinds of ore and did refine it

There are two cases where the number was mixed up for other words taking the compound morpheme *-man*. In both these cases, the error occurred in the printed editions:

Mosiah 12:22 (quoting Isaiah 52:8, which reads in the plural;
error in the 1879 LDS edition and the 1892 RLDS edition)
thy [watchmen 1ABCDEFGHS | watchman IJKLMNOPQR | watchman > watchmen T]
shall lift up the voice

Alma 51:6 (error in the 1840 edition)
for the [freemen 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | Free Men 1 | freeman C]
had sworn or covenanted to maintain their rights
and the privileges of their religion by a free government

See under these two passages for discussion of *freemen* and *watchmen*. There are two other words that take the compound morpheme *-man*—namely, *king-men* and *spokesman*. For these two words, the compound morpheme does not show any variation, at least with respect to the spelling of the vowel. It should also be pointed out that there has been the occasional mix-up in the number for the word *man*. For discussion and examples of manuscript difficulties between *man* and *men*, see under 1 Nephi 15:35.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 11:10 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *workman* to *workmen*; the error in \mathcal{D} may reflect an earlier error in \mathcal{C} where the scribe misinterpreted the number for *workmen* as Joseph Smith dictated the text.

■ Mosiah 11:11

*and the seats [NULL > which 1 | which ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was sat apart
for the high priests
which was above all the other seats
he did ornament with [fine >+ pure 1 | pure ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] gold*

There are two scribal corrections here in \mathcal{D} . In the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the first relative pronoun *which*, but then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted it (the level of ink flow is unchanged). The *which* is necessary since its antecedent, *the seats*, acts as the direct object of the verb *ornament* found later on in the sentence. Yet the virtual immediacy of the correction shows that the supplying of the *which* was not due to editing; instead, Oliver was simply making sure that \mathcal{D} followed the reading in \mathcal{C} .

For the second correction, Oliver Cowdery crossed out the *fine* that he had initially written and then supralinearly inserted *pure*. The correction is with somewhat heavier ink flow and may be nearly immediate, with Oliver having redipped his quill before making the correction; another possibility is that this correction was done a little later as Oliver was proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} . There are two instances of *pure gold* and two of *fine gold* elsewhere in the Book of Mormon:

1 Nephi 4:9	and the hilt thereof was of pure gold
2 Nephi 23:12	I will make a man more precious than fine gold
Mosiah 8:9	and they are of pure gold
Ether 10:7	yea even his fine gold he did cause to be refined in prison

(The 2 Nephi 23:12 example quotes Isaiah 13:12.) Thus either *fine gold* or *pure gold* is possible in Mosiah 11:11, which suggests that the change of *fine* to *pure* in \mathcal{D} was not the result of editing.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 11:11 the two corrections Oliver Cowdery made in \mathcal{D} : namely, the insertion of the relative pronoun *which* and the change of *fine gold* to *pure gold*.

■ Mosiah 11:11

and the seats which was [sat 1 | set ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] apart for the high priests . . .

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:1, the original Book of Mormon text sometimes used the verb *sit* transitively, as here in Mosiah 11:11. In this instance, the 1830 typesetter made the correction to the transitive verb *set*. The critical text will restore the original nonstandard usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in Mosiah 11:11. For further discussion, see SIT in volume 3.

■ Mosiah 11:12

*and it came to pass that he built a tower near the temple
yea a very high tower
[even 1ADEFHGHIJKLMNOPQRST | ever BC] so high
that he could stand upon the top thereof
and overlook the land of Shilom
and also the land of Shemlon which was possessed by the Lamanites*

In this passage, the 1837 edition replaced the *even* of the earliest textual sources with *ever*. The subsequent 1840 edition also continued this reading, but all later editions have reverted to the original *even*. This 1837 change appears to be a typo rather than intentional; it was not marked by Joseph Smith when he edited \mathcal{D} for the 1837 edition. As discussed under Mosiah 4:7, there is some evidence that *even* and *ever* have occasionally been mixed up in the text; for cases of manuscript variation, see the list under Mosiah 2:15–16.

Seven other passages support the occurrence of *even* in the construction “even so <adjective> that <sentence>”, although in all these examples the adjective form is the indefinite quantifier *much* or *many*:

1 Nephi 17:6

and notwithstanding we had suffered many afflictions and much difficulty
yea even so **much** that we cannot write them all
we was exceedingly rejoiced when we came to the seashore

Mosiah 2:2

and there were a great number
even so **many** that they did not number them

Mosiah 4:29

and finally I cannot tell you all the things whereby ye may commit sin
for there are divers ways and means
even so **many** that I cannot number them

Mosiah 7:25

but there arose contentions among them
even so **much** that they did shed blood among themselves

Mosiah 10:20

and we slew them with a great slaughter
even so **many** that we did not number them

Alma 1:5

and it came to pass that he did teach these things so much
that many did believe on his words
even so **many** that they began to support him

Alma 2:2

now this Amlici had by his cunning drawn away much people after him
even so **much** that they began to be very powerful

Note that the majority of these examples are found in the book of Mosiah. On the other hand, there are no instances at all of “**ever** so <adjective>” in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will maintain the original “even so high” in Mosiah 11:12.

Summary: Retain the use of *even* rather than *ever* in Mosiah 11:12 (“yea a very high tower **even** so high that he could stand upon the top thereof and overlook the land”); similar language is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mosiah 11:13**

*and it came to pass that
he caused many buildings to be built
in the land [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | of κ] Shilom*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally inserted the preposition *of* here, thus changing “the land Shilom” to “the land **of** Shilom”. Normally, the text refers to either “the land **of** Shilom” (ten times) or “the city of Shilom” (two times), but there is one other occurrence of “the land Shilom” — in fact, later on in this same verse (which the 1892 edition did not change to “the land **of** Shilom”):

Mosiah 11:13
and he caused a great tower to be built on the hill north of **the land Shilom**

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:7, the Book of Mormon text allows variation with respect to the use of *of* in the phrases “the land (of) X” and “the city (of) X”. In each case, we allow the earliest textual sources to determine the reading. Thus here in Mosiah 11:13, we maintain the phraseology “the land Shilom” — that is, without the *of*.

Summary: Maintain the two occurrences of “the land Shilom” in Mosiah 11:13; although “the land of Shilom” is more common, its occurrence without the *of* in Mosiah 11:13 appears to be intended.

■ **Mosiah 11:13**

*and it came to pass that he caused many buildings to be built
in the land [Shemlon > Shilom 1 | Shilom ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Shemlon* in \mathfrak{P} , but then almost immediately he corrected *Shemlon* to *Shilom* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). These two place-names, *Shemlon* and *Shilom*, are visually and phonetically similar, so the mix-up is not surprising. Moreover, in nearby passages these two place-names are frequently found in close proximity to each other, which adds to the possibility of confusion:

Mosiah 10:7–8
but I having sent my spies out round about **the land of Shemlon**
that I might discover their preparations . . .
and it came to pass that they came up upon the north of **the land of Shilom**

Mosiah 11:12

and it came to pass that he built a tower near the temple
 yea a very high tower
 even so high that he could stand upon the top thereof
 and overlook **the land of Shilom**
 and also **the land of Shemlon** which was possessed by the Lamanites

Note, in particular, that the *Shemlon* in the second of these passages immediately precedes Mosiah 11:13 and is most likely responsible for the momentary mix-up in Ø. In fact, in that manuscript the name *Shemlon* in verse 12 is located two lines right above where Oliver initially wrote *Shemlon* in verse 13. Further, verse 12 explains that the land of *Shemlon* was possessed by the Lamanites (see Mosiah 7:21 as well as Mosiah 9:6, 8, 14 for evidence that the people of Zeniff inhabited the land of Shilom); clearly, king Noah would not have had any buildings built in the land of Shemlon.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 11:13 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction from *Shemlon* to *Shilom*; based on other passages, *Shilom* is definitely the correct place-name for this passage.

■ **Mosiah 11:15**

*and it came to pass that
 he planted [a vineyard > vineyards 1 | vineyards ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 round about in the land*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “he planted a vineyard”, but then almost immediately he crossed out the *a* and inserted an *s* inline at the end of vineyard (the level of ink flow is unchanged). The original manuscript undoubtedly read in the plural, especially since it would be difficult for one vineyard to be “round about in the land”. Oliver’s initial phraseology may have been influenced by the parable of the wicked husbandmen in the Synoptic Gospels, which refers to “planting a vineyard”:

Matthew 21:33	there was a certain householder which planted a vineyard
Mark 12:1	a <i>certain</i> man planted a vineyard
Luke 20:9	a certain man planted a vineyard

Less likely is the possibility that Oliver was influenced by the strikingly similar language in Genesis that refers to the biblical Noah:

Genesis 9:20 and Noah began *to be* an husbandman and **he planted a vineyard**

Summary: Accept the corrected reading in Mosiah 11:15: “he planted **vineyards** round about in the land”.

■ Mosiah 11:17–18

and the Lamanites [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them
 and killed them and **drove** many of their flocks out of the land . . .
 and it **came** to pass that king Noah sent his armies against them
 and they were driven back
 or they [*drive* 1 | *drove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them back for a time

Here the 1830 typesetter dealt with two incorrect uses of the simple present tense by substituting the corresponding simple past-tense form (*came* for *come* and *drove* for *drive*). Of course, the original manuscript could have also had the simple past-tense forms. But another possibility is that the original manuscript might have used the periphrastic past-tense forms, *did come* and *did drive*, so that these errors in the printer's manuscript could have simply been due to the loss of the past-tense auxiliary verb form *did*. Nonetheless, it is rather doubtful that in Mosiah 11:17–18 both *come* and *drive* are the result of dropping the auxiliary verb form *did*. There are no examples elsewhere in the text of more than one periphrastic *do* being omitted within a given passage; but there are quite a few passages where Oliver Cowdery omitted a single periphrastic verb form, at least momentarily:

Alma 44:22

and it came to pass that
 they [*did* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *did* 1] cast their dead
 into the waters of Sidon

Alma 60:22

yea and tens of thousands
 which [NULL > *do* 1 | *do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] also sit in idleness

Helaman 3:20

and he did [*do* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *do* 1]
 that which was right in the sight of God continually

3 Nephi 3:2

yea ye do stand well
 as if ye were supported by the hand of a god
 in the defense of your liberty and your property and your country
 or that which ye [NULL >+ *do* 1 | *do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] call so

3 Nephi 3:26

and Gidgiddoni [*caused* > *did cause* 1 | *did cause* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 that they should make weapons of war of every kind

Ether 10:3

and his eldest son whose name was Shez
 [*did rebell* 0 | *rebelled* >+ *did rebell* 1 | *did rebel* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 against him

Ether 10:8

the people [*raised* >+ *did raise* 1 | *did raise* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *did rise* RT]
 up in rebellion against him

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 came to the plains of Heshlon

In each of these examples, Oliver initially omitted the auxiliary verb *do* in the printer's manuscript but later supplied it, sometimes almost immediately.

For the specific case of *come*, we have considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery frequently miswrote *came* as *come*:

2 Nephi 7:2 (error in \mathcal{P}^* ; Isaiah 50:2 reads *came*)

when I [*came* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *come* >js *came* 1 | *come* A]
 there was no man

Mosiah 19:13 (initial error in \mathcal{P})

and it [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to pass that
 those that tarried with their wives and their children
 caused that their fair daughters should stand forth
 and plead with the Lamanites

Alma 35:8 (initial error in \mathcal{O})

desiring them that they should cast out of their land
 all those which [*come* > *came* 0 | *came* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] over
 from them into their land

Alma 43:5 (initial error in \mathcal{P})

and it came to pass that
 the Lamanites [*came* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *come* > *came* 1]
 with their thousands
 and they came into the land of Antionum

Helaman 11:34 (error in \mathcal{P} and possibly in \mathcal{O})

now this great evil
 which [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto the people
 because of their iniquity
 did stir them up again in remembrance of the Lord their God

3 Nephi 4:22 (error apparently in \mathcal{O} since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition read *come*)

and thus it became the desire of the people of Zemnarihah
 to withdraw from their design because of the great destruction
 which [*come* 1ABC | *came* DEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them by night and by day

3 Nephi 6:23 (error in \mathcal{P} and possibly in \mathcal{O})

now there were many of those
 which testified of the things pertaining to Christ
 which testified boldly
 which were taken and put to death secretly by the judges
 that the knowledge of their death
 [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not unto the governor of the land
 until after their death

3 Nephi 6:25 (initial error in \mathcal{P})
therefore a complaint [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up
unto the land of Zarahemla

Moroni 7:26 (error in \mathcal{P} and possibly in \mathcal{C})
and after that he [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
men also were saved by faith in his name

Thus Oliver frequently replaced *came* with *come*. On the other hand, there are 38 occurrences in the original text of *did come* (counting only those cases without any intervening word between the *did* and the *come*), yet for none of these did the scribes ever drop the auxiliary *did*. The preponderance of the textual evidence suggests that here in Mosiah 11:17, the *come* in the printer's manuscript is an error for *came* rather than *did come*.

With respect to the case of *drive*, the solution is more difficult. There are seven occurrences of *did drive* in the text:

Omni 1:24
but behold the Nephites **did** obtain much advantage over them
yea insomuch that king Benjamin **did drive** them out of the land of Zarahemla

Mosiah 10:20
and it **came** to pass that we **did drive** them again out of our land

Alma 51:23
the Nephites **were** not sufficiently strong in the city of Moroni
therefore Amalickiah **did drive** them slaying many

Alma 62:38
insomuch that they **did** slay them with a great slaughter
and they **did drive** them out of the land

3 Nephi 2:17
nevertheless the people of Nephi **did** gain some advantage of the robbers
insomuch that they **did drive** them back out of their lands
into the mountains and into their secret places

Mormon 2:4
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

For five of these cases, the preceding finite verb is also the auxiliary verb *did*.

In contrast to these examples, there are six examples in the earliest text of the simple past-tense *drove* or *drave*:

Mosiah 11:17 (\mathcal{C} is not extant)
and the Lamanites **came** upon them and **killed** them
and **drove** many of their flocks out of the land

Alma 2:33 (Ⓞ is not extant)

but Alma with his guards **contended** with the guards of the king of the Lamanites until he **slew** and [*drave* 1 | *drove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them back

Alma 3:23 (Ⓞ is not extant)

and they **went** up and **slew** many of the Lamanites and **drove** the remainder of them out of the borders of their land

Alma 42:2 (Ⓞ is extant and reads *drove*, as in Genesis 3:24)

for behold after the Lord God **sent** our first parents forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he **was** taken yea he [*drove* 0 | *drew* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] out the man . . .

Alma 50:7 (Ⓞ is extant)

yea and they **went** forth and [*drave* 01 | *drove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all the Lamanites which were in the east wilderness into their own lands

Ether 13:29 (Ⓞ is extant)

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

In five of these six cases, the preceding finite verbs are also in the simple past tense. In only one case, the last one, is the preceding finite verb the auxiliary verb *did*. Related to this last example is the following instance where the immediately preceding finite verb is once more the auxiliary *did*:

Mosiah 21:8

and it came to pass that the Lamanites **did** beat them and [*drive* >+ *drove* 1 | *drove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them back and [*slay* >+ *slew* 1 | *slew* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] many of them

For this example, Oliver Cowdery later (with uneven and heavier ink flow) changed *drive* to *drove* and *slay* to *slew*. These two changes appear to be the result of proofing Ⓟ against Ⓞ, not editing; for discussion, see under Mosiah 21:8.

In Mosiah 11:18 the preceding finite verb is the simple past-tense *were* (“they **were** driven back”), which suggests that statistically the more probable original reading was *drove* rather than *did drive*; nonetheless, *did drive* is still possible. Yet one further possibility is that the original text read *drave* rather than *drove*. Of the six occurrences of the past-tense form for *drive* in the earliest text, two actually read *drave* (see the preceding list). For the three cases where Ⓞ is extant, one reads *drave* while the two others read *drove*. If the original manuscript (not extant for the book of Mosiah) read *drave* in Mosiah 11:18, the misreading to *drive* would have been much easier since *a* looks much more like *i* than *o* does; in fact, Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote his *a* like a *u*, which would have further facilitated the misreading *drive*.

Ultimately, the probable source for misreading either *drove* or *drave* as *drive* in Mosiah 11:18 was the occurrence of *driven* in the immediately preceding clause (“they were **driven** back”). Since *drove* is slightly more frequent than *drave* in the earliest readings, the critical text will assume that the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *drive* to *drove* restored the original reading. Yet both *drave* and *did drive* remain viable alternatives here in Mosiah 11:8.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 11:17–18 the 1830 emendations of *come* to *came* and *drive* to *drove* as the most probable original readings; even so, there is some possibility that the original text read *did come* in the first instance and either *drave* or *did drive* in the second instance.

■ **Mosiah 11:19**

and this because of the wickedness of their king
and [priest > priests 1 | priests ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *priest* here in \mathcal{P} , but of course king Noah had many priests (Mosiah 11:4–5). Almost immediately Oliver inserted the plural *s* inline; there is no change in the level of ink flow.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 11:19 the plural *priests* (the corrected reading in \mathcal{P}); the plural usage agrees with every other reference to the priests of king Noah.

■ **Mosiah 11:21**

behold I will deliver them
[in >+ into 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the hands of their enemies

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “I will deliver them **in** the hands of their enemies”, a highly unlikely reading. Somewhat later, he replaced *in* with *into*, probably while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (the level of ink flow is slightly heavier and the insertion itself is wobbly). For evidence that the scribes sometimes miswrote *into* as *in*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:33.

The Book of Mormon text has only examples of people being delivered **into** the hands of others (16 times, excluding Mosiah 11:21); but there are no examples of people being delivered **in** or **unto** the hands of others. Thus usage elsewhere systematically supports Oliver’s correction in the printer’s manuscript for Mosiah 11:21.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 11:21 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “**into** the hands of their enemies”; Oliver Cowdery’s correction here was probably the result of his later proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

■ **Mosiah 11:21**

and they shall be afflicted
by the [hand 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | hands GHK] of their enemies

Here the 1858 Wright edition substituted the plural *hands* for the singular *hand*, the reading of the earliest (extant) sources. The first two RLDS editions also followed this plural reading, but the third RLDS edition (1908) restored the original singular, the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

Elsewhere in the text we have similar examples dealing with affliction (with either the verb *afflict* or a similar verb like *destroy*, *smite*, or *slay*) for which *hand* can occur in either the singular or plural in the prepositional phrase “by the hand(s) of X”. If X is singular, then we always get the singular *hand*:

Alma 2:20	that Gideon which was slain by the hand of Nehor with the sword
Alma 6:7	the man which was slain by the hand of Nehor with the sword
Ether 1:1	those ancient inhabitants which were destroyed by the hand of the Lord
Ether 10:3	Shez was smitten by the hand of a robber

But if X is plural, we can have either the singular *hand* or the plural *hands*. In the following list, I provide the earliest extant reading; each plural case is marked below with an asterisk:

1 Nephi 13:34	after that I have . . . smitten them by the hand of the Gentiles
2 Nephi 10:18	I will afflict thy seed by the hand of the Gentiles
2 Nephi 26:19	they . . . shall be smitten by the hand of the Gentiles
Mosiah 11:21	they shall be afflicted by the hand of their enemies
* Alma 9:10	from being destroyed even by the hands of their own brethren
* Alma 25:4	they were slain by the hands of the Nephites
Alma 43:44	many of the Nephites were slain by their hand
* Alma 43:46	ye shall not suffer yourselves to be slain by the hands of your enemies
Alma 51:11	because of the many thousands which had been slain by the hand of the Nephites

The 1830 edition changed the singular *hand* to *hands* in Alma 43:44, perhaps under the influence of the phraseology in nearby Alma 43:46 (“to be slain by the **hands** of your enemies”). Yet note that the similar language in Alma 51:11 reads in the singular (“which had been slain by the **hand** of the Nephites”), as do the examples from the small plates of Nephi and this example in the book of Mosiah. We therefore let the earliest textual sources determine whether *hand* should be singular or plural in the phrase “by the hand(s) of <plural noun phrase>”. See Alma 43:44 for discussion of that particular passage.

Summary: Maintain the singular *hand* in Mosiah 11:21, the reading of the earliest textual sources; elsewhere the text has examples of “by the **hand** of <plural noun phrase>”.

■ Mosiah 11:23

*and it shall come to pass that except this people repent
and turn [NULL >p unto 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord their God
they shall be brought into bondage*

Oliver Cowdery wrote in the printer’s manuscript “and turn the Lord their God”, which clearly makes no sense. Later Oliver inserted the word *unto* here. His insertion is in pencil, which suggests that he did the correction in the printer’s shop and without reference to the original manuscript. For two other nearby examples where Oliver edited the text while apparently in the printer’s shop, see the change of *save* to *serve* in Mosiah 4:14 and *chance* to *change* in Mosiah 5:2, also both in pencil. But in Mosiah 11:23, the emendation is not quite as obvious as in the two other examples; here his emendation could have been wrong since another obvious possibility is that

the preposition was *to* rather than *unto*. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are 11 other occurrences of “turn (un)to <the Lord>”:

2 Nephi 19:13	for the people turneth not unto him that smiteth them
Mosiah 7:33	but if ye will turn to the Lord with full purpose of heart
Mosiah 11:21	and except they repent and turn to the Lord their God
Alma 3:14	except they repent of their wickedness and turn to me
Alma 39:13	that ye turn to the Lord with all your mind might and strength
Helaman 7 preface	they repent and turn unto him
Helaman 7:17	turn ye unto the Lord your God
Helaman 11:4	and perhaps they will repent and turn unto thee
Helaman 13:11	blessed are they who will repent and turn unto me
Mormon 9:6	O then ye unbelieving turn ye unto the Lord
Ether 11:1	except they should repent and turn unto the Lord

The current text has one additional example of “turn (un)to <the Lord>”, but it appears that this example originally read *return* rather than *turn*:

3 Nephi 16:15	but if they will not [<i>return</i> >js <i>turn</i> 1 <i>turn</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto me
---------------	---

See under that passage for further discussion.

We should also note that for this phrase the King James Bible uses both prepositions with approximately the same frequency; there are 13 of “turn **to** <the Lord>” and 16 of “turn **unto** <the Lord>”, including the following contrastive pairs:

Deuteronomy 4:30	if thou shalt turn to the LORD thy God
Deuteronomy 30:10	if thou turn unto the LORD thy God
Acts 9:35	all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron . . . turned to the Lord
Acts 11:21	a great number believed and turned unto the Lord

The variation in the King James text is essentially random, but this does not seem to be the case in the Book of Mormon text. When we consider the distribution of *to* and *unto* in the Book of Mormon for “turn (un)to <the Lord>”, we find that everywhere else in the books of Mosiah and Alma, the preposition is *to*, while *unto* is found only later in the text and in one biblical citation (2 Nephi 19:13, which quotes Isaiah 9:13). Note in particular that Mosiah 11:21, only two verses away from Mosiah 11:23, reads *to*; in fact, the language is virtually identical: “except they repent and turn **to** the Lord their God”. Since the evidence suggests that Oliver’s emendation was done in the printer’s shop and without consulting \mathcal{O} , we can conclude that the emendation in verse 23 represents only his guess. Given that all nearby passages read *to*, the more likely emendation here in Mosiah 11:23 is *to*. The critical text will therefore emend *unto* to read *to* (“except this people repent and turn **to** the Lord their God”).

Summary: Replace *unto*, Oliver Cowdery’s conjectural emendation in Mosiah 11:23, with *to*; usage elsewhere in Mosiah and Alma, including the nearby case in Mosiah 11:21, suggests that *to* is more likely than *unto* as the original reading for this passage.

■ Mosiah 11:24

and I will suffer them

that they [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | may D] be smitten by their enemies

Here the 1841 British edition introduced the modal verb *may*. It is quite possible that the typesetter did not like or did not expect the use of a subjunctive verb form in this *that*-clause (namely, “that they **be** smitten”). Elsewhere, the text typically has a modal verb in the clause that follows “suffer (someone) that” (53 times, including five with *may*). There are also five cases where the verb in the *that*-clause can be considered in the indicative. But there are two cases in the original text where the verb is clearly in the subjunctive rather than the indicative:

Alma 39:11

suffer not that **the devil lead away** your heart again after those wicked harlots

Helaman 15:9

for behold they will suffer themselves
that **they be trodden down** and slain by their enemies

However, in the first example, the 1841 typesetter once more removed the subjunctive *that*-clause. In that instance, he replaced it with an infinitive clause, patterned after the preceding infinitive clause in this passage:

Alma 39:11

suffer not yourself **to be led away** by any vain or foolish thing
suffer not [*that* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] the devil
[01ABCGHKPS | *to* DEFIJLMNOQRT] lead away your heart again
after those wicked harlots

The 1841 typesetter may have not liked the use of the subjunctive in clauses following “suffer (someone) that”. Even so, he did not correct the third instance of this usage (in Helaman 15:9). His change here in Mosiah 11:24 was not transmitted into the subsequent LDS text, but the one in Alma 39:11 was. The critical text will, of course, maintain these three original cases of the subjunctive.

Summary: Maintain the subjunctive *that*-clause in Mosiah 11:24 (“I will suffer them that **they be smitten** by their enemies”).

■ Mosiah 11:26

now it came to pass that
when Abinadi had [*spoke* 1 | *spoken* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] these words unto them
they were wroth with him

Here Oliver Cowdery wrote *had spoke* in \mathcal{P} , which the 1830 typesetter reinterpreted as the standard *had spoken*, perhaps assuming that Oliver had accidentally dropped the final *n* from *spoken*. There are two other possible interpretations. One is that the original text actually read *had spoke*. We have already seen many examples where the original text permitted the past participle to be identical to the simple past-tense form, such as *had came* instead of *had come* (for this example, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4; also see the general discussion under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3). The problem with this proposal is that *spoke* never seems to have occurred as the simple past-tense form for the verb *speak* anywhere in the original text; instead, the simple past-tense form was consistently *spake* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 12:19). The systematic preference for *spake* over *spoke* implies another alternative interpretation for *had spoke* here in Mosiah 11:26—namely, *had spoke* is a scribal error for *had spake*.

There is considerable evidence for this interpretation. First of all, the original text had at least 14 occurrences of *spake* as the past participle. (See the brief discussion under 1 Nephi 3:30; for a complete list, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.) One original example of *had spake* is, in fact, found in the next verse after Mosiah 11:26:

Mosiah 11:27
now when king Noah had heard of the words
which Abinadi had [*spake* 1A | *spoken* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto the people
he was also wroth

Further support can be found from Oliver Cowdery's own scribal practice. Once, in copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , he replaced an instance of the simple past-tense *spake* with *spoke*; here the scribe in \mathcal{C} was the unknown scribe 2 rather than Oliver himself:

1 Nephi 12:19
and while the angel [*spake* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *spoke* >js *spake* 1 | *spoke* A]
these words . . .

Another time, in an earlier passage in the book of Mosiah, Oliver initially wrote the simple past-tense *spoke* instead of the correct *spake*, but then almost immediately he corrected it to *spake*:

Mosiah 2:35
and behold also they [*spoke* > *spake* 1 | *spake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that which was commanded them of the Lord

As noted above, there are no instances in the earliest text of *spoke* as the simple past-tense form for the verb *speak*. Correspondingly, it seems unlikely that there would have been any occurrences of *spoke* as the past participle either. In addition, there are no instances elsewhere in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery (or any other scribe) accidentally dropped the final *n* of *spoken*, so *had spoke* as an error for *had spoken* seems unlikely. The most reasonable assumption is that Mosiah 11:26 originally read *had spake*.

Summary: Emend Mosiah 11:26 to read *had spake* instead of the standard *had spoken*; in accord with other scribal errors, the reading in \mathfrak{P} (*had spoke*) appears to be a scribal error for *had spake*.

■ Mosiah 11:27

he was also wroth and [NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *saith*
who is Abinadi that I and my people should be judged of him

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *& saith* here in \mathfrak{P} ; then somewhat later he inserted the subject pronoun *he* with slightly heavier ink flow. Perhaps Oliver’s correction was almost immediate, the result of him redipping his quill during his original copying. Or this change could represent Oliver’s proofing of \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{C} or perhaps even editing on his part. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there are a number of places where a subject’s state of mind (of joy, anger, astonishment, sorrow, or peace of mind) is referred to, followed immediately by simply “and saith/said”, without any expressed subject:

Mosiah 7:14	he was exceeding glad and said . . .
Alma 18:2	he was astonished exceedingly and saith . . .
Alma 20:13	his father was angry with him and saith . . .
Alma 20:26	he was astonished exceedingly and saith . . .
Alma 47:27	Amalickiah pretended to be wroth and said . . .
3 Nephi 17:14	Jesus groaned within himself and saith . . .
Ether 12:29	and I Moroni . . . was comforted and said . . .

There are two examples where the subject is repeated; for both of these examples, the subject is the plural pronoun *they* (in contrast to all the other examples, which have singular subjects):

Alma 27:4	they were moved with compassion and they said unto the king . . .
Alma 55:9	they received him with joy and they said unto him . . .

Interestingly, in the first example (Alma 27:4) the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the repeated *they* (thus giving “**they** were moved with compassion and said unto the king . . .”). All in all, the many examples without any pronominal repetition of a singular subject argue that there is nothing wrong with having “and saith” in Mosiah 11:27. Nor has there been any tendency to supply the repeated subject for such examples. Thus the supralinearly inserted *he* in Mosiah 11:27 undoubtedly represents the original reading rather than the result of editing; the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} may have been added either as Oliver first copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} or later when he proofed \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{C} .

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 11:27 the repeated pronominal subject (“he was also wroth and **he** saith . . .”) despite the relative infrequency of this construction in the text.

■ Mosiah 11:27

or who is the Lord that shall bring upon my people
 such great [affliction 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | afflictions s]

Here the 1953 RLDS edition changed the singular *affliction* to the plural *afflictions*. This change was unnecessary and may have been accidental since nowhere else did the 1953 edition make any change in the number for *affliction*. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has only the plural *afflictions* when premodified by *great*:

Alma 14:26	how long shall we suffer these great afflictions
Alma 56:16	and thus they had suffered great afflictions of every kind
Alma 61:2	I do not joy in your great afflictions

Even so, the singular *great affliction* is possible, as in the following King James passage:

Acts 7:11
 now there came a dearth
 over all the land of Egypt and Chanaan and **great affliction**
 and our fathers found no sustenance

More generally, *affliction* takes both singular and plural forms throughout the Book of Mormon. For discussion regarding the phrase *much affliction(s)*, see under 1 Nephi 16:35. The evidence there argues that in each case we should rely on the earliest textual evidence in determining the number for *affliction*. Thus the critical text will maintain the singular *great affliction* here in Mosiah 11:27, even though it is possible that a plural *s* could have been lost in the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Retain the singular *affliction* in Mosiah 11:27 (“who is the Lord that shall bring upon my people such great affliction”).

Mosiah 12

■ Mosiah 12:1

*and it came to pass that after the space of two years
that Abinadi came among them in disguise that they knew him not
and began [again 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] to prophesy among them saying . . .*

The 1837 edition dropped the word *again*. Joseph Smith did not mark this change in the printer's manuscript. This change appears to be a simple typo, especially since this is not the first time that Abinadi has prophesied to the people of Noah:

Mosiah 11:20
and it came to pass that
there was a man among them whose name was Abinadi
and he went forth among them and began to prophesy saying . . .

Thus there is nothing inappropriate about referring to Abinadi beginning to prophesy a second time. Moreover, there are 14 other examples of “began again” in the Book of Mormon text, including one more that refers to speaking: “therefore he began again to speak unto them” (Helaman 8:10).

Summary: Restore the *again* in Mosiah 12:1, the earliest extant reading (“Abinadi . . . began again to prophesy among them”).

■ Mosiah 12:1

thus [hath >js hath 1 | hath ACGHKNP | has BDEFIJLMOQRT] the Lord commanded me saying . . .

Here it would appear that Joseph Smith originally intended to change *hath* to *has* but ended up writing *hath*, perhaps because he changed his mind and decided that the *has* sounded strange in this highly scriptural and archaic sounding expression (“thus hath the Lord commanded me”), especially with its inverted word order. Nonetheless, the 1837 edition ended up replacing the *hath* with *has*, perhaps because Joseph Smith's *hath* was interpreted as his desire to change *hath* to *has*.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has only *hath* in the inverted declarative expression “hath the Lord”:

2 Nephi 25:21 wherefore for this cause **hath** the Lord God promised unto me that . . .
2 Nephi 33:15 for thus **hath** the Lord commanded me
Mosiah 3:27 thus **hath** the Lord commanded me
Helaman 13:23 for this cause **hath** the Lord God caused that . . .

Helaman 14:9 and behold thus **hath** the Lord commanded me by his angel that . . .
 Helaman 15:4 and for this intent **hath** the Lord prolonged their days

Thus Joseph Smith would have been correct to resist changing *hath* to *has* in Mosiah 12:1. In fact, the *hath* was restored in the 1840 edition, with the result that the RLDS textual tradition has continued with the original *hath*; the LDS text, on the other hand, has maintained the *has* (the LDS text derives through the 1841 British edition, which used the 1837 edition as copy-text). For further discussion of *hath* versus *has*, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *hath* in “thus **hath** the Lord commanded me”, which also agrees with Joseph Smith’s apparent decision to retain *hath* in this expression.

■ **Mosiah 12:2**

stretch forth thy hand
 and [*prophesying* 1A | *prophesy* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *saying*
thus saith the Lord . . .

The 1837 edition changed *prophesying* to *prophesy* because the sequence of two participles ending in *-ing* seemed unacceptable. Although the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of \mathcal{P} , it nonetheless appears to be intentional. The earliest extant reading (found in the printer’s manuscript) could well be an error for either “prophesy saying” or “prophesying say”. The doubling of the ending *-ing* would, in either case, be due to the proximity of the other participial form.

Of these two possible emendations, the one that retains *saying* is more consistent with other examples in the text:

2 Nephi 3:14 and thus **prophesied** Joseph **saying** . . .
 Mosiah 11:20 and he went forth among them and began to **prophesy saying** . . .
 Mosiah 12:1 Abinadi . . . began again to **prophesy** among them **saying** . . .
 Alma 8:29 go forth and **prophesy** unto this people **saying** . . .

For these four examples (as well as the one in Mosiah 12:2), we have a direct quote after *saying*. Moreover, the Alma 8:29 example uses the imperative in “go forth and prophesy”, much like the current text in Mosiah 12:2 (“stretch forth thy hand and prophesy”). This similarity implies that the 1837 emendation to Mosiah 12:2 probably restored the original reading.

There is also evidence that the scribes in \mathcal{P} sometimes accidentally wrote the present participle in place of a finite verb form, although in only one case was Oliver Cowdery himself responsible for making such an error:

Mosiah 29:18 (initial error in \mathcal{P} by Hyrum Smith)
 yea [*remmbering* > *remmber* 1 | *remember* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] king Noah

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

Alma 42:23 (error by Oliver Cowdery in copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P})
 and the resurrection of the dead
 [*bringeth* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *bringing* 1] back men
 into the presence of God

3 Nephi 22:16 (initial error by scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 behold I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire
 and that [*bringing* > *bringeth* 1 | *bringeth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] forth
 an instrument for his work

In Mosiah 12:2, it appears that the immediately following *saying* prompted one of the scribes (either the scribe for \mathcal{C} or Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P}) to accidentally replace *prophesy* with *prophesying*.

Summary: Retain the 1837 emendation of “prophesying saying” to “prophesy saying” in Mosiah 12:2; the earliest extant reading, with its sequence of two present participial forms, appears to be an error that entered the text early on in its transmission.

■ **Mosiah 12:2**

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

Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text suggests that the singular *cheek* in this passage may be an error for *cheeks*. Note, first of all, the plural usage later on in a passage that refers to this prophecy of Abinadi’s:

Mosiah 21:3–4
 but they would smite them on their **cheeks**
 and exercise authority over them
 and began to put heavy burdens upon their backs
 and drive them as they would a dumb ass
 yea all this was done that the word of the Lord might be fulfilled

Elsewhere the original Book of Mormon text generally has the plural *cheeks* with the verb *smite*:

Alma 14:14	and he smote them with his hand upon their cheeks
Alma 14:15	and the judge smote them again upon their cheeks
Alma 14:20	and the judge also smote them again on their cheeks
Alma 26:29	and we have been cast out . . . and smote upon our cheeks
Helaman 4:12	and smiting their humble brethren upon the cheeks

In the last example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *cheek* in \mathcal{P} , then virtually immediately corrected it to the plural *cheeks*; despite this correction, the 1830 compositor ended up incorrectly setting the singular *cheek*:

Helaman 4:12

yea it was because of their oppression to the poor
 withholding their food from the hungry
 withholding their clothing from the naked
 and smiting their humble brethren
 upon the [*cheek* > *cheeks* 1 | *cheek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Thus one could argue that here in Mosiah 12:2 Oliver Cowdery miswrote *cheeks* as *cheek* when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} —or perhaps an error was made in \mathcal{O} .

When we turn to biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon, we find one has the plural *cheeks* and the other the singular *cheek*:

2 Nephi 7:6 (quoting Isaiah 50:6)

I gave my back to the smiters
 and my **cheeks** to them that plucked off the hair

3 Nephi 12:39 (quoting Matthew 5:39)

but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right **cheek**
 turn to him the other also

Of course, the singular is expected in the last example. But this familiar passage may have led the Book of Mormon scribes to sometimes write the singular *cheek* in “to smite someone on the cheek(s)”.

When we consider the remaining citations from the King James Bible of “to smite someone on the cheek(s)”, we find evidence for only the singular *cheek* (or equivalently, *cheek bone*) with the verb *smite*:

1 Kings 22:24	but Zedekiah . . . smote Micaiah on the cheek
2 Chronicles 18:23	then Zedekiah . . . smote Micaiah upon the cheek
Job 16:10	they have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully
Psalms 3:7	for thou hast smitten all mine enemies <i>upon</i> the cheek bone
Lamentations 3:30	he giveth <i>his</i> cheek to him that smiteth him
Micah 5:1	they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek
Luke 6:29	and unto him that smiteth thee on the <i>one</i> cheek offer also the other

(As with Matthew 5:39, only the singular is possible in Luke 6:29.) All of these biblical examples show that the singular is possible, if not expected. Although the singular *cheek* in Mosiah 12:2 is unique for nonbiblical quotes in the Book of Mormon, it is still quite possible. The critical text will maintain the singular *cheek* in Mosiah 12:2, but with the realization that *cheek* could be an error for the plural *cheeks*.

Summary: Maintain the singular *cheek* in Mosiah 12:2, the invariant reading in all the (extant) textual sources; even so, the singular may be an error for *cheeks*.

■ Mosiah 12:4

*and I will cause that they shall howl
all the day [long 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | along κ]*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1892 RLDS edition; the replacement of *long* by *along* is probably due to the preceding *all*. As expected, there is no usage to support the use of *along* rather than *long* with “all the day”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *long* to the RLDS text. There are 12 occurrences of “all the day long” in the Book of Mormon, plus 13 occurrences in the King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the use of “all the day long” in Mosiah 12:4 and elsewhere.

■ Mosiah 12:5

*yea and I will cause that they shall have burdens lashed upon their backs
and they shall be driven **before** like a dumb ass*

Joanne Case (personal communication, 17 May 2004) wonders if the adverbial *before* is missing an object or if *before* is an error for *forth*. The expression “to drive forth” occurs 12 times in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following two examples where the context is similar to that found in Mosiah 12:5:

Mosiah 12:12

thou shalt be as the blossoms of a thistle
which when it is fully ripe if the wind bloweth
it is **driven forth** upon the face of the land

Helaman 3:16

even until they have fallen into transgression
and have been murdered plundered and hunted and **driven forth**
and slain and scattered upon the face of the earth

Although *forth* is possible in Mosiah 12:5, there is no textual evidence in the manuscripts or editions for *forth* and *before* ever being mixed up.

This example of *before* in Mosiah 12:5 is the only one in the entire Book of Mormon text where adverbial *before* is used to refer to space rather than time. The King James Bible, however, has a number of examples of *before* being used this way with the motion verbs *go* and *run* (but none with *drive*), as in these two examples:

Matthew 21:9 and the multitudes that **went before** and followed cried saying . . .
Luke 19:4 and he **ran before** and climbed up into a sycamore tree

Despite its uniqueness, the usage in Mosiah 12:5 is perfectly fine. There is no need to emend *before* by adding an object or by replacing *before* with *forth*.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 12:5 the adverbial *before*; such usage is fairly common in the King James Bible, but it is not found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

■ Mosiah 12:11

and again he saith that thou [shall 1 | shalt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be as a stalk

Here the printer's manuscript reads *shall* rather than the *shalt* that is expected when the subject is *thou*. The 1830 typesetter emended the *shall* to *shalt*. Although the vast majority of instances of "thou shalt" in the text have shown no tendency to replace *shalt* with *shall* (92 of them), there are 12 cases where such a change has occurred; most instances are restricted to a single edition (9 times) or to a momentary manuscript error (3 times, each marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 4:11 (error in the 1852 LDS edition)

for thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* F] inherit the land

Mosiah 13:17 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition)

six days [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* H] thou labor

Mosiah 13:23 (error in the 1858 Wright edition)

thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* G] not bear false witness

Alma 12:23 (error in the 1837 edition)

if thou eat

thou [*shalt* 0IAFIJLMNOQRT | *shall* BCDEGHKPS] surely die

* Alma 30:47 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O} , virtually immediately corrected)

therefore if thou [*shall* > *shalt* 0 | *shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] deny again
behold God shall smite thee

Helaman 7:24 (error in the 1840 edition)

even when thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* C] be utterly destroyed

Helaman 10:5 (error in the 1837 edition)

for thou [*shalt* 1ACGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* BDEF] not ask
that which is contrary to my will

3 Nephi 12:26 (error in the 1888 LDS edition)

thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *shall* J] by no means come out thence
until thou hast paid the uttermost senine

3 Nephi 12:27 (error in the 1905 LDS edition)

thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *shall* MQ] not commit adultery

* 3 Nephi 12:33 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , virtually immediately corrected)

thou [*shal* > *shalt* 1 | *shalt* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] not forswear thyself

3 Nephi 12:33 (error in the 1852 LDS edition)

thou shalt not forswear thyself

but [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKPRST | *shall* FIJLMNOQ] perform unto the Lord thine oaths

* 3 Nephi 13:5 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , virtually immediately corrected)

and when thou prayest

thou [*shal* > *shalt* 1 | *shalt* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] not do as the hypocrites

In three cases, however, the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript, reads “thou shall”; all of these have been edited in the printed editions to the standard “thou shalt”. Besides the case in Mosiah 12:11, we have these two examples:

- Mosiah 26:20 (editing in the 1879 LDS edition)
 and thou shalt serve me and go forth in my name
 and [*shall* 1ABCDEFHGKPS | *shalt* IJLMNOQRT] gather together my sheep
- Alma 10:7 (editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)
 and thou [*shall* >js *shalt* 1 | *shall* A | *shalt* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] receive him
 into thy house and feed him
 and he shall bless thee and thy house

One could argue that these three manuscript occurrences of “thou shall” are errors for “thou shalt”, especially given the three instances (in Alma 30:47, 3 Nephi 12:33, and 3 Nephi 13:5) where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “thou shall” in the manuscript but then virtually immediately corrected the *shall* to *shalt*.

There are, however, two arguments that could be made in support of an original “thou shall” in the Book of Mormon text. First, there are numerous instances in Early Modern English where “thou shall” occurs instead of the historically correct “thou shalt”. For instance, in the online Oxford English Dictionary there are 24 occurrences of *thou shall*, in comparison to about a thousand occurrences of *thou shalt*; that is, over two percent of the cases in the OED read *thou shall* rather than the standard *thou shalt*. The King James Bible has no instances of *thou shall*, but interestingly the Wycliffe 1388 New Testament consistently has *thou shall*, as in the following examples from the Sermon on the Mount (spelling regularized):

- Matthew 5
 verse 21 **thou shall** not slay
 verse 27 **thou shall** do no lechery
 verse 33 **thou shall** not forswear
 but thou shall yield thine oaths to the Lord
 verse 43 **thou shall** love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy

For these examples, see pages 11–12 of *The Wycliffe New Testament (1388)*, edited by W. R. Cooper (London: The British Library, 2002). It should be pointed out, however, that the Wycliffe translation generally uses third person singular verb forms with *thou*, such as *thou has* and *thou does*.

A second argument in favor of “thou shall” in the original Book of Mormon text is that there are examples in the earliest textual sources of other verbs for which the subject *thou* takes the base form of the verb rather than the historical *-est* ending:

- 1 Nephi 14:8 **remember thou** the covenants of the Father
 unto the house of Israel
- Mosiah 26:11 that **thou may** judge them according to their crimes
- Alma 8:15 from the time which **thou received** thy first message from him
- Alma 11:25 when **thou had** it in thy heart to retain them from me
- Ether 12:31 for thus **did thou** manifest thyself unto thy disciples

(The example in 1 Nephi 14:8 is a yes-no question, not a command.) The instance in Mosiah 26:11 is like Mosiah 12:11 in that it involves a modal verb, *may*. Accepting these examples implies that we should also accept the occasional occurrence of “thou shall” whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. (For additional discussion, see under 1 Nephi 14:8.) Admittedly, the few examples of “thou shall” may be due to scribal error in the early transmission of the text. But because “thou shall” is possible, the critical text will accept “thou shall” in Mosiah 12:11, Mosiah 26:20, and Alma 10:7.

The textual history is similar for “thou wilt”: the vast majority of examples show no variation at all, but there are cases where the “thou wilt” has tended to be replaced by “thou will”. And there are two examples where the earliest reading has “thou will”. For discussion, see under Alma 8:20 and Alma 22:16. Also see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3 for additional discussion.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 12:11 the reading of the printer’s manuscript, “and again he saith that **thou shall** be as a stalk”; although “thou shalt” is the standard form, *thou* occasionally takes the base form of the verb in the earliest Book of Mormon text, as also in Early Modern English; two other cases of original “thou shall” are found in Mosiah 26:20 and Alma 10:7.

■ Mosiah 12:11

even as a dry stalk of the field

*which is [ran 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNP | run OQRST] over by the beasts
and trodden under foot*

In Jacob 5:37, we have an example of *overran* rather than the standard *overrun* as the past participle for the compound verb *overrun* (see the discussion there). Here in Mosiah 12:11, we have a case involving the phrasal verb *run over*. In the LDS text, the nonstandard use of *ran* in this passage was replaced by the standard *run* first in the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition. In the RLDS text, the change was made in the 1953 edition.

There is only one other occurrence in the text of the past participle for the verb *run*, and in that case the earliest textual sources also have the nonstandard *ran*:

Alma 30:59

and as he went forth amongst them
behold he was [ran 01 | run ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon
and trodden down even until he was dead

In this instance, the grammatical emendation of *ran* to *run* was made by the 1830 typesetter.

The critical text will maintain the *ran* of the earliest text in both Mosiah 12:11 and Alma 30:59. For further discussion regarding the use in the original text of the simple past-tense form for the past participle, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 12:11 (as well as in Alma 30:59) the original nonstandard use of *ran* as the past participle for the verb *run*.

■ Mosiah 12:12

thou shalt be as the blossoms of a thistle
which *when it is fully ripe if the wind bloweth*
it is driven forth upon the face of the land

In this passage the final occurrence of the pronoun *it* is redundant. Without the two intervening subordinate clauses (“when it is fully ripe” and “if the wind bloweth”), the clause-initial relative pronoun *which* would be sufficient: “thou shalt be as the blossoms of a thistle **which is driven forth** upon the face of the land”. But given the intervening subordinate clauses, the redundant *it* refers the reader back to the thistle mentioned near the beginning of the sentence, thus helping the reader process the complex syntax of the entire sentence. Note especially that in the second subordinate clause (“if the wind bloweth”) the subject switches from the preceding *it* (referring to *a thistle*) to *the wind*, thus virtually forcing the repetition of the pronoun *it*. The critical text will, of course, retain this redundant usage.

Summary: Maintain the redundant use of *it* in Mosiah 12:12 (“which when it is fully ripe if the wind bloweth / **it is driven forth upon the face of the land**”).

■ Mosiah 12:12

and he pretendeth
the Lord hath [sent him > spoken 1 | spoken ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote what he expected: “the Lord hath sent him”. Oliver crossed out *sent him* and supralinearly inserted the correct verb form, *spoken* (the level of ink flow is unchanged), and then he wrote the *it* inline after the crossed-out *sent him*. The correction was therefore immediate. Since either reading (“sent him” or “spoken it”) is possible, we accept the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} as the reading of the original manuscript.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 12:12 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} : “and he pretendeth the Lord hath **spoken it**”.

■ Mosiah 12:14

*and thou O king **hast** not sinned*
therefore this man [hast >js has 1 | hast A | has BDEFIJLMNOPQRST | hath CGHK] lied
concerning you
and he [hath 1AD | has BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophesied in vain

The earliest text for Mosiah 12:14 reads “this man **hast** lied concerning you” (the reading in \mathfrak{P}). The 1830 compositor set the *hast*, but for the 1837 edition Joseph Smith edited the verb to *has*; he also edited the following *hath* in “and he **hath** prophesied in vain” to *has*. (For discussion of the rather frequent emendation of *hath* to *has*, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.) But in the 1840 edition, the first instance of the emended *has* was changed to *hath*. This reading continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 edition restored the *has* that Joseph had written in the printer’s manuscript when he edited the text for the 1837 edition.

Most probably, the original text here read *hath* in both cases (“therefore this man **hath** lied concerning you and he **hath** prophesied in vain”), but the first *hath* was accidentally replaced by *hast* because of the use of *hast* in the immediately preceding clause (“and thou O king **hast** not sinned”). This error could have occurred early in the textual transmission, either as Joseph Smith’s dictation was taken down by the scribe in \mathcal{O} or as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} for this passage. We have evidence that Oliver sometimes replaced *hath* with *hast*, even without a preceding *hast*. In the following example, \mathcal{O} is not extant, but it probably read *hath*; Oliver initially copied *hast* into \mathcal{P} but then virtually immediately corrected the text to *hath* (there is no change in the level of ink flow):

Alma 29:9

I know that which the Lord

[*hast* > *hath* 1 | *hath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commanded me

Thus there is independent support for Oliver accidentally replacing *hath* with *hast* in Mosiah 12:14.

More generally, there has been some tendency for the scribes to accidentally replace the *-eth* ending with the second person singular *-est* ending; in each of the following examples there is no nearby occurrence of *-est* that could have triggered the error:

1 Nephi 12:17 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

and the mists of darkness are the temptations of the devil

which **blindeth** the eyes

and [*hardenest* > *hardeneth* 0 | *hardeneth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

the hearts of the children of men

and **leadeth** them away into broad roads

Alma 32:19 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

and now how much more cursed is he

that **knoweth** the will of God and **doeth** it not

than he that only [*believest* > *believeth* 0 | *believeth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

or only **hath** cause to believe and **falleth** into transgression

3 Nephi 11:33–34 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and whoso **believeth** in me and is baptized

the same shall be saved

and they are they which shall inherit the kingdom of God

and whoso [*believest* > *believeth* 1 | *believeth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

not in me and is not baptized

shall be damned

There is one case, however, where the *-est* ending apparently extended itself to another verb:

Alma 45:2

and it came to pass

in the nineteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

that Alma came unto his son Helaman

and [*sayest* 0 | *sayeth* >]s *said* 1 | *saieth* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

unto him

believest thou the words which I spake unto thee

The use of **sayest** in \mathcal{C} appears to be the result of anticipating the following **believest**. See under that passage for discussion.

Thus it should not be surprising that in Mosiah 12:14 Oliver Cowdery might have accidentally replaced *hath* with *hast*, especially given the preceding “and thou O king **hast** not sinned”. For further discussion regarding the mix-up of the two inflectional endings *-(e)st* and *-(e)th*, see under 1 Nephi 11:2. For a complete analysis, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 12:14 the 1840 emendation of *hast/has* to *hath* (“therefore this man **hath** lied concerning you”); also restore the *hath* in the following clause (“and he **hath** prophesied in vain”).

■ Mosiah 12:20

*what **meaneth** the words which are written
and which have been taught by our fathers saying . . .*

Grammatically the use of the third person singular *meaneth* disagrees with the plural subject, *the words*, although in the original Book of Mormon text such usage is fairly common (that is, the inflectional ending *-(e)th* often occurred with plural subjects). For the verb *mean*, most third person plural subjects take the base form of the verb in the original text rather than the *-(e)th* inflectional ending:

1 Nephi 22:1

what [*mean* 01 | *meaneth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] these things
which ye have read

2 Nephi 29:4

yea what **do** the Gentiles **mean**

Mosiah 12:25

are you priests and pretend to teach this people
and to understand the spirit of prophesying
and yet desireth to know of me what these things **mean**

Note that in 1 Nephi 22:1 the original *mean* was accidentally replaced by *meaneth* in the 1830 edition (see the discussion under that passage). The problem with these *wh*-interrogative clauses is that the sentence-initial *what* tends to be misinterpreted as the subject. This kind of misinterpretation would also explain why subsequent editors have missed editing *meaneth* to *mean* here in Mosiah 12:20 as well as in 1 Nephi 22:1. Indeed, one could argue that *meaneth* in Mosiah 12:20 may be an error for *mean*, given that the change of *mean* to *meaneth* actually occurred in 1 Nephi 22:1. But it should be noted that in the earliest text there is one more example involving the verb *mean* where the finite verb in the earliest text has the *-(e)th* ending:

Helaman 5:38

behold what [*doth* 1ABDEPS | *do* CGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *doth* > *do* F]
all these things **mean**

Thus in these *wh*-interrogative clauses the original text allows for plural subjects to take verbs with either the standard zero ending or the nonstandard *-(e)th*. We therefore follow the earliest

textual sources in each case, which means that in Mosiah 12:20 the verb form *meaneth* will be retained and not interpreted as an early scribal error for *mean*.

The King James Bible systematically distinguishes between the third person singular *-(e)th* ending and the plural zero ending. Thus in the King James text we have only the grammatically correct *mean* with third person plural subjects in *what*-initial clauses:

Genesis 21:29	what mean these seven ewe lambs . . .
Deuteronomy 6:20	what mean the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments . . .
Joshua 4:21	what mean these stones

Summary: Maintain the nonstandard use of the third person singular form *meaneth* in Mosiah 12:20.

■ **Mosiah 12:22**

thy [watchmen 1ABCDEFGH | watchman IJKLMNOPQR | watchman > watchmen T]
shall lift up the voice

□ **Isaiah 52:8** (King James Bible)

thy **watchmen** shall lift up the voice

In this quote from Isaiah, the earliest text has the plural *watchmen*, which agrees with the plural in the King James Bible for Isaiah 52:8. The 1879 LDS edition accidentally replaced the plural with the singular *watchman*, which continued in the LDS text until the 1981 edition was corrected to the plural in 1983. For discussion of a similar mix-up with the word *workmen*, see under Mosiah 11:10.

The plural is supported by the original Hebrew as well as by the King James use of *they* later on in this verse:

Mosiah 12:22 (Isaiah 52:8)
with the voice together shall **they** sing
for **they** shall see eye to eye

The plural *watchmen* is also found everywhere else in the Book of Mormon when this same passage is again quoted (although paraphrastically in the last case):

Mosiah 15:29	thy watchmen shall lift up their voice
3 Nephi 16:18	thy watchmen shall lift up the voice
3 Nephi 20:32	then shall their watchmen lift up their voice

See under Mosiah 15:29 for discussion of the variant “**their** voice”.

Summary: Maintain the plural *watchmen* in Mosiah 12:22; the entire passage supports the use of the plural.

■ **Mosiah 12:22**

thy watchmen shall lift up the voice

[NULL >+ *with the voice* 1 | *with the voice* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

together shall they sing

□ **Isaiah 52:8** (King James Bible)

thy watchmen shall lift up the voice

with the voice together shall they sing

While copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially dropped the phrase “with the voice”, probably because his eye skipped from the immediately preceding *voice* in “lift up the voice” to the *voice* at the end of “with the voice”. Oliver later inserted “with the voice” with somewhat heavier ink flow, using a sharper quill (which argues that these supralinear words were inserted later, probably when Oliver proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}). The corresponding passage in the King James Bible has this phrase; undoubtedly the original manuscript had the phrase, in agreement with the biblical text. It should be noted that there is no evidence that Oliver ever used a King James Bible to correct the text in the manuscripts. Consider especially the many instances from the Isaiah quotations where the Book of Mormon text is missing a phrase or a clause that originally occurred in the King James text (for 15 examples, see under 2 Nephi 8:15). On the other hand, there is clear evidence that the 1830 typesetter did occasionally refer to a King James Bible to supply or correct a word or two when the manuscript reading seemed impossible (but never one of these missing phrases or clauses); for examples, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 17:23 and 2 Nephi 20:10.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 12:12 “with the voice”, Oliver Cowdery’s correction in the printer’s manuscript to the probable reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ **Mosiah 12:24**

the Lord hath made bare his holy arm

in the eyes of all [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] nations

□ **Isaiah 52:10** (King James Bible)

the LORD hath made bare his holy arm

in the eyes of all **the** nations

The 1840 edition dropped the definite article *the* in the phrase “all the nations”. This loss appears to be a typo rather than due to editing. This reading was followed in the early RLDS textual tradition, but the original *the* (which is present in \mathcal{P} as well as in the corresponding Isaiah passage) was restored in the 1908 edition. Similarly, the 1837 edition omitted the definite article from the phrase “all the nations” in the following instance:

2 Nephi 29:12

and I shall also speak

unto all [*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] nations of the earth

For discussion, see that passage.

In the original Book of Mormon text, there are 28 occurrences of “all nations” (including two occurrences in the witness statements) and 17 occurrences of “all **the** nations”, so either reading is theoretically possible. But when we consider the 33 cases where “all (the) nations” is not postmodified, we find that all 28 instances of “all nations” are without postmodification, while there are only five instances of “all the nations” without postmodification. And strikingly, all five of these cite Isaiah 52:10 (the first and last instances are paraphrases rather than exact quotations):

1 Nephi 22:11	to make bare his arm in the eyes of all the nations
Mosiah 12:24	the Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations
Mosiah 15:31	the Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations
3 Nephi 16:20	the Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations
3 Nephi 20:35	the Father hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations

In other words, outside of biblical quotations, the Book of Mormon text consistently reads “all nations” rather than “all **the** nations” whenever there is no postmodification. This predominance is quite probably the reason why the 1840 edition accidentally omitted the *the* in Mosiah 12:24 (but, it turns out, in none of the other four quotations of Isaiah 52:10). The critical text will maintain all five of these cases of “all **the** nations”. (There is one additional case of this phraseology derived from Isaiah 52:10; in this sixth case, the definite article *the* is present in all the textual sources, including \mathcal{C} , but the *all* is lacking, namely in 1 Nephi 22:10: “unless he shall make bare his arm in the eyes **of the nations**”).

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 12:24 the use of the definite article *the* in the phrase “all the nations”, which is also the reading in the corresponding King James text for Isaiah 52:10.

■ **Mosiah 12:27**

*therefore what [teachest thou >js teach ye 1 | teachest thou A | teach ye BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
this people*

Here we have one more example of singular *thou* used for plural subjects. Later on in this chapter, there are five more instances of such usage (see the discussion under Mosiah 12:30–31). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced all six of these cases of singular *thou* or *thine* with the plural. The critical text, on the other hand, will restore all these cases of the second person singular pronoun. For previous discussion of this usage, see under 1 Nephi 3:29; for a complete discussion, see THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the occasional use of *thou* for plural subjects whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources; such usage is clearly intended since it occurs fairly frequently in the text (especially here in Mosiah 12, when Abinadi is speaking to the priests of king Noah).

■ Mosiah 12:29

*why do ye commit whoredoms and spend your strength with harlots
yea and cause this people to commit sin
that the Lord hath*

[sent >+ cause send >js cause to send 1 | cause to send ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *me
to prophesy against this people*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “hath sent me”, which is the language he expected. Somewhat later, with heavier ink flow, Oliver corrected this perfectly acceptable reading to the rather unusual “hath cause to send me”, although it should be noted that he neglected to insert the infinitival *to* (he actually wrote “hath cause send me”). The 1830 typesetter added the necessary *to* in the 1830 text, and Joseph Smith himself later inserted the *to* in the printer’s manuscript when he edited the text for the 1837 edition.

Elsewhere there are 49 examples where the text refers to the Lord sending someone, but none of the Lord “having cause” to send someone. Thus there would have been no motivation here in Mosiah 12:29 for Oliver Cowdery to have edited the text from “hath sent” to “hath cause to send”. It is true that in the preceding clause Abinadi used the verb *cause* when he asked why the priests “**cause** this people to commit sin”. Of course, the noun *cause* in “the Lord hath **cause** to send me” is used quite differently. Ultimately, there was no need to edit the text here in Mosiah 12:29 except that the original manuscript must have read “hath cause to send”.

The use of the phrase “to have cause to do something” is fairly frequent elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 4:18	the same hath great cause to repent
Mosiah 16:2	and they shall have cause to howl
Mosiah 20:14	what cause have ye to come up to war against my people
Alma 4:3	every soul had cause to mourn
Alma 5:36	the same hath cause to wail and mourn
Alma 8:15	for thou hast great cause to rejoice
Alma 11:25	that thou mightest have cause to destroy me
Alma 21:6	we have cause to repent
Alma 32:18	he hath no cause to believe
Alma 32:19	or only hath cause to believe
Alma 56:10	for which cause we have to mourn
Helaman 15:2	your women shall have great cause to mourn

All the evidence argues that Oliver Cowdery’s later correction in Mosiah 12:29 is the reading of the original text.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 12:29 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} , “the Lord hath **cause to send** me”; this correction undoubtedly follows the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant for any of the book of Mosiah.

■ Mosiah 12:30–31

[*knowest thou* >js *know ye* 1 | *Knowest thou* A | *Know ye* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not that I speak the truth*
 yea [*thou knowest* >js *ye know* 1 | *thou knowest* A | *ye know* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that I speak the truth*
 and **you** had ought to tremble before God
 and it shall come to pass that **ye** shall be smitten
 for [*thine* >js *your* 1 | *thine* A | *your* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *iniquities*
 for **ye** have said that **ye** teach the law of Moses
 and what [*knowest thou* >js *know ye* 1 | *knowest thou* A | *know ye* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *concerning the law of Moses*
 doth salvation come by the law of Moses
 what [*sayest thou* >js *say ye* 1 | *sayest thou* A | *say ye* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In these two verses, the original text has Abinadi addressing the priests of Noah with the singular pronoun *thou* four times and the possessive pronoun *thine* once, not the expected plural pronoun *ye* or *you* or the possessive pronoun *your*. There is a similar instance of this usage in verse 27 (“what teachest thou this people”), as well as elsewhere in the text (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:29). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith substituted the corresponding plural forms for each of these five cases here in Mosiah 12:30–31.

This particular passage is especially interesting in that the five instances of the second person singular (*thou* and *thine*) are intermixed in the original text with one example of *you* and three of *ye*. Clearly, variation is possible, even within the same sentence (“**ye** shall be smitten for **thine** iniquities”). We can also tell that the use of *thou* is intended since in each case of *thou* the corresponding verb takes the *-est* ending: “**knowest** thou . . . thou **knowest** . . . **knowest** thou . . . **sayest** thou”. For a complete listing of all examples where the second person singular pronoun refers to more than one person, see under THOU in volume 3. The critical text will restore all instances of this nonstandard usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the five uses of the second person singular pronoun in Mosiah 12:30–31 (four cases of *thou* and one of *thine*); correspondingly, the *-est* inflectional ending will also be restored to the verbs that take *thou* as subject.

■ Mosiah 12:32–33

and they answered and said that salvation did come by the law of Moses
 [& >+ *but now* 1 | *But now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Abinadi saith unto them*
I know if ye keep the commandments of God ye shall be saved

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “**and** Abinadi saith unto them”, but then sometime later he crossed out the ampersand he had written and supralinearly inserted *but now* (the correction was done with heavier ink flow). Undoubtedly, Oliver’s original *and* resulted from the consistent occurrence (up to this point) of *and* in the exchange between Abinadi and the priests:

verse 20	and it came to pass that one of them saith unto him . . .
verse 25	and now Abinadi saith unto them . . .

verse 28 and they said . . .
 verse 29 and again he saith unto them . . .
 verse 32 and they answered and said . . .

In particular, here in verse 33, Oliver was probably influenced by the immediately preceding “**and** they answered **and** said”. The *and* that Oliver initially wrote at the beginning of verse 33 would have worked, so probably Oliver here corrected the text of \mathcal{P} to agree with \mathcal{C} , no longer extant for the book of Mosiah. For a similar example of proofing against \mathcal{C} , see the nearby correction of *sent* to *cause send* in verse 29, also done with heavier ink flow as here in verse 33. For the same reason, the critical text will maintain Oliver’s corrected reading *but now* in Mosiah 12:33.

There is also additional evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes initially wrote *and* in place of *but*:

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

Alma 14:18
and they came in unto the prison to see them
and they questioned them about many words
 [& > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they answered them nothing

Alma 57:12–13
and thus we had accomplished our designs in obtaining the city Cumeni
 [& >% *but* 0 | & > *but* 1 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass that
 our prisoners were so numerous that . . .

Notice that in each of these instances, there is at least one preceding *and* that could have served as the source for Oliver’s incorrect *and*; the same situation is found here in Mosiah 12:32–33.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in Mosiah 12:33 (“**but now** Abinadi saith unto them”); this correction probably occurred while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

■ **Mosiah 12:34**

I am the Lord thy God
 [*which* >]s *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [*have* 1A | *has* BCGHKPS | *hast* DEFIJLMNOQ | *hath* RT] *brought thee out of the land of Egypt*

□ **Exodus 20:2** (King James Bible)

I am the LORD thy God
 which **have** brought thee out of the land of Egypt

The original text of the Book of Mormon has the same verb form *have* as does the corresponding King James passage in Exodus 20:2. The *have* is actually in agreement with the preceding *I* (that is, “I . . . have brought thee out of the land of Egypt”). In the Hebrew, the verb form for *have brought* directly expresses a first person singular subject; the King James use of *have* is therefore literally consistent with the original Hebrew. A similar example is found later on in the book of Leviticus:

Leviticus 20:24 (King James Bible)

I *am* the LORD your God which **have** separated you from *other* people

Like Exodus 20:2, the original Hebrew for Leviticus 20:24 directly supports the literal English translation: the verb form that follows the relative pronoun explicitly indicates that the subject is *I*. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading in Mosiah 12:34: “I am the Lord thy God which **have** brought thee out of the land of Egypt”.

For the 1837 edition, the original *have* was replaced by *has*. In addition, Joseph Smith edited the relative pronoun *which* to *who*, in accord with his general editing practice of replacing *which* with *who(m)* whenever the relative pronoun refers to a person. The change to *has* assumes that the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* (or the edited *who*) is the nearest noun phrase, *the Lord thy God*, rather than earlier *I*. Interestingly, in the 1841 British edition, the typesetter accidentally changed the *has* to *hast*, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *thy* in “the Lord thy God”. This inappropriate verb form was maintained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition, when *hast* was replaced by *hath*, probably because the biblically styled *hath* sounded more appropriate than the *has* that the 1837 edition had introduced. Like *has*, the *hath* assumes that the antecedent for the relative pronoun is *the Lord thy God*.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 12:34 the original verb form *have* in “I am the Lord thy God which **have** brought thee out of the land of Egypt”; this verb form agrees with the King James reading in Exodus 20:2.

■ **Mosiah 12:35**

*thou shalt have no other **God** before me*

□ **Exodus 20:3** (King James Bible)

thou shalt have no other **Gods** before me

The Mosiah 12 version of the first part of the Ten Commandments has one significant difference in the first commandment: namely, the singular *God* versus the plural *Gods*. It is, of course, possible that the singular *God* in the Book of Mormon text is due to scribal error (☪ is not extant here). On the other hand, the singular will work. Note, in particular, that the biblical text has two passages where the singular *God* is used when referring to the first commandment (the singular occurs not only in the King James translation but also in the respective Hebrew and Greek originals):

Exodus 34:14

for thou shalt worship **no other God**
for the LORD whose name *is* Jealous
is a jealous God

1 Corinthians 8:4

as concerning therefore the eating of those things
that are offered in sacrifice unto idols
we know that an idol *is* nothing in the world
and that *there is* **none other God** but one

The critical text will therefore accept the singular *God* in Mosiah 12:35.

Summary: Maintain the singular *God* in Mosiah 12:35, even though the corresponding text in Exodus 20:3 has the plural *Gods*; the singular *God* could be the result of an early error in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text, but usage elsewhere in the biblical text supports the singular as well as the plural usage.

■ **Mosiah 12:36**

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

□ **Exodus 20:4** (King James Bible)

thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image
or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above
or that is in the earth beneath

Here in Mosiah 12:36 we have one substantive textual variant—namely, the extra *the* in the phrase “in the heaven above”. This *the* is not found in the corresponding King James passage in Exodus 20 (“in heaven above”); perhaps in Mosiah 12:36 *the* was added under the influence of the *the* in the following parallel relative clause (“which is in **the** earth beneath”). In fact, the corresponding Masoretic Hebrew text has a full *a* vowel (rather than a schwa vowel) assigned to the prefix *b* ‘in’ for the words corresponding to *heaven* and *earth*, thus showing that the Masoretes interpreted the original consonantal text for these two prepositional phrases as having the definite article. Thus one could argue that the Book of Mormon text for Mosiah 12:36 more consistently represents the Masoretic Hebrew, at least as far as the definite article is concerned. But it should also be noted that in the Hebrew the word for *heaven* is in the plural. This means one cannot argue that the earliest text for Mosiah 12:36 literally represents the original Hebrew; if it did, this prepositional phrase should read “in the heavens above”. Interestingly, the Book of Mormon does have one example of this very language (that is, with the definite article *the* and the plural *heavens*):

2 Nephi 29:7

I rule in **the heavens** above and in the earth beneath

Another factor to consider here is that the definite article *the* is not found when this part of Exodus 20:4 is repeated in the next chapter of Mosiah:

Mosiah 13:12

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

The two Mosiah passages also vary with respect to each other in minor ways (noted below in bold):

Mosiah 12:36

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

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

So the original extra *the* in Mosiah 12:36 may simply represent one more instance of the inherent variation found in Book of Mormon citations from the Bible.

In any event, the article *the* in Mosiah 12:36 was deleted in the 1837 edition, with the result that this passage more fully agreed with the King James reading for Exodus 20:4 (as well as with Mosiah 13:12). But the remaining differences between the two Mosiah citations and Exodus 20:4 suggest that this 1837 emendation may have been unintentionally introduced.

If we consider every example in the earliest Book of Mormon text of “in (the) heaven(s)” conjoined with a following “in (the) earth”, we find considerable variation:

2 Nephi 29:7	I rule in the heavens above and in the earth beneath
Jacob 7:14	he hath power both in heaven and in earth
Mosiah 4:9	he created all things both in heaven and in earth
Mosiah 4:9	he hath all wisdom and all power both in heaven and in earth
Mosiah 5:15	him who created all things in heaven and in earth
Mosiah 12:36	any thing in the heaven above or things which is in the earth beneath
Mosiah 13:12	things which is in heaven above or which is in the earth beneath
Alma 18:28	God created all things which is in heaven and in the earth
Alma 22:10	and he created all things both in heaven and in earth
Helaman 8:24	both things in heaven and all things which are in earth

In the last example, the 1830 typesetter added the definite article *the* before *earth*, thus showing a tendency to add the definite article to conjuncts involving *heaven* and *earth*. (See the discussion under Helaman 8:24; for a list of passages where *the* has been accidentally added before *heaven*, see under 1 Nephi 12:6.) But the important point here is that the earliest text—and the current text—shows variation, as given in the following statistical summary for the earliest text:

in the heavens . . . in the earth	1
in the heaven . . . in the earth	1
in heaven . . . in the earth	2
in heaven . . . in earth	6

In fact, we get strikingly proportional statistics for this construction in the King James Bible:

in the heavens . . . in the earth	1
in the heaven . . . in the earth	2
in heaven . . . in the earth	4
in heaven . . . in earth	10

All of this variation suggests that in the Book of Mormon text we should accept in each case the earliest textual reading for conjuncts of “in (the) heaven(s)” and “in (the) earth”. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading in Mosiah 12:36 (“any thing **in the heaven** above or things which is **in the earth** beneath”).

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 12:36 the earliest reading, “any thing in **the heaven** above or things which is in the earth beneath”; this verse is a quotation from Exodus 20:4, which has no definite article before *heaven* in the King James text; although we may have an early textual error here in the Book of Mormon, variation in the King James Bible as well as in the Book of Mormon argues that the extra *the* in Mosiah 12:36 may very well represent the original text for the Book of Mormon passage.

Mosiah 13

■ Mosiah 13:5

*and his face shone with exceeding luster
even as [Moses >+ Moses' 1 | Moses ACGJ | Moses' BDEFHIKLMNOPQRST] did
while in the mount of Sinai while speaking with the Lord*

In this passage we have a possible ambiguity with respect to *Moses*: should this name be interpreted as a subject or a possessive form? The presumable reading here is that Abinadi's face shone just like Moses's face shone, as indicated in the biblical text (although the King James Bible specifically refers to the **skin** of his face shining):

Exodus 34:29–30, 35

Moses wist not that **the skin of his face shone** while he talked with him
and when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses
behold **the skin of his face shone** and they were afraid to come nigh him . . .
and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses
that **the skin of Moses' face shone**

But since in Mosiah 13:5 the name *Moses* is not followed by any noun, one could theoretically read the text here as saying that Moses's whole being shone, not just his face. In accord with the biblical reading, the critical text will accept the possessive form *Moses'* as the correct reading.

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *Moses* without any apostrophe, but later he (or maybe Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition) added the apostrophe with heavier ink flow. The 1830 and the 1840 editions set *Moses* without any apostrophe, while the 1837 edition supplied the apostrophe. Two other editions have omitted the apostrophe (the 1858 Wright edition and the 1888 LDS edition), but all others (including the current LDS and RLDS editions) have the apostrophe.

The expanded possessive form *Moses's* does not occur here or elsewhere in the Book of Mormon; there is only one other relevant passage with the possessive form of *Moses*, and it twice reads *Moses'*:

3 Nephi 27:8

for if a church be called
in [*Meses* 1 | *Moses'* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] name
then it be [*moses* 1 | *Moses'* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] church

The critical text will therefore accept the possessive form *Moses'* rather than the alternative *Moses's*.

Summary: Accept the possessive form *Moses'* in Mosiah 13:5 (“even as Moses’ did”) since the biblical text refers only to Moses’s face shining, not his whole being; the manuscript spellings consistently support the possessive form *Moses'* over *Moses's*.

■ Mosiah 13:9

but I finish my message

and then it [mattereth >+ matters 1 | matters ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not whither I go

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *mattereth* here in the printer’s manuscript, but then somewhat later (perhaps while proofing against the original manuscript) he changed *mattereth* to *matters* with slightly heavier ink flow (he crossed out the final *th* of the *-eth* ending and overwrote the *e* with an *s*).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are 11 occurrences of “it mattereth not”, including one that is very similar to Mosiah 13:9, namely “and whither I go it mattereth not” in Mormon 8:4. There is also one example of “this mattereth not” (in Alma 40:8). On the other hand, there is one other example in the text of “it matters not”:

Alma 5:58

I say unto you
if ye speak against it / it **matters** not
for the word of God must be fulfilled

The higher frequency of “it mattereth not” suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *mattereth* because in this biblically sounding expression (for which *not* follows the main verb *matter*), Oliver expected the *-(e)th* ending more than the standard English *-(e)s* ending, which is what we would expect if the phrase had been “it does not matter”. In addition, the use of the archaic *whither* rather than the modern *where* adds to the biblical style of this sentence. Moreover, all the other examples of “it mattereth not” have remained unchanged throughout the textual history, which argues that here in Mosiah 13:9 there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have changed *mattereth* to *matters* except that \mathcal{C} itself read *matters*. Finally, there is one other example where Oliver accidentally supplied the *-eth* ending to this expression:

Alma 54:22

but behold these things [*matter* ORT | *mattereth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] *not*

In this instance, Oliver accidentally replaced *matter* with *mattereth* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} (\mathcal{C} is extant here); thus we have clear evidence that he expected the phraseology “mattereth not”.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 13:9 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : “it **matters** not whither I go”; the initial reading, *mattereth*, is expected, so the correction to *matters* most probably represents the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ **Mosiah 13:13**

and again

thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them nor serve them

□ **Exodus 20:5** (King James Bible)

thou shalt not bow down thyself **to** them nor serve them

The initial words *and again* are Abinadi's, not a part of the quote itself. Abinadi is simply moving on from the previous commandment that had earlier triggered a lengthy exchange between him and king Noah's priests (namely, Exodus 20:4, cited in part in Mosiah 12:36 and then given in full in Mosiah 13:12); notice, in fact, the introductory clause at the beginning of verse 12:

Mosiah 13:12 (citing Exodus 20:4)

and now ye remember that I said unto you

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

One additional difference in Mosiah 13:13 is the use of the preposition *unto* in the Book of Mormon text, while Exodus 20:5 has *to*. It is possible that the original Book of Mormon text also had *to* and that *unto* is a transmission error. Interestingly, the parallel quote of the Ten Commandments found in Deuteronomy uses *unto* rather than the *to* of the Exodus version:

Deuteronomy 5:9 (King James Bible)

thou shalt not bow down thyself **unto** them nor serve them

Since this variation between *to* and *unto* actually occurs in the biblical text, it seems perfectly reasonable to retain *unto* in the Book of Mormon text. Furthermore, there are many different expressions in the Book of Mormon text where either *to* or *unto* can occur. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the phrase "pertaining (un)to righteousness" under 1 Nephi 15:33 or the phrase "hearken (un)to X" under 1 Nephi 16:3. In other words, the most plausible conclusion for Mosiah 13:13 is that the invariant reading of all the (extant) textual sources—namely, *unto*—is the original reading.

It should be noted here that Abinadi is citing Exodus 20 rather than Deuteronomy 5. Whenever the two biblical versions of the Ten Commandments differ, the Book of Mormon text almost always agrees with the Exodus 20 version: namely, in 32 out of 33 differences. Only here where the Book of Mormon reads *unto* does the text agree with the Deuteronomy version. This single agreement seems accidental. There are 14 places where the Book of Mormon text in Mosiah 12–13 varies from Exodus 20, all in minor ways except for one phrasal deletion in Mosiah 13:19 (see under that passage for discussion); and of those 14 differences, only this one involving *(un)to* agrees with Deuteronomy 5.

Summary: In Mosiah 13:13 the initial words *and again* are Abinadi's, not a part of the biblical quote itself; the preposition *unto* is an acceptable variant for *to* since in many different expressions the Book of Mormon text allows variation between *to* and *unto*.

■ **Mosiah 13:13**

*for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God
visiting the **iniquities** of the fathers upon the children*

□ **Exodus 20:5** (King James Bible)

for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God
visiting the **iniquity** of the fathers upon the children

One may wonder here if the plural *iniquities* might be an error for the singular *iniquity*, the reading of the King James Bible. The Masoretic Hebrew text, which serves as the basis for the King James translation, has the singular *iniquity* here in Exodus 20:5. But interestingly, the Septuagint Greek reads in the plural (literally, “**sins** of fathers”) in its translation of Exodus 20:5. Moreover, in the two passages where Abinadi refers to the Lord visiting the people of Noah to punish them, the text uses the plural *iniquities* rather than the singular *iniquity*; in fact, the first of these paraphrases Exodus 20:5:

Mosiah 11:22

and it shall come to pass that they shall know that I am the Lord their God
and am a jealous God visiting the **iniquities** of my people

Mosiah 12:1

therefore I will visit them in my anger
yea in my fierce anger will I visit them in their **iniquities** and abominations

Thus in the Book of Mormon (including here in Mosiah 13:13, a direct citation of Exodus 20:5), the text prefers the plural *iniquities* when referring to the Lord visiting his people in anger. Similarly, in two Isaiah quotations, the Book of Mormon has the plural *iniquities* instead of the singular *iniquity* in the King James text—namely, in 2 Nephi 24:21 and Mosiah 14:6 (see the discussion under those two passages). Thus the critical text will maintain the plural *iniquities* here in Mosiah 13:13.

Summary: Retain the plural *iniquities* in Mosiah 13:13, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; the plural is consistent with usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text that refers to the Lord visiting his people in anger; the plural usage is also supported by the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew for Exodus 20:5 as well as by other Book of Mormon passages that prefer the plural *iniquities* when quoting biblical passages.

■ **Mosiah 13:13**

*for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God
visiting the **iniquities** of the fathers upon the children
unto the third and fourth [generation 1 | generations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of them
that hate me*

□ **Exodus 20:5** (King James Bible)

for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God
visiting the **iniquity** of the fathers upon the children
unto the third and fourth **generation** of them that hate me

The printer’s manuscript has the singular *generation*, in agreement with the corresponding reading in Exodus 20 of the King James Bible. The 1830 typesetter (accidentally, it would appear) changed *generation* to the plural *generations*, which all subsequent editions have followed. One could literally translate the Masoretic Hebrew as “unto the thirds or unto the fourths”; the plurality in the Hebrew refers to the plurality of the individuals themselves, not to the collective generations per se.

In similar biblical passages, the King James Bible consistently uses the singular *generation* (and always in italics, as in Exodus 20:5):

Exodus 34:7

visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children
and upon the children’s children
unto the third and to the fourth *generation*

Numbers 14:18

visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children
unto the third and fourth *generation*

Deuteronomy 5:9 (citing the Ten Commandments)

visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children
unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me

The plural reading in the current text for Mosiah 13:13 is clearly an error in transmission; the critical text will restore the singular.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 13:13 the singular *generation* in the phrase “unto the third and fourth generation”; the reading of the printer’s manuscript agrees with every King James citation of this same phraseology.

■ **Mosiah 13:17**

six days [shalt 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | shall H] thou labor

□ **Exodus 20:9** (King James Bible)

six days **shalt** thou labor

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *shalt thou* with *shall thou*. The subsequent RLDS edition (in 1892) restored the correct reading. For further discussion of the tendency in the text to replace *shalt* with *shall*, see under Mosiah 12:11. For a similar example in this chapter, see Mosiah 13:23.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 13:17 the use of *shalt* in “six days shalt thou labor”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Mosiah 13:18**

but the seventh day

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

the sabbath of the Lord thy God

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

thou shalt not do any work

□ **Exodus 20:10** (King James Bible)

but the seventh day *is* the sabbath of the LORD thy God /
in it thou shalt not do any work

In this verse, the Book of Mormon text omits two instances of italicized text found in the King James Bible (*is* and *in it*). Beginning with the 1830 edition, the phrase “the sabbath of the Lord thy God” has been set off from the rest of the text by commas, with the result that this parenthetical phrase is interpreted as a nonrestrictive appositive. In the Septuagint and Vulgate versions (and even in a few of the Hebrew manuscripts), the difficulty of the Masoretic Hebrew text has been alleviated by supplying the grammatical equivalent of the preposition *on* to “the seventh day” (although it is also possible that the *on* was original to the Hebrew text). For this passage the Book of Mormon translation literally follows the Masoretic Hebrew text. The critical text will maintain the earliest text here in Mosiah 13:18, despite its difficulty when compared with the King James version.

Summary: Retain the literal translation of the Masoretic Hebrew in Mosiah 13:18, with its nonrestrictive appositive interpretation of “the sabbath of the Lord thy God” and the lack of a preposition for the sentence-initial adverbial phrase “the seventh day”.

■ **Mosiah 13:19**

for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the sea and all that in them is*

□ **Exodus 20:11** (King James Bible)

for *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth
the sea and all that in them *is*

The Book of Mormon text has an *and* before *the sea*, with the result that the conjoined structure is fully coordinated (“heaven **and** earth **and** the sea **and** all that in them is”). The ancient versions (Greek, Syriac, Latin, the Targums, and even many Hebrew manuscripts) also have the *and* before *the sea*, so the Book of Mormon text here either fulfills a natural tendency to add the *and* or represents the Hebrew original text (which would imply that what became the standard Masoretic Hebrew text for Exodus 20:11 accidentally lost the prefixal *and* at some earlier time).

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 13:19 the highly expected *and* before *the sea*; other ancient versions strongly support the *and* here in this quotation of Exodus 20:11.

■ **Mosiah 13:19**

for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea and all that in them is wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it

□ **Exodus 20:11** (King James Bible)

for *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth / the sea and all that in them *is and rested the seventh day* wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it

The Book of Mormon text here omits the conjoined predicate “and rested the seventh day”. This omission seems to be unmotivated: there is no reason to suspect that the Nephites at the time of king Noah observed the sabbath (the day of rest) on some other day of the week (such as the first day). This conclusion is strongly supported by the earlier quote from the preceding verse (“but the seventh day—the sabbath of the Lord thy God—thou shalt not do any work”).

The loss of the conjoined predicate in Mosiah 13:19 appears to be accidental, perhaps originating in Abinadi’s biblical source or in the large plates of Nephi—or in the early manuscript transmission of the English text. Even so, there doesn’t seem to be any visual similarity in the English text that would have led to the loss of the conjoined predicate. Nor does such a loss in the original Hebrew seem particularly motivated.

As discussed under 2 Nephi 8:15, there are a number of places in the Isaiah quotations where the Book of Mormon text simply lacks some of the King James phrases and clauses. Most of these omissions seem inexplicable. Since there seems to be no specific evidence of any transmission error in these cases, the critical text will retain these shorter readings, despite their difficulty. Similarly, here in Mosiah 13:19 (where Exodus 20 is being quoted), the critical text will maintain the difficult reading that results from omitting the phrase “and rested the seventh day”.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 13:19 the reading without the conjoined predicate “and rested the seventh day” (found in Exodus 20:11 of the King James Bible); there are quite a few cases in the earliest Book of Mormon text where biblical quotations are inexplicably missing whole phrases and clauses that are found in the corresponding King James text.

■ **Mosiah 13:23**

thou [shalt 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | shall G] not bear false witness against thy neighbor

□ **Exodus 20:16** (King James Bible)

thou **shalt** not bear false witness against thy neighbor

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced *thou shalt* with *thou shall*; a similar instance of this error, also confined to a single edition, is found nearby in Mosiah 13:17. The critical text will, of course, retain the standard biblical *thou shalt* here in Mosiah 13:23 and generally elsewhere. For a more complete discussion, see under Mosiah 12:11.

Summary: Maintain the use of *shalt* in “thou shalt not bear false witness”.

■ Mosiah 13:25

and it came to pass that after Abinadi had made an end of these [things > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sayings that he said unto them . . .

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *things*, but then he crossed out *things* and wrote inline the correct *sayings*, undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here). The normal reading in the Book of Mormon text is “to make an end of one’s **sayings**”:

2 Nephi 30:18	I must make an end of my sayings
Mosiah 1:15	after king Benjamin had made an end of these sayings to his son
Alma 24:17	when the king had made an end of these sayings
3 Nephi 10:19	therefore for this time I make an end of my sayings
3 Nephi 18:36	when Jesus had made an end of these sayings
3 Nephi 26:12	and now I Mormon make an end of my sayings

There is also one case of “to make an end of one’s **saying**” (that is, where *saying* is in the singular):

3 Nephi 5:19	and now I make an end of my saying which is of myself
--------------	---

For discussion of the possibility that this singular *saying* could be an error for *sayings*, see under 3 Nephi 5:19.

In the Book of Mormon text, there is only one actual example of “to make an end of **things**”, and in that case Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *sayings* in \mathfrak{D} , then virtually immediately corrected it to *things*:

Mosiah 6:3
 and again it came to pass that
 when king Benjamin had made an end
 of all these [*sayings* > *things* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

(See under Mosiah 6:3 for discussion of why *things* might be more appropriate than *sayings* for that passage.) Oliver’s initial error of *things* in Mosiah 13:25 might have been influenced by the earlier occurrence of “made an end of all these **things**” in Mosiah 6:3.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 13:25 the corrected reading in \mathfrak{D} : “after Abinadi had made an end of these **sayings**”; here we can be confident that Oliver Cowdery corrected the text to agree with \mathfrak{C} , given that the word *sayings* was written inline in \mathfrak{D} .

■ Mosiah 13:25

have ye taught this people that they should observe to do all these things
 [1RT | ? ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
 [for 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | For A] to keep these commandments
 [1 | ? ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original text of the Book of Mormon had a number of examples of the now-archaic infinitive clause structure “**for to** <do something>”. Out of 15 original examples, Joseph Smith edited 13

to the modern English “**to** <do something>” (that is, by deleting the *for*). For discussion of one example that Joseph edited, see Mosiah 20:1; for a complete list of all 15 examples, see FOR TO in volume 3. But in two places, Joseph missed removing the archaic *for to*, here in Mosiah 13:25 and in a later passage:

Alma 12:4
 and thou seest that we know that thy plan was a very subtle plan
 as to the subtlety of the devil
for to lie and to deceive this people

Here in Mosiah 13:25, the 1830 punctuation seems to have prevented the 1837 editing out of the *for* since the 1830 typesetter broke up the original single question into two questions:

Mosiah 13:25 (1830 accidentals)
 Have ye taught this people that they should observe to do all these things?
 For to keep these commandments?

The resulting punctuation could have misled Joseph Smith into interpreting the *for* as a conjunction (which would have been independent of the following *to*). In any event, the 1837 edition retained the *for to* and the preceding question mark, although the capitalized *For* of the 1830 edition was replaced with a lowercase *for* in the 1837 edition. The 1920 LDS edition correctly removed the sentence-internal question mark but left the *for to* (as also in Alma 12:4). The critical text will, of course, restore all original instances of *for to*.

Summary: Restore the original archaic *for to* in the Book of Mormon text wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources; in two cases, the standard text has maintained the original *for to*, in Mosiah 13:25 and Alma 12:4.

■ **Mosiah 13:32**

*for they understood not
 that there could not any man be saved except it were
 through the [redeemer > redemption 1 | redemption ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “through the **redeemer** of God”; soon thereafter he crossed out *redeemer* and supralinearly inserted *redemption* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Obviously, *redemption* is correct. Elsewhere, for each case of “redeemer of X”, the meaning is always that ‘X is redeemed’:

1 Nephi 10:5	this Redeemer of the world
1 Nephi 11:27	the Redeemer of the world
1 Nephi 21:7	the Redeemer of Israel
Alma 28:8	the Redeemer of all men

Clearly “redeemer of God” would be wrong in Mosiah 13:32: the text is not talking about how God could be redeemed but instead about how mankind would be redeemed, as explained in the following verse:

Mosiah 13:33

for behold did not Moses prophesy unto them
concerning the coming of the Messiah
and that **God** should **redeem** his people

On the other hand, the X in the phrase “redemption of X” can act semantically as either subject or object for the verb *redeem*:

□ X as subject (‘X redeems’)

The Words of Mormon 1:8	the redemption of Christ
Mosiah 13:32	the redemption of God
Mosiah 18:13	the redemption of Christ
Alma 5:15	the redemption of him who created you
Alma 15:8	the redemption of Christ

□ X as object (‘X is redeemed’)

1 Nephi 1:19	the redemption of the world
Mosiah 18:2	the redemption of the people
Alma 42:26	the redemption of men
Mormon 7:7	the redemption of the world
Mormon 9:12	the redemption of man
Mormon 9:13	the redemption of man

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 13:32 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : “there could not any man be saved except it were through the **redemption** of God”.

■ **Mosiah 13:33**

*for behold did not Moses prophesy unto them concerning the coming of the Messiah
and that God should redeem his people
yea and **even** all the prophets which have prophesied
[even >+ ever 1 | ever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] since the world began*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *even*; perhaps he was influenced by the preceding occurrence of *even* in this verse (“and even all the prophets”). Somewhat later, Oliver corrected the *even* to *ever* (the level of ink flow is only slightly heavier). His correction may have occurred almost immediately, after redipping his quill, or perhaps later when he proofed \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} . The use of *even* in the phrase “even since the world began” makes little sense in this context. In addition, other passages that refer to the beginning of the world use *ever* rather than *even*:

Mosiah 15:13

and are not the prophets
every one that has opened his mouth to prophesy
that has not fallen into transgression
I mean all the holy prophets **ever** since the world began . . .

Mosiah 15:26

yea even all those that have perished in their sins **ever** since the world began . . .

Alma 7:25

that ye may at last be brought to sit down
with Abraham Isaac and Jacob and the holy prophets
which have been **ever** since the world began

For further discussion of the potential confusion between *ever* and *even*, see the discussion under Mosiah 4:7.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 13:33 Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{D} of *even* to *ever* in the phrase "ever since the world began"; the text consistently uses *ever* rather than *even* for this phrase.

Mosiah 14

■ Mosiah 14:1

who [hath 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | have D] believed our report

□ Isaiah 53:1 (King James Bible)

who **hath** believed our report

The 1841 British edition introduced the reading *who have*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *hath*, the King James reading. For *wh*-questions in English, we expect either *who hath* (in the biblical style) or *who has* (in modern English), not *who have*. To be sure, *who have* does occur in the Book of Mormon text, but only as the head of relative clauses. For instance, the original text of the Book of Mormon has seven occurrences of the relative-clause use of *who have*, as in Mosiah 3:11: “those who have fallen by the transgression of Adam”. The current LDS and RLDS texts have many more examples of *who have*; again, all are in relative clauses. Most of these additional instances of *who have* are due to the editing of *which have* to *who have*. For further discussion of the editing of *which* to *who*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 14:1 the singular *hath*, the reading of the earliest Book of Mormon textual sources as well as the King James Bible for Isaiah 53:1.

■ Mosiah 14:2

*for he shall grow up before him as a tender plant
and as a root out of dry ground*

□ Isaiah 53:2 (King James Bible)

for he shall grow up before him as a tender plant
and as a root out of **a** dry ground

The Book of Mormon text is missing the indefinite article *a* before “dry ground”. This article is found before other noun phrases in the passage (“a tender plant” and “a root”). Hebrew has no indefinite article, so either translation (“a dry ground” or “dry ground”) is possible. The Hebrew word for *ground* in “dry ground” is the word *’ereṣ*, which means that this phrase could also be translated as “(a) dry earth” or “(a) dry land”. If the word *land* is used in the sense of ‘country’, then we would expect the indefinite article in the English translation. Interestingly, modern translations of Isaiah 53:2 have the *a* for *plant* and *root* (or their equivalents) but not for *ground*:

Isaiah 53:2

- Revised Standard Version (RSV, 1952)
for he grew up before him like a young plant
and like a root out of **dry ground**
- New International Version (NIV, 1978)
he grew up before him like a tender shoot
and like a root out of **dry ground**

Elsewhere in the King James Bible we find no other cases of “a dry ground”, only “dry ground” and “the dry ground”—that is, without the indefinite article *a*:

Exodus 14:16

and the children of Israel shall go on **dry ground**
through the midst of the sea

Exodus 14:22

and the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea
upon **the dry ground**

Joshua 3:17

and the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD
stood firm on **dry ground** in the midst of Jordan
and all the Israelites passed over on **dry ground**
until all the people were passed clean over Jordan

2 Kings 2:8

and Elijah took his mantle and wrapped *it* together
and smote the waters and they were divided hither and thither
so that they two went over on **dry ground**

Psalms 107:33

he turneth rivers into a wilderness
and the watersprings into **dry ground**

Psalms 107:35

he turneth the wilderness into a standing water
and **dry ground** into watersprings

Isaiah 44:3

for I will pour water upon him that is thirsty
and floods upon **the dry ground**

The Book of Mormon refers four times to the crossing of the Red Sea; each time “dry ground” occurs without any *a*:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 Nephi 4:2 | and our fathers came through out of captivity on dry ground |
| 1 Nephi 17:26 | and they passed through on dry ground |
| Mosiah 7:19 | that they should walk through the Red Sea on dry ground |
| Helaman 8:11 | insomuch that the Israelites . . . came through upon dry ground |

Thus the Book of Mormon’s rendering of “a dry ground” as simply “dry ground” is expected and could, in fact, be intended. The consistent reading without the *a* will therefore be accepted here in Mosiah 14:2, but with the understanding that the omission of the *a* could be the result of an early transmission error in the text.

It should also be noted that there are a number of Isaiah passages where the earliest attested Book of Mormon reading differs from the King James text with respect to the occurrence of the indefinite article *a*:

- 1 Nephi 21:7 (Isaiah 49:7 has *a servant*)
to **servant** of rulers
- 2 Nephi 7:11 (Isaiah 50:11 has *kindle a fire*)
behold all ye that **kindleth fire**
- 2 Nephi 8:12 (Isaiah 51:12 has *a man*)
behold who art thou that thou shouldst be afraid of **man**
- 2 Nephi 27:2 (Isaiah 29:6 reads *and great noise*)
and with earthquake **and with a great noise**

In two of these four cases, the critical text will accept the earliest extant Book of Mormon reading—namely, in 2 Nephi 8:12 (without the *a*) and in 2 Nephi 27:2 (with the *a*). In the two other cases, the Isaiah reading will be accepted rather than the earliest extant Book of Mormon reading—namely, in 1 Nephi 21:7 and in 2 Nephi 7:11 (both with the *a*). Sometimes the omission or the addition of *a* seems to be intended, other times accidental. We consider each case on its own merits; see under each of these four passages for discussion of the evidence.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 14:2 the consistent reading of the Book of Mormon textual sources for the phrase “out of dry ground”—that is, without the indefinite *a* that is found in the King James reading for Isaiah 53:2; the reading without the *a* will work here and may very well be intended.

■ Mosiah 14:3

and we hid as it were our [faces 1AT | face BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] from him

□ Isaiah 53:3 (King James Bible)

and we hid as it were **our faces** from him

The earliest Book of Mormon source for this passage, the printer’s manuscript, has the plural *faces*, which agrees with the King James translation in Isaiah 53:3. This plural reading was changed to the singular in the 1837 edition, perhaps accidentally since the use of the plural *faces* is perfectly acceptable; note also that Joseph Smith did not mark this change in the printer’s manuscript. The 1981 LDS edition restored the plural, but the RLDS text has kept the singular *face* despite the fact that the printer’s manuscript reads in the plural. For additional discussion regarding textual variation for *face* and *faces* in Isaiah quotations, see under 2 Nephi 6:7 and 2 Nephi 26:20.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 14:3 the original plural *faces* in “and we hid as it were our faces from him”; the plural *faces* is also found in the corresponding King James reading for Isaiah 53:3.

■ **Mosiah 14:4**

surely he [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] borne our griefs

□ **Isaiah 53:4** (King James Bible)

surely he **hath** borne our griefs

Here the 1837 edition replaced *hath* with *has*, yet this change could be an error since it was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer's manuscript for the 1837 edition. Moreover, throughout this quotation of Isaiah 53, none of the five other examples of *hath* have ever been changed to *has*:

verse 1	who hath believed our report
verse 2	he hath no form nor comeliness
verse 6	and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all
verse 10	he hath put him to grief
verse 12	because he hath poured out his soul unto death

Only rarely in the preceding biblical quotations has *hath* been changed to *has* in the editions:

1 Nephi 20:17 (1837 change)
the Lord thy God . . . [*hath* 01ART | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] done it

2 Nephi 16:7 (1830 change)
this [*hath* 1 | *has* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] touched thy lips

Both of these changes were probably accidental. The first occurred in the 1837 edition but was not marked by Joseph Smith in Ø; the second occurred in the 1830 edition. See both of those passages for further discussion.

As far as the change in Mosiah 14:4 is concerned, it should be pointed out that in the next chapter of Mosiah we have eight cases where the 1837 edition changed *hath* to *has* (although only half of these were marked by Joseph Smith in Ø); one of these cites Isaiah 53:4 once more, although paraphrastically (marked below with an arrow):

Mosiah 15:11
behold I say unto you that
whosoever [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heard
the words of the prophets . . .

Mosiah 15:12
for these are they whose sins
→ he [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] borne
these are they for whom
he [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] died

Mosiah 15:18
yea even the Lord
who [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] redeemed his people
yea him who [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] granted salvation
unto his people

Mosiah 15:23

they are raised to dwell with God
 who [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] redeemed them
 thus they have eternal life through Christ
 who [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] broken the bands of death

Mosiah 15:27

for he cannot deny justice
 when it [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] its claim

In contrast to this intentional editing in Mosiah 15, the single change earlier in Mosiah 14:4 appears to be unintentional. In any case, the critical text will restore the original *hath*, not only in Mosiah 14:4 but in all the examples cited above from Mosiah 15. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the biblical *hath* in Mosiah 14:4, the earliest reading in the Book of Mormon text (which is also the reading in the King James Bible for Isaiah 53:4).

■ **Mosiah 14:6**

*and the Lord hath laid on him the **iniquities** of us all*

□ **Isaiah 53:6** (King James Bible)

and the LORD hath laid on him the **iniquity** of us all

In the Mosiah 14 quotation of Isaiah 53, the Book of Mormon text pluralizes several references to evildoing that involve the words *iniquity*, *transgression*, and *sin*. There are three instances where the plural already occurs in the corresponding King James text (and in the Masoretic Hebrew):

Mosiah 14:5	but he was wounded for our transgressions
Mosiah 14:5	he was bruised for our iniquities
Mosiah 14:11	for he shall bear their iniquities

On the other hand, there are three places where Isaiah 53 reads in the singular in the King James Bible (and the Masoretic Hebrew) but in the plural in Mosiah 14. Besides *iniquities* in Mosiah 14:6, we have one case of *sins*, plus one more of *transgressions*:

Mosiah 14:8	for the transgressions of my people was he stricken
Mosiah 14:12	and he bare the sins of many

Interestingly, for all six of these cases, the Greek Septuagint also uses words in the plural to refer to evildoing (translated as either *sins* or *lawless acts*). The consistency in the use of the plural for Abinadi's citation of Isaiah 53 definitely implies that this plural usage is intentional and was originally in the Book of Mormon text. (Also see under 2 Nephi 24:21 and Mosiah 13:13 for additional examples where the Book of Mormon text favors the plural *iniquities* instead of the singular *iniquity* of the King James Bible.) The critical text will therefore maintain these three additional cases of plural usage in Mosiah 14.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 14 all the plural instances that refer to evildoing (namely, the words *iniquities*, *transgressions*, and *sins*), including the three cases (in verses 6, 8, and 12) where the King James Bible and the Masoretic Hebrew text read in the singular; for these three cases, the Greek Septuagint reads in the plural, just as do all the (extant) textual sources for Mosiah 14.

■ **Mosiah 14:7**

*he was oppressed and he was afflicted
yet he **opened** not his mouth
he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter
and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb
so he **opened** not his mouth*

□ **Isaiah 53:7** (King James Bible)

he was oppressed and he was afflicted
yet he **opened** not his mouth
he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter
and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb
so he **openeth** not his mouth

The King James translation for this passage first has the simple past-tense verb form *opened* but later the present-tense verb form *openeth*. The reason for this difference in tense seems to derive from the fact that the past-tense *opened* is preceded by past-tense verb forms (“was oppressed . . . was afflicted”) while the present-tense *openeth* is preceded by present-tense verb forms (“is brought . . . is dumb”). Yet the Masoretic Hebrew text underlying the King James Bible uses exactly the same verb form in both instances; both clauses should have been literally translated into Early Modern English in the same tense, as in “and he opened not his mouth”. The parallelism of the passage also supports translating both instances of the Hebrew verb with the same tense. In fact, modern English translations typically translate both clauses in the past tense:

Isaiah 53:7

□ Revised Standard Version (RSV, 1952)
yet he **opened not** his mouth . . .
so he **opened not** his mouth

□ New International Version (NIV, 1978)
yet he **did not open** his mouth . . .
so he **did not open** his mouth

The Greek Septuagint, on the other hand, translates both cases in the present tense; yet even there the tense remains the same for both occurrences of the verb *open*.

The Book of Mormon text in Mosiah 14:7 also has the same tense for both cases of the verb *open*—namely, the past-tense *opened*. Later on, in Mosiah 15:6, Abinadi quotes once more from the second half of the verse in Isaiah 53:7:

Mosiah 15:6

yea even as Isaiah said
as a sheep before the shearer is dumb
so he **opened** not his mouth

Again, the Book of Mormon text has the past tense *opened* for the last part of Isaiah 53:7, thus indicating that the use of *opened* in Mosiah 14:7 is not the result of scribal error but is definitely intended.

Summary: Retain the Book of Mormon’s consistent use of the past-tense *opened* in both Mosiah 14:7 and Mosiah 15:6; such usage agrees with the Hebrew text as well as modern English translations; in Isaiah 53:7, the King James Bible inconsistently reads *opened* at the beginning of the verse but *openeth* at the end.

■ **Mosiah 14:8**

for the transgressions of my people was he stricken

□ **Isaiah 53:8** (King James Bible)

for the **transgression** of my people was he stricken

As discussed under Mosiah 14:6, the use of the plural *transgressions* here in verse 8 appears to be intended.

■ **Mosiah 14:9**

because he had done no evil

□ **Isaiah 53:9** (King James Bible)

because he had done no **violence**

In this passage the Book of Mormon text substitutes *evil* for *violence*. The Masoretic Hebrew word here originally referred to a violent act, but this meaning was extended to also refer to wickedness as well as physical violence—that is, the word came to be used more generally to refer to any wrongful act. (See, for instance, the definition that refers to the “rude wickedness of men” under *ḥāmās* ‘violence, wrong’ in Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952], page 329.) The Greek Septuagint translated the word here in Isaiah 53:9 as a lawless act, which is more consistent with the Book of Mormon’s use of the word *evil*.

Summary: Retain the use of *evil* in Mosiah 14:9 (“because he had done no evil”), the consistent reading of the Book of Mormon textual sources; the word *evil* just as readily reflects the meaning of the Hebrew word translated as *violence* in the King James Bible.

■ **Mosiah 14:11**

*he shall see [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | QRT]
the [travel 1 | travail ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of his soul
and shall be satisfied*

□ **Isaiah 53:11** (King James Bible)

he shall see **of** the **travail** of his soul
and shall be satisfied

The 1911 LDS edition of the Book of Mormon removed the word *of* after *see*, perhaps because the word *of* seemed awkward here. However, the resulting text changes the meaning of the original Hebrew (and the translated King James Bible). The Hebrew text clearly means something different from “he shall see the labor of his soul”. The original meaning of the preposition *of* is ‘from’ and the implied meaning of the Hebrew text is ‘he shall see **the results** from the labor of his soul’. Three Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah (1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, and 4QIsa^d) have the additional word *light* (“from the labor of his soul he shall see light”), as does the Greek Septuagint in its paraphrastic translation of this passage. Despite the difficulty of the literally translated King James Bible (derived perhaps from a defective Hebrew text), the critical text will restore the original preposition *of* in Mosiah 14:11 since it is the earliest extant reading of the Book of Mormon text and it agrees with the King James reading.

Oliver Cowdery both spelled and pronounced *travel* and *travail* identically, as *travel* /trævəl/. As discussed under 2 Nephi 29:4, the context in each case determines whether the text should read *travel* or *travail*. Here in Mosiah 14:11, we obviously have *travail*, the King James reading.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 14:11 the King James Bible’s preposition *of* after *see* since the earliest Book of Mormon textual sources read this way; the removal of the *of* leads to a potential change in the meaning of the passage; in this verse, the manuscript reading *travel* stands for the word *travail* in modern English.

■ **Mosiah 14:12**

and he [bear 11JO | bare ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQS | bore RT] the sins of many

□ **Isaiah 53:12** (King James Bible)

and he **bare** the sin of many

Oliver Cowdery usually wrote the past-tense verb form *bare* as *bear*. Here the 1830 compositor correctly interpreted *bear* as the past-tense *bare* and therefore set *bare*. The 1879 LDS edition reverted to *bear*, and this spelling was followed in the LDS text by the 1888 large-print edition and the 1907 vest-pocket edition. Most LDS editions in the early 1900s had the correct *bare* (1902, 1905, 1906, and 1911). The 1920 edition maintained the past-tense reading but intentionally changed *bare* to *bore* (the change is marked in the 1920 committee copy, a large-print 1911 Book of Mormon). This one change of *bare* to *bore* is inexplicable, given that the 1920 edition elsewhere either maintained the verb form *bare* or emended the text to *bare* rather than *bore*:

- 2 Nephi 8:2 (quoting Isaiah 51:2)
look unto Abraham your father and unto Sarah
she that [*bear* 1ILMN | *bare* ABCDEFGHIJKOPQRST] you
- 2 Nephi 18:3 (quoting Isaiah 8:3)
and she conceived
and [*bear* 1ABCDEIJLMNOQ | *bare* FGHKPRST] a son
- 3 Nephi 17:21
and the multitude [*bear* 1ABCDEFGHijklmnopqs | *bare* RT] record of it
- 3 Nephi 18:37
but the disciples [*bear* 1ABCDEFGHijklmnopqs | *bare* RT] record
that he gave them power to give the Holy Ghost

At the time the 1920 edition was being prepared, there were three cases of *bore* in the LDS text (1 Nephi 11:7, Alma 1:25, and Alma 53:13). In other words, these three instances of *bore* date from earlier in the text; they were not introduced into the 1920 edition. For further discussion of the problem between *bear* and *bare*, see under 1 Nephi 11:7 as well as under BEAR and PAST TENSE in volume 3. Of course, here in Mosiah 14:12 the original text undoubtedly read *bare*, just as in the King James Bible.

Summary: Restore *bare* in Mosiah 14:12, the original past-tense form for the verb *bear* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mosiah 14:12**

and he bare the sins of many

□ **Isaiah 53:12** (King James Bible)

and he bare the **sin** of many

As discussed under Mosiah 14:6, the use of the plural *sins* here in verse 12 is consistent with usage elsewhere in Mosiah 14 and therefore appears to be intended; the plural number is supported by the Greek Septuagint translation of Isaiah 53:12. Later on in Mosiah 15, Abinadi refers once more to this verse from Isaiah 53, and as before he uses the plural *sins*:

Mosiah 15:12
for these are they whose **sins** he hath borne

Generally speaking, the Book of Mormon text uses the plural *sins* in referring to Christ's taking away the sins of the world. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 10:10.

Summary: Maintain the plural usage in Mosiah 14:12 ("and he bare the **sins** of many").

Mosiah 15

■ Mosiah 15:2

*and because he dwelleth **in flesh**
he shall be called the Son of God*

One may wonder here if the text originally read “in **the** flesh”. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are instances of *flesh* without a determiner, but each of these is combined with a word that refers to the physical body:

“the arm of flesh”	2 Nephi 4:34 (two times)
“maketh flesh his arm”	2 Nephi 4:34, 2 Nephi 28:31
“flesh and blood”	Mosiah 7:27, Ether 3:6, Ether 3:8, Ether 3:9
“this body of flesh”	3 Nephi 28:15

Otherwise the Book of Mormon text modifies *flesh* with a determiner, usually *the*, as in the following nearby examples in Abinadi’s discourse:

Mosiah 15:2	and having subjected the flesh to the will of the Father
Mosiah 15:3	and the Son because of the flesh
Mosiah 15:5	and thus the flesh becoming subject to the spirit
Mosiah 15:7	the flesh becoming subject even unto death

Except for Mosiah 15:2, Christ’s earthly ministry is referred to as occurring “in **the** flesh”, not “in flesh”:

2 Nephi 2:4	wherefore thou art blessed even as they unto whom he shall minister in the flesh
2 Nephi 6:9	that the Lord God the Holy One of Israel should manifest himself unto them in the flesh
2 Nephi 25:12	yea even the Father of heaven and of earth shall manifest himself unto them in the flesh
2 Nephi 32:6	and there will be no more doctrine given until after that he shall manifest himself unto you in the flesh

2 Nephi 32:6

and when he shall manifest himself unto you **in the flesh**
the things which he shall say unto you shall ye observe to do

Jacob 4:11

and having obtained a good hope of glory in him
before he manifesteth himself **in the flesh**

Enos 1:8

and many years passeth away
before that he shall manifest himself
in [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] flesh

Ether 3:16

and even as I appear unto thee to be in the spirit
will I appear unto my people **in the flesh**

The example from Enos 1:8 is particularly appropriate for this discussion since in the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially dropped the definite article *the*. This error in \mathcal{P} thus supports the possibility that a *the* might have been accidentally dropped from Mosiah 15:2. (For further discussion, see under Enos 1:8.)

In contrast to the case of “to dwell in flesh” in Mosiah 15:2, the text elsewhere has only examples of “to dwell in **the** flesh”, but there are only two examples and they both refer to others (rather than Christ) dwelling in the flesh:

Alma 31:26

O how long O Lord wilt thou suffer that
thy servants shall dwell here below **in the flesh**
to behold such gross wickedness among the children of men

3 Nephi 28:9

ye shall not have pain while ye shall dwell **in the flesh**
neither sorrow save it be for the sins of the world

Thus the Book of Mormon text supports the use of *the* in the expression “to dwell in the flesh”. There is, however, one biblical text that refers to Christ taking upon himself a body and dwelling upon the earth:

John 1:14 (King James Bible)

and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us

Of course, *the* cannot modify *flesh* in this instance. Nonetheless, the biblical reading makes one wonder if “he dwelleth in flesh”, the earliest reading in Mosiah 15:2, might be possible after all. Consequently, the critical text will maintain the phrase “in flesh”, but with the understanding that it could well have originally read “in **the** flesh”.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 15:2 the earliest (and textually invariant) reading, “and because he dwelleth **in flesh** he shall be called the Son of God”; this difficult but not impossible reading may have originally read “he dwelleth in **the** flesh”.

■ Mosiah 15:2–3

*and having subjected the flesh to the will of the Father
being **the Father and the Son**
the Father because he was conceived by the power of God
and the Son because of the flesh
thus becoming **the Father and Son***

As in the previous discussion regarding “in (the) flesh” in verse 2, one wonders here in verse 3 if the definite article *the* is missing from the conjunctive phrase “the Father and Son” at the end of the verse. Note that earlier at the end of verse 2, the text reads “the Father and **the Son**”, with the repetition of the definite article just as it is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text in conjuncts of *Father* and *Son* (in some cases *Holy Ghost* is also conjoined):

2 Nephi 31:18	the Father and the Son (2 times)
2 Nephi 31:21	of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost
3 Nephi 1:14	of the Father and of the Son
3 Nephi 11:25	of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost
3 Nephi 11:27	the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost
Mormon 7:7	unto the Father and unto the Son and unto the Holy Ghost
Mormon 9:12	the Father and the Son
Ether 3:14	the Father and the Son
Ether 5:4	the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost

There is also one example in the three-witness statement: “to the Father and to **the Son** and to the Holy Ghost”. We get the same repetition of *the* in the biblical text:

Matthew 28:19	of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost
1 John 2:22	the Father and the Son
2 John 1:9	the Father and the Son

We have already seen that occasionally the repeated *the* has been deleted from conjuncts, as in the example of “the Nephites and the Lamanites”, discussed under Enos 1:24.

Even so, in Mosiah 15:3 “the Father and Son” may be a unique reading. Although the Book of Mormon text does tend to repeat the determiner—and there are many examples where the text has lost the repetition—we must also realize that in certain instances variation is possible. See, for instance, the discussion for each of the following conjunctive expressions:

“the statutes and (the) judgments”	1 Nephi 17:22
“the wickedness and (the) abomination(s)”	Mosiah 3:7
“the cunning and (the) craftiness”	Mosiah 9:10

(Also see the discussion of this issue under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.) Since both variation and unique readings are possible, the critical text will accept the earliest reading here in Mosiah 15:3—namely, “thus becoming the Father and Son”. Nonetheless, this reading may be an error for “thus becoming the Father and **the Son**” since there is considerable evidence that scribes and printers occasionally omitted the repeated *the* in conjuncts.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in Mosiah 15:3 without the repeated *the* (“the Father and Son”) since this unique reading is possible; even so, this reading may be an error for “the Father and **the Son**”.

■ Mosiah 15:5

*and thus the flesh becoming subject to the spirit
or the Son to the Father—being one God—
suffereth temptation
and [yieldeth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | yielded N] not to the temptation
but suffereth himself to be mocked and scourged and cast out and disowned by his people*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1906 LDS large-print edition; the present-tense *yieldeth* was replaced by the past-tense *yielded*, perhaps because of the following past participial verb forms that could be misinterpreted as simple past-tense forms (“mocked and scourged and cast out and disowned”). This error was not continued in any of the subsequent LDS editions. In the original text, we have three conjoined predicates for which each verb is in the present tense (“suffereth . . . yieldeth . . . suffereth”).

Summary: Maintain the present-tense form *yieldeth* in Mosiah 15:5.

■ Mosiah 15:5–6

*and thus the flesh becoming subject to the spirit
or the Son to the Father—being one God—
suffereth temptation and yieldeth not to the temptation
but suffereth himself to be mocked and scourged and cast out and disowned by his people
and after all this
[& 1 | and APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] after working many mighty miracles
among the children of men
he shall be led yea even as Isaiah said
as a sheep before the shearer is dumb so he opened not his mouth*

The 1837 edition dropped the *and* preceding the second *after* in verse 6. Yet there is no real reason why the original *and* should not be there. The RLDS text restored the *and* in the 1908 edition since the conjunction was never crossed out in the printer’s manuscript. Perhaps placing dashes around the second *after*-clause might help the reader process this passage:

Mosiah 15:6
and after all this
—and after working many mighty miracles among the children of men—
he shall be led
yea even as Isaiah said
as a sheep before the shearer is dumb so he opened not his mouth

The demonstrative *this* near the beginning of verse 6 does not refer to the miracles Jesus will perform (referred to in the following phrase) but instead to what he will suffer (mentioned previously in verse 5). Thus the original *and* is necessary for maintaining the original distinction between what Christ will suffer and the miracles he will perform. Since Joseph Smith did not mark this change in the printer’s manuscript, it is quite possible that the loss of the *and* was simply a typo in the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore the original *and* before the second *after* in Mosiah 15:6 (“and after all this **and** after working many mighty miracles”); the demonstrative *this* refers to the preceding language rather than the following clause.

■ **Mosiah 15:6**

as a sheep before the shearer is dumb
*so he **opened** not his mouth*

□ **Isaiah 53:7** (King James Bible)

and as a sheep before **her shearers** is dumb
 so he **openeth** not his mouth

This is the second time Abinadi has quoted from this last part of Isaiah 53:7, but in this case *the shearer* is substituted for *her shearers*. This difference may indicate that in this passage Abinadi was not directly reading from a written text but instead was quoting from memory. Interestingly, the Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate for Isaiah 53:7 use the singular form of *shearer* and without any pronominal modification—that is, both these ancient translations can be read as “and as a lamb before the one shearing is silent”. The Book of Mormon reading *the shearer* is therefore a possible reading and should be retained in Mosiah 15:7.

The use of the past-tense *opened* rather than the present-tense *openeth* (not only here in Mosiah 15:6 but also in Mosiah 14:7) is undoubtedly the original Book of Mormon reading for this Isaiah citation. See the discussion under Mosiah 14:7.

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 15:6 *the shearer* instead of *her shearers*; this reading is not supported by the Masoretic Hebrew text, but it is supported by the ancient Greek and Latin versions; Mosiah 15:6 also uses the past-tense *opened*, just like in Mosiah 14:7.

■ **Mosiah 15:8–9**

and thus God breaketh the bands of death
having gained the victory over death
giving the Son power to make intercession for the children of men
having ascended into heaven
having the bowels of mercy
being filled with compassion toward the children of men
standing betwixt them and justice
having broken the bands of death

→ **taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions
having redeemed them and satisfied the demands of justice

The occurrence of the past participle *taken* here in Mosiah 15:9 (indicated above with an arrow) appears to involve some error in the early transmission. Several possibilities have been suggested. First of all, an *and* might be missing before the *taken*. Note that such an *and* is found in the immediately following participial clause: “having redeemed them **and** satisfied the demands of justice”. In other words, Mosiah 15:9 could be emended by inserting an *and* before *taken*:

having broken the bands of death
→ **and taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions
having redeemed them
and satisfied the demands of justice

Elsewhere in the text, we always get a conjunction (usually *and*) connecting such conjuncts of past participial verb forms:

2 Nephi 6:2

I Jacob **having been called** of God
and ordained after the manner of his holy order . . .

Mosiah 20:12

yet he was not dead
having been wounded
and left upon the ground

Mosiah 28:11

and after **having translated**
and caused to be written the records . . .

Alma 9:22

and **having been kept**
and preserved until now

Alma 13:18

but Melchizedek **having exercised** mighty faith
and received the office of the high priesthood . . .

Alma 17:18

having imparted the word of God unto them
or administered unto them before his departure

3 Nephi 20:26

the Father **having raised** me up unto you first
and sent me to bless you

3 Nephi 26:15

after **having healed** all their sick and their lame
and opened the eyes of the blind
and unstopped the ears of the deaf
and even had done all manner of cures among them
and raised a man from the dead
and had ascended unto the Father

For two additional occurrences of this construction in the earliest text, both with a connecting *and*, see Mosiah 23:1 and Mosiah 29:42.

A second possible emendation for Mosiah 15:9 would be to add *having* before *taken*; that is, the original text may have read “**having taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions”. This reading is supported by the long unbroken sequence of present-participial clauses in this passage:

having gained the victory over death
giving the Son power to make intercession for the children of men
having ascended into heaven
having the bowels of mercy
being filled with compassion toward the children of men
standing betwixt them and justice
having broken the bands of death
 → **having taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions
having redeemed them and satisfied the demands of justice

This emendation would assume that *having* was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text.

A third possible emendation for Mosiah 15:9 (suggested by Lyle Fletcher, personal communication, 14 January 2004) is to replace *taken* with *taking*. This emendation would also provide an unbroken sequence of present-participial clauses:

having gained the victory over death
giving the Son power to make intercession for the children of men
having ascended into heaven
having the bowels of mercy
being filled with compassion toward the children of men
standing betwixt them and justice
having broken the bands of death
 → **taking** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions
having redeemed them and satisfied the demands of justice

In this case, the error could have occurred in \mathcal{O} since *taking* might have been misheard as *taken*, especially because *taking* may have been pronounced as /teikən/, identically to *taken*. Such a pronunciation is common in colloquially spoken English. Another possibility is that an original *taking* could have been miscopied when Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} ; both *taking* and *taken* are visually similar. Further, the preceding use of *broken* (“having broken the bands of death”) could have prompted the scribe of either manuscript to have written *taken*.

There is one potential example in the history of the text where the *-en* and the *-ing* inflectional endings might have been mixed up in the early transmission of the text; the change in the 1852 LDS edition for the following passage suggests the possibility that *taking*, the earliest reading, may have been an error for *taken*:

Alma 16:3
 they had destroyed the people which were in the city of Ammonihah
 and also some around the borders of Noah
 and [*taking* 1ABCDEGPS | *taken* FHIJKLMNOQRT] others captive
 into the wilderness

For discussion of this possibility, see under Alma 16:3.

One potential problem with the third emendation is that the passage itself seems to require the perfect *taken* rather than the present participle *taking*. Abinadi is referring to Christ at the day of judgment, after his resurrection, when he will have already “**gained** the victory over death . . . **broken** the bands of death . . . **taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions . . .

redeemed them and **satisfied** the demands of justice”. Of course, at the day of judgment, the Son will have power to show mercy. For those statements referring to his mercy, the perfect is not used: “**giving** the Son power to make intercession for the children of men . . . **having** the bowels of mercy / **being filled** with compassion toward the children of men / **standing** betwixt them and justice”. This consistent difference in aspect argues that the perfect should be maintained in “**taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions”. In terms of meaning, inserting either *and* or *having* seems more plausible as an emendation in Mosiah 15:9 than changing *taken* to *taking*.

The evidence from scribal errors seems to support the loss of *having* in Mosiah 15:9 more than the loss of *and*, at least in this context. There are no specific examples in the transmission of the manuscripts where *and* has ever been lost before a conjoined past-participial form, while there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery, in copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , sometimes omitted the auxiliary verb form *having*:

Mosiah 18:32

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

Alma 58:23

and it came to pass that we took our course
after [*having* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *having* 1] traveled much
in the wilderness towards the land of Zarahemla

For one other possible case where *having* might have been omitted in the early transmission of the text, see the discussion under Jacob 4:11 regarding the reading “having faith and (having) obtained a good hope of glory in him”.

Based on this evidence, the critical text will emend Mosiah 15:9 by placing *having* before *taken*; this will result in a sequence of three present-participial clauses headed by *having*:

having broken the bands of death
→ **having taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions
having redeemed them and satisfied the demands of justice

There is support elsewhere in the text for such a sequence of three *having*-clauses without any connectors of any kind:

Mosiah 8:8

and they were lost in the wilderness for the space of many days
yet they were diligent and found not the land of Zarahemla
but returned to this land
having traveled in a land among many waters
having discovered a land which was covered with bones of men and of beasts etc.
and was also covered with ruins of buildings of every kind
having discovered a land which had been peopled with a people
which were as numerous as the hosts of Israel

Alma 13:28–29

but that ye would humble yourselves before the Lord
 and call on his holy name and watch and pray continually
 that ye may not be tempted above that which ye can bear
 and thus be led by the Holy Spirit
 becoming humble meek submissive patient
 full of love and all long-suffering
having faith on the Lord
having a hope that ye shall receive eternal life
having the love of God always in your hearts
 that ye may be lifted up at the last day and enter into his rest

As in the proposed emendation for Mosiah 15:9, all the examples of *having* in Mosiah 8:8 are instances of the perfect auxiliary form *having*.

Summary: Emend Mosiah 15:9 by inserting *having* before *taken*: “**having taken** upon himself their iniquity and their transgressions”; another possible emendation would be to insert *and* before *taken*, but evidence from scribal errors supports the omission of *having* over *and* in this context.

■ **Mosiah 15:9**

having ascended into heaven

having the bowels of mercy

being filled with compassion

[*toward* 1ABCPS | *towards* DEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the children of men*

Although in most instances the original text seems to have preferred *towards* over *toward*, there are a few cases where the earliest extant text reads *toward*. Since both *towards* and *toward* are possible, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources. In this case, the 1841 British edition introduced *towards* into the LDS text; the 1858 Wright edition introduced it into the RLDS textual tradition, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier *toward*, either accidentally or by reference to \mathcal{P} . The critical text will maintain *toward*, the reading of \mathcal{P} , in this passage. For further discussion, see under 1 Nephi 5:22 as well as TOWARDS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original use of *toward* in Mosiah 15:9, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant reading for this passage).

■ **Mosiah 15:9**

having taken upon himself

their [*iniquities* >% *iniquity* 1 | *iniquity* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and their transgressions

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *iniquities* in \mathcal{P} , perhaps because of the following plural in the conjoined “their transgressions”. He immediately corrected the plural *iniquities* by erasing the final *s* and overwriting the *ie* with *y*. The original manuscript undoubtedly read *iniquity*.

See under 2 Nephi 24:21 for a list of examples where the scribes initially mixed up the number for the noun *iniquity*.

Summary: Maintain the singular *iniquity* in Mosiah 15:9, the immediately corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ **Mosiah 15:9**

having redeemed them

and [*sanctified* > *satisfied* 1 | *satisfied* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the demands of justice*

Here we have a clear example of Oliver Cowdery misreading *satisfied* as the visually similar *sanctified*. His correction was virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *satisfied*). As might be expected, elsewhere the text refers to satisfying the demands of justice, but never to sanctifying the demands of justice:

2 Nephi 9:26

for the atonement **satisfieth** the demands of his justice
upon all those who hath not the law given to them

Alma 34:16

and thus mercy can **satisfy** the demands of justice

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 15:9 the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} : “and **satisfied** the demands of justice”.

■ **Mosiah 15:11**

*all those who [hath >js have 1 | hath A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hearkened
unto their words*

and believed that the Lord would redeem his people

*and **have** looked forward to that day for a remission of their sins*

In this passage we see that in conjoined predicates the inflected form may vary. At the beginning of the passage we have *hath* but later in the passage *have*. As noted elsewhere, *hath* frequently occurred in the original text with plural subjects. Joseph Smith edited this instance of *hath* to *have*, but the critical text will restore the original *hath*. As another example of such mixtures in usage, consider the following example where the earliest text conjoins *has*, *hath*, and *have*:

Alma 24:30

and thus we can plainly discern that after a people
[*has* >js *have* 1 | *has* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been
once enlightened by the Spirit of God
and [*hath* >js *have* 1 | *hath* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had
great knowledge of things pertaining to righteousness
and then **have** fallen away into sin and transgression
they become more hardened

For a general discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the mixture of *hath* and *have* in Mosiah 15:11; such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ Mosiah 15:11

*I say unto you that these are his seed
or they are [1ABCDEGHKPS | the FIJLMNOQRT] heirs of the kingdom of God*

The 1852 LDS edition introduced the definite article *the* before *heirs*, which is quite unnecessary and probably represents a typo. There is one other example in the Book of Mormon text of *heirs*, and it reads without any definite article:

4 Nephi 1:17
but they were in one
the children of Christ and **heirs** to the kingdom of God

Notice that both Mosiah 15:11 and 4 Nephi 1:17 refer to the people of God as the offspring of Christ and heirs of the kingdom of God.

The occurrence of *heirs* without any *the* is common in the New Testament epistles:

Romans 4:14
for if they which are of the law *be* **heirs**
faith is made void

Romans 8:17
and if children then **heirs**
heirs of God and joint **heirs** with Christ

Galatians 3:29
and if ye *be* Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed
and **heirs** according to the promise

Titus 3:7
that being justified by his grace
we should be made **heirs** according to the hope of eternal life

Hebrews 1:14
are they not all ministering spirits
sent forth to minister for them who shall be **heirs** of salvation

James 2:5
hath not God chosen the poor of this world
rich in faith and **heirs** of the kingdom

1 Peter 3:7
and as being **heirs** together of the grace of life

There are also two instances in the New Testament of *the heirs*, both in Hebrews (6:17 and 11:9). In any event, the use of *heirs* without the definite article *the* is acceptable—in fact, preferred—in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Remove the definite article *the* from before *heirs* in Mosiah 15:11 (“they are heirs of the kingdom of God”); the intrusive *the* does not conform to normal scriptural usage.

■ Mosiah 15:13

*yea and are not the prophets
every one that has opened his mouth to prophesy
that has not fallen into [transgression 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | transgressions GHK]
I mean all the holy prophets ever since the world began*

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally introduced the plural *transgressions*, which was followed by the first two RLDS editions. The third RLDS edition (1908) restored the original singular *transgression*, probably because this was the reading in \mathcal{P} . In the Book of Mormon we always have the singular *transgression* in the expression “to fall into transgression” (15 times, including Mosiah 15:13). For further discussion, see under Jarom 1:10.

Summary: Retain the singular *transgression* in Mosiah 15:13, which is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ Mosiah 15:14

*and these are they
[which hath >js who have 1 | which hath A | who have BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] published peace
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[that hath >js who have 1 | that hath A | who have BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] brought
good tidings of good
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[that hath >js who have 1 | that hath A | who have BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] published salvation
[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[that sayeth >js and said 1 | that saith A | and said BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] unto Zion
thy God reigneth*

This passage is a paraphrase from Isaiah:

Isaiah 52:7 (King James Bible)
how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him
that bringeth good tidings
that publisheth peace
that bringeth good tidings of good
that publisheth salvation
that saith unto Zion
thy God reigneth

This passage is directly quoted in two places in the Book of Mormon (namely, in Mosiah 12:21 and 3 Nephi 20:40), and in both those cases Isaiah 52:7 is quoted without any difference except for the addition of the minor phrase “unto them” twice in 3 Nephi 20:40 (see the discussion there). Joseph Smith left these two direct quotations unchanged in his editing for the 1837 and 1840 editions.

Here in Mosiah 15:14, Joseph Smith made a number of changes in his editing for the 1837 edition. To begin with, he changed each relative pronoun in this paraphrase of Isaiah 52:7 to a consistent *who* except for the last *that* (which he changed to an *and*). Except for the first relative

pronoun (*which*), all the other relative pronouns in Mosiah 15:14 were originally identical to the *that*'s in Isaiah 52:7. After changing the first *which* to *who* (since the referent was human), Joseph then apparently decided that the remaining *that*'s would be inconsistent with the initial *who*, so he changed the next two *that*'s to *who*'s. He also replaced the three instances of *hath* with the plural *have* since the antecedent for the relative pronouns is *they*. Finally, Joseph replaced the final *that* with an *and* (as already noted), which then led him to change the present tense *saith* to *said*. The change of the *that* to *and* replaced the final relative clause with a predicate, with this predicate now being conjoined to the preceding relative clause (thus “who have published salvation and said unto Zion”). The *said* in this last clause should probably be interpreted as the past participle *said* rather than the simple past-tense *said* (although the latter is also possible). To make the last predicate clearer, Joseph could have added *have* before *said* (“who **have** published salvation and **have** said unto Zion”), but this emendation would have seemed a little awkward.

One additional problem for this paraphrase in Mosiah 15:14 is the punctuation between the last two relative clauses of the original text. The 1830 compositor set a semicolon between these two clauses but only commas between the preceding pairs of relative clauses. This inconsistency in punctuation was further exacerbated when the 1837 change of *that* to *and* was implemented since readers normally expect a full clause rather than a conjoined predicate after a semicolon.

The critical text will, of course, restore the original paraphrase here, including its mixture of an initial *which* (meaning ‘who’ in modern English) followed by three *that*'s. It will also restore the cases of *hath* that Joseph Smith edited to *have* as well as the original *saith*. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS and WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original relative pronouns and present-tense verb forms in Mosiah 15:14; for consistency in punctuation, the semicolon before the last relative clause should be replaced with a comma in the standard printed text.

■ Mosiah 15:16–17

*how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of those
that [art 1 | are ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] still publishing peace
and again how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of those who shall hereafter publish peace*

Here we have a probable instance of a scribal slip, where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *art* rather than the correct *are*. The 1830 compositor set the correct *are*. As noted under Mosiah 2:24, there are four cases in the manuscripts where Oliver initially wrote a correct *are* and then accidentally crossed the *e* to form a *t*. However, here in Mosiah 15:16, the *t* of the *art* looks like an actual *t* rather than a crossed *e*. Even so, the *art* is probably a scribal error. One possibility is that in \mathfrak{C} (no longer extant here), the scribe (possibly Oliver himself) accidentally crossed the *e* of an original *are*, giving *art*, which Oliver then copied as *art* into \mathfrak{D} . Creating a *t* for this passage would have been facilitated by the fact that both the immediately preceding and following words have *t*'s, which could have prompted the scribe in \mathfrak{C} to miswrite “that are still” as “that art still”. Since there is considerable evidence for a scribal tendency to miswrite *are* as *art*, the critical text will assume here in Mosiah 15:16 that the 1830 emendation to *are* is the original reading.

Summary: Accept the 1830 emendation of *art* to *are* in Mosiah 15:16 (“that **are** still publishing peace”).

■ Mosiah 15:18

*for O how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings
that is the founder of peace
yea even the Lord who hath redeemed his people
yea [him 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | he HK] who hath granted salvation unto his people*

The first RLDS edition (1874) edited the object form *him* to the subject form *he*. This editing represents the more formal grammatical form. The most reasonable antecedent for the original *him* is *the Lord*, found in the directly parallel preceding phrase (“yea even the Lord who hath redeemed his people”). Another possible antecedent for *him* could be the relative pronoun *that* found earlier in this passage: “**that** bringeth good tidings / **that** is the founder of peace”. It is even possible that the object form *him* refers all the way back to the pronoun *him* in the phrase “the feet of **him**”, found near the beginning of this verse.

In formal contexts, modern English speakers prefer the subject form *he* rather than the object form *him* in “it is **he** who did it” (in contrast to the informal “it’s **him** who did it”). The linking verb *be* does seem to be implied in the two parallel noun phrases in Mosiah 15:18 that are preceded by *yea*, with the result that the original *him* sounds rather colloquial. In other cases where the *be* verb is explicit and the subject complement *he/him* is postmodified by a relative clause, we usually get *he* in the earliest text (24 times), as in the following sampling:

2 Nephi 4:34	cursed is he that putteth his trust in the arm of flesh
2 Nephi 8:12	yea I am he that comforteth you
2 Nephi 25:18	and that Messiah is he which should be rejected of the Jews
Mosiah 24:9	and that it was he that believed the words of Abinadi
3 Nephi 11:15	it was he of whom it was written by the prophets that should come
3 Nephi 15:5	and I am he which covenanted with my people Israel
3 Nephi 20:23	behold I am he of whom Moses spake saying . . .

But there are three cases of the same construction where *him* is found in the earliest text, all of which have been edited to *he* in later editions (the 1837 edition for the first two and the 1920 LDS edition for the third one):

Alma 1:8	and it was him that was an instrument in the hands of God
Alma 39:15	it is him that surely shall come to take away the sins of the world
Mormon 8:16	and blessed be him that shall bring this thing to light

For further discussion of these and other examples, see under 2 Nephi 1:27; also see the discussion under SUBJECT COMPLEMENT in volume 3. Here in Mosiah 15:8, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading with *him* (“yea **him** who hath granted salvation unto his people”), even if *him* is interpreted as a subject complement.

Summary: Maintain the object form *him* in Mosiah 15:18: “yea **him** who hath granted salvation unto his people”; usually the earliest text prefers the subject form *he* when the subject complement is postmodified by a relative clause, but there are a few instances in the earliest text of the object form *him* in this construction.

■ Mosiah 15:19

I say unto you

—were it not for this—

[*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all mankind must have perished*

In the 1837 edition, the subordinate conjunction *that* in this sentence was removed, probably because the intervening parenthetical “were it not for this” made the occurrence of the following *that* awkward. Without the parenthetical clause, there would have been no motivation for deleting the *that*. There are two other places in the text where a parenthetical statement intervenes between “I say unto you” and the following *that*-clause. In neither of these cases has the conjunctive *that* been deleted, perhaps because the *that* is immediately followed by a subordinate *as*-clause:

Mosiah 4:11

and again I say unto you

—as I have said before—

that as ye have come to the knowledge of the glory of God . . .

Alma 38:1

for I say unto you

—even as I said unto Helaman—

that inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
ye shall prosper in the land

The critical text will restore the *that* in Mosiah 15:19, despite its difficulty. (Another grammatical emendation would be to place the *that* before the parenthetical statement: “I say unto you **that**—were it not for this—all mankind must have perished”.)

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in Mosiah 15:19, despite its difficulty: “I say unto you—were it not for this—**that** all mankind must have perished”.

■ Mosiah 15:22

and all those that have believed in their words

—or all those that have kept the commandments of God—

[*these* >js NULL 1 | *these* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shall come forth in the first resurrection*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the redundant *these* in this complex sentence. Nonetheless, restating a form of the subject helps the reader process the sentence. If there had been no parenthetical explanation (that is, if the phrase “or all those that have kept the commandments of God” had been lacking), the reader would indeed expect the *these* to be missing: “and all those that have believed in their words shall come forth in the first resurrection”. Restating the subject after a parenthetical intervention occurs fairly often in the original Book of Mormon text. For further discussion of this kind of redundancy, see under 2 Nephi 10:3; for an extensive list of examples, see SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the redundancy of the original text in Mosiah 15:22: “and all those that have believed in their words . . . **these** shall come forth in the first resurrection”; such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ Mosiah 15:24

and [there 1A | these BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are those who have part in the first resurrection and these are they that have died before Christ came / in their ignorance not having salvation declared unto them

In Mosiah 15:24, the existential clause “and **there** are those who have part in the first resurrection” was changed in the 1837 edition to “and **these** are those who have part in the first resurrection”. This change may actually be a typo. It was not marked in Ⓓ by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. The two words *there* and *these* are visually similar. In addition, the occurrence of “and **these** are they that have died before Christ came” in the following clause may have led to replacing the preceding *there* with *these*.

When the larger passage is considered, we find that Abinadi identifies three groups of people dying prior to Christ’s resurrection who will be resurrected in the first resurrection: namely, (1) the righteous, (2) those who died without the law, and (3) little children (who died innocent of sin):

Mosiah 15:21–25

and there cometh a resurrection
 even a first resurrection
 yea even a resurrection of those that have been and which are and which shall be
 even until the resurrection of Christ / for so shall he be called

- (1) and now the resurrection of all the prophets
 and all those that have believed in their words
 or all those that have kept the commandments of God
 these shall come forth in the first resurrection
 therefore they are the first resurrection
 they are raised to dwell with God who hath redeemed them
 thus they have eternal life through Christ who hath broken the bands of death
- (2) and **there** are those who have part in the first resurrection
 and these are they that have died before Christ came / in their ignorance
 not having salvation declared unto them
 and thus the Lord bringeth about the restoration of these
 and they have a part in the first resurrection
 or hath eternal life / being redeemed by the Lord
- (3) and little children also hath eternal life

The use of *there* for the second group (listed under 2 above) is existential and means that the first resurrection will involve others in addition to the righteous. Note, in particular, that the inappropriate change to *these* makes verse 24 redundant: verse 22, in referring to the resurrection of the righteous, has already stated that “these shall come forth in the first resurrection”, while verse 24 (from the 1837 edition on) restates the same idea (“and these are those who have part in the first resurrection”). But even more problematic is that the change to *these* makes verse 24 flatly contradict verse 22 by referring to the righteous as “**these** are they that have died before Christ came / in their ignorance / not having salvation declared unto them”. The critical text will therefore restore the existential *there* in Mosiah 15:24, the reading of the earliest text and clearly more appropriate than the current reading.

Summary: Restore the use of the existential *there* in Mosiah 15:24: “and **there** are those who have part in the first resurrection and these are they that have died before Christ came / in their ignorance / not having salvation declared unto them”; the *there* allows Abinadi to introduce a second group of people who will be resurrected in the first resurrection—namely, those who died without the law.

■ **Mosiah 15:29**

yea Lord

thy watchmen shall lift [up 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | J]

their [*voice* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *voices* S]

□ **Isaiah 52:8** (King James Bible)

thy watchmen shall lift **up**

the voice

In this Isaiah quotation, we have two minor variants in the printed editions. First, the 1888 LDS large-print edition omitted the adverbial *up*. This omission was undoubtedly accidental since in three other places where this same Isaiah verse is quoted the *up* is retained in the 1888 edition (see Mosiah 12:22, 3 Nephi 16:18, and 3 Nephi 20:32).

Second, in the 1953 RLDS edition, the singular *voice* was replaced by the plural *voices*. This change appears to be intentional since the same change is found in the 1953 edition when this Isaiah passage is paraphrastically quoted later in 3 Nephi:

3 Nephi 20:32

then shall their watchmen lift up

their [*voice* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *voices* S]

The apparent motivation for the emendation to *voices* is the occurrence of *their* before *voice* in Mosiah 15:29 and 3 Nephi 20:32 (“lift up **their** voice” in the earliest text). Note that when Isaiah 52:8 is literally quoted in the Book of Mormon (as “lift up **the** voice”), the singular *voice* is maintained in the 1953 RLDS edition as well as in all other printed editions:

Mosiah 12:22

thy [*watchmen* 1ABCDEFGHGS | *watchman* IJKLMNOPQR | *watchman* > *watchmen* T]
shall lift up **the** voice

3 Nephi 16:18

thy watchmen shall lift up **the** voice

(For the variation regarding the number of *watchmen* in the first example, see the discussion under Mosiah 12:22.) The critical text will maintain the occurrence of the singular *voice* in both Mosiah 15:29 and 3 Nephi 20:32. Since both of these quotations are somewhat paraphrastic, the *their* will also be maintained.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 15:29 and 3 Nephi 20:32 the phraseology “lift up **their** voice”, in accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources; the occurrence of *their* in this phrase appears to be intentional since both these quotations of Isaiah 52:8 are somewhat paraphrastic.

Mosiah 16

■ Mosiah 16:1

*and now it came to pass that after Abinadi had spoken these words
he stretched forth his [hands 1 | hand ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and said . . .*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed the plural *hands* to the singular *hand*, probably because he expected the singular in the expression “to stretch forth one’s hand(s)”. It is quite possible that for Mosiah 16:1 the plural *hands* in \mathcal{P} is a scribal error for *hand*. There are many other examples, especially in the manuscripts, where the text shows variation in the number for *hand*:

2 Nephi 15:12 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})

neither consider the operation
of his [*hand* >+ *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 11:21 (error introduced in the 1858 Wright edition)

and they shall be afflicted
by the [*hand* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *hands* GHK] of their enemies

Mosiah 27:4 (scribe 2’s initial error in \mathcal{P})

laboring with their own [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for their support

Alma 5:4 (change introduced in the 1830 edition)

they were delivered out of the [*hand* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the people of king Noah

Alma 43:44 (change introduced in the 1830 edition)

and many of the Nephites were slain
by their [*hand* >p *hands* 0 | *hand* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 44:7 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})

ye are in our [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 46:7 (change introduced in the 1920 LDS edition)

because of their deliverance
by the [*hands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *hand* RT] of the Lord

Alma 46:24 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{G})

so shall a remnant of the seed of my son be preserved
by the [*hands* >% *hand* 0 | *hand* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of God

- Alma 52:10 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{C})
 and strengthen the cities round about which had not fallen
 into the [*hand* > *hands* 0 | *hands* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites
- Alma 57:12 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in correcting \mathcal{P})
 therefore they yielded up the city [*into our hands* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |
 NULL >+ *into our hand* > *into our hands* 1 | *unto our hands* RT]
- Helaman 4:9 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
 yea they retained many cities which had fallen
 into the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites
- 3 Nephi 4:8 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
 and deliver them
 out of the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of their enemies
- Mormon 5:23 (scribe 2’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
 ye are in the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
- Mormon 6:15 (scribe 2’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
 being left by the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of those who slew them to molder upon the land
- Moroni 2:2 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in \mathcal{P})
 on him whom ye shall lay
 your [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

(For each of these cases of variation, see the respective passage for analysis.) Most of these examples involve writing the singular *hand* in place of the plural *hands*. But the example in Alma 46:24 clearly shows that the plural *hands* can be a mistake for *hand*. (In addition, Alma 46:7 may also be an example of such an error in the early transmission of the text.) Thus there is some scribal evidence that in Mosiah 16:1 *hands* could be an error for *hand*.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, when someone starts speaking (or starts speaking again) to others, there are only examples of the singular *hand* in the expression “to stretch forth one’s hand(s)”:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Mosiah 12:2 | stretch forth thy hand and prophesy saying . . . |
| Alma 10:25 | but Amulek stretched forth his hand
and cried the mightier unto them saying . . . |
| Alma 13:21 | he stretched forth his hand unto them
and cried with a mighty voice saying . . . |
| Alma 19:12 | and as he arose he stretched forth his hand unto the woman
and said . . . |
| Alma 32:7 | but he stretched forth his hand and cried unto those . . .
and saith unto them . . . |
| Helaman 13:4–5 | he . . . stretched forth his hand and cried with a loud voice . . .
and he said unto them . . . |

3 Nephi 11:9 he stretched forth **his hand** and spake unto the people saying . . .
 3 Nephi 12:1 and behold he stretched forth **his hand** unto the multitude
 and cried unto them saying . . .

Thus the 1830 typesetter’s change from *hands* to *hand* in Mosiah 16:1 is wholly consistent with all parallel examples in the Book of Mormon.

In other contexts, the phrase “stretch forth one’s hand(s)” usually occurs in the singular, but there are a few examples in the plural. We typically get the singular *hand* in situations where one would normally use only one hand (as in striking or touching):

□ *to strike or use power against*

1 Nephi 17:53 stretch forth **thine hand** again unto thy brethren
 1 Nephi 17:54 I stretched forth **my hand** unto my brethren
 2 Nephi 15:25 and he hath stretched forth **his hand** against them
 Alma 14:11 I must not stretch forth **mine hand**
 Alma 20:20 and he stretched forth **his hand** to slay Ammon

□ *to touch*

Ether 3:6 the Lord stretched forth **his hand** and touched the stones

There is also one occurrence in the parable of the olive tree where the Lord of the vineyard stretches forth his hand as he works in his vineyard, perhaps as he works with tools:

Jacob 5:47
 I have nourished it and I have digged about it
 and I have pruned it and I have dunged it
 and I have stretched forth **mine hand** almost all the day long

If the text refers to more than one individual doing an action with the hand, we can get the plural:

Alma 14:10
 therefore let us stretch forth **our hands**
 and exercise the power of God which is in us
 and save them from the flames

In this passage Amulek refers to both Alma and himself as stretching forth their hands, but presumably each one would stretch forth his own hand, not both of his hands, which is precisely what Alma says in reply:

Alma 14:11
 but Alma saith unto him
 the spirit constraineth me that I must not stretch forth **mine hand**

On the other hand, beseeching and praying seem to involve stretching out both hands:

Jacob 6:4
 and how merciful is our God unto us
 for he remembereth the house of Israel both roots and branches
 and he stretches forth **his hands** unto them all the day long

Alma 31:14

therefore whosoever desired to worship
must go forth and stand upon the top thereof
and stretch forth **his hands** towards the heavens
and cry with a loud voice saying . . .

Yet the singular is also possible, especially in the case of Zeezrom when he is in a weakened condition:

Alma 15:5

and they went in unto the house unto Zeezrom
and they found him upon his bed sick
being very low with a burning fever . . .
and when he saw them he stretched forth **his hand**
and besought them that they would heal him

The examples involving beseeching suggest that in Mosiah 16:1 Abinadi might have extended both hands in an act of pleading with king Noah and his priests, although it is also possible that here Abinadi simply extended both hands as he continued speaking. In other words, the use of the plural *hands* in Mosiah 16:1 is possible, even though it would be a unique reading in the text; elsewhere we have only “stretch forth one’s hand” when a person begins speaking (or begins speaking again) to others. The critical text will accept the plural *hands* here in Mosiah 16:1, although it could very well be an error for *hand*.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 16:1 the plural *hands*, the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript): “he stretched forth his **hands** and said . . .”; although this plural usage may be an error for *hand*, it is also possible that Abinadi actually extended both hands as he continued speaking to Noah and his priests.

■ Mosiah 16:2

*and this because they would not hearken
unto the voice of the [good shepherd > Lord 1 | Lord ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the voice of the good shepherd”, a highly expected phrase deriving from the biblical language in John 10:11–16, especially “I am the good shepherd” and “they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold *and* one shepherd”. But almost immediately after writing down this expected phrase in Ø, Oliver crossed out *good shepherd* and supralinearly inserted the word *Lord* (the level of ink flow is unchanged).

The Book of Mormon has other examples of “the voice of the good shepherd” (4 occurrences) and “the voice of the Lord” (26 occurrences). There are three occurrences of “the voice of the good shepherd” in Alma 5 (verses 38, 41, and 57) and one in Helaman 7:18, so Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in Mosiah 16:2 may have been based more on his familiarity with the biblical text than on him remembering what he had written down in Ø for Alma 5 and Helaman 7 about half a year earlier. In either case, there would have been no reason why Oliver should have made this

change in \mathcal{D} for Mosiah 16:2 except that \mathcal{C} read that way. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} .

Summary: Retain in Mosiah 16:2 the corrected reading in \mathcal{D} : “the voice of the Lord”; Oliver Cowdery’s correction undoubtedly agrees with the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ Mosiah 16:3

yea even that old serpent that did beguile our first parents
 [*which was >js who were >js which was 1 | which was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*]
the cause of their fall

Here Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, initially interpreted the relative pronoun *which* as referring to the immediately preceding “our first parents”, and thus he edited *which was* to *who were*. But then Joseph realized that *which* referred either to the earlier “that old serpent” or, more accurately, to the beguiling itself; thus he restored the original *which was*. Interestingly, there is one other passage in the original text where the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is clearly “that old serpent”, and in that passage the *which* was edited to *who* in the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 2:18
 wherefore he saith unto Eve
 yea even that old serpent
 [*which 1A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] is the devil
 [*which 1A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] is the father of all lies

The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *which* in both 2 Nephi 2:18 and Mosiah 16:3. For discussion regarding *which* when the antecedent is “the devil” or “the evil spirit”, see under Mosiah 4:14. For general discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of the relative pronoun *which* in Mosiah 16:3; the *which* refers to “that old serpent” or to the fact that Satan beguiled Adam and Eve.

■ Mosiah 16:3

yea even that old serpent that did beguile our first parents
which was the cause of their fall
which was the cause of
 [*all mankinds 1 | all mankind ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *becoming carnal sensual devilish*
knowing evil from good
subjecting themselves to the devil

In English we have two ways of expressing the subject for a gerundive verbal: the subject can take either the possessive form or the object form (as in “the cause of **his** becoming carnal” or “the cause of **him** becoming carnal”). The printer’s manuscript here reads “the cause of all mankinds becoming carnal”; the final *s* should probably be interpreted as the possessive *s*, which Oliver Cowdery typically wrote without the apostrophe in the printer’s manuscript.

Here in Mosiah 16:3, the 1830 typesetter replaced the possessive form *mankind's* (written as *mankinds* in \mathcal{P}) with the object form *mankind*. Other places in the text show that the Book of Mormon characteristically uses the possessive in this context, although all the examples (or potential examples) involve a possessive pronoun rather than a nonpronominal noun phrase like “all mankind”:

1 Nephi 14:7	their being brought down into captivity
1 Nephi 17:35	their obtaining power over it
1 Nephi 19:5	my making these plates
2 Nephi 1:27	his commanding you that ye must obey
2 Nephi 23:10	his going forth
2 Nephi 31:1	my prophesying unto you
Jacob preface	his preaching unto his brethren
Jacob 7:27	my writing upon these plates
Mosiah 3:26	his partaking of the forbidden fruit
Alma 5:10	their being loosed from the bands of death
Alma 7:8	his dwelling in his mortal tabernacle
Alma 13:23	our being wanderers in a strange land
Alma 13:24	his coming in his glory
Alma 20:12	his tarrying in his own kingdom
Alma 50:36	their covenanting to keep the peace
Alma 56:29	our receiving provisions and strength
Helaman 3:35	their yielding their hearts unto God
3 Nephi 4:7	their being dyed in blood
3 Nephi 7:8	her wallowing in the mire
Moroni 2:3	his first appearing

One of these pronominal cases could be interpreted as an object form—namely, 3 Nephi 7:8: “**her** wallowing in the mire”; but this is only because *her* is both the possessive and object form of the pronoun *she*. Given the possessive pronominal forms in all the other cases, we should interpret 3 Nephi 7:8 as a case of the possessive pronoun, not the object pronoun.

In addition, there are two gerundive instances with possessive pronouns that have been created by later editing of the text:

1 Nephi 16:25 (“his murmuring against the Lord”)
and he was truly chastened because of
his [<i>murmurings</i> 0 <i>murmuring</i> 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] against the Lord
1 Nephi 22:8 (“their being nourished by the Gentiles”)
wherefore it is likened
unto [<i>the</i> 01ABDE <i>their</i> CGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>the</i> > <i>their</i> F] being
[<i>nursed</i> 0 <i>nourished</i> 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] by the Gentiles

Besides the one case of “all mankind’s” in Mosiah 16:3, there are two other cases where a non-pronominal noun phrase could be interpreted as a possessive:

Mosiah 9:4

after [*many days* 1 | *many days'* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wandering
in the wilderness

Moroni 4:1

the manner of their elders and priests administering the flesh and blood of Christ
unto the church

In the first case (Mosiah 9:4), the noun phrase “many days” has been treated, beginning with the 1830 edition, as a possessive (by explicitly providing an apostrophe). This interpretation appears to be unnatural given that the noun phrase “many days” should probably be treated as the object of the preposition *after* or as an adverbial. Typically, such noun phrases are not interpreted as possessives in standard English, as in the sentence “After many years living in poverty, Jim struck it rich.” (For further discussion of this first case, see under Mosiah 9:4.) In the second case listed above (Moroni 4:1), there has been no addition of apostrophes; that is, no printed edition has set the text as “the manner of their elders’ and priests’ administering the flesh and blood” (or “the manner of their elders and priests’ administering the flesh and blood” if one interprets the conjunctive “elders and priests” as combinatory rather than segregatory).

The occurrence of the noun phrase “all mankind” as a possessive in Mosiah 16:3 appears to be fully intended, despite its unique usage within the text; the possessive reading is clearly possible. For this reason, the critical text will accept the reading of the printer’s manuscript, with the understanding that the *s* of *mankinds* is the possessive ending.

Summary: Interpret *all mankinds* (the reading in \mathfrak{P} for Mosiah 16:3) as a possessive form of the noun phrase *all mankind*, thus restoring the original text (“the cause of all mankind’s becoming carnal”); this reading is supported by numerous cases where the subject for a gerund takes the possessive form (although all these other examples are possessive pronouns).

■ Mosiah 16:3

*yea even that old serpent that did beguile our first parents
which was the cause of their fall
which was the cause of all mankind’s becoming **carnal sensual devilish**
knowing evil from good
subjecting themselves to the devil*

David Calabro (personal communication) wonders if there might be an *and* missing from the conjoined sequence of nouns “carnal sensual devilish”. The one other case of “carnal sensual (and) devilish” in the Book of Mormon has the *and*:

Alma 42:10

therefore as they had become carnal sensual **and** devilish

However, there is a similar conjunctive sequence in the King James Bible for which the *and* is lacking, just like in Mosiah 16:3:

James 3:15

this wisdom descendeth not from above
but *is* earthly sensual devilish

As far as Mosiah 16:3 is concerned, it is worth noting that after the conjunctive noun sequence, we have two conjoined participial clauses, neither of which has a connecting *and*: “all mankind’s becoming carnal sensual devilish / knowing evil from good / subjecting themselves to the devil”. In other words, this whole passage avoids any kind of connective *and*. For this reason, the critical text will accept the invariant reading without the *and* for the conjunctive sequence “carnal sensual devilish”. It is, of course, possible that an *and* (especially if written as an ampersand) was lost here during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Accept in Mosiah 16:3 the sequence of nouns “carnal sensual devilish” for which the *and* is omitted between *sensual* and *devilish*; it appears that the passage as a whole intentionally avoids the use of *and*.

■ Mosiah 16:5

but remember that he that **persists** in his own carnal nature
and **goes on** in the ways of sin and rebellion against God

[he 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[remaineth >]s remains 1 | remaineth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in his fallen state
and the devil **hath** all power over him

Here the 1837 edition removed the repeated subject pronoun *he*. Such redundancy is characteristic of the original text, especially when there is some intervening subordinate text between the initial occurrence of the subject and its (pronominal) repetition at the beginning of the subsequent main clause. This kind of repetition has been sporadically removed throughout the text, as in the following nearby examples: Mosiah 8:7, Mosiah 15:22, and Mosiah 18:17 (see under each of these for discussion). For a complete list of this kind of redundancy in the original text, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed *remaineth* to *remains* in the printer’s manuscript. However, this change was not implemented in the actual 1837 edition, perhaps because in the next clause the verb *hath* was not changed to *has*; the two preceding third person singular present-tense forms (*persists* and *goes*) do have the standard-English ending *-(e)s* rather than the King James styled *-(e)th*. Another solution might have been to change the *hath* to *has*, so that all four occurrences of the third person singular present tense would have ended in *-(e)s*. The critical text will, of course, restore the mixture of endings found in the earliest text for Mosiah 16:5. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Mosiah 16:5 the repeated subject pronoun *he* that occurred in the earliest textual sources; in addition, the critical text will maintain the original *-eth* ending for the verb form *remaineth* as well as the mixture of other third person present-tense forms in this passage.

■ Mosiah 16:5

*therefore he is as though there was no redemption made
being an enemy **to** God
and also is the devil an enemy [to 1ABCGHKPRST | of DEFIJLMNOQ] God*

Here the 1841 British edition replaced the preposition *to* with *of*, which the LDS text followed until the 1920 edition, when the original *to* was restored. Note that the previous participial clause also has the preposition *to* (“being an enemy **to** God”). As noted in the discussion under Mosiah 3:19, the original Book of Mormon text has examples of both “an enemy **to** God” (four times) and “an enemy **unto** God” (one time) but none of “an enemy **of** God”; on the other hand, if the article is *the*, we get “the enemy **of** God” (one time). In each of these cases, we allow the earliest textual sources to determine the reading.

Summary: Maintain in Mosiah 16:5 the two occurrences of the preposition *to* in the phrase “an enemy to God”, the reading of the earliest text for this passage.

■ Mosiah 16:7

*and if Christ **had** not risen from the dead
or [NULL >+ have 1 | have ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] broken the bands of death
—that the grave **should** have no victory and that death should have no sting—
there **could** have been no resurrection*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “or broken the bands of death”. Later (with somewhat heavier ink flow and at a slant), Oliver supralinearly inserted the perfect auxiliary verb *have* in \mathcal{P} . This correction appears to be secondary. The use of the present-tense *have* seems out of place with respect to the past-tense subjunctive forms otherwise used in this passage (*had*, *should*, and *could*). Moreover, if we accept this intrusive *have*, then perhaps we should also get a negative *not* between the *have* and *broken* (or maybe even before the *have broken*). But even with an additional *not* (as in “or have not broken the bands of death”), the phraseology would still sound awkward because of the clash between *have* and the preceding *had*.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon there are three more examples of predicates conjoined by the conjunction *or* within a subordinate *if*-clause:

Alma 46:21
if they **should** transgress the commandments of God or fall into transgression

3 Nephi 12:23
if ye **shall** come unto me or **shall** desire to come unto me

Moroni 7:6
if he offereth a gift or prayeth unto God . . .

In the first case, the modal verb (*should*) is not repeated; in the second case, the modal verb (*shall*) is repeated. The third example does not involve any auxiliary verb. In none of these cases is there any change in tense.

But it should also be pointed out that *not* does not occur in any of these examples. When we consider cases where *or* conjoins predicates involving *not*, we still find that there is no change in tense:

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

Mosiah 7:18

for behold the time **is** at hand **or is not** far distant
when we shall no longer be in subjection to our enemies

Alma 37:42

therefore they **tarried** in the wilderness
or did not travel a direct course

These few examples suggest two possible readings for the original text here in Mosiah 16:7. One is that the original text read “or had not broken the bands of death” (with repetition of the auxiliary verb *had* and the *not*). The other is that the original text read “or broken the bands of death” (with no repetition of the auxiliary verb *had* or the *not*). The more plausible reading seems to be the second one since it involves only the insertion of *have* in the text, while the first one involves replacing *had* with *have* and omitting the *not*. Since the initial reading in \mathcal{P} was perfectly acceptable (“or broken the bands of death”), there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have inserted the *have* in \mathcal{P} except that the *have* was in the original manuscript (no longer extant here). In other words, the original manuscript may have actually read “or **have** broken the bands of death”—but this was an error for “or broken the bands of death”. One explanation for such an error, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), is that the scribe of \mathcal{C} , in taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation, may have accidentally inserted an extra *have* as he heard Joseph dictating the immediately following subordinate clause (“that the grave should **have** no victory”):

Mosiah 16:7 (proposed reading for how \mathcal{C} actually read)

and if Christ had not risen from the dead
or **have** broken the bands of death
that the grave should **have** no victory
and that death should **have** no sting
there could **have** been no resurrection

Although Joseph would not have dictated all of this passage at once, it is possible that he dictated the second and third lines (as listed above) without pausing, which could have led the scribe to have accidentally inserted the *have* in \mathcal{C} . It is also possible that Joseph himself could have accidentally dictated the *have* in anticipation of its occurrence in the following clauses.

Since the current reading here in Mosiah 16:7 is quite improbable, the critical text will accept the simplest emendation, namely “if Christ had not risen from the dead or broken the bands of death”. Not only does this reading make perfectly good sense, it is also what Oliver Cowdery initially wrote as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . But since \mathcal{C} seems to have read “or **have** broken the bands of death”, Oliver later inserted the *have*, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Remove in Mosiah 16:7 the intrusive *have* in “or **have** broken the bands of death”; the original manuscript apparently had the *have*, and Oliver Cowdery ended up copying it into \mathcal{P} ; one possible source for the extra *have* in \mathcal{C} could have been the *have* in the immediately following clause (“that the grave should **have** no victory”).

■ **Mosiah 16:12**

*and they would not / they being warned of their iniquities
and yet they would not [repent > depart 1 | depart ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] from them
and they were commanded to repent and yet they would not repent*

The initial error here in \mathcal{P} —of writing *repent* instead of *depart*—was undoubtedly the result of anticipating the otherwise identical clause “and yet they would not repent” later on in this passage. Of course, the resulting “and yet they would not repent **from** them” is very unusual; we expect “they would not repent **of** them”. The phrase “to repent of something” occurs 66 times in the text (including six with *not*), but there are no examples of “to repent from something” (and, of course, none with *not*). Here in Mosiah 16:12, Oliver Cowdery seems to have corrected his error almost immediately (the supralinear correction shows no change in the level of ink flow).

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , “and yet they would not **depart** from them”.

■ **Mosiah 16:13**

*and now had ye not ought to tremble and repent of your sins and remember
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | that RT] only in and through Christ ye can be saved*

Here the 1920 LDS edition added the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *remember*. Besides Mosiah 16:13, we have four examples of “and remember (that)”, one of which occurs without the *that* in the earliest text (marked below with an arrow):

- 2 Nephi 10:23
and remember **that**
ye are free to act for yourselves
- 2 Nephi 10:24
and remember [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after ye are reconciled unto God
that it is only in and through the grace of God that ye are saved
- Jacob 3:9
and remember **that**
their filthiness came because of their fathers
- Alma 5:52
→ and remember
the holy one hath spoken it

More generally, in the original text, after the verb *remember* we get *that* (with perhaps an intervening phrase or clause) most of the time (43 times), but occasionally the *that* is missing after the verb *remember* (5 times in addition to Mosiah 16:13 and Alma 5:52, listed above):

1 Nephi 10:20

therefore remember O man
for all thy doings
thou shalt be brought into judgment

2 Nephi 9:39

remember
to be carnally minded is death and to be spiritually minded is life eternal

Alma 42:11

and now remember my son
if it were not for the plan of redemption . . .

Alma 50:20

but remember
inasmuch as they will not keep my commandments
they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord

Ether 4:16

remember
when ye see these things
ye shall know that the time is at hand
that they shall be made manifest in very deed

Of course, it is possible in Mosiah 16:13 that the original text had a *that* which was lost during the early transmission of the text. But since there are a number of examples without the *that*, the critical text will maintain the earliest text for Mosiah 16:13. For discussion of other verbs for which *that* has been accidentally lost or added, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *that* in Mosiah 16:13 so that the text reads according to the earliest textual sources; the *that* does improve the smoothness of the text, but based on other usage in the original text, the subordinate conjunction is not necessary.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]