Revisions in the Analysis of Archaic Language in the Book of Mormon

by Stanford Carmack and Royal Skousen

In *The Nature of the Original Language* (parts 3 and 4 of volume 3 of the critical text, designated herein as NOL), we provided evidence from Early Modern English texts that certain Book of Mormon word meanings, phrases, grammar, and expressions had died out (or had become archaic or obsolete) by the 1740s. These items are listed in sections 1, 3, 4, and 7 of part 3. We excluded from these lists the obvious King James biblical examples, which are taken up in part 4 (sections 15–18). It would be inaccurate to say that we are now taking "a stricter or more accurate" approach. Instead, what we are doing here is what we stated would happen: "Over time, further advances in the size and variety of the databases may lead us to change the categorization for some of these write-ups" (page 10 of NOL). And this is what has happened. In particular, we have improved our ability to search an important database, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (referred to as ECCO), with the result that we are now able to check usage much more readily in the 1700s, and as a consequence we have found evidence that some of our archaic items persisted longer, up into the late 1700s. And additional searching using Google Books has led us to recognize that some of our archaic examples were being used in the early 1800s and in a few cases even after the dictation of the Book of Mormon in 1828–29.

In this analysis, we will go through all the items listed in sections 1, 3, 4, and 7 of part 3, plus a few others that have come to our attention. For some, the designation remains archaic, but for others we can now see that their usage persisted into the late 1700s or early 1800s. The ones that are still archaic, we will mark with a check (✓), but for those for which the evidence now indicates that their usage persisted, at least into the second half of the 1700s, we will mark with a plus (+). Finally, for the few cases that involve some kind of special analysis in determining their category, we will mark each of them with an asterisk (✴).

There are four sections in this write-up, one for each archaic category: vocabulary, phrases, grammar, and expressions, corresponding to sections 1, 3, 4, and 7 of NOL. In some cases, we will see shifting of some items to a more appropriate category in NOL. At the beginning of each of the four sections, we will provide a summarizing lists of all our categorizations and re-categorizations.

Various English language databases serve as the basis for our analyses. The first three databases were provided by the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University.

OED	Oxford English Dictionary: online, third edition [in progress]
EEBO	*Early English Books Online* (texts from the late 1400s up through 1700)
ECCO	*Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (texts from 1700 through 1800)
DOST	*A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (texts from before 1700)
Google Books	Advanced Book Search

Summary for revised section 1 · Archaic Vocabulary

Of the original 39 archaic vocabulary items discussed in this first section of NOL, we have been able to determine that ten of these have persisted through the 1700s (see the list below); these will now be assigned to section 20 · CHANGING VOCABULARY. There has also been some additional minor shifting in categories: (1) four items (*engraven, molten, rent,* and *scarlets*) are now assigned to section 10 · NON-ARCHAIC LAN-GUAGE, basically because they have been continuously re-created throughout the history of the English language from elements already in the language; (2) two items (*call of, consigned that*) remain archaic, but now as phrases, and they are therefore shifted to section 3 · ARCHAIC PHRASES; (3) two items have been shifted into section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY from other sections: *subsequent* from section 11 · UNIQUE LANGUAGE, and *scatter* from section 20 · CHANGING VOCABULARY; and (4) one item (*may*) has been shifted to section 15 · KING JAMES VOCABULARY, mainly because its usage occurs so frequently in the King James Bible. Finally, we should note that two archaic words (*opinion* and *profane*) were assigned incorrect meanings in NOL; they each remain archaic, but they are now listed with their correct archaic meaning.

26 ARCHAIC WORDS AND PHRASES

break 'to stop, interrupt'

but 'unless, except'

call of 'need for'

consigned that 'assigned that'

counsel 'to consult, counsel with'

course 'direction'

cross 'to contradict'

depart 'to divide, separate, part'

desirous 'desirable'

devour 'to consume, eat up'

extinct 'physically dead'

flatter 'to coax, entice'

give 'to describe, portray'

idleness 'meaningless words or actions'

manifest 'to expound, unfold'

mar 'to hinder, stop'

nithermost 'nethermost'

opinion 'expectation'

profane 'to act profanely'

raign 'to arraign'

scatter 'to separate from the main group'

sermon 'conversation, discussion'

study 'to concentrate thought upon'

subsequent 'consequent'

welfare 'success'

whereby 'why'

10 PERSISTENT WORDS

assured 'sure'

belove 'to love'

depressed 'weakened'

detect 'to expose'

great 'supreme'

hail 'to challenge by hailing'

rebellion 'opposition'

reserve 'to preserve'

tell 'to prophesy, foretell'

views 'visions'

4 RE-CREATED WORDS

engraven 'to engrave'

molten 'to melt ore'

rent 'torn or rent part'

scarlets 'scarlet cloths or clothing'

1 BIBLICAL WORD

may 'be able to, can'

+ *Assured* 'sure'

 "for I am **assured** that if ye had known me / ye would not have suffered that . . ." (Mosiah 7:13)

ECCO has 59 examples with the phrase "I am assured that if", including the following where *I am assured* co-occurs with the parallel and synonymous use of *I am certain*:

 1782, Robert Tomlinson, *Letters Addressed to the Admiralty*

 because **I am assured** that if you should ever see my Essay, it would give your Lordship concern that the Royal Navy was not sooner benefitted thereby; and as **I am certain** that it is not possible to confute me, I will venture to assert, . . .

Here is another example from Google Books, from the Parliamentary debates of May 1808, and this one co-occurs with the parallel use of "no doubt":

 1808, Parliamentary Debates [published in 1812]

 I am **assured** that if you go into this committee, and are willing to pursue the inquiry, the most satisfactory defence can be made against the accusations on which so much stress was laid. I have **no doubt** that those who urge these charges, . . .

+ *Belove* 'love'

 "among those who they so dearly **beloved** and among those who **had** so dearly **beloved** them" (Alma 27:4)

NOL provides evidence from Webster's 1828 dictionary that by Joseph Smith's time the verb *belove* was used only in the passive; Webster's own language usage excluded the use of *belove* in the active. Even so, we can find in ECCO and Google Books that *belove* continued to be used in the active in the late 1700s and early 1800s, as in these examples:

 1788, *The Amicable Quixote*

 Commend me to your family; may your charms and your virtues be beloved as I **have beloved** them, and you will never want a friend.

 1839, William W. Snowden, *The Ladies' Companion,* volume 11, page 43

 She **had beloved** him in her youth, and with one, single-minded, constant, never-ending love.

Yet in this second citation (appearing nearly a decade after the Book of Mormon) there is evidence that the verb *belove* is archaic in its usage. On page 105, we have this striking example of Snowden using the passive *am beloved* as well as the agentive preposition *of* (from Early Modern English) rather than the preposition *by* (from current English): "I love my father, and **am beloved of** him". Of course, what we expect in modern English is *love* in the active: "I love my father, and **he loves me**".

✓ *Break* 'stop, interrupt'

 "no monster of the sea could **break** them / neither whale that could mar them" (Ether 6:10)

The NOL discussion under *Mar* argues that the Ether passage here refers to breaking the progress of people, not ships. Here the co-occurring archaic *mar* means 'hinder, stop', and it too refers to hindering or stopping these people in their sea journey. Some might be tempted to interpret *break* here as Early Modern English

(and biblical) usage describing ships as being broken, as in Jonah 1:4: "so that the ship was like to be **broken**". The OED refers to this usage as obsolete (see definition 2d under *break:* "to wreck (a ship), *obsolete*"). However, this meaning for *break* is not what Ether 6:10 intends to say, especially given its co-occurrence with the verb *mar.* Thus far we have not been able to find *break* and *mar* used this way in English after the 1600s.

✓ *But* 'unless, except'

"I greatly fear lest my case shall be awful **but** I confess unto God" (Jacob 7:19)

The more reasonable interpretation of Sherem's language here is that unless he confesses, the day of judgment will be awful for him. We still have instances in English of *but* meaning 'except', yet these are restricted to *but* followed by a preposition phrase ("but for him") or by a noun phrase ("all but John"). If we wish to show the persistence of the conjunctive use of *but* in Jacob 7:19, we need to find cases where *but* means 'unless, except' and it is followed by a clause. Two examples of this usage from the 1500s are cited on page 229 of NOL; in both cases the clause following *but* is in the subjunctive (as in the 1531 citation: "no man may take that man **but** he **have** authority from the sheriff"). There is a link between this interpretation of *but* here in Jacob 7:19 and the original use of the phrase *but if* in Mosiah 3:19, emended in the 1920 LDS text to *unless.* Thus this use of *but* is discussed under the archaic phrase *but if.* The OED cites both these cases of *but if* and *but* together under definition 10. It is, of course, difficult to find instances of this use of *but* in texts because we have to ignore the vast number of instances of regular negative conjunctive *but* (as in 1 Nephi 8:18: "and it came to pass that I saw them **but** they would not come unto me and partake of the fruit"). And complicating all of this is the need to separate out cases of *but* S acting as verb complements (as in 1 Nephi 17:43: "and I know not **but** they are at this day about to be destroyed"). This use of *but* appears to be related to *but what,* which occurs about a dozen times in the Book of Mormon (as in Alma 24:26: "therefore we have no reason to doubt **but what** they are saved"). We take these examples from the Book of Mormon, but one would have to hunt through a lot of *but*'s in texts from the 1700s and early 1800s to find cases like Jacob 7:19. The OED claims that this use of *but* is archaic; but even so, it could have persisted through the 1700s and the early 1800s and ended up being archaic by the end of the 1800s, when the OED editors would have been working on the entry for *but.*

✓ *Call of* 'need for'

"thus we see the great **call of** the diligence of men to labor in the vineyards" (Alma 28:14)

It appears that what we have here is an archaic phrase, *call of,* and its meaning 'need for' rather than simply the lexical noun *call* with its meaning 'need'. In modern English, the closest corresponding phrase is *call for,* as in the several examples cited in NOL under *call.* In that write-up, cases of *call unto* and *call to* (where *to* is the infinitival marker) are also cited. Using Google Books, we have found this example of *call of* dating from 1715, an example that agrees with the Book of Mormon usage in Alma 28:14 and occurred in English prior to the 1740s:

1715, Charles Davenant, *An Account of the Trade between Great Britain, France, Holland, . . .*
All which is visible within Forty Years,
and has occasion'd this great **call of** a Commodity almost peculiar to us.

✓ *Consigned that* 'assigned that'

> "I am **consigned that** these are my days" (Helaman 7:9)

We have been able to find a number of non-legal examples of *consigned* with the meaning 'assigned' continuing through the 1700s and into the 1800s. Here are three examples found in ECCO and Google Books:

> 1772, *An Universal Catechism*
> By which he **was consigned to be** a Member of Christ, a Child of GOD,

> 1789, John Brown, *Select Remains of the Reverend John Brown*
> I can hardly bear the thought of **being consigned to be** an useless weight on his earth.

> 1806, William Davy, *A System of Divinity*
> And it is to this "Day of Redemption" that we **are consigned** by the "Seal of the Holy Spirit", these three Ways:

> 1825, Rebecca Edridge, *The Highest Castle and the Lowest Cave*
> the cloister to which I **am consigned** for ever, would be more dreary and more gloomy than it is at present.

The Book of Mormon usage, however, appears to be quite unique since it is a case of *consigned* taking a *that*-S clause as its complement. We have therefore revised this item to read as an archaic phrase, *consigned that,* and shifted it to the list of archaic phrases.

✓ *Counsel* 'consult, counsel with'

> "**counsel** the Lord in all thy doings" (Alma 37:37)

The editors for the OED, writing this entry in the late 1800s, stated that this usage without the expected preposition *with* was obsolete. This was probably based on two factors, (1) their own intuitions about the usage here, and (2) the lack of citations for this usage since the mid-1500s (the last citations in the OED come from Stephen Gardiner in 1528 and from John Hooper in 1547). Even so, an instance of this archaic usage has been discovered dating from the late 1800s:

> 1873, William Gowan Todd, *Sacred History, from the Creation to the Destruction of Jerusalem*
> Yes: believing their story, and not having **counselled God** first, he [Joshua] entered into a league with them.

This language is from a canon of Southwark (London). It is possible that Canon Todd was familiar with the writings—and the archaic language—of the Protestant martyr John Hooper, republished in 1843 as *Early Writings of John Hooper, Doctor of Divinity* (in fact, this is the source that the OED editors quoted from in writing up this entry for *counsel*). And of course, this particular usage, without the preposition *with,* could simply be an instance of the creative change the English language continually undergoes. It's even possible that "having counselled God" is a typo for "having counselled with God". The point here is that this one instance is an outlier: it is unsupported by any other usage in this time period. We need other examples, especially by normal speakers that could not have known the archaic usage. It seems reasonable to assume that the judgment of the OED editors is undoubtedly right: this usage was obsolete in the late 1800s (and very likely from the 1600s on). For another example, one of an archaic phrase still known to

a few speakers, see *pleading bar,* which was undoubtedly obsolete in the 1800s and 1900s, despite the fact that it was still known and used by a few specialists.

✓ *Course* 'direction'
   "in the **course** of the land of Nephi we saw a numerous host of the Lamanites" (Alma 2:24)

The complete report of the spies here in verse 24 implies that the spies were moving towards the land of Nephi (in other words, in the direction of the land of Nephi) when they observed the Amlicite army combining with a Lamanite army:

> Alma 2:24
>> behold we followed the camp of the Amlicites
>> and to our great astonishment
>> in the land of Minon above the land of Zarahemla
>> in the **course** of the land of Nephi
>> we saw a numerous host of the Lamanites
>> and behold the Amlicites have joined them

We get the same basic meaning for *course*—that is, direction—in 1 Nephi 16:33: "we did again take our journey traveling nearly the same **course** as in the beginning". In both passages, the implication is that *course* refers to the motion of people in a certain direction. Although in Alma 2:24 the spies probably did not intend to follow the Amlicite army all the way into Lamanite territory, they were moving in that direction. There appear to be no examples in modern English of the expression "in the course of a certain place", in reference to going in the direction of that place. And the only good example we have of that (besides Alma 2:24) is from Early Modern English in Richard Eden's 1555 translation of Pietro Martire d'Anghiera's *The Decades of the New World or West India:* "which is in the course of the Islands of Azori". Of course, there are many examples of the word *course* in our normal speech that involve some sense of direction, such as "in the course of life" and "to set your course towards some place" (as in the famous line from *Star Wars:* "set your course for Alderaan"). And we were able to find eight examples from 1740 up to 1840 in Google Books of the phrase "travel the same course", as in these two examples:

> 1761, Wellins Calcott, *Thoughts Moral and Divine*
>> all are **traveling the same course**

> 1830, David Russell, *Letters*
>> We acquire much of the spirit of the many who have **traveled the same course** before us

Thus the use of "traveling nearly the same course" in 1 Nephi 16:33 is not archaic. On the other hand, for that same hundred-year period of time there were no examples of "in the course of a place", meaning 'in the direction of that place'. Nonetheless, there were 23 instances of "in the course of <nominal phrase>", with the following nominal forms: *that year, the present year, eight months, time; the journey, a voyage, her voyage; a real correspondence, his business, trade; the current, mathematics; being coined; which, which comedy, the remarks which;* and the pronoun *it.* Thus the phrase itself remains in English, but in uses quite different than the one in Alma 2:24 ("in the course of the land of Nephi"), which definitely appears to have become archaic, perhaps as early as the 1600s.

✓ *Cross* 'contradict'

> "that thereby they might make him cross his words or contradict the words which he should speak"
> (Alma 10:16)

This Book of Mormon passage adds the explanation "or **contradict** the words which he should speak". The meaning 'contradict' for the verb *cross* is found under definition 14c in the OED, with citations of its use through the 1600s. We have made an extensive search of ECCO in hunting for any instances of *cross* with this meaning, with or without the noun *words,* or used in conjunction with the verb *contradict*. There is one example of "crossing and contradicting" dating from the late 1700s, but here *crossing* refers to passing contradictory orders along a battle line:

> 1799, Jacques Mallet du Pan, *The History of the Destruction of the Helvetic Union and Liberty*
> Hasty orders, **crossing and contradicting** each other, are sent to every part
> of the astonished and discouraged line.

Thus the evidence continues to support categorizing *cross* with the meaning 'contradict' (as used in Alma 10:16) as archaic.

In the NOL write-up, we also discuss the Book of Mormon expression "cross yourself in these things" (found twice in Alma 39:9). Here *cross* takes the meaning 'oppose, thwart'. In NOL we mentioned that the OED provides non-reflexive citations of this usage up through the late 1800s, but no reflexive uses (like those in Alma 39:9) were listed after the 1600s. Now, however, we have been able to find later evidence for the reflexive usage, as in these two examples found on Google Books:

> 1741, John Wilford, *Memorials and Characters*
> he will **cross himself** in any eager desire and in things most to his own humor

> 1829, Ray Potter, *Memoirs of the Life and Religious Experiences of Ray Potter*
> I must **cross myself** in every thing which I had a desire to do without making any distinction between holy and unholy desires, or between that which the law of God forbid or required. Accordingly I had to take up my cross and **deny myself**.

✓ *Depart* 'divide, separate, part'

> "God gave power unto one man even Moses to smite upon the waters of the Red Sea
> and they **departed** hither and thither" (Helaman 8:11)

The archaic designation for *depart* meaning 'divide, separate, part' is definitely correct. The evidence from the change in the matrimonial words in the 1662 (third) edition of the Book of Common Prayer from "till death us **depart**" to "till death us **do part**" shows that the earlier use of *depart* had become obsolete by the mid-1600s. The question is whether the 1611 King James use of *departed* in Acts 15:39 and Revelation 6:14 should count as meaning 'parted' and whether the translators intended it. If they did, then we would have evidence to re-categorize the verb *depart* under section 15 · KING JAMES VOCABULARY in NOL. In discussing this issue, we should also consider the translation for John 19:24, "they **parted** my raiment among them", which is identical to Tyndale's 1526 (and 1534) translation. Earlier, the 1557 Geneva New Testament read "they **departed** my raiment among them", and similarly the 1560 Geneva Bible read "they **departed** my garments among them". The use of *departed* in the Geneva translation was an innovative decision by those translators, showing that in the mid-1500s *depart ~ part* were acceptable equivalents. Usage in the OED argues that by

the early 1600s these two lexical items were no longer equivalent. The only reason *departed* was retained in Acts 15:39 ("they departed asunder, one from the other") and in Revelation 6:14 ("and the heaven departed as a scroll") was that in both passages the word *departed* could be interpreted as meaning 'departed' rather than 'parted'. The larger context for Acts 15:39, namely the three verses of Acts 15:38–40, has an instance of the verb *depart* in each verse, which led the translators to leave the instance of *departed asunder* in the middle verse since it would work with the meaning 'to depart':

> Acts 15:38–40
>> But Paul thought not good to take him with them;
>> who **departed** from them from Pamphylia,
>> and went not with them to the work.
>> And the contention was so sharp between them,
>> that they **departed** asunder one from the other:
>> and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus.
>> And Paul chose Silas, and **departed**,
>> being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God.

For Revelation 6:14, there are two possible Greek verbs to consider, both very similar in form. One is *apokhōreō,* which means 'go away, leave, desert; depart, withdraw'; the other is *apokhōrizō,* which means 'separate, part'. William Tyndale translated Revelation 6:14 in 1534 as "And heven vanysshed awaye, as a scroll when it is rolled togedder." Tyndale's notion was that the heaven vanished away, that is, departed, which works well enough when thinking of a scroll being rolled up. The 1557 Geneva New Testament introduced the verb *depart* here, which implies vanishing. And the 1560 Geneva Bible followed the 1557 version, thus maintaining the idea of vanishing. And finally, the 1611 King James translators adopted the Geneva reading of *departed,* which works well enough in context when it refers to vanishing rather than parting. Thus there is no strong evidence that the use of *departed* in Acts 15:39 and Revelation 6:14 would have been interpreted as 'parted' to the King James translators.

+ *Depressed* 'weakened'
    "and they were **depressed in body** as well as in spirit" (Alma 56:16)

ECCO and Google Books have quite a few examples that refer to the body being depressed, as in these examples:

> 1757, David Hume, *The History of Great Britain*
>> His body **depressed** with fatigue and hunger;

> 1773, English translation of Lucian of Samosata's *The Dream of Lucian*
>> You will lead a poor, illiberal, obscure life, equally abject in mind as **depressed in body**.

> 1815, Alexander Chalmers, *The General Biographical Dictionary*
>> Pace, thus degraded, and **depressed in body** and mind, resigned his deanries of St. Paul and Exeter, a little before his death;

> 1835, William Allen Hallock, *Memoir of Harlen Page*
>> I have for some time been **depressed in body** and spirit.

These later examples all show one can be physically depressed, that is, "depressed in body", not just depressed "in mind" or "in spirit".

✓ *Desirous* 'desirable'
    "for I knew that it was **desirous** above all other fruit" (1 Nephi 8:12)

As explained under this passage in *Analysis of Textual Variants,* it is possible that *desirous* here in 1 Nephi 8:12 is an error for *desirable,* especially since earlier in this passage we have an instance of *desirous*. On the other hand, if this reading is correct, then we clearly have an archaic usage which did not last past the early 1700s. The OED lists in square brackets a reference to a prescriptive complaint by Samuel Pegge (1704–96), probably originating in the 1770s or 1780s, but published posthumously in 1809 in his *Anonymiana,* stating that *desirous* was "used improperly by Gay for *desirable*" (that is, by John Gay in *The Beggar's Opera,* dating from 1728). Pegge argues that Gay "was drawn by the rhyme", namely "Fill every glass, for wine **inspires us**, . . . Is there aught else on earth **desirous**". Pegge's statement, at the least, provides good evidence that by the late 1700s this older meaning for *desirous* had become fully archaic. In addition, Joseph Smith emended this instance of *desirous* in 1 Nephi 8:12 to *desirable* in his editing for the 1837 edition, thus providing further evidence that the original archaic meaning for *desirous* had been lost by the early 1800s.

+ *Detect* 'expose'
    "we will **detect** this man and he shall confess his fault" (Helaman 9:17)

There is considerable evidence that *detect* was used reflexively up into the early 1800s, if not longer. In NOL, a 1795 quotation from J. Franklin is cited, with its phrase "they detect themselves". In addition, we have found in Google Books several dozen examples of "to detect oneself " (that is, reflexive uses of the transitive verb *detect* 'expose, reveal') dating from 1740 to 1840, including these two examples:

> 1801, Joanna Southcott, *Collected Tracts*
> but by his invented lies, he has **detected himself**;

> 1808, *The Churchman's Magazine*
> for he has completely **detected himself**, and no one else!

The non-reflexive use of the transitive *detect* (as in Helaman 9:17) appears to be less frequent, but we can still find instances of it during the same time period. In NOL, there is a 1757 citation of "I detected the man" (from John Douglas's *Bower and Tillemont Compared*). And here is a later example of the non-reflexive usage found in Google Books (quoted in its full pomposity):

> 1812, Francis Henry Egerton (1756–1829), *The Life of Thomas Egerton, Lord Chancellor of England*
> How much soever a Writer who prints, and, circulates a work, clandestinely;
> and much more One who writes in his own name, who writes, at least,
> under His Own Hand, may wish to conceal Himself, yet, at times, here and there,
> the sallies of his fancy, and, imagination, the powers of his memory,
> the force of his mind, the extent of his learning, the graces of his elocution,
> here and there, at times, perhaps all along, must **detect Him**: They must break out:
> They must escape: His spirituality must evaporate: It cannot be confined:
> The Hand of a Master Must be so traced, Must become evident.

These two non-reflexive examples with the meaning 'to expose someone' argue that the transitive use of "to detect someone" had not fully died out by the early 1800s, although it does seem to be quite infrequent, perhaps even rare. What we are seeing, it seems, is the slow death of this usage over this time period. Of course, for the OED editors in the late 1800s, the transitive use (both non-reflexive and reflexive) had become obsolete, as it is in today's English.

✓ *Devour* 'consume, eat up'

    "they did take with them all that they had not **devoured** of all their grain" (3 Nephi 6:2)

All but one of the Book of Mormon examples of the verb *devour* imply some sense of voraciousness (OED, definition 1). The one exception is the absolutely neutral use in 3 Nephi 6:2 (note that earlier in the verse the text refers to simply eating up provisions: "they had not eaten up all their provisions"). For subsequent examples of *devour* in the 1800s, *devour* is often used figuratively, yet even in these cases the word retains some sense of excess, either in speed of eating or amount of food, as in these two examples from the 1830s, cited in the OED:

    1833, Harriet Martineau, *Illustrations of Political Economy*
        and went on to **devour** their meals **hastily**, as if time was not their own

    1836, Andrew Combe, *The Physiology of Digestion*
        We never **eat more than enough**. We never **devour** lobsters, or oysters, or salmon, or cheese, or anything which experience has told us our enfeebled stomachs cannot digest!

The completely neutral sense in 3 Nephi 6:2 appears to be very old, taken from the Latin verb *dēvorō,* and found in the Wycliffite biblical translations (based on the Latin Vulgate), which date back to the late 1300s.

✳ *Engraven* 'engrave'

    "and we labor diligently to **engraven** these words upon plates" (Jacob 4:3)

This verb keeps getting re-created from the past participle form, *engraven,* going first from *engraven* to an ungrammatical one with an extra past-participial ending, *engraved,* and then from *engraved* to the base form of the verb, *engraven* (something like "it was engraven" > "it was engraved" > "he engravened it" and "he has engravened it", from which we finally get all the other forms of the verb *engraven*). Subsequently, we find in databases the past-participial form *engraved* considerably more often than the independent use of the verb *engraven,* as shown by the many examples (listed on pages 124–126 of NOL) of past-participial *engraved* dating from 1605 through 1912. In other words, it is typically harder to find citations of the verb *engraven.* In general, the verb per se is not being transmitted from generation to generation; rather, it is being independently re-created by speakers of English over the generations. This means that *engraven* is not persisting but instead it is being continuously re-created. For this reason, *engraven* should probably be listed under section 10 · NON-ARCHAIC LANGUAGE. A similar example here in section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY is the verb *molten* 'to melt ore', created from the past-participial form *molten* via *moltened.*

✓ *Extinct* 'physically dead'

> "and inflict the wounds of death in your bodies, that ye may become **extinct**" (Alma 44:7)

The use of the word *extinct* meaning 'dead'—and in reference to a person's death—seems to have become obsolete sometime in the 1700s. In NOL, we have the 1719 quotation from Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe:* "but my father was dead, and my mother, and all the family **extinct**; except that I found two sisters, and two of the children of one of my brothers". And we have discovered using Google Books one later instance of this usage dating from the mid-1700s:

> 1755, Gregory Sharpe (translator), Ludvig Baron Holberg, *An Introduction to Universal History*
> He was **extinct** in 1039.

Here the referent for the pronoun *he* is Conrad II, duke of Franconia; Sharpe is simply stating that Conrad II died in 1039. The language here is not referring to the end of a royal or family line, but instead Conrad II's actual death since his dynasty continued well after his death. Sharpe's translation was later re-issued (in 1787) by William Radcliffe, so this use of *extinct* continued in the textual record, but by the late 1700s it was clearly exceptional since for the last 30 years of the 1700s this is the only instance of "he was extinct" in ECCO, in contrast to 5,747 instances of "he was dead". The use of *extinct* to mean 'dead' became obsolete sometime in the 1700s, probably earlier than Sharpe's use of it in 1755 and perhaps even before Defoe's use in 1719, simply because we are having such difficulty finding examples of it being used with this meaning anytime in the 1700s.

✓ *Flatter* 'coax, entice'

> "or that they might by some means **flatter** them out of their strong holds" (Alma 52:19)

The Book of Mormon uses *flatter* with a number of meanings, some with positive connotation (which are now archaic) and others with negative connotation (as generally in English today). Perhaps the most striking example of archaic usage is the one that refers to flattering the Lamanites out of their strong holds. EEBO provides a parallel example of this usage dating from the early 1600s:

> 1601, Patrick Simon (translator), Jean de Hainault, *The Estate of the Church*
> the Turk by **flatteries** drew him out of the castle where he was

And here is a similar instance of *flatter,* written by "a person of quality" (otherwise anonymous) near the end of the 1600s, presumably in reference to James II, king of England 1685–88:

> 1690, *The Character of a Jacobite*
> And thus, they that **flattered** him out of his throne,
> no less absurdly flatter themselves with felicities of their own erecting,
> by restoring him again.

It is the first instance of *flatter* in this sentence that retains the archaic meaning 'coax, entice', but here used more figuratively than when referring to physically enticing people out of fortresses.

✓ *Give* 'describe, portray'

> "he **gave** all the land which was south of the land Desolation—yea and in fine all the land
> both on the north and on the south—a chosen land and the land of liberty" (Alma 46:17)

Like the example of *counsel* 'consult', the verb *give* with the meaning 'describe, portray' is definitely obsolete except for a single instance of intended archaic usage dating from the mid-1800s:

> 1850, Alfred Tennyson, *In Memoriam*
> what practice howso'er expert . . .
> hath power to **give** thee as thou wert

The usage is intended to be archaic given Tennyson's use of archaic grammar in the final line: the *-th* ending for the verb *have,* the pronouns *thee* and *thou,* and the verb form *wert.* This single exception in modern English does not mean that the usage is current. Maybe this is why the OED editors never like to say a word meaning is dead, only that it's obsolete or archaic. There might just be some bibliophile or librarian that knows that meaning for the word!

+ *Great* 'supreme'

> "I thus did send an embassy to the **great** governor of our land" (Alma 58:4)

Google Books has numerous examples of the phrase "the great governor of <noun phrase>" from 1740 up to 1840. Most of these are references to God, as in "the great governor of the world" and "the great governor of the universe". But there are also references to supreme human governors, as in these examples from the time of Joseph Smith:

> 1813, Robert Kerr, *A General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels to the End
> of the 18th Century*
> On the 10th, Abdala Khan, the **great governor** of Ahmedabad, being sent for to court
> in disgrace . . .

> 1827, Johannes Avdall (translator), Michael Chamich, *History of Armenia*
> Eleazar then repaired to Theyard Oghlu the **great governor** of Damascus and begged
> assistance from him.

> 1830, James Kirke Paulding, *Chronicles of the City of Gotham*
> From this time forward, I became the confidential friend and adviser of the **great governor**
> of the little state

> 1834, Samuel Lewis Southard, *Arguments of S. L. Southard in the Case of S. Decow
> and J. Hendrickson, versus T. L. Shotwell*
> What right had he to make such a minute, when the meeting had determined to adjourn,
> without waiting upon the **great governor** of the society for his light and direction?

So Oliver Cowdery's omission of *great* before *governor* in Alma 58:4 (when he copied the text from 𝒪 to 𝒫) was very likely unintentional since in his time there would have been nothing strange about using *great governor* to mean 'supreme governor' and to use it to refer to humans, not just God. So this usage should be shifted to section 20 · CHANGING VOCABULARY.

+ *Hail* 'challenge by hailing'
  "they saw him a coming and they **hailed** him / but he saith unto them : fear not" (Alma 55:8)

The whole point of this example of *hail* from Alma 55:8 is that the challenge is implied, but not stated. The sense here is clearly confrontational, especially given the Book of Mormon's use of the negative conjunction *but* to show Laman's reaction. Hailing an unknown person, to challenge them, either their approach or to find out who they are, extends beyond the 1600s. Here are a couple examples of *hail* being used as confrontational challenges, the first in a nautical context, the second on land, both from around Joseph Smith's time:

> 1797, Benjamin Trumbull, *A Complete History of Connecticut*
> One John Gallop, as he was going from Connecticut to Boston, discovered Mr. Oldham's vessel full of Indians, and he saw a canoe, having Indians on board, go from her laden with goods. Suspecting that they had murdered Mr. Oldham, he **hailed** them, but received no answer. Gallop was a bold man, and though he had with him but one man and two boys, he immediately bore down upon them and fired duckshot so thick among them, that he soon cleared the deck.

> 1824, *The Museum of Foreign Literature, Science, and Art,* volume 5
> An officer, marching to relieve guard, perceiving from the rampart some persons in the moat below, **hailed** them in the accustomed form—"who goes there?"

This use of confrontational *hail* has become obsolete in today's English, but it appears that this shift in the use of the verb *hail* took place after Joseph Smith's time. This means that *hail* should most likely be placed in section 20 · CHANGING VOCABULARY.

✓ *Idleness* 'meaningless words or actions'
  "see that ye refrain from **idleness** // do not pray as the Zoramites do" (Alma 38:12–13)

The one place where this archaic meaning for *idleness* holds especially well within the Book of Mormon text is in Alma's advice in Alma 38:12 to Shiblon, the energetic missionary, in fact, overly energetic. The current meaning for *idleness* will clearly not work here; instead, it seems that Alma is trying to get Shiblon to avoid using passionate expressions or perhaps meaningless prayers, much like those of the Zoramites. There are other instances in the Book of Mormon of *idleness* and *idle* that seem to work best if we interpret them as referring to the Lamanites as people whose actions are "void of meaning or sense; foolish, silly, incoherent" (see definition 2b in the OED for *idle,* also definition 3 for *idleness;* in each case, the definition is declared to be obsolete and the last citation dates from the 1650s). This meaning for *idle* and *idleness* may help to interpret the phrase "full of idleness" (in 1 Nephi 12:23) or references to "idle people" (in 2 Nephi 5:24 and Alma 22:28) or listing *idleness* in conjunction with *babblings* (in Alma 1:32). The OED entries imply that this meaning did not persist into the 1700s, but it is clear that it existed in Early Modern English. In EEBO, for example, we can find instances where *idleness* co-occurs with nouns that suggest sinful or inappropriate behavior rather than inactivity:

> 1656, Alexander Grosse (died 1654), *The Buddings and Blossomings of Old Truths*
> the tongue full of evil communication, the hands **full of idleness**, full of blood of unrighteous dealings

> 1659, Méric Casaubon (editor), John Dee (died 1608), *A True and Faithful Relation . . .*
>
> Therefore ought you when others are **full of idleness**, the dalliances of sin,
> to humble yourself upon the earth before the Lord, and to praise his Name.

The phrase "the hands full of idleness" and the linking of *idleness* with "the dalliances of sin" imply much more than our modern-day sense of *idleness* that refers to doing nothing. To be sure, we can find instances of this meaning in EEBO, where *idleness* is linked with *sloth* or *rest:*

> 1673, Nathaniel Wanley, *The Wonders of the Little World*
>
> indulging themselves in the greatest **idleness** and **sloth** that may be

> 1684, Thomas Willis (died 1675), *Dr. Willis's Practice of Physic*
>
> but to love to lie down and to indulge themselves with **idleness** and **rest**

Similarly, the Book of Mormon also has instances of this meaning for *idleness,* for example in references to sitting in idleness (in Alma 24:18 and in Alma 60:22). Of course, it is this meaning for *idleness* implying laziness that came to dominate English, beginning in the 1700s.

✓ *Manifest* 'expound, unfold'
  "I stood upon my feet and did **manifest** unto the people that I had been born of God" (Alma 36:23)

Under definition 3 for *manifest,* the online, third edition of the OED cites four examples from Early Modern English, dating from between 1530 and 1669, that take the obsolete meaning for this verb, 'expound, unfold'. Thus far we have found no evidence of this usage extending up into the 1700s.

✓ *Mar* 'hinder, stop'
  "and no monster of the sea could break them neither whale that could **mar** them" (Ether 6:10)

The early meaning here of the verb *mar* (under definition 1 in the OED) works perfectly well, but not the current meaning for *mar.* Thomas Carlyle's use of *mar* in an 1827 translation for the word *hinder* (see the OED citation in NOL) appears to be due to his Scottish dialect rather than archaic usage, especially since there is no evidence of this older meaning for *mar* in any other dialects (including American). If *mar* with the meaning 'hinder, stop' had been retained in American dialectal usage, we would have listed it under section 5 · ARCHAIC DIALECTAL.

✻ *May* 'be able to, can'

This usage is in the King James Bible, as in these examples:

Genesis 8:17	bring forth with thee every living thing that *is* with thee . . . that they **may** breed abundantly in the earth
Exodus 16:32	fill an omer of it to be kept for your generations that they **may** see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness
Acts 23:24	and provide them beasts that they **may** set Paul on

This biblical use of *may* with the meaning 'can' dates back to William Tyndale's translations from the 1530s, which we can see in two of these examples:

Exodus 16:32	fill a gomer of it that it may be kept for your children after you
	that they **may** see the bread wherewith he fed you in wilderness
Acts 23:24	and deliver them beasts that they **may** put Paul on

We are so used to this style in modern English that it seems doubtful that today's speakers would automatically think of this use of *may* as in the biblical style. Although some modern translations such as the New International Version translate these passages with the modal *can,* other more conservative translations retain the earlier *may,* such as the New Standard Version. Even so, since we can identify the Book of Mormon usage as imitative of the King James style, it is probably wise to move *may* to section 15 · KING JAMES VOCABULARY.

✱ *Molten* 'melt ore'

"I did make tools of the ore which I did **molten** out of the rock" (1 Nephi 17:16)

This verb, like the verb *engraven,* is independently produced at various times from the past-participial form *molten,* with the extra *-ed* added first to the past-participial form, and from there to the past forms, as follows: "it was molten" > "it was moltened" > "he moltened it" and "he has moltened it", from which we can finally get the other forms of the verb *molten.* The most frequent form we find in the databases is the past-participial *moltened,* as we would expect. Here are a couple more examples to add to the list on pages 148–149 of NOL:

1789, *Reason Mis-shaped*
the ARK of *Israel,* composed of shittim wood, formed into a chest of an oblong figure, **moltened** over with gold

1849, *Sea, Ships, and Adventures*
After a sultry autumn day, the blood-red sun sunk beneath a sea of crimson, which gradually deepened into **moltened** lead;

Independent instances of the verb *molten* are relatively rare. More often than not, the sporadic occurrence of *moltened* is an independent creation rather than being transmitted through time from speaker to speaker. Like *engraven,* the verb *molten* should be moved to section 10 · NON-ARCHAIC LANGUAGE because it is constantly being re-created.

✓ *Nithermost* 'nethermost'

"let us go down into the **nithermost** parts of the vineyard" (Jacob 5:38)

The pronunciation *nithermost* appears to be archaic usage. It may have been retained in American dialect usage, but thus far we have not found any evidence of this. In NOL, there are two citations of its use in Early Modern English, from the late 1600s: one from an author from Sussex and the other from Long Island, New York. Like the OED, English-language dictionaries have referred to *nethermost* as being *nithermost* in the Saxon or the Anglo-Saxon (that is, Old English):

1746, Nathan Bailey and Theodor Arnold, *A Complete English Dictionary*
[an English-French-Latin-German dictionary]

Nethermost, (v. S. *nithermost*)

1895, John Oglivie, *The Student's English Dictionary*
Nether and *most* = A. Sax. *nithermost*

NOL lists one example of its use in Irish English, from Thomas Bracken's *Paddy Murphy's Annual* (1886): "in the **nithermost** ragions". We also have this example from a 1746 book, *The History of the Cymbri or Britains:* "in the **nithermost** part of North Britain". Although this usage may have continued in American speech into the early 1800s, we have no evidence of it, only the Long Island example dating from 1670. We will therefore continue to treat the word *nithermost* as archaic usage for Joseph Smith's time.

✓ *Opinion* 'expectation'
"I give it as my **opinion** that the souls and the bodies are reunited of the righteous
at the resurrection of Christ and his ascension into heaven" (Alma 40:20)

The usage here is different than how we use the noun *opinion* in our legal system, where judges hand down "the opinion of the court". Indeed, their opinions are more than "just their opinion". Often speakers refer to their own personal opinions as "deliberate or considered" in order to emphasize some sense of certainty instead of subjectivity when using the noun *opinion*. The write-up in NOL misinterprets the meaning of *opinion* here in Alma 40:20. Instead of *opinion* meaning 'considered judgment' in this passage, the more appropriate interpretation is that the word means 'expectation'. And this meaning for *opinion* is definitely archaic; the online, third edition of the OED lists it under definition 5: 'thought of what is likely to be the case, knowledge; expectation based on knowledge or belief', with citations ending in the mid-1600s. We have not found any examples of *opinion* in the 1700s or later to argue that this meaning for *opinion* in Alma 40:20 extended beyond Early Modern English.

✓ *Profane* 'act profanely'
"and they **profaned** not / neither did they blaspheme" (Jarom 1:5)

As NOL explains, the Book of Mormon usage here is intransitive and means 'act profanely' rather than 'speak profanely'. (NOL is in error when it sometimes lists the meaning of *profane* in Jarom 1:5 as 'to swear'.) Here are a couple examples from EEBO where the verb *profane* is used with the meaning 'act profanely':

1622, Christopher Sibthorp, *A Friendly Advertisement to the Pretended Catholics of Ireland*
he changeth the good laws and establisheth his own: he **profaneth**, he raveneth:
he spoileth, he defraudeth, he massacreth:

1677, Aphra Behn, *The Town Fopp*
Oh how have I **profaned**? to what strange idol was that I kneeled?

For the first citation, given the following verb *spoil,* we can assume that the verb *raven* means 'to plunder' rather than 'to eat voraciously', and this implies that the preceding verb *profane* means 'to act profanely' rather than 'to speak profanely' (all five of the verbs deal with desecration). And in the second citation, kneeling to a strange idol is the profane act, not speaking profane words. The online, third edition of the OED states that this usage was rare after the 1600s. The three examples cited after the 1600s all appear, given the context, to mean 'to speak profanely' (that is, 'to speak words of profanity').

✓ *Raign* 'arraign'
  "and all shall be brought and be **raigned** before the bar of God" (Alma 11:44)

The last firm instances of *raign* for *arraign* date from the mid-1500s. The OED has one citation from around 1650, but as pointed out in NOL this may be a printing error for *arraign*. Similarly, ECCO has two similar errors, where the scanned reading has *raigned* but the actual printed text reads *arraigned:* one instance of "raigned before the bar" and another of "raigned before Pilate". Under Alma 11:44 in *Analysis of Textual Variants,* there is some discussion regarding the possibility that we may have a similar error here in this passage: the form *reigned* in 𝒫 may represent a scribal error for *arraigned* where the initial unstressed syllable was omitted (perhaps a mishearing on the part of the scribe when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation of the text for 𝒪).

+ *Rebellion* 'opposition'
  "and he began to stir his people up in **rebellion** against my people" (Mosiah 10:6)

As evidence that the noun *rebellion* can be used non-hierarchically, NOL cites a couple of examples from the 1600s of "in rebellion one against another". It turns out that variants of this phraseology persisted into the 1700s and 1800s, as in these examples:

  1715, George Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Religion: Natural and Revealed*
    In their Discord, Confusion, and **Rebellion** one against the other, their Degeneracy, Corruption, and Fall.

  1837, *The Confession of Faith of the Christians Known by the Name of Mennonites*
    For the kingdoms of this world are different from the kingdom of peace, inasmuch as they rise in **rebellion** one against another.

  1837, William Jones, *Memoir of the Reverend Rowland Hall*
    that we should be given over by Him to be at enmity and **rebellion** against each other

✴ *Rent* 'torn or rent part'
  "waving the **rent** of his garment in the air" (Alma 46:19)

The primary OED definition for *rent* begins with the phrase "the result of rending", which theoretically implies that *rent* could apply to the tear in the garment or to the torn portion resulting from the tear. But the latter option appears to be a highly unlikely possibility. We have only two citations where *rent* refers to the rent portion (and only one before the appearance of the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon): first, the 1649 Robert Baron instance (where "a fragment of a torn banner" is referred to as "a rent"); and secondly, the 1854 instance in Thoreau's *Walden* (where *torn sails* are referred to as "these rents"). In both cases, *rent* is difficult to interpret as referring to torn portions unless we carefully read the larger passage. Both instances seem to be the result of a productive, but rare creativity in the language, and they go against the natural interpretation of *rent* as referring to the tear itself. This rarity led to the emendation of both instances of the noun *rent* in the Book of Mormon to *rent part* in the first decade of the 1900s. And of course, we have numerous critics of the Book of Mormon, from the 1880s on, complaining about the use of the noun *rent* for 'rent part' as non-English. They definitely found it objectionable. As a result, *rent* could be placed under

that later section that includes cases of lexical creativity, namely, section 10 · NON-ARCHAIC LANGUAGE. There may be other instances of the noun *rent* in the databases, but these are difficult to find since the noun *rent* referring to a torn part would be in the minority and every example of *rent* would need to be carefully examined in context to see which meaning it takes (we would also have to filter out cases where *rent* refers to payment for use). My student, Daine Stevens (mentioned in the NOL write-up) had to work through a lot of examples of *rent* in *Literature Online* (LION) to find that one example from 1649. Since LION goes right up into current literature, Stevens was basically hunting through a very large haystack for a needle.

+ *Reserve* 'preserve'
   "and thus we will **reserve** the flocks unto the king" (Alma 17:31)

It is now clear that *reserve* retained the meaning 'to preserve' up through the 1800s, although in today's English the meaning is clearly obsolete. The online, third edition of the OED, under definition 4a, earlier stated that the usage was rare, but now declares that this meaning for *reserve* is obsolete. And the examples currently listed in the OED clearly show *reserve* taking the meaning 'to preserve alive' (which is how it is used in Alma 17:31):

> 1769, Oliver Goldsmith, *The Roman History*
> Their captains and generals he made prisoners of war, being **reserved** to adorn his triumph.

> 1797, Charles Fox (translator), Achmed Ardebeili, *A Series of Poems*
> and leading into Tartarian slavery, those still more cruelly **reserved** from slaughter

> 1817, James Hackett, *Narrative of the Expedition which Sailed from England in 1817*
> and such of the nuns as were **reserved** from slaughter, were carried away with them as victims of their brutality

> 1895, Willis John Abbot, *Carter Henry Harrison: A Memoir*
> On the way he saw his closest associates brained by the savages' tomahawks, and supposed himself **reserved** from death only for torture.

And here are some examples from the 1700s and 1800s of "reserved alive" from Google Books:

> 1737, William Whiston (translator), *The Whole Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus*
> Some of them have been half devoured by wild beasts and ye have been **reserved alive** to be devoured by them a second time.

> 1815, Abraham Rees, *The Cyclopaedia*
> at other times he was **reserved alive** for a future day's sport

> 1835, Henry Soames, *The Anglo-Saxon Church*
> They teach, accordingly, that Elias is **reserved alive** for a solemn appearance upon earth;

This meaning of *reserve* is now obsolete. *Google Ngram Viewer* shows that the frequency of the phrase "reserved alive" began a slow decline in the 1840s, so that by the 1920s its use in English had virtually vanished. It is worth noting that the emendation of *reserve* to *preserve* in Alma 17:31 occurred first in the 1849 edition, published in Liverpool, England, and edited by Orson Pratt. The corresponding phrase "preserved alive" has always been more frequent, although it too has decreased in frequency over time but has not fallen to zero.

✳ *Scarlets* 'scarlet cloths or clothing'
  "and I also saw gold and silver and silks and **scarlets** and fine twined linen and all manner
    of precious clothing" (1 Nephi 13:7)

There are two issues here. The first is the transfer of the color to any cloth with that color. Revelation 18:12 gives a clear example of this: "the merchandise of gold and silver and precious stones and of pearls and fine linen and **purple** and silk and **scarlet**". The second is the application of the plural to a mass noun to allow speakers to quantify the noun or to identify different types of the noun. In NOL, we have a citation from 1763 showing this: "broadcloths, **reds**, **scarlets**, mixed or medleys, and plain **whites**". At the end of the NOL write-up, it is suggested that this plural application in 1 Nephi 13:7 is sufficient to motivate placing this usage in section 4 · ARCHAIC GRAMMAR. But more recent analysis shows that this use of mass nouns in the plural is a productive characteristic of English, and as a consequence we have been able to find later citations in the history of English where *scarlet* has been used in the plural to refer to different types of scarlet cloth:

  1763, *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England*
    which camp was richly furnished with great store of velvets, silks, **scarlets**,
    and other clothing of value

  1800, Thomas Lipton, *A Thousand Notable Things on Various Subjects*
    to take spots from white silks and **scarlets**

  1821, *The Saturday Magazine*
    an elegant woman may be seen pacing the streets in silks and **scarlets**

  1822, Allan Cunningham, *Traditional Tales of the English and Scottish Peasantry*
    from the dame in the douce grey mantle to the maiden in glittering silks and **scarlets**

✓ *Scatter* 'separate from the main group'
  "from the book of Ether also / which is a record of the people of Jared which were **scattered**
    at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people" (title page)

This one archaic meaning for the verb *scatter* is discussed in NOL under section 20 · CHANGING VOCABU- LARY, but in this revision we move *scatter* here to section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY. The archaic examples that take this meaning are taken from the OED, EEBO, and Google Books and date from 1577 to 1745; they are cited on pages 1139 – 40 of NOL. These examples refer to people or ships being scattered from their main group. In today's English, the verb *scatter* would imply that all the people or ships in the group (unless explicitly exempted) were dispersed. Here in the title page of the Book of Mormon, the implication of the verb *scatter* is that the people of Jared were separated off from all the other peoples of the world.

✓ *Sermon* 'conversation, discussion'
  "and it came to pass that after they had ended the **sermon** that they returned to the land of Nephi"
    (Mosiah 19:24)

Here the critical text proposes that the original reading was the word *sermon* and that it took the archaic Latin meaning for *sermon,* namely, 'speech, talk; conversation, discussion'. The last citation in the databases with this meaning dates from 1594. That meaning was probably already archaic by the end of the 1500s. All

subsequent instances of *sermon* refer to preaching, either literally or figuratively. Here in the Book of Mormon, the earliest extant text for Mosiah 19:24 is the printer's manuscript, and it reads *ceremony,* not *sermon.* Numerous attempts to interpret the passage here so that *ceremony* will work have not been especially successful.

✓ *Study* 'concentrate thought upon'
"ye have **studied** and taught iniquity the most part of your lives" (Mosiah 13:11)

Google Books provides several instances of "study iniquity" coming from works published up to the mid-1700s, although the first one listed here dates from the 1650s:

1653–1656, Andrew Gray, *Directions and Instigations to the Duty of Prayer* [published in 1715]
Hence it is spoken that there are some that **study iniquity** upon their beds.

Andrew Gray (1633–1656) was a preacher in Glasgow during the last three years of his short life. His sermons were collected and later published in this posthumous work. Here Gray is paraphrasing Micah 2:1: "woe to them that devise iniquity and work evil upon their beds".

1708, *An Explanation of the Psalms of David: After the Translation Used in the* [Book of]
Common Prayer
Psalm 7:15
Behold, [*the wicked*] he travelleth with Mischief, [**studieth Iniquity** *and Trouble:*]
he hath conceived Sorrow, and brought forth Ungodliness.

Here *travelleth* is our modern-day *travaileth.* This version of the Psalms [the unbracketed text] was used in Anglican Church services prior to the 1611 publication of the King James Bible. The bracketed text provides a paraphrase for the passage. The corresponding verse in the King James text (Psalm 7:14) reads: "Behold, he travaileth with iniquity, and hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood."

1750, *The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate*
Ezekiel 11:2
Son of man, these are the men that **study iniquity** and frame a wicked counsel in this city.

Richard Challoner (1691–1781) is responsible for this 1750 revision of the original Catholic Bible, the Douay version, translated from the Latin Vulgate and first published in 1609. The King James Bible's Ezekiel 11:2 reads: "Son of man, these *are* the men that devise mischief, and give wicked counsel in this city".

From this last example we can see that the phrase "study iniquity" persisted up until the middle of the 1700s. From Google Books, later examples of "study iniquity" can be found, but for all these the verb *study* takes on the modern meaning of 'to study academically':

1755, Edward Young, *The Centaur Not Fabulous*
I have **studied iniquity** as a science.

1798, Timothy Dwight, *The Nature and Danger of Infidel Philosophy*
The seat of justice would be the next of plunder and robbery, and the edifices of learning cells of **studied iniquity**, where methodized sin would be the science, and sagacious perpetration the art.

Timothy Dwight was the president of Yale University, 1795–1817.

From these examples, it appears that the earlier meaning for the phrase "to study iniquity" became obsolete sometime in the mid-1700s, which means that it was probably archaic a half-century or more before the 1828–29 translation of the Book of Mormon. For this reason, this meaning for *study* will continue to be listed here under section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY.

✓ *Subsequent* 'consequent'
"to remove the cause of diseases which was **subsequent** to man"

Originally in NOL, this lexical item was placed in section 11 · UNIQUE LANGUAGE. Instead of treating this instance of *subsequent* as an error for *consequent,* it is perhaps more reasonable to accept the evidence of the citation mentioned at the end of the NOL write-up, the one found in *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST) where *subsequent* takes on the meaning 'consequent' (in other words, 'following as an effect or result'):

not later than 1499, William of Tours, *The Contemplation of Sinners*

Kepe ay our hart fra synfull pollucioun
Sa sall our sucharge be solace **subsequent**

"Keep ever our heart from sinful pollution
So shall our surcharge [burden] be solace consequent"

Accepting this interpretation means that *subsequent* should be moved from section 11 · UNIQUE LANGUAGE to section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY.

+ *Tell* 'prophesy, foretell'
"that I should come and **tell** this thing unto you" (Helaman 14:9)

The following *yea*-clause in this passage makes it clear that *tell* means 'prophesy, foretell': "thus hath the Lord commanded me by his angel that I should come and **tell this thing** unto you / yea he hath commanded that I should **prophesy these things** unto you". The NOL write-up gives several other Book of Mormon passages where *tell* means 'prophesy, foretell'. Of course, speakers of English today continue to use expressions like "to tell the future" and "to tell future events", where *tell* occurs in lieu of *foretell* or *prophesy.* In the following example, one could interpret *tell* as meaning 'to relate', but the actual meaning is obviously 'to prophesy, foretell':

1781, Mary Deverell, *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*
No one can **tell** the future dispensations of Providence, or what may be our own catastrophe.

+ *Views* 'visions'
"rebel no more against your brother / whose **views** have been glorious" (2 Nephi 1:24)

Searching for instances of the phrase "glorious views", we have been able to find instances at the end of the 1700s where *views* means 'visions':

1796, Hannah Neale, *Sacred History in Familiar Dialogues*
Here he [John the Revelator] had **glorious views** of the unseen world:

1800, Alexander Fraser, *A Commentary on the Prophecy of Isaiah*
> My soul being enraptured with these **glorious views** of future times,
> I found it in my heart to sing this song of praise.

✓ *Welfare* 'success'
> "he was exceedingly rejoiced because of the **welfare**—yea the exceeding success—
> which Helaman had had in obtaining those lands which were lost" (Alma 59:1)

To the analysis in NOL, we can add these two examples of *welfare* from Early Modern English where the word means 'success' (found in EEBO and the OED):

1583, Arthur Golding (translator), John Calvin, *The Sermons of Master John Calvin upon the Fifth Book of Moses*
> According whereunto, when any of them had any **welfare** or prosperity, they would say,
> God be praised, God hath done us this good turn:

1681, George Archbald, in a letter to friends in Holland, refugees from Presbyterian persecution in Scotland
> I would reckon it my comfort to injoy your fellouship alwayes, but since I cannot,
> I congratulate those who have it; and doe heartilie wish you all **weel-fare** in that place
> where the Lord hath casten your lott, which I believe be (at this tyme) a resting place.

There are examples in the 1700s of "welfare and well-doing" where *welfare* could be interpreted as meaning either 'success' or 'well-being', although in my mind the whole notion of conjoining *welfare* (that is, *well-being*) with *well-doing* is because the contrast is between being and doing:

1703, Thomas Tryon, *The Knowledge of a Man's Self the Surest Guide to the True Worship of God*
> things which no way concern him, his **welfare** or **well-doing**, and whereof he has
> no understanding

1738, Joseph Williams, *Extracts from the Diary, Meditations, and Letters of Mr. J. Williams* [published in 1779]
> I can assure you, that your **welfare** and **well-doing** will administer matter of real joy to,
> dear cousin, your affectionate friend and loving uncle, J. W.

✓ *Whereby* 'why'
> "whereby hath my father so much sorrow?" (Ether 8:9)

Another possibility is to literally interpret *whereby* as meaning 'from where'. In other words, "from where hath my father so much sorrow?", or in more modern English, "what is the source of my father's excessive sorrow?" In any event, the use here of *whereby* seems distinctly archaic.