

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

by *Stanford Carmack and Royal Skousen*

Here we will go over the 25 cases listed in section 3 • ARCHAIC PHRASES. We will also add three phrases that have come to our attention in the past two years, namely, *free man*, *harrow up*, and *see of*. The phrase *pleading bar*, originally treated in section 8 • HISTORICAL CONTEXTS, is now included here. In addition, we remind the reader that there are two revised cases of archaic phraseology, *call of* and *consigned that*, that were originally discussed under the revised section 1 • ARCHAIC VOCABULARY. Improvements in our database searches mean that about half the phrases persisted at least through the 1700s and often into the early 1800s. Yet about half the phrases are identified as archaic since evidence for their existence is still limited to Early Modern English.

Summary for revised section 3 • Archaic Phrases

14 ARCHAIC PHRASES

about to ‘engaged in preparations to’
begin to ‘to begin at’
but if ‘unless’
disappointment of ‘disappointment in’
do away ‘to dismiss, put away’
for the cause of ‘because of’
harrow up ‘to vex, disturb’
hurl away ‘to drag away’
pleading bar ‘the courtroom bar for pleading’
search knowledge ‘to search for knowledge’
see of ‘to see’
somewhat contentions ‘somewhat of contentions’
to that ‘until’
where unto ‘with respect to which’

14 PERSISTENT PHRASES AND EXPRESSIONS

accept of ‘to accept’
arrive to ‘to arrive at’
be aware ‘to beware’
behold of ‘to behold’
belief on ‘belief in’
doubt in ‘to doubt’
free man ‘a man that is free’
gain advantage of ‘to gain advantage over’
in the favor of ‘in favor of’
into an effect ‘into effect’
on the seventh month ‘in the seventh month’
some future day ‘at some future day’
strong hold ‘a hold that is strong’
subtle to do ‘subtle in doing’

1 BIBLICAL PHRASE

in the fourth day ‘on the fourth day’

✓ *About to* ‘engaged in preparations to’

“and when my brethren saw that I was **about to** build a ship / they began to murmur against me”
(1 Nephi 17:17)

In NOL, we list eight Book of Mormon passages for which the archaic phrase *about to* might be appropriate. Three of these passages appear to be solid candidates for this interpretation since in each of these cases the current interpretation of *about to* does not really work: (1) in 1 Nephi 17:17, Nephi is making actual preparations to build a ship, which Laman and Lemuel can readily observe; (2) in Helaman 1:7–8, Paanchi is actively working to instigate rebellion, which the people have actually observed him doing; and (3) in Helaman 1:22–23, Coriantumr cuts off his preparations to attack all the rest of the Nephite lands and sets out immediately to specifically attack the city of Bountiful. In all of these cases, people have been able to observe what has actually been happening, not what they might have assumed would be happening. For the four other passages, the normal, modern interpretation for *about to* is quite possible, which means that in these cases the archaic meaning for *about to* is not required.

+ *Accept of* ‘accept’

“there was not any of his sons which would **accept of** the kingdom” (Mosiah 28:10)

ECCO provides a couple of examples of “accept of the kingdom” dating from the 1790s:

1791, Charles Home, *A New Chronological Abridgment of the History of England*
Charles . . . found himself obliged to **accept of** the kingdom on their own conditions

1794, William Beckford, *The History of France*
He . . . permits his brother, the count of Anjou, to **accept of** the Kingdom of Two Sicilies,
offered by the Pope.

And from the early 1800s Google Books has examples of “accept of <noun phrase>”, in particular, for noun phrases other than “the kingdom”, as follows:

1809, Elihu Hall Bay, *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Superior Courts of Law in the State of South Carolina*
Most of them, finding that nothing was secreted, and no improper intention manifested in his conduct, agreed to **accept of** his proposals.

1819, G. B., *Narrative of a Private Soldier*
And why will ye not hear his voice, and **accept of** his invitation today?

1823, Thomas Chalmers, *Report of the Speeches Delivered at the Public Dinner to Dr. Chalmers*
and he hoped they would **accept of** his resignation in the way it had been tendered

+ *Arrive to* ‘arrive at’

“we did **arrive to** the promised land” (1 Nephi 18:23)

Google Books provides these examples of “arrive to the promised land”:

1755, John Maud, *The Doctrine of Endless Torments*
we see how near they once were **arrived to** the promised land of plenty, peace and comfort

1759, Joseph Bellamy, *Theron, Paulinus and Aspasio*

I rejoiced just like the graceless Israelites, in a sense of their great deliverance,
and in expectation of soon **arriving to** the promised land

1803, Samuel Hopkins, *Twenty-One Sermons on a Variety of Interesting Subjects*

though he depended wholly on him for all his strength to act and walk
and every volition to exert himself in order to escape the dangers of this wilderness . . .
and **arrive to** the promised land

+ *Be aware* ‘beware’

“let him **be aware** lest he shall be in danger of hell fire” (Mormon 8:17)

In NOL, there is an OED citation from the 1830s of *be aware* that means ‘beware’:

1835, Isaac Taylor, *Spiritual Despotism*

we must **be** especially **aware** of those fallacies

Google Books also has examples from the early 1800s where “be aware lest” means ‘beware lest’:

1801, Rowland Hill, *Village Dialogues*

so they should **be aware lest** they trust too much on the work of the Spirit on the other

1832, *The Evening and Morning Star* (August 1832)

let every man **be aware lest** he do that which is not in truth and righteousness before me

This is, of course, a revelation that Joseph Smith received. It originally read *be aware lest* and was published that way in *The Evening and Morning Star*. But a year later it was printed in the Book of Commandments as *beware lest*, which is how it now reads in the Doctrine and Covenants (50:9).

1839, *Artisans, Farmers, and Laborers*

Let the House **be aware lest** it make good this prophecy.

By the late 1800s, the OED editors identified *be aware* with the meaning ‘beware’ as obsolete; thus the transition from *be aware* to *beware* must have occurred in the mid-1800s.

✓ *Begin to* ‘begin at’

“he **begin to** the creation of the world and also **to** the creation of Adam” (Alma 18:36)

NOL lists 11 examples of *began to* that in today’s English the preposition *to* would be replaced by *at*, *from*, or *with*, with dates from 1566 to 1663. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST) has this additional example dating from 1554: “to **begin . . . to** the bigging [building] of the tollbooth”. The OED does not have any discussion regarding *begin to* under the verb *begin*.

+ *Behold of* ‘behold’

“which caused me to **behold of** his glory” (Alma 12:29)

The argument in NOL is that the use in Alma 12:29 of “behold of <noun phrase>” is equivalent to “behold <noun phrase>”, thus the tendency to omit the *of* in that passage, originally by scribe 2 in \mathcal{P} and independently

in the 1874 RLDS edition (Oliver Cowdery supplied the *of* in Ø, while the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text). In such an analysis, we ignore the gerundive cases of “the beholding of <noun phrase>”, which is what we usually get in ECCO and also in Moroni 10:14 (“to another the beholding of angels and ministering spirits”). In these cases, we do not expect the omission of the *of*. Here are a couple examples from the late 1700s of *behold of* where the *of* could be omitted without any change in the meaning:

1778, Abraham Booth, *The Death of Legal Hope, the Life of Evangelical Obedience*
 for the more you **behold of** his personal glories and perfect obedience,
 the less will you be inclined to cleave to the law

1796, Samuel Lyndall, *A Sermon Preached at the Tabernacle, London*
 the more he **beholds of** his Jesus, the more he laments his own darkness

These examples argue that the phrase *behold of* persisted through the 1700s.

+ *Belief on* ‘belief in’

“and this because of their **belief on** the words of Alma” (Mosiah 25:18)

This usage was uncommon but persisted through the 1700s:

1791, Henry Evans Holder, *Discourses on Various Subjects, Delivered in the Island of Barbados*
 the Evangelist will furnish us with a resolution of our question: it was a **belief on** his name

1791, Samuel Newton, *A Syllabus of Christian Doctrine and Duties in the Catechetical Form*
 Does not John speak of an inward witness or testimony attending the **belief on**
 the Son of God?

1792, *The New Jerusalem Journal*
 That saving faith is a **belief on** the Lord Jesus Christ.

The verbal phrase “believe on (the name of) the Lord” occurs in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible (there are also examples in both scriptures with the preposition *in*). But the Book of Mormon has the one nominal example of “belief on the words of Alma”. The corresponding “belief on <noun phrase>” occurs in EEBO in the second half of the 1600s, with six examples from EEBO cited in NOL. And here we have added from ECCO three examples of “belief on <noun phrase>” that date from the last decade of the 1700s. To be sure, all of this nominal usage (“belief on <noun phrase>”) may simply derive from the verbal usage; that is, from “believe on <noun phrase>” we get “belief on <noun phrase>”.

✓ *But if* ‘unless’

“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” (Mosiah 3:19)

The second edition of the OED (1989) gives the last citation of *but if* with the meaning ‘unless’ as coming from 1596, Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*: “**but if** remedy thou her afford / full shortly I her dead shall see” (here cited with modern spellings). The online, third edition has added one more citation, dating from a few years later:

1601, Thomas Bodley, in a letter to librarian Thomas James

I am heartily sorry that you are vexed with the stone . . . **but if** it be of the kidneys,
the danger is not great.

That is, “unless it be of the kidneys, the danger is not great”. Here we are relying on the OED’s analysis and examples. It seems reasonable to assume that this archaic meaning for *but if* died out in the early 1600s. Yet there are an untold number of instances of *but if* in English texts, and to check each of them would be a huge task. Just consider: the NOL write-up for *but if* lists the 26 other Book of Mormon examples where *but* is the normal negative conjunction and *if* introduces a conditional clause. We recognize *but if* as archaic, as did the original editors for the OED in the late 1800s and also James Talmage for the 1920 LDS edition (since he emended *but if* to *unless*). But when was *but if* with the meaning ‘unless’ actually lost from the English language? As evidence for its loss in the early 1600s, we will follow the write-up in the second edition of the OED for *but if* (under definition 10b for *but*); but we will accept, of course, the additional 1601 example from the online, third edition.

✓ *Disappointment of* ‘disappointment in’

“he met with a **disappointment of** being repulsed by Teancum and his men” (Alma 51:31)

Here we are looking for gerundive complements for the phrase *disappointment of*. In NOL, seven instances from Early Modern English are listed, dating from 1643 through 1697. Here is an example from ECCO of this same phraseology but showing even more agreement with the language of Alma 51:31:

1773, John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*
but if I should meet with a **disappointment of** your not coming

Yet this is actually from a letter written by Queen Mary to King William in July, 1690. In other words, it’s a citation from Early Modern English. Otherwise in ECCO, we have been able to find instances of only non-gerundive noun phrases complementing *disappointment of*, as in this example where the complement is a *wh*-noun phrase:

1751, *The Presbyterian Clergy Seasonably Detected*
if the departed soul meets with a **disappointment of** what, before its departure from the body,
it had been persuaded to believe, the shock will be more dismal

The particular use of *disappointment of* in Alma 51:31 appears to be restricted to Early Modern English.

✓ *Do away* ‘dismiss, put away’

“and woe unto them which shall **do** these things **away** and die” (Moroni 10:26)

The online, third edition of the OED has now reorganized the entry for the phrasal verb *do away* (it is now listed as a phrasal verb under the verb *do*), with the result that Edmund Spenser’s 1596 example from *The Faerie Queene*, “**do** fear **away** and tell”, is now classified with two instances of the phrasal verb *do away* with the meaning ‘to take away, remove, subtract’, namely, Walter Scott’s 1819 *Ivanhoe* (“a smith and a file . . . to **do away** the collar from the neck of a freeman!”) and a 1990 issue of the magazine *Boating* (“this new model has **done away** the teak trim”). But the Book of Mormon usage is found only in archaic instances of

do away, ones that refer to mentally dismissing something rather than physically removing something. Here is another example from Early Modern English that refers to “doing things away”, taken from the Catholic New Testament published in Rheims and giving their translation of the Latin Vulgate for 1 Corinthians 13:11:

1582, *The New Testament of Jesus Christ*

but when I was made a man, I **did away** things that belonged to a little one

Here the Latin verb *ēvacuō* means ‘to rid one’s self of, to lay aside’, where the sense of the Latin is more physical than mental (unlike *The Faerie Queene*’s “do away fear” and the Book of Mormon’s “do these things away”). For the 1 Corinthians passage, the King James translation can be read as either physically or mentally putting things away: “but when I became a man, I **put away** childish things”. Despite the OED’s reorganization of the citations, the Book of Mormon’s use of “do these things away” is definitely archaic.

+ *Doubt in* ‘doubt’

“there was not a living soul . . . which did **doubt** in the least thing **in** the words of all the holy prophets”
(3 Nephi 5:1)

The Book of Mormon has only this one instance of “doubt in <noun phrase>”, and in this case there is an intervening adverbial phrase, “in the least thing”. The OED indicates that *doubt in* is obsolete, with their last cited example dating from 1523. In NOL, three examples from EEBO are cited dating from the 1500s. In addition, here are some examples from the 1600s, also found on EEBO:

1603, Richard Knolles, *The General History of the Turks*
and **doubting in** the performing hereof . . .

1609, W. Fitch (translator), Benoît de Canfield, *The Rule of Perfection*
for that I have known some which **doubted in** the practice thereof

1664, John Chandler (translator), Jean Baptiste de Helmont, *Van Helmont’s Works*
and although they **doubted in** the weight of gold . . .

Even so, we have been able to find some evidence for the persistence of the phrase *doubt in*:

1791, *The Proceedings of a Court of Enquiry*
In him, and his abilities, as an officer, he placed the great confidence,
never **doubting in** his orders, but obeying with cheerfulness.

1844, Thomas Curson Hansard, *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*
They **doubted in** the good faith of the Ministry, and experience only of the good
could convince them of their sincerity.

✓ *For the cause of* ‘because of’

“while your iniquity is **for the cause of** your love of glory” (Alma 60:32)

This phrase was generally used in Early Modern English, not just scripturally (as in Matthew 5:32 in the King James Bible). And we get the same for the Book of Mormon, with its two general instances of “for the cause of” and one scriptural one, the quotation of Matthew 5:32 in 3 Nephi 12:32. But in the 1700s, the original

archaic usage disappeared from English except for the set phraseology “for the cause of fornication” (along with the parallel “for the cause of adultery”). These phrases are retained as relic biblical phrases in the 1700s and 1800s and were also used in legal documents. At the end of the NOL write-up, we cite two legal examples of “for the cause of adultery” dating from the 1820s, but obviously modeled after the King James language in Matthew 5:32 (and quoted in 3 Nephi 12:32): “whosoever shall put away his wife saving **for the cause of fornication** causeth her to commit adultery”. Using Google Books, we searched for all instances of these two phrases in English from 1740 through 1840; excluding repetitions and citations from before 1700 we collected the following results:

“for the cause of adultery”	“for the cause of fornication”
14 in legal documents	1 in legal documents
5 in religious writings	56 in religious writings

These examples argue that the expression “for the cause of fornication” or “for the cause of adultery” is biblical in origin. So the question is: are there more general examples of “for the cause of” being used with the meaning ‘because of’ in the English of the 1700s and early 1800s? We find cases of “for the cause of”, but it turns out in every case thus far the word *cause* has taken on a non-idiomatic, standard interpretation, as in the two following examples dating from the 1790s:

1796, William Romaine, *Works of the Late Reverend William Romaine*

They shall be in bitterness not only for his death, but **for the cause of it**.

In other words, “they shall be in bitterness not only over his death, but also over the cause of his death”.

1799, *The Annual Register*

It shall refer to the Senate, but **for the cause of** unconstitutionality only, the list of the eligibles, the acts of the legislative body, and those of the government.

In other words, “except for cases of unconstitutionality only, it shall refer to the Senate the list of the eligibles, the acts of the legislative body, and those of the government”.

In a sampling from ECCO of 124 instances of “for the cause of <noun phrase>” dating from 1800 up to 1826, there were 2 instances that quoted Matthew 5:32 (“saving for the cause of fornication”). But all the rest, 122 of them, took a standard syntactic interpretation. The most frequent noun phrases were *Christ* (15×), *liberty* (9×), and *truth* (7×). Thus the phrase “for the cause of” with the meaning ‘because of’ does not seem to have persisted except in the archaic biblical phrase “for the cause of fornication” and its related “for the cause of adultery”, both of which were commonly used in legal language.

+ *Free man* ‘a man that is free’

“that he should be a **free man** like unto us if he would go down into the wilderness with us”

(1 Nephi 4:33)

The last part of the book of Alma describes the competition between the kingmen and the freemen, with the terms being defined in two verses that initially introduce the terminology:

Alma 51:5–6

and it came to pass that those who were desirous
that Parhoron should be dethroned from the judgment seat
were called **kingmen**
for they were desirous that the law should be altered in a manner
to overthrow the free government and to establish a king over the land
and those who were desirous that Parhoron should remain chief judge over the land
took upon them the name of **freemen**

The kingmen wanted a king to rule, but the freemen wanted judges, chosen by the voice of the people, to rule according to law (as described in Mosiah 29, especially verse 25). Subsequent passages in Alma 51 and Alma 60–62 refer to the warfare between the kingmen and the freemen. Both terms, *freemen* and *kingmen*, are used only in the plural in the Book of Mormon. They are spelled as single words without hyphens in the critical text; in the standard LDS and RLDS texts, we have the spellings *freemen* and *king-men*. The OED gives the following basic definition (under definition 1) for the noun *freeman*: “Originally: a man who is personally free; a man who is not a slave or serf. Later also: a man who is politically free; a man enjoying the rights and liberties of a free society, as opposed to a tyrannical regime or totalitarian rule.” It is the second half of this definition that applies to the plural term *freemen* as used in the Book of Mormon. In Mosiah 29, king Mosiah objected to the rule of kings since they were usually tyrannical. And the usurping rule of kings in the latter part of Alma is definitely viewed as a tyrannical attempt to overthrow freedom (see especially Moroni’s title of liberty and his campaign to maintain religious freedom, as described in Alma 46). Interestingly, the plural term *kingmen* appears to be original to the Book of Mormon. The OED lists *king’s man* (and thus *king’s men*) as the English word that best corresponds to the Book of Mormon’s *kingmen*, as found in definition 1a of *king’s man*: “a supporter or follower of a king, especially a royalist”. In EEBO, there are no instances of *kingman* or *kingmen*; *king-man* or *king-men*; *king man* or *king men*. But there are instances of *kings man* (36×) and *kings men* (621×); *king’s man* (12×) and *king’s men* (75×). The Book of Mormon, as already noted, has plural instances of *freemen* and *kingmen*, so that on the surface there appear to be no instances of the singular, either *freeman* or *kingman*. Yet here is one possibility for the singular *freeman*, but spelled as two words in 1 Nephi 4:33: “that he should be a **free man** like unto us”. This phrase has been interpreted as the noun *man* modified attributively by the adjective *free*, meaning ‘a man that is free’. Yet it is possible that the text here in 1 Nephi 4:33 could be read as a compound noun, namely: “he should be a **freeman** like unto us”, that is, in accord with the first part of the OED definition 1: “a man who is personally free; a man who is not a slave or serf”. The OED adds a note here that “in later use the one-word form has tended to be used exclusively with reference to freedom from slavery”. And this, we could argue, is precisely what Nephi is saying to Zoram. The citations under this OED definition show that the compound noun *freeman* was continuously used to distinguish slaves from freemen, with examples from Shakespeare’s time up to our own times:

not after 1616, William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*

Had you rather Caesar were living and die all **slaves** than that Caesar were dead
to live all **freemen**?

1942, *American Sociological Review*

Although a majority of Negroes were **slaves**, many were **freemen**.

Thus “a free man” in 1 Nephi 4:33 could be interpreted as “a freeman” (that is, a non-slave). If we emended the spelling in 1 Nephi 4:33 to read this way (in other words, “that he should be a **freeman** like unto us”), we would be explicitly acknowledging this more restricted, historical meaning for *freeman*, one that was prominently used to refer to non-slaves from Early Modern English up into the English of the 1800s and 1900s. To be sure, there is nothing in 1 Nephi 4:33 that necessarily requires us to re-interpret “a free man” as “a freeman”. The critical text will maintain the original spelling here in 1 Nephi 4:44, “a free man”, so that the verse will be read more transparently as simply referring to “a man that is free”.

+ *Gain advantage of* ‘gain advantage over’

“the people of Nephi did **gain** some **advantage of** the robbers” (3 Nephi 2:17)

This archaic language persisted into the late 1700s and the early 1800s, as in these examples:

1772, Thomas Church, *The History of Philip’s War*

the Indians **gained** great **advantage of** the English by two things . . .
they soon **gained** an **advantage of** Totoson’s company

1836, Samuel G. Drake, *Biography and History of the Indians in North America*

who **gained** some **advantage of** the English, wounding four of their men

1836, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, *Holiness, or the Legend of St. George*

to **gain advantage of** indigent and unsuspecting men

✓ *Harrow up* ‘vex, disturb’

“I had not ought to **harrow up** in my desires the firm decree of a just God” (Alma 29:4)

The verb *harrow* occurs 10 times in the Book of Mormon text, and every time in the phrase *harrow up*. All but one of the 10 occurrences take the meaning found in definition 4a in the OED: ‘to lacerate or wound the feelings of; to vex, pain, or distress greatly’. We can divide up the Book of Mormon cases according to what is harrowed up: one’s soul, one’s mind, or the person himself:

“harrow up one’s soul” (5 times)

2 Nephi 9:47	would I harrow up your souls if your minds were pure
Alma 14:6	and his soul began to be harrowed up under a consciousness of his own guilt
Alma 36:12	for my soul was harrowed up to the greatest degree
Alma 39:7	I would not dwell upon your crimes to harrow up your soul
Mormon 5:8	I Mormon do not desire to harrow up the souls of men

“harrow up a person” (3 times)

Alma 26:6	yea neither shall they be harrowed up by the whirlwinds
Alma 36:17	while I was harrowed up by the memory of my many sins
Alma 36:19	yea I was harrowed up by the memory of my sins no more

“harrow up one’s mind” (1 time)

Alma 15:3	and this great sin and his many other sins did harrow up his mind
-----------	---

The OED provides citations of this usage for the verb *harrow* dating from the early 1600s up into the 1800s, including two examples of *harrow up*:

1603, William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

I would a tale unfold whose lightest word would **harrow up** thy **soul**.

1816, Maurice Keatinge, *Travels through France and Spain to Morocco*

These sumptuous avenues will one day . . . put an end to the dreadful stories, whereby the **minds** of good people at a thousand miles distant are **harrowed up**.

But the Book of Mormon has one use of *harrow up* that is archaic in that it refers to “harrowing up the decree of God”:

Alma 29:3–4

but behold I am a man and do sin in my wish
for I had ought to be content with the things which the Lord hath allotted unto me
I had not ought to **harrow up** in my desires the firm **decree** of a just God
for I know that he granteth unto men according to their desires
whether it be unto death or unto life

Here an inanimate decree is harrowed up. This falls under definition 4b in the OED, with its obsolete meaning ‘to vex, disturb’. Thus in Alma 29:4 this complex line with *harrow up* could be paraphrased as “I shouldn’t disturb the firm decree of a just God by my desires”. Under definition 4b, the OED provides a single citation of *harrow* from Early Modern English with this meaning; in this case, the text is saying that “the memory of Constantine is harrowed”:

1609, Philemon Holland (translator), Ammianus Marcellinus, *Roman History*

He harrowed the memorial of Constantine, as one that had been a deviser of innovation.

Holland’s translated text states that Julian (Roman emperor, 361–363) vexed or disturbed the memory of Constantine; that is, Julian altered how Constantine was remembered. The OED notes that the original Latin here reads *memoriam vexavit* (the archaic meaning ‘memory’ for English *memorial* is found under definition 1 of *memorial* in the OED).

EEBO provides one further instance from Early Modern English of this now archaic use of *harrow up*; in this case, “one’s will is harrowed up” (that is, vexed or disturbed):

1604, Anthony Scoloker, *Daiphantus, or, The Passions of Love*

Vitullia, oh Vitullia, be thou still,
I’ll have revenge, or **harrow up** my **will**.

Scoloker’s “harrowing up one’s will” is like the Book of Mormon’s “harrowing up God’s decree” in Alma 29:4. The two instances from Early Modern English of *harrowing*, Scoloker’s and Holland’s, are the only two that we have been able to find that support the reading in Alma 29:4. This usage appears to have died out in the early 1600s, which means that this particular use of *harrow up* in the Book of Mormon is archaic.

✓ *Hurl away* ‘drag away’

“yea how could ye have given away to the enticing of him who art seeking to **hurl away** your souls down to everlasting misery and endless woe” (Helaman 7:16)

It is difficult to prove which of two meanings should be assigned to *hurl* here in Helaman 7:16. Based on usage in Early Modern English, the verb *hurl* usually meant ‘to cast’, but there is also evidence it could mean ‘to drag’. As noted in NOL, the patterning of other expressions in the Book of Mormon specifically refer to the devil as dragging people down to hell (7 times) but to God as casting people down to hell (2 times). Thus the most consistent meaning in Helaman 7:16 should be the archaic ‘to drag’ rather than ‘to cast’:

“dragging people down to hell”

to bring down (2×)

active: the agent is the devil

“which giveth the spirit of the devil power to captivate to **bring you down** to hell”
(2 Nephi 2:29)

passive: no agent mentioned

“yet thou shalt be **brought down** to hell / to the sides of the pit”
(2 Nephi 24:15 = Isaiah 14:15)

to carry away down (1×)

passive: no agent is mentioned

“that they are **carried away** captive **down** to the eternal gulf of misery and woe”
(2 Nephi 1:13)

to drag down (3×)

active: the agent is the devil (or “his mighty storm”)

“the devil will not support his children at the last day but doth speedily **drag them down** to hell” (Alma 30:60)

“when all his hail and his mighty storm shall beat upon you / it shall have no power over you to **drag you down** to the gulf of misery and endless woe” (Helaman 5:12)

“until he **dragged** the people **down** to an entire destruction and to an everlasting hell”
(Helaman 6:28)

lead away down (2×)

active: the agent is the devil

“that he might **lead away** the souls of men **down** to hell” (1 Nephi 14:3)

“and thus the devil cheateth their souls and **leadeth** them **away** carefully **down** to hell”
(2 Nephi 28:21)

lead down (1×)

passive: the agent is the devil

“and then they are taken captive by the devil and **led** by his will **down** to destruction”
(Alma 12:11)

“casting people down to hell”

to cast (3×)

active: no agent is mentioned

“not the destruction of the soul save it be the **casting** of it into that hell which hath no end”
(1 Nephi 14:3)

passive: no agent mentioned

“that ye may not become angels to the devil to be **cast** into that lake of fire and brimstone
which is the second death” (Jacob 3:11)

“it is better that ye should deny yourselves of these things . . . than that ye should be **cast**
into hell” (3 Nephi 12:30)

to cast away (1×)

active: the agent is God

“and the bad will I **cast away** into its own place” (Jacob 5:77)

to cast down (1×)

passive: the agent is God

“whilst all around us are elected to be **cast** by thy wrath **down** to hell” (Alma 31:17)

to thrust down (3×)

passive: no agent is mentioned

“for he shall be **thrust down** to hell” (2 Nephi 9:34)

“for they shall be **thrust down** to hell” (2 Nephi 9:36)

“for they shall be **thrust down** to hell” (2 Nephi 28:15)

In addition, Helaman 7:16 refers to hurling away souls down to “everlasting misery and endless woe”. There are two other passages that refer to hell as a place of “misery and woe”, namely, 2 Nephi 1:13 and Helaman 5:12; and the first of these has the verb *carry* and the second has *drag*. Thus this minor patterning also argues that *hurl* in Helaman 7:16 should take the archaic meaning ‘to drag’ rather than ‘to cast’. Finally, we note that there is some evidence that this archaic meaning ‘to drag’ for *hurl* persisted in English up into the first decades of the 1700s, as in this example:

1744, Alexander Hamilton, *A New Account of the East Indies*

they heedlessly mingled themselves with the Natives, who, finding so unexpected
an Opportunity, **hurl’d** them away to the Town;

Thus far we have been unable to find any clear cases after 1744 of *hurl* taking the meaning ‘to drag’. We will therefore continue to mark this meaning for *hurl* in the Book of Mormon as archaic.

+ *In the favor of* ‘in favor of’

“the voice of the people came **in the favor of** the freemen” (Alma 51:7)

In NOL, we note the persistent infrequency of the phrase “in the favor of” in comparison to the form without the definite article, “in favor of”. In fact, in the original text of the Book of Mormon itself there was only one example of “in the favor of” (here in Alma 51:7), but four of “in favor of”. For that one case, Joseph Smith deleted the definite article in his editing for the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon. At the end

of the write-up in NOL, there is an example of “in the favor of” dating from 2004: “and hence Benjamin Franklin was **in the favor of** choosing the turkey as USA’s national symbol”. It appears that the phrase “in the favor of” may not be archaic; instead, it may just be a less frequent, perhaps rare alternative which has nonetheless persisted. Here are five more examples of its use between 1740 and 1840:

1764, Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*
to which his Highness was pleased to answer very much **in the favor of** them

1790, the Marchioness de Lambert, *The School of Virtue* (first American edition,
translated from the French)

he at times fostered a hope in his bosom of the interposition of Providence
in the favor of innocence

1795, *The Parliamentary Register*

. . . if an exemption **in the favor of** those whose cause he was pleading were not admitted

1800, James Hardie, *An Impartial Account of the Trial of Mr. Levi Weeks*

if there were any bias, it ought rather to be **in the favor of** the prisoner’s innocence
than of his guilt

1836, *The Facts in the Case of the Reverend Albert Barnes*

nor was the enlisting of influence **in the favor of** Mr. Barnes confined to
the Presbyterian church

* *In the fourth day* ‘on the fourth day’

“in the thirty and fourth year / in the first month / **in the fourth day** of the month / there arose
a great storm” (3 Nephi 8:5)

As indicated in NOL, there are two Book of Mormon passages where we get the preposition *in* instead of *on* in specifying days: “**in** the second day” (Alma 56:1) and “**in** the fourth day of the month” (3 Nephi 8:5). It turns out that this usage occurs quite frequently in the King James Bible. Excluding the Apocrypha, there are 131 instances of the expected “**on** the Xth day” in the King James text, but there are also 54 instances of the now-archaic “**in** the Xth day”, all randomly scattered throughout the text, as we can see from the frequencies for the prepositions *on* and *in* for each ordinal number that occurs. At the end of the list, there are seven conjoined cases involving *twenty* or *twentieth* (where the first number is a cardinal and the second one is the ordinal):

Xth	<i>on</i>	<i>in</i>	first instance of “ in the Xth day”
first	12	12	Exodus 12:16: “and in the first day there shall be . . .”
second	6	1	2 Chronicles 3:2: “ in the second day of the second month”
third	21	1	Hosea 6:2: “ in the third day he will raise us up”
fourth	5	1	Zechariah 7:1: “ in the fourth day of the ninth month”
fifth	3	4	Ezekiel 1:1: “ in the fifth day of the month”
sixth	5	0	—
seventh	29	7	Exodus 12:16: “and in the seventh day there shall be . . .”
eighth	15	2	Leviticus 12:3: “and in the eighth day”
ninth	2	2	Leviticus 23:32: “ in the ninth day of the month at even”

tenth	6	6	Exodus 12:3: “ in the tenth day of this month”
eleventh	1	0	—
twelfth	2	1	Ezekiel 29:1: “ in the twelfth day of the month”
thirteenth	4	0	—
fourteenth	7	4	Leviticus 23:5: “ in the fourteenth day of the first month”
fifteenth	6	4	Leviticus 23:39: “ in the fifteenth day of the seventh month”
sixteenth	0	1	2 Chronicles 29:17: “ in the sixteenth day of the first month”
seventeenth	1	0	—
twentieth	2	0	—
1 and 20th	0	1	Haggai 2:1: “ in the one and twentieth day of the month”
3 and 20th	2	0	—
4 and 20th	0	4	Daniel 10:4: “ in the four and twentieth day of the first month”
5 and 20th	0	1	Jeremiah 52:31: “ in the five and twentieth day of the month”
7 and 20th	2	0	—
20 and 4th	0	1	Nehemiah 9:1: “ in the twenty and fourth day of this month”
20 and 5th	0	1	Nehemiah 6:15: “ in the twenty and fifth day of the month”

This use of “**in** the Xth day” is characteristic of biblically styled writings in the 1500s and the 1600s, as exemplified by the citations listed in NOL. The earliest example, dating from 1577, is a paraphrase of Genesis 2:2: “and God rested **in the seventh day** from all his works”. This language can be traced back to William Tyndale’s 1530 translation of Genesis 2:2, where *in* was used for this phrase: “and **in the seventh day** God ended his work which he had made and rested **in the seventh day** from all his works which he had made”. This language continued even after the 1611 King James Bible was published:

1641, William Twisse, *On the Morality of the Fourth Commandment*

in the seventh day God ended the works which he had made
and the seventh day God rested from all the works which he had made

The King James version of Genesis 2:2 reads “and **on the seventh day** God ended his work which he had made and he rested **on the seventh day** from all his work which he had made”.

This phraseology with *in* continued in the English of the 1700s, but only in religious texts and most often in biblical quotes, as in these two examples (the first is literal, the second paraphrastic):

1781, T. Parker, *The Bible, with Notes*

Thus saith the Lord God, In the first month, **in the first day** of the month,
thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and cleanse the sanctuary.

This is an exact quotation of Ezekiel 45:18 from the King James Bible.

1789, *The Christian’s Complete Family Bible*

and **in the first day** of the tenth month they sat together to examine the matter

This is a paraphrase of the King James Bible’s Ezra 10:16: “and [they] sat down **in the first day** of the tenth month to examine the matter”.

Even the rare non-biblical instances of the phrase are found in religious texts imitative of the King James biblical style, as in this example:

1785, David Levi, *Lingua Sacra*

he departed this life in the island of Rhodes, **in the second day** of the month Adar,
in the year 4954, aged 75 years

Thus the Book of Mormon phrases “**in** the second day” (Alma 56:1) and “**in** the fourth day of the month” (3 Nephi 8:5) should be categorized as belonging to the King James style, and we therefore move it to section 16 • KING JAMES PHRASES.

+ *Into an effect* ‘into effect’

“they would have carried this plan **into an effect**” (Alma 50:30)

The original text had two instances of the phrase “into an effect”, the one here in Alma 50:30 and another in Alma 56:30: “we were desirous to bring a stratagem **into an effect** upon them”. Both of these were edited to “into effect” in the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon (in Ø, Joseph Smith marked the change for the second instance). ECCO has a few examples of “into an effect”, but they each take a literal interpretation, as in the following example:

1788, S. Hollingsworth, *A Dissertation on the Manners, Governments, and Spirit of Africa*

the variety of his creation is resolved into **an effect of caprice**

But using Google Books we have been able to find a few examples of the idiomatic expression “to carry into an effect” dating from the first part of the 1800s:

1814, Barent Gardenier, *The Examiner*

to aid him in carrying **into an effect** measures of retaliation against the inhabitants
of the United States

1826, Robert Young Hayne, in a speech before the U. S. Congress

but for Congress to interpose their authority in preventing the Executive from carrying
their views **into an effect**

1832, *The Edinburgh Encyclopædia, Conducted by David Brewster*

so that none of them were carried **into an effect** so complete as to render any immediate aid
for continuing the work

+ *On the seventh month* ‘in the seventh month’

“and it was in the morning of the third day **on the seventh month**” (Alma 56:42)

This phraseology, “**on** the Yth month”, occurs twice in the Book of Mormon, here in Alma 56:42 and also in Alma 56:1: “**on** the first month”. There is also a parallel example in 3 Nephi 3:8 of “**on** the morrow month”—that is, a third example with the preposition *on*. Also interesting is the fact that the example in Alma 56:1 is immediately preceded by an instance of the biblical phraseology “**in** the Xth day”, as follows: “in the commencement of the thirtieth year of the reign of the judges **in** the second day **on** the first month”. As explained earlier, the phraseology “**in** the fourth day” is characteristic of the King James biblical style. But the use of the preposition *on* with *month* is not characteristic of the King James Bible. There are 66 instances of “**in** the Yth month” in the King James text (excluding the Apocrypha), but absolutely none of “**on** the Yth month”. Yet there

are instances of “**on** the Yth month” in biblical writings in Early Modern English (see the two quotes in the NOL write-up for *In the fourth day*, one from 1640 and the other from 1681). Here is a third one:

1641, William Twisse, *On the Morality of the Fourth Commandment*
so we read that the Jews observed a fast **on the first month**

And we have been able to find uses of “**on** the Yth month” continuing up into the 1700s, but only in biblical writings:

1781, T. Parker, *The Bible, with Notes*
on the seventh month, the fifteenth day, the feast of the tabernacles is ordered to be observed seven days with the same sacrifices as before

1789, *The Christian’s Complete Family Bible*
On the seventh month, when the feast of tabernacles was celebrated, and all the people were met together in a place near the gate facing the east, which opens into the capacious area of the temple, they desired Esdras [Ezra] to read to them the law of Moses.

Here we have a translated passage from Josephus’s *Antiquities of the Jews* (book 11, chapter 5, section 5), but not the same as William Whiston’s 1737 translation.

1794, Henry Whitfield, *Villeroy*
which, in Scripture, is said to have taken place in the six hundredth year of Noah’s life,
on the second month

1796, Robert Walker, *Analysis of Researches into the Origin and Progress of Historical Time*
Herod took Jerusalem, and made Antigonus a prisoner . . . in the 185th olympiad,
on the third month, on the solemnity of the fast

It appears that “**on** the Yth month” developed as a kind of biblically styled phraseology, a contrastive parallel to the King James styled “**in** the Xth day”. Both are maintained in texts up through the 1700s, which argues that both are persistent, even though only one is an actual King James phrase.

- ✓ *Pleading bar* ‘the bar that the defendant stood before while pleading in a courtroom’
“finally I bid you farewell until I shall meet you before the **pleading bar** of God” (Jacob 6:13)

A similar instance of *pleading bar* occurs at the end of the Book of Mormon: “and I am brought forth triumphant through the air to meet you before the **pleading bar** of the great Jehovah” (Moroni 10:34). Both of these are conjectured readings; in each case, the earliest text (found in *Ɔ*) reads *pleasing bar*. The term *pleasing bar* has no independent textual support in reference to courtroom situations, but *pleading bar* has six literary references dating from 1607 to 1718. This term is discussed in NOL in section 8 · HISTORICAL CONTEXTS, but in this revision we move it to section 3 · ARCHAIC PHRASES. This phrase is a good example of an archaic term, used in reference to earlier courtrooms, that maintains a marginal existence, but only to a few who have been aware of its historical use. The general populace is completely unaware of it. The OED editors do not list it, despite its occurrence in several plays dating from the early 1600s. It appears that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were completely ignorant of it, which explains why they accidentally replaced it twice with a more familiar (but impossible) reading, *pleasing bar*. The write-up for this term in section 8 · HISTORICAL CONTEXTS, gives these citations after 1718: (1) 1887, Julia Ward, *My Northern Travels*;

(2) 1908, Guy Wrench, *The Grammar of Life*; (3) 10 September 1999, a press report on the Fordwich England courtroom; (4) 23 July 2003, the website for the Fordwich Town Hall; (5) 25 September 2003, Christian Gellinek (originally a law student at the University of Göttingen in Germany), in personal communication with Royal Skousen. Yet we would be wrong to claim that *pleading bar* was not archaic simply because it persists here and there as an historical relic. *Pleading bar* dropped out of current English usage, probably in the 1700s when the dock started to replace the pleading bar in courtrooms. Truly, the term is obsolete or archaic, although the vast majority of English speakers would say it is dead! A word or term may be archaic even when a small number of speakers still know it. For other examples, see *counsel* ‘consult, counsel with’ and *give* ‘describe, portray’, both discussed from this point of view under the revised section 1 · ARCHAIC VOCABULARY.

✓ *Search knowledge* ‘search for knowledge’

“for they will not search knowledge” (2 Nephi 32:7)

There are two instances in the earliest Book of Mormon text where we get “search <noun phrase>” instead of “search for <noun phrase>”: namely, this case of “search knowledge” in 2 Nephi 32:7, and a case of “search much gold and silver” in Jacob 1:16. Although there is one example of this usage in the Bible, in Ezekiel 34:11 (“behold I *even* I will both search my sheep and seek them out”), it is highly unlikely that English speakers are aware of this biblical usage, with the result that there is no strong motivation to claim that the Book of Mormon usage is King James phraseology. Various examples of “search <noun phrase>” in Early Modern English are cited in the NOL write-up, but only one example from the 1800s is provided, from one of Alfred Tennyson’s poems (“to search a meaning for the song”) where rhythmic requirements make it suspicious as a bona fide example of “search <noun phrase>”. In any event, we have continued to find additional examples of “search <noun phrase>” in Early Modern English, but not later:

1601, Richard Hakluyt (translator), Antonie Galvano, *The Discoveries of the World*

They therefore **searched this gold**, and in searching came to the said town, where they found no gold nor silver:

1664, J. C. (translator), Jean Baptiste van Helmont, *Van Helmont’s Works*

the Examiners of the goodness of Coin do make their Crucibles thereof, wherein they melt and **search Gold and Silver**:

It is interesting to note that neither of the two Book of Mormon examples of “search <noun phrase>” have ever been emended to “search for <noun phrase>”.

✓ *See of* ‘see’

“Abraham **saw of** his coming” (Helaman 8:17)

In February 2020 Paul Hoskisson brought to our attention this phrasal verb *see of*, found in Helaman 8:17: “Abraham **saw of** his coming”. Based on examples of the phrasal *see of* in Early Modern English, it appears that the preposition *of* here is vacuous, so that this instance in Helaman 8:17 is equivalent to “Abraham **saw** his coming”. Thus far we have found instances of the phrasal verb *see of* only in Early Modern English. First of all, EEBO shows several cases of present-participial *seeing of* in Early Modern English where the *of* is clearly vacuous, so that *seeing of* is equivalent to simply *seeing*:

1603, Richard Knolles, *The General History of the Turks*

but finding himself there in no safety, with his wife and his said sons . . . presently fled over the strait to Andronicus, who **seeing of** him coming towards him, is reported to have used this text of Scripture, Behold I will send mine Angel before thy face, to prepare thy ways

1625, Samuel Purchas, *Purchas's Pilgrims*

and one of the Moors **seeing of** him entreating so hard to go with him, gave him two or three blows and bade him get him down into the hold again

1657–58, “translated by a person of quality”, Honoré d’Urfé, *Astra*

for I never in my life had a more earnest desire of anything, than of **seeing of** you; beseeching you to believe

There is also one case of *saw of* which appears to mean simply *saw*; in this passage Rollock’s intended meaning is that the disciples would testify “that they heard and saw the resurrected Christ”:

1616, Robert Rollock, *Lectures upon the History of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Our Lord Jesus Christ*

and then we shall come to the second part of His Sermon, concerning a direction unto His Disciples, to go out to the world, and testify of these things, that they heard and **saw of** Him

This phrase *see of* overtly parallels the use of *behold of* in Alma 12:29: “therefore he sent angels to converse with them / which caused men to **behold of** his glory”. One difference, however, is that *behold of* in Alma 12:29 may have a partitive sense (that is, “conversing with angels caused men to behold, in part but not fully, of God’s glory”). Another difference is that in Alma 12:29 there has been a tendency to omit the *of*, that is, to change the text to “which caused men to behold his glory”, so that the partitive interpretation is no longer possible (for this textual variation, see the discussion under Alma 12:29 in *Analysis of Textual Variants*). Here in Helaman 8:17, the *of* has never been omitted in any of its extant textual sources. Finally, there is one other example of the phrasal verb *see of* in the Book of Mormon, namely in Mosiah 14:11, in a quotation from Isaiah 53:11: “he shall **see of** the travail of his soul”. This second Book of Mormon passage, however, has been emended to read “he shall **see** the travail of his soul” (the reading in the LDS text since 1911). The Masoretic text for Isaiah 53:11 literally reads: “out of the travail of his soul shall he see”, while the Qumran versions of Isaiah and the Greek Septuagint have the direct object *light* at the end of the clause. This pervasive variant very likely represents the original Hebrew reading, which means that the *of* in the King James translation represents the Hebrew prefix *mē-*, translated into Early Modern English as *of* but meaning ‘from, out of’).

+ *Some future day* ‘at some future day’

“that it might be brought forth **some future day** unto the Lamanites” (Enos 1:13)

We have found numerous examples of the adverbial “some future day” without any preceding preposition such as *at* or *in*. Here are some examples dating from the half century preceding the publication of the Book of Mormon:

1777, Henry Man, *Mr. Bentley*

the singular mode of the young man's education might, **some future day**, subject him to the greater temptations from the world

1790, Elizabeth Hervey, *Louisa*

she cherished the pleasing idea, that if he continued thus tender and constant, she might, **some future day**, be united to him

1830, Plumpton Wilson, *Protestant Truths and Roman Catholic Errors*

And if another sort of bridal should **some future day** be solemnized in those aisles, whilst you are living . . .

✓ *Somewhat contentions* 'somewhat of contentions'

"he had **somewhat contentions** among his own people" (The Words of Mormon 1:12)

In dealing with *somewhat*, we need to distinguish between its various uses in the text. Here in the Words of Mormon we have the archaic expression "have somewhat <plural noun>", along with John Spencer's 1658 example cited in NOL: "when they **have somewhat rolls and tumbles** in their thoughts". This construction was rare in Early Modern English, and we have not found evidence of its persistence after the 1600s. But the corresponding singular form, "have somewhat a <singular noun>" does persist, as we see in these examples:

1755, Deane Smith, *An Essay upon the Life, Writings, and Character of Dr. Jonathan Swift*
and Virgil **had somewhat a like idea**

1793, Robert Anderson, *A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain*
Of all men Goropius **had somewhat a violent conjecture**

1813, Thomas Lewis O'Beirne, *A Serio-Comic Letter to a Reverend Personage*
the subject of the religious discourse **had somewhat a tendency** towards the politics of the day

1814, Walter Scott, *Waverley*
this word **had somewhat a sedative effect**

We therefore classify the plural existential construction "have somewhat <plural noun>"—that is, without any article—as archaic and move it to section 7 • ARCHAIC EXPRESSIONS.

* *Strong hold* 'a hold that is strong'

"thus Moroni did prepare **strong holds** against the coming of their enemies" (Alma 50:6)

There is a paragraph on page 258 of NOL summarizing the shift in American spelling from *strong hold(s)* to *strong-hold(s)* and then ultimately to *stronghold(s)*, stating that printed texts show this shift rapidly occurring in the 1840s. This means that the original, now-archaic *strong hold(s)* persisted up until the time Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon. In fact, Oliver Cowdery never spelled *strong hold(s)* as *stronghold(s)*, or *strong-hold(s)*, in \mathcal{C} or \mathcal{D} . The same holds for the 1830 typesetter. For this reason, *strong hold* shouldn't have been at all placed in NOL in section 3 • ARCHAIC PHRASES, but instead in section 21 • CHANGING PHRASES. And by the early 1900s, when the OED editors prepared their entry for this word, the word had

become *stronghold*, which they then identified as coming from the noun *hold* modified attributively by the adjective *strong*.

* *Subtle to do* ‘subtle in doing’

“for he being a very **subtle** man **to** do evil” (Alma 47:4)

There is another construction in the text similar to this one: “thy plan was a very **subtle** plan as to the subtlety of the devil for **to** lie and **to** deceive this people” (Alma 12:4). This second one is archaic sounding, chiefly because of the *for-to* construction, plus the repetition of the infinitival *to*. So if we omit the *for* and the repeated *to*, we end up with “thy plan was a very subtle plan . . . to lie and deceive this people”. As a result, there doesn’t seem to be anything especially archaic about the syntax for these two Book of Mormon expressions. It is true we can find similar constructions in Early Modern English (two of them are listed in NOL), to which we can add this one from the early 1700s, found in ECCO:

1710, Simon Patrick, *The Books of Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon*
 he defeats the craftiest designs of **subtle** men **to** raise themselves

Ultimately, these constructions are more like expressions than phrases and could therefore be placed in section 7 · ARCHAIC EXPRESSIONS. Another possibility is that we could just as well omit them entirely from NOL since they do not seem to exhibit any special kind of syntax.

✓ *To that* ‘until’

“even **to that** they did forget by what power they had been brought thither” (1 Nephi 18:9)

This usage in Early Modern English is quite rare and did not persist. Thus far we have been unable to find additional examples of this subordinate conjunctive phrase. In NOL, we list three instances of *to that*, two from the fifteenth-century Towneley Mystery Plays and one from a 1626 letter written by James Haig, a Scot. The Towneley Mystery Plays were performed in Wakefield, England, located in West Yorkshire; and James Haig was one of the Scottish Haigs of Bemersyde. These locations imply that *to that* with its meaning ‘until’ may have been restricted to Scottish and Northern English dialects.

✓ *Where unto* ‘with respect to which’

“thou hast made us mighty in word by faith / **where unto** thou hast not made us mighty in writing”
 (Ether 12:23)

The interpretation that we give here to *where unto* must be a literalism, one that would necessarily derive from older English. In Early Modern English *where unto* is usually declared to be equivalent to “unto which”, which doesn’t quite work here in Ether 12:23. But another equivalent is “with respect to which”, which works well here in Ether 12:23. Examples of *where unto* from around 1500 provide support for both interpretations, as in these two examples:

1495, William Caxton (translator), Jerome, *Vitas Patrum*
 he should give him part of that [which] he should find / **where unto** he was agreed

not after 1504, Robert Fabyan (died 1513), *Fabyan's Chronicle Newly Printed* (published in 1533)
he commanded to ask if that chamber had any special name / **where unto** it was answered
that it was named Hierusalem

We can also find 16th-century examples of *where unto* preceded by the phrase “in respect of <noun phrase>,
thus showing by this expansion that speakers understood that *where unto* could be interpreted as meaning
‘with respect to which’:

1533, Thomas Elyot, *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man*
or so ignorant that thou knewest not what an image or similitude is
in respect of that where unto it is wrought

1570, Augustin Marlorat (died 1562), *A Catholic and Ecclesiastical Exposition of the Holy Gospel*
after St. Matthew
so the same seemed incomprehensible to the wisdom of the flesh,
specially **in respect of that whereunto** they were accustomed

1593, William Rainolds, *A Treatise Containing the True Catholic and Apostolic Faith*
of the Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament Ordained by Christ at His Last Supper
yet in the supper it is called spiritual, a spiritual thing, spiritual food,
in respect of the spiritual end where unto it serves to my body and soul