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The Zoramites’ transformation from quiescent dissidents to aggressive enemies of their former brethren and mother culture is a powerful study of human nature. The Book of Mormon does not delineate the reasons that the Zoramites separated themselves from the larger population at Zarahemla, but they obviously felt a great deal of animosity toward their former brethren. Perhaps they had been marginalized in Nephite society because of their ethnicity. They constructed a culture that deliberately differed in many ways from that at Zarahemla, and they expelled all who were converted by Alma. Because of their extreme hatred of the Nephites, the Zoramites ultimately joined with the Lamanites as fierce enemies of the Nephites.
The daily experiences and socio-cultural realities of Book of Mormon peoples stand largely beyond our grasp. Few details besides those associated with important political, military, and religious events, rate even a passing notice in the sacred history. However, by applying norms of human social behavior to information preserved in the text, we can sketch a fuller picture of these peoples. A case in point is the Zoramites, a group that withdrew from the larger Nephite-Mulekite culture and, in time, came to oppose it with ferocious energy.

We first encounter the Zoramites when we learn that after being struck deaf and dumb, the antichrist Korihor sought refuge among them in Antionum. Hugh W. Nibley explained that Korihor “sought out a community of certain dissenters who were as proud and independent as himself.” But instead of finding safety, Korihor was “run upon and trodden down, even until he was dead” (Alma 30:59). In noting this, Mormon discloses that the Zoramites had “separated themselves from the Nephites” and were “led by a man whose name was Zoram” (Alma 30:59).

Time of the Zoramite Separation

We do not know exactly when the Zoramites separated from Nephite culture, only that Alma began his efforts to reclaim them in about 74 bc. By this time the Zoramites had built homes and synagogues and established themselves in Antionum. We do know that not too much time had elapsed since their separation because the people that Alma encountered in Antionum were of the same generation that left Zarahemla. Amulek’s words to the Zoramites substantiate this: “I think that it is impossible that ye should be ignorant of the things which have been spoken concerning the coming of Christ, who is taught by us to be the Son of God; yea, I know that these things were taught unto you bountifully before your dissension from among us.”
Amulek says that those in his audience, not their fathers or grandfathers, had been taught and then had dissented.

Amulek’s claim that the word had been taught to the Zoramites “bountifully” may indicate that they were still in Zarahemla or its environs during the time of the extensive missionary labors that took place there in the seventh year of the reign of the judges (ca. 85 BC). During that time 3,500 people joined the church (see Alma 4:5). But in the following year “there began to be great contentions among the people of the church; yea, there were envyings, and strife, and malice, and persecutions, and pride, even to exceed the pride of those who did not belong to the church of God. . . . And the wickedness of the church was a great stumbling-block to those who did not belong to the church; and thus the church began to fail in its progress” (Alma 4:9–10).

Mormon goes on to explain that Alma saw “great inequality among the people” in the land of Zarahemla (Alma 4:12), a troubling setback that prompted him to give up the judgment seat and devote himself entirely to preaching. As we will see, this inequality is the most likely cause of the Zoramite dissension. If so, the oppressed Zoramites probably would have left Zarahemla in the eighth or ninth year of the reign of the judges, when inequality and discrimination became significant problems.

The Question of Zoramite Origins

It is unclear whether or not the Zoramites were an ethnic element within the Nephite culture that traced its lineage back to the original Zoram, the servant of Laban. Even though the Book of Mormon usually delineates people as being either Nephites or Lamanites, both designations include additional groups: “The people which were not Lamanites were Nephites; nevertheless, they were called Nephites, Jacobites, Josephites, Zoramites, Lamanites, Lemuelites, and Ishmaelites” (Jacob 1:13).

It is possible to adduce evidence to support either side of the Zoramite origins question. Before he began to teach the Zoramites, Alma prayed, “Behold, O Lord, their souls are precious, and many of them are our brethren” (Alma 31:35). In what sense is the term brethren used here? Alma’s statement could indicate that the Zoramites were not a uniformly ethnic group—that is, they could have been of mixed heritage, with some being Nephites (“brethren”) and some being Mulekites. The statement could also indicate that most were ethnic Zoramites but that some Nephite sympathizers (“brethren”) had dissented along with them. Another possible meaning is that they were all Zoramites by lineage but that some had previously been members of the church and were therefore considered “brethren” while others were not.

It is most probable, however, that the term Zoramite is used as an ethnic designation. For one thing, the Zoramite named Ammoron claims to be a descendant of the original Zoram (see Alma 54:23). It is true that aside from Ammoron (and by extension his brother Amalickiah), no other Book of Mormon personality with lineage through Zoram is noted in the text. And since the leader of the dissident group was named Zoram, it is possible that the people became known as Zoramites when they became his followers. Even so, this founder Zoram could have been an ethnic Zoramite named after his forefather, or he may have adopted the name of his forefather when he attempted to unite the clan members and sympathizers. The most compelling factor in favor of the ethnic origins view, however, is that throughout the Book of Mormon, ethnicity is very important to the people, as we will see later.

A Marginalized People

Another clue that leads us to suspect that the Zoramites were an ethnic group is found in what occurred after they separated from Zarahemla. The practices they adopted are indicative of a marginalized group that separates because of discrimination. In Alma 31:3 we learn that the Zoramites had “gathered themselves together in a land which they called Antionum.” This indicates that rather than being an intact group that moved to a new place, the Zoramites were scattered throughout the land of Zarahemla and for some reason “gathered together” in Antionum.

That they named the place Antionum tells us it was either a new city or an existing city that they came to dominate and then renamed. In either case, they were looking for a new start, a place where they could establish their own rules and regulations. Notably, they did not follow the traditional Nephite practice of naming their city after their leader, Zoram (see Alma 8:7). This is the first in-
dication that they had been discarding Nephite norms and consciously refusing to follow Nephite traditions.

The meaning of the name Antionum is not known, but given the focus that the Zoramite culture placed on wealth and materialism, it is interesting to note that when the Nephite system of exchange was standardized at the beginning of the reign of the judges, one of the gold measures was called an antion (equivalent to three shiblons of silver or to one and one-half measures of grain; see Alma 11:15, 19). While we do not know if there is a direct relationship between the words antion and Antionum, the prospect is intriguing.

Motivation for Separation

In her work *Commitment and Community*, sociologist Rosabeth Moss Kanter explains that separatist groups have traditionally been motivated by religious, politico-economic, or psychosocial reasons. Although Kanter’s study focused on 20th-century American groups that endeavored to establish a utopian or communal society, the traits she identifies apply to any separatist group whether or not it establishes a communal system.

Kanter elaborates on the motivations that prompt groups to separate from a mainstream
culture. She explains that religious separation usually takes place because of “a desire to live according to religious and spiritual values, rejecting the sinfulness of the established order.” Politico-economic separatists are motivated by the “desire to reform society by curing its economic and political ills, rejecting the injustice and inhumanity of the establishment.” The separating party members have usually experienced the injustice themselves and subsequently reject it. Psychosocial groups separate because of “a desire to promote the psychological growth of the individual by putting him into closer touch with his fellows, rejecting the isolation and alienation of the surrounding society.”

Since Mormon’s account of the Zoramites focuses on a report of their religious deviance, it may at first seem that the Zoramites separated for religious reasons. In this case we would expect religious ideas to permeate the culture and the newly established society to be grounded in and centered on regular if not daily religious practices and ideals. This is not the case. The Zoramites met once a week, offered up a rote prayer, and then “returned to their homes, never speaking of their God again until they had assembled themselves together again to the holy stand” (Alma 31:23). In addition, Alma saw that the hearts of the Zoramites were “set upon gold, and upon silver, and upon all manner of fine goods” (Alma 31:24). Yet most dissenting religious groups eschew materialism. This fact, combined with the Zoramites’ limited religious life, suggests that religion was not the main motivation for the Zoramite separation.

There is also little evidence to support a separation due to psychosocial reasons. Psychosocial groups tend to remove themselves so their members can better nurture one another. Their focus is to separate from the predominant, repressive culture in order to build or strengthen the individual. The Zoramites displayed none of these traits. Instead of establishing a more equitable system that focused on nurturing one another, they not only marginalized the poor in their society (see Alma 32:3) but refused to care for others. For example, when the smitten antichrist Korihor sought refuge among them, he found no safety even though he professed a similar belief system, but was run down and killed (see Alma 30). The Zoramites clearly were not people who focused on overcoming the effects of psycho-
others of similar circumstances and banded together to establish a government and economy that favored them. In this case we would expect to find a new society that disavowed the old culture (including its religious and political systems) while disengaging or distancing itself in any way possible in order to create a distinct identity of its own—which is what we find in the account of the Zoramites.

This all brings us back to the point that ethnicity may have been a major reason behind the Zoramites’ marginalization in Nephite society. The population of Zarahemla was largely a mixture of Mulekites and Nephites, with Nephites being a minority (see Mosiah 25:2). The Zoramites would have been a minority even among the Nephites, assuming that the people married chiefly within their respective ethnic groups. In a situation like this, the Zoramites, who traced their lineage from a servant who married one of Ishmael’s daughters, would not have shared the same lineal descent from Lehi that other Nephites did. This may have motivated the Nephites to marginalize the Zoramites, and in turn the more numerous Mulekites could have assumed this attitude when they began to adopt the Nephite culture. That the Mulekites and Nephites maintained their ethnic identities is affirmed by the fact that when Mosiah gathered them together to read them the record of Zeniff, they gathered in two bodies: the people of Zarahemla and the people of Nephi (see Mosiah 25:4). As we have already noted, earlier writers of the Book of Mormon combined smaller ethnic groups when chronicling events (see Jacob 1:13). It is likely that this practice was still occurring so that the gathered Nephites included Jacobites, Josephites, and Zoramites.

Stratification of society, despite all the ills it causes, has been a constant reality of civilization. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in The Communist Manifesto in 1848, went so far as to claim that all of human history is a “history of class struggles.” The famous sociologist Max Weber identified three factors that contribute to social stratification: class, status, and party. Modern social scientists, in an effort to clarify Weber’s original terms, renamed them property, prestige, and power. President Ezra Taft Benson aptly summarizes these three p words with another: pride.

It is interesting to note that usually education and ability play a part in class discrimination. However, when Alma addressed the Zoramite poor, he assumed they could read (see Alma 33:2–3, 12, 14). This is a revealing insight into both Zoramite and Nephite culture. Despite the fact that these people were poor and of the lowest social class, they were literate.

Given the Book of Mormon’s emphasis on heritage, it is easy to see how lineage could have significantly contributed to a person’s prestige. We are told that “the kingdom had been conferred upon none but those who were descendants of Nephi” (Mosiah 25:13). Whenever one genealogical line is the only one allowed to rule, that family holds a position of prestige as well as power. This is especially true when that ruling line is a minority, as the Nephites were among the Mulekites. Even among the people designated as Nephites, the blood descendants of Nephi were actually a minority. These people (those who followed Nephi) consisted of five ancestral lines: descendants of Nephi, Sam, Jacob, Joseph, and Zoram. However, in the first generation, Lehi counted the descendants of Sam with those of Nephi (see 2 Nephi 4:11), so Jacob identifies only four distinct Nephite clans: Jacobites, Josephites, Zoramites, and Nephites (see Jacob 1:13). These designations were so important that hundreds of years later the people continued to identify themselves as members of these clans (see 4 Nephi 1:36).

Mormon and his son Moroni stated that they were blood descendants of Nephi (see Mormon 1:5; 8:13), and Mormon further qualified that statement by declaring that he was “a pure descendant of Lehi” (3 Nephi 5:20). Amulek disclosed that he was a direct descendant of Nephi in order to establish his credibility before preaching to the people of Ammonihah (see Alma 10:2–3). Mormon also felt it important to acknowledge that Alma was a direct descendant of Nephi (see Mosiah 17:2). We are reminded in the heading to 3 Nephi that Helaman was a descendant of Nephi. Moreover, when the abandoned children of Amulon and the other priests of Noah wanted to renounce their heritage, “they took upon themselves the name of Nephi, that they might be called the children of Nephi and be numbered among those who were called Nephites” (Mosiah 25:12). These expressions seem to be more than simple declarations of lineage. Being a Nephite, especially through direct lineal descent, obviously placed one in a position of prestige and authority.
The importance of lineage is compounded, as John L. Sorenson points out, by the fact that “the lineage founded by the original Nephi continued to hold the charter and sacred emblems of rulership over all Lehi’s descendants, which is precisely why rivals tried to kill off the line.”

Thus we see that the problem of who has the right to rule is a major source of contention throughout the Book of Mormon. Whenever differences in property, power, and prestige exist, societies become stratified, with the result that the people of low politico-economic standing frequently become marginalized. It is easy to see how, in a society that prized heritage, the descendants of a servant who was not a member of the founding family could have been discriminated against and how a charismatic leader like the later Zoram could have used this inequity to galvanize those people and entice them to dissent.

While acknowledging that the exact descent of the Zoramites is unclear, Sorenson posits that “a reason for their split with the Nephites was evidently recollection of what had happened to their founding ancestor: Ammoron, dissenter from the Nephites and king of the Lamanites in the first century BC, recalled: ‘I am . . . a descendant of Zoram, whom your fathers pressed and brought out of Jerusalem’ (Alma 54:23).” This statement indicates there was a tradition among the people that Zoram had been forced to accompany Nephi. Such a tradition could have been one of the rallying cries Zoram used to recruit his following.

**Distancing from Nephite Norms**

By noticing the way the Zoramites established their new culture, we find more clues indicating that the Zoramites were a marginalized group seeking to establish a society where they were favored. As the sociologist Christian Smith points out, “Groups construct their collective identities primarily by marking socially constructed symbolic boundaries that create distinction between themselves and others.” In forming their society, the Zoramites constructed distinctions that were built not on new ideals but on a foundation of anything anti-Nephite. In other words, their primary motivation seems to have centered on disallowing anything distinctively Nephite rather than on establishing something idealistic.

Even the Zoramites’ perversion of religious practices demonstrated an attempt to place themselves in a polarized position to the Nephites. This perversion was so thorough that Alma and his brethren were astonished upon seeing it. The observation that these people did “worship after a manner which Alma and his brethren had never beheld” (Alma 31:12) indicates that the Zoramites did not simply elaborate on Mulekite practices or revive differing religious traditions they were aware of from the past. Instead they invented new practices, and most of this inventing seems to have been an attempt to do what would most distinguish them from the Nephites or establish themselves as different and thus “better” than the Nephites.

Significantly, they no longer followed the law of Moses, nor did they believe in Jesus Christ. They had...
priests (see Alma 32:5), but we know nothing about how those priests functioned except that they had jurisdiction over the synagogues to the extent that they could control who worshipped and who did not. Instead of engaging in communal practices whereby priests officiated in behalf of a congregation worshiping together, the Zoramites apparently adopted an individualized mode of worship. One at a time the elite, arrayed in their “costly apparel, and their ringlets, and their bracelets, and their ornaments of gold, and all their precious things which they are ornamented with” (Alma 31:28), climbed to the top of their prayer tower (the Rameumptom), lifted their hands toward heaven, and loudly prayed. Of course, only the rich and well-costumed could stand on the platform and worship, thereby maintaining their image. We suspect that the poor were an embarrassment because they could not acceptably demonstrate supposed superiority to the Nephites.

Once atop the Rameumptom, each person repeated the same rote prayer:

Holy, holy God; we believe that thou art God, and we believe that thou art holy, and that thou wast a spirit, and that thou art a spirit, and that thou wilt be a spirit forever. Holy God, we believe that thou hast separated us from our brethren; and we do not believe in the tradition of our brethren, which was handed down to them by the childishness of their fathers; but we believe that thou hast elected us to be thy holy children; and also thou hast made it known unto us that there shall be no Christ. But thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever; and thou hast elected us to be thy holy children; and also thou hast made it known unto us that there shall be no Christ. But thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever; and thou hast elected us that we shall be saved, whilst all around us are elected to be cast by thy wrath down to hell; for the which holiness, O God, we thank thee; and we also thank thee that thou hast elected us, that we may not be led away after the foolish traditions of our brethren, which doth bind them down to a belief of Christ, which doth lead their hearts to wander far from thee, our God. And again we thank thee, O God, that we are a chosen and a holy people. (Alma 31:15–18)

More than words of praising God, these are anti-Nephite sentiments uttered in the form of a prayer. The expressions center on the “foolish” Nephites and claim that the Nephite traditions are corrupt, that the Nephite beliefs are childish, that the Zoramites rather than the Nephites are the chosen people, and that the Nephites will be cast down to hell. The people then thank their god for electing them over the Nephites.

As Kanter points out, separatist groups use such ideology to attach people to the new group while detaching them from the old group.14 However, the new elite excluded the lower classes, who consequently did not achieve a strong emotional attachment to the new culture. Not surprisingly, when Alma and his brethren preached the gospel to this poor and oppressed class, they were not as hardened against the Nephites or as committed to the new religion as the elite were.

Also in counterpoint, the Nephite religion observed the law of Moses, which under prophetic interpretation pointed to the coming of Jesus Christ, while the Zoramite religion unabashedly eliminated Christ.15 The religion of the Nephites encouraged people to pray anywhere and about all things that concerned them, a teaching that Amulek stressed to the Zoramites (see Alma 34:18–25), who offered a rote prayer only in their synagogue and only on the appointed day for worship (see Alma 31:14–23). The Nephite religion rejected idol worship, but the Zoramites reportedly worshipped dumb idols (see Alma 31:1). The Nephites had temples, sanctuaries, and synagogues built after the manner of the Jews (see Alma 16:13), but there is no mention of temples or sanctuaries among the Zoramites. The defining feature of their synagogues was the Rameumptom, the holy stand in the center of the synagogue with a platform high above the heads of the other worshippers (see Alma 31:13–14).

Such points of differentiation within the religion were a way for the Zoramites to distance themselves from the prevailing Nephite religion and culture. This distancing is typical of groups who become disaffected because of marginalization. This being the case, we would expect to find detaching mechanisms evident in many aspects of their culture besides religion. And in fact the Zoramite practice of gathering “themselves together on one day of the week, which day they did call the day of the Lord” (Alma 31:12), is one such detaching mechanism: the restructuring of time. Mormon’s wording indicates they had purposely chosen a day for their Sabbath that was different from the Nephite Sabbath (see Alma 31:12).

Such restructuring of time is evident in separatist groups that Kanter studied. For example, Synanon, a group that began as a drug-rehabilitation...
center and later became a religious commune in Tomales Bay, California, carried out its work and self-improvement routines based on a 28-day cycle consisting of what they called “cubic days.” Twin Oaks, a utopian community located in rural Virginia, sets its own community time and begins the week on Friday. The now-disbanded Ba’hai commune of Cedar Grove, New Mexico, divided time into months comprising 19 days. Members of Amish religious districts throughout the United States meet for worship services every other Sunday in an effort to establish a pace of life that is distinctly slower than the world around them.

Language may have been another cultural property the Zoramites sought to alter. They seem to have adopted or coined words that were not common among the Nephites. This is demonstrated by the fact that the word Rameumptom needed to be interpreted for readers (see Alma 31:21). Citing this example, Nibley suggested that the Zoramites had begun to develop “their own strange dialect,” another distancing mechanism.

Continued Stratification

Sociologist James S. Coleman has observed that social classes tend to develop and maintain distinctive cultures typically consisting of styles of speech, etiquette, body language, dress, information, interests, and tastes. Separatist groups alter some or all of those features as they detach from the prevailing culture and establish themselves as a new culture. For example, some separatist groups adopt unisex dress standards hoping to end gender stratification, and many others rotate daily tasks and jobs so that no person becomes associated with a position that could foster perceptions or behavior reflective of prestige or inferiority. Other groups forbid some forms of stratification while consciously maintaining others they deem necessary to preserve their way of life. The Amish fit that last category; they maintain a distinct stratification based on age and gender even though they have eschewed stratification arising from such things as property, dress, or governing power outside the family.

Other groups that rebel against the perceived inequity of existing norms establish a new order only to change the criteria for stratification. The leaders of such groups take the position of the elite while most of their followers remain in the lower-class positions. Communism is an example. Under Communist rule the means of production are removed from the bourgeoisie, eliminating them from the position of privileged class. However, a privileged class and stratification within the society still exists. The new elite consists of members of the party and, more significantly, leaders of the party.

This is essentially what happened among the Zoramites. Instead of doing away with political and economic inequality, they established an elite class based on wealth. The new elite maintained a society built on discrimination, with the pariahs being the poor Zoramites instead of a separate ethnic group.

The people who found themselves doomed to lower-class status in the new land were laborers. Amulek’s counsel to them to pray over their crops and flocks (see Alma 34:24–25) indicates they were farmers and shepherds—possibly the ones who grew the foodstuffs and provided meat for the wealthy. They built the synagogues used by the elite (see Alma 32:5), and they probably labored for the

Figurine of an upper-class Maya woman wearing, as the Zoramites did, “costly apparel” (Alma 31:28). Image courtesy of El Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico.

This painting on a Maya vase dating to ad 700 depicts a well-dressed woman holding a severed human head. Photograph by Justin Kerr.
wealthy in other ways as well. Thus the elite were understandably angry with the missionaries and their new converts, since the resulting change in affairs, especially once the poor were cast out of the land, meant that the elite no longer had a lower class to serve them and provide for their needs (see Alma 35).

Population of Antionum

Although the size of the population in Antionum went unrecorded, the narrative provides some clues about its size. We learn, for example, that more than one synagogue served the city, and also that Alma took seven people with him to preach there: his sons Shiblon and Corianton; his former missionary companion, Amulek; the converted lawyer, Zeezrom; and Mosiah’s sons Ammon, Aaron, and Omner. (Except for Alma’s sons and Amulek, these missionaries had at one time been disaffected with the church. Perhaps Alma chose them because they, like himself, could relate to a disaffected people.) Once in Antionum, the missionaries separated and went different ways to preach. The multiple synagogues and the number of missionaries that Alma took with him indicate that the population of Antionum was not small.

Another defining feature of this population was that the people maintained an open society. Unlike the secretive and closed Gadianton society, the Zoramites allowed Alma and the other missionaries to live among them and to preach in their synagogues.

Despite the Zoramites’ hatred toward them, demonstrated to its fullest extent in the binding and stoning of Shiblon (see Alma 38:4), they preached. We are also told that Corianton chose to be brave and caught up in his own wisdom and that he abandoned the work to chase after a harlot (see Alma 39:3). Corianton’s actions aggravated the ill feelings that the Zoramites had for the Nephites and made the work much more difficult for the missionaries (see Alma 39:11), but despite all this they taught without formal restrictions or prohibitions.

The Missionary Message

The record preserves details of Alma and Amulek’s preaching, including doctrines taught. Despite initial setbacks, these doctrines were received by the lower classes, who had not become part of the mainstream Zoramite culture. Because the Zoramites had once known the doctrines of the gospel, Alma did not begin by teaching them basic principles, but instead encouraged them to put what they knew into practice—to act upon the “seed,” or word of God, that they already possessed (see Alma 32). In developing his metaphor of the seed, Alma placed great emphasis on patience and diligence (see Alma 32:41–43), virtues they apparently had neglected before their dissent, resulting in failure to nurture the word. Accordingly, Alma promised that if this time they would nurture the word in patience and diligence, they would “hunger not, neither . . . thirst” (Alma 32:42). In other words, they would no longer feel the discontent that had driven them from their mother culture and the teachings of the gospel.

Alma then recalled the words of three prophets who had also experienced oppression and with whom these people were familiar: Zenos, Zenock, and Moses. Alma quoted Zenos’s prayer: “Thou hast also heard me when I have been cast out and have been despised by mine enemies” (Alma 33:10). From Zenock he quoted, “Thou art angry, O Lord, with this people, because they will not understand thy mercies which thou hast bestowed upon them because of thy Son” (Alma 33:16). Alma reminded them that for delivering such a message, the people had cast Zenock out of their midst and stoned him. Alma also recalled the promise of healing from the time of Moses—that if the people looked to the brass serpent, they would live. But many of the Israelites who had been slaves—the lowest of social classes in Egypt—refused to look. Each of these accounts reinforced the testimony that despite the stratification that existed in Nephite society, despite the unfair circumstances and bitter injustices, if they would look to Jesus Christ he would heal them and help them.

Throughout their preaching, both Alma and Amulek demonstrated sympathy for the oppressed Zoramites but never encouraged them to run away or withdraw. The better course was to endure and to turn to Jesus Christ for help. Why did Alma not encourage the converted Zoramites to leave Antionum? We cannot be sure, but we do know that while Alma’s primary motivation in reclaiming the Zoramites was his sorrow at their iniquity (see Alma 31:2), his concern also included the fear of an
alliance between the Zoramites and the Lamanites (see Alma 31:4). Since the missionaries came to Antionum in part because they hoped to prevent such an alliance, they may have known that if the poor withdrew from the Zoramite social system, it could lead to a confederacy between the elite Zoramites and Lamanites. On the other hand, Alma may not have realized what the conversion of the poor class would do to the culture, and he may have encouraged the poor to remain because he thought they would be a good influence on the elite and an aid in further missionary efforts.

Whatever the reason, Alma never suggested that the oppressed Zoramites leave Antionum or rebel against the elite. Instead, he promised that if they would nourish the seed of the gospel, it would grow. “And behold, it will become a tree, springing up in you unto everlasting life. And then may God grant unto you that your burdens may be light, through the joy of his Son. And even all this can ye do if ye will” (Alma 33:23). While this advice was pertinent to their problem of overcoming or enduring the oppression they were experiencing in Antionum, it may have led them to reflect on their situation before they withdrew from Nephite culture. Perhaps Alma’s words caused them to wonder how different their circumstances would have been had they remained in Zarahemla and stayed true to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

In answer to a question about whether the Zoramites should believe in one God, Amulek testified that Christ would come and that the law of Moses (which the Zoramites had discarded) was designed to point them to the atonement (see Alma 34:14). After bearing testimony, Amulek concentrated most of his teaching on what the oppressed Zoramites must now do: repent, pray, and care for the needy (see Alma 34:17–28, 33–36).

It is interesting that Amulek instructed the oppressed poor to care for the needy. This seems to be a warning that they should not begin a new community (as was done before) that would merely change who the elite were. Rather, they were to always care for anyone in need, thus counteracting effects of a stratified society that marginalized segments of the population. Amulek then explained, “If ye do not remember to be charitable, ye are as dross, which the refiners do cast out, (it being of no worth) and is trodden under foot of men” (Alma 34:29).

Amulek admonished the people to “come forth and harden not your hearts any longer” (Alma 34:31). This reiterates the major theme of the missionary message—that despite offenses, persecution, and adversity, what matters most in life is not a person’s station or situation but how a person reacts to it. The vital thing is to repent because “this life is the time for men to prepare to meet God” (Alma 34:32). According to Amulek, the Zoramite poor could not afford to wait until they were free or wealthy or part of the elite to do what is good; rather, they needed to soften their hearts, obey the commandments regardless of their circumstance in life, and concentrate on the things of God now.

Amulek then closed with an admonition similar to Alma’s. Rather than urge the people to leave Antionum or to rebel against the elite, Amulek told them to be patient and “bear with all manner of afflictions; that ye do not revile against those who do cast you out because of your exceeding poverty, lest ye become sinners like unto them; but that ye have patience, and bear with those afflictions, with a firm hope that ye shall one day rest from all your afflictions” (Alma 34:40–41).

After preaching, Alma and Amulek and the other missionaries traveled to Jershon, where the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi lived. Their departure should have made the ruling Zoramites happy: the offensive missionaries were gone. However, the “more popular part of the Zoramites” were angry because the missionaries’ message “did destroy their craft” (Alma 35:3). This may indicate that the Zoramite belief system was somehow holding the poor in check, that the teachings of Jesus Christ convinced the oppressed Zoramites of the error of the belief system, and that they were no longer willing to buy into the system and continue to serve the elite as they had done. In their anger the ruling Zoramites identified those who believed the missionaries and banished them from Antionum. Once cast out, the displaced Zoramites followed the missionaries to Jershon. When the people in Jershon received the fugitives, the Zoramites grew angrier.

The Ruling Zoramites Retaliate

As we have seen, the Zoramite society had consciously and purposely constructed social classes. Sociologists Michael L. Schwalbe and Douglas Mason-Schrock call this process of constructing
social class identity “subcultural identity work,” and they posit that such social construction consists of four elements: (1) creating social representations, (2) coding or rule making that creates the identity, (3) affirming or enacting and validating identity claims, and (4) policing or protecting and enforcing the identity code.

The Zoramites had defined a society in which the position of the upper classes was dependent upon having a lower class to rule over. Thus the preaching of the Nephite missionaries not only altered the Zoramites’ craft and economic situation, it challenged their carefully constructed identity. Their code had been broken, and this necessitated policing in order to protect the identity of the group. Casting out the believers was an act of both policing and of affirming the ruling class’s position as elites. But instead of solving the problem and returning the society to its norms, that action further disrupted the society and intensified the hatred against the meddlesome Nephites, who were directly responsible for upsetting the social order.

From this point on, the Zoramites who had not reconverted grew increasingly wicked. Their hatred was fueled by a perception that the Nephite missionaries destroyed their comfortable way of life. The fact that the poor Zoramites were being sheltered by the people of Jershon became a rallying cry for war. The vindictive Zoramites sought allies among hostile Lamanites and turned their efforts to subjugating the Nephites. It is easy to imagine them saying, “If they had left us alone, we would have left them alone. But they didn’t!”

In the end, the missionaries may have questioned what they had done. They went to Antionum to reclaim the Zoramites, but in the process some of the Zoramites became even more hateful than before and formed an alliance with the hostile Lamanites to wage war against the Nephites. In fact, so intense was the Zoramites’ hatred for the Nephites that the Lamanites later appointed them to be chief captains and leaders of their armies (see Alma 43:44). The very situation the missionaries had hoped to avoid became a reality: the Zoramites and Lamanites joined forces. As feared, this alliance proved disastrous. For many years to come, the Zoramites continued to be a terrible threat to the Nephites—not only because of their extreme hatred but also because the Zoramites knew “the strength of the Nephites, and their places of resort, and the weakest parts of their cities” (Alma 48:5).

Lessons from the Zoramites

While it is impossible to ascertain the historical and sociological dynamics of the Zoramites in full, when we combine the details in the record it becomes apparent that the Zoramites were a people marginalized by the Nephite-Mulekite culture. Among other lessons, their story shows us what can happen when a society is stratified in a way that disadvantages and oppresses the lower class. Such mistreatment apparently caused the Zoramites to leave the church and to withdraw to Antionum, where they attempted to establish their own religion and culture. It follows that the antipathy engendered by the original marginalization intensified when the Nephites challenged the very foundation of the new society by preaching religious doctrines that the Zoramites had already rejected. At this point the apostate Zoramites turned from their attempt to establish a separate culture and began to war against their mother culture. This demonstrates a major Book of Mormon theme: people who at one time have the gospel and then turn from it become the most embittered enemies of the people of the church and of God.

This transition from quiescent dissidents to spiteful, aggressive enemies forms a powerful study of human nature. These sobering realities underscore the importance of prophetic teachings calculated to promote unity, equality, community, and other Zionlike qualities that lead to being one in Christ (see Mosiah 23:7; 4 Nephi 1:17; and Doctrine and Covenants 38:25–27). Seeing the Zoramite narrative in this fuller perspective, we are powerfully reminded of one of the reasons prophets such as Alma have consistently warned, “Will you persist in turning your backs upon the poor, and the needy, and in withholding your substance from them?” (Alma 5:55).
30. Huffman, “Treaty Background of Hebrew YÄDAH,” 33; emphasis added. The bracketed for is our insertion, all other bracketed words are from Huffman.

31. Mays, Hosea, 69 (see note 8 herein for full citation). “Knowing,” or making covenants, binds or oblige the suzerain, God, to bless or curse his vassal, the house of Israel, depending upon their recognition of him. Hosea prophesied: “My people [Israel] are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children” (Hosea 4:6; emphasis added; see note 2 herein).


36. Just as Hosea and Isaiah prophesied destruction or captivity for lack of “knowledge,” the opposite, “knowledge,” will bring freedom, gathering, and protection. In the words of Nephi, “[God] will bring them again out of captivity, and they shall be gathered together to the lands of their inheritance; and they shall be brought out of obscurity and out of darkness; and they shall know that the Lord is their Savior and their Redeemer, the Mighty One of Israel” (1 Nephi 22:12). Again, we see a reference to the responsibility of the suzerain to protect and gather his vassals and their responsibility to recognize him as their only source of safety and redemption. Specifically, the children of Israel will learn that their only true source of protection and deliverance comes from God.


38. We see that blessings are withheld as a consequence of “not knowing” God. “The reason why [God] cease to do miracles among the children of men is because that they dwindle in unbelief, and depart from the right way, and know not the God in whom they should trust” (Mormon 9:20). The logic put forth here by Moroni is that the creation of heaven and earth and humans is miraculous. Since God does not change, miracles should continue. If miracles are not evident, it is not the fault of an unchanging God but the fault of humans who have changed their beliefs and been unfaithful to their covenants with him (see Mormon 9:17–19; Isaiah 24:5).

39. Abraham also desired to enter into a covenant with God; however, this point is not found in the Old Testament but rather in the Pearl of Great Price (see Abraham 1:2–4). Moses desired his people to enter into a covenant with God, but they were too frightened to do so directly (see Exodus 20:18–21).

40. See Whittaker, “Covenant People,” 206 (see note 3 herein for a full citation).

41. George Mendenhall maintains that the similarity of the Sinaitic covenant to Hittite treaties is an argument attesting to the historicity of the Exodus narrative. Along that same line of reasoning, we maintain that the similarity of Book of Mormon covenants to Old Testament covenants is evidence attesting to the historicity of the Book of Mormon. See George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," The Biblical Archaeologist 17 (May 1954): 37. Nibley calls these similarities “patterns” and titles a chapter “Old World Ritual in the New World”; see Hugh Nibley, An Approach to the Book of Mormon, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1964), 295.
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2. See Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1966), s.v. “Zoramites.”


4. Kanter, Commitment and Community, 8.


9. Mark Davis and Brent Israelens point out, however, that because of the frequent assimilation of one ethnic group into another, “the nation’s character became one of culture, religion, and disposition, rather than of race or ancestry” (Mark Davis and Brent Israelens, International Relations and Treaties in the Book of Mormon (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1980), 9). Therefore it is difficult to determine how or on what bases the people at the time of Mormon determined these clans.


14. See Kanter, Commitment and Community.


16. See Kanter, Commitment and Community.

19. Many thanks to S. Kent Brown for the insight that the fact the Zoramite leaders were able to "find out privily the minds of all the people" (Alma 35:5) without resorting to intimidation reinforces the argument that these people were a distinct clan. A familial relationship would encourage this kind of trust and accessibility to people whereas a mixed-clan community would not.

"No Poor Among Them"
Lindon J. Robison

1. A study of a connection between commandment keeping and economic prosperity could deal with economic issues in each Book of Mormon era; I have chosen to deal with matters that span the entire record.
3. In an earlier issue of this journal, I discussed how keeping the commandments to love God and one’s neighbors leads to increased specialization, trade, freedom of choice, and prosperity; see Lindon J. Robison, "Economic Insights from the Book of Mormon," *JBMS* 1/1 (1992): 35–53.
4. Actually, Adam Smith was well aware of the importance of friendly relations. The first chapter in his book *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* is titled "Of Sympathy" (London: A. Millar, 1759).
5. Colleagues and I found that the same requirement for friendly relations exists today. A survey of 1,500 farmland operators in Michigan, Illinois, and Nebraska showed that less than 2 percent of the sales occurred between a seller who viewed the buyer as unfriendly. See Lindon J. Robison, Robert J. Meyer, and Marcelo E. Siles, "Social Capital and the Terms of Trade for Farmland," *Review of Agricultural Economics* 24/1 (Spring/Summer 2002): 44–58.

The Hebrew Text of Alma 7:11
Thomas A. Wayment

1. A text critic is one who considers the process by which an accepted text has been passed down through history. All known textual variants are considered in this process as well as historical influences that may have led to alterations in the text. Therefore, it is the work of the text critic to consider which text most accurately represents what the original author wrote or intended.
2. For example, the term the law and the prophets had become a technical term for the Old Testament in Jesus’s day (see Matthew 11:13; 22:40). The descriptive nature of the term adequately expresses the contents of the Old Testament while Mosiah’s reference seems to include only the first portion of the Old Testament.
3. Moroni does explicitly state that the Hebrew had also been altered by them; therefore what we call Hebrew may have been significantly different from what he referred to as Hebrew (see Mormon 9:33).
5. The superscription included by Mormon before the beginning of Alma 7 reads, "The words of Alma which he delivered to the people in Gideon, according to his own record." See *The Printer’s Manuscript of the Book of Mormon, Part I*, ed. Royal Skousen (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2001), 420.
6. Alma frequently uses introductory formulas to introduce quotations from the brass plates and earlier Book of Mormon prophets; see Alma 9:13, 24; 11:37; 30:8; 35:3, 15, 19. In Alma 11:37 Amulek uses a very similar method to introduce a prophetic quotation from an angel by saying, "I cannot deny his word, and he hath said" (compare Alma 12:21).
8. The Book of Mormon contains one other translation of Isaiah 53:4, which is found in Mosiah 14:4. The Mosiah quotation follows the KJV’s English translation of Isaiah 53:4 much more closely than the quoted version in Alma 7:11.
9. It is important to note that although intiminates and pains offer slightly different meanings, each noun is in the plural and not the singular.
10. The lexical range, or established range of meaning, for these two terms can be better appreciated in Deuteronomy 7:15; 28:61 and Isaiah 38:9 for ḫôlāyēnû; and in Exodus 3:7 and Isaiah 53:3 for mākâbēnû.
11. Matthew uses astheneiaûaû, which should be correctly rendered as a "weakness" of any sort, and nôsous, which would be the natural term for disease.
12. This is surprising given the Gospel of Matthew’s penchant for adhering to the Septuagint over the Hebrew Old Testament. Matthew does not follow the Septuagint in any substantive manner for this quotation. One suggestion is that he wanted to correct the more loosely worded Septuagint, which had translated these terms as “sins and pain.” See W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993), 2:37–38. No significant textual variants to this passage would warrant the suggestion of divergent manuscript traditions for the Hebrew text and the text used by Matthew or Alma.
13. The parallel between Matthew and Alma suggests that Isaiah 53 carried a messianic interpretation even before Christ’s mortal ministry. For Latter-day Saints, and Christians generally, Isaiah 53 is one of the most important Old Testament prophecies concerning the coming of Christ, but hints from the targum on Isaiah and the Great Isaiah Scroll of the Dead Sea Scrolls suggest that this passage was understood messianically before Christ came; see Margaret Barker, *The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy* (London: Clark, 2003), 303–4. Although this evidence cannot prove a messianic understanding of Isaiah 53 during the early Christian period, it suggests that other Jews had understood this passage as referring to the ministry of the Messiah before his advent.

Alma’s Enemies: The Case of the Lamanites, Amlicites, and Mysterious Amalekites
J. Christopher Conkling

1. John L. Sorenson writes that the Nephi saw things this simply: “In a broad sense the Nephi’s rivals were called Lamanites, but that master rubric obscured differences that seem to have made little difference to the Nephi. At a strategic level, if Nephi wore white hats, they considered that any sort of Lamanite was a black one” (“Religious Groups and Movements among the Nephi, 200–1 EC,” in *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, ed. Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges [Provo, UT: FARMS, 2000], 171). Of course, many otherwise astute readers of the Book of Mormon see the Nephi–Lamanite rivalry in the same simplistic terms as the Nephi apparently did, since their view of the Lamanites is reflected in the record. For example, Fawn M. Brodie wrote: “The Nephi, peace-loving and domestic, and the Lamanites, bloodthirsty and idolatrous. The two races fought intermittently for a thousand years” (see Brodie, *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet* [New York: Knopf, 1978], 44).