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This issue of BYU Studies Quarterly proudly leads off with the 2015 Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecture by political science professor David Magleby. I am confident that all current readers will enjoy and benefit from the timely insights that this speech offers regarding the persistent pressures on political parties to justify their existence and to seek opportunities for mutually beneficial accommodations and compromises.

Magleby’s Maeser Lecture stands in an illustrious tradition now reaching back over half a century at Brigham Young University. Fifty years ago, the second Maeser Lecture was given by Professor Hugh W. Nibley on March 17, 1965, when I was a freshman at BYU. Like many of these annual faculty lectures, Nibley’s was promptly published in BYU Studies, entitled “The Expanding Gospel.” Its opening lines read, “The expression ‘expanding Gospel’ is not a contradiction of terms.” While “no man may add to the scriptures, . . . that imposes no restriction on God.” “Where has God imposed any limits on His own prerogative of imparting His word to man?” (vol. 7, no. 1, p. 3; emphasis in original). For twenty-five pages, Nibley then goes on to show how the revealed details in the plan of salvation known distinctively to Latter-day Saints can be found by careful analysis of dozens of ancient sources that “follow along familiar grooves to the end and then continue onward into new territory” (4). Although these ancient sources are often only “shattered remnants of a forgotten structure,” behind them stands “a solid reality” (26–27). In many ways, Nibley’s quest for further light and knowledge...
has been the guiding hermeneutic of BYU Studies, in search of those solid realities, as this current issue attests.

Political applications of gospel principles such as unity, love, humility, shared objectives, reconciliation, unselfishness, and community well-being are boldly brought forward and expanded in David Magleby’s wise advice on politics and compromise.

Second, as Nibley also laid out, in dealing with historical writings and gospel texts, “our first obligation is to inform ourselves” about what they actually teach (4). In this regard, the groundbreaking decipherment and analysis by LaJean Purcell Carruth and Gerrit Dirkmaat of shorthand transcriptions of early addresses by General Authorities that were eventually published in the *Journal of Discourses* expands our knowledge of the unfolding of Latter-day Saint doctrines and practices.

The picture above shows me seated on a bench with a statue of William Tyndale in Bristol, England, which memorializes the importance of translating scripture clearly and correctly. In this spirit of understanding scripture, linguistic research by Brent Schmidt into the ancient meanings of the Greek and Hebrew words that stand behind the vital gospel term *grace* expands the familiar understandings of that biblical term, showing that the authors who contributed to the Book of Mormon likely understood the original, but now usually overlooked, covenantal and relational dimensions of grace.

And finally, the detailed examination by Jeffrey Chadwick of the chronology of the death of Jesus expands our understanding of that key event in the Father’s eternal plan. Using scriptural, historical, astronomical, and archaeological evidence, Chadwick arrives at what he feels is a definite date for the crucifixion. In the process, he proposes a different interpretation of the timing of events in Jesus’s final week, an interpretation that seeks to harmonize seeming discrepancies between the synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John.

In Nibley’s words, “Israel escaped both pessimism and fatalism by being constantly reminded by the prophets of the great pre-existent plan that lies behind everything that happens. This we believe to be the most significant element in the expanding Gospel” (27). That Good News continues today to expand in ways that God has chosen to impart his knowledge and reassurance to all who will listen to and learn of him.
David B. Magleby, BYU’s 2015 Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecturer, presenting the forum address on May 19, 2015, in the de Jong Concert Hall. Photo courtesy of Brigham Young University.
The Necessity of Political Parties and the Importance of Compromise

David B. Magleby

BYU Studies has a long history of publishing the annual lecture given by the recipient of the Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Award, BYU’s highest faculty honor. It is with great pleasure that BYU Studies Quarterly publishes this year’s lecture by Dr. David B. Magleby, a professor of political science. His speech was delivered as a forum address on May 19, 2015, at Brigham Young University.

Vice President Webb, other members of the administration, deans, colleagues, friends, and students, I am honored and humbled to be recognized in this way. The occasion invites introspection and appreciation.

I have been greatly blessed by the opportunity to study, teach, and write for now thirty-three years on the faculty at Brigham Young University. There is a sense of mission about teaching at BYU, which for me is personified by you students and your predecessors—those I have known and taught in classes, those I have worked with as teaching or research assistants, and those who have been members of BYU wards or stakes in which I have served. You are smart and good. You have lifted me and my family. You motivate me to be a better person. You will do remarkable things in your families, church, community, and occupation. I hope my remarks today will encourage you to make civic engagement a part of who you are.

I teach in a discipline whose name some find presumptuous: political science. Politics seems so disorganized, messy, personal, and sometimes even evil that it can hardly be seen as science. Politics can be all
of that, but as Alexander Hamilton put it in Federalist Paper no. 9, “The
science of politics, however, like most other sciences, has received great
improvement.”1 Similarly, James Madison wrote in Federalist no. 37
of “political science” and “science of government.”2 Or as John Adams
wrote to his wife Abigail in 1780, “I must study Politicks and War that
my sons may have liberty to study . . . Mathematicks and Philosophy,
Geography, natural History, Naval Architecture, navigation, Commerce
and Agriculture, in order to give their Children a right to study Painting,
Poetry, Musick, Architecture, Statuary, Tapestry and Porcelaine.”3

To Adams, Hamilton, Madison, Jay, and the other framers of our grand
experiment with self-government, the data for their science came from
their experience in colonial legislatures and the Continental Congress;
and from their study of religion, history, and science. Think of the Con-
stitution as an engineering blueprint for the design of a functioning and
enduring government. By that standard, their blueprint has stood the
test of time—and they were remarkable social scientists.

Today, I would like to address two seemingly contradictory elements
of politics that are relevant to our times; indeed, I would argue they will
always be relevant: the necessity of political parties and the importance
of compromise.

The Necessity of Political Parties

With respect to political parties I will argue an idea widely accepted in
political science: that political parties are essential to modern democ-

1. Alexander Hamilton, Federalist, no. 9, “The Union as a Safeguard against
Domestic Faction and Insurrection,” available online at http://avalon.law.yale.
edu/18th_century/fed09.asp.

2. James Madison, Federalist, no. 37, “Concerning the Difficulties of the
Convention in Devising a Proper Form of Government,” January 11, 1788, avail-
able online at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed37.asp.

3. John Adams to Portia [Abigail Adams], May 12, 1780, Adams Family
Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, available online at http://www.mass-
hist.org/digitaladams/archive/doc?id=L17800512jasecond.
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elections but become involved in political parties. So, how do parties facilitate democracy?

First, parties organize democracy. They recruit and nominate candidates and structure the competition. Without them, voters would face the daunting task of choosing from among scores of candidates. In this sense, parties simplify democracy and voting.

Second, parties in a broad sense stand for a particular view of the role of government. They stake out positions on issues like health care, energy, the environment, foreign and defense policy, and at times issues like civil rights. The orientation of parties can change, and it is easier to change a party’s direction than to start a new party. Parties also play an important role for citizens in a democracy by providing important cues to voters about the electoral competition.

Political scientists use the term “party identification” to describe how citizens identify with parties. The enduring, subjective identity people develop with a political party helps explain their voting behavior. It is not the same as party registration, the legal process where you declare a party for purposes of voting in primaries. Nor is it a reflection of how a voter feels about parties in a particular election. Rather, we measure party identification with a series of questions that first ask people to identify themselves as Democrat, Republican, Independent, or something else. Those who answer Republican or Democrat are then asked if they consider themselves strong or not so strong in that attachment. For purposes of simplification, scholars label the not-so-strong partisans as weak partisans. Those who answered Independent to the first question are asked if they consider themselves as closer to the Republican or Democratic party. There are then three types of Independents: those who lean Democratic, those who lean Republican, and pure Independents. Respondents who say “other” to the initial question are typically about 2 percent of the American voting-age public.

Looking at the distribution of party identification using the KBYU–Utah Colleges Exit Poll shows this to be the case in Utah since 1982 (see fig. 1). In this figure, I have combined Independent leaners with the party toward which they lean. I will demonstrate why in a moment. Note the stability of the response. National data is similarly stable but with Democrats outnumbering Republicans.

Party identification is important because it is the single best predictor of how we vote. Figure 2 illustrates this with voting in the 2012 presidential election, but the same generalization applies to voting in partisan candidate elections generally.
Figure 1. Utah party ID (1982–2014). KBYU–Utah Colleges Exit Poll Data.

Figure 2. 2012 presidential vote. 2012 American National Election Study Data.
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Note that very nearly 100 percent of strong Democrats voted for Barack Obama and very nearly 100 percent of strong Republicans voted for Mitt Romney. Over 80 percent of weak partisans voted for their preferred party nominee. What my colleagues and I discovered in the 1970s is that the Independent leaners are as loyal to the party toward which they lean as are the weak partisans, and sometimes they are more predictably partisan. Only the pure Independents appear without partisan moorings, what we titled “The Myth of the Independent Voter.”

It is important to emphasize that the strong partisans are the most informed and interested citizens, who vote more frequently than others, as shown in figure 3. But it is also true that the Independents with party leanings are more informed, interested, and participatory than the weak partisans or pure Independents. Let me illustrate this with data from recent elections.

Strong partisans have been consistently the most interested in politics and presidential campaigns. In 2012, as seen in figure 4, 63 percent of strong partisans said they pay attention to politics and elections always or most of the time. On this measure of civic virtue, strong partisans are the most attentive citizens. Just under half of Independent leaners pay attention all or most of the time, while 39 percent of weak partisans do.

Figure 3. Party ID and turnout in 2012 election. 2012 American National Election Study Data.

---

so. Pure Independents have always been the least interested in politics and campaigns.5

Another characteristic of civic virtue is the extent to which Independents and partisans are knowledgeable about politics. Data from 2012, as seen in figure 5, show that strong partisans are the most likely to know which party has a majority in the House of Representatives. Leaners are more knowledgeable than weak partisans. Pure Independents were notably the least knowledgeable; only one in four answered correctly.

Many think that being a partisan means a person is unthinking or uninformed, but the opposite is true. The most active and attentive citizens are strong partisans. While Independent leaners shun the party label in their personal self-identification, they behave much more like strong partisans than pure Independents.

A widely held misconception is to view strong partisans, or any partisan, negatively while viewing an Independent positively. The data we found in the 1970s, which I have shown remains unchanged, leads to a different conclusion. Independent leaners are behaviorally partisans and exhibit positive citizenship traits, while pure Independents are the least active and engaged citizens. It is part of our national mythology that Americans vote for the person and not the party. The reality is that the person we prefer is from our party, and about 90 percent of Americans have a party preference. While many are aware of our findings, others, like the Gallup Poll, continue to release reports, as recently as January of this year, claiming a “New Record 43% [of Americans] Are Political Independents.”6 Buried in the Gallup release was the datum that 11 percent of their 2014 sample were pure Independents, while the other 32 percent were “leaners,” who—as research done by my colleagues and me has shown—are consistently partisan in their behavior and attitudes.

Parties also play an important role in government. The only state in the U.S. with a nonpartisan state legislature is Nebraska. While the legislature is officially nonpartisan, both major parties endorse candidates.

5. Thomas Patterson conducted weekly interviews with one thousand Americans to tap their interest in the 2000 presidential campaign and found that leaners were no more likely than pure Independents (or weak partisans for that matter) to be interested in the campaign. Thomas E. Patterson, The Vanishing Voter: Public Involvement in an Age of Uncertainty (New York: Vintage, 2003), 43–44. Patterson’s findings support our own.

Figure 4. Party ID and attention to politics/government. 2012 American National Election Study Data.

Figure 5. Party ID and political knowledge. 2012 American National Election Study Data.
Rarely is a legislator not known as a Democrat or Republican, and the news media tallies the number of legislators elected from each party. The absence of parties appears to lessen accountability because voters may not be able to hold a party accountable when they do not like what the legislature is doing. Within government, parties help structure the governing processes and bridge the separation of powers, and they can either lead to more polarized politics or help to moderate policy.

The current reality in the U.S. is that we live in a time of heightened party polarization. The internal cohesion on issues and policies within parties has led to a widening of the ideological gap between the parties. Today, as seen in figure 6, there are relatively few representatives in Congress who are moderate. These data are from Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal, who have developed widely used measures of ideology among elites and the

---

mass public over time. The chart shows that since the 1980s members of Congress have become more and more polarized in comparison to those serving in Congress from the 1930s through the 1970s.

The legislative districting process has also led to more and more solidly partisan districts, which means that today’s representatives worry more about being “primaried”—that is, being defeated by a fellow partisan in a primary—than they are about a general election opponent from the other party. The result in recent years has been government shutdowns, brinksmanship, and a dwindling number of members of Congress who are willing to work with the other party.

The view of parties I am articulating—that they are vital to the functioning of democracy, that they serve important governmental purposes, and that they are unavoidable—was not shared by many of the Founders at the time of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 or thereafter. In his presidential farewell address, George Washington described parties as a “fire” that could “consume” government, which would elevate candidates seeking “absolute power,” thereby endangering “liberty.” John Adams wrote in a letter to Jonathan Jackson that parties were “to be dreaded as the greatest political evil under our Constitution.”

The Framers, who were visionaries in many respects, were mistaken in assuming their system would work well without parties. Even during Washington’s presidency, two parties had organized around competing perspectives on politics and government. John Adams, our first vice president, as noted, dreaded parties but helped form one—his Federalist Party—and ran against Thomas Jefferson and his Democratic Republican Party in 1796. Jefferson, like Alexander Hamilton, saw parties as a natural extension of politics. He wrote, “In every free and deliberating society, there must, from the nature of man, be opposite parties, and


violent dissensions and discords; and one of these, for the most part, must prevail over the other for a longer or shorter time.”

James Madison, who also had been averse to parties, later embraced them in his opposition to Hamilton’s proposed First Bank of the United States. Political parties became a means for Madison and other early leaders to check the actions of the opposing party.

Why were parties inevitable? Because we often don’t agree on policies or priorities, and as humans we organize into groups to pursue common aims and interests. As Nancy Rosenblum has written, “Someone must create the lines of division over social aims, security, and justice. Party rivalry is constitutive. It ‘stages the battle.’”

There are also constitutional roots for our decentralized, two-party system. The Framers designed a system with single representative districts where the candidate with the most votes in the election represents the district or state. Such winner-takes-all elections have long been seen as leading to two-party systems. Maurice Duverger, a French political scientist, stated what has come to be known as Duverger’s law. As translated from the original French it is: “1. The plurality (1 winner) voting system tends to lead to a 2-party system. 2. The proportional representation (multiwinner) system tends to lead to many mutually independent parties.”

Our party system is decentralized because of the constitutional provisions for federalism. Elections in the United States are organized around the unit of competition, and most competition is at the state level. U.S. senatorial, gubernatorial, presidential (because of the Electoral College) and even congressional elections (because they do not cross state boundaries) have a state focus. The political culture of the


state, its history and politics, impacts the kind of Republican or Democratic Party the state has. Oregon Republicans, for example, are likely more liberal than Utah Democrats on at least some issues.

In my view, competitive parties reinforce the Founders’ desire to “check ambition with ambition”\(^\text{18}\) and provide the accountability intended in free and fair elections. In this sense, parties are an extra-constitutional check and balance, one not intended by the Framers.

Are there negative consequences from a one-party system? In the U.S. case, the region most identified with one-party rule was the South, the eleven former Confederate states once known as the “Solid South” because they were dominated for several decades by Democrats. Some voters in the South were known as “Yellow Dog Democrats,” which was understood to mean they would vote for a yellow dog before they would vote for a Republican.

Noted political scientist V. O. Key wrote a book in 1949, called *Southern Politics*, which remains the best summary of a one-party system in operation.\(^\text{19}\) Key found that one-party politics tends to be highly personalized or to rely on strong individual leaders rather than ongoing groups, to have limited accountability because there is not a viable electoral alternative, to have erratic and chaotic changes in personnel and policy, to face challenges in disciplining rogue actors, and to experience low levels of voter participation. I would posit that some of our problems in Utah politics in recent years have the same root causes that Key found in the American South, including declining voter participation, serious ethical breaches and possibly illegal acts in the office of attorney general, and a politics organized more around particular political figures than enduring groups. Having two competitive parties moderates outcomes and reduces corruption.

So what do you do as a citizen if you don’t like either of the parties? You work to change the one you dislike the least. Parties are permeable organizations. Citizens and leaders can change the orientation of a party. Barry Goldwater and, even more, Ronald Reagan changed the focus and agenda of the Republican Party. Goldwater lost the 1964 election in a


landslide, but Reagan, following in his path, built a coalition in California and then the nation that reshaped the Republican Party. Similarly, Bill Clinton reshaped the Democratic Party in 1992 and 1996, moving it more to the center. The most visible example of this was welfare reform, but it was not limited to that.

The Necessity of Compromise

Government is necessary because people need it to resolve their conflicts. If we all agreed with each other, we would not need government. As Madison wrote in Federalist no. 51, paraphrasing Locke, “But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.” Government thus has as one of its primary purposes to ensure basic freedoms and liberties against foreign enemies, against domestic factions, and even against majority tyranny.

Compromise has been and will remain vital to sustaining our two-hundred-year-long experiment with self-government. Compromise is a process of give and take, of blending and adjusting, of accommodating competing interests and views in order to find a position most acceptable to the largest number or, at a minimum, the majority. It is not consensus, for rarely is consensus possible, and to make it the standard makes self-government untenable. The important issues of our time like immigration, taxation, health care, the size of government, and justice are all issues upon which disagreement and divisions are deep.

But compromise is often criticized as being unprincipled, too conciliatory, a slippery slope away from core values. It is important to underscore that not all compromises are good or right. Chamberlain’s compromise with Hitler over parts of Czechoslovakia, for example, was a mistake. But to label all compromises as bad is to learn the wrong lesson from history. On many important issues, resolution of a disagreement was only possible with compromise.

The media loves conflict and seeks to reinforce it, so it is not surprising that TV and radio commentators often criticize compromise. We also live at a time when our nation is evenly divided, and both sides are
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seeking to exploit any weakness in the other side for electoral advantage. The high cost of our campaigns and the pressure to raise lots of money also push politicians to take a hard line on issues in order to appease groups who would spend against their reelection if they were to compromise.

Compromise is not wrong in public life; it is the way we reconcile our differences. To acknowledge the importance of compromise is to recognize that we have different preferences, priorities, and approaches. It is also to acknowledge that everyone knows something and no one knows everything. Nor is it unprincipled. As U.S. Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen, one of the principal architects of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act, said, “I am a man of fixed and unbending principles, the first of which is to be flexible at all times.”

A good example of how compromise achieved something important is the Great Compromise between the large and small states at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. James Madison had arrived in Philadelphia with a plan for a new and stronger national government. His Virginia Plan set the terms of discussion once the delegates decided to jettison the Articles of Confederation. Madison’s plan provided for a bicameral legislature, an executive chosen by the legislature, and a strong judiciary. Power in the new bicameral legislature was proportionate to the population of the states, an advantage for large states and a disadvantage for small states. The Virginia Plan would have given the national government more power than it has today. For example the national government could veto virtually any state law.

Many of the small states were already suspicious of the designs of the large states, and being perpetually outnumbered in the national legislature was not acceptable to them. They proposed a small state plan, known as the New Jersey Plan, with a unicameral legislature, an executive removable by state majority, and a more limited judiciary. This plan did not go nearly far enough for Madison and those seeking a stronger national government.

The debate between the large and small states became so heated that Madison threatened to dissolve the Union if small states insisted on retaining a disproportionate share of power, and these states would be left at the mercy of their large neighbors. Gunning Bedford of Delaware countered


that the small states would, in that event, find foreign allies. The intensity of the differences in Philadelphia in 1787 prompted George Washington to say, “To please all is impossible, and to attempt it would be vain.”

How was this conflict between the large and small states resolved? With what was known as the Connecticut Compromise, or Great Compromise. As David Brian Robertson has recently written:

They compromised on the contentious question of representation by devising one legislative chamber based on population and another based on the states as political units. They constructed a new kind of federalism, in which the national and state governments would share political authority. They also invented the system of presidential electors and the vice presidency to deal with the problem of presidential selection and replacement. They resolved some intractable disputes simply by delaying implementation (the slave trade), by using symbolic language (the House of Representatives’ control of money bills), and by writing ambiguous words and phrases to paper over differences about specific powers (with such deliberately imprecise phrases as “general welfare” or “necessary and proper”).

What lessons can we learn from the Great Compromise for politics today? First, neither side got all of what it wanted; each had to concede something to achieve a shared objective. It is hard to imagine the delegates accomplishing anything had they been in today’s 24–7 news cycle with Twitter and other modern media operating. Had the positions of the large and small states before the Great Compromise been repeatedly aired, it likely would have made it harder for both sides to compromise and would have reinforced negative perceptions of the other side. The Framers needed time and secrecy to carry out their work. They also provide a model for us by not solving every problem. In some areas, like judicial review, they are simply vague. In others, they agreed on what we see today as an unjust solution, the Three-Fifths Compromise, where slaves counted as 3/5 of a person for purposes of apportionment. Sadly, it took decades for the new nation to resolve the issue of states’ rights and slavery. Given the intensity of the views on both sides, the Founders made the right political choice to postpone that question.

In our celebration of the Constitution, we forget that the Framers were themselves politicians who recognized the need to compromise to

25. Robertson, Original Compromise, 14.
achieve the important broader goal to form a more perfect union (note that they do not say they were forming a perfect one), establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and provide for the common defense. Evidence that the Framers knew there was more work to be done in improving the Constitution is that they provided for a means of amending it. Again, quoting Robertson: “The resulting Constitution—this original compromise—has proved remarkably durable and authoritative. It has anchored the national government through spectacular economic growth, social changes, and expansions of democracy and rights that were inconceivable in 1787. It is easy to forget that politicians produced this remarkable document—talented, often idealistic politicians, but politicians nonetheless.”

There are many examples of compromise in our history. But in recent years our politics has been marked by a resistance to compromise and a view that to compromise is inappropriate.

In addition to the Great Compromise, which I have already discussed, I will point to a more local and quite recent compromise, one that has gained national attention and is labeled by some as the “Utah Compromise.” The law that passed by overwhelming majorities in both houses of the legislature bans employers or landlords from discriminating against employees or tenants on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity while simultaneously excluding religious organizations and their affiliates, such as colleges and charities, from the law. More broadly, the law protects employees from being fired for discussing their religious beliefs, so long as such speech is nonharassing and not disruptive.

The Utah legislature had previously debated and voted on bills banning discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered individuals, but those efforts had not won passage. What was different here was a series of compromises and a willingness to include in the Utah compromise protections both for religious freedom and for housing and employment rights regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

I would like to share with you a couple of quotes from President Hugh B. Brown's 1968 commencement address at BYU. President Brown was called as an Apostle in 1958 and served in the First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints between 1961 and 1970. The quotes are from a talk you may know as the “God Is the Gardener” talk. If you have not listened to it, I urge you to do so. Here is what President Brown said about politics in May 1968:

26. Robertson, Original Compromise, 8.
You young people are leaving your university at a time when our nation is engaged in an abrasive and increasingly strident process of electing a president. I wonder if you would permit me—one who has managed to survive a number of these events—to pass on to you a few words of counsel.

First, I’d like you to be reassured that the leaders of both major political parties in this land are men of integrity and unquestioned patriotism. Beware of those who feel obliged to prove their own patriotism by calling into question the loyalty of others. . . .

Strive to develop a maturity of mind and emotion and a depth of spirit that will enable you to differ with others on matters of politics without calling into question the integrity of those with whom you differ. Allow within the bounds of your definition of religious orthodoxy a variation of political belief. Do not have the temerity to dogmatize on issues where the Lord has seen fit to be silent.

I have found through long experience that our two-party system is sound. Beware of those who are so lacking in humility that they cannot come within the framework of one of our two great parties.

. . . Strive to develop that true love of country that realizes that real patriotism must include within it a regard for the people, for the inhabitants of the rest of the globe. Patriots have never demanded of good men hatred of another country as proof of one’s love for his own.27

The advice of President Brown seems as timely today as it was in 1968. The Framers left us with a remarkable structure, one that has been improved through amendment and application. By design, the Constitution fostered a two-party system and the need for compromise.

My talk today has emphasized that political parties play an important role, one that should be celebrated rather than ridiculed. I also speak today in defense of sensible and principled compromise. The reality in life is that we do not get everything we want. Part of resistance to compromise

comes from a lack of mutual respect and a false sense of confidence in our very real human fallibility. President Brown added that we have a tendency to “dogmatize” where we have no basis to do so. Mutual respect is necessary for a democracy to function, and denigrating another’s patriotism, misrepresenting an opponent’s positions, and refusing to cooperate even on matters on which there is agreement undermine the relationships needed to resolve differences. Such actions not only deny the country the benefit that would result from accommodation but also diminish the prospects for future compromises and rigidify conflict.

But the inspired structure of the Constitution is insufficient if we do not appreciate it and use it through our own engagement in politics and government. Soon after the drafting of the Constitution was complete, a lady asked Benjamin Franklin as he left Independence Hall, “‘Well Doctor what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?’ ‘A republic,’ replied the Doctor, ‘if you can keep it.’”
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The Prophets Have Spoken, but What Did They Say?

Examining the Differences between George D. Watt’s Original Shorthand Notes and the Sermons Published in the Journal of Discourses

Gerrit Dirkmaat and LaJean Purcell Carruth;
Shorthand transcriptions by LaJean Purcell Carruth

On a summer day in August of 1867, Brigham Young delivered a powerful sermon to the residents of Tooele, Utah. He urged the assembled Saints to more faithfully live the principles of the Word of Wisdom and cease their attempts to parse out the words of the revelation, seeking a loophole. Young responded directly to such thinking, telling the congregation:

"Many try to excuse themselves because tea and coffee are not mentioned, arguing that it refers to hot drinks only. What did we drink hot when that Word of Wisdom was given? Tea and coffee. It definitely refers to that which we drink with our food. I said to the Saints at our last annual Conference, the Spirit whispers to me to call upon the Latter-day Saints to observe the Word of Wisdom, to let tea, coffee, and tobacco alone, and to abstain from drinking spirituous drinks."¹

The practicality and straightforward manner of the explanation is often seen as a reflection of not only Young’s position on the doctrine, but of the man himself. Direct, clear, brief. Indeed, it is easy to imagine Young speaking those sentiments to a congregation anxiously waiting upon every word.

However, while Young certainly expressed these sentiments, he apparently did not speak these words as they have come down to us in published form. The shorthand notes that reporter George D. Watt took that day in Tooele read as follows:

Some of the sisters and some of brethren will say tea and coffee is not mentioned in the Word of Wisdom but hot drinks [as] if this doesn’t refer directly perfectly absolutely definitely and truly to that that we did drink hot[.] What does it allude to[?] What did we drink hot[?] Tea and coffee[.] When we made milk porridge it was food[.] We could not wash it red hot as we drank down tea[.] It alludes to tea and coffee or whatever we drank[.] I said to the Latter-day Saints at the annual conference 6 of April the spirit whispers to me for this people to observe the Word of Wisdom[.] Let the tea and coffee and tobacco alone whether they smoke take snuff and chew let it alone[.] Those that are in the habit of drinking liquor[,] cease to drink liquor[.]²

While the overall sentiment remains similar, the specification of the forms of tobacco in use, the cadence of the speaker, and rhetorical devices he used were lost as this speech was transcribed from the original shorthand notes to its published version found in the Journal of Discourses.

Speeches published in the Journal of Discourses and Deseret News are often viewed as principal primary sources by which historians and members of the LDS Church can access the teachings, ideas, and personalities of apostles and prophets during the second half of the nineteenth century. The sermons sometimes provide the only insights we have on the particular thoughts and words of Church leaders from specific time periods. LaJean Purcell Carruth, an employee of the Church History Department, has returned to the original shorthand notes taken by scribe George D. Watt during these meetings, painstakingly transcribing them to illuminate the spoken words vis-à-vis the published text. Carruth’s new transcriptions have revealed that extensive editorial alterations were often made during the process of transcription and publication as Watt and others prepared the sermons for publication in the Journal of Discourses or the Deseret News. The differences between the shorthand record and the published versions are often quite extensive. Nearly every sermon for which we have compared the shorthand and the published versions demonstrates the same level of revision shown in Young’s Tooele speech above, and in many cases the changes are far more pronounced.

---

² Brigham Young, speech, Tooele, August 17, 1867, Papers of George D. Watt, Church History Library, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as CHL), transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.
This article provides a generalized look at the scope and form of some of the changes. Through examples of some of these variations between the initial shorthand and the published word, the reader will get a sense of the potential changes inherent in all of these texts. We will complete the analysis by providing side-by-side comparisons of two prominent sermons by Brigham Young as examples so that readers can clearly see the differences between what Watt recorded in shorthand and what he eventually published in the *Journal of Discourses*. These sermons were selected from the dozens examined because they reflect the range of changes that are found between the shorthand and the published sources.

This article is far from an exhaustive study of changes in the *Journal of Discourses*. While Watt is the best known among the early scribes of sermons given by Church leaders, he certainly was not the only one taking dictation of sermons that were later published in the *Journal of Discourses*. Unfortunately, very little shorthand created by these other reporters is extant, and most of the shorthand that does exist has not yet been transcribed and compared to the published versions. Nor does this study examine every sermon recorded by George Watt that was later published in the *Journal of Discourses*. A complete study is also not possible because many of the published sermons do not have extant shorthand with which to compare. Instead, the authors of this study examined dozens of the published sermons that have been transcribed from extant shorthand in order to give researchers a glimpse into the difficulties inherent in using the published *Journal of Discourses* as a verbatim source. This study is therefore limited to sermons reported, transcribed, and published by George D. Watt and is further limited by the sermons the authors examined closely among those surviving records. Despite these limitations, enough of these sermons and the types of variations have been examined that preliminary conclusions can be made about the likelihood that published forms of speeches in this era are verbatim transcriptions. Historians using the *Journal of Discourses* as a source should do so with an understanding that the examples given below preclude reasonably assuming a verbatim account for any of the published sermons.

**Changes Made in the Publication Process**

The process by which a sermon came to be published in the *Journal of Discourses* involved numerous steps, only a few of which historians can make definitive statements about because of the dearth of
associated sources. George D. Watt began recording sermons in shorthand almost immediately after his arrival in Salt Lake City in September 1851. Willard Richards, editor of the Deseret News, urged Watt to record sermons of Church leaders for publication in the paper. Though Watt recorded several sermons in 1852, he received no compensation for his efforts, a situation that led to several acrimonious exchanges between Watt and Richards. In 1853, Church leaders authorized Watt to publish accounts of the sermons he had recorded as the Journal of Discourses in England as a private venture, in order to provide a living for his family.

Watt recorded the sermons in Pitman shorthand, which allowed him to record individual words and sometimes phrases quickly and thus capture the words of the speaker with significant accuracy as they were spoken. To prepare the sermon for publication, Watt had to first transcribe his shorthand record into longhand, and he edited and altered the content as he transcribed. Further editing was apparently then performed on this longhand version in preparation for publication, usually by Watt himself.

The result of this transcription and editing process is a published version of the speech that often has significant differences from the originally spoken words. In some cases, the variations are only slight, and the thoughts and expressions, and indeed many of the words, published are very close to the way that they were initially recorded. In most sermons recorded by Watt and published in the Journal of Discourses or Deseret News, however, there are significant variations. Some of these variations are in fact so different from the initial record that historians and other users should carefully re-evaluate the way they use these sources. While the topic of the sermons and some of the general points can be garnered from the published version of these speeches, the precise wording and exact examples and phrases used by the speaker cannot be relied upon with any degree of certainty.


The variations between the shorthand transcription and what was eventually published in the *Journal of Discourses* or the *Deseret News* take several forms but can be roughly categorized as omissions, summarizations, insertions, and rephrasings.

**Omissions and Summarizations.** It might be tempting to assert that Watt felt comfortable making changes to the sermon text because as he went over his notes, he remembered phrases and points that were not actually in the notes themselves. Students taking notes during a university class, for instance, often use key words and ideas to help them remember the larger point when they begin to study for the exam. Was Watt simply remembering additional portions of the speech when he examined his notes? For each of these sermons, it is not precisely known at what point Watt proceeded to create his longhand version of the sermon from his shorthand notes, information that is crucial in trying to discern whether or not at least some of the variations in the longhand could be reasonably attributed to his own recollection of the original words spoken. In the example given above, the original speech was given on August 17, 1867. The speech was not published, however, until December 25, 1867. We cannot tell when during this four-month interim Watt created the longhand transcript from his shorthand. In any case, the argument that Watt was simply trying to fill out the speech using his memory to insert things he recalled being spoken does not seem viable in light of the evidence we do have. On the contrary, in the sermons examined for this study, the majority of the changes to the original sermons take the form of excision as Watt cut out portions of the sermon. Clearly Watt was not making these changes because he remembered that those words had never been spoken when his notes reflect the contrary. Furthermore, Watt would often transcribe his shorthand in longhand correctly, then cross out the original transcription and insert text that differs from the shorthand—clearly a deliberate act showing his own editorial intervention.

While the extent of the omissions made varies from speech to speech, these deletions often can have a great impact on the way a reader understands the context of the sermon. For instance, in one 1865 sermon by

---

5. Many of the scripture references in the published sermons in the *Journal of Discourses*, for instance, are simply editorial insertions, without any specific reference to them in the shorthand whatsoever.

Brigham Young that was eventually published in the eleventh volume of the *Journal of Discourses*, the shorthand indicates that prior to beginning the sermon in earnest, Brigham Young railed against the book *Joseph Smith the Prophet*, written by Lucy Mack Smith. Young publicly reviled the text and excoriated Orson Pratt for his connection with the book, which he considered to be riddled with factual and doctrinal errors. Referring to a portion of the book that had been read to the congregation, Young had exclaimed, according to the shorthand notes:

>This article been read to congregation so very tedious that I expect they will forget all about it[.]. This is the result of false doctrine[.]. Read over pages of these books and a person will forget all they ever did know all they had desired to know with regard to the true religion that has been revealed from heaven[.]. There is quite a number of people went to sleep[.]. I don't wonder at it[.]. It is virtual darkness the light disappears the night goes on and that is the time to sleep[.]. We have said all we can say in favor of Brother Orson Pratt[.], had this transpired in the days of Joseph he would have been cut off from the church but we have held [illegible] him and still feel to hold on to him to save him forcibly and we want to be charitable as we possibly can be towards him and wherein we have said that he is a man of integrity and truth and honesty and all this[.]. Skin the fig closely and you will find we have had to use a tremendous large mantle of charity.

When Watt came to transcribe his shorthand notes into longhand, he eliminated these words from the transcript entirely. Well over two hundred words that Brigham Young had opened his remarks with, words that the assembled congregation at general conference had heard, were omitted from the longhand transcription of the speech and were therefore also not a part of the sermon that was later published in the *Journal of Discourses*. Those sentiments of Young on that occasion were, for all intents and purposes, lost to history until now.


8. Brigham Young, speech, Salt Lake City, October 9, 1865, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

While this omission may have resulted from Watt’s attempt to determine what was and was not part of the sermon he intended to record, many other such omissions are much more difficult to explain and apparently reflect Watt’s own efforts to edit the speech either for readability or for content. In this same October 9, 1865, sermon noted above, Watt’s shorthand records Young as saying:

The first item that we have to lay before the [saints] now that is on my mind is to call upon the sisters[.] You know we are all led by the women more or less should be and my discourse upon this subject is directed to the ladies of the kingdom of God upon the earth wishing them and requiring and saying to them that this is the will of God concerning you that should to go now first in the manufacture of our own barley and make your bonnets of straw or grass such as is grown in the valleys of these mountains manufacture your bonnets from material that grows here in our midst and not sell the oats the barley the wheat.10

When he rendered this passage into longhand, Watt summarized by way of omission and hence lost some of the spoken details. He wrote:

The first item that presents itself to me is, to call upon the sisters—and you know they form an important element of the kingdom of God in the last days—to listen to the will of God concerning them—that they go to now and manufacture from straw, grass or any other fitting material that grows in these valleys, their bonnets and hats, and cease to sell the barley, the oates, the wheat, etc.11

Several differences in what was spoken and what was transcribed are clearly evident, including the depth and personality reflected in Young’s originally spoken words. Watt cut some of Young’s statements out and inserted words that Young never spoke.

Some of the sermons were so heavily edited and summarized by the time they were printed in the Deseret News or the Journal of Discourses that they only scarcely resemble the words and thoughts of the speaker, and most of the details, both religious and historical, have been omitted. For example, in one Heber C. Kimball address, Watt’s shorthand notes of the sermon total nearly six thousand words. The published version of this same sermon features just over twenty-six hundred, and many of the words that are included are summarizations and inserted phrases that

10. Young, speech, October 9, 1865.
11. Historian’s Office Reports of Speeches, 1845–1885, CHL.
Kimball apparently never uttered. Notice the extent of the omitted material in a brief comparison of this sermon below:

**Transcription of Shorthand Taken at the Time of Speaking**¹²

> when a man tells a lie that is a crime
> when he steals that is a crime can you get rid of it except he repent and make restitution no can President Young forgive him no the man has got to make a restitution that satisfies the demands of justice or it stands against him in time and eternity and until he takes a course to redeem it that applies to me as well as you that is a sin for a man or a woman to violate forfeit their covenant which they made when they received their endowments you promised you would not lie would not steal that you would not bear false witness what is a false witness for a man to go and tell a lie when not a word of truth in it and then have a tendency to prejudice his neighbors against his neighbors and crush him down that is a crime who is wrong the man that is wrong and the restitution has got to be made to the man that is wronged that is what we have to do and that is according to the law of God which Jesus gave to his people and that same law is renewed unto us given to Joseph by Jesus to this people and for us to live by it

---

¹² Heber C. Kimball, speech, Salt Lake City, October 6, 1865, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

---

¹³ Heber C. Kimball, in *Journal of Discourses*, 11:144 (October 6, 1865).
Few of the same words or statements contained in Kimball’s speech on this point are represented in the published version. The tone is strikingly different. The end result of the editing is that dozens of spoken thoughts and words were lost to excision, and other words that were never spoken were inserted as though they had been.

Rephrasings. The following excerpt from an 1859 Brigham Young sermon provides another example of great variations from the spoken to the published word, although a few similar phrases and words are retained.

Transcription of Shorthand
Taken at the Time of Speaking\textsuperscript{14}

I might go on and enumerate many more instances and say they are all right many of us perhaps have been in habit of hearing lectures on the free agency of man upon the destiny of man have heard lecture after lecture and sermon upon sermon proving from holy writ that Christ has died for the world for all the sons and daughters of Adam and so far are we from believing that he will not accomplish his errand for which he came into the world that we believe that all will be saved you hear this doctrine in opposition to this you hear the doctrine declared from the pulpit publically to the world that God has foreordained a certain portion of the human family family \textit{sic} to life everlasting the residue to damnation and that infants not a span long weterling in the flames of hell that is one item of doctrine that is not

As Published in
\textit{Journal of Discourses}\textsuperscript{15}

I might enumerate many more instances, and say that they are all right so far as they go in truth. The doctrine of freewill and conditional salvation, the doctrine of free grace and unconditional salvation, the doctrine of foreordination and repروبation, and many more that I have not time to enumerate, can all be fully and satisfactorily proved by the Scriptures, and are true. On the other hand, many untrue doctrines are taught and believed, such as there being infants, not a span long, weterling in the flames of hell, there to remain throughout the countless ages of eternity, and the

\textsuperscript{14}. Brigham Young, speech, Salt Lake City, October 9, 1859, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

\textsuperscript{15}. Brigham Young, in \textit{Journal of Discourses}, 7:283 (October 9, 1859).
true you take certain portions of the Bible you can prove all this doctrine with exception of this last one that is not in any revelation God ever gave nothing like it but to the reverse you hear others exclaim that the fall of man placed all mankind in a totally depraved condition that they are deprived of every means of light intelligence grace knowledge of the power of action or will but they are totally depraved in every particle that is within them about them the spirit within them their reflections prayers their sacraments and all their devotions are [in/n?] abominations in the sight of God some of us used to get so religious would believe all this doctrine of total depravity.

**Insertions.** Watt frequently expanded upon the words originally spoken, as shown in the following examples from Brigham Young’s sermon of April 17, 1853. At some point before these sermons were printed, these words were greatly expanded upon and were published with much more detail. Entire sentences and thoughts, explanations, and key details that were not originally spoken to the congregation were added, as the comparison below demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription of Shorthand Taken at the Time of Speaking(^\text{16})</th>
<th>As Published in <em>Journal of Discourses</em>(^\text{17})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>let a person contemplate the works of God be honest with themselves be acquainted</td>
<td>If people would contemplate the stupendous works of God, and be honest and candid in their investigations, there is much to be learned that would show them how comparatively worthless are earthly things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we see the</td>
<td>We see the spangled vault of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) Brigham Young, speech, April 17, 1853, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

\(^{17}\) Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 2:122 (April 17, 1853).
starry heavens we know but little about them our astronomers give us something of idea of them they tell us great stars

what are these worlds

who lives there who governs them people there intelligent beings there light glory and power and the enjoyments that would satisfy the hearts of an angel or intelligent person upon the earth

contemplate these things and let reason good judgment be with you guide you and what will it tell you I tell state to you what it tells me

there the Lord Almighty himself reigns there is people there is intelligence there are worlds and there is eternity as old Enoch said and thy curtains stretched out still

In addition to these types of changes, scriptural references were apparently added by Watt as he created his transcription. Many scriptural citations in the versions of the speeches published in the Journal of Discourses do not appear in the original shorthand notes.
Editorial Involvement of Speakers

Changes so extensive and stark naturally lead to historical questions about the endorsement of the revised transcripts either by the General Authority who gave the sermon or by Brigham Young exercising editorial control over the final product. Young was certainly cognizant that many sermons were being published in the Deseret News and in the Journal of Discourses. Watt recorded Young's statement at the beginning of his sermon on October 9, 1865: “I commence now my few discourses I have to tell to the saints it matters not I suppose which sermon I preach first because they will all be written printed published to the saints and they can read the first one last one first to suit themselves.”18 Young was likely also aware of, and possibly even condoned, Watt's general practice of editing the sermons in order to present the speakers in a more polished, erudite light. Indeed, Watt’s efforts certainly portrayed to the public much more refined discourses, and Young may have expressly charged Watt to make such changes.

Others were also aware of the changes regularly made from the spoken to published word. Heber C. Kimball, seemingly somewhat annoyed at the extent of the revisions, noted the presence of Watt and John V. Long to record his sermon on April 4, 1864, but flatly told them, as Long recorded, “Do not stick in your own stuff put in words said.”19

An unidentified reporter in Utah at the time of the Utah War (1857–1858) asserted his belief that Brigham Young’s spoken words were heavily edited before publication. This antagonistic writer claimed that “no sermon preached by B.Y. was laid before the public as delivered. The <Mormon> reporters[,] some of whom are competent[,] can by always correcting the prophet put good instead of bad grammar into his mouth, soften his rashness, smooth his sentences[,] in short[,] rein his discourses before they were placed in the hands of the printers.” The reporter went on to claim that the knowledge of his presence in the territory had caused Brigham Young to receive a “revelation from the Lord commanding him to hold his jaw for a season” so unvarnished speeches would not be reported to the outside world. With self-satisfaction he declared that Young could not any longer “go on in his vulgar abusive treasonable talk against our people and government as he did of late”

18. Young, speech, October 9, 1865.
19. Heber C. Kimball, speech, April 6, 1864, Papers of John V. Long, CHL, transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.
because there was finally someone in Utah to “give the world truthful report of his surroundings.”

Brigham Young’s understanding that the sermons were being edited for publication does not necessarily mean that he was involved in the editorial decision making. Still, with at least some of Watt’s earliest published sermons there is evidence of an editorial review undertaken by the Church Historian’s Office and Brigham Young directly. In the May 25, 1853, entry in the Historian’s Office journal, Thomas Bullock wrote that among his other duties that day he was “reading sermons to Gov. Young.” The following day, the review process continued and Bullock spent the day “hearing more sermons read and revised.” In a reference to a very hands-on approach to the publication of the speeches, Bullock included a note that the office was “recopying such pages as would not do to go to England,” where the Journal of Discourses was being published. At least at this early stage, enough editorial control was exercised over some sermons that major revisions were apparently undertaken under Brigham Young’s supervision prior to publication.

Despite this early reference, however, we do not have ongoing and later evidence of Young’s systematic examination of every sermon before they were published. Even when Young’s review was generally intended, anecdotal evidence suggests that things were sometimes published in the Deseret News of which Young did not approve. For instance, an August 18, 1854, entry in the Historian’s Office Journal records Brigham Young’s anger at a recent publication of the serialized “History of Joseph Smith” because there were some items he had wanted cut out and others he had wanted to insert. Ostensibly, every part of the “History” was reviewed and approved before it was published, but this entry demonstrates the contrary.

Another stark example of Brigham Young and others exercising editorial control over a spoken sermon that was being readied for publication is found in the events of late 1859 and early 1860. On December 11, 1859, Orson Pratt delivered a sermon in the tabernacle that focused on the attributes of God. Pratt went so far as to argue that he worshiped

20. Undated, unidentified document located in the Papers of George D. Watt, transcribed from Pitman shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth. Crossed-out words are silently omitted. The author’s description of Governor Cumming’s first meeting with the Mormons and other events date the notes as during the Utah War.
22. Historian’s Office Journal, August 18, 1854, CHL.
the attributes God possessed, not the personage, at one point explain-
ing to the congregation, “I never considered that we were to worship a
ing that had no life intelligence for Jesus possesses flesh and bones I
don’t worship them any more than I would you or Brother Brigham
or Adam’s flesh and bones but I worship the attributes that dwell in
[them].”²³ George Watt was present for this sermon and recorded it
in shorthand notes.

A month later, as it was being prepared for publication in the Deseret
News, its contents were taken to Brigham Young for review. Young
objected to what he considered to be false doctrine and called a special
meeting which included the First Presidency, the Twelve, the Presidency
of the Seventy, and others to discuss the matter on January 27, 1860.
Young opened the meeting by announcing that “the object of the Meet-
ing was to Convers upon Doctrinal Points to see if we see alike & think
alike. I Pray that we may have the spirit of God to rest upon us that our
minds may be upon the subject & that we may speak by the Holy spirit.”
He then requested Albert Carrington to read Pratt’s December 11, 1859,
sermon that had been recently prepared for publication in the paper
but without telling the assembled group the identity of the author of
the remarks. Certainly recognizing that the cause of the meeting was
Young’s disapproval of the sermon, John Taylor spoke out against the
content of the sermon, and when Young called for a vote of those that
supported it, not one person raised his voice. Young then explained,
“This is O[ron] Pratts Sermon prepared for the Press. I do not want to
have it published if it is not right.”²⁴ While the meeting continued as the
particular points of the sermon were debated and exchanges between
Pratt and Young became quite pointed and acrimonious, the end result
was that the sermon was never printed, and the full content of it was
thus unknown prior to the retranscription of the shorthand notes by
LaJean Carruth. In this case, Young was not only reviewing but making
editorial decisions about sermons prepared for the press.

Though Pratt had doggedly refused to state he had been in error dur-
ing the meeting, he came to Young’s office the next day and of the con-
tentious exchange the night before apologetically “admitted he had been

²³. Orson Pratt, December 11, 1859, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, tran-
scribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.
Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature, 1983–84), 4:420–21 (Janu-
ary 27, 1860).
excited” and promised to confine his teaching “to the first principles of the Gospel” in the future.25 Two days later on January 29, he delivered another sermon in the tabernacle in an attempt to close the public rift that had opened up between himself and Brigham Young over their doctrinal disputes, which dated back to 1853 and Pratt’s publications in the Seer.26

The treatment of this sermon provides another example of the editorial influence at times manifested by Brigham Young but also suggests the relatively sporadic nature of it. While the shorthand notes of Pratt’s apology sermon are no longer extant, the sermon was slated for inclusion in the February 22 edition of the Deseret News, ostensibly because Brigham Young had approved the content. On February 21, however, Young examined the proof sheets that contained Pratt’s January 29 apology sermon and ordered the Deseret News office to take out Orson Pratt’s sermon on the first side of the newspaper and put in another sermon instead and “gave a reason for <so> doing.”27 The sermon had not only been typeset for publication in the February 22 issue of the Deseret News, but the second page containing much of the sermon had already been printed in large numbers. News items were made to fill the space of the hastily redacted sermon on the first page, but the second half of Pratt’s January 29 sermon remained on the second page, unattributed and only explained by a notice that read, “Through some inadvertency, part of a sermon that had not been intended for publication in this number got inserted on the second page and that side of the paper was struck off before the mistake was discovered.”28

25. Brigham Young, Office Journal, January 28, 1860, CHL.
26. Wilford Woodruff, who was in attendance as Pratt spoke, was struck by the surprise public confession of Orson Pratt, given his obstinacy two days earlier. Woodruff recorded, “Orson Pratt was in the stand and Quite unexpected to his Brethren he arose before his Brethren and made a vary humble full Confession Before the whole assembly for his oposition to President Young and his Brethren and He said he wished all the Church was present to hear it. He quoted Joseph Smiths revelation to prove that President Brigham Young was right and that all was under obligation to follow the Leader of the Church. I never herd Orson Pratt speak better or more to the satisfaction of the People than on this occasion. He would not partake of the sacrament untill he had made a Confession. Then he partook of it.” Woodruff, Journal, 4:430 (January 29, 1860).

On the Young–Pratt dispute, see, for example, Orson Pratt to Brigham Young, November 4, 1853, Brigham Young Collection, CHL.
27. Young, Office Journal, February 21, 1860, CHL.
This was not the end of the sermon or the controversy with Pratt. After further attempts to correct Pratt’s teachings in March, Young had become convinced that the apology sermon was problematic enough that a council was convened to determine what to do with what he deemed to be Pratt’s, however well-intentioned, misguided attempt at a public confession. In particular, he felt like the sermon reflected the continuing problem with Pratt’s theology; it merely acknowledged Brigham Young’s leadership and right to declare doctrine, but did not disavow the doctrine Pratt had taught that Young deemed incorrect.

In an apostolic meeting held on April 4, 1860, Young explained to Pratt that they were assembled because his “late sermon had/like to got into the paper” and that he objected because Pratt made “no [con]-fession of his errors, but [only] a confession to me. As though a confes-sion was to be made to me.” Young felt that if no public correction of such doctrines was made it would have long-lasting consequences.29 After another tension-filled meeting in which Wilford Woodruff described Orson Pratt as seeming “vary dark in his mind upon many points of Doctrin,” the decision was made to have the Quorum of the Twelve edit the sermon prior to its publication.30 The heavily redacted sermon was finally published on July 25, 1860, and was introduced with the following explanation: “On the 29th of January, in the Tabernacle, Elder Orson Pratt, sen., addressed the Saints; and, through an oversight, a portion of his remarks was printed in Vol. ix, No. 51, of the Deseret News, previous to being carefully revised. Since then those remarks have been examined by br. Pratt and the Council, and are now printed as agreed upon by them, as follows.”31

While that announcement suggested to the readers that each sermon went through a careful vetting process before publication, evidence suggests that such hands-on editorial control was very much the exception. Despite the starkness of these two examples of prophetic and apostolic editorial intervention prior to publication, both involved the ongoing difficulty between Brigham Young and Orson Pratt over the matter of correct doctrine. It is likely that such strict editorial control was not normally the rule, and certainly this collaborative editing of a spoken

---

sermon by one of the Quorum of the Twelve has no other known equivalent. In fact, the April 4 discussion with Pratt suggests that in general sermons were not so carefully vetted. Brigham Young even declared to the group, “I never look at my sermons,” apparently indicating that he did not study the published versions of his sermons either for consistency or error, and certainly not for editorial flourishes potentially added by Watt.32

Nevertheless, even if every one of the edited sermons was examined prior to publication, because the speakers generally spoke extemporaneously they would have had nothing to compare Watt’s longhand transcription of the speech to. Separated as they were by weeks and even months from a particular sermon, and having given sometimes dozens of other sermons in the interim between the time it was given and the time of publication, it would have been difficult if not impossible for any of the speakers to notice with certainty either omissions or additions in what they had originally spoken. They may have been able to change the content to what they wished they had spoken or what sounded better upon reflection, but the resulting publication would have been even further afield then from the extemporaneous discourse they had actually delivered. Most problematic, however, is that Watt’s own initial longhand transcription differs greatly at times from the shorthand notes he took, even prior to the possibility of editorial examination of a Church authority or the speaker themselves. This means that in many cases the document that was under review by the speaker or other authority already included substantial changes introduced by Watt in the transcription phase.

In any case, available evidence suggests that it was not the usual practice for the original speaker to review the longhand transcription before publication. Among the dozens and dozens of longhand transcripts, on only one are the insertions and editing marks known to be in the handwriting of the original speaker, in this unique case Orson Pratt in his well-known 1852 sermon on plural marriage.33 At least according to the currently available evidence, it seems that the substantial edits made to the longhand manuscripts prior to publication were likely not

32. Young, Office Journal, Minutes, April 4, 1860, as published in Collier, Office Journal of President Brigham Young, 423.
33. Watt's longhand transcript is found in CR 100 317 at the CHL and is available online at https://dcms.lds.org/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE2343768.
personally made by the speakers themselves and most were made by Watt as he created the transcript.

A Caution Regarding Use of Published Sermons

Even if the content of the published sermons was consistently reviewed by either Brigham Young or the original speaker prior to publication and was therefore at the very least tacitly approved because there is no record of Young’s objection, those speakers’ potential after-the-fact acceptance of the heavily edited text does not absolve the historian from the necessity of treating the published versions of the sermons with very specific and special care. The published text in the Journal of Discourses simply cannot be relied upon to represent the actual words delivered by the speaker. The edited, published versions may represent ideas similar to what the speaker intended and may occasionally represent the speaker’s own editorial changes, but they do not represent a word-for-word echo. In fact, they often would not be recognizable when compared to the originally spoken words.

The differences between originally recorded shorthand and published versions of a particular document, however, are not unique to the Journal of Discourses. Indeed, in most other instances of nineteenth-century shorthand studied and transcribed by Carruth—ranging from trial testimony in the John D. Lee trials to Quaker sermons delivered in 1850 and 1851—similar editing can be seen between the shorthand and the published versions.34

Further complicating the issue of discovering the differences in any given sermon, some sermons have the longhand transcription but no shorthand notes, thus making it impossible to determine what Watt had originally recorded at the time the speech was given. For most sermons, the published version is the only version that has survived. In fact, there are no known Watt shorthand reports of sermons delivered in 1856, 1857,

or 1861. There is an extant shorthand record from only one day in 1855. Thus, for hundreds of published sermons there is no way of knowing how the well-known, published version compares to what the speakers actually said. And, for many of the published speeches, there are no extant longhand transcriptions from Watt, only his untranscribed original shorthand notes and what was published in the Deseret News or in the Journal of Discourses. In these cases, determining in any way the process by which an altered version of the speech was published is essentially impossible. Conversely, Carruth’s recent transcriptions of previously untranscribed shorthand notes has brought to light sermons that had been lost to history.35

The Value of the Shorthand Transcriptions

Perhaps the most important and revealing aspect of the shorthand transcriptions, aside from resurrecting thousands of previously lost words spoken by prophets and apostles, is the way the shorthand notes reflect the character and personality of the speakers. Watt’s editing for concision and clarity might have made for a cleaner transcript but also obscured the personalities and humanity of the speakers. Placing more elegant words and well-rounded thoughts into the published transcript may have made the sermons more acceptable to nineteenth-century ears, but many of the beautifully crafted sentences bore little resemblance to the originally spoken words. Reading the shorthand transcripts reveals a picture of these apostolic speakers that is often far removed from the more static and one-dimensional images that are often painted as the result of the published versions of the discourses. The re-creations of these men in the modern mind based upon their apparent patterns of speech, their apparent directness, and their apparent choice of words found in the Journal of Discourses are in fact hollow representations of the words and attitudes actually reflected by the speakers. Those published sermons often reflect the content but not the emotion of the speech. They reflect the purpose of the sermon, but

35. For examples of some of these “lost sermons” that have now been transcribed and made available to read by the Church History Department, go to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Lost Sermons Introduction and Explanation: Where The Came From, What They Are,” April 23, 2013, https://history.lds.org/article/lost-sermons-editorial-method; Matthew S. McBride, “Lost Sermons,” Ensign 43 (December 2013): 54–57, available online at https://www.lds.org/ensign/2013/12/lost-sermons?lang=eng.
not the purposeful way the preacher grappled with the subject. Historians and members alike should be aware of these often important, often unknowable, differences between the originally spoken words and those that were published. Anyone referencing particular ways in which ideas were stated from sermons published in the *Journal of Discourses* should especially be mindful of the differences between the shorthand and the published text.

**Introduction to the Two Brigham Young Sermons Presented Here**

Differences between Watt’s shorthand, his longhand transcripts, and the published sermons in the *Journal of Discourses* are most evident when the different versions are placed in parallel columns, as they are here. There are very few sermons for which Watt’s shorthand and his longhand transcript are both extant. From these, we selected two sermons by Brigham Young to illustrate the differences between Watt’s shorthand, his longhand transcript, and the sermon as published in the *Journal of Discourses*. These sermons were delivered on June 13, 1852, and on October 6, 1853. Though Watt altered both sermons as he made his longhand transcription, the *Journal of Discourses* version of Young’s sermon of October 6, 1853, is closer to the shorthand than is the case of his sermon of June 13, 1852. The interlineations on the longhand transcript of these two sermons are in Watt’s handwriting. Watt’s transcript of the latter shows significant editing, at least some of which was done after the original transcript. A third draft version of this sermon, a copy made by Jonathan Grimshaw, introduced new editorial changes.

Watt altered the text of both sermons as he transcribed them; he later made additional editorial changes, most notably in the June 13, 1852, sermon. Changes in the flow of the text were apparently made at the time of longhand transcription, while changes made to the resulting longhand transcript itself, such as deletions (either crossed out, wiped out, or scraped from the page), words written over other words, and interlineations could have been made at the time of transcription or as later editorial alterations. The shorthand record contains almost no punctuation. Occasionally, the ink in the alteration differs from the ink in the original transcript, indicating that Watt made the change after he wrote the original transcription.

---

36. Jonathan Grimshaw worked in the Church Historian’s Office until 1856.
37. Occasionally, differences in ink indicate later emendations.
The reader will note some of the types of changes reflected in these sermons. For instance, Watt in these and other sermons regularly changed questions posed by Brigham Young to the congregation into statements made by the speaker, changes that alter how Brigham Young’s sermons depict the man himself. In the June 13, 1853, sermon, an important “if” is removed from Brigham Young’s conditional statement “if I am as perfect in my sphere as is God.” The resulting sentence became declarative rather than conditional. Such changes make Young appear to be more dogmatic and assertive on this point than the original shorthand notes demonstrate. Text in both sermons is at various instances omitted or greatly expanded, and the sentence structures changed from the short, direct statements of Brigham Young to much more complicated and longer sentences. Not only are sentences restructured, but at times particularly important words are changed that can greatly alter the perceived meaning. The concluding portion of Young’s October 6, 1853, sermon, for instance, includes changes in tense, the restructuring of statements from active to passive voice, and other emendations. In particular, the reader will note that Watt changes the originally spoken “heart” to “mind,” a change that could carry with it several new implications to a reader.

Gerrit Dirkmaat is an assistant professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University. He is a coeditor of volumes in the Documents and Administrative series of The Joseph Smith Papers, which includes the forthcoming Council of Fifty records. He received his PhD in American history from the University of Colorado, Boulder, in 2010, where he studied nineteenth-century American expansionism and foreign relations. His dissertation was titled “Enemies Foreign and Domestic: US Relations with Mormons in the US Empire in North America, 1844–1854.” He is the co-author, along with Michael Hubbard MacKay, of From Darkness Unto Light: Joseph Smith’s Translation and Publication of the Book of Mormon. He served as the senior assistant editor of Diplomatic History from 2003 to 2009.

LaJean Purcell Carruth is a historian/writer at the LDS Church History Library, Salt Lake City, with over forty years’ experience transcribing documents written in Pitman shorthand, Taylor shorthand, the Deseret alphabet, and Pernin shorthand.
Speech by Brigham Young, June 13, 1852, in four parallel columns

George D. Watt’s Shorthand

[Sketched profile of Ira Ames]

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

A Discourse or Testemoney
By Pres’Young
delivered in the Tabernacle in G S. L City

Tabernacle
Sunday morning

The meeting was crowded to excess almost. President Young
There is yet time
to be improved this
morning
I arise to say a few
words [to the] congregation feeling thankful for this as well as all other
privileges I enjoy from day to day
we have had the privilege
of hearing declared to us
the truth of this work and
the testimony of one [of the] servants [of the] Lord that has had an experience
now of 20 years there are [-?-] many others [-?-] who have a
lengthy experience
not a mere six months trial but
an experience that tells
them
upon natural principles
that there is a God in this work
there is a Supernatural Power attending
the rise and the progress of the gospel of

June 13th 1852. after <Elder> Ira Ames had addressed the congregation.
Reported by G D Watt
There is not much <a little more> time that <which> remains to be improved this
morning. <In which> I arise however to say <will offer A> A few
words to the Congregation; feeling thankful for this as well as <and> for all other
privileges that I enjoy from day to day.
We have had the privilege <pleasure, this morning> of hearing declared to us
the truth of this the work <of the last days declared>; and <with> the testemoney of one of the servants of the Lord that <who> has had an experience <of 20 years> in this Church of 20 years.49
There are many others who <also> have a lengthy experience, and some <have> not had more than 6 month’s trial; but <in that short time> they have <obtained> an experience <which> has informed <given> them <sufficient information> upon natural principles <to satisfy them> that there is A God in this work,—that A supreme power has attended the rise and progress of the Gospel of salvation, or what
Grimshaw’s Longhand Transcript

Discourse by President Brigham Young, delivered in the Tabernacle, G. S. L. City,

June 13th 1852

Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

A Discourse Delivered by President Brigham Young, in the Tabernacle, Great Salt Lake City,

June 13th, 1852.

As there is more time which remains to be improved this morning, I will offer a few words to the congregation, feeling thankful for this and for all other privileges that I enjoy from day to day.

We have had the pleasure this morning of hearing the truth of the work of the last days declared, with the testimony of one of the servants of the Lord (Ira Ames) who has had an experience of twenty years in this church. There are many others who also have had a lengthy experience, and some who have not had more than six months trial, but who have, in that short time, obtained an experience which has given them sufficient information to satisfy them that there is a God in this work—that a supreme power has attended the gospel of salvation, or what
salvation what is called Mormonism
to every person both saint and sinner there is not an individual that has heard the sound of this work and reports of that book the Book of Mormon not an individual that has ever heard the report of it but what the Spirit of Lord attended that report to them no person no matter who they are what character has been they had not knowledge enough previous to the coming forth of the priesthood calculated to save the children of men in celestial kingdom they had not knowledge enough never had attained enough of God and godliness to pass the ordeal where the spirits could not operate upon their feelings any longer or in other words to sin against the Holy Ghost consequently the righteous the wicked the good the evil the upright and froward no matter what class characters every person that has ever heard the sound Book [of] Mormon Joseph Smith and latter day work the spirit of Almighty has convicted that individual it is true and I know it the kings upon their thrones the princes of earth the lords of the land beggar upon the dung hill has felt the power of God witness to their hearts at times that the Book Mormon true Joseph a prophet the Lord has set about his hand again
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salvation what is called Mormonism

to every person both saint and sinner there is not an individual that has heard the sound of this work and reports of that book the Book of Mormon not an individual that has ever heard the report of it but what the Spirit of Lord attended that report to them no person no matter who they are what character has been
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is called Mormonism, from the beginning to today from its the rise of the Church to this day. I say to every person all, both saint and sinner, that there is not an individual who has ever heard the sound of this work, and the reports report of that Book, (the book of Mormon,) but what the spirit of the Lord attended accompanied that report to them in power to them.> There is no person, no matter who, as to his character or what kind of A carracter, he has been, if he has heard the truth, and, has not been made to does not knowlege that there is enough of proof to substantiate the coming forth of the Holy Priesthood, which is calculated to save the children of men in the Celestial kingdom, he must have passed the ordeal, where the spirits could not operate upon his feelings, or in other words have sinned against the Holy Gohest. Consequently the religious, and the irreligious, the good and the evil, it makes no matter what class of carracters you refer to, every person who has ever heard the sound of the Book of Mormon, and of Joseph Smith, and of the Latterday work, the spirit of the Almighty has convicted that individual of its truth, and I know it. The kings upon their thrones, the princes of the earth, the Lords of the land, with the beggar upon the dung hill has have all felt the power of God at times witnessing to their hearts, at times, that the Book of Mormon is true, [And?] Joseph Smith A prophet, and that the Lord has set to his hand the second time
Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

is called “Mormonism,”
from its rise
to this day.
I say to all, both Saint and
sinner, that there is not an individual who
has heard the sound
of this work, and
the reports of that book (<laying his hand
on> the Book of Mormon)
but the Spirit of the Lord
accompanied that report with power to
them. There is no person,
no matter as to his character,
if he has heard the truth, has has not been
made to acknowledge that
there is enough of proof to substantiate
the coming forth of the Holy Priesthood,
which is calculated to save the children of
men in the Celestial Kingdom,
he must have

passed the ordeal where the Spirit could not
operate upon his feelings,
or in other words have sinned against
the Holy Ghost: consequently the
religious and the irreligious, the
good and the evil—
no matter what class of character you
refer to—every person who has ever heard
the sound of the Book of Mormon, of
Joseph Smith, and of the Latter day work,
the Spirit of the Almighty has convicted
that individual of its truth, and I know it.
The Kings upon their thrones, the princes
of the earth, the lords of the land, with the
beggars upon the dung hill, have all felt the
power of God at times, witnessing
to their hearts that the Book
of Mormon is true, Joseph Smith
a prophet, and that the Lord has set to
his hand the second time
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is called Mormonism,
from its rise
to this day.
I say to all, both Saint and
sinner, that there is not an individual who
has heard the sound
of this work, and
the reports of that book (<laying his hand
on> the Book of Mormon)
but the Spirit of the Lord
accompanied that report with power to
them. There is no person,
no matter as to his character,
if he has heard the truth, has not been
made to acknowledge that
there is enough of proof to substantiate
the coming forth of the Holy Priesthood,
which is calculated to save the children of
men in the Celestial Kingdom,
he must have

passed the ordeal where the Spirit could not
operate upon his feelings,
or in other words have sinned against
the Holy Ghost: consequently the
religious and the irreligious, the
good and the evil—
no matter what class of character you
refer to—every person who has ever heard
the sound of the Book of Mormon, of
Joseph Smith, and of the Latter day work,
the Spirit of the Almighty has convicted
that individual of its truth, and I know it.
The Kings upon their thrones, the princes
of the earth, the lords of the land, with the
beggars upon the dung hill, have all felt the
power of God at times, witnessing
to their hearts that the Book
of Mormon is true, Joseph Smith
a prophet, and that the Lord has set to
his hand the second time
to redeem Israel let the world fight no matter
Brother Ames says that Mormonism will progress if doesn’t God will be dethroned when [he/they?] [the day/they do?] [things?] will be done

when they have power to blow out the sun that it shines no more when they have power to bring in conclusion the elements of whole planetary system and mash up the whole season

they may then stop Mormonism perhaps

not before they will have to make a foot stool of throne of Almighty before check Mormonism one particle they may persecute the people publish and report lies in order to bring persecution upon head of those believe doctrine

but it stands as firm unconcerned as the pillars of heavens the doctrine of Mormonism never was opposed driven out [what by?] they may persecute the prophet and those believe in him they may drive the saints kill them men women and children

but it will stand while the elements melt with fervent heat heavens wrapped up [as] a scroll and while the earth is dissolved

Bro. Ames says <has said> that “Mormonism” will progress.” If it does not God will be dethroned, for when he undertakes to do anything it will be done <in spite of every opposing influence>. When the wicked have power to blow out the sun that it shines no more, when they have power to bring to a conclusion the operations of the elements, and suspend the whole system of Nature, <and make A footstool of the thrown of the Allmighty> they may then think to stop Mormonism <in its course>, and thwart the <unalterable> purposes of heaven. <but> not before. They will have to make a footstool of the throne of the Allmighty before they check Mormonism in its onward course one particle:

They may persecute the people <who believe its doctrine,>; report and publish lies in order to bring tribulation <and distress> upon their heads of those who believe the doctrine; <earth and hell may unite in one grand league against, it, and exert their power> <malicious> power to the utmost > but it will stand as fierce, and as unmoved <in the midst of it all> as the pillars of heaven <eternity>.

They may persecute the prophet, and those who believe in, and uphold him; they may drive the saints, and kill them, men women and children; but this <that> does not affect <the truths of> Mormonism <on iota>; for it <they> will stand when the Elements melt with fervent heat, and <when> the heavens are <were> raped up like a scroll, and the Solid earth <is> dissolved.
Bro. Ames has said that “Mormonism will progress”. If it does not, God will be dethroned; for when He undertakes to do anything it will be done, notwithstanding every opposing influence. When the wicked have power to blow out the sun, that it shines no more — when they have power to bring to a conclusion the operations of the elements, suspend the whole system of nature, and make a footstool of the throne of the Almighty; they may then think to check Mormonism in its course, and thwart the unalterable purposes of heaven.

They may persecute the people who believe its doctrines, report and publish lies to bring tribulation upon their heads:

earth and hell may unite in one grand league against it and exert their malicious power to the utmost; but it will stand as firm and immovable in the midst of it all as the pillars of eternity.

They may persecute the prophet and those who believe and uphold him — they may drive the saints and kill them;

but they do not affect the truths of Mormonism one iota; for they will stand, when the elements melt with fervent heat, and the heavens are wrapt up like a scroll, and the solid earth is dissolved.
It stands upon the everlasting basis of omnipotence. Jehovah is their Mormonism, their priesthood, their power; and all that adhere to it in the day appointed will come up and enjoy it and any will have it.

While I was speaking the other day to the people I arose and observed that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither riches to men of wisdom. As I traced around I saw Ira Ames sitting congregation in this direction. I know he had been in the Church a considerable length of time. I have known him personally acquainted with him 20 years. My eye caught many others at the same time.

These men know that Mormonism is true. They have moved steadily forward, and have not committed some outrageous crime to become a noted character as many have, but unseen, as it were, they have steadily maintained their footing kept in the right path. There are those who are afraid that they will not become public enough, so they will do some outrageous act to bring their names before the public; to be talked of. They are so afraid they will not be talked about; they will commit some sin to make them noted.

I can point out a many of saints in this Congregation, that will win the race, though they are not very swift.
Grimshaw’s Longhand Transcript

Mormonism stands upon the eternal basis of omnipotence: Jehovah is the Mormonism of this people—their priesthood and their power; and all who adhere to it, will in the appointed day come up into the presence of the King Eternal, and receive a crown of life.

While speaking the other day to the people, I observed that “the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong”, neither righteousness <riches> to men of wisdom.

I happened to cast my eyes upon Ira Ames who was sitting in the congregation; I knew he had been in the church a considerable length of time; I have been personally acquainted with him for twenty years. Mine eye also caught many more of the first saints at the same time.

These men know that Mormonism is true: they have moved steadily forward, and have not committed

sought to become noted characters, as many have; but unseen, as it were; they have maintained their footing steadily in the right path.

Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

“Mormonism” stands upon the eternal basis of omnipotence. Jehovah is the “Mormonism” of this people, their Priesthood and their power; and all who adhere to it, will, in the appointed day, come up into the presence of the King Eternal, and receive a crown of life.

While speaking the other day to the people, I observed that “the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong,” neither riches to men of wisdom.

I happened to cast my eyes upon Ira Ames, who was sitting in the congregation, I knew he had been in the Church a considerable length of time, I have been personally acquainted with him for twenty years. My eye also caught many more of the first Saints at the same time.

These men know that “Mormonism” is true, they have moved steadily forward, and have not

sought to become noted characters, as many have; but, unseen as it were, they have maintained their footing steadily in the right path.

I could place my hand upon many in the congregation who will win the race, though they are not very swift

I could place my hand upon many in this congregation, who will win the race, though they are not very swift,
Watt's Shorthand

not very valiant [page break] to outward appearance look at them talk with them walk in streets come in at meeting attend to their own business
they appear not great warriors
will win the battle in the end possess the riches of eternity
what is their character they have faith today they are filled with faith
their voice is not heard but full of faith
you find them tomorrow as they were yesterday or to day you go to them
today you find them as were yesterday
you go to them
tomorrow they are the same you cross their path pick them up a year from now same as now and
finally when you have spent your life with them you will find they are alive alive
like a fine spun thread full of faith hope and charity good works
as far as have the ability and their life is filled up doing good on earth

hence win the race conquer in the battle and possess the riches of eternity. I would like to inquire of congregation if they have recollected the text that has been presented to the people it is the text for the season and every man gets up here and preaches and had he prepared himself every man and women that gets [and?] [hear/here?] and speaks by [from?] the Spirit of Lord will speak from the same text it is impossible to ever get out of pales of text if

Watt's Longhand Transcript

to outward apearance; <or make any great pretensions> but you will find them all the time <they are found continually> attending to their own bussiness. They do not appear great warriors [page] 3 or as if they were likely to win the battle; but what is their true carracter? They have faith to day; they are filled with faith; they are not heard <their words are few,> to say much, but they are filled full of integrety. You find them tomorrow as they were yesterday or to day; You go to them <and> to day, and you will find them <as> unchanged as they were yesterday; visite them when you will <under any <whatever> sercumstances>, and you find them <unalterably> the same; and finally when you have spent your life with them, you will find that there <their> live<fe> throughout has been well spent, has been full of faith <and> hope And charity and good works <as far as they have had the ability>, as far as they have had the ability. there life has been filled in up in doing good on the earth. These are the ones who will win the race; these are the ones who will conquer in <the> Battle, and obtain the peace and righteousness of eternity. I would like to inquire of <if> the con- gregation if they have recollected the text that has been presented to the people, it is the text for the season? and <Let And let> every man who preaches it, should act according to it himself. Every man and woman <If those> who rises here to speak, and speaks <do so> by the spirit of the Lord, <they> will speak according to the same text, for it is impos- sible to ever <to> depart from it <if> they
Grimshaw’s Longhand Transcript

visit them when you will, or under whatever circumstances, and you find them unalterably the same: and

finally, when you have spent your life with them, you will find that their lives throughout have been well spent, full of faith, hope, charity, and good works,
as far as they have had the ability.

These are the ones who will win the race, conquer in the battle, and obtain the peace and righteousness of eternity.
I would inquire if the congregation recollect the text for the season?
Let every man who preaches it, act according to it himself.
If those who speak do so
by the spirit of the Lord, they will speak according to the text; for it is impossible ever to depart from it if they

Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

to outward appearance, and they make not great pretensions;
they are found continually attending to their own business.
They do not appear to be great warriors, or as if they were likely to win the battle.
But what is their true character? They have faith today, they are filled with faith, their words are few, but they are filled full of integrity.
You will find them to-morrow as they were yesterday, or are today.

Visit them when you will, or under whatever circumstances, and you find them unalterably the same; and

finally when you have spent your life with them, you will find that their lives throughout have been well spent, full of faith, hope, charity, and good works,
as far as they have had the ability.

These are the ones who will win the race, conquer in the battle, and obtain the peace and righteousness of eternity.
I would inquire if the congregation recollect the text for the season.
Let every man who preaches it act according to it himself.
If those who speak do so
by the Spirit of the Lord, they will speak according to the text, for it is impossible ever to depart from it if they
remain in truth; it is impossible they will always be within the purview of being a son or daughter of Almighty the whole [verse?] and if they live to it to their own preaching their whole lives will point directly at the one object to be sealed up to be wrapped up and to be filled and surrounded to be over whelmed with the power and knowledge of God that will make them one ready to meet the Savior do unto others and keep the law of Father and Son and all the laws of celestial kingdoms [sic] has been or ever will be revealed it is not is it not satisfaction brethren to hear men testify that the gospel is true is not a satisfaction to hear men get up and tell their experience it is it is one of the best sermons ever preached to me it is the most lively conversation that can be presented to congregation to hear men women relate to each other how the Lord has wrought upon their understandings and brought them unto path of truth life salvation I will say that I had rather hear men get up here and tell their experience and testify Joseph prophet
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remain in truth it is impossible they will always be within the purview of being a son or daughter of Almighty the whole [verse?] and if they live to it to their own preaching their whole lives will point directly at the one object to be sealed up to be wrapped up and to be filled and surrounded to be over whelmed with the power and knowledge of God that will make them one ready to meet the Savior do unto others

Watt’s Longhand Transcript remain in truth; and they will always be within the purview of being a son or daughter of Almighty the whole [verse?] and if they live to it to their own preaching their whole lives will point directly at the one object to be sealed up to be wrapped up and to be filled and surrounded to be over whelmed with the power and knowledge of God that will make them one ready to meet the Savior do unto others

is it not satisfaction brethren to hear men testify that the gospel is true? it is not A satisfaction to hear men get up and tell their experience it is; one of the best sermons ever preached to me it is; the most lively conversation that can be presented to A Congregation to hear men and women relate to each other how the Lord has wrought upon their understandings and brought them into the path of truth, life, and salvation, I will say that I had rather hear men get up here and tell their experience and testify Joseph prophet

is it not satisfaction brethren to hear men testify that the gospel is true? is it not interesting to hear men get up and tell their experience? it is; one of the best sermons ever preached to me, it is; to hear men and women relate to each other how the Lord has wrought upon their understandings and brought them into the path of truth, life, and salvation, I will say that I had rather hear men get up here and tell their experience, and testify that Joseph was a prophet of the Lord, that the
If they live to it, their whole lives will aim directly to the one grand object, namely: to be encircled, wrapt up, and surrounded with the Knowledge of God: that will make them one (according to the text) prepare them to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them—to keep the whole law of the Father and the Son, and all the laws of the celestial Kingdom which have, or ever will be revealed, and to meet the Saviour at his coming. It yields solid satisfaction to hear men testify of the truth of the Gospel: it is always peculiarly interesting to me to hear the saints tell their experiences; it is to me one of the best of sermons, to hear men and women relate to each other how the Lord has wrought upon their understanding, and brought them into the path of truth, life, and salvation.

I would rather hear men tell their experience, and testify that Joseph is a prophet of the Lord, and that the
Watt's Shorthand

Book of Mormon true this Bible
true it is the words of Lord and of good
men included with other matters contained
in history book
hear them testify that they know by
the power of God by the Holy
Ghost they have conversed with
angels have had
the Holy Ghost pour upon them and
perhaps the administration of angels and
visions and revelations
and testify to me and anybody else
that they know these things and testify by
the power of Holy Ghost

best preaching ever preached to me ever
saluted my ears tell you why
if I had the language of angels
and the eloquence of angel say nothing
about [--?] say nothing about if I had the
eloquence of angel I never could

convince any man women that
God is true
by my eloquence that is independent
of it being clothed by the
power of Holy Ghost
it
is useless to the people
what convinces it is the
influence of Almighty enlightening
the mind give instruction to the
understanding of the inner man not the
outer man sensibility that
every person is endowed with by the power
of Father that has created that

when that
is enlightened is that came from the
regions of glory by
the same influence
power and spirit that inhabits that part
swallows up the organization

Watt's Longhand Transcript

Book of Mormon is true, that the Bible
<and other revelations of God> is are true

and I would rather
hear them testify, that they know it by
the <gift and> power of God, by the Holy
Ghost, that they have conversed with
angels, have [page] 4 have had the power
of the holy Ghost upon <them>, and
perhaps the administration of Angels,
<giving them> visions and revelations,
testifying
that they know these things by the <that>
 holy Ghost <power>, <than hear any other
kind of preaching;> I say <for> it is the
best preaching that ever
saluted my ears. I would tell you why, if
<If> I could command the language,
and eloquence of the Angels of God
<I would tell you why>, but if I had
the eloquence of an Angels I never could
<can>

convince any man <person> or woman that
God is true, that he lives, <and makes truth
the habitation of his thrown> independant
of its being clothed by the <with>
power of the holy Ghost, <the absence of
this> it would be <a mass> <a combina-
tion> <of> useless sounds. to the people.
What is it that convinces men? it is the
influence of the Allmighty, enlighten-
ing their mind, giving instruction to the
understanding of the inner man, not the
outer man, touching the sensibility that
every person is endowed with by the power
of the Father who has created it <that
brings conviction to the mind>;
when that <which inhabits> is enlightened
<this body, that> which came from the
regions of Gal<ory is enlightened> by
the same <its kindered> of influence,
power, and spirit, is enlightened, that part
<it> swallows up the organisation which
Grimshaw’s Longhand Transcript

Book of Mormon, the Bible, and other revelations of God are true—

that they know it by the gift and power of God—

that they have conversed with Angels, have had the power of the Holy Ghost upon them,

giving them visions and revelations—

than hear any other kind of preaching that ever saluted my ears.

If I could command the language and eloquence of the Angels of God I would tell you why; but the eloquence [pages 4 to 7 of the manuscript are not extant]

Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

Book of Mormon, the Bible, and other revelations of God are true;

that they know it by the gift and power of God;

that they have conversed with angels, have had the power of the Holy Ghost upon them,

giving them visions and revelations,

than hear any other kind of preaching that ever saluted my ears.

If I could command the language and eloquence of the angels of God, I would tell you why, but the eloquence of angels never can convince any person that God lives, and makes truth the habitation of his throne, independent of that eloquence being clothed with the power of the Holy Ghost; in the absence of this, it would be a combination of useless sounds.

What is it that convinces man? It is the influence of the Almighty, enlightening his mind, giving instruction to the understanding.

When that which inhabits this body, that which came from the regions of glory, is enlightened by the influence, power, and Spirit of the Father of light, it swallows up the organization which
pertaining to this world
they lose sight of all things here
they are convinced by the power of eternity they lose sight of time
all the knowledge wisdom strength and all
pertaining to this organization independent of that that came here is obliterated to them and they hear and understand by the same power and spirit that clothed the Deity and angels

nothing besides that can convince any man and woman the gospel of salvation this is the reason why I like to hear men testify for
it is delightful and instructive when

congregation is endowed by power of Holy Ghost filled with light of eternity let the subject be laid before them with all the candor with all the calculation and all the custom fashions and manners of eloquence of the world they can understand it divide it place it where it should be placed dispose of it as should be they understand the worth and magnificence of it and it is interesting but the [subjects?] not clothed upon
Grimshaw’s Longhand Transcript

Journal of Discourses 1:88–94

pertains to this world. Those who are governed by this influence lose sight of all things pertaining to mortality, they are wholly influenced by the power of eternity, and lose sight of time. All the honor, wisdom, strength, and whatsoever is considered desirable among men, yea, all that pertains to this organization, which is in any way independent of that which came from the Father of our spirits, is obliterated to them, and they hear and understand by the same power and spirit that clothe the Deity, and the holy beings in His presence.

Anything besides that influence, will fail to convince any person of the truth of the Gospel of salvation. This is the reason why I love to hear men testify to the various operations of the Holy Spirit upon them—it is at once interesting and instructive. When a subject is treated upon with all the calculation, method, tact, and cunning of men, with the effusions of worldly eloquence, before a congregation endowed with the power of the Holy Ghost, and filled with the light of eternity,

they can understand the subject, trace its bearings, place all its parts where they belong, and dispose of it according to the unalterable laws of truth.

This makes all subjects interesting and instructive to them. But the case is quite different with those whose minds
by [page break] the power
of God sermonizing and dividing and
superstructure
laid before
the congregation
will
never do them good with all the elo-
quence of world
this you knew before and you know this
is my feelings
this my manner of life
is to know things
by the power of the Holy Ghost
if the world and the wisdom there of
had been combined in one in one individual
all the talent and tact of human wisdom
had have been
combined in one and that individual
had have come to me with the Book of
Mormon and said

true and undertaken to
prove it by his learning eloquence worldly
wisdom all that would have been
like the smoke from the fire rising
vanishes again it is no more
but when I could see one man
an individual no eloquence
no talent for public speaking
could just get up and say I know by
power of Holy Ghost and that voice and
caracter should speak a vocal prayer filled
with the power of Holy Ghost and spirit of
revelation declare that
book is true Joseph
is prophet
and I know it and
the Holy Ghost breathing
through that individual illuminates my
whole system light glory power
immortality before me wrapped
in it filled with it

are opened, and instructed by the power
of God. Sermonising, and dividing, and subdividing
subjects, and building up a fine superstructure, a fanciful and
aerial building, to lay before <to fascinate>
A Congregation <coupled with all the
<choicest> eloquence of the world> will
never do them <not produce> any good
<to mortals>.

This you knew before, you know these are
my <The> sentiments <of my mind, and
the>, this is my manner of <my> life (viz)
<is> to know <obtain knowledge> things
by the power of the holy Ghost.
# If all the world, or the <wisdom thereof>
had been combined in one,
if all the talent and tact, and wisdom
<and refinement> of the world had been
combined in one individual, and that person had been sent to me with the Book of
Mormon, and <had> declared in the most
exalted <of earthly> eloquence that it
<the> truth of it; had undertake<i>n<g> to
prove it by his learning and worldly
wisdom; it would have been to me
like the smoke from the fire <which> arising
only to vanish away.
But when I saw A man,
<without eloquence>, with
<or> talents for public speaking who
could only just get up, and say “I know by
the power of the Holy Ghost,
by
the spirit of
revelation that that the
<Book of> B Mormon is true, that Joseph
Smith is A prophet of the Lord, and <I know
it, and
the holy Ghost breathing <proceeding> from that individual illuminates my System
<understanding and>, Light Glory and
immortality is before me, I am wrapped
<encircled by> in it, I am filled with it, and
are not opened and instructed by the power of God. Sermonizing, dividing, and subdividing subjects, and building up a fine superstructure, a fanciful and aerial building, calculated to fascinate the mind, coupled with the choicest eloquence of the world, will produce no good to them.

The sentiments of my mind, and the manner of my life, are to obtain knowledge by the power of the Holy Ghost. If all the talent, tact, wisdom, and refinement of the world had been sent to me with the Book of Mormon, and had declared, in the most exalted of earthly eloquence, the truth of it, undertaking to prove it by learning and worldly wisdom, they would have been to me like the smoke which arises only to vanish away. But when I saw a man without eloquence, or talents for public speaking, who could only say, “I know, by the power of the Holy Ghost, that the Book of Mormon is true, that Joseph Smith is a Prophet of the Lord,” the Holy Ghost proceeding from that individual illuminated my understanding, and light, glory, and immortality were before me. I was encircled by them, filled with them, and
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I [knew/know?] it myself

but the wisdom of the world I say was
like the smoke like the fog

like the dew

my own judgment my own discretion
the endowments

Almighty endowed
me with
was enough to obliterate like the rising sun
gone no more
there sits the man baptized me
Book of Mormon
Brother Miller
and others it filled my
system with light my soul with joy
what is the world
wisdom of the world what is the
power
of
all the sons of
man upon the earth what is the glory
of kings of earth of all the
potentates of all the gaudy
show ever was [take?] the secret prayer
in glory and beauty no

Jesus says
see the lilies of field
behold the splendor and
beauty
show me the man who
clothed thus can you bring forth the
individual clothed thus no
says he look upon the lilies of fields see
their beauty
Solomon the greatest and wisest
a man swayed his scepter

Watt's Longhand Transcript

I know <for myself> that the testimonie<y> of the man is true <for myself>.
But the wisdom of the world I say is
like Smoke, like the fogg <of <the> nigts> that dissapears before the rays of the
Luminary of day, or like the dew upon the
grass <ore frost in the warmth of the suns ray>.
My own judgment,
<natural endowments, and> my own edu-
cation, the endowments of my own mind:
with which the allmighty has endowed me with,
bowed to this humble <but mighty> testemoney.
There sits the Man who Baptised me, and
who first presented the Book of mormon to
my notice, Bro Miller.54
and <There were also> others. It filled my
System with light, <and> my soul with joy.
# What is the<world> what is the <with all its> wisdom of the world? What is the
<and> power <with all the glory and
gilded show of the <its> kings and
potentates of the world of all the sons of
men upon the earth? What is all the glory
of <the> Kings of the world, of all the
potentates of earth, <and> of all the Gaudy
show they manifest? <sinks into perfect
insignificans compared with the simple
unadorned testemoney of an A
servant of God.>
Jesus says <said>
“See <consider> the lilies of the feild,”
etc. behold the splender, and <simple>
beauty who with which they are <of their>
clothed <ing>, and show me the man who
is clothed [page] 6 like one of these.
You cannot do it;
says he look upon the Lilies of the feild, see
their beauty;
<Even> Soloman, the greatest, and wisist
of earthly kings, A man who swade his
I knew for myself that the testimony of the man was true. But the wisdom of the world, I say again, is like smoke, like the fog of the night, that disappears before the rays of the luminary of day, or like the hoar-frost in the warmth of the sun's rays. My own judgment, natural endowments, and education bowed to this simple, but mighty testimony. There sits the man who baptized me, (brother Eleazer Miller.) It filled my system with light, and my soul with joy. The world, with all its wisdom and power, and with all the glory and gilded show of its kings or potentates, sinks into perfect insignificance, compared with the simple, unadorned testimony of the servant of God. Jesus said, “Consider the lilies of the field,” behold the splendid, yet simple beauty of their clothing; even Solomon, the greatest, and wisest of earthly kings, who swayed his scepter.
and nation [had?]\textsuperscript{41} gain over
nations of earth at his command but
Solomon in all his glory not
compared with these lilies
you snap off
with your fingers
look at a little while
and toss it away

what is [all/but?] that [every/ever/very?]
dt/dd? who can shine upon the earth
that is made to decay

vanish disappear again
and is no more
like the shadow of
Mormon\textsuperscript{42}

when the power of Holy Ghost shines upon
a man the whole
world before brought before
them in truth and light
just as it is the glory of man
compared to
the flower of grass cut down
withered it is gone but
when the Almighty sheds forth his spirit
upon an individual upon a congregation when
the mind is opened the whole vision of
mind opened
by the power [of the] Holy Ghost that they
can discern between the things
pertaining to this organization to those
pertains to the organization and to other
bodies are brought forth

all things made new
the heavens
and earth to
endure in presence of Almighty

scepter, so as to be admired, and feared by
<all> the nations of the earth, and yet
Solomon <he> in all his glory could not
compare with one of these lilies, which
you can <snap off> <sever> from its native
stem with the least effort of your fingers,
look at it A little while <admire for
A moment>, and then toss it away <from
you.> <as you would A thing of no value>.

What is\textsuperscript{55} All that
is considered valuable, precious, or glori-
ous, or magnificent among men,? <cannot
even compare in excellence <with that> lili
which you tread under your feet in beauty
and excellence.> It <all>
vanishes, away,
and is no more <it <is> fleeting>
like <as> the shadow <twilight of the
morning>, or the <a and as> faceless fabric
of <as> A dream.

When the power of the H. G. shines upon
<illuminates> the mind of man, the whole
world is brought before <appears to him>
them <him> in its true character. it appears
to them just as it is. The Glory of man
is <fitly> compared <in the scriptures> to
the flower of the grass, when it is cut down,
it <which> withers, and is gone forever; but
when the Allmghty sheds forth his spirit
upon an individual, or upon A congregation,
<people>, when the vision of the their
minds is <are is> opened

by the power of the H. G. they
can <so as to> discern between the things
pertaining to this organisation, and those
pertaining to the organisation of other
bodies, <which> are brought forth <in
other spheres>.\textsuperscript{56}

All All things are made new to them, for all
things, the that <are in the> heavens, and
<on> the earth
endure in the presence of the Allmghty,
so as to be admired and feared by all nations—
he, in all his glory could not
compare with one of these lilies, which
you can sever from its native
stem, with the least effort,
admire for
a moment, and then toss it from you.

All that
is considered valuable, precious, glorious,
or magnificent among men, cannot
even compare with that lily,
which you tread under your feet, for beauty
and excellence.

The glory of man is fleeting as the twilight,
and like the “baseless fabric”
of a dream, it vanishes away.

It
is fitly compared in the Scriptures to the
flower of the grass when it is cut down,
which withers and is gone forever, but
when the Almighty sheds forth His Spirit
upon an individual, or upon a
people, the vision of their
mind is opened,

so as to discern between the things
pertaining to this organization, and those
pertaining to organizations
which are brought forth in
other spheres,
all things are made new to them, for all
things in the heavens and
on the earth
are in the power of the Almighty,
then it appears through to creatures in true light not until then

while Brother Ames was speaking upon his experiences previous to believing and embracing the faith of gospel a few words of conversation passing between him and Brother George Curtis I felt like asking this question if they knew what means spoke as he did what makes a man or woman speak in candid reflected moment as soon as the spirit of Lord touches their understanding why did I speak to my brother in law as I did does the experience of this congregation tell them and you are the oracle for the spirit and the intelligence that comes from another state of existence those that are not visible to the natural eye this is influence that produces the effect that does not show the cause and makes the world believe in miracles

you know what I think speak about miracles no such things only the to [sic] ignorant those spirits invisible to natural understanding are all the time not only in us in [--?] but in elements in heavens above earth

Anne A. Whitney
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then it appears through to creatures in true light not until then

while Brother Ames was speaking upon his experiences previous to believing and embracing the faith of gospel a few words of conversation passing between him and Brother George Curtis I felt like asking this question if they knew what means spoke as he did what makes a man or woman speak in candid reflected moment as soon as the spirit of Lord touches their understanding why did I speak to my brother in law as I did does the experience of this congregation tell them and you are the oracle for the spirit and the intelligence that comes from another state of existence those that are not visible to the natural eye this is influence that produces the effect that does not show the cause and makes the world believe in miracles

you know what I think speak about miracles no such things only the to [sic] ignorant those spirits invisible to natural understanding are all the time not only in us in [--?] but in elements in heavens above earth

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

then it appears through to creatures in true light not until then

while Brother Ames was speaking upon his experiences previous to believing and embracing the faith of gospel a few words of conversation passing between him and Brother George Curtis I felt like asking this question if they knew what means spoke as he did what makes a man or woman speak in candid reflected moment as soon as the spirit of Lord touches their understanding why did I speak to my brother in law as I did does the experience of this congregation tell them and you are the oracle for the spirit and the intelligence that comes from another state of existence those that are not visible to the natural eye this is influence that produces the effect that does not show the cause and makes the world believe in miracles

you know what I think speak about miracles no such things only the to [sic] ignorant those spirits invisible to natural understanding are all the time not only in us in [--?] but in elements in heavens above earth

Does the experience of thees <most of the> Congregation <can> answer this question? You are the orical for <of> the spirit; and <the repository of the> intelligence that comes from above <another> state of existance that is invisible to the natural eye; <of the> this influence that produces an effect that does not show <without revealing> the Cause, and makes the world believe in miracles. <creates produces, aparantly, miracles before in the world.>

You know what is <are already aquainted with> my faith <veiws upon the docterine of miricles> about <upon> miricles. it is <are> that there are no <In reality there can> [page] 7 things <be no miricals> only to the ignorant. These <invisible spirits<ual> <agents,> that are invisible to the natural understand Ing, are all the time; <continually> not only in us, but they are also in the elements, in the heavens, above, and in the earth
and can only
be revealed unto mortals, in their
proper light, by the
power of the Holy Ghost.
While brother Ames was relating
his experience previous to believing and
embracing the faith of the Gospel, and
the few words of conversation
that passed between
him and brother George Curtis,

dthis question occurred to my
mind—“What causes men
and women, whose minds have been
unaccustomed to reflect upon theological
subjects, to
speak so intelligently as soon as the
Spirit of the Lord touches their
understanding?”

The experience of most of the
congregation can answer this
question. You are the oracle of the
Spirit, the repository of the intelligence
that comes from another
state of existence invisible
to the natural eye; of the influence
that produces an effect
without revealing the cause, and

is therefore called a miracle.

You are already acquainted
with my views upon the doctrine
of miracles.
In reality there can
be no miracle, only to
the ignorant.
There are spiritual agents,
invisible to the natural eye,
not
only in us, but in the elements,
in the heavens above, and in the earth
beneath the power that does exist in another state of being are all the time producing effects
you cannot see the cause
does the experience of this people teach them what is causes men and women speak do that which is wrong they have an idea many of them understanding it tolerably well
Paul could not explain [page break] though he was one of Gamaliel’s servants probably a household servant swept his house blacked his boot had an opportunity of knowing a great deal I throw this in by way of remark with all his learning he could not do any better to his brethren with all his tact and talent explain it to his brethren when I would do good evil is present with me when I would seek the Lord with all my heart behold the item [in the] way if I do not knock that out of road it over come me I must say get out of way when I go along in my path he had to explain it by saying when I would do good evil present with me did he do it for the evil is here for the evil the influence that came into world for the express purpose of proving you and I give us

Does the experience of this Congregation people, teach them what it is that causes why men and women to speak that which is wrong? They have an idea, many of them but not all have an understanding of it tolerably well.
Paul could not explain it, though he was one of the Gamaliels servants, and probably swept his house, or cleaned his sandals. he however had an oppertunity of learning a great deal I throw this in by way of remark.
With all his learning he could not tact and talent, he could not explain it any better than his uneducated do any better than his brethren he could not explain it to them, but says he when I would do good evil is present with me; when I <he> would seek the Lord with all my heart, <he found> something is in the way, that endeavours to overcome me; I must say to it get out of and block up his path my way when I <he> persued my course in the path of righteousness. Paul had to the only way he could explain it was by saying “when I would do good evil is present with me”. # 57
The evil is here; with its influence that evil influence that tempts to sin which has come into the world for the express purpose of proving you of giving us
beneath,

who are continually producing effects, the cause of which we cannot comprehend.

Does the experience of this people teach them what that is, which causes men and women to speak that which is wrong? Many of them, but not all, understand it tolerably well. Paul could not explain it though he was one of Gamaliel's household servants, and probably swept his house, or cleaned his sandals. However, he had an opportunity of learning much, but,

with all his learning and talent, he could not explain this matter any better than his uneducated brethren.

When he would seek the Lord with all his heart, he found something in the way, which endeavored to overcome him, and block up his path, when he pursued the course of righteousness; and the only way he could explain it was by saying “when I would do good, evil is present with me.” This evil is with us, it is that influence which tempts to sin, and which has been permitted to come into the world for the express purpose of giving us an
opportunity of proving ourselves to God and our Elder Brother to all good men [people?] that ever was ever will be that we are determined to over come the evil for the Lord has given ability consequently when the evil is present with me wait a little while I have got a little fighting to do it is present with me I have to turn and combat it until I get it out of my actions and let me go forward and do good I wish to do is every person capable of it they are or can be bridle tongues they are or can be capable of ceasing every evil act from this time hence forth do good [ever?] or can be used to be a old maxim and in many cases an excellent good one think twice before speaking once think 3 times before you act if we can train ourselves enough to think what we are going to do before we doing we can avoid the evil present with us we do not do it I have the warfare the battle before I proceed with the weapons of warfare in my possession I commence the defensive instance the attack is made on me and if I skillfully use my weapons with firmness I overcome
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opportunity of proving ourselves to God and our Elder Brother to all good men [people?] that ever was ever will be that we are determined to over come the evil for the Lord has given ability consequently when the evil is present with me wait a little while I have got a little fighting to do it is present with me I have to turn and combat it until I get it out of my actions and let me go forward and do good I wish to do is every person capable of it they are or can be bridle tongues they are or can be capable of ceasing every evil act from this time hence forth do good [ever?] or can be used to be a old maxim and in many cases an excellent good one think twice before speaking once think 3 times before you act if we can train ourselves enough to think what we are going to do before we doing we can avoid the evil present with us we do not do it I have the warfare the battle before I proceed with the weapons of warfare in my possession I commence the defensive instance the attack is made on me and if I skillfully use my weapons with firmness I overcome
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an opportunity of proving ourselves before God before Jesus Christ our Elder Bro. and to before the holy angels, and before all good men that are, or ever will be; proving that we are determined to overcome the evil, and cleave to the good for the Lord has given us the ability to do so; consequently when the evil is present with me, I have got a little fighting to do; the evil is present with me, I have to turn and combat it, until I get it is eradicated from out of my affections, as well as from my actions, and actions, that I may have power to do all the good; go forward and do all the good I wish to do. is every person is capable of it this. they are. Can they. can they. is every person capable of and ceasing from every evil act from this time hence forth and forever; and do good instead. They are. There is an old maxim, and in many cases a excellent good one, which is “think twice, before you speak once, and 3 times before you act. If we cannot train ourselves enough to think what we are going about to do before we do it, and have power understanding and power to know, and power to perform the good we can thereby avoid the evil that is present with us. we do not do it. I have the warfare to make, the battle to fight, before I proceed to use with the necessary weapons of warfare in my possession I commence when the attack is made upon me; and if I use my weapons skillfully, and with firm-ness of purpose I overcome my antagonist must yeild to me the victory.
opportunity of proving ourselves before God, before Jesus Christ our elder brother, before the holy angels, and before all good men,

that we are determined to overcome the evil, and cleave to the good, for the Lord has given us the ability to do so. Consequently, when the evil is present with me, I have a little fighting to do, I must turn and combat it until it is eradicated from my affections, as well as from my actions, [end of 91] that I may have power to do all the good I wish to perform. Every person is capable of this, all can bridle their tongues, and cease from every evil act from this time henceforth and forever, and do good instead. There is an old maxim, and in many cases an excellent one, it is, “think twice before you speak, and three times before you act.” If we train ourselves to think what we are about to do, before we do it, and have understanding to know, and power to perform the good, we can thereby avoid the evil that is present with us.

When the enemy makes war with me, I am thrown on the defensive, and if I use my weapons skilfully, and with firmness of purpose, my antagonist must yield to me the victory, the Lord being my helper.
Watt's Shorthand

another [of the] Apostles says rebuke the devil and he flee from you44
do you have to do that it is its duty it is
with evil present with us

up and do it when the devil is here in hearts tempting us to do this that and other that is wrong
speak away we say now

you can see it exhibited in what Brother Ames remembered before pausing to think Brother George

I do not want to hear one word of Mormonism it is was the evil spoke in him in organization of men they are endowed with power and wisdom if exercise if
hush be silenced my tongue say to my hands stop cease your operations go no further feet may swift to shed blood I pause I reflect I combat the enemy good is here and I am influenced by the spirit [of the] Lord now can this congregation understand these things use them do you not see and experience

them in your every day lives are you not tried tempted over taken in it do you say things wrong do things wrong

now stop and pause and from this time hence forth whatever you do
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Another of the Apostles say says rebuke the devil and he will flee from you"; which is the duty of every saint. Do you have to do that? And is it your duty? it is.

When evil is present with us we must overcome it or be overcome by it. When the devil is here in our hearts tempting us to do this or that; and the other thing that is wrong we must resist him or be led captive by him.

We see it exhibited in what Bro. Amas, before he had time to say he Bro. George

"I do not want to hear one word of Mormonism," It was the evil in him that caused that spoke in him This illustrates the idea so to speak. Man is endowed with power and wisdom if he will exercise them if he will exercise them to hush into to silence his tongue, and cause to say to his hands stop to cease your their operations, My

His feet may be swift to shed blood, but if he has power to pause, reflect and conquer the enemy; for good is present with him also and he is influenced to a greater or less degree by the spirit of the Lord. Now can this Congregation understand these things?

Do you not see and experience these two opposites of Good and evil them in yourselves every day of your lives? Are you not tried, tempted, and overtaken in sin? by saying, and doing that which is wrong. Do you not say things that are wrong? And do things that are wrong?

Now stop and pause; and from this time henceforth pause and what-ever you do
The Scriptures say—“Rebuke the devil, and he will flee from you.” This is the duty of every Saint.

When evil is present with us, we must overcome it, or be overcome by it. When the devil is in our hearts, tempting us to do that which is wrong, we must resist him, or be led captive by him.

When brother Ames, without giving himself time to pause or think, said to the person who presented the Gospel to him—“I do not want to hear one word about ‘Mormonism,’” it was the evil in him that caused him so to speak. Man is endowed with power and wisdom sufficient, if he will exercise them, to hush to silence his tongue, and cause his hands to cease their operations. His feet may be swift to shed blood, but he has power to pause, and combat and conquer the enemy; for good is present with him also, and he is influenced in a greater or less degree, by the Spirit of the Lord.

You experience these two opposites of good and evil in yourselves every day you live, you are tried, tempted, and overtaken in sin, by saying and doing that which is wrong.

Now from this time, henceforth, pause, and, whatever you do,
let it be with a considered reflected consideration
do not be in hurry

...is one item in my life
...do not hurry me...we shall get through the world
Do you recollect that this "Do not hurry me" is one item in my life, is one of the most prominent leading characteristics of my history,

here is the gospel we have embraced we are professedly latter-day saints is not evil in the midst my brethren know I have to frequently chastise them
if two thousand here and half dozen done wrong I could not get at them the whole congregation might think I chastising the whole people not so

the good men women whose consciences clear and their hearts pure clean as piece of white paper

We have embraced the Gospel, we are professedly L. D. Saints; but is not evil in the midst of my brethren has I have to frequently to chastise them. There are two thousand people here in this assembly and if only half a dozen of them has done wrong, I could not get at them evil doers without appearing to chastise the whole congregation, and they may think I am chastising the whole people, which in reality but it is not so.

By chastising the guilty however it is impossible to spot the conscience of all the good man men or women whose conscience is clear and there whose hearts are clean and pure spotless as a piece of white paper.
let it be done in a spirit of reflection,
never again act in haste, but
let your action always be the result of mature consideration.

“Do not hurry me,” is one
of the prominent characteristics of my history.

I frequently exhort the brethren not to be in a hurry, for
we shall not stop here, we are only hunting for the grave,
and there is no fear but we shall find it.

We have embraced the Gospel, and are professedly Latter-day Saints, but evil will introduce itself in the midst of my brethren, then I have frequently to chastise them. There are two thousand persons in this assembly, and if only half a dozen of them have done wrong, I could not chastise them without appearing to chastise the whole congregation, which in reality is not so.

By chastising the guilty however, it is impossible to spot the conscience of good men and women, whose hearts are clean and pure as a piece of white paper.
Watt’s Shorthand

do I spot up
clean consciences
you know that experience teaches you
that the principle is true
and the Lord will help them that help them
let people be determined from this time hence forth never do anything
but what is good from this time
go forth and build up the kingdom of God and do everything
to promote the cause and never do a wrong thing
I do not know some talk with angels now
how long be before this be a [page break]
a holy people but you are we not the best people on earth
but you know my doctrine we can improve yet
we are made for it organized for it our confidence
to expand forth to receive unto our comprehension knowledge wisdom and there the end there of will never be
and there is a thought strikes my mind upon this moment perhaps be well enough to throw a few ideas upon the principle of language it has been been [sic]
in the world is now is the brute creatures do actually increase in knowledge and wisdom to
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chastiseing this half dozon do I spot up a clean conscience?
<No.> Experience teaches you that the this principles are true; and he Lord will help them that help themselves to do right.
Should the people be determined from this time hence forth never to do wrong any thing but what is good, and from this time go forth, and doing every thing in their power to promote the cause of truth, and never do Another wrong,

how long it would it be before this but A short time before this people would be A holy people? santified unto the Lord.>
We are already the best people on earth, but you know my doctrine is we can still improve if we are made for that purpose; our capacities are organised to expand forth; until we can receive unto our comprehension, and Celestial knowledge, and wisdom; and so continue, worlds without. for the end there will never be # There is A another thought which strikes my mind upon at this moment, which it will perhaps be well enough to throw out A few Ideas. upon.

It has been believed by numerous individuals in the world and is now, that the brute creation do actually increase in knowledge and wisdom, and will continue so to progress from one state of intelligence to another through through numerous spheres of existence do until they become equal to as intelligent as mankind are now.
The Lord will help those who help themselves to do right. Should the people be determined from this time henceforth, never to do anything but good, and go forth to build up the Kingdom of God, doing everything in their power to promote the cause of truth, and never do another wrong,

it should be but a short time before this people would be a holy people, sanctified unto the Lord. We are already the best people on earth; but we can still improve: we are made for that purpose; our capacities are organized to expand until we can receive into our comprehension celestial knowledge and wisdom; and so continue worlds without end.

There is another thought which strikes my mind at this moment upon which it will perhaps be well enough to throw out a few ideas.

It has been, and is now believed by numerous individuals that the brute creation by increase in Knowledge and wisdom, and will continue to progress from one intelligence to another, through numerous states of creation and until they will become as intelligent as mankind are and change their physical or bodily existence organisation through
This is one of the most vague ideas that could possibly be embibed by the world, in the mind of man.

It is called the transmigration of spirits. I expect you all know what that is.

<It is enough for me to know that mankind are made to improve <themselves,> all the works of God every partical of them that we see and are acquainted with; all creation that is visible to us, and that is invisible is the workmanship of our God the supreme architect and ruler of the whole world, who organised the world, created man and every living thing that is upon it to act in its sphere, and in its order and it is precisely for,> this reason he has ordained it so to <all things to> be <as they are>, and not one iota has <for upon the principle of increase has> the Lord Allmighty decreed placed upon this earth only upon the principle of increase <decreed to be the great governing law of existence among the creatures that are the works of his hands, and for that purpose are we> # Well now we are made to increase, formed, and organised for that express purpose. #

Furthermore, if men can understand, and receive it, mankind are organised to receive intellegence until they become, what we call, perfect in their sphere they are appointed to fill, that is far ahead of us at present.

When we use the term perfection it will apply applies to man in his present condition,
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numerous states of existence, so that the minutest insect, in the lapse of time, can take to itself the human form, & vice versa.>
This is one of the most inconsistent ideas that could be possibly entertained in the mind of man: it is called the transmigration of souls.

It is enough for me to know that mankind are made to improve themselves.

Furthermore, if men can understand and receive it, mankind are organized to receive intelligence until they become perfect in their sphere they are appointed to fill; which is far ahead of us at present.
When we use the term perfection, it applies to man in his present condition as well as to Heavenly beings;
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numerous states of existence, so that the minutest insect, in the lapse of time, can take to itself the human form, and vice versa.
This is one of the most inconsistent ideas that could be possibly entertained in the mind of man; it is called the transmigration of souls.

It is enough for me to know that mankind are made to improve themselves.

Furthermore, if men can understand and receive it, mankind are organized to receive intelligence until they become perfect in the sphere they are appointed to fill, which is far ahead of us at present.
When we use the term perfection, it applies to man in his present condition, as well as to heavenly beings.
Supreme in you yes and in every
man woman upon
earth the foundation [laid?] there elements
there every individual that lives on face of
earth in all these possess the Godhood that
you can not understand but you will
the Deity is there
that is the principle that causes
men and women to increase grow in
grace and truth as it is in themselves
we want the operation to begin and then
we have [at/it?] an
end with
but if we do not commence with it
never end
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We are now, or may be, as perfect in our sphere as God and Angels are in theirs; but the greatest intelligence in creation can continually ascend to greater heights of perfection. We are created for the express purpose of increase: there is nothing within us but what can increase, from birth to old age:

What is there that is not ordained after an eternal law of existence? It is the Deity within us that causes increase.

Does this idea startle you? Are you ready to exclaim, “What! the Supreme in us?” Yes. He is in every person upon the face of the earth. The elements that every individual is made of and lives in, possess the Godhead. This you cannot now understand, but you will hereafter. The Deity within us is the great principle that causes us to increase, and to grow in grace and truth.

The operation once begun, strict obedience to the requirements of heaven is necessary to obtain the end for which we were created;
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We are now, or may be, as perfect in our sphere as God and Angels are in theirs; but the greatest intelligence in existence can continually ascend to greater heights of perfection. We are created for the express purpose of increase. There are none, correctly organized, but can increase from birth to old age.

What is there that is not ordained after an eternal law of existence? It is the Deity within us that causes increase.

Does this idea startle you? Are you ready to exclaim, “What! the Supreme in us!” Yes. He is in every person upon the face of the earth. The elements that every individual is made of and lives in, possess the Godhead. This you cannot now understand, but you will hereafter. The Deity within us is the great principle that causes us to increase, and to grow in grace and truth.

The operation once begun, strict obedience to the requirements of heaven is necessary to obtain the end for which we were created,
what shall I do

commence operation to [do] the will of

[page break] [page] 3. God from

time hence forth what shall

child to begin to [perfection/operation?]
grows up and

communicate with him he says

Father from this time hence forth and

ever more I will do thy will and so it

runs from first
to last beginning end from

Father Adam
to the last one of his
posterity upon the face of earth who

will be sanctified made pure and holy and

enter in Celestial Kingdom that [--?] 47

makes [ones/ns?] that will make every per-

son do to others as they will do to them that will

make them pure and holy in their

sphere as God is in his I commence with

it go through the veil with it into
eternity with it continue

and the end there of no man on earth knoweth nor the angels in heaven they
can not know now what

short of power of Holy Ghost do us any good nothing short of it no nothing short of it

I told you in beginning of my remarks

the truth just as it is in heaven on earth

precisely as it is with angels

with prophets that lives on the earth

with all good people and

every sinner dwells upon

the face of earth not a man or

woman but

on the report of that

Book of Mormon the Spirit

of Almighty convinces

it is true

Commence the operation
to do the will of

God <in earnest> from

this time hence forth. What does <shall>

A child do to begin to operate?

<Let the Child> when he grows up <comes
to understanding>

and the father <begins to operate with

<communicates his will to> him he says,

"Father from this time hence forth and

for ever more I will do thy will," and so it

<has been from> [illegible] from first <and-

will continue so> to last, beginning from
<beginning with> Father Adam,

<and will continue> to the last one of his

posterity upon the face of the earth who

will <be> santified And enter into the
Celestial [page] 11 kingdom; <and>

this will make <cause> every person do to
<do unto> others as they would that others

should do <unto> them, it will <and>

make them <as> pure and holy in their

sphere as God is in his.; I commence with

it <and> go through the vail <with> into
eternity <with it>, and <still> continue still,

and <the end thereof> no man on earth

knoweth, nor the Angels in heaven, they

cannot know it. # Now what is there

<Nothing> short of the Holy Ghost will do

us any <lasting> good.? There is nothing

short of it will.

I told you, in the beginning of my remarks,

the truth just as it is in heaven on earth,

precisely as it is <as it is> with Angels, and

with <with> prophets who live on the earth,

and as it is with all good people, and

<with> every sinner that live dwels upon

the earth<.> t<\textsuperscript>T>here is not A man or A

woman but <who>
on hearing the report of that book, the

Book of Mormon <but> the spirit

of the Almighty <convinced> <has testified
to them> of its truth; neither have they
therefore let us commence to do the will of God in earnest from this time henceforth.

Let the child, when he comes to understanding, and the father communicates his will to him, say, “Father, from this time, henceforth, and for ever, I will do thy will”; so it has been, beginning with Father Adam and so it will continue to be the duty of his posterity who will be sanctified, and enter into the celestial Kingdom: this will cause every person to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them, and will make them as pure and holy in their sphere as God is in His. I commence with it, go through the veil into eternity with it, and still continue; and the end thereof no man on earth knoweth, nor the Angels in heaven.

Nothing short of the Holy Ghost will do us any lasting good.

I told you, in the beginning of my remarks, the truth as it is in heaven and on earth; as it is with Angels, with prophets, with all good people, and with every sinner that dwells upon the earth; there is not a man, or woman <that love the truth> who, on hearing the report of the Book of Mormon, but the Spirit of the Almighty has testified to them of its truth: neither have they heard...
Watt’s Shorthand

name of Joseph Smith
spirit tell [page break] [page] 4
he is true prophet Mormonism

the Spirit of Almighty whispers to them at times gospel of salvation
it is the spirit invisible to natural mind understanding
produces effects without causes
mysteries marvels wonders or those things
we behold we cannot account for them or the nature of them

we can’t tell what in this in mouth of every community
and all people
it is you can not say you may go among saints sinners high or low beggars
no different here is what operates upon the people God has brought them forth

to operate upon
to the lay the foundation
one of a kingdom
two of a family and as Brother Ames says one
of country comes out and says Book of Mormon divine origin Joseph true while thousands or millions crying against it priest will recollect the story Sister Ames sitting opposite the door the honest shall never see the devil in him before doing anything to bring it out of him before he never knew anything about the truth the Lord sees Brother Ames embraced truth the devil steps in it is falsehood
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heard the name of Joseph Smith but the spirit has convinced them “he was A true prophet”. They have not heard of these things without the spirit of the Almighty whispering to them at times the truth of the gospel of salvation.

It is the spirit which is invisible to the natural mind, and understanding of man, that produces effects apparently without causes, that creates mysteries, marvels, and wonders here. These things we behold, but we cannot, account for them, and the end of them they their ultimate end.

we can not tell. This is in the mouth of every Community, these wonders are talked of by and of all people, by but it is what it is you cannot say; you may go among saints and sinners, high and low, Kings and beggars it is no matter their condition in life makes no difference, the same power operates upon the hearts of all people; God has brought forth the raised up A prophet, and brought forth the book of mormon, and influenced the people operated upon the people to lay the foundation of his kingdom, taking one of A nation and two of A family. their is in the mouth of every Community.

When A person is worked upon by the spirit to believe in the truth of the Gospel the Devil steps in saying tells them it is A falsehood; and
the name of Joseph Smith, but the spirit has whispered to them, “he is a true prophet.”

name of Joseph Smith, but the Spirit has whispered to him—“He is a true Prophet.”

God has raised up a prophet, brought forth the Book of Mormon, influenced the people to lay the foundation of his Kingdom, taking one <two> of a nation, and one of a family.

God has raised up a Prophet, brought forth the Book of Mormon, influenced the people to lay the foundation of his kingdom, taking two of a nation, and one of a family.

When a person is worked upon by the spirit to believe the truth of the gospel, the Devil tells them it is a falsehood;

When a person is worked upon by the Spirit to believe the truth of the Gospel, the Devil tells him it is a falsehood.
Watt's Shorthand

my good name

I am
not going to part with Mormonism any
[for/if?] if he Brother Ames
deled I would have robbed that fellow's
horse and at the same time convicted Mor-
monism true
that is what [ruins?] with the world
because when the Lord tells them that the
gospel is true the devil says not true [an/
and?] independent [page break]
[page] 5 [reign?] independent God and
have proved themselves worthy
of it few take
right path but few do
near all the world are left to themselves
take their own road
they will not believe when it is told
[them/they?] will not
see when it is before their
eyes closed their eyes harden their
hearts and left to believe a lie that
be dammed and I [expect/respect/--?] Mormonism [down/done?] at Missouri
I can
give you history further back to the time
Brother Ames did he it commenced in 1830

Mormonism must be put down if it was
false do you suppose say a word about it no
all creation that would never get into evil
all the way falsehood expands is to take the
truth and make a lie the whole of creation
are left to choose now this the end of Mor-
monism I see it popping up there let's put
our hands upon put it down Mormonism
big as ever
kill the prophet kill the prophet [sic]
kill the body of man
that is all
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a<A>gain <the loss of> “My good name”,
if the person <exercises A powerful influ-
ence against A person's embracing the
truth, for> <for if he -> is determined
not to part with Mormonism then it is
taken for granted by his freinds who do
not beleive as he does that he is deluded;
<therefore>

“That is what ruins the [page] 12 <World>
because when the Lord tells them that the
gospel is true the devil says it is not, and
independent of God <this
but> A few only prove themselves worthy
of it <the truth by> A few take<ing> the
right path, and but A few do.
Nearly all the world are left to themselves
take <persue> their own road <path>;
they will not beleive when the truth is told
<when it is declared to> them, they will not
<nor> see <the light> when it is before their
eyes, but they close their eyes,
harden their hearts, and would rather
beleiv a lie that they may be damned. #

I can <am <individualy>
conversant> go further back with the
history <of this church further back> than
Bro. Ames, did he and he commenced in 1830.
 a At that time it was said
“Mormonism Must be put down”

but it is no larger <than> as ever.
\t<T>hey have killed the prophet, but they
can only kill the body of man,
that is all; <and hath no more that then
and again, “the loss of my good name,” exercises a powerful influence against a person’s embracing the truth; for if he determines to adhere to Mormonism, his unbelieving friends take it for granted that he is deluded: therefore

but a few prove themselves worthy of the truth by taking the right path. Nearly all the world pursue their own path; they will not believe the truth when it is declared to them, nor see the light when it is before their eyes. [page] 10 but they close their eyes, harden their hearts, and would rather believe a lie that they may be damned.

but it is now larger than ever!

They can only kill the body, and
Mormonism nothing to do with that
that is
the oracle through which God
spoke Mormonism
the same do you suppose of course
by fighting against falsehood not a word about it

let it be nothing to fight.
They feel just as I do when I am
requested to make out a report contradict-
ing his report of officers ran away [page break] [page] 6 I make
out a report against their report I could
not get anything to do it with but
beating against the air
not a spot of truth to begin
on it would be just like that if this gos-
pel was not true and Joseph true and
sent by the power of God and that power
sent forth upon the face of earth to
convict every man and woman it is true
never contend against us
again in world
perhaps I have said enough to the brethren
for this time I would be very
much pleased if we could prevail
on our selves and all the inhabitants of
valleys and
whole earth to cease
to do evil and learn to do well that is all
I would want all ask for it
is all I desire all I want to live for is to
see the inhabitants of earth honor
God bow down to him
honor his supremacy his righteous
covenant and every knee bow and
every tongue confess let all creation
say amen to the providences of
God every individual
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Mormonism nothing to do with that
that is
the oracle through which God spoke Mormonism
the same do you suppose of course
by fighting against falsehood not a word about it

let it be nothing to fight.
They feel just as I do when I am requested to make out a report contradict-
ing his report of officers ran away [page break] [page] 6 I make
out a report against their report I could not get anything to do it with but
beating against the air
not a spot of truth to begin
on it would be just like that if this gos-
pel was not true and Joseph true and
sent by the power of God and that power sent forth upon the face of earth to
convict every man and woman it is true never contend against us again in world
perhaps I have said enough to the brethren for this time I would be very
much pleased if we could prevail on our selves and all the inhabitants of valleys and
whole earth to cease
to do evil and learn to do well that is all
I would want all ask for it
is all I desire all I want to live for is to see the inhabitants of earth honor
God bow down to him
honor his supremacy his righteous covenant and every knee bow and
every tongue confess let all creation say amen to the providences of God every individual
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can do; and> Mormonism has nothing to do with that <is not altered by that in the least.> <T>he prophet <Joseph> was <the oracle> <his organ> through which God spoke, <they slew his body but> Mormonism is still the same. Had mormonism been A faulshood instead of all creation <of the devil and the world> fighting against it, they would <have sustained and built it up> not have seen anything to fight they would have
let it be
They<sup>62</sup> would feel just as I do when I am requested to make out a report contradict-
ing the report of the officers who ran away from here last fall. I commenced to make
out my report but I could not get any material to do it with. I consequently
headed it “beating against the air.
There was not A spot of truth to begin
with. I would be just like that if this gospel was not, if Joseph was not true And
sent by the power of God, and that power sent forth upon the face of the earth to
convict every man and woman of its truth they woudl never contend against us
again<sup>63</sup> in the world. #
Perhapses I have said enough to the Bre<sup>e</sup> at this time. I<sup>1</sup> would <give me> be very
much pleased< ure> if we could prevail on ourselves, and on all the inhabitants of
these vallies, and <on the inhabitants> of the whole earth, <and on ourselves> to cease
to do evil, and learn to do well; that is <all>
I would want < I could wish> or ask for. it is a<A>ll I desire to live for is to see the inhabitants of the earth acknowledge God, bow down to him and confess his supremacy, and his righteous
covenant. To him let every knee bow, and ever tongue confess, and let all creation
say Amen to the <his wise> providences. of God [page] 13 Let every <all> individual
and Mormonism is not altered by that in the least. The prophet Joseph was the oracle through which God spoke; they slew his body, but Mormonism is still the same. Had Mormonism been a falsehood, the Devil and the world, instead of fighting against it, would have sustained and built it up.

“Mormonism” is not altered by that in the least. The Prophet Joseph was the oracle through which God spoke; they slew his body, but “Mormonism” is still the same. Had “Mormonism” been a falsehood, the Devil and the world, instead of fighting against it, would have sustained and built it up.

Perhaps I have said enough to the brethren at this time. It would give me much pleasure if we could prevail on all the inhabitants of these valleys, or the inhabitants of the whole earth, and on ourselves, to cease to do evil, and learn to do well; that is all I could wish or ask for: all I desire to live for is to see the inhabitants of the earth acknowledge God, bow down to him, and confess his supremacy and his righteous covenant. To him let every knee bow, and every tongue confess; and let all creation say Amen to his wise providences.

Let all
declare and then live to it as for me and my house as for me and all I have is the Lord’s and shall serve the Lord all my days if this can be Zion is here happiness is here peace is here God is here angels are here and we are wrapped in the visions of eternity that is all I desire I am not the Lord I can do nothing more than to speak as others of his servants I can do myself and brethren and sisters can follow suit and we can unitedly keep his commandments and do his will if I want happy heart follow his will as I [page break] I can when I see a man look up to stand high to be looked at then I feel bad see an elder in Israel doing something to tarnish his character and tarnish others that makes [my heart bleeds?] when I can see all people filled with the knowledge of God all is peace and all is happiness may the Lord help us to live to our religion from this time hence forth and forever amen.

[In longhand on verso of page 7: Bishop roundy wishes the Inhabitants of the 16 Ward to meet at the School house at 6 oclock [shorthand: this] this evening.]
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persons declare his allegiance to God, and then live to it, saying, “as for me and my house we will serve the Lord.” As for me and all I have it is the Lord’s, and shall be dedicated to him all my days. If this can be done, happiness is here, Angels are here, God is here, and we are wrapt in the visions of eternity.

But I am not the Lord, and can do nothing more than to speak, like others of his servants. I can do good myself, and my brethren and Sisters can follow suit; we can unitedly keep his commandments, and do his will; this is all I desire to make me happy here, and feel as well as I can in my mortal body. When I see an Elder in Israel who is looked up to—who stands high in the Kingdom of God, doing something to tarnish his own character, and that of others, it makes me feel very unhappy; <grieves my spirit.>
but when I can see all <that> people filled with the knowledge of God, then all is peace—all is happiness with me. May the Lord help us to live up to our religion from this time henceforth, and for ever. Amen.
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person declare his allegiance to God, and then live to it, saying—“As for me and my house we will serve the Lord. As for me, and all I have, it is the Lord’s, and shall be dedicated to Him all my days.” If this can be done, happiness is here, angels are here, God is here, and we are wrapped in the visions of eternity.

But I am not the Lord, and can do nothing more than others of His servants. I can do good myself, and my brethren and sisters can do the same; we can unitedly keep His commandments, and do His will. This is all I desire, to make me happy here, and feel as well as I can in my mortal body. When I see an Elder in Israel who is looked up to, who stands high in the Kingdom of God, doing something to tarnish his own character, and that of others, it grieves my spirit;
but when I can see all the people filled with the knowledge of God, then all is peace, all is happiness with me. May the Lord help us to live our religion, from this time henceforth and for ever. Amen.
[end of 94]
38. Brigham Young, speech, June 13, 1852, Papers of George D. Watt, Church History Library, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as CHL), transcribed from Watt’s shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

39. Watt’s shorthand is not extant for the previous speaker; *Journal of Discourses* 1:88 identifies the speaker as Ira Ames.

40. Word could also be read *conversion* or *conversation*.

41. Ink blot over shorthand.

42. Probable intent is *morning*.

43. See Romans 7:21.

44. See James 4:7.

45. While *know* and *no* are spelled the same in Pitman shorthand, here the phrase is *you know*, clearly know. While transcribing, Watt omitted the *you* and changed *know* to *no*.

46. At top of page in longhand: alley m fff; arithmetic computations.

47. Word may be crossed out.

48. Historian’s Office Reports of Speeches, 1845–1885, CHL. The authors thank Silvia Ghosh and Brent L. Carruth for their assistance with the longhand transcripts.

49. *Of 20 years* has been mostly scraped off the page.

50. [And?] has been mostly scraped off the page.

51. Period written over comma.

52. Line drawn across page in pencil; line marks place where Watt’s transcript differs from his shorthand.

53. *I* written over *and*, or vice versa.

54. Period written over crossed-out insertion mark.

55. Rest of phrase is very difficult to read. Watt apparently transcribed *what is*, then realized he could not read the rest of the phrase, so crossed it out and omitted the rest, as he omitted other passages that he could not read.

56. Period written over crossed-out comma.

57. ¶ written over #, or vice versa; ¶ is in pencil.

58. Watt apparently crossed out *cannot*, then wiped out the line through *can*, and thoroughly crossed out *not*.

59. ¶ is in pencil and is very large.

60. Large ¶ written in pencil over #.

61. *Bull* is written in pencil; it does not appear to be in Watt’s hand.

62. *They would feel . . . again in the world* is crossed out with a large *X*.

63. End of material crossed out with a large *X*.

64. Written by Jonathan Grimshaw, who was an employee at the Church Historian’s Office until 1856. Historian’s Office Reports of Speeches, 1845–1885, CHL. Only part of this transcript is extant. A sermon by John Taylor is recorded on the verso of each page.

65. Page crossed out with pencil loops.

66. Pencil brackets in left margin enclose text from this point to the end of underlined section, below. There is a note in pencil in the left margin of this section, in an unidentified hand: *to be re written*, followed by a large ink *X*. 
67. Large ink X over text in page. Page also has large pencil wiggly line from top of page to bottom.
68. Large ink X over text in page. Page also has large pencil wiggly line from top of page to bottom.

First page of George D. Watt’s shorthand notes of Brigham Young’s speech on October 6, 1853. A transcript of this page begins on page 96. Papers of George D. Watt, Church History Library, Salt Lake City; © Intellectual Reserve, Inc.
Speech by Brigham Young, October 6, 1853, in three parallel columns

George D. Watt’s Shorthand

President

I wish to call the attention of this conference and extend my invitation to all the saints in the valley to the subject of the gathering of the poor saints. Many of us are acquainted with the circumstances of the Latter-day Saints when they came to this valley 6 years ago, 5 years ago, and 4 years ago etc. Were we to hunt through this community and search out the men the women and the children that have come here on their own resources and those that have been helped here by the Perpetual Emigration Fund.

Watt’s Longhand transcript

President Brigham Young <said.> gave the following instructions to the Assembly.

I wish to call the attention of this conference to an invitation I shall give them, and wish to extend it to the saints in this valley, or <and> elsewhere. It refers <allude> to the subject of the gathering of the poor <among the> Saints. Many of us are acquainted with the circumstances of the Saints when they came to this valley 6 <six> years ago, also 5 <five> years ago; and 4 <four> years ago. Until now Where we to <send> go> through this community and search out the men, women, and children <that> <who> have come here on their own resources, and those <that> <who> have been helped here by the Perpetual Emigration <Emigrating> Fund, <and by private individuals,>
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A discourse delivered by president Brigham Young, in the general conference, October 6, 1853

I wish to call the attention of this Conference to an invitation I shall give them, and wish to extend it to the Saints in this valley and elsewhere. I allude to the gathering of the poor Saints. Many of us are acquainted with the circumstances of the Saints when they came to this valley six years ago, also five and four years ago.
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Watt’s Shorthand

we will find quite a proportion of this community have been helped here not the majority but there are thousands and there are a number of thousands of men, women and children been helped here by the Perpetual Emigration Fund and this is the subject that I wish to call the attention of this conference and community to reflect upon to hearken to it think of it contemplate it and I call upon those who have not yet put forth their hands to assist in gathering the poor now give us your names and your means during this conference let’s raise a few thousand dollars suppose we should try to raise as much as we did 4 years ago right in our poverty in our distress just arrived here and hardly had sufficient grain to sustain life

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

it would be seen that quite a large proportion of the community had been brought here through the assistance of others. I will not say a majority of the community has come here under those circumstances, but there are thousands who have.
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it would be seen that a large proportion of the community have been brought here through the assistance of others. I will not say a majority have come here under those circumstances, but there are thousands who have.

Thousands of men, women, and children have been helped here by the Perpetual Emigration Fund alone. This is the subject to which I wish to call the attention of the Conference, and the community at large. I wish all to hearken to it, reflect upon it, and contemplate it seriously. I call upon those who have not yet put forth their hands to assist in gathering the poor, to give us your names, and your means, during this Conference, that we may raise a few thousand dollars to be applied to this purpose. Suppose we should try to raise as much as we did 4 years ago, when we were in the midst of our greatest poverty and distress—we had just arrived here, and had scarcely sufficient to sustain life.

Notwithstanding these
the very first conference it was agitated, we raised almost six thousand dollars all in gold to send for the poor, might I venture to flatter my feelings that we could raise 5 6 thousand dollars this conference

people are better able to raise 50 thousand now than the people then were able to raise 5 thousand suppose we raise ten 15 20 thousand dollars to send for the relief of the poor and bring our poor brethren and sisters who long to be here as much as any of you 1 year ago 2 3 years ago or at any other period of time

let me ask you to reflect upon the days that you spent in yonder land that you could not walk the streets hardly go into shop but what the finger of scorn pointed at you you was sneered at for your religion seemingly every man woman met you in street was willing to scoff

straightened circumstances, at the first Conference we held in the old Tabernacle, this subject was agitated, and $6000, in gold was raised, and sent to gather in the poor. Dare I venture to flatter myself that we can raise 5 or 6000$ this Conference, to be applied to the same good purpose? The people are better able to raise 50,000$ now, than they were able to raise $5,000 then. Suppose we raise 15 or $20.000 to send for our poor Brethren, and Sisters, who long to be here as much as you did, before your way was opened. This amount can be raised now, and not call forth an unusual effort. We might ask you to reflect upon the days that you have spent [page] 2 in yonder distant land, where you could scarcely walk the streets, or enter a shop like another Citizen without the finger of scorn being pointed at you; without suffering the malignant taunts, and sneers of the ungodly
Let me refer your minds to the time that the Gospel was first introduced to you, and the light and glory of it opened up to your understandings, when eternity and eternal things reflected upon your benighted minds, and your conceptions were aroused to see things as they were, as they are, and as they will be. What were your feelings, and meditations, when Zion and its glory burst upon your vision? When the people of God appeared to you, assembled together, preparatory to the coming of the Son of Man?

<Again> What were your feelings when you turned your eyes in every direction that you turned your eyes, they were met with scenes of wickedness, and your ears saluted with deep dyed blasphemies of every description?

Was there any that feared the Lord? No.
The most pious could do nothing more than some did in days of Apostles; they could erect the
image to the unknown God and worship somebody or something but knew not what. What was your feelings and reflections, under such circumstances, when you first heard of the Latter Day work? of the Gospel in its fulness? When you first learned that the Lord had a Prophet, and Apostles, who held the words of life for the people?

What was there you would not have sacrificed in a moment if by the privilege of assembling with the saints if you could mingle your voice conversation day by day and your visiting your journeying your business transactions your dwelling your labors and your lives with those who knew the Lord and would serve him is there anything you would not have sacrificed? Verily, no! Then let your minds expand reflect how you felt then you can tell how others feel then you perhaps can realize how thousands and thousands and scores of thousands

image to the unknown God, and worship somebody, or something, but they knew not what. What were your feelings, and reflections, under such circumstances, when you first heard of the Latter Day work? of the Gospel in its fulness?

When you first learned that the Lord had a Prophet, and Apostles, who held the words of life for the people?

What was there you would not have sacrificed? Verily, no! Then let your minds expand reflect how you felt then you can tell how others feel; you can realise how thousands, and scores of thousands

image to the unknown God, and worship somebody, or something, but they knew not what. What were your feelings and reflections, under such circumstances, when you first heard of the Latter Day work? of the Gospel in its fulness?

When you first learned that the Lord had a Prophet, and Apostles, who held the words of life for the people?
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feel at this present moment this very day
there is no hardship they would not undergo

to meet with us here this day there is no trial be too hard for them
no sacrifice be called to make they would not readily and willingly make for privilege you enjoy here this day
can you realize it

read the other side of the page and what do we find the hearts of men and women by crossing the ocean travelling few weeks months by water and land it seems as though their hearts partly closed up they lost sight of object of their pursuit it seems as though the hardships they passed through had driven every spark of light of Christ out of their hearts

if you <started> with the influence of the Holy spirit who prevented you from keeping it

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

feel at this present Moment.

There is no hardship they will <would> refuse to undergo [sic], no danger they will <would> not endeavour to surmount, if they could assemble with us here this day. No trial would be too keen for them, <there is> no sacrifice <that> they would not readily and willingly make for the privilege you enjoy this day. Brethren and Sisters can you realize this?

Let us now read a chapter on the other side of the page, and we81 find the hearts of men, and women, by crossing the ocean, by traveling a few weeks or months by water, and land, appear to become perfectly <partially> closed up; <and> they lose sight of the object of their pursuit. It seems as though the hardships they pass through, in coming to this land, banished <nearly> every particle <cle> of the light of Christ out of their hearts <minds>.

If you started on your journey with the influence of the Holy Spirit warming your hearts, who prevented you from retaining it every
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feel at this present moment.

There is no hardship they would refuse to undergo, no danger they would not endeavour to surmount, if they could assemble with us here this day. No trial would be too keen for them; there is no sacrifice that they would not readily and willingly make for the privilege you enjoy this day. Brethren and sisters, can you realize this?

Let us now read a chapter on the other side of the page, and we find the hearts of men and women, by crossing the ocean, by travelling a few weeks or months by water and land, appear to become partially closed up, and they lose sight of the object of their pursuit. It seems as though the hardships they pass through, in coming to this land, banish nearly every particle of the light of Christ out of their minds.

If you started on your journey with the influence of the Holy Spirit warming your hearts, who prevented you from retaining it every
Watt’s Shorthand

You may say it was the devil that robbed you of it. But what business had you with the devil? Was there any necessity that you should enter into fellowship with him, or into partnership with the works of darkness? “No,” you reply; “I had forsaken him and all my old associates and feelings, and had given myself to the Lord, and embraced His gospel, and set out to build up His kingdom, and wished to gather with the saints at the gathering place.”

Suppose the devil does tempt you, must you of necessity enter into partnership again with him, open your doors and bid him welcome to your house, and tell him to reign there? Why do you not reflect, and tell master devil, with all his associates and imps, to begone, feeling you have served him long enough. Says one, “I did not know that I could possibly come here with unruly cattle without getting wrong in my feelings;” or, “this brother did wrong, and marred my feelings; I was irritated, and the cares of

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

day of your life?
You may say it was the devil that robbed you of it. But what business had you with the devil? Was there any necessity that you should enter into fellowship with him, or into partnership with the works of darkness? “No,” you reply; “I had forsaken him and all my old associates and feelings, and had given myself to the Lord, and embraced His gospel, and set out to build up His kingdom, and wished to gather with the saints at the gathering place.”

Suppose the devil does tempt you, must you of necessity enter into partnership again with him, open your doors and bid him welcome to your house, and tell him to reign there? Why do you not reflect, and tell master devil, with all his associates and imps, to begone, feeling you have served him long enough. Says one, “I did not know that I could possibly come here with unruly cattle without getting wrong in my feelings;” or, “this brother did wrong, and marred my feelings; I was irritated, and the cares of
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journey bewildered my mind and hurt our feelings
I don't know
whether I have got to where I started for or not; things are different. I don't see here that I anticipated
do any of you feel in this way that have come across plains this season
go and be baptized for remission of your sins to start again; do you think you will be overcome again in temptation
pause and reflect before you [were to be?] overcome by the evil one
in first place if you are baptized for remission of sins peradventure
you may receive the spirit of gospel again in its glory light and beauty but if your hearts are so far engrossed in things of this world that you don’t know whether you want to be
baptized or not you had better shut yourselves up in some canyon or closet and repent of your sins and call upon the name of Lord until you get his spirit light thereof reflect upon your offences more know

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

the journey bewildered my mind, and hurt me so that I do not really know whether I have got to where I started for or not; things are different here than I expected to find them, etc."
This is a representation of the feelings of some who have crossed the plains this season. My advice to you is,
Go and be baptized for the remission of sins and start afresh. That temptation may not overcome you again,
pause and reflect; that you be not overcome by the evil one unawares. In the first place, if you are <re>baptized for the remission of sins, peradventure you may receive again the spirit of the Gospel in its glory, light, and beauty. But if your hearts are so engrossed in the things of this world that you do not know whether you want to be
<re>baptized or not, you had better shut yourselves up in some Kaynon, or closet, and repent of your sins and call upon the name of Lord until you get His spirit, and the light thereof to reflect upon you, that you may know the nature of your offences <this year>
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the journey bewildered my mind, and hurt me so that I do not really know whether I have got to where I started for, or not; things are different here to what I expected to find them, &c."
This is a representation of the feelings of some who have crossed the plains this season. My advice to you is,
go and be baptized for the remission of sins, and start afresh, that temptation may not overcome you again;
pause and reflect, that you be not overcome by the evil one unawares. In the first place, if you are re-baptized for the remission of sins, peradventure you may receive again the spirit of the Gospel in its glory, light and beauty; but if your hearts are so engrossed in the things of this world, that you do not know whether you want to be re-baptized or not, you had better shut yourselves up in some kanyon or closet, to repent of your sins, and call upon the name of the Lord, until you get His Spirit, and the light thereof, to reflect upon you, that you may know the nature of your offences,
Watt's Shorthand

what you have been doing this year passed
that you may realize
you are
here with the saints again
let me lead
your minds little further
I want to tell you something perhaps you
know it as well as I do
reflect upon it and realize it perhaps not and I call tell
you one truth
when the Lord Almighty opens [page break] the
vision of a person's mind
he shows them
things in spirit things
that will be and if any of
you had the vision of Zion you had when she was
in her beauty and glory
after Satan bound if
had reflected upon
the gathering of the saints it
is the spirit of gathering
and when your minds
open in vision
glory and excellency glory
[of the] gospel you didn't
see the vision
of driving cattle across
the plains
mud hole
stampede
amongst the cattle
not if there bad one
amongst the people you
saw the beauty

Watt's Longhand

Transcript

and your <your>
true condition;
that you may realize, and
appreciate the
blessing you enjoy in being
here with the saints of the
Most High. Let me lead
your minds a little further.
I wish to tell you something
which you may perhaps
know as well as I do, but
you may not have realized it.

When the Lord Almighty
opens the
vision of a person's mind
he shows them
things in spirit things
that will be. If any of
you had a vision of Zion, it was shown to you
in its beauty and glory,
after Satan is bound. If you
have reflected upon the
gathering of the saints, it
is the spirit of gathering
that enlightened you; and
when your minds were
opened in vision to behold
the glory and excellency of the gospel,
you did not see a vision
of driving cattle across
the plains, and where you
would be mired in this or
that mud hole. You did
not see the stampedes
among the cattle, and
one <those> of a worse
character among the
people; but you saw the
and glory of Zion, that you might be encouraged, and prepared to meet the afflictions, sorrows and disappointments of this mortal life, and overcome them, and be made ready to enjoy the glory of the Lord as it was revealed to you. It was given to you for your encouragement. Recollect that.

You will recollect my exhortation to those who have means; we want you to go forth and give the Perpetual Emigrating Fund a lift. Bring in your tithes and offerings, and we will help a great many more to this place next sea in the future than we have this year. We wish to double our diligence, and treble the crowd of emigrants by that fund. I wish to show you a little of the philosophy of mankind in their fallen and degraded state; you may consider it in the Gospel, or out of it; in the light of the Holy Spirit, or without it, as you please. The philosophy of mankind, in their daily vocations and deals one with another [page
by your own observation, and experience. I wish to notice a portion of it that has come under my notice. I could mention names, but I will content myself with naming circumstances. We pick up, say, 200 persons in England, and convey them across the water, and across the plains, and set them down in this valley: they commence to labor, and in a short time they make themselves comfortable. They can soon obtain plenty of the best kind of pay for their labor, such as bread, the staff of life, butter, cheese and vegetables. When a man gets these things, without the fancy nicknacks, he does well.

Suppose we pick up a company of these poor saints in England, whose faces are pale, and who cannot thread their way through the streets without the aid of a staff of life; for you may see them bowed down from very weakness with their arms across their stomachs, going toe and from their work; the greater part of them not enabled to get a bit of meat more than once.
Watt’s Shorthand
than once a month
get one
table spoonful of meal for
each person
family in day without butter
cheese by working
[21/20?] hours out of 24
and when go from
their work and come
from it want a staff in
hands to lean their stomach
upon bring 200 of
them here instead of
come being obliged to work
for 2 or 3 pence day
got dollar
dollar half and

go buy flour
to last
family week meat to last
week for day’s work
go walking through
streets
ask that
man
will you pay me for bringing
you here
I don’t
know you says he go to
another see if work for
you bringing you
to this place [page break]
what have I had
from you
what pay me your heart
begins to [sink?] you go to
third one

Watt’s Longhand
Transcript
once A month; and upon
an average only about one
table spoonful of meal per
day, for each person in A
family, without butter, or
cheese, by working
16 hours out of the 24; and
when they go from
their work, and return
from it they need A staff in
their hands to lean
upon. We bring 200 of
them here instead of
come being obliged to work
for 2 or 3 pence day,
you can get A dollar, and
A dollar and a half per
day. With one day’s wages
they can purchase flour,
and meat, and vegetables
enough to last A moder-
ately sized family one
week. They have not been
here long when they may
be seen swelling in the
streets with an air of perfect
independence. Ask that
one of these men if he
will pay you for bringing
you here; and he
will reply, “I do not
know you Sir.” You ask
another if he will work for
you, for bringing him out
to this place, and he will
appear quite astonished,
saying, “What have I had
from you!!”
Another will say “If I
work for you what will you
give me?”
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a month; and upon an
average only about one
table spoonful of meal per
day, for each person in a
family, without butter or
cheese, by working
16 hours out of the 24; and
when they go to their work and return
from it, they need a staff in
their hands to lean
upon. We bring 200 of
them here instead of their
being obliged to work for
two or three pence per day,
you can get a dollar and
a dollar and a half per
day. With one day’s wages
they can purchase flour
and meat and vegetables
enough to last a moderately
sized family one week.
They have not been
here long when they may
be seen swelling in the
streets with an air of perfect
independence. Ask
one of these men if he
will pay you for bringing
him here; and he
will reply, “I don’t
know you, sir.” You ask
another if he will work for
you, for bringing him out
to this place; and he will
appear quite astonished,
saying, “What have I had
from you?”
Another will say, “If I
work for you, what will you
give me?”
Can you give me some adobies? for I am going to build a fine house, or if you have any money to pay me, it will answer as well."

How does such language and ingratitude make the benefactor of that person feel? Why, his heart sinks within him. I can find thousands of just such men and women when brought to this place, they do not know their benefactors, who saved them from death, but they are head and shoulders above them, when they meet them in the streets.

Do you know the conclusion which is natural to man, when he is treated in such a manner by his fellow man? It is, “I wish I had left you in your own country.” I wish so too. I say let such persons starve to death, and die Christians, instead of being brought here to live and commit the sin of ingratitude, and die, and go to hell; for while they remained in their poverty they were used to the daily practice of praying for deliverance, let me have some adobes adobes no I am going build a fine house perhaps make you a few if you have money to pay me after I have house done how does man feel his heart sinks in him I can go through this town and territory find thousands of just such men and women when brought to this place don’t know their benefactors who saved them from death meet them in streets head and shoulders above them do you know what philosophy of man is this wealthy man used his means wished I had left you in England I wish so too let them starve to death and die Christian instead of coming here and go to hell

Can you give me some adobies? for I am going to build a fine house, or if you have any money to pay me, it will answer as well.”

How does such language and ingratitude make the benefactor of that person feel? Why, his heart sinks within him. I can find thousands of just such men and women in this territory. When they are brought to this place, they do not know their benefactors, who saved them from death, but they are a head and shoulders above them, when they meet them in the streets.

Do you know the conclusion that is natural to man, when he is treated in such a manner by his fellow man? It is, “I wish I had left you in your own country.” I wish so too. I say, let such persons starve to death, and die Christians, instead of being brought here to live and commit the sin of ingratitude, and die, and go to hell; for while they remained in their poverty they were used to the daily practice of praying for deliverance;
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they would die praying unto eternity and

bowels of compassion have mercy upon them but

here

go into eternity swearing.

I can pick up hundreds of men passed by their benefactors

turned around and didn’t know them

speak every thing against them their tongues can be allowed to and go and swear falsely about them the very men saved them from starvation to death (voice on stand true)73

I frequently referred to facts come under my own observation when I came into this valley74 I had

11 thousand dollars notes against brethren

nobody pay me [page break] one dime for we have helped men women and children from England to over 30 thousand dollars except

and I say it is better for them to die praying, and go into eternity praying, and the Almighty to have bowels of compassion and mercy towards them, than for them to come here, and lose the Spirit of God through ingratitude, and go into eternity swearing. I can pick up hundreds of men who have passed by their benefactors, and if they should speak to them, would turn round and say, “I really don’t know you.”

Or if they do, they will speak every thing against them their tongues can utter, or can be allowed to; and they will swear falsely about them—about the very men who have saved them from starvation and death.

I frequently refer to facts that come under my own observation. When I came into this valley I had notes amounting to $30,000 against brethren that we had assisted, which no person will pay me one d[1] Cent for.

We have helped men, women, and children from England to over the amount of $30,000. Except
Watt's Shorthand

one and that is a man name of Thomas Green lives in Utah and one woman but with exception of Thomas Green and one young woman from England never been man paid one dime to the

amount of over 30 thousand dollars and I hold their notes as obligations do I mean to be understood that no person pays their passage by no means great many here that do my remarks won't hit those honest with themselves God and brethren but it is the dishonest ones I expect my remarks will hit great many do pay and willing and thankful to pay but as far as I are concerned before I came into this valley with exception of one man and woman no person offered pay us one dime or would of them turned around and apostatized that we helped over and great many of them joined the mob

now do you see the philosophy of humanity
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one individual, and that is a man by the name of Thomas Green, who lives in Utah,

and one <young> woman who came from England, there has never been a single person who has paid one dime towards cancelling the debt amounting to over $30,000, besides other notes, accounts, and obligations which we hold.

Do I mean to be understood that no person pays their passage by no means.

My remarks will not hit these those, neither are they directed to them, who are thankful to their benefactors, who do, and are willing to pay.

But as far as I am concerned, before we came into this valley, with the exception of one man and woman, no person has offered to pay us one dime, and of them have turned away from the Church, and a number of them joined the mob, and sought to dye their hands in our blood.

Now do you see the philosophy of human Nature;
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one individual, and that is a man by the name of Thomas Green, who lives in Utah,

and one young woman, who came from England, there has never been a single person who has paid one dime towards cancelling a debt amounting to over $30,000, besides other notes, accounts, and obligations which we hold.

Do I mean to be understood that no person pays their passage by no means.

My remarks will not hit those, neither are they directed to them who are thankful to their benefactors, and who do, and are willing to pay.

But as far as I am concerned, before we came into this Valley, with the exception of one man and woman, no person has offered to pay us one dime, and eight-tenths of them have turned away from the Church, and a number of them joined the mob, and sought to dye their hands in our blood.

Now do you see the philosophy of human nature,
and I will go a little further
I say of divine nature do you see the philosophy of it
let me help a man
that makes an evil use of
the assistance that he gets
from me and
turns around to injure
himself and me and his
neighbor what do I say them
what does spirit of
Lord teach me
what Lord do
himself provided he was here do you
think he would with hold
the hand from him do
you think an
angel help a man
turn around and
destroy that angel and himself I do not neither
do I think the Lord [page break] would good man would neither then
I think bad man
distribute means
to have that means
use it to his own
injury it is the evil acts
covetousness in the hearts
of poor shuts up
bowels of compassion
in rich and they say
they will not help the poor
and we could have gathered

and <and> I will [page] 7
and <say> of divine Nature?

Let me help A man that
<who> makes an evil use of
the assistance
I render him, and
endeavour to injure
himselfe and me, and his
neighbor with it,

what does the spirit of
the Lord teach me in such <a>
circumstance?
What would the Lord do
himself provided he was here himself? Do you <not> think he would with<h>old
the thing from him? Do
you think A<n> man Angel
<Angel> would help a man
who would turn round and
destroy that Angel and himself? I do not; neither
do I think the Lord would,
and no good man
would if he knew it, <unless
it were Done with a view to
prove a person>. I do not think A bad man
would disstribute his means
to another individuals, or
to individuals # who would
use it <them> to his <or-
their> injury.
It is the evil actions, and
covetousness in the hearts
of the poor, that shuts up
the bowels of compassion
in the rich, and they say
they will not help the poor.
We could have gathered

and I will say
of divine nature?

Let me help a man
who makes an evil use of
the assistance
I render him, and
endeavours to injure
himself and me, and his
neighbour with it,

what does the Spirit of the
Lord teach me in such a
circumstance? What would the Lord do,
provided He was here himself? Do you not
think He would withhold
the thing from him? Do
you think an
angel would help a man
who would turn round and
destroy that angel and
himself? I do not, neither
do I think the Lord would,
and no good man
would if he knew it, unless
it were done with a view to
prove a person.
I do not think a bad man
would distribute his means
to another individual, or to
individuals, who would use
them to his injury.
It is the evil actions and
covetousness in the hearts
of the poor that shut up
the bowels of compassion
in the rich, and they say
they will not help the poor.
We could have gathered
hundreds of thousands to help the poor were it not that they have been so biased and continue to be biased and says they I don’t wish my means to go to evil use if you want to know what I mean by all this I mean when men women refuse to pay their passage fund

let them be cut off from the church and sue them to the law and collect that debt severe off that limb from the tree and then make them pay their honest debts that is to the poor I have said enough to the rich we want you to help turn in your means bring it on here perhaps some of you come along and say Brother Brigham send means to England now yes we have means there and this [instead of there?] turn it into the tithing office credit on books and our checks go there and turn there [would not?] we want we want to give a heavy lift another season

hundreds of thousands more of the poor were it not that the rich have been so biased, and still continue to be. Say they, “We do not wish our means to be applied to an evil use.” If you wish to know what I mean by all this, it is, that if any man or woman refuses to pay their passage to this place when they are in circumstances to do it, let them be cut off from the Church, and then sue them at the law, and collect the debt. Sever that limb from the tree, and then make them pay their honest debts. That is to the poor. We have said enough to the rich. We now want the rich to turn in their means, that the poor, the honest poor, may be delivered. Some of you may inquire if we wish to send the means to England now? Yes, we want the means now, which you can pay into the tithing office, and have it recorded on the books, to answer the means we have there, which can be used for next season. We want to give a heavy lift to the emigration of the poor next season.
We have brought out a considerable number this season, but it is hardly a beginning to what we wish to be brought out next season. The first duty of those who have been brought out, by the Perpetual Emigrating Fund, is to pay back that which they have received from it, the first opportunity, that others may receive the same benefit they have received.

We wish you in the first place to get something to eat, drink, and wear; but when you are in any way comfortable, we wish you to pay that debt the next thing you do, and replenish the Fund.

It is built upon a principle, if carried out properly, and the debts punctually refunded, to increase in wealth. The $5,000 that was sent for the poor four years ago this fall, if every man had been prompt to pay in that which he received, would have increased to $20,000.

We are the greatest speculators in the world. We have the greatest speculation on
Watt’s Shorthand
hand
on the earth I never denied being speculator
miser
greed for riches but some men chase
a picayune five thousand miles I would not turn around for it and preach the same gospel

little strong speculation
I am after to exchange this world

Watt’s Longhand
hand that can be found in all the earth. I never denied being a speculator. I never denied being a miser, or of feeling eager for riches; but some men will chase a picayune five thousand miles when I would not turn round for it, and yet we are preachers of the same gospel, and brethren in the same kingdom of God.

You may consider this is a little strong; but the speculation I am after, is to exchange this world, which in its present state, passes away, for a world that is eternal and unchangeable, for a glorified world filled with eternal riches,

for a world to come that is made an inheritance of the Gods of eternity. The plan is to make every thing bend to come to point revelation object of our priesthood to bring it again

the plan of system to make it bear
when we get through we reap the reward of just and get all our hearts can anticipate or

Journal of Discourses
1:322–27
hand that can be found in all the earth. I never denied [end of 326] being a speculator. I never denied being a miser, or of feeling eager for riches; but some men will chase a picayune five thousand miles when I would not turn round for it, and yet we are preachers of the same Gospel, and brethren in the same kingdom of God.

You may consider this is a little strong; but the speculation I am after, is to exchange this world, which, in its present state, passes away, for a world that is eternal and unchangeable, for a glorified world filled with eternal riches,

for the world that is made an inheritance for the Gods of eternity. The plan is to make every thing bend to the revelations of God; this is the object of our Priesthood—to bring into requisition every good thing, and make it bear for the accomplishment of the main point we have in view; and

when we get through we shall reap the reward of the just, and get all our hearts can anticipate or
Watt’s Shorthand

desire to lay plans for this just as much as merchant would think he was going into merchandizing for tradesmen of earth and is laying up gold and silver he lays his plans for it it is for us to lay plans to secure eternal lives for miser to lay up his gold upon the earth it is a [perfect/principle?] system gather into systematically if you do [page break] I say poor pay debt rich help the poor would not this bring wealth it would to be united as any work it in [--?] hands and helping one from another all possible and assisting in every point and place in speculation and be of one heart and mind in resurrection and then we will have all we can ask for here is wealth it is said union is power and that is enough if we get that we shall have power this plan for us to work upon and I wish the brethren to just whisper this around

Watt’s Longhand Transcript

di<s>ire. To lay plans for the attainment of this is just as necessary as to <for> A merchant to lay plans to get earthly riches by enter-ing by buying and selling merchant<d>ise.

It is for us to lay plans to secure to ourselves eternal lives, which is just as necessary as it is for the miser to lay plans to amass a great amount of Gold upon the earth; and it is for us to engage in it syst<e>matically.<l>y.

I say to the poor, pay your debts to the Perpetual Emigrating Fund, and to the rich, help the poor; and this will bring wealth, and strength, by each one according to his ability, calling, and means [page] 9 assisting in every point, and place in this great speculation for kingdoms, throns <thrones>, principalities, and powers.

It is said union is strength, and that is enough; if we get that, we shall have power. This is the plan for us to work upon, and I wish the Bre<n> to w<h>isper this arround among your <their> neighbors

Journal of Discourses 1:322–27

desire. To lay plans for the attainment of this, is just as necessary as for a merchant to lay plans to get earthly riches by buying and selling merchandise.

It is for us to lay plans to secure to ourselves eternal lives, which is just as necessary as it is for the miser to lay plans to amass a great amount of gold upon the earth; and it is for us to engage in it systematically.

I say to the poor, pay your debts to the Perpetual Emigrating Fund; and to the rich, help the poor; and this will bring wealth and strength, by each one according to his ability, calling, and means,

assisting in every point and place in this great speculation for kingdoms, thrones, principalities and powers.

It is said union is strength; and that is enough; if we get that, we shall have power. This is the plan for us to work upon, and I wish the brethren to whisper this around among their neighbours,
when they go out of this tabernacle, and say, what can we give to the Perpetual Emigrating Fund? Can we give anything this season? We will not refuse to take anything from the sisters. Do you ask how small an amount we will take? We will take from a pin to a bed quilt; but be sure, when you bring a pin, that you have not many other things in your trunk that would be useful, more than you at the present need; for if you bring a pin under such circumstances you cannot receive a blessing, and the reward it is entitled to. If the clothing you wear each day is all you have, and you need to borrow a shawl to go out in, and you have only a pin to bestow, bring that, and you shall receive a blessing.

We think it is not necessary to give you the report of the P. E. Fund this Conference.

It is doing well but if we want it to do a great deal better. A great deal.

We want to swell the operation, and bring the
them by
scores of thousands instead
of by hundreds. This is one object I
wish laid before the
conference
before we
get through we shall call for
quite number of elders
we anticipate
our missionaries
called at the
other conference in August

call a great many
this conference
inquire may be where
do you want us to go
tell you when you
are ready to go prepare
your hearts and
circumstances
against your going we
want to send the gospel to
all Israel may the Lord
bless you amen

poor from the nations by
scores of thousands, instead
of by hundreds.
This embraces what I
wished to lay before the
Conference upon this point.
Before the Conference is
concluded we shall call for
quite a number of Elders.
It was anticipated that the
our missionaries would
have been called at the
August Conference of this
year, but we will
call a considerable number
this Conference. instead.
You need not inquire where
we want you to go, for it
will be told you, when you
are ready. Prepare
your minds and circumstances,
against that time, for we
wish to send the gospel to
Israel. May the Lord
69. Brigham Young, speech, Salt Lake City, October 6, 1853, Papers of George D. Watt, Church History Library, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as CHL), transcribed from shorthand by LaJean Purcell Carruth.

70. Start of new paragraph; previous phrase is part of separate paragraph.

71. Middle digit is illegible.

72. 21 written over 20, or vice versa.

73. Watt used ( ) to enclose words spoken from the audience.

74. Throughout this discussion, Brigham Young described two groups of people, those who owed him money when he first arrived in Salt Lake Valley, and those who owed money for their journey to the valley. While transcribing, Watt conflated these two groups and incorrectly changed numbers to fit the situation as he saw it.

75. Brigham Young is apparently referring again to the first group, those who received money prior to the Saints’ departure to the valley, not to those who received help under the Perpetual Emigrating Fund. See continued discussion below, which more clearly states that the nonpaying group were those who had received aid before the Saints came to the valley.

76. Journal of Discourses reads 8/10; number as written is ambiguous.

77. Thousands written over 0.

78. Put in it appears to be wiped out.

79. Brigham Young, speech, Salt Lake City, October 6, 1853, Papers of George D. Watt, CHL, transcription prepared by Silvia Ghosh, Brent L. Carruth, and LaJean Purcell Carruth.

80. Would not is written over illegible longhand.

81. And we is written over illegible, wiped-out longhand.

82. The is written over illegible, wiped-out longhand.

83. His is written over illegible, scraped-off longhand.

84. Of life is written over illegible, scraped-off longhand.

85. 24 written over 22.

86. Note on manuscript: “no paragraph wanted here.” A circle is drawn around this note, and a curved line drawn from the end of this paragraph to the beginning of the next paragraph.

87. By is written over illegible longhand.

88. The is written over illegible, scraped-off longhand.

89. Tabernacle is written over illegible, wiped-out longhand.
Grace in the Book of Mormon

Brent J. Schmidt

This chapter is excerpted from Relational Grace: The Reciprocal and Binding Covenant of Charis, by Brent J. Schmidt (BYU Studies, 2015).

Teachings of the Book of Mormon, published in 1830, sometimes stand in tension with ideas of grace that emerged in late antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the modern era. These Book of Mormon usages reach back into the ideas of grace that are more at home in the worlds of the Bible and the ancient Mediterranean. In teaching that grace is a manifestation of God’s goodness to human-kind, and that it is closely aligned with mercy and Christ’s Atonement to meet the demands of justice and make salvation possible, Book of Mormon usages of grace largely parallel the meanings of hesed (mercy, Hebrew) from the Old Testament, together with the social concepts that prevailed in the ancient world that all gifts give rise to reciprocal obligations. In essence, grace in the Book of Mormon necessarily enables and encourages disciples to try to restore broken covenant relationships by finding their way back into God’s presence, reciprocating his mercy and goodness, and thus enjoying life and eternal rest with him, embraced by his love and outstretched arms.

The word grace appears thirty-one times in the Book of Mormon, in twenty-seven verses found in the words of Lehi, Nephi, Jacob, the two Almas, Mormon, and Moroni. This chapter does not provide an exhaustive analysis of grace in the Book of Mormon. Rather, my goal here is to give an overview of the meaning of grace in the Book of Mormon to
When I was twelve, a young friend whose father was a local pastor told me that I was not a Christian because Mormons don’t believe in Christ’s grace. My questions about grace and salvation eventually led me to study Greek and Roman classics as well as the Bible. In graduate study, I learned that the Greek word for grace, *charis*, has several usages, including giving compliments about a person’s gracefulness and beauty, but when used in the sense of giving favor or in any context of a relationship between people, the word always has a connotation that the person giving grace expected something in return. The giver expected return favors, service, gratitude, honor, and obedience. These *charis* relationships were generally between people of unequal status, such as a king and a commoner.

Reading the New Testament with this knowledge in mind, I see that grace is not the free, one-way, permanent gift that some Christians say it is. Augustine, Luther, and others used neo-Platonic philosophies to create a new paradigm of grace that requires little or nothing of recipients to receive salvation. I have become aware of several New Testament commentators who acknowledge this shift in meaning.

The New Testament teaches that receiving God’s grace leads to the formation of a reciprocal or covenant relationship—informing the very nature of the Father’s gift of his Son that is extended to us. This understanding has increased my appreciation for the Atonement of Jesus Christ and my desire to keep and renew covenants and endure to the end. I sincerely hope understanding a little about the theological and linguistic history of grace will intellectually and spiritually benefit all readers in these and so many other ways.

In my book *Relational Grace: The Reciprocal and Binding Covenant of Charis* (BYU Studies, 2015), the first eight chapters review reciprocity and gift exchange in ancient cultures, in classical Greek, Roman, and Jewish usage, in the Bible, and in Christian history from ancient to modern times. This chapter, number nine, shows that Book of Mormon teachings resonate with the ancient understanding of grace and give us precious and plain truths of salvation. Final chapters explicate the meaning of grace in LDS doctrine and scholarship.
show that grace is regularly associated there with reciprocal obligations and to situate the Book of Mormon broadly within the history of grace. No teaching of the Book of Mormon implies that grace, or the coming or returning to God, is available to humans outside of a reciprocal relationship between God and humanity. These usages will be reviewed here sequentially and also thematically.

Much more frequently used but conceptually related to the idea of grace are other relational terms, such as mercy, mercies, and merciful, which together appear about 150 times in the Book of Mormon, with love and loved being used some 68 times. These and other similar terms in the Book of Mormon strongly cultivate the importance of reciprocal relationships between righteous individuals and their God. Thus, the following discussion will first survey all the places in the Book of Mormon where the word grace explicitly appears, author by author. It will then look at King Benjamin’s speech and other sermons or texts, which, although they do not use the word grace, are nonetheless also crucial to understanding the Book of Mormon’s teachings about how one can obtain salvation from death and hell through grace, covenantal service, repentance, and obedience. All of this is made possible only by maintaining a loyal and thankful relationship with Christ, the Redeemer, Lord, and Savior.

Explicit Mentions of Grace in the Book of Mormon

Although all authors who contributed to the Book of Mormon likely understood the important formation and operation of the covenant relations between God and his people (which afforded blessings contingent upon the performance of righteous responsibilities), only seven writers in the Book of Mormon refer to grace explicitly. The insights added by each of these authors reflect their own times, circumstances, needs, and desires, as they urgently wrote about the covenants of God with his people. In this religious context, these writers speak of the grace and goodness God has promised to give to those who will have him to be their God, and at the same time they remind the people of the commitments and obligations they willingly and lovingly have taken

upon themselves as their part of the reciprocal covenant relationship between themselves and God.

**Lehi.** The word *grace* appears in Lehi’s words only twice, in his blessing to his son Jacob, but the word *mercy* appears from the beginning of his calling as a prophet. Lehi painfully witnessed the unfaithfulness of the people in Jerusalem, which would lead to the destruction of the Temple and the Holy City. He also suffered physical agonies during his family’s arduous journey to the New World and was torn by internal strife among his own sons. In facing these challenges, Lehi found refuge in the assurances given to him by revelation that all the inhabitants of the earth could eventually be blessed and preserved by the Lord God Almighty, to which he exclaimed: “Thy throne is high in the heavens, and thy power, and goodness, and mercy are over all the inhabitants of the earth; and because thou art merciful, thou wilt not suffer those who come unto thee that they shall perish!” (1 Ne. 1:14). In that vision, it was plainly made manifest to Lehi that a messiah would come to redeem the world (1 Ne. 1:19).

At the end of Lehi’s life, as he blessed his son Jacob, Lehi spoke about the relationship that would exist between that messiah and those who would receive the benefits of his redemption. On the Messiah’s part, he would minister to people in the flesh (2 Ne. 2:4), offering himself “a sacrifice for sin.” Lehi affirmed that “redemption cometh in and through the Holy Messiah; for he is full of grace and truth” (2 Ne. 2:6). Lehi is evidently thinking very broadly here, speaking of a fullness of the various aspects of grace founded on this reciprocal relationship. As Lehi goes on to state, the grace of the Holy Messiah operates together with his “merits and mercy” (2 Ne. 2:8). For Lehi, grace exists within a constellation of divine virtues—God’s truth, dependability, holiness, and mercy, even to the laying down of his own life (2 Ne. 2:10). This Atonement, however, would be efficacious only to those who would serve him and would come with “a broken heart and a contrite spirit” (2 Ne. 2:7).

Through this grace, everyone will stand in the presence of God to be judged and may “dwell in the presence of God” (2 Ne. 2:8, 10). Through his covenant, which God will always remember (Lev. 26:42), all who have died will be resurrected (2 Ne. 2:8); and here Lehi may be thinking of the people in Jerusalem, which he knows has been destroyed, as well as remembering deceased family members.

**Jacob.** No doubt influenced by his father’s words, Lehi’s son Jacob mentions grace on four occasions in his great covenant speech in 2 Nephi 9–10. Jacob locates grace together with God’s wisdom, mercy,
and greatness (2 Ne. 9:8, 53). In a temple context and speaking shortly after the temple in the land of Nephi was completed and dedicated, Jacob distinctively refers to “grace divine” (2 Ne. 10:25), and he sees the extension of God’s greatness, grace, and mercy coming through the great “covenants of the Lord,” “his condescensions,” and his covenantal promises that Lehi’s “seed shall not utterly be destroyed,” but that God would preserve them to become “a righteous branch unto the house of Israel” (2 Ne. 9:53).

In order for this salvific relationship to materialize, those bound to God through his covenant, as Jacob taught, must reconcile themselves “to the will of God,” and “remember, after ye are reconciled unto God, that it is only in and through the grace of God that ye are saved” (2 Ne. 10:24). If covenant people do not submit to the will of the devil and to the flesh, God will then cause their spirits to rise, to be protected “from everlasting death by the power of the atonement,” that people “may be received into the eternal kingdom of God” and there praise God in thankful return for his divine grace (2 Ne. 10:25). In this powerful temple sermon, Jacob elaborates in detail about the covenantal relationship between God and his people, including the services that both he and his people are obliged to perform under what Jacob calls “the merciful plan of the great Creator” (2 Ne. 9:6).

Nephi. On only two occasions does Nephi, Jacob’s older brother, refer to grace. First, in the text immediately after Jacob’s temple sermon, Nephi affirms his father Lehi’s declaration that the fullness of grace is to be found in the Holy Messiah and also ratifies the explanation that Jacob had given about the covenant relationship between God and his people. Nephi here not only looks back to the covenant made by God with Lehi and his posterity, but also his soul delights “in the covenants of the Lord which he hath made to our fathers,” evidently referring to the covenants made by God to Moses, Abraham, and others (2 Ne. 11:5). Realizing this full array of covenants that established durable promises and obligations by his fathers, Nephi concurrently delights in God’s “grace, and in his justice, and power, and mercy in the great and eternal plan of deliverance from death” (2 Ne. 11:5). To Jacob’s panoply of grace, wisdom, mercy, and greatness, Nephi adds God’s “justice and power,” and ties grace into not only the merciful plan by which the world was created, but the “eternal plan” through which God’s people can be delivered from death.

Second, knowing the value and importance of that relationship, Nephi, later in the text, explains why he works so hard to persuade his
posterity and his brethren, faithful or recalcitrant, “to believe in Christ,” the Messiah, and “to be reconciled to God,” preserving or restoring their good standing within the covenantal relationship between them and the Lord, “for we know that it is by grace that we are saved, after all we can do” (2 Ne. 25:23). Here Nephi’s famous words, as indicated by the italics, echo almost verbatim the words of Jacob in 2 Nephi 10:24,2 where Jacob admonished the brethren to reconcile themselves to the will of God and to remember that “after ye are reconciled unto God, that it is only in and through the grace of God that you are saved.” Nephi’s phrase “be reconciled to God” is a shortened allusion to Jacob’s slightly longer phrases “reconcile yourselves to the will of God” and “after ye are reconciled to God.”3 When Nephi says that “we know that it is by grace that we are saved,” he speaks not only for himself but also implicitly recognizes Jacob as the source of this expression of their belief. Moreover, when Nephi refers to “after all we can do,” he would expect his readers to recall what Jacob had previously said, when Jacob explained that salvation can operate through the grace of God only after one is reconciled unto God. “After all we can do” is then an elliptical reference to Jacob’s “after ye are reconciled unto God,” thereby maintaining the covenantal relationship through divine atonement and human reconciliation of any infractions, thereby allowing the grace, justice, wisdom, power, mercy, and greatness of God to operate so that we “are saved” (2 Ne. 10:24; 25:23).

Joseph Spencer, who draws many connections between 2 Nephi 10:24 and 2 Nephi 25:23, places these verses in the context of the whole book of 2 Nephi and the purpose for which Nephi kept his record. What “Nephi and Jacob ask their readers and hearers to do is to be reconciled to God.” This happens when people “stop holding out against God’s purposes, when we ‘yield’ and therefore cease, at last, to be ‘an enemy to

2. These two verses may be seen as chiastic parallels, suggesting that they are to be contemplated as a pair. Welch sees the book of 2 Nephi as a five-element chiasm, with Jacob’s commentary of Isaiah (2 Ne. 6–10), having 2 Nephi 10 at its end, corresponding to Nephi’s commentary on Isaiah (2 Ne. 25–30), having 2 Nephi 25 at its beginning. John W. Welch, “Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon,” in Chiasmus in Antiquity (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 201, available online at http://publications.maxwellinstitute.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1131&index=9.

3. Stephen Ehat also has noted that both of these verses use the word “after” and not the word “because,” thus avoiding the idea that grace is the result of works. The requirement of works, or “all we can do,” then leads to reconciling oneself to God; after a person is reconciled he can then be saved by grace. Stephen Ehat, email to John W. Welch, May 15, 2015.
God, ‘as the angel put it to King Benjamin (Mosiah 3:19),’ and enter into a covenant to keep God’s commandments (Mosiah 5:5–8). Spencer suggests that “Nephi took the doctrine of grace to be most relevant when he recognized the real temptation human beings feel to resist the revelatory. . . . Grace is what we are ignoring whenever we resist God’s gentle (or not-so-gentle) entreaties. . . . If we can be still . . . we might know, as Nephi did, that God is God, and that it is God who saves by grace.”

Discussion of Nephi’s view of grace is incomplete without connecting it to his message in 2 Nephi 31. In that chapter, it becomes clear that “all we can do” is to recognize Christ as the Savior, follow him, repent, enter into the covenant of baptism, receive the Holy Ghost, remain steadfast in hope and love, and endure to the end. Those who keep the covenants will then receive eternal life through grace.

Alma. The next primary author to use the word grace in the Book of Mormon is Alma the Younger. In three of his most powerful speeches—first, in addressing Nephites in Zarahemla who appear to have slackened in their covenantal commitments; second, to faithful recent arrivals from the land of Nephi now resettled in the city of Gideon; and third, in addressing the apostate Nehorites in Ammonihah—Alma turns powerfully to grace as a crucial element in maintaining righteousness before God. Like Lehi and Jacob before him, Alma couples grace with mercy. He goes on in describing the Son of God as being full of grace, mercy, truth, equity, patience, and longsuffering (Alma 5:48; 9:26; 13:9).

On God’s part in this grace relationship, Alma emphasizes that God will “take away the sins of the world” and will be “quick to hear the cries of his people and to answer their prayers” (Alma 9:26). On the part of the beneficiaries, Alma enumerates that they must “steadfastly believe on his name” (Alma 5:48) and humble themselves before God (Alma 7:3), repent and obey the will of God, and petition God, “supplicating of his grace” (Alma 7:3).

As the high priest of the people in the land of Zarahemla, but having recently stepped down after nine years of serving also as the chief judge, Alma shows particular interest in the judicial aspects of mercy, equity, and justice as he invites his people to be faithful, repent, and maintain, individually and as a people together, their relationship with God. Thus, in his words to Corianton in Alma 39–42, Alma names the path to salvation

as “the plan of redemption” (Alma 39:18; 42:11, 13), “the plan of restoration” (Alma 41:2), “the great plan of salvation” (Alma 42:5) “the great plan of happiness” (Alma 42:8, 16), and “the plan of mercy” (Alma 42:15, 31), but he could just as well have called it “the plan of grace.” Alma explains that God’s plan gives mankind time to repent—a space of time between sin and judgment (Alma 42:4), and this is the essence of mercy. If people were to see immediate judgment and punishment for their sins, it would be easy to avoid sin, there would not be any need for faith, and there would not be a space of time for people to examine their hearts or to come to themselves, and the plan of salvation would be frustrated (Alma 42:5). Delayed judgment allows for voluntary, not compulsory, repentance, and that condition makes it possible for mercy to take effect and not destroy justice (Alma 42:13). Mercy defers justice, but does not rob justice, for there will still be a judgment. In Alma’s view, God’s grace extends to a time or space for repentance to occur.

**Mormon.** The word *grace* makes an important appearance in Mormon’s editorial writings. First, in describing the baptisms at the waters of Mormon, Mormon reflects wistfully upon the righteous successes of Alma the Elder, whose posterity would keep the records that were finally entrusted to Mormon. Looking back on that idyllic moment, Mormon was undoubtedly drawn to the beauties of that place, not only because he shared the name of that place of covenanting, but also because of his great disappointment that his own people had turned from their covenants and “that the day of grace was passed with them, both temporally and spiritually” (Morm. 2:15). He looked back on that as a time when 204 souls were “filled with the grace of God” (Mosiah 18:16), and when their priests for their recompense received only “the grace of God, that they might wax strong in the spirit, having the knowledge of God, that they might teach with power and authority from God” (Mosiah 18:26), and in “doing these things, they did abound in the grace of God” (Mosiah 27:5).

Commenting on the wicked condition that plagued the people of Nephi during the book of Helaman, Mormon devoutly prayed that God might “grant, in his great fulness, that men might be brought unto repentance and good works, that they might be restored unto grace for grace, according to their works” (Hel. 12:24). Knowing as he did the impending demise of the Nephite civilization, Mormon realized that some will not be brought back unto repentance and that indeed some will ultimately be cast out, not being restored to a reciprocal “grace for grace” relationship with God (Hel. 12:25), who would, as a mother hen, have gathered these people unto himself, but they would not (3 Ne. 10:5–6).
In his own day, four centuries later, Mormon could not find grace operating among his people (Morm. 2:15), who had come out “in open rebellion against their God,” in effect repudiating the covenants and the relationship they could and should have maintained with God. Nevertheless, in each of the three letters that he wrote to his son Moroni, Mormon recognized the grace of God that still extended to him and to his few righteous followers. In the first, having survived several initial catastrophic military disasters, Mormon acknowledged that he was able to speak to the congregation of his beloved brethren only “by the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, and his holy will, because of the gift of his calling” (Moro. 7:2). As his second letter begins, grace is once again on Mormon’s mind, who prays continually to the Father in the name of his Holy Child Jesus that he, “through his infinite goodness and grace, will keep you through the endurance of faith on his name to the end” (Moro. 8:3). Mormon’s third letter concludes by exhorting Moroni to be faithful, hopeful, and reassured that through God’s mercy and longsuffering, the grace of God the Father will “abide with you forever” (Moro. 9:25–26).

**Moroni.** Having received this final encouragement from his father, Moroni goes on to complete the plates of Mormon, adding the books of Ether and his own book of Moroni to the final record. From Moroni’s perspective, the importance of men coming to God in order for them to partake of and benefit from God’s grace takes prominence: “If men come unto me I will show unto them their weakness. . . . My grace is sufficient for all men that humble themselves before me; for if they humble themselves before me, and have faith in me, then will I make weak things become strong unto them” (Ether 12:27). In other words, all must humble themselves, putting themselves in a relationship with God that recognizes him as the Lord, with themselves as hopeful beneficiaries. If they have faith and trust in this relationship, the Father promises to make their weakness a strength.

No doubt, the invitation to “come unto me” in Ether 12:27 echoes the invitation of Jesus Christ, who speaks in the first part of the book of Ether, saying, “Come unto me all ye Gentiles, and I will show unto you the greater things,” and “Come unto me, O ye House of Israel, and it shall be made manifest unto you how great things the Father hath laid

5. Likewise, four late New Testament letters, perhaps also authored in times of distress by Paul and John, begin by recognizing that it is by grace, mercy, and peace that they might yet communicate encouragement to their people, albeit in times of great trouble (1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; Titus 1:4; 2 John 1:3).
up for you, from the foundation of the world” (Ether 4:13–14). Moroni now affirms that he has “prayed unto the Lord that he would give unto the Gentiles grace, that they might have charity” (Ether 12:36), in particular that the Gentiles would be charitable in not rejecting the Book of Mormon because of the weaknesses of their writers (Ether 12:35). Moroni recognizes that the Gentiles have been given a “talent” and therefore were in some kind of stewardship relationship with God, who expected them to use that talent in doing the will of the Master. As for Moroni, however, having himself been a faithful servant to the Master, the Lord assures him that “because thou hast seen thy weakness thou shalt be made strong, even unto the sitting down in the place which I have prepared in the mansions of my Father” (Ether 12:37). In other words, Moroni is told that he will successfully enjoy the perfection of his relationship with the Lord.

In much the same way that Mormon had concluded his final epistle to Moroni (by invoking a blessing upon his son that the grace of God would abide with him forever [Moro. 9:26]), Moroni concludes his final editorial insertion in the book of Ether by commending Jesus to his readers that they might seek a relationship with Christ so that “the grace of God the Father, and also the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, which beareth record of them, may be and abide in you forever” (Ether 12:41).

Reiterating these ideas in his culminating conclusion, Moroni invites all people to “come unto Christ, and be perfected in him,” and to “love God with all your might, mind and strength,” promising “then is his grace sufficient for you, that by his grace ye may be perfect in Christ” (Moro. 10:32). By coming to Christ, denying oneself of all ungodliness, and loving God with all one’s might, a grace relationship is created so that the obligor “may be perfected” in and by his Lord. And on God’s part, sanctification in Christ will be brought about “by the grace of God, through the shedding of the blood of Christ” (Moro. 10:33). All of this is possible through the reciprocally obliging “covenant of the Father” (Moro. 10:33), bestowing upon the covenant observers the benefit of “the remission of your sins, that ye become holy, without spot” (Moro. 10:33).

**Thematic Uses of Grace in the Book of Mormon**

Thematically, grace is used in the Book of Mormon in conjunction with such covenantal teachings as returning service and thanks to God, repentance, relating to God, salvation, and the loss of one’s access to the grace relationship.
What Is Required in Return for Grace? As King Benjamin teaches of mercy, atonement, service, obedience, wisdom, power, and justice (Mosiah 2:39; 3:26; 4:2; 5:15), he teaches that disciples should serve God and others, even though in so doing they still remain unprofitable servants and unable to repay God for his gifts; the very air we breathe is a gift from God (Mosiah 2:22). Even though no one can come close to repaying God for his offer of forgiveness, resurrection, and eternal life, there is still much that disciples must do. Benjamin does not say that nothing is required in return. God has given the gift of life to mankind, and when his children respond to God with obedience, he blesses them in return, and they are forever in his debt (Mosiah 2:21–25). This kind of recurring reciprocity was practiced in the ancient world: a person of means would give something of value, the receiver was then obliged to respond with gratitude and obedience, the giver would give more gifts, and the cycle continued indefinitely.6 The recognition of this obligation to keep God’s commandments and praise and thank him parallels the ancient idea of reciprocity. Benjamin’s teachings thus align with the view of hesed and charis in the ancient Mediterranean world. (See the sidebar on p. 120.)

Grace and Repentance. Helaman 12:24 commands men to remember God and his greatness: “And may God grant, in his great fulness, that men might be brought unto repentance and good works, that they might be restored unto grace for grace, according to their works.” The phrase “that they might” suggests that when God brings people to repentance and good works, then they will be restored unto grace for grace, and the final clause clarifies that grace is restored “according to their works.” While this verse may say that grace is dependent on works, it needs to be taken in context of this chapter, which lists many ways that people are foolish, proud, selfish, and forgetful of God. The message is that those whose works are evil will not attain grace until they remember God and repent. Repentance is necessary to obtain grace; disciples must become true followers of God. One of the best examples of this in the Book of Mormon is the conversion of Alma the Younger, who was one of the vilest of sinners (Mosiah 28:4). But after his conversion, Alma

---

6. Anciently, grace was a “code which recognized that reciprocal favors initiated a sequence of exchanged kindnesses. The code enjoyed the endorsement of the most basic unwritten law.” Bonnie MacLachlan, The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 22.
labored throughout the rest of his life to build up the Church by working to help others repent and receive the Holy Ghost (Alma 36:23–24).

The Book of Mormon urges all to repent, which parallels the ancient virtue of loyalty to those who had given *charis*. Because people cannot be saved in their sins (Alma 11:34, 36, 37), we gain full access to the Savior’s grace and can be saved from spiritual death through repentance. Two brief examples illustrate this point. First, when being taught the gospel by Aaron, Lamoni’s father declared that he was willing to give up all his sins to know God (Alma 22:18). Second, repentant Lamanites who became Ammonites buried their swords rather than shed blood again (Alma 24:12–17). These examples demonstrate how the Book of Mormon teaches that those who truly received the gift of the Atonement reciprocally did all in their power to show their thankfulness, be obedient, and endure to the end.

**One’s Relationship with God Is of Supreme Importance.** Ether 12:27 teaches, “And if men come unto me I will show unto them their weakness. I give unto men weakness that they may be humble; and my grace is sufficient for all men that humble themselves before me; for if they humble themselves before me, and have faith in me, then will I make weak things become strong unto them.” I read this as God giving men weakness to cause them to realize that he is in charge and that they must seek a relationship with him. Pride is an enemy; people must become humble before him; God alone has the power to make individuals and communities strong. Humanity’s relationship with God is everything, and that relationship must be founded on humility.

Perhaps Moroni 10:32–33 stresses grace more than any other verse in the Book of Mormon:

Yea, come unto Christ, and be perfected in him, and deny yourselves of all ungodliness; and if ye shall deny yourselves of all ungodliness, and love God with all your might, mind and strength, then is his grace sufficient for you, that by his grace ye may be perfect in Christ; and if by the grace of God ye are perfect in Christ, ye can in nowise deny the power of God. And again, if ye by the grace of God are perfect in Christ, and deny not his power, then are ye sanctified in Christ by the grace of God, through the shedding of the blood of Christ, which is in the covenant of the Father unto the remission of your sins, that ye become holy, without spot.

The “if, then” structure throughout this verse marks the cause and effect: those who seek God with all they have and deny themselves of all ungodliness will be forgiven and will be acceptable because of God’s grace. Then comes the amazing promise that they may become perfect
in Christ. Those who receive this grace cannot possibly deny the power of God. If they become perfect in Christ, they become sanctified. It is God’s power, not theirs, that makes them whole. It is because of their relationship with both God and Christ that they become recipients of grace. One does not achieve this reward quickly or easily. In fact, these final verses from the book of Moroni are mirrored by the very first chapters of that same book (chapters 1–6), which describe several ordinances, actions, and commandments necessary to achieve salvation—some of which must be repeated indefinitely (such as meeting often to “partake of bread and wine, in remembrance of the Lord Jesus” [Moro. 6:6]).

What We Are Saved From and How We Are Saved. The authors of the Book of Mormon teach that there are two kinds of death that we must overcome in order to become exalted—physical and spiritual. As I will discuss below, Jesus Christ’s gift we call grace will save all people from physical death. It is free to all people; all will be resurrected (Alma 40:4). The Savior’s gift can also save people from spiritual death if they keep God’s commandments. Book of Mormon prophets teach that only those who fully engage with the Savior’s atoning sacrifice are able to escape spiritual death and receive eternal life and exaltation.

Another aspect of grace in 2 Nephi 10:23–24 (mentioned above) is agency, or free will. “Remember that ye are free to act for yourselves. . . . Reconcile yourselves to the will of God . . . and remember . . . that it is only in and through the grace of God that ye are saved. Wherefore, may God raise you from death by the power of the resurrection, and also from everlasting death by the power of the atonement, that ye may be received into the eternal kingdom of God, that ye may praise him through grace divine.” It is clear in this verse that certain actions are required for individuals to reach God’s kingdom. They cannot depend on grace alone, though grace is absolutely essential and necessary. In addition to providing this grace, God requires individuals to choose, to work, to act. Both grace and works are essential to this plan.

Physical resurrection is the Savior’s free gift given to all who have lived upon the earth. The prophet Alma taught in Alma 11:42–45 that God will provide salvation from physical death for all: “Now, there is a death which is called a temporal death; and the death of Christ shall loose the bands of this temporal death, that all shall be raised from this temporal death” (v. 42). Resurrection is an essential part of God’s plan for us to receive a body and is contingent on the Atonement. Even though all people will receive resurrection, it will not be all at the same time. The righteous will be resurrected first (Mosiah 15:22).
Spiritual death is a separation from God or being denied access to God's presence. While God will eventually bring all into his presence to be judged (Alma 42:23), for some, this reunion will be temporary. To truly overcome spiritual death is to enter God's kingdom and dwell with him eternally. Multiple Book of Mormon authors make it clear that faith in Christ, repentance from sin, baptism, obedience to commandments, and enduring to the end in faith are essential for salvation from spiritual death (especially in 2 Ne. 31 and 3 Ne. 11). Being reconciled unto God or released from spiritual death occurs through keeping one's sacred covenants with the Lord. I see this as reciprocal grace.

Some dissidents within the Book of Mormon argued that salvation required absolutely no individual effort and were characterized as teaching popular but false doctrines. The idea that all will enter the kingdom of God whether or not they have repented is condemned in the Book of Mormon through the dramatic silencing of these dissenters. They substituted their system of free grace for the grace offered by the Savior.\(^7\) The dissenter Nehor taught the Nephites a sort of salvation by grace that was unconditional. This doctrine became popular among the people and had to be condemned by the prophets:

> He [Nehor] had gone about among the people, preaching to them that which he termed to be the word of God, bearing down against the church; declaring unto the people that every priest and teacher ought to become popular; and they ought not to labor with their hands, but that they ought to be supported by the people. And he also testified unto the people that all mankind should be saved at the last day, and that they need not fear nor tremble, but that they might lift up their heads and rejoice; for the Lord had created all men, and had also redeemed all men; and, in the end, all men should have eternal life. And it came to pass that he did teach these things so much that many did believe on his words, even so many that they began to support him and give him money. (Alma 1:3–5)

In my reading of this text, Nehor rejected the need for the transformative power of the Atonement, since I believe he promoted an easy and convenient form of grace in which “all mankind should be saved at the last day.”\(^8\) The Book of Mormon emphatically teaches that this particular

---

interpretation of grace is a false doctrine (Alma 1:14–16). It hindered many Nephites who followed Nehor and others of his order from truly repenting of their sins.

In an additional example, Korihor drew upon his followers’ desire for control and self-righteousness, as he argued that one should carve out success through one’s own intellect, brawn, and skills. Under this philosophy, those who are independently strong will naturally progress without any help from the Savior (see Alma 30:16–17). Furthermore, according to Korihor’s way of thinking, covenants and grace are not needed. As I have highlighted above, Book of Mormon prophets consistently taught that God required dependence on him alone for salvation.

**Grace Can Be Lost.** Some who once were righteous fell away and lost the grace that they had received. Even the righteous brother of Jared was warned by the Lord that the Spirit would not always strive with him if he continued to forget to pray (Ether 2:15). Throughout the Book of Mormon, we read about dissenters among the Nephites who eventually left the church, refused to repent, and continued to live sinful lives in a state of apostasy, often defecting to the Lamanites. Unless the power of the preaching of the word touched their hearts, as with Aminadab and others mentioned in Helaman chapter 5, dissenters such as Amlici and Amalickiah usually led difficult lives filled with contention, warfare, and often an early death. Nephi told us that the spirit ceased to strive with the Jerusalemites because they rejected the prophets (1 Ne. 7:14). Both the Nephites and the Lamanites eventually rejected the Savior (2 Ne. 26:11; Morm. 5:16) and destroyed each other in combat with merciless slaughter (Morm. 4:5); their whole societies lost grace. Mormon reports that “the day of grace was passed with them” (Morm. 2:15).

**Conclusion**

In sum, the Book of Mormon teaches that grace and salvation are available only through coming to Christ, following him, and enduring to the end. This point of enduring to the end is taught in nine Book of Mormon verses. For example, Amaleki exhorts his brethren, “Yea, come unto him, and offer your whole souls as an offering unto him, and continue in fasting and praying, and endure to the end; and as the Lord liveth ye will be saved” (Omni 1:26). The Savior’s personal teaching included,

---
“Behold, I am the law, and the light. Look unto me, and endure to the end, and ye shall live; for unto him that endureth to the end will I give eternal life” (3 Ne. 15:9). While this teaching is found only rarely in the New Testament (see Matt. 24:13; Mark 13:13), the Book of Mormon emphasizes the need for continuing in grace as a lifelong endeavor. The reception of grace is not a one-time event, but the extension of and the development of a comfortable, loving, committed and endearing relationship between God and his children. This conceptualization of grace in the Book of Mormon resonates strongly with the ancient concept of *charis*: that of reciprocally obliging gift-giving. Thus, from a religious perspective rooted in the ancient world and amply reflected in the Book of Mormon, grace is an everlasting series of offerings and benefactions from God, in response to which the willing receiver reciprocates, as well as possible, aiming to please the Lord, thereby ensuring the formation and continuation of a saving relationship with God.

Dating the Death of Jesus Christ

Jeffrey R. Chadwick

In December 2010, BYU Studies published a study I prepared entitled “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ.” It presented historical and scriptural evidence showing that Jesus was not born in April of 1 BC, as popular Latter-day Saint thought supposed, but most likely in December of 5 BC.1 The article attracted considerable attention; was covered in both print and broadcast news stories as well as by radio shows, blogs, and other forums of discussion;2 and received positive response in many venues.3

3. Differing views were presented in response to my 2010 article as Lincoln H. Blumell and Thomas A. Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born? A Response to a Recent Proposal,” BYU Studies Quarterly 51, no. 3 (2012): 53–81. Notwithstanding the claims made there, which I have carefully considered, I stand behind every aspect and conclusion presented in “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ.” This article about dating the death of Jesus Christ presents additional support for calendric considerations about the birth, life, and ministry of Jesus in general.
A significant component in “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ” was the proposition that Jesus died at Passover in the early spring of AD 30. While this dating is widely accepted, a minority of scholars disagree. Recently, two colleagues raised concerns about an AD 30 crucifixion date, suggesting that “we cannot know with any degree of certainty in which year Jesus died.” A great deal of historical and scriptural evidence suggests otherwise, however, and in the pages to follow this study will demonstrate, with some degree of certainty, that Jesus did in fact die in AD 30, on the eve of Passover, the 14th day of the Jewish month Nisan, which in that year fell on April 6 in the old Julian calendar. In what may come as a surprise to many Latter-day Saints and other Christians generally, this study will also present evidence that the day on which Jesus died was not a Friday, but the fifth day of the Jewish week, the day we call Thursday.

As was the case with “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” it will be necessary in this study to introduce a great deal of data, including modern scholarly assessments, original primary historical references, citations from the New Testament and the Mishnah, astronomical information, and tables that display the timing of events. At times, some of these issues may seem disconnected from each other. But the reader may be assured that all of this quite complicated evidence will come together by the end of this article to support the conclusions presented.

The Crucifixion at Passover

The execution of Jesus is described in all four New Testament Gospels as having occurred at the beginning of the Passover festival (see Matt. 26–27; Mark 14–15; Luke 22–23; John 12–19). Passover was a major festival, mandated by the Law of Moses in the Hebrew Bible (see Ex. 12:2, 6, 18; 13:4) to occur in the middle of the first month of the spring season of the year (the season and month called “Aviv” in Hebrew). This means that Passover would occur in the four-and-one-half-week window of


5. In fact, much more data must be explored in this study than in my 2010 article. This is due to the fact that, as noted by Blumell and Wayment, fixing the date of Jesus’s death is an extremely complicated task, one that admittedly was approached in only a summary manner in my “Dating the Birth” study. Accordingly, this article strives to address numerous issues raised by Blumell and Wayment that deserve to be treated as comprehensively and as definitively as possible.
time directly after the vernal equinox, which is to say after March 21. Scholars of the Jewish calendar note ancient sources which affirm that Jews in the first century, by rule, celebrated their Passover festivals soon after the vernal equinox.⁶ Exodus also mandates that the lambs of the Passover should be slain and roasted on the 14th day of the first spring month and that when evening came, the roasted lambs should be eaten in the ritual meal with unleavened bread and bitter herbs (Ex.12:5–10). Since the ancient Israelite day began at sunset, the actual date of the feast and beginning of the festival was the fifteenth day of the month. While this month was simply called Aviv (KJV “Abib”) in the time of the Israelite monarchies, following the Babylonian captivity (sixth century BC), the ancient Jews adopted the Babylonian name for the spring month, which was Nisan.

By the time of Jesus (first century AD), the spring month of Nisan was known to Jews not only as the first month of their year, as it had been counted in books of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament), but also as the seventh month of the year, as it was counted in the prevailing Syrian calendar. Nisan was, in fact, the seventh month after the early autumn Jewish new year, known as Rosh Hashanah.⁷ And ancient Jewish sources refer to Nisan as both the first month and the seventh month. The Jewish historian Philo of Alexandria, for example, who wrote around AD 40, very close to the lifetime of Jesus, began his discussion of Passover by declaring that it occurred in the seventh month, explaining afterward why it was also considered by Jews to be the first month.⁸ Whether

---

⁸ See Philo, Special Laws II:XXVIII, in The Works of Philo, trans. C. D. Yonge (Peabody Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993), 582. Philo refers to Passover and the festival of unleavened bread in the seventh month and then goes to great effort to explain why this should be considered the first month. For a diaspora Jewish writer such as Philo to designate Nisan as the seventh month lends significant support to my position in “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 21–22, that Luke, in mentioning the “sixth month,” could be referring to Adar, the month preceding Nisan. This was challenged by Blumell and Wayment in “When Was Jesus Born?” 71, and also by S. Kent Brown, “What Do We Know about ‘the Sixth Month’ in the Infancy Story?” posted December 25, 2013, Brigham Young University New Testament Commentary, http://www.byunewtestamentcommentary.com/what-do-we-know-about-the-sixth-month-in-the-infancy-story/. In their
counted as in the first or seventh month, however, the Passover was to occur at the time of the full moon after the vernal equinox.

The day of the Passover festival was also known as a Yom Tov, a Hebrew term that literally means “good day,” indicating a high holy festival day of most special importance. Only the biblical mandated festival days that were also regarded as Sabbaths (regardless of the day of the week on which they fell) were designated as Yom Tov. These were Passover (first and seventh days), Shavuot (the “feast of weeks”), Rosh Hashanah, Sukkot (the “feast of tabernacles”), and Shemini Atzeret.9 Leviticus designates these festival days as Sabbaths, both specifically and by implication.10 All acts of work forbidden on the weekly Saturday Sabbath were forbidden on a Yom Tov festival day, with the exception of some issues of food preparation. The obligation on a Yom Tov was to rejoice together with the family and the nation, and no event of sadness was to occur, be undertaken, or be participated in on a Yom Tov. These festival terms and procedures were in common practice in the first century AD and were recorded in the second century in the tractate of the Mishnah that was known by the title Yom Tov, later to be known as Betzah.11 Of course, there were Jewish festival holidays that were not also Sabbaths, Purim and Hanukkah being just two examples. The Hebrew term ḥag, meaning festival or holiday, could describe either a Yom Tov ḥag or a ḥag with no Sabbath-like restrictions. So the specific nature and restrictions of

comments, however, neither Blumell and Wayment nor Brown refer to Philo’s writings in general or to the reference to Passover in the seventh month in particular. It seems significant, however, that autumn appears to be the beginning of the year not only for Philo, but for the diaspora Jewish writer Luke, as demonstrated by Bruce in this study (see also nn. 51 and 52 below). For the view that Luke was a Jew, see William Foxwell Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1960), 199.


10. Leviticus 23 specifically designates Rosh Hashanah (see v. 24), the first day of Sukkot (see v. 39), and the eighth day called Shemini Atzeret (see v. 39) as Sabbaths, regardless of their position in the week. The first and last days of the Passover week (see vv. 7–8) and the day of Shavuot (see v. 21) are also understood as biblically mandated Sabbaths, since the passages describing them feature the same admonition against work as Rosh Hashanah and Sukkot: “Ye shall do no servile work therein.”

Passover as a *Yom Tov* festival Sabbath are crucial to understanding the narratives of the crucifixion and will be referred to later as we proceed.

**The Crucifixion in AD 30: Scholarly Consensus**

A broad majority of scholars maintain that AD 30 was the year in which Jesus was crucified at the season of Passover. It is not an exclusive consensus, to be sure, for there is a minority who suggest other dates. However, the ratio of New Testament scholars who prefer AD 30 over AD 33 as the year of Jesus's execution is more than two to one, and that ratio is higher still for AD 30 when compared to any other year.

Before sampling this consensus, it will be instructive to review what LDS Apostles have said concerning the dating of the Savior's death. During the 1800s, the exact year of Jesus's crucifixion was not a debated issue in LDS conversation, and there is no record of any Church Presidents, from Joseph Smith to Lorenzo Snow, having commented upon the subject. Elder Orson Pratt of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles did offer his calculation, on record, that the crucifixion occurred on April 6, AD 30.12 During the 1900s, three different LDS Apostles published lengthy authoritative treatments on the life of Christ. In his 1915 work *Jesus the Christ*, Elder James E. Talmage reckoned the year of Jesus’s death as AD 33.13 In contrast, President J. Reuben Clark, in his 1954 study entitled *Our Lord of the Gospels*, preferred the year AD 30,14 as did Elder Bruce R. McConkie in 1980 in his four-volume series *The Mortal Messiah.*15 It is

---

12. Elder Orson Pratt did not say “AD 30” but instead said “the 6th day of April the very day on which he was crucified precisely eighteen hundred years prior to the organization of this Church.” This clearly means AD 30, which is also clear from his reckoning of Jesus's birth in April of 4 BC. See Orson Pratt, in *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (Liverpool: F. D. Richards, 1855–86), 13:126–27, April 10, 1870; and 15:256–57, December 29, 1872. It should also be noted that Elder Pratt believed the crucifixion occurred on a Friday, rather than on Thursday as proposed by this study.

13. See James E. Talmage, *Jesus the Christ* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1915), 103, where an AD 33 crucifixion date is implied in the statement “we accept the Dionysian basis as correct.”


notable that of these three twentieth-century Apostles who prepared systematic studies on Jesus’s life, two of the three agreed his death occurred in AD 30 rather than in AD 33, which mirrors the ratio in modern New Testament scholarship in general. All three Apostles, it should be noted, accepted the common tradition that Jesus was executed on a Friday.

Of modern LDS scholars who have addressed the issue of dating Jesus’s death, we may first sample recent commentaries by a rising generation of Brigham Young University professors. Thomas A. Wayment’s 2005 assessment entitled “The Birth and Death Dates of Jesus Christ” states a solid case for AD 30 as the year of Jesus’s execution:

The most likely date for the death of the Savior is A.D. April 7, 30. This date coincides with the majority of other date-specific references in the Gospels and elsewhere. . . . It also agrees with the dating provided by Josephus and Roman sources for the reigns of important historical figures. The early Christian author Clement of Alexandra also refers to this date. The Montanists, an early Christian splinter group, also recognized April 6 or 7 as the date of Jesus’ crucifixion. After considering all the historical accounts, we maintain that the first weekend of April A.D. 30 is the most likely time of the death of Jesus.16

Two other respected LDS professors, Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and Eric D. Hunstman, joined Wayment as coauthors of Jesus Christ and the World of the New Testament, a richly illustrated 2006 reference volume, where the dating reference to the crucifixion is noted as “likely April 6 or 7, A.D. 30.”17 Although Wayment has not remained entirely consistent in this view,18 my 2010 study concluded that Jesus died in AD 30, though

18. Blumell and Wayment, in “When Was Jesus Born?” 70, suggest that evidence “seems to prefer a death date around AD 29 or 30.” However, they also assert that “we cannot know with any degree of certainty in which year Jesus died” (69). This seems like a marked departure from Wayment’s earlier, quite detailed and definitive support for AD 30 as the year of Jesus’s execution (see nn. 16 and 17 above).
my preference for Thursday, April 6, implied in the notes of that article, was not expressly stated.  

Turning now to the vast world of New Testament scholarship in general, among twentieth-century Protestant experts none is more respected and influential than F. F. Bruce, who produced several highly regarded histories and commentaries on the New Testament. Based on historical factors, Bruce dates the crucifixion to AD 30 in all of his works, including his widely used *New Testament History*, his well-respected commentary *The Gospel of John*, and his landmark study *The New Testament Documents.*

Raymond Brown is perhaps the most respected and preeminent among twentieth-century Catholic scholars of the New Testament. In his exhaustive, two-volume commentary entitled *The Death of the Messiah*, he explores the views of virtually all of his contemporaries (of all denominations) on issues related to the narratives of Jesus's final days and death. With regard to dating, Brown cites the 1969 study of German scholar Josef Blinzler, in which 53 of 100 noted scholars maintain that AD 30 must be the date of Jesus’s death. Brown summarized those scholars’ views: “Between one and three respectively have opted for the years 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, and 36. Thirteen opted for AD 29, fifty-three for 30, and twenty-four for 33.” In this observation, it is clear that an absolute majority of the scholars surveyed support AD 30, and there is a more than two-to-one preference for AD 30 over AD 33, as noted earlier. The preference rises to four to one for AD 30 over AD 29. Brown notes Pierre Benoit (a fellow Catholic scholar), Bruce Metzger (a prominent American Presbyterian scholar), Joachim Jeremias (the famous German Lutheran scholar), and David Flusser (the preeminent Jewish scholar on early Christianity) as “among the more famous or knowledgeable

---

authorities who have opted for AD 30.” To Blinzler’s list must be added scholars whose works appeared after his study was published and who favored AD 30, such as Catholic scholars Jerome Murphy O’Connor, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Bargil Pixner, as well as the prolific but idiosyncratic Bart Ehrman, who is of no current religious affiliation.

As for Brown himself, after considering the positions of all of the above and more, he concludes, based partially on the astronomical study of Oxford scholars Humphreys and Waddington, that Jesus died in either AD 30 or 33, but does not favor one over the other. (That Brown equivocates between these two dates is interesting when it is remembered that James E. Talmage adamantly advocated AD 33.) Brown implies that a primary issue in his indecision is that he has no measure by which to ascertain the length of Jesus’s life and thus cannot be certain about which year he died. The credibility given by Brown to the calculations of Humphreys and Waddington, however, demands that we review their study. But before that, a word about the length of Jesus’s life is in order.

The Length of Jesus’s Life in the Book of Mormon

There are no reports concerning the exact length of Jesus’s life in the New Testament or any other scriptural or historical sources from the ancient

25. Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1375 n. 50.
30. Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1375–76.
31. Brown’s option of AD 33 is ruled out by the study of Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ” (15–17), which demonstrates that Talmage’s preference for AD 33 as the date of Jesus’s death is not possible, a conclusion that Blumell and Wayment agree with in “When Was Jesus Born?” (70–72). Notable also, however, is that AD 29, one of Blumell and Wayment’s suggestions for the date of Jesus’s death (see note 18 above) was ruled out in Brown’s view.
32. Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1376.
Dating the Death of Jesus Christ

Near East. Latter-day Saints are fortunate to have the Book of Mormon, in which there is a chronological indicator that Jesus lived thirty-three full years. The explanation I gave in my 2010 article may be profitably reviewed here:

The book of 3 Nephi reports that a sign appeared in ancient America on the very day that Jesus was born on the other side of the world (see 3 Ne. 1:12–19). Some nine years later, “the Nephites began to reckon their time from this period when the sign was given, or from the coming of Christ” (3 Ne. 2:8). Then, thirty-three full years after the sign of Jesus’s birth, a great storm occurred, accompanied by significant destruction and three days of darkness, marking the day on which Jesus died (see 3 Ne. 8:5–23). In connection with this destructive sign of Jesus’s death, Mormon recorded that “the thirty and third year had passed away” (3 Ne. 8:2) and that the storm hit “in the thirty and fourth year, in the first month, on the fourth day of the month” (3 Ne. 8:5). In terms of how many years Jesus lived in mortality, the record in 3 Nephi seems clear. Jesus lived thirty-three full years, not a year more or a year less.33

It should be noted that the years referred to in the report of 3 Nephi would have been lunar years of twelve lunar months,34 intercalated to coincide over time with the tropical or solar year of 365 days. This combination is commonly referred to as the lunar-solar calendar. Thus, Jesus would have lived thirty-three years tropical or solar years. Although a thirty-three-year lifespan has been questioned,35 the description in my previous study is again useful:


34. For the Jewish calendar year described as “lunar,” see Stern, Calendar and Community, 1. Note that Stern explains that the Jewish calendar is also correctly described as a lunar-solar or lunisolar: “Jewish . . . lunar calendars are usually referred to as ‘lunisolar,’ because they keep up with the annual solar year by adding a 13th lunar month every two or three years; in this respect, these calendars comprise a solar element, which distinguishes them from purely lunar calendars such as the Muslim calendar.”

35. See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 62–64, where those authors conclude that the Book of Mormon evidence only “indicates [that] Jesus lived between thirty-two and nearly thirty-four years” (64). They maintain that “the weakness in Chadwick’s argument is that he fails to account for the many variables in Nephite chronology” (76 n. 37), yet many of these issues were covered in the treatment of the Haab in Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 19, and in the description of Nephite dating on pages 18–19, elements of which are covered below (pp. 145–47).
The Nephites were still observing the Law of Moses during the 3 Nephi period.\[36\] The performances of the Law of Moses, as found in biblical writings available to the Nephites (on the brass plates of Laban), were keyed to the seasons of the 365-day solar year, beginning with a “first month” (see Ex. 12:2, 18), which was the spring month that the biblical record called Aviv (KJV “Abib,” a name that actually means “spring”; see Ex. 23:15; 34:18; Deut. 16:1). But the solar count notwithstanding, those biblical months ran on a lunar cycle, beginning with each new moon. In other words, the ancient biblical months were lunar counts, even though the Jewish agricultural and festival year was based on the seasons of the solar count. This is why the Jewish year is referred to as lunar-solar. The lunar count was intercalated to coincide with the solar count. A twelve-month lunar year is only 354 days long, on average, which is eleven days shorter than the 365-day year. Without adjustment, the first month of the lunar year would occur eleven days earlier each solar year. Within just a few years it would fall back to winter rather than spring, and within a few more to autumn instead of winter, and so on. So the ancient Israelites devised a system of intercalation that added an extra month to their year every three years or so in order to ensure that their first month (according to the lunar count) always stayed in early spring (according to the solar count).\[37\]

The exact method of intercalation in biblical times (and also among the Nephites) is not known. Even as late as New Testament times, there was not yet a fixed calculation that automatically inserted an extra month when needed—this was done by consensus of the Jewish sages observing the signs of the seasons.\[38\] The fixed cycle of the lunar-solar Jewish year in modern use is usually said to have come into use in the fourth century, instituted by the rabbinical sage Hillel II in AD 358 (although there is even debate on whether this early date is accurate).\[39\] That the ancient Jewish year was a lunar-solar count, however, is well known, and that the Nephites used this biblical lunar-solar count is an inescapable

---

38. For a detailed description of the Jewish calendar intercalation during the period under discussion, see Stern, Calendar and Community, 47–98.
39. Stern, Calendar and Community, 175.
conclusion. This does not mean that Nephites did not also concurrently operate according to other calendar counts that were in use in ancient American society, such as the Mayan *Haab* (the 365-day solar year), the 260-day *Tzolkin*, or the “Long Count” system of *k’ins*, *winals*, and *tuns*.\(^{40}\) (Contrary to some LDS sources, however, the 360-day *tun* count was not regarded as a year.\(^ {41}\) That Nephites functioned within the Mesoamerican macroculture of which they presumably were a part is a conclusion shared by many Book of Mormon scholars. That the Nephites would also have concurrently observed the biblical lunar-solar calendar of the Law of Moses is a sound assumption, as noted in the previous study: “To properly observe the Law of Moses, the Nephites would have observed Passover in the ‘first month’ (Ex. 12:2; 18), which their biblical record would have called Aviv, or spring (Ex. 23:15; 34:18; Deut. 16:1). That the first Nephite month did indeed fall in spring, at least at the time of Jesus’s death, seems clear from the account in 3 Nephi 8:5.”\(^ {42}\) And that the Jewish Passover (in Jerusalem) occurred during the Nephite “first month” is a key indicator that the Nephites employed the lunar-solar count to reckon their years in 3 Nephi. Neither the 365-day Mayan *Haab* year\(^ {43}\)

\(^{40}\) For a description of the Mesoamerican (Mayan) calendar system, see Michael D. Coe, *The Maya*, 8th ed. (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2011), 62–69 and 231–35. The *Haab* was the 365-day solar year of eighteen 20-day months and a 5-day year-end period known as *wayeb*. The *Haab* year was also intercalated with the 260-day count called *Tzolkin* in a system known to scholars as the Calendar Round, a cycle that repeated itself every 52 years. The separate, long-term dating system known as the Long Count involved the perpetually increasing sum of *k’ins* (days), *winals* (20-day periods), *tuns* (360-day periods that were the sum of 18 *winals*), *ka’tuns* (7,200-day periods that were the sum of 20 *tuns*), and *bak’tuns* (144,000-day periods that were the sum of 20 *ka’tuns*), calculated from a theoretical starting point in 3114 BC.

\(^{41}\) Coe does not refer to the *tun* as a “year” anywhere in his discussion of the Mayan calendar system, although he does refer to the *Haab* as such. See Coe, *Maya*, in note 40 above.

\(^{42}\) Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 19.

\(^{43}\) The *Haab* year falls back against the true solar year by one day every four years, due to the fact that Mayans did not provide for a leap day (the true solar year actually being 365¼ days long). See Coe, *The Maya*, 64. Thus, the *Haab* fell back against the true solar year by some 25 days each century. The new-year celebration for the *Haab* is known to occur during the five-day *wayeb* period at the end of each *Haab*, followed immediately by the first 20-day month (called *Pop*) of the newly beginning *Haab*. The *wayeb* new-year celebration is also known to have begun on July 16 in the era around 1550 (the time of Bishop Diego de Landa in the Yucatan), with *Pop* then beginning on July 21 in that era. See Coe,
nor the 360-day *tun* began in the spring season. Yet the Nephite year of 3 Nephi 8 did begin in the spring. All of the combined evidence suggests

*Maya*, 233. Calculating the day loss backward from 1550 to AD 30 (1,520 years) as 380 days against the true solar year would also place the *Haab* new year in *wayeb* around July 1 in the AD 30 era, with the month of *Pop* beginning about July 6. Thus, the “first month” of the Nephite year, which occurred in connection with the spring Passover in 3 Nephi 8, cannot have been the new year or first month of the *Haab*. 3 Nephi 8 does not seem to be speaking of *Haab* years.

44. It is possible to calculate the Long Count value for any Gregorian or Julian calendar date in history, which allows us to see what the *winal* (20-day period) for that *tun* date was. Using the online calculator of the prestigious Smithsonian Institute (available at [http://maya.nmai.si.edu/calendar/maya-calendar-converter](http://maya.nmai.si.edu/calendar/maya-calendar-converter)), I determined Long Count values for four selected dates discussed in the present study as candidates for the Jewish date 14th of Nisan, to see on what Long Count *k'in*/*day* the selected date fell, and to see in what *winal* it occurred. None of the sample dates fell in the first *winal*. This means the spring “first month” of 3 Nephi 8 cannot be regarded as having been the first *winal* of a *tun* for any of the selected dates. Likewise, no *Haab* date in these samples fell in the first *Haab* month of *Pop*. In the sample results presented below, the Long Count is given as five numbers separated by four periods—the *bak'tun*, *ka'tun*, *tun*, *winal*, and *k'in*. These are followed by a heavy dot divider, and then the Calendar Round day number and name of the *Tzolkin* count, and the day number in the named month of the *Haab* year. In the samples, readers should focus on the fourth and fifth numeric figures (the *winal* and the *k'in*) in the Long Count, and observe that no *winal* is calculated as 1 (in other words, no *winal* in the samples could be conceived as having been a “first month”). After the dot divider, in the two Calendar Round date-names, readers may focus on the second date-name combination and note that in all four cases the month name is *Mak*, the 13th month of the 18 months in the *Haab* year (in other words, no “first month” appears in these samples, since all are calculated in the 13th month, called *Mak*). The four samples follow:

**AD 33, Friday, April 2 (Gregorian), April 4 (Julian) = Long Count 7.19.11.8.0**
- 10 *Ajaw* 8 *Mak*
  [this *k'in*/*day* was the “0” or seat day of the 8th *winal*; the *Haab* date 8th of *Mak*, the 13th month]

**AD 30, Friday, April 5 (Gregorian), April 7 (Julian) = Long Count 7.19.8.7.7**
- 9 *Manik'* 10 *Mak*
  [this *k'in*/*day* was the 7th day of the 7th *winal*; the *Haab* date 10th of *Mak*, the 13th month]

**AD 30, Thursday, April 4 (Gregorian), April 6 (Julian) = Long Count 7.19.8.7.6 • 8 *Kimi* 9 *Mak***
  [this *k'in*/*day* was the 6th day of the 7th *winal*; the *Haab* date 9th of *Mak*, the 13th month]
that Jesus was thirty-three full solar years of age at his death, reckoned according the biblical lunar-solar calendar count. In “Dating the Birth

AD 29, Friday, April 13 (Gregorian), April 15 (Julian) = Long Count
7.19.7.10 • 3 Ok 18 Mak
[This k'in/day was the 10th day of the 7th winal; the Haab date 18th of Mak, the 13th month]

Each of the above samples dates to the 7th or 8th winal of the noted tun, and none of these winals can be regarded as a “first month.” Note again that the 20-day Haab month of Mak is the 13th month of the 18 months that made up the Haab count. Mak cannot be mistakenly regarded as a “first month” just because it follows Keh, the 12th month of the Haab, since the Haab has a total of 18 such months. For the list of all 18 Haab months see Coe, Maya, 63.

45. The Maya had a very accurate idea of the real length of the true solar (tropical) year of 365¼ days. See Coe, Maya, 234. There is no indication that the Maya thought of their tun count as a “year,” and nowhere in his descriptions does Coe refer to the tun as a “year.” The Maya did, however, regard the Haab as their year, with accompanying new-year celebrations at the end of each Haab (see note 43 above). Thus, the models used by some LDS investigators cited by Blumell and Wayment, such as Clark, Gardner, and Sorenson (see “When Was Jesus Born?” 76 nn. 39–40), which use the tun to calculate Lehi’s 600-year prophecy (as 591 or 592 real years), or the 33-year length of Jesus’s life calculated as 32 real years, are ultimately to be rejected. The natives of ancient America simply did not regard the tun as a year. Sources cited by Blumell and Wayment are John Clark, “Archaeology, Relics, and Book of Mormon Belief,” Journal of Book of Mormon Studies 14, no. 2 (2005): 46–47; Brant Gardner, Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2007), 1:362–63; and John L. Sorenson, An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; and Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1985), 272–73.

46. The model of Spackman, cited by Blumell and Wayment (see “When Was Jesus Born?” 76 nn. 40–41), maintains that the Nephites used a strictly lunar calendar for reckoning their years and that Lehi’s 600-year prophecy may be calculated using only the 354-day lunar count. See Randall P. Spackman, “The Jewish/Nephite Lunar Calendar,” Journal of Book of Mormon Studies 7, no. 1 (1998): 51, 54. But this does not account for the fact that a lunar-solar calendar is required for Law of Moses reckoning, which the Nephites clearly observed, particularly in regard to the required Law of Moses festivals that were tied to the seasons of the solar year. Blumell and Wayment also maintain that Lehi’s prophecy must be counted from 597 BC to a point between 7 BC and 5 BC, and that “600 Nephite years would correlate to roughly 591 modern years.” See “When Was Jesus Born?” 77 n. 42. This also fails to account for the fact that a lunar-solar year would have been required for Nephite observance of Mosaic law. More compelling is a model that relies on full, regular years and that dates “the first year of the reign of Zedekiah” spoken of in 1 Nephi 1:4 to 609 BC rather than

of Jesus Christ,” evidence was presented supporting the conclusion that Jesus’s actual life span was thirty-three years and three or four months (not more), and also by this calculation Jesus would have been thirty-three full years old at his death.47

Knowing from the Book of Mormon that Jesus lived thirty-three full years, but not thirty-four years or longer,48 rules out AD 33 as a possible


47. See the discussion in Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 19–21.

48. Wayment theorizes that “the time period between the sign of Jesus’s birth and the signs of his death was thirty-four years” and parenthetically adds “thirty-three years if counted inclusively” (see Wayment, “Birth and Death Dates,” 393). In “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 35 n. 50, I pointed out an error in Wayment’s model, but I also made an error of my own: “A thirty-fourth year could not be counted unless the year had passed away, but the text of 3 Nephi 8:5 specifies that the thirty-fourth year had just barely begun and also specifies that thirty-three years had passed away (3 Ne. 7:23, 26). Therefore, the number of years that had passed was not ‘thirty-three years if counted inclusively,’ as Wayment suggests, but simply thirty-three years.” Thus, I must acknowledge that Wayment was correct in saying “thirty-three years if counted inclusively,” but his reference to thirty-four years was in error. In “When Was Jesus Born?” 77 n. 43, Blumell and Wayment attempted an explanation: “Because the 3 Nephi 8:5 reference may be built upon an adjustment of the Nephite calendar to accord with the birth of Christ, it seems prudent to be cautious because the thirty-fourth-year reference may include a portion of the original Nephite year.” This explanation, however, is confusing and still incorrectly focuses on the thirty-fourth year. To be sure, Blumell and Wayment accurately sense a lack of absolute arithmetic clarity in 3 Nephi 1–8 with regard to Jesus’s age at his death, but the real issue is not whether Jesus was 33 or 34 years old at his death, but whether the text is indicating he was 32 or 33. This is to say that it is not absolutely clear in the 3 Nephi 1 narrative whether Jesus was born in the 91st or the 92nd year of the judges. If 3 Nephi 1 is read as placing Jesus’s birth in the 92nd year (which seems the likely reading), then the signs of Jesus’s death in 3 Nephi 8 would make him only 32 years and a few months old at his execution (this is calculated from the references in 3 Nephi 2:5–7, which synchronize the 100th year of the judges with the 9th year since the sign of Jesus’s birth). But if 3 Nephi 1 is read “inclusively” with regard to the 91st year of the judges, and Jesus’s birth is placed in that year, then he was indeed 33 years and a few months old at the sign of his death in 3 Nephi 8. How best to read the numbers in 3 Nephi 1 is not a settled issue, and I believe this may be one of at least two possible reasons that Mormon sensed the possibility of error in the Nephite
year for Jesus’s death and indeed rules out any year later than AD 30. This is a matter of simple addition. Here is why. It is a historical fact that the death of Herod the Great occurred in April of 4 BC, but the birth of Jesus occurred prior to Herod’s death (see Matt. 2:1–20). And as demonstrated in the earlier study, Jesus’s birth cannot have occurred later than eight weeks prior to Herod’s death, meaning that the latest date Jesus can have been born was very early February of 4 BC (although I suggest it was even several weeks earlier, in December of 5 BC).49 Calculating forward to a Passover that fell thirty-three full years after the absolute latest birth date possibility of early 4 BC yields a result of AD 30 as the latest possible year that Jesus can have died. (In counting this, remember that there was no “year zero”—there was only one year from 1 BC to AD 1). Thus, AD 31, AD 32, and AD 33 are all ruled out as years when Jesus can have died. They were too late to accommodate the life span reported in the Book of Mormon. Of the two candidates to which Raymond Brown had narrowed his preferences, the New Testament and the Book of Mormon combine to demonstrate that only AD 30 is a possibility for Jesus’s death.

record’s calculation of the years since Jesus's birth, evident in his caveat “if there was no mistake made by this man in the reckoning of our time” (3 Ne. 8:2). However, other evidence cited in the present study enables us to rule out the notion that Jesus was only 32 years old at his death—such a notion would place the crucifixion in the year AD 29, which is not possible for at least two different reasons (see fig. 4 on page 159). From the 3 Nephi text, however, it is absolutely clear that the thirty-fourth year cannot be part of the year count of Jesus’s life. The fact is obvious that the elapsed time between Jesus’s birth and death was not thirty-four years—the text is specific in explaining that only thirty-three full years had passed away (3 Ne. 8:2).

The Length of Jesus's Ministry—Three Years or Two?

Another key factor in determining the year of Jesus's death has always been the question of how long his active ministry lasted. There are a considerable number of scholarly approaches to this issue. Some commentators, unwilling to accept the Gospel of John as chronologically reliable, utilize only the synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, none of which record the beginning of Jesus's ministry in Judea, and which mention only one Passover festival, the one at which Jesus was executed. Such commentaries generally suggest a ministry lasting only a year, or they conclude that the length of Jesus's ministry cannot be calculated. However, among the commentaries that accept the reliability of the Gospel of John, two ministry models are prominent: the two-year model and the three-year model. In this study, I advocate for the two-year model. But an understanding of both models is important in this discussion.

The three-year model of Jesus's ministry, commonly found in LDS commentaries, is based on the theory that the unnamed “feast of the Jews” mentioned in John 5:1 was a Passover festival. This idea is also known as the four-Passover theory. In this model, the holiday of John 5:1 is added to the three specifically named Passovers of John 2:13, 6:4, and 12:1 to arrive at a total of four Passovers. Thus, the first spring-to-spring year of Jesus's ministry is counted from the Passover of John 2 (Passover #1) to the supposed Passover of John 5 (#2), the second year from John 5 to the Passover of John 6 (#3), and the third and final year from John 6 to the Passover of John 12 (#4). There are two weaknesses in this model, however. One is that Jesus's exact age at the beginning of his ministry is not certain. In most LDS commentaries, it is generally supposed that Jesus had turned thirty years old just before the Passover of John 2 and turned thirty-three years old at his final Passover in John 12. But Luke is the only Gospel account that mentions Jesus's age, and all that is said in Luke is that at the time of his baptism, Jesus “began to be about thirty years of age” (Luke 3:23). The words “began” and “about” render this statement imprecise in terms of how old Jesus actually was at his baptism. Had he turned thirty yet, or was he a little younger than thirty? Or, perhaps more likely, was he a little older than thirty, maybe thirty-one? A three-year ministry model, lasting from age thirty to thirty-three, cannot be demonstrated based on the imprecise

statement of Luke 3:23. The second weakness in the four-Passover theory is that the feast of John 5:1 is not called a Passover by John. In all other cases, where John meant a Passover he specifically called the festival a Passover. That he did not do so in John 5:1 seems a clear indicator that it was not a Passover. In fact, the themes of Jesus’s teachings at the temple in John 5 are the identifiable themes of the autumn Rosh Hashanah (New Year) festival, which occurred in mid to late September, on the first day of the month of Tishri, the first month of the Syrian and secular Jewish year. Scholars such as Bruce, taking into account the context of Jewish culture in understanding the New Testament, point to Rosh Hashanah as the festival of John 5:1, which can be reliably placed midway between the Passover of John 2 and the Passover of John 6.

The two-year model of Jesus’s ministry is based primarily upon the three specifically mentioned Passover festivals in the Gospel of John: the Passover at which Jesus began his public ministry (John 2:23), a Passover midway through his ministry (John 6:4), and the Passover at which he was executed (John 12:1). That the Passover of John 6 is not the same event as the Passover of John 12 is clear from the fact that between the two references are accounts of a Sukkot festival (the autumn “feast of tabernacles” of John 7:2) and a Hanukkah festival (the winter “feast of dedication” of John 10:22). The two-year model of Jesus’s ministry identifies a first year from the Passover of John 2 to the Passover of John 6, and a second (final) year of his ministry from the Passover of John 6 to the Passover of John 12. Bruce explains how this model accounts for virtually all of the historical factors involved with dating Jesus’s ministry:

The crucifixion of Christ took place, it is generally agreed, about AD 30. According to Luke 3:1, the activity of John the Baptist, which immediately preceded the commencement of our Lord’s public ministry, is dated in “the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar.” Now, Tiberius became emperor in August, AD 14, and according to the method of computation current in Syria, which Luke would have followed, his fifteenth year commenced in September or October, AD 27. The fourth Gospel mentions three Passovers after this time; the third Passover from that date would be the Passover of AD 30, at which it is probable on other grounds that the crucifixion took place. At this time, too, we know

---

51. On the themes of John 5 as Rosh Hashanah, see pages 84–85 in Chadwick, “The Jerusalem Temple, the Sadducees, and the Opposition to Jesus,” in Holzapfel and Wayment, From Bethlehem through the Sermon on the Mount, 48–88.
52. Bruce, New Testament Documents, 49.
from other sources that Pilate was Roman Governor of Judaea, Herod Antipas was tetrarch of Galilee, and Caiaphas was Jewish high priest.53

In a footnote to the second sentence of the preceding passage, Bruce explains Luke’s point of reference in dating Tiberius’s reign:

The method in Syria, retained from the days of the Seleucid kings, was to reckon the start of a new regnal year in September–October. As Tiberius became emperor in August, AD 14, his second regnal year would thus be regarded as beginning in September–October of the same year. The Passover of Jn. 2:13ff. accordingly was that of March, AD 28, and this agrees with the chronological indication of 2:20, for Herod’s temple was commenced in 20–19 BC, and 46 years from that brings us to AD 27–28.54

Now, it should be noted that the Jewish general and historian Josephus gave two conflicting reports about the year in which construction on Herod’s temple was begun. In *The Jewish War* (1.21.1) he stated that the temple’s construction was commenced in the fifteenth year of Herod’s reign, which would be the year 23/22 BC (the year being counted, in Syrian and Jewish practice, from October to September). But in his later work, *Antiquities of the Jews* (15.11.1), Josephus dated the commencement of temple construction to the eighteenth year of Herod’s reign, which would be the year 20/19 BC. The later date is more likely to be correct, as it was noted in the later work, which presumably corrected the earlier work’s error. If the Passover of spring 19 BC is reckoned as being in year 1, then the Passover of spring AD 27 would have to be reckoned as being in year 46, and the Passover of spring AD 28 would be in year 47. The passage in John 2:20—“Forty and six years was this temple in building”—is somewhat ambiguous and could be taken to mean either that the temple was in its forty-sixth year of construction or that the forty-sixth year of construction had passed when Jesus opened his ministry at Passover. Wayment, for example, seems to opt for the former, and suggests “a date of 26–27 AD . . . as the first year of Jesus’ ministry.”55 But this is likely too early (Brown notes no scholar who favors it),56 and a wider consensus agrees with Bruce that the Passover of spring AD 28 is preferable in calculating the forty-six-year count. As

56. Brown, who gives summaries of scholarly models on these dating issues, does not note a single authority that favors AD 26/27 as the fifteenth year of
Brown observed, “Many scholars accept the latter date [of Josephus] as historical and use it to confirm Luke’s chronology pointing to the year AD 28 as the commencement of Jesus’ public activity.”

With regard to “the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar” (Luke 3:1), however, there is some scholarly confusion. Augustus Caesar died on August 19 of AD 14. If fifteen years are simply added to AD 14, the result is the year AD 29, or more precisely the Syrian (and Jewish) year from autumn AD 28 to autumn AD 29. Brown notes that “many would opt for Aug./Sept. AD 28–29” for Tiberius’s fifteenth year, but this cannot be correct, since it would necessarily place the beginning of Jesus’s ministry at the Passover of spring AD 29, too late for any ministry model that relies on the Gospel of John as well as the synoptic Gospels. Such a calculation also skips the few weeks from August 19 to the actual beginning of the year, which took place not in August, but in mid to late September (Brown errs in suggesting that the year began as early as August). When the last few weeks of the year AD 13/14 (that is, August 19 to mid-September AD 14) are counted as referring to Tiberius’s first regnal year, then his fifteenth year would have been from autumn AD 27 to autumn AD 28. This more precise method is the one employed by Bruce above. It would place the beginning of John the Baptist’s activities in the autumn of AD 27 or the winter of AD 27/28 and precisely places the beginning of Jesus’s ministry to the Passover of spring AD 28.

Two significant issues are addressed by the remarks of Bruce, quoted earlier, and the rest of the discussion above. The first is that the implied point of reference for the beginning of the year, in both Luke 3 and John 5, was the autumn month of Tishri, the same which served as the first month of the year in the Syrian calendar (which, as noted earlier, was widely utilized in the eastern part of the Roman Empire). The second issue demonstrated by Bruce is that the two-year ministry model, in which Jesus began his activities at Passover of AD 28 and was executed at Passover of AD 30, is the model supported by the chronological allusion in Luke 3:1, the three specific Passovers mentioned by John, and by the historical reference of Josephus to the construction of the temple in Herod’s eighteenth year. That Jesus died at Passover of AD 30 may now also be corroborated by the astronomical study of Humphreys and Waddington.

---

Tiberius, and, in fact, he himself calculates that year to 27/28. See Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1374.
The Study of Humphreys and Waddington

In 1983, two professors at the University of Oxford, Colin J. Humphreys and W. Graeme Waddington, published an article presenting detailed astronomical information relating to the dating of Jesus’s death.\(^5^9\) Their data included precise calculations of the occurrences of the new moons in the spring seasons of every year from AD 26 to AD 36 (the duration of Pontius Pilate’s governorship) and extrapolation of the Julian calendar dates and days of the week on which the 14th day of the Jewish month of Nisan (the eve of Passover) would have fallen. Their calculations took into consideration that the 14th of Nisan may occur only after the vernal equinox\(^6^0\) (after March 20), since Passover was biblically mandated to be a spring event. Their own interpretation of the compiled data was that Jesus died in AD 33, on Friday, April 7 (Julian). The study of Humphreys and Waddington has been widely cited, and subsequent publications by the two scholars in 1989 and 1992 confirmed and expanded their data. My own study “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ” utilized their astronomical data to specify that Jesus died in AD 30.

The method of Humphreys and Waddington was to determine the Julian calendar dates, weekdays, and times of the new moons as they would have appeared in Jerusalem in March and early April during the above-mentioned years, which in each case marked the beginning of the month of Nisan (Aviv). The Jewish day was reckoned with its beginning at sunset. The new monthly count began with the Jewish day following the Jewish day on which the new moon was observed (noting, obviously, that if the new moon occurred during daylight hours, its observation would not occur until the ensuing night). Counting ahead fourteen days in each case, Humphreys and Waddington determined the normal daytime day of the week and Julian calendar date on which the 14th of Nisan, the eve of Passover, fell in each year. Figure 2, opposite, is a table of their charted results, with their own caveat notes.

In considering the data of the Oxford scientists, and particularly the asterisk (\(\ast\)) and dagger (\(\dagger\)) notes that appear with their table in figure 2,


\(^{60}\) See Stern, *Calendar and Chronology*, 70–71, who demonstrates that the vernal equinox rule was observed by Jews in the first century AD, even though by the fourth century AD there was some deviation from this norm.
two points may be profitably clarified.\textsuperscript{61} First, the asterisk note in the table for AD 27 and AD 32 can be ignored. While poor atmospheric conditions could, on occasion, obscure the sighting of new moons, this would not affect the calculation of the 14th day of Nisan, since that day was not counted from the sighting of the new moon alone, but from a sighting of the moon that allowed for an accurate determination of when the new moon had actually occurred. This is evident from the Mishnah (Rosh Hashanah 2:8, see fig. 5) and will be discussed below. The second issue for clarification involves the dagger (†) notes for AD 29 and AD 30, which stipulate the possibility that the 14th of Nisan occurred

\begin{quote}
61. The adaptation of this table offered by Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” \textsuperscript{67}, does not include these points, namely, the possible later dates or the possible earlier dates suggested by Humphreys and Waddington for the 14th of Nisan. Moreover, it adds dates for the 15th of Nisan, which are not part of Humphreys and Waddington’s table.
\end{quote}
a day earlier than posted on the chart. This is not “highly improbable,” however, as the authors suggest. They seem to doubt that the new moon could be observed at the calculated early evening hour of its occurrence in those years and thus add an extra day in their count. But the sky in Jerusalem is sufficiently dark at 19:00 around April 1, even in the west, for the new moon to be easily observable at its actual occurrence. Hence, the fourteen-day count would have begun normally in both AD 29 and AD 30, and the 14th of Nisan would have actually fallen on Sunday, April 17, in AD 29 and on Thursday, April 6, in AD 30 (Julian dates).

In my 2010 study, I prepared a table (fig. 3), based on all the data of Humphreys and Waddington, which notes for each year the dates they calculated for the 14th of Nisan. In this table, two dates appear for some years, as reflected in the chart of Humphreys and Waddington, since the point of the 2010 study was only to demonstrate in what year Jesus must have died, in support of calculating a year of his birth. However, in that table, only the first day in those years was the absolute date for the 14th of Nisan—the second day may be disregarded, for the reasons mentioned above. This means that the 14th of Nisan fell on Thursday, April 10, in AD 27; on Sunday, April 17, in AD 29; on Thursday, April 6, in AD 30; and on Sunday, April 13, in AD 32.

In this table, asterisks (*) appear by three years: AD 27, AD 30, and AD 33. These are the only years during the administration of Pontius Pilate when the eve of Passover, and Passover itself, fell within a three-day window of time prior to Sunday.62 (This is also apparent in fig. 2.) As affirmed in all four Gospels, Jesus’s body was in the tomb for three days, and his resurrection occurred on a Sunday, the “first day of the week.” Therefore, the crucifixion cannot have occurred on any day from Saturday through Wednesday. Only Thursday and Friday fall within a three-day window of time prior to Sunday, and even this depends on how the three days are counted (as will be discussed below). So, when considering the historical factor of Pilate’s administration, only AD 27, AD 30, and AD 33 qualify as candidates for the year in which Jesus could have died. However, when the historical factor of Tiberius Caesar’s reign

62. This contrasts with the chart offered by Blumell and Wayment in “When Was Jesus Born?” 70, which allows that crucifixion on the 14th of Nisan could have occurred in AD 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, or 34. But the parameters behind their chart are unrealistically broad, no source or authority is cited for the chart, and no other New Testament scholars are on record supporting its results or the premises behind it.
Dating the Death of Jesus Christ (discussed above) is taken into consideration, AD 27 must also be ruled out—Jesus cannot have died in the spring of AD 27, since the ministry of John the Baptist did not begin until after that point, in the fall or early winter of AD 27. This narrows down the choices to only AD 30 and AD 33 for the death of Jesus, which, as noted above, is where Brown left the question.

The year AD 33, however, can be ruled out as the year of the crucifixion, based on several other issues. It cannot be reconciled with either the two-year or the three-year models for the length of Jesus’s preaching ministry, if the onset of Jesus’s preaching was at Passover of AD 28, as determined by Bruce63 and noted by Brown.64 Even if that onset

---

64. With regard to AD 28 see Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1374.
date is shifted by a year one way or the other, to AD 27 (as suggested by Wayment) or to AD 29 (as noted by Brown), no model would bring the end of Jesus’s activity as late as AD 33. And the fact that the Book of Mormon seems to indicate that Jesus lived thirty-three full years, combined with the fact that he cannot have been born later than the winter of 5/4 BC (as suggested in Wayment 2005 and shown in Chadwick 2010), means that AD 33 is too late a year to accommodate his lifespan. When all available scriptural and historical data are taken into consideration, only AD 30 emerges as the year in which Jesus must have died, as depicted in figure 4.

The New Moon and the Month of Nisan

As noted, Raymond Brown is among the list of New Testament scholars who accept the study of Humphreys and Waddington as correctly dating the citing of the new moons of the month of Nisan during the later years of Jesus’s life. But others have attempted to discredit it. These include Blumell and Wayment, who cite Roger T. Beckwith’s dismissal of Humphreys and Waddington in two publications: a 1989 article and a 1996 book. But the former is credibly rebuked by Brown, who chides it as “the very skeptical article of Beckwith . . . that calls into doubt almost every means used to calculate the year of Jesus’ death.” And Beckwith’s book, while rejecting the work of Humphreys and Waddington, does not actually address any specific issue or any piece of data offered by them, nor does it actually demonstrate a single flaw in any aspect of their study.

By contrast, Blumell and Wayment focus on one specific issue in their dismissal of Humphreys and Waddington. In their BYU Studies Quarterly article, they maintain that the new moon was commonly sighted

65. With regard to AD 27 (the Jewish year AD 26–27), see Wayment, “The Birth and Death Dates of Jesus Christ,” 391.
66. With regard to AD 29, see Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1374.
68. Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1376 n. 54.
69. Beckwith, Calendar and Chronology, ch. 9, 281.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year AD</th>
<th>Aspects That Disqualify a Year for Jesus’s Crucifixion / Resurrection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AD 26 Spring | • This is prior to Tiberius’s 15th year, too early for any part of Jesus’s ministry.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Sunday, too early in week for the resurrection account. |
| AD 27 Spring | • Too early for start of Jesus’s ministry, Tiberius’s 15th year begins in autumn.  
• Too early to accommodate a two-year ministry model beginning at Passover. |
| AD 28 Spring | • Probable start (not end) of Jesus’s ministry at Passover in Tiberius’s 15th year.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Tuesday, too early in week for resurrection account. |
| AD 29 Spring | • Too early to accommodate either a two-year or three-year ministry model.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Sunday, too early in week for the resurrection account. |
| AD 30 Spring | **No disqualifying aspects in AD 30.**  
14th of Nisan fell on Thursday. |
| AD 31 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate a two-year ministry model beginning in AD 28.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Tuesday, too early in week for the resurrection account. |
| AD 32 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate any ministry model that begins in AD 28.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Sunday, too early in week for the resurrection account. |
| AD 33 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate any ministry model that begins in AD 28.  
• 14th of Nisan fell of Friday, too late in week for three days of darkness. |
| AD 34 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate any historical ministry or birth-year model for Jesus.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Wednesday, too early in week for resurrection account. |
| AD 35 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate any historical ministry or birth year model for Jesus.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Tuesday, too early in week for the resurrection account. |
| AD 36 Spring * | • Too late to accommodate any historical ministry or birth year model for Jesus.  
• 14th of Nisan fell on Saturday, too late in week for the resurrection account. |

* All years marked with an asterisk are too late to accommodate a 33-year life span for Jesus (see 3 Ne. 8:2), born no later than winter of 5/4 BC.

**Figure 4.** The year AD 30 as the only historical possibility for Jesus’s death during Pilate’s administration.
incorrectly by Jews in the time of Jesus and that therefore the days on which Passovers were celebrated would not necessarily be those calculated by modern astronomers,\(^70\) alleging that “there was a tendency for witnesses to claim they had seen a new moon one day or potentially even two days early.”\(^71\) In support, they cite an article entitled “Lunar Crescent Visibility” by LeRoy E. Doggett and Bradley E. Schaefer.\(^72\) However, that study was based on an aggregate of modern new moon sightings by volunteer associates in planned observations between 1987 and 1990 at sites almost exclusively in the western hemisphere. But modern lunar observations alone cannot demonstrate that anciently there was any tendency for mistaken sightings. Nor did Doggett and Schaefer use ancient Jewish models in their study; in fact, they acknowledge that they are not even aware of Jewish methods.\(^73\) None of the modern sightings in their study was made at or anywhere near Jerusalem. There is no aspect of the study of Doggett and Schaefer that can be reliably applied to the subject of how Jews in Judea of the first century AD sighted new moons and pronounced their new months.\(^74\)

Reports of alleged Jewish calendar errors in the fourth century AD, three centuries after the time of Christ, are cited by Blumell and Wayment as evidence that Passover was celebrated a day or two off from the proper date, but these are garnered from Byzantine sources hostile to Jewish practice, a bias that makes their reliability questionable. In any case, they are inapplicable in assessing the findings of Humphreys and Waddington. One citation is quoted from Constantine at the Council of Nicea, alleging that Jews erred in their Passover dating and also celebrated Passover on two different days.\(^75\) However, celebrating consecutive first days and second days of Passover was a common practice among Jews outside the land of Israel, well documented in the Mishnah.\(^76\) This was a diaspora convenience, and no indication exists

\(^{70}\) See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 66–70, for their entire argument.
\(^{71}\) Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 68.
\(^{74}\) See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 67 and 68 n. 69 for the reference to Doggett and Schaefer.
\(^{75}\) Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 68–69.
\(^{76}\) See Steinsalz, *Talmud*, s.v. יומ טוב שני של גלויות (*yom tov sheni shel galuyot*), 200.
that the calculation of the new moons was believed to be in error.\textsuperscript{77} But this was not even Constantine’s complaint. As Stern points out, the real issue discussed at Nicea was the charge that some fourth-century Jews were prone to celebrate Passover before the vernal equinox, while others celebrated it after the equinox.\textsuperscript{78} In other words, Constantine was not complaining about Jews who got Passover wrong by a day or two, but by a whole month.\textsuperscript{79} The question was not one of whether the new moon was correctly observed; rather it was a question of pre- or post-vernal equinox celebration of Passover. Thus, any use of this complaint about fourth-century diaspora Jews celebrating Passover a month too early as evidence that first-century Judean Jews somehow improperly identified their 14th of Nisan by one or two days is too problematic to be accepted.

The Mishnah is also cited by Blumell and Wayment to suggest that the new moon could be observed in error. They quote the first line of Rosh Hashanah 2:8, which reports that a chart of the phases of the moon was used by a first-century rabbi to aid in declaring the new moon. The rest of the passage relates that on one occasion the witnesses of the new moon accepted by the rabbinical court were wrong. Blumell and Wayment derive, from this single event, that false sightings must have been regularly accepted by the Jewish court. However, the Mishnah describes

\textsuperscript{77} The celebration of two consecutive days of Passover was a Jewish invention to aid diaspora Jews who might not receive news of the correct date in ancient Jerusalem. It was not because of any suspicion that the new moon had not been properly observed in Judea. Blumell and Wayment suggest that “celebrating it on back-to-back days” was “because they were unsure which day was truly Nisan 15 and by so celebrating it twice they would hope to get it right.” “When Was Jesus Born?” 69. But this notion is unsupported and not true. The reference they offer (p. 80, n. 72) cites Stern, Calendar and Community, 80–84, which makes no mention of consecutive days of Passover being the issue raised by Byzantine sources in the fourth century.

\textsuperscript{78} Stern, Calendar and Community, 69.

\textsuperscript{79} Stern’s own citations for this are themselves problematic—including hostile Byzantine sources and the characteristically cynical Beckwith. Stern, Calendar and Community, 69–70 and n. 74. But Stern correctly maintains that fourth-century Jewish practice contrasted with first-century practice and explains that “in the times of Jesus the Jews observed the rule of the equinox.” Calendar and Community, 71. Stern also cites a Byzantine source which stresses that some Jews of the fourth century were not even in compliance with “their own law as laid down by Philo, Josephus, and the other Hebrew sages” of the first century. Calendar and Community, 69. What all of these sources actually demonstrate is that Jewish method in the first century was different than in the fourth century.
only this single event, and there is no report of any similar error in the entire Talmud. The narrative is sufficiently important that we should examine it here. The account involves a ruling by Gamaliel II, also known as Rabban Gamaliel, who served as the *nasi* (president) of the Jewish rabbinical court and community in Judea in the generation after the destruction of Jerusalem (c. AD 80–110), whose headquarters were at Yavneh on Israel’s coastal plain. The Mishnah passage from tractate Rosh Hashanah (see fig. 5) is the translation of Jacob Neusner, with his peculiar spellings and his parenthetical additions in brackets, used here since it was the version quoted by Blumell and Wayment.

At least a dozen things about this passage are evident to a trained student of the Talmud: (1) Great care was taken to insure that a new month was properly proclaimed from the actual occurrence of the new moon. (2) A chart of the lunar phases was even employed by Rabban Gamaliel to determine if witnesses had actually observed the new moon. (3) Rabban Gamaliel erred on one occasion in accepting the incorrect early claim of a new moon sighting. (4) It was immediately recognized, by Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri and Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas, that the witnesses Rabban Gamliel relied upon were in error by a whole day. (5) Rabbi Joshua recognized the error pointed out by his two other colleagues. (6) The crux of the error was not the false claim by the witnesses, but Rabban Gamaliel’s declaration of the new month on a clearly erroneous date. (7) Rabban Gamaliel insisted that Rabbi Joshua recognize his authority, ordering him to appear with staff and purse in hand (items not permitted for carrying on a *Yom Tov* Sabbath) on the day of the Yom Kippur fast (the 10th day of the month of Tishri) according to Rabbi Joshua’s reckoning of when the month of Tishri should have started. (8) Rabbi Aqiba (a.k.a. Akiva) and Rabbi Dosa both supported Rabban Gamaliel’s authority to declare the new month, even on the wrong day, and encouraged Rabbi Joshua to recognize that authority. (9) Rabbi Joshua instead went to Rabban Gamaliel, with staff and purse in hand, on the day of the Yom Kippur fast according to Rabban Gamaliel’s declaration, which was actually the wrong day for the 10th of Tishri. (10) Instead of reprimanding him for violating a *Yom Tov* Sabbath and coming on a day other than the one he appointed, Rabban Gamaliel received Rabbi Joshua warmly, admitting that Rabbi Joshua was right, and was wiser than he, implicitly recognizing his own error. (11) Rabban Gamaliel also acknowledged that

2:8 A. A picture of the shapes of the moon did Rabban Gamaliel have on a tablet and on the wall of his upper room, which he would show ordinary folk, saying, “Did you see it like this or like that?”

B. Two witnesses came and said, “We saw it at dawn [on the morning of the twenty-ninth] in the east and at eve in the west.”

C. Said R. Yohanan b. Nuri, “They are false witnesses.”

D. Now when they came to Yabneh, Rabban Gamaliel accepted their testimony [assuming they erred at dawn].

E. And furthermore two came along and said, “We saw it at its proper time, but on the night of the added day it did not appear [to the court].”

F. Then Rabban Gamaliel accepted their testimony.

G. Said R. Dosa b. Harkinas, “They are false witnesses.

H. “How can they testify that a woman has given birth, when, on the very next day, her stomach is still up there between her teeth [for there was no new moon]?”

I. Said to him R Joshua, “I can see your position.”

2:9 A. Said to him Rabban Gamaliel, “I decree that you come to me with your staff and purse on the Day of Atonement which is determined in accord with your reckoning.”

B. R. Aqiba went and found him troubled.

C. He said to him, “I can provide grounds for showing that everything that Rabban Gamaliel has done is validly done, since it says, *These are the set feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which you shall proclaim* (Lev. 23:4). Whether they are in their proper time or not in their proper time, I have no set feasts but these [which you shall proclaim].

D. He came along to R. Dosa b. Harkinas.

E. He [Dosa] said to him, “now if we’re going to take issue with the court of Rabban Gamaliel, we have to take issue with every single court which has come into being from the time of Moses to the present day, “since it says, *Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel* (Ex. 24:9).

G. “Now why have the names of the elders not been given? To teach that every group of three [elders] who came into being as a court of Israel—lo, they are equivalent to the court of Moses himself.”

H. [Joshua] took his staff with his purse in his hand and went along to Yabneh, to Rabban Gamaliel, on the Day of Atonement which is determined in accord with his [Gamaliel’s] reckoning.

I. Rabban Gamaliel stood up and kissed him on his head and said to him, “Come in peace, my master and my disciple—

J. “My master in wisdom, and my disciple in accepting my rulings.”

Figure 5. The Mishnah: A New Translation by Jacob Neusner.
Rabbi Joshua’s coming was a humble attempt to recognize the Rabban’s authority, even in a wrong ruling. This is the only recorded time in the entire Mishnah, comprising the era from the first century BC to the second century AD, that a new month had been declared in error.

Even though the declaration of the new moon was made by observation, and not by counting of the twenty-nine or thirty days since the previous new moon, it is clear that the Jews of the first century were counting those days, and knew when to expect the new moon—they knew that the new moon could not possibly occur any earlier than twenty-nine days since the previous new moon. Thus, a suggestion that the new moon could be erroneously declared two days early (twenty-eight days after the previous new moon), making their calendar that month off by two days, is hardly possible. That Jews were aware of the only two days on which the new moon could appear, and that the beginning day of any new month was figured from the actual day on which the new moon appeared, even if the new moon had not been sighted, is clear from the two lines in the Mishnah immediately preceding the story of Rabban Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua. It is declared in Rosh Hashanah 2 that the beginning of the new month was to be recognized and sanctified from the actual date of the new moon, whether that new moon appeared and was observed or not: “Whether it appears at the expected time or does not appear in the expected time, they sanctify it. R. Elazar b. R. Sadoq says, ‘If it did not appear in its expected time, they do not sanctify it, for Heaven has already declared it sanctified’” (Rosh Hashanah 2:7).

The reason for a new moon not appearing and being observed “in the expected time” would be that the sky was visually obscured during the night hours due to clouds or stormy weather. Even when that happened, however, the new moon not being observed did not result in the new month being declared early or late. The court would use their knowledge of the lunar phases (implied from the chart Rabban Gamaliel is said to have possessed) to correctly ascertain when the new moon had actually occurred, and from that date the new month would be sanctified and counted, and any festival that month would fall on its correct designated day. The Yom Tov festivals were commanded to begin on certain days of the month. Passover, for example, was to be on the 15th day of the month of Nisan, actually commencing at sunset after the 14th day of the month, when the full moon would be present.

81. See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 68, 70.
82. Neusner, Mishnah, Rosh Hashanah 2:7C–D.
Failure to keep the Passover on the correct day, at the time of the full moon, was not theoretically excused by not having observed the new moon when it appeared two weeks earlier.

From the entire discussion above, it should be evident that great care was taken by Jews of the first century in declaring their new months from accurate observations and reckonings of the new moon. This demonstrates two things: First, that the chart in the article by Blumell and Wayment, portraying a broad span of four possible weekdays for the 14th of Nisan in any year from AD 27 to AD 34 is untenable. And second, that the calculations of Humphreys and Waddington (see figs. 2 and 3 above) for the new moons and the 14th day of Nisan in those same years may be accepted as accurate and authoritative. This rules out any year but AD 30 as the year of Jesus’s death.

Crucifixion on the 14th or 15th of Nisan—a Gospel Discrepancy?

A well-known issue in studies of the four New Testament Gospels is the so-called discrepancy between the three synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) and the Gospel of John with regard to the timing of Jesus’s last Passover supper and the day of his death. Brown’s treatment of this complicated matter surveys as much information and opinion on the issue as any source. The problem arises because John clearly describes Jesus’s crucifixion as having occurred on the “preparation of the passover” (John 19:14), which is the day of the 14th of Nisan, whereas Matthew, Mark, and Luke seem to describe Jesus’s last Passover supper as having occurred on that day (see fig. 6). This leads some commentators to assume the three synoptic Gospel writers were describing Jesus’s crucifixion as having occurred on the following day, on the 15th of Nisan.

83. See the chart in Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 70. Its four-day window for the 14th of Nisan in the years portrayed is without valid support, as is its allowance for the 14th to fall “up to two days early.”

84. The issue is referred to as a “discrepancy” and also as a “discord” by Blumell and Wayment (“When Was Jesus Born?” 65, 77 n. 49), who fault “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ” for not discussing “this discrepancy,” since “Dating” consistently presents the crucifixion as having occurred on the 14th of Nisan. Neither do Blumell and Wayment discuss this issue: “The discord in the Gospels on this point will not be treated here” (77 n. 49). Although they present both the 14th and 15th of Nisan as days when the crucifixion could have occurred (66 and chart on 67), they ultimately focus on the 14th (70), as did “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 15–16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synoptic Gospel References</th>
<th>Gospel of John References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suggesting that the 14th of Nisan (Passover preparation) was the day Jesus’s last Passover supper was prepared.</td>
<td>suggesting that the 14th of Nisan (Passover preparation) was the day of Jesus’s crucifixion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 26:17</td>
<td>John 18:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?</td>
<td>Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:12</td>
<td>John 19:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?</td>
<td>And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare?</td>
<td>The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.</td>
<td>Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulcher, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews’ preparation day; for the sepulcher was nigh at hand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.** 14th of Nisan comparison in the synoptic Gospels and in the Gospel of John.
So, either John’s account is in conflict with that of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, or there is something else to be considered.

The most widely suggested solution to this conundrum is that two different Passover meals are described in the four Gospels as occurring during Jesus’s final days—the official Passover of Nisan 14/15, recognized throughout Judea and alluded to in John’s Gospel, and an unofficial Passover a day or two earlier, on which Jesus had his last supper. In other words, Jesus’s last Passover supper did not take place on the official Judean date of Nisan 14/15, but a day or two prior, and the synoptic Gospels refer to the earlier date as “the first day of unleavened bread” (Mark 14:12) in order to support the legitimacy of Jesus celebrating the earlier Passover. Commentators have, over the years, suggested a number of models for a Passover held a day earlier than the official Jerusalem Passover, such as an earlier Passover celebrated by Galileans or by Pharisees or by diaspora Jews, but there is not a shred of historical evidence to support these inventions. As Brown observes, “We do not

Figure 7. This medieval hall, known as the Coenaculum, is a second floor “upper room” built by the Crusaders in the likely location of the home in which Jesus had his last Passover supper with his Apostles. Photo by Jeffrey R. Chadwick.
have any evidence for the celebration in Jerusalem of two adjacent days as Passover."

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, however, revealed that Essene Jews, who observed the so-called Qumran calendar (or Essene calendar), usually celebrated Passover on another day than appointed on the official Judean calendar, unless the official date was a Wednesday. The Essene adhered to an intercalated solar-lunar calendar, rather than the intercalated lunar-solar calendar of normative Judaism. The Qumran calendar was based on a 364-day solar year. It is unclear how the Essene dealt with the extra 1¼ days of the solar year, but they appear to have had a method. In the Qumran/Essene calendar, Passover (the 15th of Nisan) always fell on a Wednesday, with the Passover Seder meal always taking place Tuesday evening after sundown. The 14th of Nisan in the Qumran/Essene calendar was therefore always on Tuesday. Beginning with Annie Jaubert in 1957, a number of influential scholars, willing to break from tradition and consider options for Jesus’s last Passover supper other than a Thursday night, have suggested that Jesus’s early Passover meal took place on Tuesday evening. Brown notes five such scholars, including the highly influential Eugen Ruckstuhl, in his description of the Tuesday evening Essene model for the last supper, although Brown himself ultimately rejects it. However, another influential Catholic scholar, Father Bargil Pixner of the Dormition Abbey in Jerusalem, whose background included decades of living in Israel and Jerusalem and studying the Jewish context of the

86. Brown, _Death of the Messiah_, 2:1365. For a short description of various early Passover suggestions, see pp. 2:1364–66.
87. For a comprehensive treatment of the Essene and the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, _Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls_ (New York: Doubleday, 1995).
89. See Annie Jaubert, _La Date de la Cène_ (Paris: Gabalda, 1957), and its English translation, _The Date of the Last Supper_ (New York: Alba House, 1965).

Those who suggest that Jesus celebrated his last Passover supper on Tuesday evening are divided as to whether he observed the Essene calendar as a rule or only as an exception on that one occasion. It seems to me that the doctrines and practices of the Essene were so dissimilar to those of Jesus and his followers that he would not have normally observed their alternative calendar. However, that Jesus would, for his own convenience and security, hold his own early Passover meal on a Tuesday night when Essene Jews in Jerusalem would also be doing so, thus not attracting undue suspicion or attention to his own gathering, seems both logical and likely. And that the synoptic Gospel writers would refer to that Tuesday as the “first day of unleavened bread” seems appropriate—it portrayed Jesus’s regard for his last supper as a genuine Passover experience, even though it did not occur on the official date. The Tuesday night Last Supper model solves virtually every problem connected with the issue of the two Passovers the Gospels mention regarding Jesus’s final days. Additionally, a Tuesday night at Gethsemane allows for adequate time between the events of Jesus’s arrest and crucifixion for his morning Sanhedrin trial, his transfer to Pilate, his interview with Pilate, his transfer to Herod, his interview with Herod, his transfer back to Pilate, his ultimate sentencing and display by Pilate, and his beatings, all of which are impossible to compress into the early hours of a single morning in the traditional model.

The Tuesday model for the Last Supper, occurring on a day prior to the official 14th of Nisan, leaves John’s report of Jesus’s execution on the 14th of Nisan as the correct dating of the crucifixion. But there are also elements of the trial, sentencing, and crucifixion reports in the three synoptic Gospels that suggest they are not actually portraying the events to have happened on the official 15th of Nisan. Here are half a dozen examples:


92. For examples of other Essene involvement in the narratives of the New Testament Gospels, see the discussion by Chadwick in “The Jerusalem Temple, the Sadducees, and the Opposition to Jesus,” 65–69.

1. The trial and sentencing of Jesus by the Sanhedrin (see Matt. 27:1, Mark 15:1, Luke 22:66) would surely not have occurred on the 15th of Nisan, on the Yom Tov festival day—such activities would violate the Law of Moses and the sanctity of the festival, which was considered a Sabbath, and would have been invalid under any existing interpretation of Judean law. Geza Vermes, a respected scholar of the New Testament in its Judean context, succinctly states that “Jewish courts did not sit, investigate or pronounce sentence on a feast-day or a Sabbath.”

2. On the day of the execution, Pilate sought to release Jesus as a goodwill gesture for the Passover festival, but instead released Barabbas (see Matt. 27:15–24, Mark 15:6–15, Luke 23:16–24). The release would surely not have been proposed or carried out on the 15th of Nisan, nor would the chief priest and the crowd of supporters have gathered on a Yom Tov festival day to demand the release. Rather, these events suggest a context on the 14th of Nisan, just in advance of the festival and in time for the Seder supper that evening.

3. Simon the Cyrenian is said to have been “coming out of the country” when he was pressed to carry Jesus’s cross (Mark 15:21, Luke 23:26). This would surely not have happened on the 15th of Nisan, because Simon, and any other Jew coming to Jerusalem, would have been traveling to arrive prior to the beginning of the festival. And, if he were late, he would surely not have been traveling on the festival day itself. Rather, this event is also best placed in the context of the 14th of Nisan.

4. Crowds are depicted as passing by the execution site and insulting Jesus while he was on the cross (Matt. 27:39–40, Mark 15:29–30) and also as having accompanied him in sorrow on the way to the

94. See the discussion in Geza Vermes, *Who's Who in the Age of Jesus* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 135–36, cited in Charlesworth, “Historical Jesus in the Fourth Gospel,” 10. I note here that Charlesworth maintains that Jesus was interrogated after his arrest, but that no trial was actually held. However, the references in the synoptic Gospels to the Sadducean chief priests (plural), the council (Sanhedrin), witnesses, and pronouncement of guilt (see Matt. 26:59–60, 65–66; Mark 14:55–56, 63–64; Luke 22:66, 71) all convince me that a bona fide trial of Jesus was indeed conducted before a minimum quorum “small Sanhedrin” of twenty-three members (all Sadducees except for Joseph of Arimathea) after daybreak on the morning following Jesus’s arrest (see Luke 22:66).
site (Luke 23:27–28). Such activity would have violated the sanctity of the *Yom Tov* festival, which was considered a Sabbath and, especially in the case of the Matthew and Mark accounts, would have been unlikely to occur on the 15th of Nisan.

5. The burial of Jesus's deceased body, depicted as occurring prior to sundown (see Matt. 27:59–60, Mark 15:46, Luke 23:53), would surely not have been carried out on the 15th of Nisan. Any event or action considered tragic or unhappy was forbidden on a *Yom Tov* festival day, which was considered a Sabbath and was a day on which only rejoicing was permitted. In any case, a burial was not to be carried out on such a festival or on the Saturday Sabbath.

6. Although it may seem superfluous to mention, an execution would surely not have been carried out on the 15th of Nisan! It is inconceivable that a crucifixion would be carried out by Pilate on a *Yom Tov* festival, or for that matter even on a Saturday Sabbath. Pilate, who was clearly desirous of keeping peace among the Jews (not only the Sadducean chief priests and their elders, but also the tens of thousands gathered to Jerusalem for the festival), would simply not have risked violating the sanctity of the festival by carrying out a public execution on that day. The riots that surely would have ensued would also have been impossible to control. The crucifixion clearly has to have occurred prior to the onset of the *Yom Tov* day, which means that it has to have taken place on the 14th of Nisan.

That Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in fact, do not really depict a crucifixion on the 15th of Nisan then raises the question of why the three Gospel writers did not declare that the day of the execution was the 14th of Nisan. They could have easily done this, for example, by specifying (as in John 19:14) that it was the “preparation of the Passover.” While my suggestion for an answer to this is not to be demanded, I think it is possible that Matthew, Mark, and Luke (whose Gospels are often interdependent in terms of factual information) avoided specifying that it was the official Passover preparation because they had designated the day of Jesus's last supper as a Passover preparation. Whether through a desire not to be repetitious or confusing, or merely wanting to focus attention on Jesus's last supper as a legitimate Passover experience, I believe they simply decided to feature only one Passover preparation in their narratives. On the other hand, John did not specify Jesus's last supper as a Passover meal, perhaps for a different but related reason—to focus attention on the fact that Jesus's death, which John understood to be
symbolized by the killing of Passover lambs, had indeed occurred on the official preparation day of Passover, when the lambs of the feast were sacrificed. Caution must be taken in imputing complicated motives to the four Gospel writers, so I offer these possibilities only as suggestions. What remains clear, however, is that both John and the synoptic Gospels present numerous factual elements that can only be construed as pointing to the official Judean 14th of Nisan as the day of Jesus’s execution. The reluctance of New Testament scholarly consensus to recognize this notwithstanding, there is no real discrepancy between the synoptic Gospels and John with regard to the day of the crucifixion.

As a final note in this section, it is also apparent that the Gospel of John, which portrays Jesus’s crucifixion on the official 14th of Nisan, also portrays Jesus’s last supper as occurring prior to that day. When, in the middle of the meal, Judas leaves the group, some of the Apostles thought he was going out to purchase things needed for the festival (see John 13:29). This would be inconceivable on the official night of the Passover Seder—no markets would have been open, the whole city and thousands of surrounding family camps outside the walls would have been in the middle of their own Seder meals, and in any case the evening would have been considered a festival Sabbath, when buying or selling was forbidden. Clearly, even John depicts Jesus’s last Passover supper as having occurred on a night prior to the official 14th of Nisan.

And what was that night? When all the scriptural, historical, and even archaeological evidence is considered (archaeology is included, since that field of study is an aspect of the Qumran discoveries)—that Jesus celebrated his last Passover supper on Tuesday evening is the only realistic solution to the New Testament’s two-Passover conundrum. Tuesday evening is the only option that has both historical and contextual evidence of first-century Judean society to support it. And because it is sound and logical, a Tuesday Last Supper is the model I suggest as reality and also present as a valid consideration to my students (see fig. 8).

A small number of New Testament scholars have suggested that the crucifixion took place on a Thursday (Brown refers to them as “a few dissenters”), but the overwhelming majority of New Testament commentators are strongly committed to the model of Byzantine origin—the traditional Good Friday—as the day of crucifixion, perhaps more so than to any other aspect of the accounts of Jesus’s passion. Two issues,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’s messianic parade into Jerusalem.</td>
<td>Jesus’s curse of a fig tree that died instantly.</td>
<td>Peter and John go to prepare a Passover.</td>
<td>Jesus’s trial conducted by the high priest.</td>
<td>Passover Preparation. Jesus is sentenced by Pilate.</td>
<td>Official day of Passover Festival.</td>
<td>Weekly day of Sabbath.</td>
<td>Jesus is resurrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He cleanses the temple, teaches the crowds, and returns to Bethany.</td>
<td>Final day teaching at the temple and on the Mount of Olives.</td>
<td>Jesus eats his last Passover supper with Apostles. Arrest at Gethsemane.</td>
<td>Jesus taken to Pilate, sent to Herod, and then back to Pilate.</td>
<td>Crucifixion</td>
<td>Jesus’s body in the tomb.</td>
<td>Jesus’s body in the tomb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nisan</td>
<td>11 Nisan</td>
<td>12 Nisan</td>
<td>13 Nisan</td>
<td>14 Nisan</td>
<td>15 Nisan</td>
<td>16 Nisan</td>
<td>17 Nisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ess. 12 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 13 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 14 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 15 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 16 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 17 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 18 Nisan</td>
<td>Ess. 19 Nisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, AD 30</td>
<td>April 3, AD 30</td>
<td>April 4, AD 30</td>
<td>April 5, AD 30</td>
<td>April 6, AD 30</td>
<td>April 7, AD 30</td>
<td>April 8, AD 30</td>
<td>April 9, AD 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8.** The final week of the life of Jesus, April AD 30 (Julian calendar dates) © Jeffrey R. Chadwick. Bold Nisan dates are official Judean lunar-solar calendar dates. “Ess.” indicates Essene calendar dates.
imbedded within the texts of the four Gospels, are key to identifying the weekday of Jesus’s death: (1) statements about the length of time from the execution to the resurrection, and (2) statements about the crucifixion having occurred on a preparation day prior to a Sabbath. We will examine these in order.

There are twelve passages in the four Gospels that refer to the length of time between Jesus’s death and resurrection. These are displayed in figure 9. Eleven of these statements are predictions made by Jesus well prior to his execution. Only one, the statement made by Cleopas96 in Luke 24, is a direct report of the time that actually passed between the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Length</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Speaker / Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the third day”</td>
<td>Matthew 16:21; 17:22; 20:19</td>
<td>Jesus prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τη τριτη ημερα</td>
<td>Mark 9:31; 10:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke 9:22; 18:33</td>
<td>“” “”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“today is the third day since”</td>
<td>Luke 24:21</td>
<td>Cleopas report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τριτην ταυτην ημεραν αγει σημερον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“three days and three nights”</td>
<td>Matthew 12:40</td>
<td>Jesus prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρεις ημερας και τρεις νυκτας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“after three days”</td>
<td>Mark 8:31; Matthew 27:63</td>
<td>Jesus prediction; Jesus’s enemies quoting him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετα τρεις ημερας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“in three days”</td>
<td>John 2:19</td>
<td>Jesus prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εν τρισιν ημεραις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Statements in the four Gospels about the length of time between the crucifixion and the resurrection. Quotations from the King James Version are reliable, accurate translations of the provided Greek originals.

96. In Luke 24:19, the statement is actually attributed to both Cleopas and his unnamed companion on the road to Emmaus. The identity of that companion is generally disputed by most modern scholars, although traditional commentary suggests Luke himself as Cleopas’s companion, which is also my preference. The intimacy and detail of the distinct narrative support it as an eyewitness account by the Gospel author and one that is completely reliable in terms of the quotations. Although the LDS Bible Dictionary characterizes the identification of Luke as the other disciple on the road to Emmaus as “picturesque but historically unsupported” (LDS Bible Dictionary, 726, “Luke”), Bruce R. McConkie took the very certain position that Cleopas’s companion was “undoubtedly Luke.” See McConkie, Mortal Messiah, 275, which in turn cites Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols. (1883; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971), 2:638.
crucifixion and the Sunday of Jesus’s rising. This statement is the single most important piece of evidence in identifying the day on which Jesus died, since it was originally expressed only after, and directly after, both the crucifixion and the resurrection had occurred. Speaking on Sunday afternoon and having explained how Jesus was executed, Cleopas reported that “today is the third day since these things were done” (Luke 24:21). The King James Version translation of this passage very accurately represents the tense and timing of the Greek original. And the timing is clear: Sunday being the third day since the crucifixion, Saturday would have been the second day since the crucifixion, and Friday would have been the first day since the crucifixion, meaning that Cleopas was referring to the execution as having occurred on Thursday.

Of the eleven predictive statements by Jesus, seven feature the same timing phrase as the report of Cleopas, that Jesus would rise on “the third day” (Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Mark 9:31; 10:34; Luke 9:22; 18:33). These references must be understood in light of the report of Cleopas, that is to say, these passages should clearly also be taken as referring to Jesus rising on the third day since (meaning “after”) the crucifixion, and that the crucifixion thus occurred on Thursday. Many commentaries, of course, claim that Friday was both the day of the crucifixion and the first day of the three-day count, but because of these other considerations, support for that calculation is weak. The several “third day” predictions were all recorded by the synoptic Gospel writers years after the resurrection occurred and years after the report of Cleopas would have been common knowledge to informed disciples of Jesus throughout the church. In particular, Luke, who recorded two “third day” predictions as well as his quotation of the report of Cleopas, must certainly have understood the “third day” of the predictions to be the same as the “third day” of his own narrative in Luke 24. All eight of the “third day” Gospel passages, including Cleopas’s report, may be considered as indicating that Jesus’s crucifixion was on Thursday.

As for the other predictions, the single reference in John is unique in that Jesus did not overtly refer to his own death, but rather to a theoretical destruction of the temple “in three days” (John 2:19), which John then says the disciples later understood as a prediction of Jesus’s death and resurrection. And the Matthew 27 reference is different from the rest in that it represents Jesus’s enemies quoting his prediction that he would rise “after three days” (Matt. 27:63), although Mark also attributes the same phrase and prediction directly to Jesus (see Mark 8:31). Timing Jesus’s resurrection on Sunday as “after three days” would be impossible
to reconcile with a Friday crucifixion (even if Friday were considered the first day of the count) and could only work with a Thursday crucifixion if Thursday were counted as the first day.

Besides the very clear report of Cleopas, the declaration by Jesus in Matthew 12 gives another quite specific timing indicator that points to Thursday as the day of crucifixion. In that passage, Jesus said, “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Matt. 12:40). In a note to my 2010 study, I explained, “A Friday crucifixion allows for the counting of three days, if one includes Friday, Saturday, and Sunday in the count, but cannot accommodate three nights, since only Friday night and Saturday night would have passed before dawn on Sunday. A Thursday crucifixion, however, allows for three nights to have passed prior to the Resurrection on Sunday morning, as well as something closer to three real days.”

In response to this note, Blumell and Wayment took the position that “since Matthew 12:40 is a partial quote of Jonah 1:17 (LXX Jonah 2:1), wherein it was reported that Jonah was ‘in the belly of the fish three days and three nights,‘ the reference here need not be pushed so hard that the actual timing has to be taken literally.” They refer to Krister Stendahl’s study of Old Testament passages in Matthew and assert that “Matthew’s Gospel had a tendency to find any reference in the Old Testament that might relate to Jesus and cite it, whether or not it was a perfect fit.” Stendahl’s approach notwithstanding, it must be recognized that Jesus’s prophecy was not about the story of Jonah. It was given specifically to declare the length of time he would spend in the grave. Even if the Jonah passage had not been referred to at all, the actual length-of-time statement Jesus made would remain, by itself, as a clear and precise prediction: “The Son of man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” Jesus said these words not to elaborate on the story of Jonah (the tale is not mentioned again in any Gospel passage) but to make a succinct point about his own death and the length of time that would pass until his resurrection. Though some New Testament literary scholars attempt to explain away Jesus’s declaration in Matthew 12:40 as a

97. Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 33 n. 44.
98. Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 79 n. 56.
100. Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 79 n. 56.
merely imprecise metaphor that relies on the timing in Jonah, the prediction in the passage stands solidly on its own, declaring that Jesus would, after his death, be in a tomb for three nights as well as three days. And, like the report of Cleopas, this clearly indicates a Thursday crucifixion.

**That Sabbath Day Was an High Day**

In the four Gospels, there are six passages about the crucifixion having occurred on a day of “preparation” (Greek παρακευή—*paraskeuē*) prior to a Sabbath (see fig. 10). Matthew, Mark, and Luke each contain one passage, and the Gospel of John contains three (which were already alluded to above; see fig. 6).

As far as the references to the “preparation” in the three synoptic Gospels are concerned, combined they actually represent only one report tradition. As already mentioned, the narratives in the synoptics are highly interdependent, and traditional scholarship holds (probably correctly) that they rely on a single source for many elements, including...
aspects of the crucifixion account. Many scholars point to the Mark account as the original source from which Matthew and Luke copy in this particular instance, but some highly respected scholars, such as Flusser, suggest the Luke account is the most authentic source, preserving the original tradition of Jesus’s life. In any case, the synoptic accounts must be considered as a single report tradition, leaving the narrative in John as the second unique witness describing the crucifixion on the “preparation” day.

In the historical descriptions preserved by the fourth-century Church historian Eusebius, as well as in most scholarly assessment, the Gospel of John was reported to have been composed decades after the synoptic Gospels. The dating of the synoptics is a debated issue, but most authorities place them at least twenty to forty years before John was written, and in some cases as much as fifty. Without arguing the exact date of the Gospels of Matthew or Mark or Luke, the point is that John wrote his Gospel at Ephesus around AD 100, long after the others, and that he was aware both of the other Gospels and of their ultimate original sources. John even seems to have included information in his own Gospel that would clarify certain issues in the earlier Gospels. And when John spoke of the “preparation” day on which Jesus was crucified, he not only mentioned it three times, but he included two explanations


103. On the dating of the composition of the four Gospels, see the summary in Bruce, *New Testament Documents*, 6–15, and on the dating of John, see page 12.

104. On John’s Gospel being aware of other Gospels and sources, see the lengthy discussion in Charlesworth, “Historical Jesus in the Fourth Gospel,” 34–46.

105. Several instances exist where the Gospel of John clarifies issues or events presented in the synoptic Gospels. One example is found in John 4:43–54, which reports Jesus’s initial ministry activities in the Galilee and recounts how Jesus, while in Cana, healed a boy a great distance away in Capernaum. This passage clarifies a report in Luke 4:14–30, where Jesus was challenged in Nazareth to do there “whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum” (Luke 4:23). The Luke account does not explain what was done in Capernaum, therefore the John account of the boy healed at Capernaum, written decades after Luke, adds clarity by giving details of the event alluded to but not explained in Luke.
to clarify the kind of Sabbath on which the preparation was occurring. John 19:14 very specifically indicated that the day on which Jesus died was “the preparation of the Passover.” This is absolutely straightforward and appears intentional, and the two subsequent references to the “preparation” in John 19:31 and 19:42 must be considered in this regard.

In John 19:31 particularly, where John mentions both the “preparation” and its “sabbath,” it is quite clear that the Sabbath he was referring to was the festival Sabbath (that is, Passover), since he distinctly explained “that sabbath day was an high day.” The King James Version phrase “an high day” is the translation of the Greek phrase megalē hē hēmera (μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα), literally “a great day.”¹⁰⁶ New Testament commentaries in general do not provide any clarity on this term or any satisfactory interpretation of what it means in John 19:31.¹⁰⁷ However, the phrase seems clearly to be John’s attempt in Greek to express the Hebrew term Yom Tov, which, as mentioned earlier, is a specific Jewish reference to a high festival day such as Passover. John 19:31 is actually saying that the Sabbath preparation day on which Jesus was crucified was a Yom Tov festival Sabbath preparation day rather than the preparation day for a Saturday Sabbath.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶. The “high day” or “great day” (megalē hē hēmera) of John 19:31 is not to be confused with the KJV phrase “great day of the feast” in John 7:37, an error made by Brown in Death of the Messiah, 2:1174 n. 81. The Greek phrase in John 7:37 is megale tes eortes (literally “the great of the festival”—the word day does not appear in the Greek), which represents the Jewish Hebrew term rabba, a reference to Hoshannah Rabba, the final day of Sukkot (the Feast of Tabernacles).

¹⁰⁷. New Testament commentaries in general offer no logical or realistic explanation for the “high day” or “great day” (megalē hē hēmera) of John 19:31. Bruce, for example, suggests only that it indicated “in that year the Passover coincided with the weekly Sabbath.” See Bruce, Gospel of John, 374. And while Brown, in Death of the Messiah, 2:1174, says that “the seemingly more important fact that the next day was Passover is echoed only in the statement ‘that Sabbath was a great day,’” this is no clear explanation. Perhaps the best effort is Brown’s rendition of megalē hē hēmera as “a solemn feast day” in his Anchor Bible Series translation of John, but this is not followed up by any clarifying explanation in the accompanying notes or comments. See Raymond E. Brown, The Anchor Bible: The Gospel According to John XIII–XXI, vol. 29A (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970), 932 (John XIX:31), also 933 (Notes) and 944 (Comment).

¹⁰⁸. This idea was introduced in my 2010 study, although the Jewish Hebrew term Yom Tov was not mentioned as the inspiration for the phrase “an high day” in John 19:31. See Chadwick, “Dating the Birth of Jesus Christ,” 33 n. 42. Blumell and Wayment subsequently disputed the whole idea that “high day” refers to the Passover in John 19, maintaining “there is absolutely no evidence that the
John was clarifying an issue that was not clear in the synoptic Gospels, where the day on which Jesus was executed is only said to have been the preparation of a Sabbath, and where the day following Jesus’s execution is referred to as a Passover only by implication. John makes it clear that Jesus was crucified on the preparation day for Passover, and also makes clear that the Sabbath day following Jesus’s death was a Yom Tov (“high day”) festival Sabbath rather than a weekly Saturday Sabbath.\(^{109}\)

It is well known by informed students of Jewish studies that there were two types of Sabbaths in the second temple period, at the time of Jesus, as there still are in Judaism today: (1) the weekly seventh-day Sabbath on Saturday and (2) the Yom Tov festival Sabbath, which can occur on any weekday. This reality is reflected in the book of Leviticus, as I explained earlier. A New Testament example of this reality was the unnamed festival of John 5, which is referred to as a Sabbath, but which is impossible to have fallen on a Saturday if it is modeled as a Passover, and

---

Passover was ever called ‘an high day’ or High Sabbath when it occurred on any day of the week besides the actual day of Sabbath (Saturday).” See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 66. In their accompanying endnote 55 on page 79, Blumell and Wayment exclaim, “This designation (High Sabbath) is without precedent in Jewish literature,” citing Israel Abrahams’s discussion in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 2 vols. (New York: KTAV reprint, 1967), 2:68, a source also mentioned in Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1174 n. 81. However, in that study, Abrahams says nothing of the sort. Further, Abrahams’s discussion actually regards an account known as the Martyrdom of Polycarp, the earliest known source of which is the fourth century *AD* Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. Abrahams notes the Greek term *sabbatou megalou* (σαββάτου μεγάλου), meaning “great sabbath,” as the day on which Polycarp was put to death, and then discusses possible dating and interpretations of the phrase. However, Abrahams made a serious mistake in saying, “The only argument in favour of an early date is its occurrence in John xix.31.” Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*, 2:68. Abrahams’s error is that the phrase *sabbatou megalou* (“great Sabbath”) does not occur at all in John 19:31, rather, the phrase in John 19:31 is *megalē hē hēmera*. Abrahams’s mistake is unfortunate, and the unrecognized use of his false comparison by Blumell and Wayment represents a serious failure in their discussion. The attempt to turn the “high day” of John 19:31 into the “High Sabbath” or “great Sabbath” of the Martyrdom of Polycarp is an error that must be rejected.

109. It is, admittedly, quite remarkable that there is not a single New Testament commentary in existence that recognizes or discusses the “high day” (*megalē hē hēmera*) of John 19:31 as a “rendition” of the Jewish Hebrew term *Yom Tov*. In this regard, the present study is, also admittedly, breaking new ground.
unlikely to have been a Saturday when modeled as Rosh Hashanah. The Sabbath day following Jesus’s execution is referred to as a Passover, by implication in the synoptic Gospels and in direct terms in the Gospel

110. It is highly unlikely that the Sabbath spoken of in John 5, which was a festival day, fell on a Saturday Sabbath. As the chart below demonstrates, if the Passover of John 19 is modeled as a Saturday (as per conventional tradition), and if the festival of John 5 is modeled as a Passover (as in the three-year model), counting back two exact lunar years (708 days) from the John 19 Passover would place the John 5 festival Sabbath on a Friday. But if a second month of Adar had occurred in between the two festivals, the John 5 event would have been on a Thursday or Wednesday (depending on whether the second Adar had lasted twenty-nine or thirty days). On the other hand, if the John 5 festival Sabbath is modeled as Rosh Hashanah (as in the two-year model), then the count backward would have been eighteen lunar months and fifteen days, and the corresponding weekday would have been a Saturday only if there had not been a second Adar during Jesus’s ministry; otherwise the John 5 festival would have fallen on Friday or Thursday. And, since Passover in AD 30 fell at the end of the first week of April, it is highly likely that there had indeed been a second month of Adar proclaimed the year previous, in the early spring of AD 29, which would then point to a Friday or Thursday for the festival of John 5 at Rosh Hashanah in AD 28, further diminishing the possibility that the festival fell on a Saturday. The chart below displays these variables, figured for both a Saturday and a Friday model of the John 19 Passover. And in only one case (a much less likely case) would the John 5 festival have fallen on a Saturday Sabbath. All possible variables considered, the likelihood is that the John 5 festival Sabbath indeed occurred on a day other than Saturday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John 19 Passover modeled as . . .</th>
<th>John 5 festival modeled as . . .</th>
<th>Days John 5 was prior to John 19</th>
<th>Days prior with a 2nd Adar of 29 days</th>
<th>Days prior with a 2nd Adar of 30 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday (traditional)</td>
<td>Passover (3-year model)</td>
<td>708 days prior—Day = Friday</td>
<td>737 days prior—Day = Thursday</td>
<td>738 days prior—Day = Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday (traditional)</td>
<td>Rosh Hashanah (2-year model)</td>
<td>546 days prior—Day = Saturday</td>
<td>575 days prior—Day = Friday</td>
<td>576 days prior—Day = Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday (alternative)</td>
<td>Passover (3-year model)</td>
<td>708 days prior—Day = Thursday</td>
<td>737 days prior—Day = Wednesday</td>
<td>738 days prior—Day = Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday (per this study)</td>
<td>Rosh Hashanah (2-year model)</td>
<td>546 days prior—Day = Friday</td>
<td>575 days prior—Day = Thursday</td>
<td>576 days prior—Day = Wednesday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of John, but it was a Yom Tov festival Sabbath that fell on a Friday, not a weekly Saturday Sabbath.

The notion that Jesus died on a Friday preparation for a Saturday Sabbath is incompatible with the report of Cleopas in Luke 24, where it is clear that Jesus was executed on a Thursday. In my opinion, John was aware of this potential disconnect and purposefully crafted his own report in John 19 to clarify the story presented in the synoptic Gospels, in an attempt to assure that later readers would understand Jesus had not died on a Friday preparation day prior to a Saturday Sabbath, as might be inferred from the imprecise references in the synoptics, but on a Thursday Passover preparation day prior to a Friday Passover that was also a Yom Tov festival Sabbath. That gentile Christians in subsequent centuries failed to appreciate how megalē hē hēmera (“an high day”) meant a Yom Tov festival Sabbath and also failed to consider John's reference to the “preparation of the Passover” (John 19:14) in its correct context is a curious failure of religious history, probably due to the general gentile unfamiliarity with Jewish terminology.

John’s careful clarification of the preparation day for the Yom Tov (“high day”) Passover festival Sabbath as the day of Jesus’s death, rather than a preparation day for a Saturday Sabbath, paired with the specific report of Luke and Cleopas that the Sunday of the resurrection was the third day since Jesus had been executed, and added to the very specific prophecy of Jesus that he would be in the grave for three days and three nights as well, all combine to point to Thursday as the day of his crucifixion, the vague and less-specific references to “sabbath” in the synoptic Gospels notwithstanding. When all the evidence from both the New Testament and the sources that describe Jewish practice in the first century are considered, that Jesus was crucified on a Thursday is a clear and logical conclusion.

**Book of Mormon Timing on the Weekday of Jesus’s Death**

In addition to the evidence already examined from the Book of Mormon about the length of Jesus’s life and the year of his death, some very specific details are presented in the book of 3 Nephi that relate to the actual day of the week on which he died. The terrible storm described in 3 Nephi 8 is universally understood to have occurred during a three-hour period when Jesus was hanging on the cross outside the wall of Jerusalem, with the end of the storm coinciding with the time of his death. Centuries earlier, Nephi had specifically prophesied that three days of darkness would be “a sign [that should be] given of his death” (1 Ne. 19:10). Samuel the Lamanite foretold three important timing factors concerning Jesus’s death. The first
was that a storm (“thunderings and lightnings”) would occur “at the time that he shall yield up the ghost” (Hel. 14:21). The second was that three days of darkness would be a sign of Jesus’s death and, specifically, that the onset of darkness would occur on the day Jesus would die: “In that day that he shall suffer death the sun shall darkened” (Hel. 14:20). The third factor was that the darkness would end at Jesus’s resurrection, lasting “for the space of three days, to the time that he shall rise again from the dead” (Hel. 14:20). The actual occurrence of the storm is reported in 3 Nephi 8:5–19, with the three-hour duration of that storm specified in verse 19. That same verse notes the commencement of the darkness, which is then described as having lasted for three days (3 Ne. 8:23; 10:9). That Jesus had died at the time of the storm seems confirmed by the account of his voice being heard from the heavens, during the period of darkness, by Nephite survivors (3 Ne. 9:1–10:9, esp. 9:15 and 10:3–9).

An eight-hour time difference exists between Jerusalem and the central time zone of the Americas. This means, for example, that an event that occurs in Jerusalem at 3:00 PM is timed as occurring at 7:00 AM that same day in the American central time zone. The New Testament Gospels place Jesus’s death around the “ninth hour” (Matt. 27:46, Mark 15:34, Luke 23:44), which would be roughly around 3:00 PM in Jerusalem. This means that his death occurred around 7:00 AM in what today is known as the American central time zone (which covers the entirety of Mesoamerica, the likely venue of the Book of Mormon narrative, as well as the largest part of Mexico and the central United States). The onset of the Book of Mormon’s three days of darkness may therefore be estimated around 7:00 AM on the first day of that darkness, the day of the crucifixion, with the three-hour storm having commenced around 4:00 AM, two hours prior to sunrise (which occurs close to 6:00 AM around the beginning of April).

Two facts become obvious from the above information. The first is that three days of darkness cannot be reconciled with a Friday crucifixion model—darkness in America would have occurred only on Friday and on Saturday prior to Jesus’s resurrection, which would have occurred prior to midnight on Saturday night, American central time.111

111. The elements of the model for the three days of darkness that are presented in this section were developed by the author independently during his tenure as an LDS institute instructor in the 1990s. The discussion of them in this article was completed before a review of literature discovered that some of the same issues were raised by David B. Cummings in “Three Days and Three
No darkness could have still been present in America during the day on Sunday (see fig. 11 below). The second obvious fact is that a Thursday crucifixion model exactly fits the timing necessary for three days of darkness to have occurred in America prior to Jesus’s resurrection (see fig. 12 below). The evidence is clear that Jesus passed away on Thursday around 7:00 A.M. American central time, that the first day of darkness in America was Thursday, and that the second and third days of darkness were Friday and Saturday. Jesus’s resurrection occurred prior to sunrise in Jerusalem on Sunday, which was well prior to midnight Saturday night in the American central time zone. At sunrise on Sunday in America, normal daylight once again appeared, serving as the sign that Jesus had risen more than eight hours earlier in Jerusalem.

One curious issue in the Book of Mormon dating of Jesus’s death must be addressed here. The day on which the storm occurred in the Nephite record, which Book of Mormon commentators universally regard as the day on which Jesus died, is noted by Mormon as “the first month, on the fourth day of the month” (3 Ne. 8:5). However, in Jewish reckoning, as demonstrated earlier, Jesus’s death occurred on the 14th day of the biblical first month (Aviv, or Nisan). To what is this ten-day difference to be attributed? Without insisting on certainty, I would suggest that there was an error in the Nephite record that had come into Mormon’s hands, and that it was actually on the 14th day of the first month of the Nephite Law of Moses calendar that the storm marking the death of Jesus occurred. This suggestion relies on two factors, one a virtual certainty and one my own supposition.

The first factor is that in observing the ordinances of the Law of Moses, including the festival ordinances, the Nephites would certainly have used the lunar-solar calendar of the ancient Jews as it had come down to them from the time of Nephi (c. 600 BC). As explained earlier, the Law of Moses is dependent upon that calendar cycle, and its ordinances and festivals, including the operations of a Law of Moses–based temple, cannot be carried out exclusive of that calendar reckoning. The Nephite records stipulate that they observed and kept the Law of Moses with strict care (see Alma 30:3; 3 Ne. 1:24–25; compare 2 Ne. 5:10, 5:16; 25:4; Jarom 1:5; Mosiah 2:3, 12:28, 13:27; Alma 25:15; Hel. 13:1) Regardless of how their own

---

Nights: Reassessing Jesus’ Entombment,” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 16, no. 1 (2007): 56–63. Although Cummings’s discussion is less conclusive and his figures somewhat confusing, he, too, arrives at the view that a Thursday crucifixion best fits the Book of Mormon description of the three days of darkness.
methods of observing ordinances and festivals may have evolved differently from the Jews of Judea during the six centuries after Nephi's ship landed in America, the Nephites would have surely observed the lunar-solar calendar for the Mosaic operations, since it is a systemic component of the Law of Moses, in particular with regard to the festival ordinances, and since astronomical dynamics (solar seasons and phases of the moon) would be the same in ancient America and the ancient Near East.

The second factor (my supposition) is that a dating error existed in the plates of Nephi from which Mormon was drawing data when composing his own narrative in the book of 3 Nephi. Mormon lived centuries after the events of 3 Nephi and had no personal experience with the Law of Moses or its systemic lunar-solar calendar. In a disclaimer quite unique in his account, Mormon admitted the possibility of a calendar error for the events of 3 Nephi 8. In dating the storm to the “fourth day of the month,” he also said, “if there was no mistake made by this man in the reckoning of our time” (3 Ne. 8:2–5). Mormon was careful not to condemn the ancient record keeper, pointing out that he had been a very righteous man (3 Ne. 8:1). But that Mormon would insert his “if there was no mistake made” caveat at this very point in his text suggests, to me at least, that he indeed suspected a calendar error. In my opinion, such an error did exist—it was in the plates of Nephi, and it was a ten-day error in which the 14th day of the first month was mistakenly written

112. Blumell and Wayment cite 3 Nephi 8:2 (“if there was no mistake made by this man in the reckoning of our time”) in discussing the 600-year prophecy of Lehi. See Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 64. While it is certainly possible that Mormon had that year count in mind, it is more probable that he suspected an error in the recording of the day of the month in which the storm occurred, for 3 Nephi 8:2 speaks of the passing of the thirty-third year, which relates directly to the first month of the thirty-fourth year subsequently mentioned in verse 5. The 600-year count is not mentioned anywhere in close proximity to 3 Nephi 8, its most recent references occurring in 3 Nephi 1:1 and 2:6. With regard to the 600-year prophecy, Blumell and Wayment refer to it as having been declared by Nephi in 1 Nephi 19:8 (see Blumell and Wayment, “When Was Jesus Born?” 64), without acknowledging that the prophecy was actually first uttered by Lehi in 1 Nephi 10:4, a passage with context in the valley of Lemuel, long prior to the voyage to America. Lehi’s prophecy, uttered while still in the Old World, cannot logically have had reference to any type of year other than the lunar-solar Jewish year with which he was acquainted. In other words, the 600-year prophecy cannot have had reference to any type of calendar count in ancient American calendars, and it certainly cannot have somehow referred to 600 Mesoamerican tuns, which were not years anyway (see nn. 41 and 45 above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday (Day One) Central Standard Time</th>
<th>Saturday (Day Two) Central Standard Time</th>
<th>Sunday (Day Three) Central Standard Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 a.m. Jesus on cross (12:00 noon, Jerusalem) “the sixth hour”</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. Sunrise, America (2:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. Sunrise, America (2:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness commences in Jerusalem for three hours. Violent storm occurs in America for three hours.</td>
<td>Darkness commences in America (Day One)</td>
<td>Jesus has been risen for over eight hours by the time sunrise occurs on Sunday in America, in a Friday model for the crucifixion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 a.m. Jesus dies (3:00 p.m., Jerusalem) “the ninth hour”</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Jesus in tomb (6:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day Two)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m. in America (Sunset, Judea) (7:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>11:00 a.m. in America (Sunset in Judea) (7:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>There is no possibility for a third day of darkness in America with a Friday crucifixion model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day One)</td>
<td>6:00 p.m. Sunset, America (2:00 a.m., Sat., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 p.m. Sunset, America (2:00 a.m. Sun., Jerusalem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’s resurrection occurs prior to Sunday sunrise in Judea.</td>
<td>12:00 midnight, America (8:00 a.m., Sat., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>12:00 midnight, America (8:00 a.m., Sun., Jerusalem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors already at empty tomb in Jerusalem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11.** Day chart showing that a Friday crucifixion model does not work with the Book of Mormon description of three days of darkness.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 a.m. Jesus on cross (12:00 noon, Jerusalem) “the sixth hour”</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. Sunrise, America (2:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. Sunrise, America (2:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. Sunrise, America (2:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness commences in Jerusalem for three hours. Violent storm occurs in America for three hours.</td>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day Two)</td>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day Three)</td>
<td>Daylight finally appears again in America as morning comes, after the three days of darkness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 a.m. Jesus dies (3:00 p.m., Jerusalem) “the ninth hour”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness commences in America (Day One)</td>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day Two)</td>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day Three)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m. Jesus in tomb (6:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m. in America (Sunset, Judea) (7:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>11:00 a.m. in America (Sunset in Judea) (7:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>11:00 a.m. in America (Sunset in Judea) (7:00 p.m., Jerusalem)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness all this day in America (Day One)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m. Sunset, America (2:00 a.m., Fri., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 p.m. Sunset, America (2:00 a.m., Sat., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>6:00 p.m. Sunset, America (2:00 a.m., Sun., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>Jesus’s resurrection occurs prior to Sunday sunrise in Judea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 midnight, America (8:00 a.m., Fri., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>12:00 midnight, America (8:00 a.m., Sat., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>12:00 midnight, America (8:00 a.m., Sun., Jerusalem)</td>
<td>Visitors already at empty tomb in Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12.** Day chart showing that a Thursday crucifixion model works well with the Book of Mormon description of three days of darkness. © 2014 by Jeffrey R. Chadwick
down as the fourth day of the month.113 If this supposition is correct (and I emphasize again that it is my own theory and not to be demanded), the actual Nephite Law of Moses date on which Jesus died would have been the 14th day of the first month, which would be the same as the 14th of Nisan in the Judean calendar, in the year we know as AD 30.

Conclusion

The numerous avenues of inquiry explored in this study together demonstrate that Jesus died on Thursday, April 6 (Julian), AD 30, which was

113. Such a mistake is quite plausible, given what is known of Mesoamerican writing and numeral systems (assuming a Mesoamerican setting for most of the Book of Mormon narrative). Numbers in ancient Mayan were written in a “bar and dot” system, in which values from 1 to 4 were written with dots (1 = •, 2 = ••, 3 = •••, 4 = ••••) and values of 5 and its multiples were written with bars (5 = —, 10 = ——). The way to write the number 9, for example, was •••• (a 5-bar and four 1-dots). The way to write 14 was with four dots above a double bar (a 10-double-bar plus four 1-dots). But if the scribe erred, either by having the wrong number in his mind or by simply forgetting to include the double bar for 10 and simply put down four dots, the number 4 can easily have been mistakenly inscribed instead of the number 14. For a concise and authoritative treatment on ancient Mesoamerican (Mayan) numbers, see Coe, Maya, 231–35.
Figure 14. Skull Hill in Jerusalem, the likely site of Golgotha, is located just outside the main northern gate of the Old City. This ancient feature now looms over the parking lot of a modern bus station. As it is today, Golgotha would have been a busy crossroads just outside the city gate when Jesus was crucified. Photo by Jeffrey R. Chadwick.
the 14th day of Nisan in the Judean calendar, the day of the preparation of Passover. The evidences from the New Testament, the Book of Mormon, the Mishnah, and from historical, archaeological, and astronomical studies all combine to endorse this dating beyond any reasonable doubt. Jesus died at the location known popularly as Golgotha, outside the northern wall of Jerusalem, and his body was laid, late that Thursday afternoon, in a rock-hewn tomb located in an olive garden, probably just east of the crucifixion site.114

To readers of this study who may not be Latter-day Saints—those of other faiths and backgrounds, Christian and otherwise, who may hesitate to give credence to evidence from the Book of Mormon—I would suggest that the issues presented in this study from the New Testament, the Mishnah, and the historical and astronomical studies alone are more than enough to definitively demonstrate the dating of Jesus’s death to the year AD 30, to the 14th of Nisan on April 6, and to the Passover preparation on a Thursday. It is my hope that New Testament scholarship in general will take note of this evidence. That said, as a Latter-day Saint, I am not only duty-bound but personally grateful to accept and present data from the Book of Mormon, the genuine historical reliability of which I am both spiritually and materially convinced, to corroborate the evidence of the New Testament and the other avenues explored. To all this I add my additional conviction that three days later, prior to dawn on Sunday morning, the 17th of Nisan, April 9 (Julian), AD 30, that same Jesus rose from the dead, walked away from that garden and tomb, and was seen by witnesses to whom this study has referred.115

114. For a detailed description and study of the crucifixion and burial sites, see Jeffrey R. Chadwick, “Revisiting Golgotha and the Garden Tomb,” Religious Educator 4, no. 1 (2003): 13–48. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher being disqualified on several key points, the location known as “Skull Hill” or “Gordon’s Calvary” is proposed as the probable site of the execution of Jesus. But the well-known “Garden Tomb” also fails to meet the New Testament criteria for Jesus’s sepulcher, and a burial location to the east of Golgotha is suggested.

115. The conclusions in this study are, of course, based on careful examination of accounts found in the four New Testament Gospels. The origin and veracity of New Testament texts and accounts are highly debated topics. With regard to the four Gospels, the breadth of opinion spans from those whose research has found the reports in the Gospels to be generally and genuinely trustworthy to those who insist those reports are largely contrived and untrustworthy. An example of the former is James Charlesworth, who has produced many volumes demonstrating the basic reliability of the Gospel narratives, and
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an example of the latter is Bart Ehrman, who has produced many other volumes declaring those narratives unreliable.

The most ancient sources that describe the compositions of the four Gospels, including the earliest descriptions preserved from the second century AD writer Papias, strongly suggest to me, personally, that the Gospel accounts are quite reliable, and this is the premise from which I have worked in preparing this study. For those wishing to explore this topic, I suggest the work cited several times above: The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable? by F. F. Bruce, a concise but thorough work of unusual genius, which I strongly endorse. For the perspective of multiple LDS scholars, I suggest How the New Testament Came to Be, edited by Kent P. Jackson and Frank F Judd Jr. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 2006), a valuable anthology of numerous and various views, not all of which, however, I personally endorse.
Desert Sonnet

Our passenger disclaims our landscape, “bare.”
Bemused, the desert quiets down her cast
Of subtle color, withholds her perfumed air.
She shades her jewels from eyes that do not ask.
To me, her forms are home; are psalms of grace.
I’ve felt her tantrum storms, seen August’s blight,
Known spring’s and winter’s pauses, shared her face
As dawn prepared a morning bath of light.
I’ve climbed her painted cliffs, borne sun’s last arc
’Til moon the curfew called. And made a bed
To watch the stars burst over her, and marked
The wind: from breeze to gust to breeze, then dead.
   Though fortune’s turn has borne me from her land,
   I’m quick to own my veins are filled with sand.

—Tayva Patch
Blue

Cindy Gritton

Air—so tantalizingly close—remained painfully out of reach as I stared frantically up through the serene blueness of the swimming pool water. Such a beautiful color that blue was. Vivid and as permanently etched into my memory as thinking out what I would yell as soon as my head (hopefully) broke the surface of it one more time, because I knew I could only do it once more, knew it was a miracle I’d surfaced twice already, that after this next time, blue would turn to black and after that, I would not be walking home. “LET GO!” I screamed and sucked in that last, final, desperate breath of chlorine-scented air before I sank back down and into blackness.

I was in eighth-grade PE, and it was free time. Everyone was having a blast doing what they wished at the end of our regularly scheduled two weeks of swimming lessons. Instead of doing laps, it was lovely, disordered chaos, and, as usual, it was great! Also, as usual, I’d chosen to enjoy my favorite activity: jumping from the side of the pool into the ten-foot section, touching the bottom and then rising back up. It was soothing and something I could do on my own. It wasn’t that I didn’t enjoy doing things with the others in class; I simply enjoyed doing this, and so I found myself that day going up and down, finding brief solitude on the pool floor, then entering a world of noise and splashing and laughter on breaking the surface.

Across from me, about ten feet from the wall, Anh, Elaine, and Mae splashed, screaming and yelling. From the diving board, someone was

1. Names have been changed.
entering the water with a cannonball, or perhaps it was gracefully—much more gracefully than the belly flop I had demonstrated for the photography class earlier that year. (They had howled in laughter, their teacher included, and I couldn't really blame them. At least they never published that shot!) In the shallow end, balls were being thrown and chased. I paused to watch it all and then sank back down. It was the fourth or fifth time I had done so when I looked upward at Anh's, Elaine's, and Mae's kicking feet, and my mind suddenly grasped what it should have earlier: Mae didn't know how to swim. The three of them had been screaming at me—for help!

I rose to the surface and swam to them. My hand pulled Mae up first, then took hold of Elaine, followed by Anh (all three of them having just sunk under), and then a hand grabbed my arm, a body climbed onto my back, and I found myself out of breath, kicking with all my might to rise back to the world above me, praying for help, wishing I could get Mae off, grateful at the same time that at least she had to be getting air!

I made it up once, gulped in a breath, and went under, wondering where Anh and Elaine had gone, my mind desperately thinking, “Why aren’t they helping me?” unable to process how worn out they were.

I made it up again, saw they were clinging to the side of the pool, knew Mae and I now were in the middle, that I would never make it back to the side. I breathed in and sank once more, my mind frantically trying to come up with the shortest possible sentence I could scream out that might save me, that might save us both, because if I went down, unable to rise, Mae would too.

Kicking with all the strength I had, I came up screaming, “LET GO!” In that instant, I saw Theresa holding onto the side of the pool, her eyes intent on me, knew she would be coming toward me in a moment; I saw Mrs. C, our PE teacher, bending down to get her shoes off, giving instructions to Theresa; and in that frozen fraction of time, I took a final breath, and sank, knowing that I would never make it back up again with Mae on my back. I’d been blessed to ever rise the first time, let alone a second and a third, but now my strength was spent. And then her weight was gone. My feet propelled me up. My face broke through that thin, tension-tight skin of the water, and I drew in air. The light was yellowish; sounds washed around me. Theresa and someone else had Mae nearly back to the pool’s edge. Exhausted, I made my way there, too, and somehow pulled myself out.

“Are you alright?” Mrs. C asked me anxiously.
“Yes,” was all I could say, my body beginning to shake.
“What happened?”

I told her, briefly, tiredly, and then heard her say, “I thought they were only playing around, too, and then I heard you, saw you, and I thought, ‘She wouldn’t play around that way,’ and I knew you were in trouble.” She fell silent, studying me, seeing how I trembled, and not from being cold. “Go get dressed,” she said gently, and I did.

That night, I ate dinner and was quiet, my mind repeatedly going over what had happened. I sat next to Marissa, my Indian Placement sister, whose aunt had clung to my back that day. Growing up on the reservation, away from any major bodies of water, neither of them had ever needed, or wanted, to learn how to swim; both were now doing so, as required, during PE time. In the dressing room, I had learned that Anh and Elaine had hoped to help Mae swim in the deep end, certain that between the two of them, they would be able to help her do it. That didn’t bother me. They had been trying to help her. Not the best way in hindsight, but they’d just wanted her to be able to have more fun. Meanwhile, I felt stupid for not understanding their shouts to me sooner and fearful over what might have happened. But what weighed on me just as much was that I’d almost signed up to take the life guard class the month before and hadn’t.

Why hadn’t I? I would have known what to do, known to never turn my back on a distressed swimmer, known to use something besides me to pull her up and get her to the side, known to approach Mae from behind so it wouldn’t have been so easy for her to climb on me, thus endangering me and not really helping her. I felt foolish and awkward and afraid and grateful to be alive and to have been there to help Mae and Anh and Elaine.

That night, in the room I shared with Marissa, I closed my eyes to sleep, and water encased me. My eyes flew open, my lungs gasping desperately in terror, my arms pushing back the blanket. I knew what being in the dark meant: I was in the pool, unable to breathe; the sight behind my eyelids was blue water holding me down. Time after time after time I tried to sleep. Tears came. Fear wrapped its arms around me. Lying on my bed, my blanket snuggled around me, I knew: death waited for me. All I had to do was close my eyes and it would pull me under, close me off from my family. I was fighting for the very air that touched every part of
me. And so I prayed, prayed to be able to sleep, that Mae and the others could sleep, that I wouldn’t be so afraid, and somehow I finally slipped into a much needed rest.

In the many years since I nearly drowned with Mae, I have made many choices. Sometimes I’ve been wise and heeded that still, small prompting to do something, whether it meant walking home a different way, stopping to see a friend, or passing up one job opportunity for another, a decision that eventually led to me meeting my husband. But there were other times when I felt something and assumed it was merely a passing thought, only to later realize that, much like the idea of registering for the life guard class, this, too, had been the Spirit attempting to guide me to avoid future heartache or discomfort.

The Lord knew I would be in the deep end of the pool that day so long ago, knew I would be willing to do what I could to help my classmates because I’d daydreamed about doing just that (I try not to daydream so dangerously anymore), knew I would be risking my life to do it too. He also knew those few moments of my life would be easier to recover from if I had the necessary tools to do so. He tried to prepare me. I failed to take advantage of his offered help—not rebelliously, but distractedly, procrastinatingly—and yet he didn’t let me sink to the bottom of the pool that day. He gave me the strength I needed to make it up to the surface enough times until help came so that both Mae and I could live. He didn’t stand on the sidelines, shaking his head at me, saying, “I tried to warn you, child. I’m so sorry you didn’t listen. I guess we’ll talk about it in a few more minutes when you come home earlier than I’d planned. Thank you for doing what you could to help Mae, Anh, and Elaine, though.” No. Instead, he lifted me up after all I could do, gave me the strength to fight for air, and wrapped his arms around me that night when I called out to him again for comfort and help.

I sank that day and night into a nightmare. I rose exhausted, shaking, able to go on. Water wrapped around me, enveloped me, and so, too, did my Father’s and my Savior’s love.

The light was blue as I looked up through the water. It will always be blue in my mind. Feet, kicking above me, surrounded by that blueness, no longer haunt me, nor does the weight of one in desperate need whom I should have known better how to help. The sounds of those moments are muted and tangible, distant and graspable. The faces of those coming
to our rescue are fixed in my mind—their emotions and looks frozen in time. So, too, are my remonstrations and thoughts and memories:

I should have taken that class; I would have known what to do.
“At least Mae can breathe.”
“LET GO!”

The water is so blue.

“I knew you wouldn’t play around like that. I knew you were in trouble.”

I was in trouble. Several of us were in the gravest of danger, but we were never alone.

The light was so beautifully blue.

This essay by Cindy Gritton won third place in the BYU Studies 2015 personal essay contest.
Alex Beam. *American Crucifixion: The Murder of Joseph Smith and the Fate of the Mormon Church.*

Reviewed by Alexander L. Baugh

Alex Beam is a columnist for the *Boston Globe* and the *International Herald Tribune* and the author of *Gracefully Insane: The Rise and Fall of America’s Premier Mental Hospital* (2001) and *A Great Idea at the Time: The Rise, Fall, and Curious Afterlife of the Great Books* (2008). He has now taken a substantial turn and ventured into the realm of mid-nineteenth century Mormon history with his book *American Crucifixion: The Murder of Joseph Smith and the Fate of the Mormon Church.*

*American Crucifixion* is divided into fourteen chapters, which are set primarily in the years 1839–46, when Joseph Smith and the main body of Latter-day Saints occupied Nauvoo, Hancock County, in western Illinois. As the subtitle suggests, the purpose of the book is to explain the reasons, in the context of time and place, behind the violent killing of Joseph and his older brother Hyrum on June 27, 1844. Beam’s narrative does not provide a lengthy examination of Smith’s life, which was obviously never his intention, so to provide historical background he integrates flashbacks and vignettes to provide glimpses of the Mormon leader’s earlier years in New England, New York, Ohio, and Missouri.

In the introductory chapter, Beam justifies his writing of the book: “Latter-day Saint historians and their Gentile colleagues have pored over many signal events in Mormon history, such as Joseph’s First Vision of God, his purported discovery of the Book of Mormon, and the Saints’ grueling trek to Utah. But most historians have ignored Joseph’s death” (xiv). However, a veritable plethora of reputable scholarly books, book chapters, and professional journal articles about Joseph Smith’s martyrdom and its aftermath have been produced by distinguished LDS and non-LDS scholars from a variety of disciplines. In fact, Joseph Smith’s martyrdom is one of the most frequently discussed topics in Mormon historiography.
In a June 2014 interview with KUER radio host Doug Fabrizio, Beam explained that until just two years ago he knew nothing about Joseph Smith. Apparently, in his efforts to write the book, Beam had to take a self-styled crash course on Joseph Smith. This leads to the question of how credible Beam’s treatment of the Mormon leader could be, especially in light of the fact that until recently he had no knowledge of the beginnings of Mormonism, nor had he ever previously researched or published any type of scholarly study on the subject of Mormonism or the church Joseph Smith founded. A weak track record often equates to weak scholarship, and in regard to Beam’s version of Mormon history, such weakness is found in many portions of the book. Given his short learning curve, Beam relies heavily on information previously published in books and journal articles to compose his own storyline. It is evident that many of the original or primary source quotations he uses are actually taken or cited from secondary sources.

Portions of Beam’s work have merit. The chapters devoted to chronicling the events leading to the Prophet’s arrest, the assault on Carthage Jail, the burial of Joseph and Hyrum, the Mormon succession crisis, and the May 1845 trial of the alleged assassins are noteworthy, but they are not exceptional (chapters 8–13). In these pages, Beam tends to rely more on the facts and speculate less, thereby giving more credibility to his history. That said, readers will be better informed and more enlightened by reading the comparable chapters (13–15) in Glen M. Leonard, *Nauvoo: A Place of Peace, a People of Promise* (2002) and the award-winning book by Dallin H. Oaks and Marvin S. Hill, *Carthage Conspiracy: The Trial of the Accused Assassins of Joseph Smith* (1975).

A major focus of Beam’s book is on Joseph Smith’s practice of polygamy (chapter 5). Not surprisingly, his treatment of plural marriage aligns closely with that of Fawn M. Brodie’s psychoanalytic history *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet* (1945) and, more recently, George D. Smith’s *Nauvoo Polygamy: . . . but we called it Celestial Marriage* (2008). Both of those works give distorted interpretations of the practice, straying far from available source materials. Beam perpetuates these imaginative accounts by essentially reiterating Brodie and Smith. Beam’s analysis of Joseph Smith’s practice of plural marriage is also partially reflected in information provided in Todd B. Compton’s *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith* (2001), albeit this work is a more reliable analysis. However, the most definitive and comprehensive study on plural marriage—and in my opinion, the
most balanced and objective—is Brian C. Hales’s three-volume work *Joseph Smith’s Polygamy: History and Theology* (2013), a work that Beam does not acknowledge. Hales’s analysis reverses many of the stereotypical interpretations, and Beam’s work would have benefitted by it.

The book’s system of source citation is problematic. Instead of using the format prescribed in *The Chicago Manual of Style*, quotation information is included in the notes section at the end of the book, where citations appear in abbreviated fashion by page location and are often incomplete. He also misuses quotations, at times not providing sources, thereby creating the impression that a particular individual is being quoted when in reality the quotation is from a secondary source.

Beam is a skillful writer and wordsmith, and his journalistic style is clearly evident in the text. The narrative flows well and is often colorful and creative. But the craft of writing does not make up for what at times is unbalanced and otherwise shaky history. More often than not, Beam presents a one-sided, unsympathetic, and disparaging view of Joseph Smith, which leaves readers with the impression that the Mormon prophet was a delusional, pompous, dictatorial megalomaniac. Beam portrays Joseph as a womanizer, a fugitive from justice, a deceiver, and a spiritual hypocrite—in short, a religious charlatan. Perhaps that is exactly the impression Beam intended to convey, but is that the *real* Joseph Smith? Many historians have argued otherwise.

But even more egregious is Beam’s frequent misrepresentation of Joseph Smith’s spiritual claims and teachings—clear evidence of the author’s limited understanding of Smith’s theology (particularly in connection with polygamy and eternal marriage). Also disturbing are statements by the author that reflect more innuendo than fact. Beam notes, for example, that the law of consecration observed for a short time by the Latter-day Saints in Ohio and Missouri was “pure communism” (20), but he offers no explanation about what constituted the practice or how it was intended to be lived. Concerning “spotted fever” among the Saints, Beam observes, “To ensure that they were consuming boiled water, the Mormons drank tea and coffee, a technical violation of Joseph’s Word of Wisdom, the guide to personal conduct that counsels the Saints to abjure alcohol and ‘hot drinks.’ The mortality rate in Nauvoo was double that of Illinois, and of the United States. So many immigrants perished that the Saints arranged a mass funeral service for their dead” (39). No sources are given for these so-called facts; frankly, everything in the quote is problematic in terms of historical accuracy.
Review of *American Crucifixion*

*American Crucifixion* contains many other errors, and here are just a few: Hyrum Smith, William Law, W. W. Phelps, and George Adams were never ordained Apostles in the Quorum of the Twelve (3, 69, 143, 248); Beam writes that Joseph Smith appointed himself as lieutenant general in the Nauvoo Legion (5), but Smith actually received his official military commission and rank in the state militia from Illinois Governor Thomas Carlin; Hyrum Smith never represented Hancock County in the Illinois legislature (69); the record shows that Joseph Smith first saw the gold plates on his first visit to the Hill Cumorah in 1823, whereas Beam claims that “Joseph often mentioned that the angel Moroni refused to show him the golden plates until Joseph was married” (88), which took place in 1827; the Nauvoo Temple was not completed until April 30, 1846, but Beam writes that on May 24, 1845, “Brigham Young presided over a secret ceremony marking the completion of the Nauvoo Temple” (209); Joseph Smith never named Sidney Rigdon as a likely successor to him (232); Utah Valley is south of Salt Lake Valley, not north (255); and Beam writes that over five thousand Latter-day Saints received their temple blessings in November and December 1845 (257), though the dates were actually from December 10, 1845, continuing through February 7, 1846. Some of these may be minor mistakes, but they nevertheless distract readers who are familiar with LDS history and should signal to them the level of the book’s reliability.

So why was Joseph Smith killed? There is not much to debate on the subject. Scholars are of the general consensus that the martyrdom essentially stemmed from a growing anti-Mormon sentiment among the non-Mormon populace around Nauvoo (which sentiment was generated by anxiety over the constant influx of LDS converts into the region), fear of Mormon political domination (particularly in Hancock County), suspicion about the Mormon practice of Freemasonry, distrust of the Nauvoo Legion, repulsion over rumors of polygamy, internal dissensions, concerns over Joseph Smith’s ever-increasing influence, and religious intolerance. Beam touches on these issues, but adds little to what has been known and published by writers and scholars for years.

Beam’s work appeals to a more general audience—those who are interested in learning more about Joseph Smith and particularly those interested in the controversies (deserved or not) surrounding him and his death. Those casually interested in this history may find Beam persuasive; however, more informed readers will recognize that the book was written too
hastily. Beam’s work is typical of other secondary-source histories, suggesting that his scholarship, claims, and analysis do not explore much beyond the superficial. While this book has received national attention (and therefore has perpetuated inaccuracies on a large scale), serious academicians of American religious history, Illinois scholars, and Latter-day Saint historians will find little of what Beam writes to be new, reliable, or pathbreaking.

Alexander L. Baugh is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University and a volume editor of the Joseph Smith Papers. He received his PhD in American history from BYU and since has authored numerous books and articles on American and Church history.
In writing Helen Andelin and the Fascinating Womanhood Movement, it was Julie Debra Neuffer's hope that her study would “provide a scholarly and evenhanded look at the philosophy and motivations of . . . Helen Andelin and the movement she founded, within the larger historical context of women’s reform efforts” (4). Neuffer reached this goal, for, having finished the book, I am still unsure if Neuffer is for or against Andelin’s philosophy. Though she is sympathetic to Andelin, Neuffer’s portrayal is accurate, impartial, and unbiased.

While growing up, I heard about Fascinating Womanhood (FW) but did not realize the scope of the movement’s influence on millions of women in the twentieth century. The movement sought to demarcate feminine roles and gifts rather than close the gender gap; a woman’s “essential nature” (39) could bring love and order to a marriage. Neuffer’s biography gives an unprecedented view of a neglected topic in twentieth-century women’s history, gender studies, women’s studies, and Mormon studies.

One contribution of Neuffer’s work is to show that Andelin’s FW movement was an alternative to the ideas forwarded by the women’s liberation movement (159). This volume makes the study of the “femininity women’s movement” a part of a growing body of scholarship that expands the definition of the women’s movement in politics and religion during the 1960s and 1970s (3). Neuffer’s research brings us an understanding of Andelin’s “wide appeal as both a religious and political leader,” which augmented “the fast-expanding discussion about women’s strategies to cope with—and shape—political and social change” (3). As Neuffer explains, “In order to fully understand the feminist movement, one must also understand the fascinating womanhood movement” (x).

This important scholarship gives us that understanding and shows that
“FW represented a significant aspect of a growing political and social backlash to the era's turbulence, which many feared was eroding traditional institutions and values” (2). Neuffer introduces her readers to another side of the women’s movement in her juxtaposition of Andelin’s *Fascinating Womanhood* and Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*.

Another outstanding contribution of this biography is that it gives, with thoughtful empathy, a clear lens to Andelin's motivation; Neuffer’s analysis provides remarkable insight into Andelin’s personality and character. For instance, Neuffer explains that one of the reasons Andelin was so appealing amid hostile and vocal criticism (89) was “that she refused to play by the rule of intellectual arguments. . . . While she was often booed by live audiences, it was nearly impossible for her detractors to wage a war of words. . . . Mostly she just refused to bend to convention” (116–17). Neuffer puts flesh on her subject as she describes “Andelin’s personal magnetism, over-the-top femininity and prim self-righteousness” in vivid detail (117). Behind-the-scenes disclosures, such as Andelin’s surgical facelift at age forty-seven, bring new light to how she personally engaged her convictions (75).

The triumphs and tragedies of Andelin’s life are well documented. Readers come away with a profound understanding of the often complex, sometimes ambivalent, generally loving, and mutually supportive relationship that existed between Helen and Aubrey Andelin throughout their fifty-seven-year marriage and business partnership.

Neuffer’s research of Andelin’s complex and changing relationship with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints also contributes to the body of scholarship. Readers will see Andelin serving as both a single and senior missionary but also calling General Relief Society President Barbara B. Smith one of her greatest enemies (121). Though Andelin felt it was her mission to write *FW* (41) and even quoted President David O. McKay in the book, in the 1990s she called certain LDS leaders “uninspired men in business suits” (122). She had wanted those leaders to endorse *FW* for churchwide use (120), but the Church navigated away from her movement (103). In the end, Neuffer shows Andelin struggling between her loyalty to *FW* and her loyalty to the Church, unable to fully overcome the grudge against Church leaders for failing to endorse her program (121–24).

Neuffer’s qualifications for research in this area of expertise include a PhD in American history from Washington State University. Currently, she is an adjunct instructor of American history at Eastern Washington University and affiliated with the American Historical
Association Organization of American Historians, Western Association of Women Historians, American Academy of Religion, and the Mormon History Association. This book, her first, was awarded “The Best Biography Prize” in June 2015 by the Mormon History Association. Neuffer also lists other unique qualifications for writing about this topic. As she puts it, she “had been raised as a Fascinating woman,” was familiar with the philosophy, and had an understanding for the women who adopted the movement (viii).

Neuffer’s sources are a biographer’s dream, including over thirty hours of recorded personal interviews conducted with Helen Andelin herself, her children, and former FW teachers. Neuffer scoured hundreds of private letters to Andelin from FW followers as well as support materials such as teaching manuals, newsletters, newspaper clippings, and nearly a thousand completed FW teacher application forms. She also had access to Andelin’s personal papers, located in the special collections archive of the Marriott Library at the University of Utah (4). The scholarship is solid and meticulously documented.

The book’s strengths far outweigh any weaknesses that might detract from its overall quality. One of the few shortcomings is a small number of unsupported generalizations. By way of illustration, Neuffer states that Andelin “did not believe in some of the basic tenets of the Mormon Church” (ix). I am curious to know what those beliefs included. In another passage, Neuffer states that Andelin’s daughter negates the idea that her mother used material from eight booklets published in 1922 that were titled The Secrets of Fascinating Womanhood, or The Art of Attracting Men. It would have been easy to refute the daughter’s claim by comparing FW with the pamphlets. In another passage, Neuffer states, “Andelin’s instructions to perform only ladylike tasks were, at least to [Barbara B.] Smith, materialistic” (123). There is no citation to support this statement either.

Similarly, some assumptions are unsubstantiated. Neuffer makes the case that John Gray’s Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus, P. B. Wilson’s Liberated through Submission: God’s Design for Freedom in All Relationships, Ellen Fein and Sherrie Schneider’s The Rules: Time Tested Secrets for Capturing the Heart of Mr. Right, Laura Schlesinger’s Proper Care and Feeding of Husbands, and Dr. Phil McGraw’s Love Smart: Find the One You Want—Fix the One You Got used “key aspects of the FW philosophy, that Andelin had made famous a generation earlier” (148). Neuffer later admits that “although it is likely that these modern-day relationship experts don’t know who Helen Andelin is, they continue to
be guided by the ideas that distinguished her” (158). While such an argument may be sound, support is not provided that these authors used Andelin’s book or her ideas. The FW philosophy, according to Neuffer, had been around at least since 1922, and these subsequent authors could be drawing from general knowledge rather than Andelin’s work.

One other very small distraction is in the organization of the six non-chronological chapters. Sometimes the timeline of Andelin’s life seems muddled, and a chronological treatment may have served the biography better. The same material is covered in several chapters, such as the subject of FW teachers applications. Sometimes material is squeezed into a chapter that is unrelated to that chapter’s topic, which can awkwardly interrupt the narrative.

These small limitations in no way preclude me from highly recommending Helen Andelin and the Fascinating Womanhood Movement. The growth of Andelin’s philosophy into an international phenomenon is a “fascinating” read, and there is much to be explored. This important work gives us a new glimpse into twentieth-century women’s history and is essential reading for all students of Mormon studies.

Mary Jane Woodger is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University. She received her EdD from BYU, and her research interests include twentieth-century Church history and Latter-day Saint women’s history. She has over a dozen books published and has written for the Journal of Book of Mormon Studies, LDS Church News, and The Religious Educator.
Textual and Comparative Explorations in 1 and 2 Enoch by Samuel Zinner (Orem, Utah: The Interpreter Foundation; Salt Lake City: Eborn Books, 2014).

Samuel Zinner (PhD, University of Nebraska–Lincoln), an independent researcher and Holocaust scholar, publishes his extensive studies on 1 and 2 Enoch in a new book from The Interpreter Foundation. Zinner performs a valuable service in this series of nineteen essays by taking on some of the most difficult questions in the field of Enoch studies. He provides new and refreshing perspectives on a wide variety of topics that range from the issue of the identification in 1 Enoch of Enoch as “the Son of Man” to textual and historical problems in the texts of both 1 and 2 Enoch that have puzzled scholars for decades. His explorations respond to some of the biggest players in the field, including George Nickelsburg, James VanderKam, and Daniel Boyarin. The majority of the essays focus on issues surrounding the text of 1 Enoch, which is perhaps the more widely known and read of the Enoch writings, but he also touches on some interesting and important topics from 2 Enoch as well. The last chapter of the book provides an analysis by Zinner, who is not LDS, of the topics of Zion/Jerusalem and Lady Wisdom in early Jewish texts and also in Moses 7 and the Tree of Life vision in 1 Nephi.

Zinner takes an innovative approach to a number of problems and controversies in the field, making several positive contributions. His discussions on the title “Son of Man,” both as it is applied to Enoch and as it is used in 1 Enoch and the biblical book of Daniel, are helpful for making sense of a phenomenon in early Jewish and Christian writings that depicts the apotheosis (or deification) of human beings so that they can function in the celestial realm. He also compares his conclusions for the Enochic writings to what early Christians believed about Christ, providing a helpful perspective. He tackles the question of the dating of some of the Enochic writings (he argues for an earlier date than is commonly suggested) and whether this extrabiblical text had an influence on canonical books such as Daniel. Zinner’s essay on Zion as Lady Wisdom, how this idea is expressed in both biblical and extrabiblical texts, and how Zinner sees parallels in Restoration scripture is a fascinating perspective that most LDS readers will not have encountered previously.

Because Zinner engages the texts he analyzes at a high level of scholarship, this book will be of interest to those who have previous experience with a serious study of the Enochic, and related, literature. Latter-day Saint readers with at least a moderate interest in and experience with these texts will likely find the discussions of the Son of Man and also the last chapter involving Restoration scripture to be refreshing and useful.

—David J. Larsen


While there have been dozens of important devotional books about Mormonism and its doctrinal concept of the Great Apostasy, little has been published from a scholarly perspective. Ten years ago, BYU Press published a collection of new studies about the Apostasy in Early Christians in Disarray: Contemporary LDS Perspectives on the Christian Apostasy (2005; reviewed in BYU Studies 44:3), and there has been a smattering of articles over the years on...
the subject, including Eric Dursteler’s important “Inheriting the Great Apostasy: The Evolution of Mormon Views on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.” Dursteler’s essay was originally published in Journal of Mormon History (2002), subsequently reprinted in Early Christians in Disarray, and now included in Standing Apart in an updated and revised form. Dursteler’s chapter is the only previously published contribution of Standing Apart’s thirteen excellent chapters (fourteen if you include Terryl Givens’s epilogue).

The editors, Miranda Wilcox and John D. Young, are associate professor of English at Brigham Young University and associate professor of history at Flagler College, respectively. Wilcox specializes in medieval literature, and Young specializes in medieval history.

Wilcox and Young have set out to address the relatively narrow focus of the LDS Great Apostasy Narrative, which tends to disparage, or at least discount, Christian theologians and historians after the death of the original Apostles until AD 1820. Each contributor to Standing Apart attempts to contextualize and perhaps complicate this narrative by showing a more nuanced approach to this period of Christian history. As was mentioned, Dursteler’s updated work on the Great Apostasy establishes a strong foundation for the remaining chapters. Both of the editors also have their own contributions to the volume. Without reviewing every chapter in the book due to space, some highlights might be excused.

Of particular note, Spencer Young offers a fine piece on the rich intellectual and spiritual environment that was the Middle Ages, a period too often viewed as theologically and artistically backwards and provincial. Lincoln Blumell discusses the documents and sources surrounding the Council of Nicaea, encouraging Latter-day Saints to reconsider some of their assumptions about the Nicene Creed as it relates to Christian and LDS theology. Additionally, David D. Peck draws parallels between Mormonism and Islam, their views of religious pluralism, and each religion’s acknowledgement of divine inspiration among members of other faiths.

Readers familiar with LDS theology will find each of the chapters in Standing Apart insightful and well researched. Scholars of early Christianity and Mormonism will likewise benefit from the academic treatment of this topic.

—Gerrit van Dyk