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Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?
An Analysis of Wordprints

Wayne A. Larsen, Alvin C. Rencher, and Tim Layton

The problem of Book of Mormon authorship has challenged historians and theologians since the book was published in 1830. Opponents of the book have claimed that Joseph Smith wrote it himself, or that an accomplice such as Solomon Spaulding or Sidney Rigdon penned it and somehow transferred it to Joseph Smith. The defenders of the book maintain that it is just what it claims to be—a sacred record written on metal plates by many ancient authors and translated by Joseph Smith with divine assistance and direction (Joseph Smith—History 2:62–65).

Both sides present arguments to strengthen their case. Proponents note that proper names and cultural traits found in the book have been validated by recent Middle Eastern research, while opponents point out the similarities between the book’s theology and the religions of early nineteenth-century upstate New York. Book of Mormon apologists find evidence of Hebrew and other ancient writing styles in the book, but detractors point to the grammatical mistakes in the earlier editions as evidence that there could have been no miraculous translation. Both sides also cite archaeological evidence to defend their points of view.

One element missing in all of this literature is an approach that would allow for quantification of the evidence followed by a rigorous and objective statistical analysis as a test of the competing claims. The book purports to have been written by a number of ancient authors. We can now test this claim scientifically by combining certain
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assumptions of modern linguistics with new advances in the statistical analysis of texts.

For our analysis we started with a basic assumption that individual authors leave something analogous to a fingerprint in all their works. Each author’s style has some subconscious individualistic patterns that are not easily altered. These patterns form his unique “wordprint.” The growing number of wordprint studies includes inquiries into the authorship of letters, biblical books, and ancient Greek works.6

STYLOMETRY

Our approach is sometimes referred to as the science of stylometry,7 which can be defined loosely as statistical analysis of style. It is also called computational stylistics. We do not use the word style in the literary sense of subjective impressions characterizing an author’s mode of expression. We must deal with countable items which are amenable to statistical analysis. We look then for what is frequent but largely unnoticed, the quick little choices that confront an author in nearly every sentence. Such choices become habits, so the small details flow virtually without conscious effort.

One writer on this subject, Douglas Chretien, used the term “linguistic fingerprint” to describe an author’s subconscious pattern of usage of the language features which uniquely characterize his writings. He stated: “The conscious features of style can be imitated, . . . but the unconscious and subconscious features surely cannot, and a test of authorship, if it is to be reliable, must be built on them.”8


7Chretien, reviews, p. 87.

8Chretien, reviews, p. 87.
In the literature of stylistic analysis we find many references claiming that for a given author these habits are not affected by (1) passage of time, (2) change of subject matter, or (3) literary form. They are thus stable within an author’s writings, but they have been found to vary from one author to another. We give two examples which illustrate this approach to authorship identification.

The first concerns the controversy over the authorship of twelve of the eighty-five Federalist Papers. Although the Federalist Papers were first published anonymously, it was later found that five were written by John Jay and that the rest were divided between Alexander Hamilton and James Madison. Although authorship of seventy-three of the papers was determined, there was still a question as to whether Hamilton or Madison wrote the remaining twelve.

Two statisticians, Mosteller and Wallace, compared the twelve disputed papers to other of Hamilton’s and Madison’s writings. Using frequency of usage of the small filler words, they found overwhelming evidence favoring Madison as the author of all twelve disputed papers.10

As a second example, when Jane Austen died in 1817 she left an unfinished novel along with a summary. A few years ago, an anonymous admirer completed this novel and published it. She was a highly skilled author and tried her best to imitate the style of Jane Austen. She succeeded very well in the conscious elements of style but failed totally in the subconscious habits of detail. When these habit patterns were examined, the difference was clearly evident.11

We made the same assumption, then, that has been generally accepted and proven widely applicable: each author has a wordprint. We coined the term “wordprint” to describe a writer’s linguistic fingerprint or habit patterns of usage of noncontextual words.

The noncontextual words which have been most successful in discriminating among authors are the filler words of the language such as prepositions and conjunctions, and sometimes adjectives and adverbs. Authors differ in their rates of usage of these filler words.

Some previous investigators of authorship identification have oversimplified the problem. Some have chosen a definition of wordprint and then have taken several controversial passages from an author and tested for statistically significant differences in the wordprint between passages. If any statistically significant differences

---

11Morton, pp. 189-91.
occurred, they assumed different individuals had authored the passages. We believe a larger view must be taken. In addition to comparing several passages written by the same author, we must also compare them with the works of a control group of contemporary authors. Conceivably, an individual author might produce wordprints which differ in a statistically significant manner and yet be consistent within themselves when compared with other authors’ wordprints. We have taken this into consideration in our study by including authors who were contemporaries of Joseph Smith.

We propose to test the assumption that the Book of Mormon was written by one author (Joseph Smith or whomever) against the alternative hypothesis of multiple authorship. If the book were written by several people, we should statistically reject the hypothesis of single authorship. Showing multiple authorship would be strong evidence for Joseph Smith’s account of the origin of the book, since it is the primary explanation which asserts multiple authors. Finding single authorship would not necessarily invalidate the believers’ claims, however, because it is logically possible that even though Joseph Smith had divine direction in translating he might have paraphrased the text into his own words. This argument would also hold for Mormon’s abridgment, but then there would be other authors in Nephi and Moroni. That Joseph Smith could have received the translation word for word in a uniform literary mode with all style differences between authors obliterated is yet another possibility.

BOOK OF MORMON CLAIMS OF NUMEROUS AUTHORS

According to the Book of Mormon itself, numerous prophets whose lives cover a period of over a thousand years wrote the book. Three-and-one-half centuries after the birth of Christ, Mormon realized that his writing would soon come to an end, but he was shown in vision that a later people would profit from it. Acting on divine instructions, he made a very brief abridgment of the records in his charge, engraving it on gold plates. He passed these plates on to his son Moroni, who added to the record and then deposited it in the appointed place for safekeeping. With this record compiled by Mormon and Moroni, Joseph Smith also found a much smaller record, “the small plates,” which contained the early history of these people beginning with their departure from Jerusalem soon after 600 B.C. Most of this smaller record was written by Nephi and his younger brother Jacob, who were in the original group which left Jerusalem.
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Joseph Smith used this original material in place of Mormon's abridgment covering that period. Thus, according to the text, there were four major engravers of the gold plates—Mormon, Moroni, Jacob, and Nephi—and a few minor engravers as well (see Appendix A).

In addition, the abridgers of the record often appear to be quoting from other authors; for example, Mormon recorded the commandments given by Alma to his son Helaman (Alma 36, 37). Since quotation marks do not appear anywhere in the Book of Mormon, the question remains as to whether these passages are verbatim or paraphrased.\(^\text{12}\)

For the purpose of the statistical tests, we started with two assumptions: (1) that each of the major engravers and those they quote were distinct individuals, and (2) that the writers of each verse, or partial verse, could be identified according to information given in the text. We found very little ambiguity as to who wrote what. However, identifying the source of each verse or portion of a verse required careful scrutiny since authorship or source shifts approximately two thousand times in the text of the Book of Mormon. The following example illustrates the rapidity of many of these changes. The two verses are from Alma 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>19. And as he entered the city he was an hungered, and he said to a man:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Will you give to an humble servant of God something to eat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>20. And the man said unto him:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amulek</td>
<td>I am a Nephite, and I know that thou art a holy prophet of God, for thou art the man whom an angel said in a vision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Thou shalt receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amulek</td>
<td>Therefore, go with me into my house and I will impart unto thee of my food; and I know that thou wilt be a blessing unto me and my house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the process of assigning each quoted segment a source, we identified over one hundred authors or originators. Twenty-two of these contributed over 1,000 words; they, along with two others who had close to 1,000 words, are listed in Appendix B in descending order according to word count. As expected, Mormon is first on the list, with nearly forty percent of the book attributed to him. Nephi has the second highest word count. The third author on this list, Alma, is not one of the engravers of the book but was quoted frequently by Mormon. A very interesting facet of this list is that if all the words attributed to Deity are combined then Deity becomes the third most quoted source in the book, with approximately ten percent of the words.

NON-BOOK OF MORMON AUTHORS

For control and comparison purposes we analyzed the writing of several nineteenth-century authors, including that of both Sidney Rigdon and Solomon Spaulding, who have been proposed as authors of the Book of Mormon. We also included other known works by Joseph Smith and contemporary works by W. W. Phelps, Oliver Cowdery, and Parley P. Pratt. Also we analyzed the Lectures on Faith plus two sections from the Doctrine and Covenants. Finally we added an article called "The Paracletes," which was published anonymously in the Times and Seasons.

13These word counts were done using the computerized tapes of the Book of Mormon developed by Eiden Ricks and Translation Services of Brigham Young University.
14Some arbitrary definitions were made. Since, in Mormon theology, the term Lord can refer either to God the Father or to his son Jesus, we classified Deity as three distinct authors: the Father, the Lord, and Jesus. We also made the definition that the Lord as quoted by Isaiah is different from Isaiah and also from the Lord in the rest of the book. Our statistical studies showed that these divisions were largely unnecessary.
15For excerpts from the writings of Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, Parley P. Pratt, Oliver Cowdery, and William W. Phelps, we used a computer disk prepared by Alan J. Phipps (see Phipps, "Lectures on Faith," cited in fn. 6). We are indebted to Jim Callister for providing this disk. Joseph Smith's writings were taken from articles in the Messenger and Advocate, his journal, and letters to various individuals. Joseph Smith's writings included in this study are his own words. This is important since many works attributed to Joseph Smith were actually written by his scribes or others. See Phipps, "Lectures on Faith," for further information. Sidney Rigdon's writings were taken from the Evening and Morning Star and the Messenger and Advocate. Parley P. Pratt's works were A Voice of Warning and A Short Account of a Shameful Outrage. Oliver Cowdery's writings were taken from six letters published in the Messenger and Advocate. W. W. Phelps's excerpts were from the Evening and Morning Star and the Messenger and Advocate. The Doctrine and Covenants sections used in this study were 101 and 104. Solomon Spaulding's writings consisted of five random selections from Manuscript Found.
16We included "The Paracletes," Times and Seasons, 6:891–92, 917–18, to determine whether any of our 1830 contemporaries appears to be the author of this unsigned article. Our results were consistently inconsistent—a strong indication that none of the authors used in our study wrote this selection.
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METHODOLOGY

We used three basic statistical techniques: Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Cluster Analysis, and Discriminant or Classification Analysis. These techniques will be described below. We also used three basic wordprint definitions: (1) frequency of letters, (2) frequency of commonly occurring noncontextual words, (3) frequency of rarely occurring noncontextual words. Although this paper emphasizes the frequency of commonly occurring noncontextual words, all three wordprint definitions produced similar results. Appendix C contains the 38 common and 42 uncommon words we used; they were selected from a list of words ordered by frequency.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (MANOVA)

We will first describe multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and then present a few examples from the many analyses that we conducted. MANOVA is a technique that tests for homogeneity of groups, the similarity of the wordprint patterns from one author to another. To illustrate the procedure, suppose that there exists a set of ten plays ascribed to Shakespeare. However, some scholars hypothesize that Shakespeare wrote only seven of the plays and that the other three were written by an unknown individual. To use MANOVA, we divide the ten plays into two groups, one containing the seven undisputed texts, the other the three disputed plays. A wordprint definition is precisely chosen. MANOVA allows us to compare the wordprints for the two groups of plays and determines whether the observed difference in wordprint is large in relation to the internal consistency within each group of plays. A large observed difference would support the conclusion that different authors wrote the two groups of plays, while a small difference (relative to the groups’ internal consistency) would suggest that one author wrote all ten plays.

Here is an oversimplified numerical example to clarify further the concept. Consider a case where we have only two authors, with three different passages from each author. We are examining the frequency of the word and and find the following frequency results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage 1</th>
<th>Passage 2</th>
<th>Passage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author A:</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author B:</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency in this case means relative frequency; i.e., *and* appeared 32 times per 1,000 words. It is clear that, if the three selections from each author are typical, the authors will differ in the average frequency with which they used the word *and*. However, if the results were as follows, we could not discriminate between these authors on the basis of this word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage 1</th>
<th>Passage 2</th>
<th>Passage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author A:</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author B:</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this information alone we could not rule out the possibility that A and B were the same individual.

The MANOVA technique can be applied to any number of authors and any number of words. Based on the frequencies it analyzes, MANOVA states the probability of a set of data arising if a single author wrote all of the materials examined. Certain statistical assumptions are required before this probability statement is valid. We have satisfied these sufficiently for the purposes of this study.

The writings of our 24 authors were divided into 251 blocks of text containing approximately 1,000 words apiece. Mormon was presumed to be the author of 98 of these blocks, while the last three authors—Mosiah, Enos, and the Father—had only 1 block each. The frequency of each of the words in Appendix C was computed for each of these 251 blocks.\(^1\)

In the first analyses the blocks of words attributed to Jesus, Isaiah, and the Lord quoted by Isaiah were deleted since they agree so closely with the Bible. We thus avoid the possibility of these authors causing significant differences.

**MANOVA—10 Words—**

*Book of Mormon Only*

We first compared the 21 remaining authors by using the 10 most frequently occurring words in our list. Statistically, the differences among the authors are highly significant. Differences as large as these simply could not occur if a single author wrote the book. The statistical odds that a single author wrote the book are less than 1 in 100 billion. However, this number should not be taken too

---

\(^{1}\)Rather than use this frequency, we generally used the arc sine transformation of the frequency for statistical requirements. The program RUMMAGE was used on all MANOVA analyses. See G.R. Bryce, "MAD: An Analysis of Variance Program for Unbalanced Designs," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series C* (Applied Statistics), vol. 24 (London, 1974), p. 35.
literally. It depends on several assumptions, one of which is that we have a random sample of each author's writings. The 100 billion to 1 ratio does imply, however, that the authors' wordprints vary significantly with respect to each author's own internal consistency.

The 10 words which we compared were and, the, of, that, to, unto, in, it, for, and be. Only one word, in, was not significantly different across the 21 authors. Seven of them were significant at less than the .0001 level; i.e., the probability that a single author would produce such disparate results is less than 1 in 10,000. In a typical research study, a difference would be labeled significant if its probability level was .05 (less than 1 in 20) or smaller. Most of the differences we found were so large that the associated probability level was very much smaller than .05.

**MANOVA—38 Words—**

*Book of Mormon Only*

The MANOVA was repeated using the 38 frequently occurring words listed in Appendix C, with similar results. Thus the 21 authors do not appear to be the same individual. We have not shown statistically the existence of 21 distinct styles but have strongly demonstrated wide divergence among most of the 21. The pattern of differences among the authors will be examined further in connection with the MANOVA which includes non-Book of Mormon authors as well.

**MANOVA—Other Book of Mormon Tests**

The preceding analyses were repeated using the Book of Mormon authors in a variety of contexts. These include analyses on word frequencies, analyses on all 24 authors (Jesus, Isaiah, and the Lord as quoted by Isaiah added to the data base), analyses on the 42 uncommon words listed in Appendix C, and analyses on frequency of letters. The results were the same in each case. We consistently found extremely low probabilities that the differences among these 24 groups of text could have been produced by a single author. There were no contradictory results.

**MANOVA—38 Words—**

*Including non-Book of Mormon Authors*

We also compared the writing in the Book of Mormon with that of Joseph Smith and his contemporaries, who wrote in the time period when the Book of Mormon was published. The 90 blocks of words we used were from Joseph Smith, W. W. Phelps, Oliver
Cowdery, Parley P. Pratt, Sidney Rigdon, Solomon Spaulding, the article "Paracletes," and the Lectures on Faith. It has been suggested that certain of these men were the authors of the Book of Mormon.

As a control test we first performed a MANOVA using all 38 words on 341 word blocks from the 33 authors (24 Book of Mormon plus 9 non-Book of Mormon authors). Probability that differences as large as those observed could occur by chance is less than 1 in 10 billion.

1. There is some evidence of a wordprint time trend within the Book of Mormon; i.e., writers are more similar to their contemporaries than to writers in other time periods. This needs further investigation.

2. The passages quoting the Father do not differ from the combined passages quoting the Lord and Jesus. But there may be a little difference between quotations from Jesus and those from the Lord.

3. There is no statistical difference between the Isaiah passages and the Lord as quoted by Isaiah.

4. Joseph Smith's writing is very different from that of the author of Lectures on Faith (see Appendix E).

5. The most salient result, however, was that none of the Book of Mormon selections resembled the writing of any of the suggested nineteenth-century authors. The Book of Mormon itself offers the strongest evidence for a clear scientific refutation of the theories that it was written in the nineteenth-century.

The MANOVA tests have shown conclusively that (1) the 21 major groups of Book of Mormon text we examined were indeed written by several distinct authors, who were individually consistent as suggested in the book itself, and (2) none of the modern candidates whom we tested for Book of Mormon authorship wrote any of that text. This leaves Joseph Smith's account as the only explanation consistent with these clear yet hitherto unnoticed characteristics of the Book of Mormon. The only alternative would be that, in spite of its growing reputation in scientific circles, the theoretical basis of wordprint is not generally valid. But our own results on known nineteenth-century authors provide strong support for the wordprint concept.

To avoid the possibility that our MANOVA results might be unconsciously biased by any particular statistical technique, we included

---

19The result remained true even when we removed formal words reflecting nineteenth-century religious style from the analyses (hath, unto, etc.). The results depend as much on words such as and, of, for as on any of the other words.
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two additional analyses: cluster analysis and discriminant or classification analysis.

CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Cluster analysis takes a series of measurements on a set of observations and identifies which observations are closest to each other. In this study, the series of measurements would be the frequencies of the 38 words which form the wordprint profile, and the set of observations would be the 1,000-word blocks. “Closeness” is defined by a distance measure of the difference between two wordprints.20 Cluster analysis can be used as an additional test of multiple authorship, but, more importantly, it can also be used as an informal method of assessing relationships between blocks of words.

The major cluster analyses we performed yielded conclusions similar to the MANOVA results discussed earlier. Mormon’s word blocks clustered with other blocks by Mormon, Nephi’s with Nephi’s, King Benjamin’s with King Benjamín’s, etc. These results were the same no matter which definition of wordprint we selected—letters, common words, or uncommon words. The percent of clusterings corresponding with the multiple authors as named in the Book of Mormon was much higher than could have been produced by chance. Since these results are very similar to those presented in the MANOVA sections, we include only two examples which show a different application of clustering.

Cluster Analysis—
24 Book of Mormon Authors

This cluster analysis was for the 24 Book of Mormon authors using one observation consisting of each author’s total words combined. Frequencies of the 38 common words were used as data. The purpose in combining each author’s words was to determine how the authors relate to each other. To calculate a distance measure which would most clearly distinguish the authors, we chose the 9 words which discriminated best in the MANOVA.

Some results indicating that contemporaries write alike were—

1. Nephi’s word blocks paired with his father Lehi’s; together these then clustered with the group of word blocks of Nephi’s brother Jacob and of Isaiah, the prophet most quoted by Nephi and Jacob.

2. The Lord’s word blocks grouped with Jesus’.  
3. Alma’s word blocks grouped with those of Amulek, his missionary companion; once combined they paired with those of Abinadi, the man who converted Alma’s father.  
4. Samuel the Lamanite’s word blocks paired with those of Nephi, son of Helaman. Samuel the Lamanite and Nephi were contemporary prophets.  
5. The word blocks of the Lord as quoted by Isaiah paired with the Father’s. 

Some contrasting results were—

1. Mormon’s word blocks paired with Helaman’s, a bridge of 300 years.  
2. Moroni’s word blocks paired with Zenos’ even though these two authors were most widely separated in time. Overall, Moroni’s word blocks clustered less “correctly” than other authors’. Perhaps this is because much of his writing is an abridgment of the Jaredite record or quotation from unspecified earlier sources.  

Cluster Analysis—Book of Mormon and Non-Book of Mormon Authors Combined  
All 34 authors were used in this analysis, with one replication per author which consisted of all blocks combined for that author. As before, 9 selected words were used for the distance calculations. The following results were noted:  

1. Joseph Smith’s word blocks combined with those of Lectures on Faith; this pair then combined with Oliver Cowdery’s (see Appendix E).  
2. Jacob’s word blocks combined with those of “The Paracletes.”  
3. Nephi’s word blocks combined with Lehi’s.  
4. Phelps’s word blocks and Pratt’s combined.  
5. The word blocks of the Lord and Jesus combined.  
6. Alma’s word blocks, Amulek’s, and Abinadi’s combined.  
7. Ammon’s word blocks and General Moroni’s combined.  

21See fn. 16.  
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8. Samuel’s word blocks and those of Nephi (the son of Helaman) combined.
9. The word blocks of the Lord as quoted by Isaiah and those of the Father combined.
10. Mormon’s word blocks and Helaman’s combined.
11. Moroni’s word blocks and Zeniff’s combined.

In general, word blocks of Book of Mormon authors clustered with those of Book of Mormon authors, and word blocks of non-Book of Mormon authors clustered with those of non-Book of Mormon authors. The tendency of contemporaries to combine was also evident.

DISCRIMINANT OR CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS

The third and most powerful statistical technique used in this study was discriminant analysis. This procedure reduces the dimensionality of differences among authors. The MANOVA has established the existence of significant differences in wordprints from one author to another. However, these wordprints are essentially 38-dimensional profiles; i.e., they are composed of the frequencies of 38 words. With 38 words to consider, it is difficult to grasp the pattern of separation between two or more authors. The discriminant procedure determines a set of functions (fewer in number than 38) which reveal the configuration of separation among the authors.22

A discriminant analysis is often followed by a classification analysis in which the profile of word frequencies (wordprint) of a block of words is compared to the average profile of each author, and the block of words is assigned to the most probable author. The comparisons are made by means of classification functions which measure how closely one profile matches another. We consider the techniques of discriminant and classification analysis to be the most powerful because they are self-verifying; i.e., the results tell how well the wordprint concept works on the data being studied.

Discriminant Analysis—2000-Word Blocks—
for 21 Authors

The discriminant analysis we used was performed in steps. The word which best separates authors was entered first, the second best word next. This process continued sequentially until a designated

---

22The discriminant functions can also be used to examine the coefficients of each function so as to possibly identify it as a meaningful new variable. We did not attempt this, but the coefficients are available for someone who may wish to investigate further the nature of the differences among authors.
critical level was reached, after which no more words were included in the analysis. In this case 18 words provided a high percentage of the discriminating power of the 38 words, and the amount of computation was thereby reduced without sacrificing much accuracy.\(^\text{23}\) We evaluated and plotted the discriminant functions for each block of words, thus providing a visual display of the differences among authors. Some of these plots will be shown (see Figure 1, p. 239, and Figure 2, p. 241).

The words selected in this discriminant analysis were then used in a classification analysis as described above. In this phase each block of words was classified with the author whose wordprint it was closest to. The percent of the correct "hits" is a measure of how well the authors can be separated, of how unique the profile of word frequencies is for each author.

In the computer run with 2,000-word blocks and 18 words selected, 93.3 percent of the blocks were correctly classified. This is a very high success rate for a situation such as this where the number of groups (authors) is so large. Typically the percent of correct classifications drops off when the number of groups exceeds four or five, and in many applications the percentage of hits is low even when the number of groups is small. The 93.3 percentage in this case was unexpectedly high.

A better method of classifying the blocks of text is to drop one or more blocks of words from the analysis, compute the classification functions, and use these new functions to classify the blocks dropped, thus eliminating the partial circularity of the previous test. This was done on the above data base and in many other cases. The results, though not as impressive as the 93 percent just mentioned, were consistently in the 70 and 80 percent range, still very high percentages for so many groups. We performed many more analyses of this type with similar results. We mention a few.

**Discriminant Analysis, Non-Book of Mormon Authors Included**

Four Book of Mormon authors who had fewer than 2,000 words were deleted. This left 162 blocks of words by 29 authors. The first two discriminant functions (see Appendix F) were evaluated for all 162 observations and are shown in Figure 1. The Book of Mormon authors are rather widely separated from the non-Book of Mormon group. It should be remembered that this two-dimensional plot is

\(^{23}\)Eighteen discriminant functions were used even though only six were statistically significant. (The two 18's are coincidental. These numbers will usually be different.)
Figure 1. Discriminant Analysis of Book of Mormon and Non-Book of Mormon Authors
essentially a projection of higher dimensional points onto a plane. The actual points in a higher dimensional space are even more separated than they appear here.

Taken together, these tests strongly reinforce previous conclusions that
1. distinct authorship styles can be readily distinguished within the Book of Mormon, and
2. the nineteenth-century authors do not resemble Book of Mormon authors in style.

The pattern of separation which can be noticed in Figure 1 suggests another interesting observation. The 9 non-Book of Mormon authors are known to be different. Yet their pattern of variation one from another is similar to the pattern of variation among the Book of Mormon authors. This emphasizes the differences among Book of Mormon authors and helps clarify that the differences we have found are neither—
1. artifacts of the book which might possibly be typical of other books, nor
2. natural random fluctuations of word frequencies from one section of the book to another.

The presence of Isaiah among the Book of Mormon authors yielded a similar result. Believers and nonbelievers agree Isaiah is a different author than the author(s) of the rest of the Book of Mormon, yet none of our statistical tests showed Isaiah to particularly stand out. That is, Mormon, Nephi, and others appeared to be as distinctively individual as Isaiah. If Joseph Smith or any other nineteenth-century author had written the book, this would not be expected.

**Discriminant Analysis of Four Major Book of Mormon Authors and Joseph Smith**

The intent in this analysis was to focus on the four major authors who together account for 62.2 percent of the Book of Mormon. These authors are Mormon, Nephi, Alma (the son of Alma), and Moroni (see Appendix B). These four were compared with each other and with Joseph Smith. Some 91 blocks of 2,000 words were available. Words of the King James Version were excluded, and 18 words were selected in the stepwise phase. We used four discriminant functions.

A plot of the first two discriminant functions is given in Figure 2. The following conclusions are apparent from the plot:

1. Alma's writing is different from Mormon's. Since all of Alma's words are taken from Mormon's writings, we
Figure 2. Discriminant Analysis of Four Major Book of Mormon Authors and Joseph Smith
can conclude that Mormon copied directly from Alma’s writings and Joseph Smith translated literally from Mormon’s writings.

2. Joseph Smith’s writing is very definitely distinct from that of the authors in the Book of Mormon.

3. Moroni’s position between Alma, Nephi, and Mormon again indicates that Moroni is consistently hard to classify.

In the classification phase, 96.7 percent of the word blocks were correctly classified. This number speaks for itself.

TWO QUESTIONS

There are two questions that may have occurred to our readers.

1. Could Joseph Smith have altered his wordprint habits by trying to imitate the King James style?

From all the research results with which we are familiar, the answer is no.

We mentioned the case of the lady who recently tried to imitate Jane Austen but whose own wordprint showed through the imitation when subjected to stylometric analysis. In a number of other cases, it has been shown that where an imitation is compared to the wordprint of the original, “the result resembles its creator more than it does the model.”

2. Could the large differences among authors in the Book of Mormon be misleading; i.e., could we find similar differences among several works by the same author?

In all the studies we are aware of either no significant differences were found or at most very few minor differences. As near as we can determine the answer to this question is also no.

We elaborate with a few interesting examples. One of the authors assisted in an analysis of wordprint in the Book of Isaiah. Although virtually all the higher critics believe Isaiah is the product of two or more distinct authors, the Adams and Rencher work pointed to a unity of the Book of Isaiah. In fact, it showed a greater internal consistency for Isaiah than any other Old Testament book of that approximate time period.

---

24Morton, Literary Detection, p. 191.
The unity of some of Shakespeare’s plays has also been questioned, but when these plays were subjected to wordprint analysis, no significant variations in wordprint were found within the given plays. An attempt to prove that part or all of Shakespeare’s works were really written by Bacon resulted in what was described by A. Q. Morton as “one of history’s finest examples of serendipity.” A man by the name of William Friedman was hired by a prominent Baconian to unravel the ciphers or code which would reveal the identity of Bacon in the text of Shakespeare. Friedman’s study actually refuted the cipher idea in Shakespeare. But he became intrigued with ciphers and went on to publish some very important papers on decipherment. His work led directly to cracking the Japanese naval code in World War II.

Another study examined two books by Sir Walter Scott, one written early in his career, the other just before he died. Even though Scott had suffered four strokes during the intervening time period, there were no significant differences in wordprints either within the two works or between them.

CONCLUSIONS

Subject to the usual statistical assumptions and allowance for error, we make the following conclusions:

1. The wordprint hypothesis appears to be justified. Based on our analysis of known non-Book of Mormon authors, each writer appears to have a unique set of unconscious style characteristics. This profile of usage habits can serve in many cases to identify a piece of writing as belonging to a particular author, just as a fingerprint or voiceprint can be traced to its owner or originator.

2. The results of MANOVA, discriminant analysis, and cluster analysis all strongly support multiple authorship of the Book of Mormon. According to some of the MANOVA results, the odds against the Book of Mormon having a single author are more than a billion to one. Of course the assumptions for MANOVA should be checked. For example, it is unlikely that the data can be considered to have come from a multivariate normal distribution. However, we used the arc sine transformation which partially compensated for the lack of multivariate normality.

28Ibid., pp. 184–85.
29Ibid., pp. 134–36, 142–43.
However, the conclusion of multiple authorship does not rest on the significance tests alone. One of the most telling arguments is provided by the plots of discriminant scores in which the variation among known authors such as Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, P. P. Pratt, and others is seen to be very similar to the variation among Book of Mormon authors. Thus if one questions the highly significant results of the MANOVA by suggesting that the differences may be statistically significant but possibly reflect only minute real differences, we can clearly refer to the graphs of discriminant functions to show that the differences among Book of Mormon authors are of the same magnitude as the differences among known authors.

Conversely, the MANOVA results reinforce the discriminant function plots. These plots exhibit a very convincing pattern of separation among authors. With the backup of significance tests, this separation becomes very real and there remains little doubt of its validity.

In further support of the MANOVA results, it should be noted that most of the 38 words were individually significant; i.e., the 24 authors differed from each other on each word considered separately.

This finding of multiple authorship has several implications.

1. It does not seem possible that Joseph Smith or any other writer could have fabricated a work with 24 or more discernible authorship styles (wordprints). The 24 authors do not appear in 24 separate blocks of connected words but are shuffled and intermixed in a very arbitrary manner. How could any single author keep track of 38 (actually more than 38) word frequencies so as to vary them not only randomly from one section to another but also according to a fixed underlying pattern, particularly more than a century before scholars realized that word frequencies might vary with authors?

2. The implications for translation are that the process was both direct and literal and that each individual author’s style was preserved. Possibly it was given to Joseph Smith word for word. If not, then he was required to render it in a rather precise format with minimum deviations from the original “wordprint.” The demonstrated presence of distinguishable authorship wordprints in the Book of Mormon argues for a formal translation in which information was transferred but the imprint of the original language remained.

3. The Book of Mormon authors taken individually or collectively do not resemble any of the nineteenth-century authors which we considered, taken individually or collectively. These authors include Joseph Smith and his contemporaries who have been considered as possible contenders for authorship of the Book of Mormon. The
overwhelming evidence given by MANOVA and discriminant analysis, and to a lesser extent by cluster analysis, should discredit the alternative theories that Joseph Smith, Solomon Spaulding, or others wrote it.

The separation between Book of Mormon and non-Book of Mormon authors was established by both MANOVA and discriminant analysis. Especially convincing were the plots of the first two discriminant functions. In these plots the two groups could be cleanly separated by a straight line, an extremely rare occurrence in discriminant analysis studies. This visual separation was confirmed by the MANOVA significance test, and the possibility that the observed pattern was a chance arrangement was thus ruled out.

4. An analysis of letter counts (not detailed in this paper) yielded similar results to the word count data. Letters are obviously a rough way of detecting wordprint, since many contextual words contribute to the letter count. The method, however, seems to be fairly effective.

5. In a cluster analysis including both Book of Mormon and non-Book of Mormon authors, the Book of Mormon authors clustered with themselves, and the nineteenth-century authors clustered with themselves.

6. Each of the discriminant analyses was followed by a classification analysis, where each block of words was classified according to which author's wordprint it most resembled. When all the blocks of words were used in computing the classification functions and then submitted one by one for classification, the percentage of correct classifications varied from 69 to 100. When one block at a time was withheld from computation and then submitted, the percentage of correct classifications varied from 50 to 81 percent. These percentages are rather high considering the number of authors being classified and, therefore, reinforce the multiplicity of authors conclusion shown by the MANOVA and discriminant analysis.

7. An analysis was done using 42 words which were not among the 38 words used in the previous analyses. These 42 words occurred less frequently than the 38. The MANOVA results also showed the Book of Mormon authors differ from each other in their rates of usage of these words. In fact, the indicated level of significance showed the differences to be even more highly significant than those determined with the 38 words.

Our study has shown conclusively that there were many authors who wrote the Book of Mormon.
### APPENDIX A

Number of Words by Engravers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engravers</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Percent of Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>174,610</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi</td>
<td>54,688</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>26,270</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>9,103</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaleki</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarom</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omni</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoroni</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abinadom</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemish</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX B

Major Book of Mormon Writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Percent of Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>97,777</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi</td>
<td>29,320</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma II</td>
<td>19,777</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>19,408</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>9,654</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>8,493</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helaman</td>
<td>5,121</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord (quoted by Isaiah)</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenos</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amulek</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel the Lamanite</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Moroni</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abinidi</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi (Son of Helaman)</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel 1</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeniff</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Frequently Occurring Noncontextual Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>10000*</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>10000*</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>8268</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>5717</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unto</td>
<td>2955</td>
<td>upon</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behold</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>forth</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrequently Occurring Noncontextual Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>out</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>nevertheless</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>until</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>exceeding</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>thereof</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>towards</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>verily</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>notwithstanding</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>whatsoever</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>lest</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>whether</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>nay</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>ever</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>whereby</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>thereby</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These counts overflowed the printout field on the computer; therefore exact counts are not available.
APPENDIX D

Miscellaneous Tests Internal to the Book of Mormon

We comment briefly on two questions we tried to resolve using MANOVA. The first question involves the unity of Isaiah. Many present-day Bible scholars accept the theory that there were at least two authors of the Book of Isaiah. The principal divisions are chapters 1–39 and 40–66. We compared these two using word frequencies for the portions available in the Book of Mormon. Although we ran this test four times, we could get no significant results. This means we were unable to detect any statistical difference which would support the theory that Isaiah has more than one author.

The Sermon on the Mount as recorded in Matthew was compared with Jesus' teachings to the Nephites as recorded in 3 Nephi excluding chapters 12–14 which contained material similar to the Sermon on the Mount. There were 2 replications (1000-word blocks) for the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew and 7 for Jesus in 3 Nephi. Due to the small number of blocks it was necessary to run 5 analyses of 4 words each. Only 1 of the 5 tests achieved a probability level as low as .05. Thus there is little evidence of a style disparity between Jesus in the New Testament Sermon on the Mount and Jesus in 3 Nephi (excluding Sermon on the Mount material).

Again, a word of caution is needed. The tests on Isaiah and Jesus involved much smaller sample sizes than the tests on the book as a whole; therefore statistical differences would be harder to find, even if there were a real difference.
APPENDIX E

Lectures on Faith

Who Wrote the Lectures on Faith?

Most Latter-day Saints attribute the Lectures on Faith to Joseph Smith. However, historians have long been doubtful of this identification, since the lectures were originally published unsigned. Recently Alan J. Phipps completed an authorship study on the Lectures on Faith.\textsuperscript{39} Our conclusions largely support his results with some differences as described below.

First a cluster analysis was performed on the 9 non-Book of Mormon authors. The Lectures on Faith paired with the writings of Sidney Rigdon—which is the same general conclusion that Phipps made.

\textit{Discriminant Analysis, Non-Book of Mormon Only}

In this analysis each of the 7 lectures of the Lectures on Faith was counted as 1 block (there were 7 blocks for 7 lectures).

The computation set consisted of 7 non-Book of Mormon authors with 36 blocks of 2000 words. Eight words were used as dependent variables and 4 discriminant functions were retained.

A plot of the first two discriminant functions shows 6 out of the 7 lectures grouping with Sidney Rigdon’s known writings. There is no overlap of this group with other writers. The fifth lecture is rather distant from this group and is somewhat closer to W. W. Phelps’s group. The fifth lecture has only 772 words, which may not be sufficient for a stable estimate of word frequencies.

In the classification phase, 88.9% of the blocks from the computation set were correctly classified. The lectures of the Lectures on Faith were classified as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>1st Choice Author</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>2nd Choice Author</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W. W. Phelps</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>P. P. Pratt</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S. Rigdon</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results differ somewhat from Phipps’s conclusions. He assigned Lectures one and seven to Sidney Rigdon and five to Joseph Smith. He claimed that Lectures two, three, four, and six possessed elements of both men’s style and concluded that these four represented a collaborative effort.

APPENDIX F

Standardized Discriminant-Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unto</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the coefficients for a weighted average. Thus Function 1 = \(-0.35Z_1 + 0.04Z_2 - 0.21Z_3 - \ldots - 0.07Z_{20}\) where the \(Z\)'s are the standardized frequencies of the words. The sizes of the coefficients are related to their importance in separating the authors. In Function 1, the words *and*, *of*, *unto*, *for*, contribute heavily. In Function 2, the most important contributors are *the*, *that*, *to*, *be*, *this*, and *therefore*.  
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APPENDIX G

Further Questions

The study reported here is the first major computer analysis of its kind that we are aware of. It raises a number of questions for further study which we list here.

First, we need to devise better definitions of wordprints using, for example, phrases as well as words. "And it came to pass that" was undoubtedly one word in Reformed Egyptian. Conversely, some words with two or more distinct meanings should be separated in wordprint definitions.

Second, we need to determine whether the discriminant functions possess any intrinsic meaning. An investigation of this in conjunction with more precise definitions of wordprint might be particularly fruitful.

Third, we need more investigation of wordprint time trends. In particular, the Jaredite record should be compared with the rest of the book.

Fourth, we need to take a closer look at why Moroni was relatively poorly classified.

Fifth, we need to determine what differences are introduced by using the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon rather than the present edition.

Finally, we need to determine whether some of the misclassifications are correct after all. For example, from the context of Alma 29 it is clear that Alma is writing, yet Mormon does not identify this as a quotation. This is the only instance we found of this nature. Did we miss some others? A careful misclassification study might yield some light on this subject.
Strawberry Canal

Dennis Smith

Strawberry Canal, flowing down and out onto the heartland;
thousands of pounds of water passing every second,
somber as it passes.

It was here along the concrete banks
where giddy swimmers felt the world go by,
and on a Friday afternoon in June,
Keith’s uncle, when he was a boy,
remembered being current-dragged,
along with his dog, and the yells,
and farmer legs running along the bank,
and a strong, brown arm grabbing him just before the siphon,
and the sound of his dog going under,
rubbing against the planks
and appearing, later, on the other side,
not quite floating, but visible.

It was as if the sky and water
were playing for keeps
and hadn’t told you,
but just kept flowing
like you hadn’t been there.

Dennis Smith is a poet and a sculptor from Alpine, Utah.
"It Seems Like Heaven Began on Earth":
Joseph Smith and the Constitution
of the Kingdom of God

Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth
as it is in heaven.

Andrew F. Ehat

In the last issue of BYU Studies, D. Michael Quinn presented for the first time a chronology of the Council of Fifty that annihilates the previously held theory that this Council was one of the most important institutions in nineteenth-century Mormon history. Formally organized by Joseph Smith on 11 March 1844, just three months before he was murdered at Carthage, Illinois, the Council of Fifty was his concrete description of the millennial government of God. In his article, Quinn gave an overview of the organization, officers, activity, and meaning of the Prophet's Council of Fifty and presented insight into some of the internal political doctrine that guided Council meetings. However, he did not present or analyze the governing directive of the Council: The Constitution of the Kingdom of God. Nor did he discuss all the parliamentary procedures of the Kingdom that illustrate the theoretical rights, powers, and limitations of its officers and members. The purpose of this article then is to show that internal nature, role, and organization of Joseph Smith's "Kingdom of God."

Admittedly, this study will appear more like a theological treatise, but considering Quinn's research, there seems little else significant to say about the external chronology of the Council of Fifty. Using materials Quinn apparently did not see, I will do three things in this article that he did not do in his. First, I will provide an

Andrew F. Ehat graduated from Brigham Young University in mathematics in 1973. He is currently a graduate student in history, a researcher with the Religious Studies Center and an editorial intern with Brigham Young University Studies.

answer to the question he raised in his article: Why did Joseph Smith wait two years after he received the revelation authorizing the existence of the Council of Fifty to actually organize it? Second, although Quinn discussed the importance of 7 April 1842, the date the Lord revealed the official name of the Council, as well as the dates various Council members gave for its formal organization two years later (namely, 10, 11, and 13 March 1844), there is one date he did not discuss. I will show that the 18 April 1844 meeting of the Council of Fifty was, without any question, the most important one in its organizational development, because it was on that date Joseph Smith finalized all the theoretical features of the Kingdom of God. And, third, I will present excerpts from William Clayton's journals to demonstrate the essentially spiritual, theological, and nonmilitant role of the Council of Fifty.

WHY DID JOSEPH SMITH WAIT
FROM 7 APRIL 1842 UNTIL 18 APRIL 1844?

According to Daniel 2:44–45, the Lord must take the first step in establishing his Kingdom: the stone that is to roll forth and consume all other nations has to be cut out of the mountain without hands—that is, by God. The first step to coalesce the randomly scattered and partially developed themes of the Kingdom fostered within the Church priesthood organization appears to be the revelation to Joseph Smith on 7 April 1842. On this date the full title of the Kingdom was revealed.

Verily thus saith the Lord, This is the name by which you shall be called, The Kingdom of God and His Laws, with the Keys and power thereof, and judgment in the hands of his servants, Ahman Christ.

No other government has had such a prestigious title. Furthermore, to show the stark contrast between the ideals of government hinted at in this title and those operating upon the earth, Joseph Smith began to teach that man's attempts at government had come woefully short both in principle and in practice.

In July 1842, three months after receiving this revelation, Joseph Smith published an essay in the Times and Seasons entitled "The

---

3Joseph F. Smith Minutes of the Council of Fifty, 10 April 1880, used by special permission. Since 1957, a typed version of these minutes has been available at Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. The typescript does not give any source. Though there are minor errors in the typescript, the date given for the revelation is correct.
4See entry in William Clayton journal for 1 January 1845 included with this article. There are many other sources for this text, but Clayton seems to be copying from the original minutes which were in his possession.
Government of God." In it he said the governments of men "have failed in all their attempts to promote eternal power, peace and happiness. . . . [Even] our nation, which possesses greater resources than any other, is rent, from center to circumference, with party strife, political intrigues, and sectional interest." Joseph Smith called Isaiah 33:22 the political motto of ancient Israel (and note how unmistakably close to the revealed name of the Council of Fifty this motto is): "The Lord is our lawgiver; the Lord is our judge; the Lord is our King; and He shall reign over us." To bring about this ideal state of things, the Prophet said great confusion and destruction would have to occur throughout the world. "The world has had a fair trial for six thousand years; the Lord will try the seventh thousand Himself." Though he did not give many details of the ancient government of God, Joseph Smith did say the following:

The government was a theocracy; they had God to make their laws, and men chosen by Him to administer them. . . . [They were led] in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. . . . So will it be when the purposes of God shall be accomplished: when "The Lord shall be King over the whole earth" and "Jerusalem His throne." "The law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

This is a preciously limited description of Joseph Smith's precise ideas of the nature of the Kingdom and he knew it, for he said a month later: "I have the whole plan of the Kingdom before me, and no other person has."

Other theological developments that year have a specific bearing on the organization of the Kingdom of God. In May of 1842 Joseph Smith introduced the "temple endowment" and anointed nine men to become hereafter kings and priests. Consistent with John the Revelator, Joseph Smith anointed them "Kings and priests . . . [who] shall reign on the earth [during the Millennium]." However, in September of 1843, a year later, Joseph Smith did attend to the temple ordinances that actually made mortals "kings and priests."

Joseph Smith on 27 August 1843, a month before first administering these ordinances, taught that this ordination as a "king and priest" conferred the ultimate, legitimate power of government.

---

2Ibid., p. 249.
3Ibid., p. 252.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
7HC, 5:1-2.
8Revelation 20:5-6; italics supplied.
Those holding the fulness of the Melchizedek Priesthood are kings and priests of the Most High God, holding the keys of power and blessings. In fact, that Priesthood is a perfect law of theocracy and stands as God to give laws to the people.  

Joseph Smith in this discourse also indicated that he had not as yet conferred on any man in the Church the fulness of the priesthood ordinances whereby they were made kings and priests.  

On 28 September 1843 Joseph Smith inaugurated these higher ordinances in which he ordained men kings and priests. And in the ensuing five months he conferred them on twenty other men. For it was the “dispensation of the fulness of the priesthood” that Joseph Smith felt was the mission he was to accomplish. Hence, it should not be surprising that with one exception all the men upon whom the fulness had been conferred by February 1844 were initiated into the original Council of Fifty on 11 March of that year. Therefore, in the period between May 1842 (and more particularly September 1843) and February 1844, the organization of the Kingdom of God awaited Joseph Smith’s unfolding of temple theology. 

Thus the two-year lapse between 7 April 1842 (the date the founding revelation of the Council was received) and 11 March 1844 (the date the Council was actually organized) exists because Joseph Smith delayed organizing this Council until after he had unfolded all temple ordinances.

These ordinances he claimed conferred ultimate priesthood authority upon men. When men were ordained kings and priests and thereby received the fulness of the priesthood, they were “given . . .

---

13Smith, *Teachings*, p. 322.

14See undated entry in manuscript entitled “Scriptural Items,” which matches other manuscript versions of Joseph Smith’s 27 August 1843 discourse found in the Library–Archives of the Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Church Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah (hereafter referred to as Church Archives). I have determined that this manuscript is in the hand of Franklin D. Richards, who in 1849 became an apostle of the Church. See also Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1968), 124:28 (hereafter referred to as D&C), and Brigham Young’s comments three weeks before Joseph Smith’s discourse, found in *HC*, 5:527.

15Joseph Smith Diary, kept by Willard Richards, 28 September 1843, Church Archives.

16The twenty men were Hyrum Smith, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards, Newel K. Whitney, William Marks, John Taylor, John Smith, Reynolds Capan, Alpheus Cutler, Orson Spencer, Orson Hyde, Parley P. Pratt, Wilford Woodruff, George A. Smith, Levi Richards, Cornelius P. Lott, William W. Phelps, Isaac Morley and Orson Pratt. This is based on my “Summary of Data on the Individuals Who Received the Endowment Before Ordinance Work Began in the Nauvoo Temple,” privately distributed.

17*HC*, 5:140, or Smith, *Teachings*, p. 258.

18The exception was Isaac Morley, who was not initiated into the Council of Fifty until 1 March 1845. With only two exceptions, all the additional men on whom Joseph Smith conferred the Endowment but not the Fulness of the Priesthood ordinances were also initiated into the Council of Fifty. These men were as follows: George Miller, Amasa Lyman, Lucien Woodworth, John M. Bernhisel, Joseph Fielding, William Clayton, and John P. Greene. The only exceptions are Samuel H. Smith (who died in August 1844) and Joseph Young (who did not become a member of the Council of Fifty until 1 March 1845). Ehat, “Endowment Data Summary.”
all that could be given to man on the earth.” 19 With the restoration of this fundamental source of legitimacy, the Kingdom of God could be reestablished. For, from the Mormon point of view, governments which had apostatized from that dominion the Lord gave Adam had usurped authority and annulled their priesthood. Hence, worldly kings anointed by priests who had no priesthood power ultimately did not have legitimate right to reign. 20 It is no wonder then that the official name of the Council, “The Kingdom of God and His Laws . . . ,” when condensed to its “Key Word”—“Ahman Christ”—means, according to the Mormon lexicon, “God Anointed Ones” (see D&C 95:17; 116).

**WHAT HAPPENED AT THE 18 APRIL 1844 MEETING?**

With this theological overview, we are ready to discuss the meaning of the 18 April 1844 meeting of the Kingdom of God. Regarding this meeting, William Clayton records in his journal that the individuals “who have been called upon to form the grand K. of G.” were called by revelation. This principle was echoed in a revelation to John Taylor 27 June 1882:

And now I speak unto you who are members of this Council and my Kingdom, I say unto you, as I said unto my disciples of old, Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you. I called you by my servant, Joseph [Smith], and by my servant, Brigham [Young], and by my servant, John [Taylor].

This calling included the three nonmembers of the Church who were members of the Council of Fifty: Uriah Brown, Edward Bonney, and Merinus G. Eaton. For, according to the above revelation given to John Taylor, the Lord said: “I moved upon [Joseph Smith] to introduce into my Kingdom certain parties not in my Church.” 22 With the ultimate source of representation of God on earth inherent in the priesthood, having only Church members rule would not be fair in a plural society unless, as stated in this 1882 revelation, nonmembers of the Church “be admitted to the right of representation . . . and have

---

19Heber C. Kimball Journal kept by William Clayton, 26 December 1845, Church Archives.
20In light of this it should be pointed out that the Mormons, nevertheless, had been cautioned by revelation to be content with pluralism: “Be subject to the powers that be, until he reigns whose right it is to reign” (D&C 58:22). To Mormons this was not evidence of a patronizing God. He had revealed that he had not only countenanced but had also inspired the Constitution of the United States. There was to be no contradiction: “For he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land” (D&C 58:21).
21Revelation dated 27 June 1882 in notebook collection of John Taylor revelations; notebook given to Annie Taylor Hyde (daughter of John Taylor) by Emma Smith Woodruff (wife of Wilford Woodruff); xerox of holograph, Church Archives.
22Ibid.
full and free opportunity of presenting their views, interests and principles, and enjoying all the freedom and rights of the Council."23

The leaders of the Council of Fifty did not consider the presence of nonmembers of the Church as members of the Council to be a dilution of its priesthood undergirdings. Rather, they accepted what Joseph Smith had taught them, namely, that in the initial stages of the Millennium the Council would participate in concert with men of differing religious and political persuasions. Apparently the highest ranking representative(s) of non-Mormon political systems would be invited to come and present the "views, interests and principles" of their constituency. In December 1842, the Prophet had interpolated the Book of Revelation phrase "reign on earth" to mean "reign over the earth." He explained that immortal men, including Christ, would not dwell permanently on the earth but would only visit it during the Millennium. Day-to-day government would therefore be left to mortals. Furthermore, Joseph Smith explained the earth would still have a pluralism of governments and religions in the early part of those thousand years:

> There will be wicked men on the earth during the thousand years. The heathen nations who will not come up [to Jerusalem] to worship will be visited with the judgments of God [e.g., "no rain"] (Zechariah 14:17) and must eventually be destroyed from the earth.24

Because the Kingdom of God was conceived of God it could be a government of a plural society without prostituting its principles. The way that such an apparently unrealizable ideal could be achieved was what Joseph Smith made known during the 18 April 1844 meeting.

When the Prophet began the meeting, he initiated Joseph W. Coolidge and David S. Hollister and then added Lyman Wight’s name to the list of members. The Council then had a total of fifty men sitting in the circle. With that accomplished, Joseph Smith announced: "Now we have the number which the Lord requires—[but] we will take a few more on our own hook."25 The term "Council of Fifty" then became the familiar name of "The Kingdom of God and His Laws . . ." when it was mentioned in public. Although the name "Council of Fifty" has been considered by scholars merely as a

---

23Ibid.
24Smith, Teachings, pp. 268–69.
25Leonard John Nuttall Minutes of the Council of Fifty, 12 October 1880, used by special permission; hereafter referred to as Minutes followed by date. Subsequent to the 18 April 1844 meeting, William Smith and Jedediah M. Grant were included in the pre-martyrdom Council, much in the same manner as alternates are called into the Church’s priesthood organization—the "High Council"; alternate councilors are officially called in case regular members of the High Council are absent.
nickname,²⁶ as seen here it was an essential feature of the Council to have a particular size and hence this official title.

Joseph Smith next asked the committee assigned the responsibility of drafting the Constitution of the Kingdom of God to report their progress. Although this committee had not been organized until a week before the 18 April 1844 meeting, the Council from the very beginning had considered drafting a constitution. At the first of two 10 March 1844 preliminary organizational meetings, Joseph Smith had assigned the entire Council the task of amending the Constitution of the United States to become the “voice of Jehovah.”²⁷ At the 11 April meeting, Joseph Smith had given the assignment to a committee of three. During the week the committee had tried to draft the constitution. Though the Prophet had not been at the meeting of the “Committee of the council” in the afternoon of 14 April, he too during the week had attempted to help draft the document.²⁸

Committeeman John Taylor reported to the Council that the committee had “worked & strove to get up such a constitution as would suit our feelings” but could not do it. The Prophet then told the Council that he knew they could not draft a constitution worthy of guiding the Kingdom of God,²⁹ and that he had gone before the Lord and had received the Constitution by direct revelation:

> Ye are my Constitution and I am your God and ye are my spokesmen, therefore from henceforth keep my commandments.³⁰

Though this statement may seem short and more on the order of a preamble to a constitution, Council members viewed it quite differently. John Taylor said:

> These words are pregnant with meaning & full of intelligence & point out our position in regard to these matters—it is expected of us that [we] can act right—that our interests [are] bound up in the Kingdom of God. That we should consider we are not acting for ourselves, but that we are the Spokesmen of God selected for that purpose in the interest of God & to bless & exalt all humanity. We acknowledge him as our God and all men who enter this body must acknowledge him here. There is a peculiary [sic] significance to these things which needs some consideration.³¹

²⁷Joseph Smith Diary, 10 March 1844, Church Archives.
²⁸Joseph Smith Diary, 14 April 1844, and HC, 6:333.
²⁹Minutes, 8 April 1881.
³¹Minutes, 8 April 1881.
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Orson Pratt in regard to this has said:

In the Church we take the Law of God & his Priesthood as the Constitution of his Church—here in this Council we have a living constitution not a written one—which we must conform to.\(^{32}\)

The implicit breadth of this constitution was staggering to Council members. The Constitution of the Kingdom subsumes those political principles of mankind consistent with Judeo-Christian-Mormon scriptures. Analogous to this is the case of the strikingly similar constitutional monarchy of Great Britian. Its unwritten constitution is the sum total of all the basic legislation developed over the centuries since the Magna Carta of 1215. Joseph Smith was serious then when he said, "We should gather all the good and true principles in the world and treasure them up, or we shall not come out true 'Mormons.'"\(^{33}\) "One of the grand fundamental principles of 'Mormonism' is to receive truth, let it come from whence it may."\(^{34}\)

This brief constitution may imply that the Council operated in loose and chaotic fashion. However, order in the Council was assured by certain parliamentary procedures that were also finalized in the 18 April 1844 meeting. Given the unwritten nature of the Constitution of the Kingdom, these parliamentary procedures consequently take on constitutional proportions.

THE RULES OF THE KINGDOM

1. The Council is convened and organized by the President of the Church subject to the rules of the Kingdom of God. He is elected standing chairman upon convening of the Council.

2. Members of the Council sit according to age, except the chairman.

3. According to the order of voting in the Council, a recorder and a clerk of the Kingdom are elected. The clerk takes the minutes of the meeting and the recorder enters the approved minutes into the official records of the Kingdom. They are voting members though they do not occupy a seat in the circle.

4. All motions are presented to the Council by or through the standing chairman. All motions must be submitted in writing.

5. To pass, a motion must be unanimous in the affirmative. Voting is done after the ancient order: each person voting in turn from the oldest to the youngest member of the Council, commencing with the standing chairman. If any Council member has any objections he is

\(^{32}\)Minutes, 12 October 1880.

\(^{33}\)Smith, *Teachings*, p. 316.

\(^{34}\)Ibid., p. 313.
under covenant to fully and freely make them known to the Council. But if he cannot be convinced of the rightness of the course pursued by the Council he must either yield or withdraw membership in the Council. Thus a man will lose his place in the Council if he refuses to act in accordance with righteous principles in the deliberations of the Council. After action is taken and a motion accepted, no fault will be found or change sought for in regard to the motion.

6. Before a man can be accepted as a member of the Council his name must be presented to the members and voted upon unanimously in the affirmative. When invited into the Council he must covenant by uplifted hand to maintain all things of the Council inviolate agreeable to the order of the Council. Before he accepts his seat he must also agree to accept the name, constitution and rules of order and conduct of the Council.

7. No member is to be absent from any meeting unless sick or on Council business. If this were not the case, rule five could be invoked to invalidate any action of the Council.

8. A member can be assigned to only one committee of the Council at a time.

9. Adjournment and specific date of reconvening the Council are determined by vote. The Council may be called together sooner at the discretion of the chairman. If the Council adjourns without a specific meeting date (sine die), it next meets only at the call of the standing chairman (or new President of the Church, if applicable).\(^3\)

Beginning with rule number two, I shall discuss the implications of the most important rules of order of the Council. The most conspicuous feature of William Clayton’s journal entry for 18 April 1844 is that he lists each of the members (except for the officers of the Council) according to age. Joseph Smith explained nearly a year before: “The way to get along in any important matters was to gather unto yourself wise men, experienced & aged men to assist in council in all times of trouble.”\(^3\)\(^6\) This rule of order seems to have followed precedent established earlier by Joseph Smith in connection with the priesthood organization of the Church. When the Council of the Twelve Apostles was organized in 1834, Joseph Smith instructed them “to take their seats together according to age, the oldest to be seated at the head.”\(^3\)\(^7\) They even spoke in order from the oldest to the youngest.\(^3\)\(^8\) While seniority by ordination date

\(^3\)This is a compilation of descriptive statements of the rules of order scattered throughout the minutes of the Council of Fifty. I have prepared a typescript of these minutes and corresponding diary entries and expect to publish this compilation in the future.

\(^3\)Wilford Woodruff Journal, 14 May 1843, Church Archives. See also Smith, Teachings, p. 299.

\(^3\)B.H. Roberts has observed “that this arrangement had reference only to the first organization of the quorum of the Twelve. After this first arrangement, the brethren of that quorum held and now hold their place in it and preside according to seniority of ordination, not of age.” For further details see note in HC, 2:219-20. Cf. D&C 124:129.

\(^3\)Times and Seasons 6 (15 April 1845): 869.
eventually replaced seniority by age in the Council of the Twelve, in the Council of Fifty seniority was determined strictly by age. Ecclesiastical rank, except in the case of the President of the Church, had no bearing on standing in the Council. For example, the President of the Twelve Apostles, Brigham Young, was ranked twenty-third in the Council of Fifty.

Alphabetical lists of the Council of Fifty do not suggest this rule of order which gave rise to tensions within the Council. Of particular interest is the case of Lyman Wight. Eldest of the Twelve Apostles, he first took his seat in the Council of Fifty on 3 May 1844. He was ranked sixteenth—ahead of all his fellow apostles. When Brigham Young, after the martyrdom of Joseph Smith, did not enthusiastically renew Wight's mission to Texas that had been arranged by the 1844 Council of Fifty, Lyman Wight rebelled and took a company of Saints away anyway. So when the Council appointed the President of the presiding quorum of the Church, President Brigham Young, as Standing Chairman of the Council of Fifty on 4 February 1845, Apostle Wight was on his way to Texas and was not present to sanction the action. This may in part explain why after August 1846 following the death of Samuel Bent, who was ranked second, Lyman Wight refused to accept Brigham Young's election as standing chairman. He repeatedly stated that "nobody under the light of the heavens except Joseph Smith or John Smith, the president of the Fifty, could call him from Texas." Since John Smith was ranked third in Joseph Smith's Council, Lyman Wight considered John Smith and not Brigham Young "president of the Fifty." Wight's interpretation of succession in the Council was certainly self-serving. For in the Council of the Twelve Apostles he was responsible to President Brigham Young, but in the Council of Fifty he thought his age gave him advantage, justifying his rebellion against Brigham Young's authority. Because he attended only at most three of the seventeen Council of Fifty meetings held during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, possibly Lyman Wight did not know or forgot the rule that age seniority did not determine who was to be standing chairman. That office was always to be filled by the President of the Church.

39For example, the Joseph F. Smith Minutes of the Council of Fifty (referred to in notes 3 and 30) for 10 and 21 April 1880 included a listing of members. Joseph F. Smith originally listed them according to age. The individual who typed the BYU Special Collections copy of these minutes reshuffled the names into alphabetical order. William Clayton's lists for 18 April 1844 and 4 February 1845 are in order of age. So are the lists kept by Joseph F. Smith in his journal under the dates of 10 April, 12 October and 31 December 1880 and 4 August 1881, Church Archives.

40HC, 6:351; Joseph Smith Diary and Willard Richards Diary, both for 3 May 1844, Church Archives.

41Heman Hale Smith, "The Lyman Wight Colony in Texas, 1846-1858," p. 21, typewritten manuscript, BYU Special Collections. See Abraham H. Cannon Journal, 4 April 1894, BYU Special Collections.
Wight's thinking carried a step further could have made it possible for nonmember of the Church Uriah Brown, ranked fifth, to have succeeded to the "presidency," leaving even Lyman Wight in a quandary.

But this seniority rule certainly is not the most important of the rules governing the Council. Without any question rule number five was the most important one to members of the Council. All the perplexing questions raised about government in general and theocracy in particular were answered by this rule. It eased their own anxiety regarding Joseph Smith's intentions in establishing a theocracy. It qualified the meaning of the action of the 11 April 1844 meeting when Joseph Smith was anointed "Prophet, Priest and King" of the Council. Because of this rule Council members did not feel that they were bound to the "fanciful revelations of Joe Smith, whether right or wrong," as anti-Mormons claimed. This rule satisfied members of the Council that they were involved in a theocratic republican form of government and not a theocratic tyranny. Rule five was the unique answer to the inevitable clash between majority and minority rights. It guaranteed freedom of speech and encouraged the right of dissent. To them this rule blended divine sovereignty and popular sovereignty.

As in the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the Kingdom of God empowers the "government of God" in its legislative capacity more than in any other branch of power. The standing chairman does have veto power, but no more than other members. He too is subject to the same rules of righteousness in exercising his franchise. "If I esteem mankind to be in error, shall I bear them down?" asked Joseph Smith. "No. I will lift them up, and in their own way too, if I cannot persuade them my way is better; and I will not seek to compel any man to believe as I do, only by the force of reasoning, for truth will cut its own way."42 Joseph Smith felt that these liberal sentiments could be enacted through the agency of the Council of Fifty. The miracle of fifty men coming to a unanimous decision would make them "spokesmen" of God. According to the theory, if fifty men seek in candor and order to put self and represented interest in perspective with all other points of view and are committed to find the locus where the best interests of all converge, then the Council will have found the will of God. This unanimous decision clause in rule five is, as in the case of rule number

---

42Smith, *Teachings*, p. 313; italics supplied.
two, an obvious duplication of the parliamentary procedures of the Church’s leading councils.

Every decision made by either of these quorums [the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and the Quorum of Seventy] must be by the unanimous voice of the same; that is, every member in each quorum must be agreed to its decisions in order to make their decisions of the same power or validity one with the other. . . . Unless this is the case, their decisions are not entitled to the same blessings which the decisions of a quorum of three presidents anciently. . . . The decisions of these quorums . . . are to be made in all righteousness, in holiness, and lowliness of heart, meekness and long suffering, and in faith, and virtue, and knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity; because the promise is, if these things abound in them they shall not be unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord.43

Therefore the chairman would not resort to “revelation” unless the Council was at a stalemate. The desire of the nonmembers of the Church in the Council to avoid revelation as the final say would certainly be a compelling force for unanimity. It could then be argued that the voting procedure in practice would merely be majority rule. Certainly this is so. The key, of course, is whether members of the Council would seriously consider the interests of all in their deliberations. As John Taylor saw it, only in seeking the good of all could they fulfill the implications of their “constitution.” One factor that would contribute to realization of this lofty goal is the covenant (rule number five) that if objections existed to any legislation they had to be voiced.

Because the leadership of the Church handpicked the men to fill the Council of Fifty, one could argue that true freedom of expression did not exist in the Council. Yet one cannot escape the impression of total honesty and unintimidated expression actually practiced in the meetings. For example, when, in 1880, the Council discussed the stand the People’s Party should take on the question of taxes in support of the public school system in Utah Territor, both George Q. Cannon and Wilford Woodruff opposed the move because it would require the removal of the Church’s scriptures from the curriculum. (Taxes had not been used to an appreciable extent in the territorial

43Joseph Smith on 12 February 1834 said he would explain “the order in which a Council ought to be conducted” for the first time since the organization of the Church. He said, “In ancient days Councils were conducted with such strict propriety, that no one was allowed to whisper, be weary, leave the room, or get uneasy in the least, until the voice of the Lord, by revelation, or by the voice of the council by the Spirit was obtained: which has not been [p. 28] observed in this church to the present. It was understood in ancient days, that if one man could stay in Council another could, and if the president could spend his time, the members could also. But in our councils, generally, one would be uneasy, another sleep, one praying another not; one’s mind on the business of the council and another thinking on something else &c.” (“Kirtland Council Minute Book,” pp. 27–28, Church Archives; published in Smith, Teachings, p. 69.)
school system before this.) It might be surprising to us that Daniel H. Wells, former member of the First Presidency and then a councilor to the Twelve Apostles, recommended rather liberal views. He suggested that the Latter-day Saint children receive a more secular education and be taught the scriptures at home "without crowding them into the 6 hours of the school day." Echoing the fundamental principles of the Council, Daniel H. Wells concluded, "This looks to me as good statesmanship & be providing for all the people." There were no rebuttals to his comments. John Taylor agreed that "there does seem to be an unfairness in using other people's money for our schools . . . we can afford to do right."44 This is only one example, but it confirms the whole tenor of the Council minutes: the leaders of the Council of Fifty practiced what they preached. The minutes breathe openness and candor without vindictiveness or unkindness. If the Mormons felt so committed to this freedom of expression in the Council, we can expect that the gentiles would feel even more so.

A six percent representation of the overwhelming gentile population does not seem to be good mathematics on the part of Joseph Smith if he expected the Council soon to be in control of the world. Having only three nonmembers in the original Council of Fifty seems a poor representation. But Joseph Smith told the younger members of the Council—Benjamin F. Johnson, Erastus Snow, and George A. Smith—always to remember the example he had set. Then when they were "hoary with age" they would maintain alive the principle of gentile representation in the Council of Fifty should the day come in their lifespan that the Kingdom of God would be established in power and glory.45 Given the Mormon expectation that at the beginning of the Millennium a plural society will exist and that nonmembers of the Church will have fair representation, theoretically the proportion of nonmembers in the Council will then be considerably higher than it was in Nauvoo. Under such conditions, gentiles in the Council of Fifty will not feel their position to be so tenuous.46

Therefore, it was not the specific projects of Joseph Smith's Council of Fifty that so excited its members. It was his theories and doctrines that arrested their attention. For it did not escape them

44Minutes, 12 October 1880.
46Hansen, Quest for Empire, p. 37.
that this form of government was not possible under existing world conditions. But an already well-developed apocalyptic outlook helped keep the notions alive. First, the Church would gain in influence and respect with the world. Second, the chaos of a disintegrating world would drive people to the Ensign of the Latter-day Saints, saying: We don’t care about your religion; but you are a good people, and you have a just and stable government with which we would be willing to cooperate. Then lastly, cataclysmic events would elect the Saints as governors of the earth.

With all these principles finalized on 18 April 1844, surely it is no wonder William Clayton rejoiced: “Much precious instructions were given, and it seems like heaven began on earth and the power of God is with us.” As will be seen in the following entries from Clayton’s journals, his childlike faith in the revelations on the Council of Fifty to Joseph Smith was explicit and complete. They demonstrate the spiritual other-worldly orientation of Council proceedings and its role when it came into contact with the world.

EXCERPTS FROM THE JOURNALS OF WILLIAM CLAYTON

Sunday, March 10 [1844]. ... Evening attended Council with the First Presidency and the Twelve on important business arising from a letter from the Pine Country. Bro., W. Richards was appointed Chairman and myself, was appointed Clerk.

Monday, March 11. In Council again all day—as last night many great and glorious ideas were advanced, we had a very profitable time. We organized into a Council and I was admitted a member. I will here name whose names were put on the list of members of this important organization: Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, Brigham Young, W. Richards, P.P. Pratt, O. Pratt, J. Taylor, H.C. Kimball, G.A. Smith, W.W. Phelps, L. Woodworth, G. Miller, A. Badlam, P. Haws, Erastus Snow, R. Cahoon, Amos Fielding, A. Cutler, Levi Richards, N.K. Whitney, J.M. Bernhisel, L.D. Wason myself ...

Wednesday March 13. ... At 11 the Council was called together, ... P.M. in council again, also in the evening O. Hyde, W. Woodruff, and James Emmett were admitted members. The Pres. appointed W. Richards Recorder, and me the Clerk of the Kingdom.

47D&C 105:23–32.
49This theme is so abundant in Judeo-Christian–Mormon scriptures that it is impossible to list here all the passages dealing with the Apocalypse. See Ezekiel 37–39, Zechariah 14 and Malachi 4 in the Old Testament; Matthew 24 and Revelation in the New Testament; 1 Nephi 13–14 and 3 Nephi 21 of the Book of Mormon; and finally sections 1, 43, 45, 77, 87 and 133 of the Doctrine and Covenants.
50William Clayton kept three volumes of journal in Nauvoo, Illinois, covering the years 1842–1845, 1843–1844, and 1845–1846. The extracts used in this article were made by L. John Nuttall in the 1880s. L. John Nuttall was William Clayton’s successor as “Clerk of the Kingdom,” hence Nuttall’s interest in compiling these extracts. This fifteen page manuscript is entitled “Extracts from the Journal of Elder Wm Clayton, regarding the K. of G.,” and is located in the Church Archives.

Tuesday, March 19. At the Council meeting, S. Bent, Uriah Brown, Samuel James, John D. Parker, O.P. Rockwell, Sidney Rigdon. Wm Marks and O. Spencer were admitted members.

Thursday, April 4. In Council of the Kingdom. Eleven Lamanites\textsuperscript{51} appeared and wanted council. We had a very pleasant and impressive interview.

Thursday, April 11. ... Afterwards in the Council. We had a glorious interview. Pres. J. was voted our P. P. & K.\textsuperscript{52} with loud Hosannas.

Thursday, April 18. ... At 9 met in Council. This day Pres. J. introduced J.W. Coolidge and D.S. Hollister and added L. Wight's name, and then declared the council full. The names as they now stand of those who have been called upon to form the grand K. of G. by revelation are as follows:

1. Prest J. Smith. Standing Chairman

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Samuel Bent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alpheus Cutler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Uriah Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reynolds Calhoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ezra Thayre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Wm W. Phelps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Amos Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wm Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sidney Rigdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>John P. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Geo Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>N.K. Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Peter Haws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jos. Fielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>C.P. Lott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Levi Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>J.M. Bernhisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>J.D. Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>H. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>L. Woodworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>B. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>H.C. Kimball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>O. Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>J. Emmett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>P.B. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Elias Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>O Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Saml James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>W. Woodruff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>P.P. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Edwd Bonny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>D.D. Yearsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>D.S. Hollister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>John Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Alex Badlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>C.C. Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>G.J. Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Orson Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>M.G. Eaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>A. Babbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>A. Lyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>J.W. Coolidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>O.P. Rockwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>G.A. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>E. Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>L.D. Wason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>B.F. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>W. Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>W. Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>L. Wight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the day much precious instructions were given, and it seems like heaven began on earth and the power of God is with us.

\textsuperscript{51}The Book of Mormon term for the American Indians.

\textsuperscript{52}Prophet, Priest and King. See Smith, Teachings, p. 318 where Joseph Fielding Smith was the first to publish Joseph Smith's Diary for the date of 23 July 1843. See also H.C, 5:510, 512, 513 and 523.

Saturday June 22. Joseph whispered and told me either to put the r. of K. into the hands of some faithful man and send them away, or burn them, or bury them. I concluded to bury them, which I did immediately on my return home.

Sunday. August 18. At the Office copying the Record of the Kingdom.

Friday. Sept 6. At the Temple all day copying Records of the Kingdom.

Reflections. Jan. 1st 1845

... The organization of the Kingdom of God on 11th March last is one important event. This organization was called the Council of Fifty or Kingdom of God, and was titled by revelation as follows, "Verily thus saith the Lord, this is the name by which you shall be called, the Kingdom of God and his Laws, with the Keys and power thereof, and judgment in the hands of his servants, Ahman Christ." In this Council was the plan arranged for supporting Pres. Jos. Smith as a candidate for the presidency of the U.S. Prest Joseph was the standing chairman of the council and myself the Clerk. In this Council was also devised the plan of establishing an emigration to Texas, and plans laid for the exaltation of a standard and ensign of truth for the nations of the earth. In this council was the plan devised to restore the Ancients\(^5\) to the Knowledge of the truth and the restoration of Union and peace amongst ourselves. In this Council was Prest Joseph chosen our Prophet, Priest and King by Hosannas. In this Council was the principles of eternal truth rolled forth to the heavens without reserve and the hearts of the servants of God made to rejoice exceedingly.

Tuesday Feby. 4. 1845 Met at the 70s Hall with the Council of the Kingdom. There were only 25 members present viz: B. Young, S. Bent, John Smith, Alpheus Cutler, R. Cahoon, W.W. Phelps, G. Miller, P. Haws, Josh Fielding, Levi Richards, J.D. Parker, L. Woodworth, H.C. Kimball, O. Spencer, P.B. Lewis, D.D. Yeatsley, C.C. Rich, O. Pratt, A. Lyman, J. W. Coolidge, O.P. Rockwell, G.A. Smith, E. Snow, and Wd Richards and myself. This is the first time we met since the massacre of Pres. Joseph & Hyrum Smith. The Council was reorganized and President B. Young appointed standing chairman as successor to Prest Joseph Smith by unanimous vote. The vote was then taken in ancient order on each one present and all were received by unanimous vote. The vote then passed for absent members according to their ages and stations and resulted as follows, viz: Ezra Thayre, Amos Fielding, N.K. Whitney, C.P. Lott, J.M. Bernhisel, Elias Smith, O. Hyde, W. Woodruff, P.P. Pratt, D.S. Hollister, John Taylor, Wm Smith, A.W. Babbitt, J.M. Grant, and B.F. Johnson were unanimously sustained and received into the new organization. The following were rejected and dropped from the Council: Uriah Brown, Wm Marks, Sidney Rigdon, Lyman Wight, James Emmett, Samuel James, Edward Bonny, Alexander Badlam, Geo. J. Adams, Merinus G. Eaton and Lorenzo D. Wasson. President Joseph & Hyrum two of the members were martyred for the truth and John P. Green is dead, so that there is only 40 members left in the Council.

\(^5\)Namely the "Lamanites" or the American Indians.
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It was voted to fill up the Council, at some future time. The weather is extremely cold and the Council adjourned at 2½.

Thursday Feb. 6. 1845. At the office all day recording minutes of Council. &c

Tuesday. Feb. 11. 1845. At the Office all day copying records of the Kingdom

Wednesday. Feb. 12. 1845. At the office all day copying records of the Kingdom

Saturday. March 1. 1845. At 10 A.M. met at the Seventies Hall in the Council of Fifty. The following brethren were taken into fill up the Quorum viz: Joseph Young, John E. Page, David Fullmer, Theodore Turley, Albert P. Rockwood, Jonathan Dunham, & Lucien R. Foster. They subscribed to the laws of the Council and covenanted before God with uplifted hands to maintain all things inviolate agreeable to the order of the Council. Bros Daniel Spencer, Isaac Morley, and Shadrack Roundy were selected to make up the number of 50, but they were absent and sick. Brother John Pack was admitted to sit in the place of Wilford Woodruff, John D. Lee in the place of Ezra Thayer, and Lewis Dana in place of Amos Fielding they being absent in on business. Lewis Dana is a Lamanite of the Oneida nation, and the First Lamanite who has been admitted a member of any Quorum of the Church.

The object of the Council was to decide whether we shall send out a company of men with Bro. Dana to fill Joseph's measures originally adopted in this Council by going West to seek out a location and a home where the Saints can dwell in peace and health, and where they can erect the ensign and standard of liberty for the nations, and live by the laws of God without being oppressed and mobbed under a tyrannical government, without protection from the laws. Many able speeches were made on the subject, and the Council finally agreed to send out a company with Brother Dana to accomplish this important object. The following brethren were selected and appointed by unanimous vote of the Council, for this mission, viz. Samuel Bent to be the first man and president of the Mission, Jonathan Dunham next, Cyrus Daniels, Daniel Spencer, John S. Fullmer, Charles Shumway, Albert Carrington, and John W. Farnham. These brethren are expected to start immediately after Conference and proceed from tribe to tribe, to unite the Lamanites and find a home for the saints. The Council adjourned in the midst of the best kind of feelings.

Tuesday 4 Mch 1845. ... At 9 o'clock met with the council of the Kingdom. We had a very interesting meeting. The subject being the Oregon Mission.

Thursday March 6. 1845. At the Office all day copying records of the Kingdom.

Friday March 7. 1845. As above

Monday Mar. 10. 1845. ... While writing and copying the records of the Kingdom, I was writing these words dropped by Er H.C. Kimball in the council on the 4th inst. viz. "if a man step beyond his bounds he will lose his kingdom as Lucifer did and it will be given to others who are more worthy." This idea came to my mind. It has been a doctrine taught by this church that we were in the Grand Council amongst the Gods when the organization of this world was contemplated and that the laws of government were all made and sanctioned by all present and all the ordinances and ceremonies decreed upon. Now is it not the case that the Council of the Kingdom of
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God now organized upon this earth are making laws and sanctioning principles which will in part govern the saints after the resurrection, and after death will not these laws be made known by messengers and agents as the gospel was made known to us. And is there not a similarity between this grand council & the council which sat previous to the organization of this world.

Tuesday March 11, 1845. In the Council of Fifty all day. Cyrus Daniels was admitted a member. The subject of writing letters to the Governor's and a number of other subjects were discussed. The subject of the movements of the mob was talked over, and it was considered best for those who are hunted with writs to go on Missions so that we may if possible evade the blow until we can finish the Temple and the Nauvoo House. It was also decided that the workmen on the walls of the Temple commence tomorrow.

Wednesday March 12. At the office all day copying Records of the Kingdom

Friday March 14. At the Office all day chiefly recording records of the Kingdom

Saturday, March 15. A.M. at the Office copying records of the Kingdom

Monday 17. At the office all day chiefly copying records of the Kingdom

Tuesday March 18. 1845. In the Council of Fifty all day. D. Spencer was admitted a member. The subject of the Western mission was most on hand, and all seemed interested fully in it.

Wednesday March 19, 1845. P.M. copying records of the Kingdom.

Thursday 20. At the office all day. A.M. recording tithings, afterwards copying records of the Kingdom.

Saturday March 22, 1845. At the council of the Kingdom all day The Western Mission occupied near all day. The subject of the Nauvoo House, Printing office, Church History and organization of the City were talked over.

Monday March 24, 1845 … Chiefly recording the minutes of the Council of Fifty.

Tuesday, March 25—1845. At the Council of Fifty all day. The subject of the Nauvoo House, and organization of the City, were the principle topics of conversation

Thursday March 27, 1845 … At the Office all day copying records of the Kingdom

Tuesday, April 1, 1845. At the office all day, quite unwell, recording minutes of the Kingdom

Saturday April 5. 1845. At 9 at the Seventies Hall with the Council of Fifty but on account of a multitude of business waiting the Council adjourned until without doing business, to next Friday at 8.45
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Friday April 11, 1845. With the Council of Fifty all day taking minutes. Pres. Young appointed J. Dunham, C. Shumway Lorenzo Young to go with Brother Dana on the Western Mission. It was decided to move the printing Office into three lower stories of Masonic Hall and commence the business on a larger scale. The Council all voting to do their utmost to sustain it.

Tuesday April 15, 1845 ... Dined at 12 Oclock with Brother Miller and afterwards rode with him to meet with the Kingdom of God in the upper room of the Seventies Hall. Phineas Young was received into the Council and decided to go with Bros Dana, Dunham and Shumway to the Indian Council at Council Bluffs and thence if they think best to the Pacific Ocean. It was also decided that Bro. Solomon Zundal (Zendal) should go with them to his tribe the Delawares. A letter from Gov. Ford was read giving his advice relative to our policy in organizing the City. He advises to organize the City into corporations of a mile square so as to include the whole surface. He d-also recommends to go and establish an independent government in California

Wednesday April 16, 1845 ... P.M. at the Office mostly copying records of the Kingdom

Thursday April 17, 1845 ... Part of the day I was copying records of the Kingdom ... The following verses were composed by Er John Taylor, the Apostle, and revised by him at the Council of the Kingdom on Friday 11th inst.

"The Upper California. O that the land for me.’" &c (See p. 280.)

Monday April 21, 1845 ... Recording minutes of the Kingdom.

Tuesday April 22, 1845. A.M. at the Office recording the minutes of the Kingdom. P.M. attended the Council of the Kingdom. There was not much business done. The brethren are not yet gone west and will probably not start for a day or two.

Thursday April 24, 1845. At the Office all day recording minutes of the Kingdom

Monday April 28, 1845 ... A.M. recording minutes of the Kingdom

Tuesday April 29, 1845 at 6:30 met the Council of Fifty at the Seventies Hall

Tuesday May 6, 1845. ... Evening met with the Council of Fifty in the Seventies Hall. The principal topic of conversation was the movements of the mob. It appears their determination is to get up an excitement at the Court and they are already trying it by reporting that the Saints are going en masse to Carthage at the Court, and if the Court does not execute the law on the murderers that we intend to destroy the Court and citizens of the County. From reports which the brethren have brought which have been at Carthage the mob are laying deep plans to bring us into collision with the State, so as to bring about our expulsion or extermination forthwith. It was agreed that none of the brethren leave the City at the Court, only those who are required to be there on business, so that we may prevent the mob from coming into the City and committing deprivations in the absence of the brethren. An article was
written by O. Hyde & W. Richards to publish in tomorrow's paper notifying the
public of the designs of the mob -ab- and also the course we intend to
pursue. The Council did not break up till 10 1/4

Saturday 10 May 1845 ... P. M. met with the Council of Fifty and adjourned sine die.
The adjournment was about in consequence of the Conduct of D.D. Yearsley of
whom there is strong suspicions of treachery.

Saturday Sept. 7. 1845 ... Notified the members of the Council of Fifty to meet next
Tuesday

Tuesday Sept. 9 1845 ... At 2 P.M. met in the upper room of the Seventies Hall with
the Council of Fifty. The subject of sending a company of Saints to the West next
spring was talked over, and the following motion of by W.W. Phelps—"Moved that
the President select such a portion of this Council as he may choose to remove west,
and they select and organize the company subject to the final revision of the Presi-
dent," a vote was taken and the motion was carried unanimously. The following
motion was also put and carried unanimously "That a Committee of five be ap-
pointed to gather all information relative to immigration and impart the same to this
Council, and those about to emigrate when called upon"

Thursday Sept 11, 1845. A.M. at the Office recording minutes of the Kingdom of God
... A selection has been made by Pres. Young of those of the Council of Fifty who
shall start west next spring. My name is included in the list.

Tuesday Sept 30, 1845 Met the Council of Fifty at the Seventies Hall. Elders Bent
Cutler & Cahoon presented their lists of families selected by them to go west. They
have each got their companies nearly made up of one hundred families each. Pres.
Young also appointed S. Roundy, J. Fielding, C.P. Lott, P. Haws and Daniel
Spencer to select and organize each a company. Isaac Morley has got his company
about full. While in Council report was brought in that two officers had just rode in-
to town and had come to the Mansion. Pres. Young sent B.F. Johnson to find out
what they were after. He soon returned and stated that they called for liquor but
could get none. They then went to Packs but could get none there. They finally got
some at Clapps and then went off in different directions. Word was brought in that
an armed company were outside the City. Pres Young sent C.C. Rich to see what
they wanted. He soon returned and reported that Gen. Hardin, Judge Douglas and
the troops had arrived on the Square near the Temple, and that Douglas was at Elder
Taylor's wanting to see the Twelve or the authorities of the place. The Council was
immediately adjourned and the Twelve with one or two others went over to Elder
Taylor's ... P.M. at the Office recording minutes of the Council of Fifty.

Saturday, October 4, 1845 ... At 9 O'Clock met with the Council of Fifty at the
Seventies Hall and Kept minutes of the Council.

Sunday, October 5, 1845. At the Office all day recording minutes of the Council of
Fifty.

Tuesday January 6, 1846 ... Evening went to notify some of the Council of Fifty to
meet next Sunday morning.
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Sunday January 11, 1846 ... A.M. in the Temple with the Council of Fifty, arranging to make an early start West

Sunday January 18, 1846. In the Temple with the Council of Fifty and also Captains of Companies.

As of 1 January 1845 all the special projects of the pre-martyrdom Council of Fifty had failed. The Council had not met in eight months. It had not revived itself to undertake any of the "measures of Joseph." No California, Oregon, or Texas scouting parties materialized. The campaign for the Presidency of the United States was terminated not only before the election but even before a national convention. The mission among the Lamanites never got underway. William Clayton mentions all these failures in his 1845 New Year's day entry. Then why is he so buoyant?

As important as each of these efforts by the Council were, they were, in Clayton's mind, only secondary in importance to the spiritual-religious organization conceived by Joseph Smith. Clayton's implicit faith in the divine nature of the Prophet's revelations on the Council of Fifty overshadowed any earthly policies that the Council may have developed. It was the love of the principles espoused by Joseph Smith, principles the Council applied to policies, that enamoured William Clayton and bound him to the Prophet. The Council could accommodate changes and he felt the divinity of the Council's principles were confirmed when they met new circumstances.

The Council of Fifty was frustrated in each of its attempts to prepare the way for the unhurried, systematic removal of the Saints from the presence of their enemies in and around Nauvoo. However, after three years' struggle, the Council of Fifty achieved the "measures of Joseph" when Brigham Young entered the Salt Lake Valley on 24 July 1847. As William Clayton phrased it in his famous hymn, they found "the place which God . . . prepared, far away in the West, where none [would] come to hurt or make afraid; [w]here the Saints [would] be blessed." And the Council achieved its goal within the time limit Joseph Smith had originally given:

[I prophesy] that within five years we [shall] be out of the power of our old enemies, whether they were apostates or of the world; and [I tell you] brethren to record it, that when it comes to pass [you] need not say [that you] had forgotten the saying. 34

34Smith, Teachings, p. 333; the Wilford Woodruff Journal, 25 February 1844, is the original source for this prophecy.
This then is the legacy of Joseph Smith’s Council of Fifty. Though it was conceived as the nucleus of a world government for the Millennium, through the flexibility of its own Constitution the Council assumed the less imposing role of locating the Saints in a less than ideal Zion. And when realities militated against the Council’s fulfilling all of its plans, only individuals like William Clayton who remained as adaptable as the Council’s Constitution could find consolation despite all the failures.
A LISTING OF THE DATES OF COUNCIL OF FIFTY MEETINGS

The following is a list of the 142 dates when the Council of Fifty met during its seven distinct periods of activity. An italicized date means that the meeting is verified by the official attendance rolls of the Kingdom of God. An asterisk indicates the dates during periods two, three, and seven of other meetings which are significant to but are not meetings of the Council of Fifty.

1. 1844—Joseph Smith Council of Fifty Meetings

Joseph Smith assigned the Twelve Apostles in February 1844 to organize and supervise an exploring party to the far West in order to find a new location for the Saints. He learned on 8 March 1844 that Lyman Wight and George Miller (when they were hundreds of miles from Nauvoo) had at the same time prepared letters suggesting that the Church move from Nauvoo to Texas. Consequently, when the Prophet decided to organize the Kingdom of God, he assigned these fifty men to manage these two exploring efforts preparatory to a final decision regarding a removal of the Church from Nauvoo. The Council of Fifty also assumed other projects likewise previously undertaken by Joseph Smith, namely, the campaign for the presidency of the United States and appeals to Congress for redress of the Saints’ grievances concerning the Missouri expulsion in 1839. However, when the Prophet was killed on 27 June 1844, all “measures of Joseph” considered by the 1844 Council were tabled until the Council was reorganized seven months later on 4 February 1845.

10, 11, 12, 13, 14 [“adjourned til Tuesday 19 9 am” (JS–WR)], 19, 21, 26 March; 4, 11, 18, 25 [“sine die” (WC, JS–WR, and HC)] April; 3, 6 [“adjourned till to next Monday” (JS–WR)], 13, 25 [“adj to friday next” (JS–WR)], and 31 May 1844—17 meetings during this period.

2. 1845–1846—Post-Martyrdom Nauvoo Council of Fifty Meetings

Although the Council was reorganized 4 February 1845, it adjourned that day with only the vague anticipation that “at some future time” it would be filled up to its full complement of fifty members. However, one month later, as spring approached, Brigham Young reconvened the Council to fulfill his promise to carry out the “measures of Joseph.” Following the March and April 1845 deliberations on the western expedition, the exploring party finally got away from Nauvoo. The Council then adjourned for four months. In September 1845, after part of the exploring party returned to give a preliminary report of their findings, the Council met and decided to send a settling party to the valley of the Great Salt Lake; after conducting this business it adjourned again. However, during the latter part of September, the anti-Mormons of Hancock County issued an ultimatum to the Saints requiring them to agree to leave the state in the spring of 1846. Consequently, the Council reconvened and planned for an organized evacuation of
Nauvoo. Then in January 1846, after an adjournment of three months, when word came from separate sources that Federal troops were on their way to prevent the Saints from leaving Nauvoo, the Council met in emergency sessions to prepare for an early move west. Because he believed this was a crisis situation, Brigham Young on 13 January 1846 invited the leaders of the wagon train companies, even though they were not members of the Council, to meet with the Council of Fifty in this emergency session. Because so many of the members of the Council were scattered along the trail leading west, Brigham Young convened several such “augmented” Council meetings during the 1846 trek west. (Although these meetings were clearly based on precedent established in Nauvoo, they were not Council of Fifty meetings. Because they were held during the trek west, and because they were significant “council” meetings, I have listed them during period three.) The Council last met in Nauvoo 18 January 1846 and, as shown by the single attendance roll that covers both the second and third periods of activity of the Council, the Council of Fifty did not meet again until 12 November 1846.

4 [“This is the first time we met since the massacre of Pres. Joseph . . . Smith” (WC); “It was voted to fill up the Council, at some future time” (WC)] February; 1, 4, 11, 18, 22, 25 [AML says Council adjourned to 5 April] March; 5 [HCK says they adjourned to 12 April, WC says 11 April, and WR says 10 April], 11 [“adjourned to Tuesday next” (WR)], 15, 18, 22, 29 April; 6, 10 [“adjourned sine die” (WC)] May; 9, 30 September; 4 [“adjourned at 2 ¼ without date” (WR)] October 1845; 11, 13* [First “augmented” Council of Fifty meeting where at the conclusion of the meeting Brigham Young says: “The 50 to meet on Sunday at 10 [18 January 1846] and the whole [the “augmented” Council of Fifty to meet] on Monday at 10” (Minutes)], 18, 19* January 1846—20 meetings during this period.

3. 1846—The Exodus Winters Quarters Council of Fifty Meetings

Although Brigham Young convened the Council of Fifty in November 1846, he did not have any “business to lay before the Council.” However, at the 27 December 1846 meeting, the important yet obvious decision was made to send a pioneer company to the Salt Lake Valley in the spring of 1847. The Council then adjourned sine die until they could meet in the Valley. They did not reconvene until 6 December 1848, two months after Brigham Young’s second and final arrival in the Valley 20 September 1848.

30* [“Council adjourned to Thursday April 2nd” (WR). Members of the Council of Fifty are identified in the proceedings of these “Council” meetings] March; 2* [“council adjourned sine die” (WR and JDL)], 18* [“meeting adjourned Mon 10” (JDL)], 20*, 27*, 28* April; 20*, 21* May; 2*, 7* August; 12, 13 November; 25, 26, 27 [“These three days Council has been held . . . consisting of 30 to 40 persons” (HCK); “council having [sic] been adjourned sine die from Winter Quarters, and to be at the call of the first Presidency in the Valley” (Orson Hyde during trial of Peter Haws and Lucien Woodworth, 6 January 1849, Pottawattomie
High Council Minute Book, p. 132; “adjourned sine die” (GM)] December 1846—5 meetings during this period.

4. **1848–1850—“Legislative Council” or Provisional State of Deseret (Salt Lake City) Council of Fifty Meetings**

In terms of concentration and involvement, no other period of activity of the Council of Fifty rivals this golden era. Yet for all its accomplishments during this “Provisional State of Deseret” period, the Council of Fifty retired itself seven months before Brigham Young took the oath of office as governor of Utah Territory on 3 February 1851 and fifteen months before the Territorial Legislature first officially sat in session 22 September 1851.

6, 9, 16, 23 December 1848; 6, 20 January; 3, 9, 17, 24 February; 3, 4, 10, 17, 31 March; 5, 14, 28 April; 12, 26 May; 2, 16, 30 June; 2, 7, 11, 15, 19, 21 July; 4, 11, 18, 25, 29 August; 6, 8, 12, 22, 29 September; 5, 10, 13, 20, 27 October; 3, 10 [There was probably a meeting of the Council of Fifty on this date though I have no evidence for it.], 17 November; 22 December 1849; 12 (“adjourned” (TB)], 26 January; 9, 16, 23 February; 30 [“adjourned to last Saturday in June at 1 P.M.” (TB)] March; and 29 [“18 present adjourned until State House is ready, to meet at call of B.Y.” (TB)] June 1850—56 meetings during this period.

5. **1851—The 1851 Utah Territory Council of Fifty Meetings**

On 1 January 1845, William Clayton wrote in his journal that Joseph Smith taught the Council of Fifty the ancient plan of how the “restoration of Union and peace” amongst officials of the Government of God could be achieved. Theoretically, if members of the Council of Fifty could not fellowship one another, their deliberations would be fruitless. If they were at odds one with another they would be unable to be the “Spokesmen of God,” even if they ostensibly followed the rules of the Kingdom. The positive advantages of strict privacy regarding Council of Fifty deliberations, then, provided assurance to Council members that they could, without fear of exposure or public ridicule, freely and fully express their hesitancy or bad feelings for other Council members. Joseph Smith’s belief that such complete fellowship had to exist between members of the legislature of the Kingdom of God impelled him to institute what I call “Fellowship of the Council” meetings. So while it may appear that these 1851 meetings were the Council’s last gasp to return to its golden era, a one last attempt to seize control of the Territory despite the presence of the unwanted gentile officials, actually Utah Territorial business and tensions regarding the first officials were completely ignored in these meetings. These 1851 meetings were originally convened to restore fellowship between certain Council members and not to discuss Utah Territorial affairs. Following the 4 October 1851 meeting, the Council adjourned and did not meet until 1867.
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21, 22, 23 [these three meetings were Fellowship of the Council meetings], 25, 30 August; 13 September; 4 [nine are present for A.M. session—no quorum is available for the P.M. session: "on motion adjourned to the call of the President" [Minutes provide the dates for all the meetings during this period] October 1851—7 meetings during this period.

6. 1867–1868—Utah Territory Council of Fifty Meetings: 1867 Renewal

The 1867 renewal of the Council of Fifty after fifteen years of inactivity must be seen as a subset of Brigham Young’s renewal of Joseph Smith’s many faceted program of “Zion.” Apparently anticipating that with the completion of the railroad in 1869 Babylon would encroach itself on Zion in an unprecedented way, Brigham Young not only renewed Joseph Smith’s concept of the Kingdom of God, but also he began to take steps to revitalize the School of the Prophets, the Relief Society, and the United Order. He created Zion’s Cooperative Mercantile Association (ZCMI), and he performed again the Fulness of the Priesthood Ordinances. All these other elements of “Zion” had not been functioning for at least twenty years. This resurgence was intended to fortify the Church from the influences of forces without. Unlike other programs receiving renaissance beginning with this new era of the Church in 1867, the Council of Fifty was not a substantive stabilizing force within the Church. For example, even ZCMI, commonly considered a product of the Council of Fifty, was a project adopted by the Council three days after the Saints publicly accepted the program in general conference. Since the Council of Fifty did not meet again for nearly twelve years after the 9 October 1868 meeting when it “absorbed” this project, it was not the agency that implemented nor managed ZCMI. Moreover, before the next meeting of the Council in 1880, the decline of the cooperative effort was irreversibly set and the Council did nothing to prevent its extinction in 1882.

23 ["The clerk reported thirteen members died since the last meeting of the Council on the 4th. October 1851; . . . [Brigham Young] stated that he was not aware of any particular business to be brought before the Council, further than to meet and renew our acquaintance with each other in this capacity” (Minutes)], 25 January; 5 April; 5, 10 October 1867; 4, 9 ["The Council of 50 Met but adjourned without doing Business" (WW)] April; 9 October 1868—8 meetings during this period of activity.

7. 1880–1884—Utah Territory Council of Fifty Meetings: 1880 Renewal

As seen by this chronology, the Council of Fifty during the 1880s was not a significant catalyst of Church involvement in politics. Furthermore, even when the Council operated as caucus of and private political machinery behind the Church’s political party—the People’s
Party—the Council’s efforts were narrow and limited. That the Church leadership was the real power behind the People’s Party is supported by the fact that the party continued to function for nearly seven years after the last meeting of the Council of Fifty on 9 October 1884.

10 [“Meeting adj. until 21st April 1880” (Minutes)], 21 [“Adj. Oct. 5. 1880” (Minutes)] April; 5 [“Adjourned till next Tuesday Morning at 10 o’clock” (Minutes)], 12 [“Adjourned till April 5th 1881” (Minutes)] October 1880; 5, 8 April; 18 May; 4 October 1881; 4, 5, April; 21, 22, 23 [“Adjourned till 10 a.m. tomorrow” (Minutes)], 24, 26, 27 [“adjourned till call of the President” (FDR and JHS)] June; 10, 11 [“adjourned till 9 April or till Call” (FDR)]; 10, 11 [“adjourned till 27th June at 2 pm” (RTB)] April; 27, 28, 29 [“adjourned to Oct. 3–2 p.m. unless on call by the President” (FDR)] June; 6th [special meeting of the First Presidency and the members of the Council of Fifty who resided in the Salt Lake City area]; 3 [“adjourned till the 10th instant at 10 a.m.,” (FDR)], 10 [“Council adjourned to Jan 12-1884—10 a.m.” (FDR)] October 1883; 12 [“adjourned till call of the President” (FDR)] January; 8 [“adjourned . . . sine die or until called by the President” (FDR)] April; 8, 9 October 1884; and, 4th February 1885—29 meetings were held during this period.55

55The following is the key to the abbreviations used in the preceding listing. The abbreviations are arranged in alphabetical order according to the first initial. The following sources are available in the Church Archives: AML—Amasa M. Lyman Journal; FDR—Franklin D. Richards Diary; HCK—Heber C. Kimball Diary; JDL—John D. Lee Diary; JS—WR—Joseph Smith Journal kept by Willard Richards; PR—Phinehas Richards Journal; RTB—Robert Taylor Buiton Journal; TB—Thomas Bullock Diary kept as the Historian’s Office Journal; WC—William Clayton Journal; WR—Willard Richards Diary; and WW—Wilford Woodruff Journal. The following source is available in the George A. Smith Family Papers, Western Americana, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah: JHS—John Henry Smith Journal, photocopy of holograph. Minutes—Minutes of the Council of Fifty. Two published sources were also referred to in this listing: HC—Joseph Smith, History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and GM—Letter of George Miller to the Northern Islander, 1 July 1855. The attendance rolls used in compiling this information are as follows: “1845/Apr 22 to Dec 27 [1846] Roll—K. of G.” in the hand of William Clayton; “Roll of Names of members of the Kingdom of God, sitting from Decr 6, 1848 to Mch 4. 49 inc.” in the hand of William Clayton; Roll in the hand of William Clayton for the period of 10 March–3 November 1849; Roll in the hand of William Clayton for the period of 23 January 1867—9 October 1868; and “Roll of Council” for 8 April 1881–23 June 1882 in the hand of L. John Nuttall.
THE Upper CALIFORNIA, O! THAT'S THE LAND FOR ME

John Taylor

The Upper California, O! that's the land for me,
It lies between the Mountains and great Pacific Sea:
    The Saints can be supported there;
    And taste the sweets of liberty,
In Upper California. O! that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

We'll go and lift our standard, we'll go there and be free,
We'll go to California and have our jubilee,
    A land that blooms with endless spring,
    A land of life and liberty,
With flocks and herds abounding. O that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

We'll burst off all our fetters and break the Gentile yoke;
For long it has beset us, but now it shall be broke;
    No more shall Jacob bow his neck;
    Henceforth he shall be great and free,
In Upper California. O! that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

We'll reign, we'll rule, and triumph, and God shall be our king,
The plains, the hills and vallies shall with hosannas ring,
    Our tow'rs and temples there shall rise
    Along the great Pacific sea,
In Upper California. O! that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

We'll ask our cousin Lemuel to join us heart and hand:
And spread abroad our curtains throughout fair Zion's land.
    Till this is done, we'll pitch our tents,
    Along the great Pacific Sea;
In Upper California. O! that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

Then join with me my brethren, and let us hasten there;
We'll lift our glorious standard and raise our house of prayer.
    We'll call on all the nations round,
    To join our standard and be free,
In Upper California. O! that's the land for me.
    O! that's, &c. O! that's, &c.

John Taylor, HYMN 290, Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Europe, 9th ed. rev. and enlarged (Liverpool: F.D. Richards, 1851), pp. 352-54. The Great Basin area east of the Sierra Nevada, where the Saints finally settled, was then known as the Upper California.
Some Thoughts on Higher-dimensional Realms

Robert P. Burton and Bruce F. Webster

For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.
For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.

(Isaiah 55:8-9)

In 1975, the Hyperspace Research Group was established at Brigham Young University. The objective of this group has been to develop special computer graphics techniques for generating and presenting meaningful representations of figures with more than three spatial dimensions. In the course of research, discussions have often arisen about the likelihood of higher spatial dimensions and how their possible existence might relate to our eternal experience. We were particularly excited by the striking similarities between hypothesized four-dimensional phenomena and certain incidents and descriptions found in the scriptures and other religious literature. The results of our discussion and subsequent investigation form the basis of this article.

Our purpose here is not to prove a theory but rather to propose one by exploring some indications and possibilities that have occurred to us. We have not found our theory to be at odds with accepted doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In no sense do we offer our ideas as prospective new doctrine, but merely for contemplation.

While we have found indications in a variety of locations, we have limited our source material almost exclusively to the standard works of the Church and to statements by Joseph Smith and Brigham Young. There are two reasons for this. First, our readers primarily will be Latter-day Saints, and second, a survey of all discussions and
indications of this topic in religious and secular literature would make this article unwieldy and expand its scope at the expense of a closer scrutiny of a rich source of indications. Though we have restricted ourselves primarily to ideas suggested in accepted LDS scriptures and literature, we have been willing to explore some other ideas which, while not precluded by the scriptures, are not dealt with in detail.

There are four major sections in this study. The first is an introduction to the concepts necessary to deal with four (or more) spatial dimensions. Next is a discussion of major indications of higher dimensions found in the scriptures and other LDS sources. The third is an exploration of possibilities of a more speculative nature. Finally, there is a summary with ideas for further investigation.

AN INTRODUCTION TO HYPERSONE

Spatial Dimensions

High school geometry has taught us that each new dimension of space builds upon the previous ones. A point, having no dimensions, is moved through space and defines a one-dimensional line segment. This line segment can then be moved in a direction not contained in itself, and the result is a two-dimensional area. If the area is then moved in a direction not contained in itself, it defines a three-dimensional volume. Length, area, and volume are all concepts with which we are familiar. But what if we go one step further? What sort of geometric entity do we get if we move a three-dimensional volume in a direction not contained in itself? One might protest that there isn’t such a direction, which for some is an acceptable argument. However, if some choose to limit themselves to three dimensions, we must part company at this point. On the other hand, if the readers are willing to postulate a fourth spatial dimension (and there is no reason not to), then a new realm opens up, one which most can scarcely imagine.

All of our mortal experience has been within a three-dimensional universe, and thus we have no natural conception of a fourth dimension. To permit us to deal with these hard-to-grasp concepts, we will rely upon analogy.\(^1\) We will explore the hypothetical interaction between a two-dimensional world and the three-dimensional universe.

that envelops it. Then, by analogy, we will extend our observations to a three-dimensional universe within a four-dimensional realm.

Flatland Revisited

Let us imagine that we have discovered a two-dimensional world complete with two-dimensional creatures living in two-dimensional houses (see Figure 1 on the following page). We would find such a world to be strange, indeed, since it and everything in it would be virtually flat. The creatures' world might be a large, flat disk, and the inhabitants thereof would live on its rim. There creatures would also be flat and would probably live in structures consisting of broad lines with gaps in them for entrances and exits.

While observing this novel situation, we would notice that these flat people could perceive and move in only two dimensions! Such beings could not move in a third dimension except through the intervention of an extra-dimensional force and would probably need special help and protection to survive such an experience. If one such 2-D being were to be taken out of his world and then returned, he would be at a loss for words to describe his adventure because he would have nothing in his previous experience to compare it to. His attempts to describe his perceptions to his peers would be met with puzzlement or scorn. He might even be deemed mad.

As 3-D beings, we would quickly see that there would be no areas in two-space hidden from us. All surfaces, including those considered by the 2-D beings to be completely enclosed, would be open to our inspection. Regardless of how many walls lay between a given room and the outside of the house, for example, we would have access to that room as easily as any other. If our 2-D friend were to lock himself in such a room, we could reach him easily and directly. We could even enter the room, but we would meet with one problem: only a two-dimensional cross section of our body would actually be in that room at any one instant. The "rest" of our body would be on either side of the plane of the two-dimensional world.

We could see not only enclosed areas but also the insides of the walls enclosing the areas. In fact, we could see every particle of every object in the entire 2-D world. No amount of two-dimensional

---

2There must be some three-dimensional thickness or else there can be no interaction at all between a three-dimensional object and the two-dimensional world, since no actual cross section of the three-dimensional object could be defined.

3Since such a being would be infinitesimally thin by our standards, he would probably fall apart upon being subjected to three-dimensional forces.

4Such was the fate of the protagonist of Edwin Abbott's classic work, Flatland. He could only come up with the phrase, "Up, but not North!"

5Ignoring, of course, the problem of distance.
Figure 1. Two-dimensional World

Artwork by Dianne Whitelock Burton
substance could hide anything, because there would be no "behind" from our point of view. The core of the planet would be just as visible as rocks on the surface, and the skeleton and internal organs of a person, as his skin.

Finally we would notice that, due to the infinitesimal 3-D thickness of this 2-D world, an infinite number of such worlds could be "stacked" on top of one another, permitting worlds without end.6 These worlds would be closer together than the pages in a book, and yet no interaction would occur between them without intervention from a higher-dimensional force. The inhabitants of such a world could never know of the existence of these adjacent worlds unless they were told by someone who had been outside of their own plane of existence.

Extending the Analogy

Our purpose thus far has been to establish some of the basic relationships between an n-dimensional universe and the (n + 1)-dimensional realm in which it is contained. But now let us suppose that our three-dimensional universe is enclosed in a four-dimensional realm and that there are beings in that higher realm who are observing us. What would they see? Their initial observation would probably be that our space is "flat" relative to theirs; i.e., it would have only a miniscule extension into the fourth dimension. This earth and the inhabitants thereof (namely us) would all lack extension into the fourth dimension.

They would next observe that, by their standards, we are very limited in our movements and perceptions, functioning only in three dimensions instead of four. If they were to help us "out" of our 3-D predicament, we would find ourselves experiencing perceptions beyond words, or at least beyond familiar words, for our vocabulary is founded upon a three-dimensional experience. If we attempted to describe our adventure to others, we would probably be laughed at or considered insane.

The hyperdimensional beings would quickly discover that there are no volumes or spaces in our dimension into which they could not come. Every room, every container, every vault would be as accessible to them as the 2-D rooms would be to us. A hyperdimensional being—or, rather, a three-dimensional cross section of such a being—could directly enter a room, explore it, and leave again, without having to pass through doors or windows which might even be locked.

---

6Assuming our space is infinite. If it is not, then the number is still very great, but not infinite.
There would be no need for the hyperdimensional being to pass through an opening—it would simply exit our three-dimensional universe.

Not only would all spaces be accessible, but every particle of every object would be exposed to view, just as in our observation of the 2-D world. Our skeletons, the earth’s core—all things (and every particle thereof) would be completely visible to these viewers. Nothing would be hidden or obscured, for there would be nothing to hide “‘behind.’”

A last observation they might make is that an infinite number of our three-dimensional universes could be “‘stacked’” on top of one another, as it were, within their four-dimensional realm. These universes would be separated only by an infinitesimal space and yet could have no interaction with each other by their own efforts. The inhabitants of such universes could only know of and influence their “‘neighbors’” through the intervention of a higher-dimensional power.

Summary of Hypothesized 4-D Phenomena

Before proceeding, we summarize the significant characteristics that might accompany the existence of a higher-dimensional realm:

1. A four-dimensional being could access any part of our universe and could enter into and leave any three-dimensional enclosure (e.g., a room) without having to pass through an opening.

2. A four-dimensional view of our three-dimensional universe would allow the viewer to see every particle of our universe.

3. A three-dimensional being would have difficulty describing four-dimensional objects or events, since he would have but a “‘three-dimensional’” vocabulary to call upon.

4. Many three-dimensional universes could be stacked together within a four-dimensional realm. Interaction between such universes could take place only by employing higher-dimensional forces.

We turn now to the scriptures and other prominent LDS literature to look for indications of these hypothesized phenomena.

---

1Ignoring again the problem of distance.
MAJOR INDICATIONS

Comings and Goings

An incident encountered early in our investigations is found in the Gospel According to John. The setting is a gathering of the apostles shortly after Christ’s death:

Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in their midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.

(John 20:19)

The point of interest here is that “the doors were shut,” which indicates that the Savior appeared in a closed room. Luke also reports this incident and establishes two important points. First, the disciples were upset by Jesus’ arrival and thought him a spirit. Second, Jesus definitely was not a spirit but had a body of “flesh and bones” (Luke 24:36–39). The sudden appearance of a corporeal being in a closed room could be explained by an entrance from another dimension.

This is not an isolated incident. There is at least one other “closed room” event involving Christ after his resurrection. This occurred during his sojourn with the two disciples travelling to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–32). After stopping to dine with them, he was recognized by the two while he blessed the bread, and then he subsequently disappeared from the room.

Celestial messengers have also made “closed room” appearances. Gabriel appeared to Zacharias inside the temple during an important ceremony to tell him of the forthcoming birth of Zacharias’ son, John the Baptist (Luke 1:11, 19). The angel Moroni visited Joseph Smith’s bedside three times during one night to deliver his message. The account of Moroni’s visit is unique in that it contains a detailed description of the actual coming and going of the angel which might suggest a direct route to another realm:

...I discovered a light appearing in my room, which continued to increase until the room was lighter than at noonday, when immediately a personage appeared at my bedside, standing in the air, for his feet did not touch the floor...8

After this communication, I saw the light in the room begin to gather immediately around the person of him who had been speaking to me, and it continued to do so until the room was again left dark, except just around him; when, instantly, I saw, as it were, a conduit open

8A higher-dimensional personage would not need to stand upon the floor; there would probably be no gravitational attraction between him and the elements of our three-dimensional world.
right up into heaven, and he ascended till he entirely disappeared, and the room was left as it had been before this heavenly light had made its appearance.

(Joseph Smith–History 2:30, 43)

In addition to these appearances, there have been numerous "open area" visitations by the Lord and his angels.9 These incidents may lack some of the obvious characteristics of a "closed room" experience, but the questions of origin and means of arrival still arise when they are carefully considered. For example, where did the angel who appeared to Alma the Younger actually come from (Mosiah 27:11)? And how did he travel here and then return again? The same questions can be asked about Christ's visit to the Nephites and the ten tribes and about the other recorded visits of celestial beings to the earth. A possible answer in accordance with our discussion is not that they travelled some number of light-years from another system through empty space, but that they came quickly and directly from another (and perhaps adjacent) dimension.

There are two other points we wish to explore before leaving this topic. First is the process of translation, or being "caught up into heaven."10 In the Book of Moses we find the account of the removal of an entire city—the city of Enoch—an event which provoked those who remained to exclaim, "Zion is fled"! (Moses 7:69). In the same chapter, we find that those who were converted after the city of Enoch departed were "caught up by the powers of heaven into Zion" to be there also (Moses 7:21, 27). In 2 Corinthians, Paul describes being "caught up to the third heaven," possibly while still in a mortal body (2 Cor. 12:2); while in 3 Nephi, the three disciples of Christ were caught up into heaven and then returned to earth (3 Nephi 28:13–16). All of these quotations refer to a phenomenon in which people and other physical objects are suddenly removed from this planet to another place. Where did they go? How did they get there? Again the question arises: did this involve a traversal of interstellar space, or were the people and things in question simply moved to an adjacent realm? For the authors of this article, the inconveniences of interstellar travel, even at speeds near the speed of light, make the latter explanation more acceptable.

The second topic deals with the creation of the earth. Brigham Young, speaking of the Creation and the Fall, used some very

---

9See Joseph Smith–History 2:16–17; 3 Nephi 11:8, 27:1–3; Mosiah 27:11; Daniel 10:5–7; 1 Corinthians 15:5–8, etc.
10While these two phenomena may not be identical, they are similar enough to warrant consideration together.
unusual language when referring to where the earth came from at the
time of the Fall and where it will return someday:

When the earth was framed and brought into existence and man was
placed upon it, it was near the throne of our Father in heaven. And
when man fell . . . the earth fell into space, and took up its abode in this
planetary system, and the sun became our light. . . . This is the glory the
earth came from, and when it is glorified it will return again unto the
presence of the Father, and it will dwell there, and these intelligent be-
ings that I am looking at, if they live worthy of it, will dwell upon this
earth.11

The description of “falling into space” and then leaving to
return to the former place suggests a realm “outside” our universe.
Once again, this can be understood in the context of a fourth spatial
dimension.

*Four-dimensional Perceptions*

Another indication of a possible existence of a fourth spatial
dimension comes from the descriptions found in prophetic visions.
An example is the vision of Moses:

...Moses cast his eyes and beheld the earth, yea, even all of it; and
there was not a particle which he did not behold, discerning it by the
spirit of God.

And he beheld also the inhabitants thereof, and there was not a
soul which he beheld not; and he discerned them by the Spirit of God;
and their numbers were great, even numberless as the sand upon the sea
shore.

(Moses 1:27–29)

Moses’ comment that there was “not a particle” that he did not
see parallels exactly our hypothesis that someone viewing our world
from the fourth dimension would see every particle thereof.

A more unusual vision is described in the first chapter of Ezekiel:

And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a
great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it....
Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living
creatures. And this was their appearance; they had the likeness of a
man.

And every one had four faces, and every one had four wings....
And they had the hands of a man under their wings on their four
sides; and they four had their faces and their wings.
Their wings were joined one to another; they turned not when they
went; they went every one straight forward.

---

cited as JD. See also JD, 9:317.
...whither the spirit was to go, they went; and they turned not when they went....
And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.
Now as I beheld the living creatures, behold one wheel upon the earth by the living creatures....
The appearance of the wheels...was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel.
When they went, they went upon their four sides: and they turned not when they went.

(Ezekiel 1:4-18)

The highly unusual and somewhat confusing language that Ezekiel used to describe what he saw might well be the result of the inadequacy of our language to describe hyperdimensional objects or events. His description of "a wheel in the middle of a wheel" could suggest a four-dimensional torus, just as a hypercube is often represented as a cube within a cube (see Figure 2). The reference to multiple-sided beings who went straight forward (though, apparently, facing in different directions) parallels in part a description of a hyperobject entering our space. These, of course, are only possibilities, but we feel that they may be viable.

Earlier, we alluded to the experience of the three Nephite disciples' being caught up into heaven. What they saw there they were forbidden to discuss. The description of this event, however, carries the implication that their experience simply could not be articulated:

And behold, the heavens were opened, and they were caught up into heaven, and saw and heard unspeakable things.
And it was forbidden them that they should utter; neither was it given unto them power that they could utter the things which they saw and heard.13

(3 Nephi 28:13-14)

Adjacent 3-D Universes
The first possibility that springs to mind when considering the topic of adjacent 3-D universes is the nature and location of that realm which we call the "spirit world":

The spirits of the just are exalted to a greater and more glorious work; hence they are blessed in their departure to the world of spirits.

12Abbott, Flatland, p. 72.
13See also 3 Nephi 17:15-17.
Enveloped in flaming fire, they are not far from us, and know and understand our thoughts, feelings, and motions, and are often pained therewith.

Flesh and blood cannot go there; but flesh and bones, quickened by the Spirit of God, can.¹⁴

There are myriads of disembodied evil spirits—those who have long ago laid down their bodies here and in the regions round about among and

---

around us; and they are trying to make us and our children sick, and are trying to destroy us and tempt us to evil.15

When you lay down this tabernacle, where are you going? Into the spiritual world.... Where is the spirit world? It is right here.16

The preceding quotations of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young indicate that there is a world of spirits very near to us and yet seldom perceived by us. While those spirits can view us and can to a certain degree affect us, we cannot see them without special help from God. Enoch, for example, anointed his eyes as directed by the Lord and was able to see spirits and other "things which were not visible to the natural eye" (Moses 6:35–36). Elisha prayed, and the servant of Elisha beheld the army of spirits surrounding the besiegers of Dothan:

And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw; and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.

(2 Kings 6:17)

Other indications of the existence of adjacent 3-D universes are found in the books of Moses and Abraham. In the vision referred to earlier, Moses saw this:

And he beheld many lands; and each land was called earth, and there were inhabitants on the face thereof.17

(Moses 1:29)

This passage could be interpreted at least three ways. First, Moses could have seen other planets within our own universe; second, he could have seen different planets adjacent to the earth in different 3-D universes; or third, he could have seen our earth at several different points in time. An echo of the image of multiple worlds is found in Abraham's vision:

And he said unto me...., behold, I will show you all these. And he put his hand upon mine eyes, and I saw those things which his hands had made, which were many; and they multiplied before mine eyes, and I could not see the end thereof.

(Abraham 3:12)

Brigham Young has also indicated that there are more kingdoms than we realize:

15JD, 6:73; see also JD, 5:54–55.
16JD, 3:369.
17Moses 1:11 explains that one must have spiritual eyes to see the things of God.
How many kingdoms of glory there are, I know not; and how many
degrees of glory there are in these kingdoms, I know not; but there are
multitudes of them. 18

The kingdoms that God has prepared are innumerable. 19

ADDITIONAL POSSIBILITIES

Our purpose in this section is to present ideas that have come as
we have pondered and discussed the implications of a possible hyper-
dimensional existence. Simply put, we are taking a fresh look at cer-
tain gospel teachings in light of the hypothesis that there is a hyper-
dimensional existence, to see if the hypothesis may be consistent with
these teachings and perhaps of some value in helping us comprehend
some heretofore difficult to understand occurrences.

Increasing Dimensions

After one has entertained the possibility of a fourth spatial
dimension, the next question almost inevitably is—Is there a fifth? A
sixth? Then, is there an end to it? If there might be additional
dimensions, then interesting interpretations of two basic doc-
trines—different kingdoms of glory and eternal progression—in invite
consideration.

Kingdoms of Glory. The seventy-sixth section of the Doctrine
and Covenants tells us that there are three principal kingdoms or
realms of glory: the celestial, the terrestrial, and the telestial (vv.
50–113). Those in the celestial kingdom will enjoy the presence of
God and Christ (v. 62); those in the terrestrial will have just the
presence of Christ (v. 77); and those in the telestial, the presence of
neither (vv. 86, 112). The idea that the inhabitants of a particular
kingdom cannot visit higher kingdoms but can visit lower kingdoms is
implicitly (and to a degree explicitly) stated in this section (vv. 77,
86–88, 112). One possible explanation for this limitation would be
that each kingdom has one more spatial dimension than the next
lower kingdom. Thus the inhabitants of a given kingdom could not
enter into the next higher kingdom any more than we could by our
own power leave this three-dimensional space and move about in one
which has four dimensions. The inhabitants of a dimensionally
superior kingdom could, however, visit any lower kingdom contained
within their space, just as we could visit a two-dimensional world if

18JD, 9:107.
19JD, 8:154.
such a world existed within our universe. This bring us to our next point.

_Eternal Progression._ We can consider the concept of eternal progression in a similar fashion. Joseph Smith's statement about progression and exaltation takes on a special meaning if our hypotheses are correct:

What did Jesus do? Why; I do the things I saw my Father do when worlds come rolling into existence. My Father worked out his kingdom with fear and trembling, and I must do the same; and when I get my kingdom, I shall present it to my Father, so that he may obtain kingdom upon kingdom, and it will exalt him in glory. He will then take a higher exaltation, and I will take his place, and thereby become exalted myself. So that Jesus treads in the tracks of his Father and inherits what God did before; and God is thus glorified and exalted in the salvation and exaltation of all His children.²⁰

We wonder if that advancement in exaltations may not be advance-
ment to a higher dimension. This idea has at least two implications. First, it would give an exalted person dominion over an infinity of dimensionally inferior realms similar to the realm of his previous
dominion. Second, it would allow each of those "under" him to ad-

tance to the position previously occupied by him. In light of this
possibility, the following passages from the Doctrine and Covenants
offer a new meaning:

All kingdoms have a law given;
And there are many kingdoms; for there is no space in the which
there is no kingdom; and there is no kingdom in the which there is no
space, either a greater or a lesser kingdom.
And unto every kingdom is given a law; and unto every law there
are certain bounds also and conditions. (D&C 88:36–38)

This earth, in its sanctified and immortal state, will be made like
unto crystal and will be a Urim and Thummim to the inhabitants who
dwell thereon, whereby all things pertaining to an inferior kingdom, or
all kingdoms of a lower order, will be made manifest to those who dwell
on it; and this earth will be Christ's.
Then the white stone mentioned in Revelation 2:17 will become a
Urim and Thummim to each individual who receives one, whereby
things pertaining to a higher order of kingdoms will be made known.
(D&C 130:9-10)

Here, explicit reference is made to greater (or higher) and lesser
kingdoms filling up all of existence. In fact, the last passage quoted

seems to indicate that there will be an order of kingdoms higher than the celestial kingdom that will exist on this earth after its sanctification. Again, Brigham Young is not without comment on this subject:

And when we have passed into the sphere where Joseph [Smith] is, there is still another department, and then another, and another, and so on to an eternal progression in exaltation and eternal lives.21

**Nature of Time**

The nature of time, a subject far too complex to be given just treatment here, still deserves mention. In various places in the scriptures, we read where prophets were shown the future with detailed accuracy, such visions often encompassing the entire history of the earth.22 For example, Joseph Smith said:

> The great Jehovah contemplated the whole of the events connected with the earth, pertaining to the plan of salvation, before it rolled into existence, or ever “the morning stars sang together” for joy; the past, the present, and the future were and are, with him, one eternal “now.”23

Because of this quote as well as passages in the scriptures and elsewhere, we offer the possibility that time as we perceive it may itself be a dimension, and that those existing in higher dimensions may view time in its entirety (see Alma 40:8), just as one could see the entire Grand Canyon from the air but could only see a small portion at a time if traversing it on foot. We offer this idea as a suggestion and forgo its exploration at present.

**CONCLUSION**

Lest any of our readers misunderstand the nature and purpose of this article, we emphasize the following:

1. We do not claim to have proved or established anything, nor do we think our ideas are provable at this time. We are only exploring possible (though, to us, somewhat satisfying) explanations of certain passages of scripture and statements by major LDS authorities.

2. We do not claim that our explanations of these passages are correct—merely possible.

3. We do not claim that the concept of hyperspace resolves anything, though we do feel that it both simplifies

---

21JD, 3:375.
22Moses 1 and 7; Ether 3:25–26; Mormon 8:35; Isaiah 29, etc.
23Smith, *Teachings*, p. 220; see also D&C 84:100.
concepts and forms an apparently consistent framework in which to contemplate.

4. Though we have not restricted ourselves exclusively to accepted ideas, we do not find our comments to be at odds with LDS doctrine or teachings; rather, our speculations offer a more comfortable explanation of some heretofore difficult to understand concepts and occurrences.

The purpose of this paper has been to consider the possibility of hyperdimensional realms, using scripture and statements of prominent LDS authorities as principal sources. We invite further discussion on the subject. We suggest these additional areas of exploration:

1. A new survey of religious and philosophical books written on the subject.
2. A study of religious language intimating hyperdimensional references, such as the passage from Isaiah.
3. A study of the nature of man, including birth, body–spirit relationships, and near-death and clinical-death descriptions from LDS literature and other sources.
4. An analysis of indications found in such sources as apocryphal literature, literature from other religions, and comments from other LDS authorities.
5. Some speculation on the physics of the situation. For example, a very small 4-D thickness might become significant on a subatomic level. How might that affect particle behavior?
6. Some contemplation on how the idea of higher dimensions might affect our perceptions of ourselves, of our relationship with God, and of our understanding of the universe.

Investigation of these and other related topics may lead us to a greater understanding of the nature of existence and our position therein. We hope that such an understanding will humble us through a tiny glimpse of the glory of God and will help us to draw closer to our Eternal Father, to follow in his footsteps forever.

When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?
For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.

(Psalms 8:3–5)
The Historians Corner

Edited by James B. Allen

Historical research sometimes takes on a very personal flavor, as it did recently when Donald Q. Cannon discovered that one of his ancestors was the last Mormon to hear the final testimony of the last of the Three Witnesses to the Book of Mormon. In this issue of "The Historians Corner" Professor Cannon uses this incident to demonstrate the value of comparing primary and secondary sources in attempting to validate historical claims.

The second item in this issue comes from Ronald K. Esplin, whose continuing study of Brigham Young has given him some important insight into various personal characteristics of this pioneer leader. He has used the publication of a tender, heartwarming letter written by Brigham Young in 1840 as an opportunity to illustrate some of these characteristics.

ANGUS M. CANNON AND DAVID WHITMER: A COMMENT ON HISTORY AND HISTORICAL METHOD

Donald Q. Cannon

Angus M. Cannon was apparently the last Latter-day Saint to hear David Whitmer’s testimony concerning the origin of the Book of Mormon. David Whitmer was the last to die of the Three Witnesses who testified that a heavenly angel had shown them the plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated.

The first inkling I had of Angus Cannon’s association with David Whitmer came through reading a newsletter of the George Cannon Family Association. As a great-grandson of Angus Cannon, I read the November 1973 issue of The Cannon Chronicle with great interest because it contained the following lead article:

Donald Q. Cannon is a professor of Church history and doctrine, Religious Instruction, Brigham Young University.
I. Angus M. Cannon’s Story of David Whitmer’s Testimony as told by Charles F. Solomon, March 2, 1952.

The writer, Charles F. Solomon, was intimately acquainted and lived and traveled with President Angus M. Cannon, who was the son of Ann Quayle and George Cannon, the Immigrant. Charles F. Solomon lived in Salt Lake in Beatrice Cannon Evans neighborhood and recounted this experience with her grandfather, Angus M. Cannon. At her request he wrote this so that we can all share it.

“In the year of 1897, President Cannon told me he was on the 25 day of January 1888 returning from the east and concluded to call at the home of David Whitmer in Richmond, Missouri, who was one of the three witnesses to the Book of Mormon. President Cannon found David Whitmer on his death bed, with his wife and family around his bed. His wife, Mrs. Whitmer, asked President Cannon to remain with them, which he did, and before Mr. Whitmer passed away he said he wanted his entire family to know for assurity that he did hear the voice of the Lord, and he did see the angel of the Lord and hear them both testify the Book of Mormon was translated correctly and did contain a true and correct record of Christ’s teachings and the history of the ancient inhabitants of this continent.

“President Cannon stated that he remained in Richmond for the funeral of David Whitmer, and on 26 of January 1888 he walked down the street and saw three elderly men standing together. He addressed them saying, ‘Did any of you men know David Whitmer?’ To which one replied, ‘We all knew him very well.’ President Cannon said, ‘Did any of you ever hear him deny the divine authenticity of the Book of Mormon,’ to which one of the men replied, ‘See that saloon right there? We took him in there one day, and knowing that he liked liquor, we got him thoroughly intoxicated and I said, ‘Now Dave, what have you got to say about that old Book of Mormon?’’ ‘The man told President Cannon Mr. Whitmer had a cap on his head which he removed and held in his left hand over his heart, raised his right hand to the square, and said, ‘Gentlemen, I will have to admit you have got me thoroughly intoxicated, but I positively cannot deny the truthfulness of the Book of Mormon. I did hear the voice of the Lord. I did see the angel and hear both of them declare the truthfulness of this record.’

Respectfully

Charles F. Solomon’’

As I read this article I became very skeptical about its authenticity. Having been trained as a professional historian, and having taught history at the college level for several years, I was suspicious because of the nature of the source. It was a secondhand reminiscence of an event that took place sixty-four years earlier: Charles F. Solomon, who did not experience the event, was relating
from his memory in 1952 something that supposedly happened to Angus M. Cannon in 1888, but that President Cannon did not tell him about until 1897. Such evidence is always suspect by historians.

My original feelings of skepticism were suddenly transformed into a spirit of acceptance, however, as I in working on a current research project was reading the Angus M. Cannon journals, recording excerpts, and writing notes and commentary. The journals consist of seventy-two volumes located at the Library–Archives, Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City. While studying the journal for 1888, I was delighted to find the following passage, which seemed to confirm that my ancestor was indeed the last to hear the testimony of David Whitmer:

Jan 7, 1888, Sat.

I took RR tem at Lexington Junction and reached Richmond after going 8 miles where I got breakfast—at Hotel and visited David Whitmer 83 years old that day. He said:—My friend, if God ever uttered a truth the testimony I now hear is true. I did see the angel of God and beheld the glory of the Lord and He declared that Record true. I felt I should be the last stranger to hear it.

I immediately recognized the relationship of this diary entry to the story recounted by Charles F. Solomon. Although Charles Solomon clearly embellished the account, the essential facts were supported by the journal entry. Indeed, Angus M. Cannon was probably the last member of the Church to hear the testimony of the last survivor of the Three Witnesses.¹

Here is a fascinating example of the difference between a reminiscence and a journal entry. The reminiscence recalls the essential core issues, but also adds detail and color which probably were not part of the original experience. The diary entry, on the other hand, refines and sharpens the image produced by the reminiscence. It contains the facts as recorded by the observer at the time of the event. Both kinds of sources are important in helping us understand the past. In this instance, both sources tell us that Angus M. Cannon was the last of the Latter-day Saints to hear the testimony of David Whitmer.²
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INSIDE BRIGHAM YOUNG: ABRAHAMIC TESTS AS PREPARATION FOR LEADERSHIP

Ronald K. Esplin

Recently a competent observer and writer on the Mormon past read to a literary group a chapter of an unpublished work. Discussion followed on the suffering and sacrifice associated with many of Brigham Young’s demands upon the Saints. The audience wondered how he could make such requests. Were his perceptions untempered by an appreciation of the human pain and sacrifice involved? It was concluded that the Church leader was neither naturally sensitive nor was he taught by experience to feel the cost of what he asked. The discussion was not necessarily critical of Brigham Young: it was agreed only that certain harsh exigencies often demand this type of leadership.

The fact that competent students of the Mormon past could agree on a conclusion so out of harmony with President Young’s real inner character highlights the difficulty of getting at a man’s motivations and deepest emotions. As with many public figures, Brigham Young’s public persona and popular stereotypes interfere with understanding the man. Highly disciplined, he seldom allowed his tender emotions to surface publicly. Nor do most of his letters, coming to us through a clerk’s hand, preserve certain important nuances of his personality.

Rare personal (holograph) writings where Brigham Young bares his soul during times of trial provide some of the best windows to his inner self. Of these, none is better than a recently available holograph letter from Brigham Young, written while he was in England, to his wife, who remained in Nauvoo. By considering this important letter in its larger historical setting, we come to better appreciate the qualities of Brigham Young’s personality that have long been obscured but that really were the basis for his leadership, qualities that his people responded to.

In April 1838, a revelation through Joseph Smith counseled Brigham Young to settle on his newly purchased Missouri farm “until I shall command him to go hence, and not to leave his family until

Ronald K. Esplin, a Ph.D. candidate in history at Brigham Young University, is a research historian in the History Division of the Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.
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they are amply provided for."1 But violence and the forced removal from Missouri followed a short season of respite with his family, and soon Brigham was needed again in the ministry in spite of the fact that his family, like most of the refugee Mormons, was penniless.

Nothing could have been more difficult for Brigham than to leave his family poorly housed, without provisions and prostrated by sickness. Yet duty was unmistakable. The very circumstances that had impoverished his family had also shattered the Church. It was imperative, Joseph explained, to seek new blood and new resources in England. And there was a promise: while he was away on the Lord’s errand, his family would be protected and provided for. Without hesitation—though not without pain—he embarked.

It was September 1839 when Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball left the Mississippi river bottoms that would become Nauvoo. Brigham’s family members, all sick with river fevers, were poorly housed with other Missouri refugees in abandoned Fort Des Moines on the Iowa side of the river. His wife Mary Ann had delivered a baby girl only ten days before. Brigham, also suffering from river sickness, required assistance even to walk.

By the time they arrived in England, Elder Young’s health had improved enough to lead the Twelve in a highly successful mission. Trusting his family to God freed his mind and energies for missionary service. Still, he could not forget his distant loved ones. Nor could he suppress entirely the longing to be with them again, to labor with his own hands to protect and provide for his own.

This letter—really a series of letters—was written more than a year after Brigham’s last glimpse of his wife and children and many months after he left the shores of his beloved America. It reveals an important quality of this future Church leader seldom seen in the records of his public activities—his deep concern and affection for his family and, equally important, his great empathy for the families of all those with whom he was associated. Further comment on the significance of this side of his personality will follow the document.2

---

2After many years in private hands, this holograph letter was recently donated to the Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and is here reprinted with their permission. Paragraphing has been supplied, along with minimum punctuation for clarity. Personal and place names and the first word of each sentence have been capitalized even in cases where they were not in the original. Spelling and grammar remain the same as in the document.
Once more I take my pen to wright to you. It is about five weak sence I wrote; it was [sent] by Brother [Theodore] Turley who saled from Liverpool the 7 of september with about 200 of the Brethren. We have not hered from them yet, but think we shall before long. Brother P[arley] P. Pratt, that left here the first of July for New York for to bring his famely, we have not hered a word from him. We have hered of O[ron] Hyde & J[ohn] E. Pages starting for Jerusalem but have not scene them yet. We hope we shall before we leve England. They doe not apar to progress in there jorny much faster then we did. I am very anxious to have them arive here for I long to see them. Brother Levi Richards wrote from Richmond July the 18th if I reculect right. He stated in his letter that about 10 of the Bretherin would start from New York the first of September. I hope they will be here soon for we want help in the v인이다. The work is grate in this country—and to all apperance it will be very short for nothing but destruction awates this Nation; it will specilly be upon them. I have not herd who is acomin but I trust they will be good men that will be sent, for churely it requires men of strong mind and determined persistence to due all things right, & then due nothing more.

I find I am not in America althou there is carly [scarcely] a night but what I dreme of being in my own native country with some of my old frends. Brother O Pratt received a letter from his wife and one from Dr. [Lucien R?] Foster dated September. They both stated that the families of the Bretherin ware all well, which gave me feelings of joy to here from my wife and children while in a far contry. I am rejoiced to here that you are this side [of] the missicippy River. I hope you and the rest of the Bretherin will have the priveledge of staying their [in the Nauvoo area] till we returne and could wish that we might still have the prevelige of staying their and making our selves comfortable.

I trust within one year from this time I shall have the priveledge [of] injoying the society of my famely; I feel as though their faceses would look and voices sound better then ever before. How I long to see my wife and children. When I let my mind meditate upon past scenes and the triels we have past through to gether, I feel as thou I could not concet to be so far from them, and where I cannot administer to their comfort. But so it is, and I must be content. One thing I have to say praise God for it: I have wanted for nothing but what I could get. All of my wants have ben suplied. There has ben an effectul dore opened for us sence we left home. Could I be sure that my famely fared as well as I due, I would be happy. Still I have not ben concerned about them, for the Lord said by the mouth of Brother Joseph that they should be provided for, and I believed it. And through the goodness of God I have ben abailed to send some little help to you, which I hope you have injoyed the good of in a degree.

We have past through scenes that when I think of it causes my hart [to] greve and morn. your scenes in Kirtland and going up to Mos. [Missouri], your sickness the summer we ware there, and fortuge [fatigue] comming out of the State. I never want you to moove agan unless I am with you, if it can be so. But I trust I shall be recounceled to all things, knowing that all shall worke to gether for good especilly to them that love the Lord. And I think we have grate reson to love and serve him. To think that we have the priveledge of seeing and knowing what we doe in these last days, while thousands are in midnight darkness.
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Sence we have ben in Manchester We have don all that we posably could to spread this work. We have succeeded in makeing the priest mad, so that they rave like demonds. We keepe Baptiseing every weak which causes much per[se]cution. We have Baptised som of the old West[y]ans, which makes them feele verry uneasy.

I am with Brother [Willard] Richards at Present. His wife[']s sister Jennette has got a fine Boy. His name is Hebor John. He was born last Sabath the 11 of oct about 10 C—A.M. Brother and Sister Richards talks much about you. He thinks he has got the best woman for his wife that there is in the World, excep you. Their is non better in his eye then coson Mary ann. Brother [Heber C.] Kimball is with me. We are agoing to leve here soon for Preston and Liverpool on som buyness concerning the Book of Mormon.3 When we get through with our buyness in this part of country we exspect to go[o] to London to [spend] the Winter or the most of it their.4 I think it will be an advantage to my helth. I doe not enjoy good helth in this place though my helth is much better then it was. I trust I shall regain my helth again by a nother year. If [I] could be in a warm contry it would be better for me.

I som expect som to goe in to Hamburge Germany befor I return home. We have one Elder there. I hope there will be a church there before we leve this contry. Their is a small branch in Ireland. Brother Theadoah [Theodore] Curtis from New York is laboring their. Brothers [John] Taylor and [Hiram] Clark is on the Ile of Man; the work takes grate hold their.

[Four days later, October 20]

20—Yesterday about 2 ocklock in after noon Brother P.P. Pratt his wife, wife[']s sister and children arived here in Manchester. Brothers Kimball & Richards and my self had jest recieved two letters. One from Orson Hyde. He was in Phedeldelphy. Brother Page was not with him. He thought he should come with Brother Pratt. The other letter was from Father John Smith to George Smith. We ware just rejoicing for the knews from America when P. P[ Pratt] and famely arived. I know [now] am at liberty to goe to other places to Preach and attend to business. Br. P. Pratt had a long joriny. 37 days going to New York, 34 on there return to Liverpool. But they are all well and in good spirits. But I think they will get enuph of old England before one year roles around. I am glad that my famely is in America and if it was the will of the Lord I should be willing to be their my self though I am contented here at present.5

How much I think of [the] children. I want them to be [good?] children. I pray for you all continually that God will preserve you from all evell from sickness and from sin. My daughter Elizabeth be a good girl. Love and serve the Lord with all your hart. Stay at home, goe not into company unless it is among humble ones. Let your mother direct you in all things. I pray the Lord to preserve you and the rest of the

---

3The Twelve Apostles published the Book of Mormon in Liverpool during their mission.
4Inserted at corner of manuscript page:

"Mr. Brigham Young
52 Iron Monngor Row St. Luke Church
London
in care of Henry Connor
direct all of your letters to me after you receive this as above states as I expect to spend the winter and Spring their. B. Young."

children. I have sent you som presents, but I have one for you and Vilate that I keep till I com home and bring it to you my self. Elizabeth doe not run about any but take good care of your heth and take care of the little children and mind your mother. I want my daughter Vilate to be a good girl and mind your mother. Spend all the time you can get in stud[y]ing your book and instructing the little children.

[Ten days later]

Oct 30 I jest arrived in Liverpool with Brother Kimball. There was a letter here fore him from his wife. It gave us good knews from our famelys except the sickness of Elizabeth and Vilate which I hope is over by this time. I aske my Hevenly Father to preserve my famely till I returne home. How I long to see my famely or know they are well and provided for so that they doe not suffer for food and rament. And I know that the Church is poor and it is as much as they can doe to attend to without doing anything for my famely. I know they woul[d] [have] done [something] if they could but th[e]y cannot.6 Sister Kimball states in his letter that you boath had receive[d] a present we sent you. I am thankeful that I had it in my power to send you som assistence, and be fore this I hope you have reciev[ed] som things from Br Turly which will cause you to rejoic[e] I think.

Last weak Brother Kimball and my self left Manchester for Preston and Liverpool on buisness about the Book of Mormon. Last Monday a letter came to Preston from Br Richards. Stated that Br Lorenzo Snow had arived from Nauvoo. Had brought a letter from you [and] one from Presedent Joseph Smith in ancer to mine to him. We wrote to Manchester to have Br Richards to keep all the letters till we returne to that place. When I com to your letter I except I shall want to wright agane but I doe not know what the knews will be but hope it will [be] good. The worke of the Lord is roll-ing on in this contry. The Elders are going in every direction to preach. The people are reciving there testemony and they are building up Churches in meny parts of the Land. The Book of Mormon will not be out of press as soon as we expect but we shall get it to the People as soon as we can.

I feele to say [a] fue words of what past yesterdy. We ware in South Port at the house of Sister Dickson, Brother Peter Mellen [Melling] the Patriarch was there. He was fild with the holy Spirit of the Lord [which] was upon him. He Proveside [prophesied] concerning things which caused my hart to rej[o]ice in the Lord. I feele to say no more about it at present but may hereafter.

Sister Kimball stated in his letter there had ben about 50 deths this seson. This gives pane of hart but still I feele they are better of[f] [there] then they are here. Nauvoo is a sickely place. I think the mob will not truble them selves about the saints while they are in Nauvoo. I expect I should hardly know the Place if [I were] to come home now. And my Children will grow out of my knowledge so things will will [sic] apear strange to me no doubt when I doe come. I hope and pray you will not have so much trial to pass through as to alter you so I shall not know you. Sister Vilate says your house could hardly be caud [called] a shelter. This makes me fee[l] bad but I will doe [all] I can for you to help you to make you and the Children comfortable while I am in the vinyard.

---

6In spite of a Church resolution 4 August 1839 "that the Twelve proceed on their mission as soon as possible, and that the Saints provide for their families during their absence," Brigham Young had no illusion about Church resources to do so. *HC*, 4:5.
Doe tell mee somthing about T[other] B. Marsh when you wright agan if you
can and tell me about him. 1 have som dreams about him and others. Sister Kim-
bball also states that Br Joseph Smith was agoing to send for som of the Elders to come
home and takcare of their famelies. Perhaps I am one of them. I have not seen his
letter yet. I think we shall get home jestebout the right time. I want the Lord to con-
duct the hol matter, for I doe not feele as though I could doe enny thing with out
him. The Lord must guide me or I shall goe rong.

How doe the church feele about Br Joseph Smith at [this time?] Is there feelings
agant him. I have ben informed he has said the Brotherin would for sake him and
som of them would secke his life and he would have to swim the Miss[ssi]p[pi] River
to get out of their hands.8 I shall be glad when [the] Church understand things and
Lern that the Lord and he will takcare of his own work, and Moses will doe the
work the Lord tells him to doe. May the Lord preserve us from provoking him as the
Children of Israel did the Lord and Moses in there day. I aske one thing of the Lord
God the Eternall Father in [the] name of Jesus Christ that is that our Moses9 that the
Lord has given us, may live to see the winding up scene of this generation, sin and in-
etquity destroyed from the face of the Earth and Jesus come to raign with his people
on the Earth and he go into the promist Caneneon [Canaan].

To Brother Joseph Young: we wis[h] you and your Br[other]n the Presedents of
the 70ts wou[d] send som faithfull Elders that are men of judgment and that is
able of buylding up the Church—and managen things in the Church. And also
see the Presedent of the Hy Priest Quorum and send som high priest. We have
hered their is som on the way but we have seene non. [Jorenzo] Snow is in Man-
chester. We want menny. Brothers Hadlock [Reuben Hedlock] and [Hiram] Clark
will soon be gone over with companys. The Saints have got a start for to gether to
America and goe they will, and nothing can stop them. And it is nesarry to send
some one of the America Brotherin with them. But for Heven sake due not send men
here that is to big to be counsled. We doe not want men to leve there famelies to suf-
ferr for we can see enuph of poverty here with out here [hearing] of it from home
among the Church there.

Some have sailed for New Orleans. Brother Mulner [Samuel Mulliner] and
som famelies from Scotland—they have ben gone about 2 weeks. We expect a com-
pany to start about the first of February. Provibly Br Hadlock will goe with them. A
nother company in spring early as posable. And so[o]n they [will?] have so much of
the spirit of getherin that they would goe if they knew they would die as soon as they
got there or if they knew that the mob would be upon and drive them as so[o]n as
they got there. They have the spirit of the times here as well as the Church there.
They get the spirit of Provisi [prophecy] upon them and they tell many things that is

---

1Thomas B. Marsh was President of the Quorum of the Twelve when he left the Church in Missouri,
1838, leaving Brigham Young as senior member and President of the Quorum.
2Note the foreshadowing of Joseph's death including his crossing the Mississippi River to escape events
that when acted out four years later would thrust Brigham Young to the head of Church administration. Had
Joseph anticipated that event as early as 1840?
3Those aware of Brigham Young's leadership after Joseph's death have often likened him to a latter-day
Moses. To Brigham Young the disciple, Joseph Smith was clearly "our Moses," an analogy he used more
than once.
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about so and all we can due is to laugh at them a little and so pass it off. There will be a grate menny comming next seson.

I wish you would get council from Br Joseph Smith and doe acordinly. We will not ask you to send more Elders to us then we send to you. A change of Pasters [pastures] makes fat calves. So it is in comparison with the Elders. They due better in a strange contry then in there own as a general thing. Give my love to [your wife] Jane and the children and to all my fr[i]end[s]. I have not time and paper to men-chen names—I remember all of them—I am your Br in the New Cv. [Covenant]. Brigham Young

Mary: I shall not have time and room to say much more to you at present. I shall wright again soon as I trust you will be enabled to take letters out of the office. I dreame last night of seeing the house where you live & that it looked very open and cold. I feele for you. Tell [the] Brs of the first Presedent [Presidency] my love to them. I want you to see Br. Truman Angel for me and if you can due enny thing for him due it for me or my sake. Give my love to Mother Angel and Careoline. I am glad that you have not come a way from that contry. I trust I shall have plasher of seeing that contry again. I am rejoiced to here that the Brotherin are settin up west and north. Take good care of the little Children. I have sent som presents to the Children. I am your husben and

frend in [the] E[verlasting]. C[ovenant]. Brigham Young

[Note: Brigham Young penned three postscripts before finally posting the letter, the last short greeting being added after the letter was sealed and addressed:]

Mary take no concern about me for I am doing as well as I can and fare as well as I can ask. The Brotherin and Sisters would pluck out there eyes for me if it ware nessary. They due all they can for my comfort. They feed me and give me close and monny. They wash my feet and wate upon me as they would a little child. And may the Lord bless them for it and he will and they shall stand upon Mount Zion.

The climet dos not agree with me in this contry. I expect to try London this winter to see how that place will agree with me though my helth is a grate deal better then it was when I first came here. The helth of all the Bretheren is better. Be of good chere, the time will soon come when we shall meet agan and rejoice to gether. I suppose the time seemes long to you and the Children that I am gon; it would seeme longer ware it not the will of Lord. When I think how diligent you are and how faithful to my famely and willing to suffer for the sake of my going to preach the gospel, you must be blest and blest you shall be. I pray the Lord to Bles you and I Bles you and all the faithful sisters—so farewell.

I am now in Liverpool but shall goe to Manchester to morrow or next day. Shall see Br Snow and find out more about things. I want to here from Br [Sidney] Rigdon and know how he is and Br. G. Roberson [George W. Robinson]. Give my love to them. Tell my Br[other]s acording to the flesh to not come here till I returne home. May the Lord bless you and the Children and preserve your lives and helthes. I am as ever.

Bro Kimball sends his love to you and the children and all the frends.

---

10 Joseph and Hyrum Smith both instructed the elders that only the first principles of the gospel should be taught abroad. Additional doctrines should be taught only in Nauvoo where priesthood direction could insure their correctness. In the spirit of this principle, Brigham Young chose to treat doctrinal questions and speculations—even when prompted by the Spirit—with humor, rather than with confirmation or denial.
Elder Young returned to Nauvoo in the spring of 1841 to find his family well. A few weeks later he learned through Joseph that the Lord recognized the successful completion of his trial:

Dear and well-beloved brother, Brigham Young, verily thus saith the Lord unto you: My servant Brigham, it is no more required at your hand to leave your family as in times past, for your offering is acceptable to me.

I have seen your labor and toil in journeyings for my name. I therefore command you to send my word abroad, and take especial care of your family from this time, henceforth and forever.11

No more would he travel abroad, leaving his family a year or more at a time. But shorter missions continued. The summer of 1843, for example, found him again on assignment in the East with his family ill in Nauvoo. Though he had largely recovered from his almost fatal illness of the winter before, his own health was still poor. Deeply concerned about his family, he had already sent five letters homeward without response before writing again on 17 August: "When I was so sick, I thought if I could only be home, I should be thankful. There is no place like home to me." Nonetheless, if only he had health to labor, he was willing to leave "home and all that is deare to me for the sake of the gospel." "You and I," he wrote Mary Ann, "must take some masure to recover our helth or we shall not last a grate meny years; and I want that we should live for meny years yet and due much good on the earth."12

Indeed, continuing sickness was the reason that Mary Ann had not written sooner. The day before Brigham Young posted the above letter Mary Ann had finally written. "My dear and well Beloved husband," she began. "While our little family is quirely resting in bed, which has been very seldom for four weeks past," she could steal a few moments to write a tale of suffering and sickness. She and the children had been ill with everything from influenza and scarlet fever to little Mary's canker "so she did not swallow for ten or eleven days eny thing But drink." Daughter Vilate had just taken sick in a very severe manner so she appeared nigh unto Death, But through mercy of God and the utmost exertion She is quite comfortable. The children are all geting Better and I can truly Say, I feel thankful for I am much worn down with Standing over them By day and By night and hearing their cries with pain and distress oftimes calling for Father to

11Doctrine & Covenants section 126.
12Brigham Young to Mary Ann Young, 17 August 1843, Western Americana, Beinecke Library, Yale University.
come and lay hands on them. I am shure it pierced my heart with much Sorrow. There has Some children died with the Same disease our family has had.

In closing Mary Ann assured her husband that she had had enough provisions for the family and then declared:

I do not want to say things to you to trouble you. You must excuse me for Saying so much about the distress we have passed through. I feel sometimes as though I could never get any thing else on my mind. May the Lord Bless You and make you an instrument of doing much good. You have all our Prairs.13

One can easily imagine Brigham’s feelings upon receipt of such a letter. Less than two weeks later Willard Richards wrote to inform him of the death of little Mary Ann: “I have called to see them many times & prayed for & with them,” Willard explained to his friend as he provided the details of Brigham’s child’s passing. “Little Mary had every thing done for her possible. By this I mean her mother has been supported to watch over & administer to her child. Her ability & faithfulness you know.”14

Brigham Young and his family learned pain and suffering firsthand and together learned to rely on the Lord as sustenance and balm. Inevitably, experiences like these influenced his leadership and prepared him to know and appreciate the sacrifices of his people. After he returned to England, Elder Young stressed to new missionaries their responsibility to provide well for their families before departing. He and his brethren had left their families destitute only by “special command . . . & God promised to provide for them, but God does not require the same of the Elders now. They Must take care of their families.”15 Over the years of Brigham Young’s leadership this advice remained constant.

President Young’s personal understanding of the trauma of a husband and father called to leave home led to another kind of advice that, taken out of context helped create the image of harshness. In an age of slow travel and poor communication a missionary had to muster the faith to trust his distant family to God: “Let a man suffer his mind to be drawn out all the time after his family, and he will become inactive in the work of the Lord.” Thus his frequent reminder:

13Mary Ann Young to Brigham Young, 16 August 1843, Brigham Young Papers, Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah.
14Willard Richards to Brigham Young, 28 August 1843, Brigham Young Papers.
15General minutes collection, 10 April 1843, Church Archives.
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When you leave, understand it, you have neither wife nor children: you have handed them all over to the Lord Jesus Christ. Let the brethren go and say, I will keep my eyes straight before me on the object of my mission, and not look behind me to my family. 16

True to the thrust of his faith and labors, but with exaggeration as he stressed the ideal, he reminisced:

In my first administrations in the gospel . . . when I went out to preach, I would leave my family and friends in the hands of the Lord, and I gave them no further thought. . . . I did not think about wife, children, home, native land or friends; but my thoughts were on the great work before me. This should be the state of our feelings continually. 17

The truth is that he did think of his family and felt deeply the trials and suffering of his fellow Saints, but he disciplined himself to keep private his emotions:

There is not a father who feels more tenderly towards his offspring, and loves them better than I love this people; . . . my heart yearns after them with all the emotions of tenderness, so that I could weep like a child; but I am careful to keep my tears to myself. 18

Because of this reticence, public glimpses into his deep sensitivity and empathy are rare. One of these occurred September 1848, as Brigham re-entered his new Zion—this time his family in tow—never to leave the Great Basin again. He was filled with joy and gratitude that an era of wandering and tribulation was now ended; his emotions overflowed as he addressed the Saints:

I also trust to have command over my feelings to speak in a childlike spirit and yet with the confidence and courage of a man, although it may be hard to suppress my feelings. . . . Perhaps not another person in [this] congregation . . . has the sensations I have. This people have been scattered and driven homeless and houseless, scattered in a world friendless not knowing where to go. . . . This is but a small portion . . . of that weight that has been on my shoulders. I have felt their sufferings and all their feelings from the death of Joseph till now. I doubt if there [are] four persons that feels as I do . . . having to guard every moment from bursting into tears and sitting down like a child. We are


17Sermon ca. June 1865; JD, 11:116.

18Sermon, 9 April 1852; JD, 1:49. One month earlier Brigham Young had said “my feelings sympathize so with the injured, that I am grieved and distressed, and my head aches, and large drops of cold sweat sit upon my brow, and no man or woman knows anything about my feelings, and I do not want them to know. . . . I calculate to carry my own sorrows just as long as I live. . . . and when I go to the grave, I expect them to go there.” Sermon, 4 March 1852; JD, 1:31. Brigham Young was not one who could express such feelings easily even when he would. In 1849 he confessed to the Twelve, “I never cry—all disappointments losses & crosses never bring a tear,” this in spite of remembering that upon the death of Joseph “I felt as tho my head would crack.” Minutes, 12 February 1849, Brigham Young Papers.
here, thank the Almighty God of Israel. . . . I say brothers and sisters please to receive my warmest thanks and receive the choicest blessings of the Lord. 19

Brigham Young personally experienced poverty, sickness and want. He ached when forced to leave his children and beloved Mary Ann improvident. Such sacrifice, common in his early career, made him fully aware of the price his later presidential leadership exacted. Part of his success as a leader lay in his ability to demand sacrifice for the gospel even though he knew well and felt personally what he was asking. Indeed, such shared experience helped create the bond between Brigham Young and his people. At his request and under his direction they gave their all.

---

19Thomas Bullock Minutes, 24 September 1848, Church Archives. Clerk’s abbreviations expanded.

Reviewed by Ishmael Stagner, assistant professor of education at Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii.

*Mormonism: A Faith for All Cultures* is a book that ought to be read by all adult members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, even though it has some problems. It is too long in parts that could be cut, too short in parts that should have been expanded, and too academic throughout, almost making it unreadable for the average member of the Church. This is unfortunate because it is one of the most provocative, informative, faith-promoting, and intellectually stimulating church books I have read in a very long time. Too little is written in the Church about the “Mormon” experience outside the white, English-speaking Wasatch Front. When we hear about pioneers, we immediately think of handcarts, oxen, and Conestogas trekking across the American Plains. Yet, if the gospel of Jesus Christ is to cover the earth and is to be appreciated for the universality of its message, then, somehow, we must recognize and acknowledge contributions made by other people of other times, of other places, of other languages. Tullis’s book makes such an attempt, and it is a mighty one.

Because it attempts to do so much—in such a short space, with so few people, in the absence of any definitive precedent—the book has some drawbacks. It is actually three books in one: an academic Christian history, an institutionalized LDS Church history, and a book of personalized individual histories and testimonies. To the student and scholar, the insights given by contributors such as Hugh Nibley, Arthur Henry King, Noel Reynolds, and Douglas Tobler are most instructive and informative. But they are so weighty as to be almost entirely boring to the academically uninitiated. If the gospel is to be for all cultures, hopefully it will also be for all members, written in non-academic language with simple nouns, verbs, adjectives, and sentences.
The selections on the history of the Church in various parts of the world (i.e., Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, France, Scandinavia, Latin America, Philippines, Korea, and Japan) are most fascinating and among the most readable portions of the book. Of particular interest to me is the testimony of Bishop Orlando Rivera, especially his explanation of Mormonism and the Chicano. It is a scholarly, yet a very human, discussion of one of the great paradoxes in the Church: why Chicanos are not joining the Church in the numbers that their brethren in Mexico, and Central and South America are.

Without a doubt, the section of the book which has the greatest poignancy and spiritual uplift is the one containing personal testimonies of local leaders involved in Church growth. While all the testimonies and comments are outstanding, the one that I like most is that of President Rhee Ho Nam of South Korea. His account of his search for prospective Church-member spouses for his children is simultaneously hilarious and sobering. It reminds me of a statement I once heard from a Church member of a culture different from mine: "The trouble with you is that you want me to be your brother, but not your brother-in-law." President Rhee’s presentation and subsequent testimony cogently remind us that the gospel doesn’t change: it is people and their attitudes that do, or ought to.

President Augusto Lim’s explanations of the humbleness of the typical Filipino budget should remind us that among the strengths of early Mormonism were hard work, frugality, and thrift. We need to remember these values when we attempt to place our designed-for-Utah buildings in places where they don’t fit, or where the local Saints cannot even afford to use them.

Given the time frame for the presentation of these lectures and discussions in the bicentennial year, and the logistical considerations for assembling any type of international group, the twenty-five participants and contributors have done a Herculean initiatory work. But much has been left out of Mormonism: A Faith for All Cultures. Areas such as the Pacific, and people such as the American Indians, are totally ignored. Yet, there must be something that could be learned from the Church’s spectacularly successful experiences with these cultures and peoples. Even more importantly, if the gospel is still to be taken to the great masses of the Indian sub-continent, the African continent, the Chinese mainland, and the Arab world, it would seem that we would want to know more of the things we have done right in the past in order to explore the ways we might be more successful in the future. Perhaps one of the perspectives we might
take is that rather than view the gospel as being threatening to culture or peoples, we might see it as being compatible with and supportive of society. If the gospel can be seen in this light, then, perhaps, we can accelerate even more spectacularly the missionary work for which the Church is already known. And in this respect, what LaMond Tullis has done—incomplete, tentative, and skewed though it appears—is still a most promising beginning. Hopefully, this book is just that: the beginning of more thought-provoking and faith-promoting discussions of a church whose message is universal and loving because its God is universal and loving.


Reviewed by William E. Evenson, professor of physics, Brigham Young University.

The two volumes of Science and Religion: Toward a More Useful Dialogue, the initial efforts of an intended series, are the first works on science and religion within a Latter-day Saint framework which deal substantially with the scientific questions of interest in religion. Some thirty competent LDS scientists, experts in their subject matter, explore some significant questions carefully and thoroughly in thirty-six different articles. In spite of some problems and disappointments, these volumes of Science and Religion far surpass in quality and value anything else presently published on this subject for a Mormon audience. They are an excellent source for the scientific background that is necessary for an intelligent discussion of questions about God’s and man’s relation to nature, and the relationship of scientific and religious methods of inquiry.
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Along with their strengths, Volumes I and II have serious weaknesses in defining the issues relating science to religion and in addressing the implications for religion of the scientific questions they discuss. The philosophical and theological background of these questions, along with additional scientific discussion, can best be found in such non-LDS books as Ian G. Barbour's *Issues in Science and Religion* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1966). It would be most interesting to address the religion side of science and religion from a uniquely Mormon perspective as carefully and thoughtfully as non-Mormons have done from their own perspective, taking modern science fully into account.

**SCIENCE AND RELIGION, Vol. I**

The Latter-day Saint who wants to understand how scientists come to the conclusions they do about the nature of the physical universe, the age of the earth, the age and meaning of fossils, and the chronology and development of prehistoric cultures can profitably turn to this volume.

Volume I is divided into four parts: (1) "Science and Religion as the Bases of Modern Life" (philosophical questions); (2) "The Science Base for Earth Chronology" (earth chronology, including a mixture of several quite disparate dating techniques relating both to features of the earth and to prehistoric cultural artifacts); (3) "Revelations from the Earth" (fossils and their interpretation); and (4) "Earth in the Universe" (the physical universe).

The essays I found most valuable include "Dendrochronology—Dating with Tree Rings" by Kimball T. Harper, "The Principle of Uniformity and Constancy of Natural Laws" by W. Kenneth Hamblin, and "Evolution of the Physical Universe" by R. Grant Athay. These papers are well organized and smoothly written, and they provide perspective for the work they discuss as well as for other articles in the volume.

Although the other articles vary in quality, most are well worth reading. I appreciated those papers that are straightforward in their presentation, with no apology, such as the ones by Clark, Bissell, and Hamblin, among others. "Paleobotanic Evidence of Evolution" by William D. Tidwell contains much interesting data, but it is not well written or well organized and will be too technical for most readers.

**SCIENCE AND RELIGION, Vol. II**

Volume II is made up of three sections: (1) "The Search for
Reconciliations' (treats such issues as the absence of an official Church position on organic evolution); (2) "The Science of Life" (scientific aspects of organic and prebiotic evolution); and (3) "The Crown of Creation—Man Inherits the Earth" (the physical and cultural development of man).


The paper by E. G. Larson has a somewhat convoluted style and is not easy to read, but it is well organized and very carefully thought through. It makes a real contribution to a difficult subject. Matheny's paper is rather too technical in places, and the glossary provided at the end is not an adequate solution. However, even though the nonscientist may find it difficult reading, he should find it rewarding and worth the effort to understand. There are many other excellent papers in Volume II. Virtually all of Part II is well done and informative, as are the pieces by Wade E. Miller in Part III and Duane E. Jeffery in Part I.

As good as it is, there are also several serious problems in Volume II. Part I is a much more ambitious excursion into philosophy, theology, and metaphysics than anything in Volume I, but it is a great disappointment to find so much naiveté and uncritical thought in these efforts. The essays by Donlu D. Thayer and A. Lester Allen are reasonable, occasionally insightful, but of limited perspective: Thayer relies almost entirely on Louis J. Halle's view of science; Allen does not examine religious assumptions and lapses into apologetics.

The real problems, however, are the second half of Bruce W. Warren's article and the paper by John A. Tvedtnes which go off into the wild blue of unsupported speculation which more careful thought would have avoided; we should be able to think as carefully about religion as we do about science. Warren writes about the earth, moon, and sun as "of increasingly larger size" (p. 71). He divides W. W. Phelps's 2.555 billion years by four to obtain the length of a day of creation (p. 70), even though 2.555 billion years is just 7000 "years" of 1000-year long days (7000 years of the Lord's time?). Then Warren builds a huge cosmology on creation days of 638,750,000 years, but his basis is thin air. He introduces just enough biology, geology, and astronomy to make a superficial case, but not enough to put together a coherent rather than ad hoc picture. With even more problems than Warren, Tvedtnes writes in defense of a basically fun-
damentalist position. Unfortunately, he is not sufficiently ac-
quainted with the relevant science to make a valid contribution. He
does not understand uniformitarianism and the role of catastrophic
events (earthquakes, volcanoes, meteor showers, etc.) in that point of
view. He quotes selectively, or at least naively, from General
Authorities relative to the creation of man. In addition, he uncritically
introduces thoroughly discredited arguments on such subjects as
the Flood and other "catastrophic" events in world history. The
volume would be better without this paper. Yet, even with these
serious lapses in Part I, Volume II remains valuable for its excellent
discussion of scientific questions in Parts II and III.

VOLUMES I AND II

There are a few problems of a general nature in both volumes.
First, with some exceptions, there is a critical lack of synthesis to con-
nect the essays. The introductory article by the editors in Volume I
does not fill this role partly because of its philosophic naivete. This is
a problem shared by almost all the papers of philosophical or
theological orientation, except for John Sorenson's brief essay. The
perspective that could have been gained through study of non-LDS
thought on science and religion is sorely missed.

The lack of synthesis is a serious limitation on the science in these
books as well. For example, taking the various dating techniques
together and finding them remarkably consistent gives much greater
confidence than we could gain from any single approach. While this
point is alluded to, it is not made effectively. This same problem
arises again in the discussion of other topics such as the analysis of the
fossil record.

There are a few exceptions to this observation: R. Grant Athay's
article on the evolution of the universe weighs the range of arguments
for and against certain basic concepts briefly (and necessarily super-
ficially) but effectively. W. Kenneth Hamblin's brief essay to open
Volume I, Part III, helps provide perspective on both preceding and
following articles. Farmer, Larson, Stokes, and Matheny all con-
tribute substantially to the needed synthesis in Volume II, but
necessarily from the context of their own topics. I hope that in future
volumes the editors will provide more synthesis. What really is need-
ed is a substantial synthesis article for each of the major themes
discussed.

Second, many of the bibliographies seem dated; some of the
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discussion of such topics as human evolution and dating techniques is not as current as one would expect of a book with a 1979 copyright. A brief perusal of the bibliographies shows not only few references since 1973 or 1974 but also a clustering of references to articles from the late 1960s and early 1970s. This apparently came about because of long delays in publication. Editor Hess explained that the project was begun seven or eight years ago. Approval for the involvement of BYU faculty members was sought at that time from the BYU administration, the Church Commissioner of Education, and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. The response from these bodies to the preliminary review was unanimously favorable and encouraging. BYU Press, Bookcraft, and Deseret Book (Church-related publishers) were all approached. Eventually, with delays that extended the project several years, all three publishers decided against financing the publication of the books. Although BYU Press agreed to publish them if outside financing could be obtained, the problems of marketing considerations and economic timing precluded printing such specialized material. At that point, Paladin agreed to do the books. They have kept the price as low as possible in order to make the books available to students; and the editors and authors have assisted by personally not receiving any royalties through at least the first printing. The authors did have a chance to revise their essays just prior to publication, and several added more recent references and carefully updated their material.

Third, there are wide variations in technical level and quality of writing. Consequently, Science and Religion is not to be read quickly. Rather, most readers will find reading one article at a time over a longer period rewarding.

Although typographical errors are common, serious scientific errors are very few. In Volume I, page 59, Arthur Wallace describes the decay of carbon-14 atoms to boron-14. In fact, carbon-14 decays to nitrogen-14, but this error does not affect the rest of his article. On page 68, both the label on the vertical axis and the figure caption should refer to square hydration thickness in microns-squared.

Fourth, some of the papers, including the editors' introductory essay, are occasionally defensive in tone toward perceived religious views. While the defensiveness is understandable in light of dogmatic assertions many LDS scientists have been confronted with, it is unproductive and unnecessary. Any real dialogue on science and religion can only take place with no condescending attitudes or defensiveness. There must be respect for the aims and methods of both science and religion. There must be willingness to listen and to
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withhold judgment until the evidence and our understanding warrant making judgments. Despite occasional defensiveness, the authors of this volume plainly respect spiritual as well as scientific learning and show evidence of willingness to pursue the dialogue in this spirit.

In spite of the many problems in *Science and Religion*, vols. I and II, they make a real contribution in presenting the scientific basis of several issues relevant to religion. The better essays make these volumes well worth purchase and study by all thoughtful Mormons with serious intellectual interests.
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