

CCT: A Genetic Analysis of TS, RC. Pericope 21.

WR	SR TB	WW	WC	GL1 TS	RC
Mind of man coequal ¹ with God himself. friends separated for a small moment from their spirits . coequal with God . and hold converse when they are one with another —	<i>the mind of man</i> —the mind mind of man is as immortal as God himself—hence <i>while</i> I talk to these mourners— they are only separated from their bodies for a short <i>period</i> —their Spirits <i>coexisted</i> with God & now converse <i>one</i> <i>another</i> same as we do— <i>does not</i> <i>this give your</i> <i>satisfactn.</i> ² I want to reason more on the Spirit of Man	man existed in spirit & mind coequal with God himself, you who mourn the loss of friends are ownly seperated for a moment, the spirit is separated for a little time, they are now conversant with each other as we are on the earth. I am dwelling on the immutability of the spirit of man,	The mind of man— <i>the</i> <i>intelligent part</i> is <i>coequal</i> ³ with God himself. I know that my testimony is true. hence when I talk to these mourners what have they lost— They are only separated from their bodies for a short season <i>but</i> their spirits existed coequal with God and they now exist in a place where they converse together <i>as much</i> as we do on the earth.	The mind of man is as immortal as God himself. I know that my testimony is true, hence when I talk to these mourners; what have they lost , ⁴ they are only separated from their bodies for a short season; their spirits existed co- equal with God, and they now exist in a place where they converse together, the same as we do on the earth.	The mind or the intelligence which man possesses is coequal with God himself. ⁷ I know that my testimony is true; hence when I talk to these mourners, what have they lost? their relatives and friends are only separated from their bodies for a short season; their spirits which existed with God ⁸ have left the tabernacle of clay only for a little moment as it were , ⁹ and they now exist in a place where they converse together the same as we do on the earth. ¹⁰ I am dwelling on the immortality ¹¹ of the spirit of man ¹² -

for I am dwelling on the body of man on the subj. of the dead—the Sp of man	is it logic to say the spirit of man had a beginning & yet had no end? It does not have a beginning or end,	Is it logic to say that a spirit is immortal and yet have a beginning because if a spirit have a beginning it will have an end— good logic—	Is it logic to say that a spirit is immortal, and yet have a beginning? Because if a spirit have a beginning it will have an end; good logic.⁵ I want to reason more on the spirit of man,⁶ for I am dwelling on the body of man, on the subject of the dead.	Is it logical¹³ to say that the intelligence of spirits is immortal, and yet that it had a beginning? The intelligence of Spirits¹⁴ had no beginning neither will it have an end; that is good logic. That which has a beginning may have an end. Their never was a time when there were not Spirits, for they are co-equal with our Father in heaven.¹⁵ I want to reason more on the spirit of man; for I am dwelling on the body and spirit of man - on the subject of the dead.
--	--	--	--	--

¹ The word coequal appears in several of the source documents and was no doubt used by JS. Its precise interpretation is suggested by the other remarks. In B. H. Roberts's 1909 notes on the passage, he substitutes "coeternal" (also see Appendix B). Since JS has already said that God was not always God, the meaning here is that both God and man are eternal as persons, but status may not be eternal—by JS's lights, status must change and change again and so forth (chapter 1). See note 8 below; also the RC variorum in Appendix D.

² Once again, the purpose of the sermon: to comfort the bereaved. The permanence of the human personality is the point of this part of the sermon. The dead are not lost, they still exist because they always have. JS's logic requires then (in a reversal of Lorenzo Dow) that they always will. This is the point of the no beginning, no end axiom (chapter 1).

³ WW and WR attest to "coequal". Contemporary usage shows coequal to mean co-extensive. The phrase "intelligent part" may be a mishearing by Clayton. A likely correction may be the similar sounding "immortal spirit." Conditions of an outdoor venue like this one, variations in speaker volume, wind, crowd noise, etc. can account for such variants.

⁴ JS makes the point again that his teaching on souls is to comfort his listeners. See notes at the previous pericope and chapter 1.

⁵ This reference to "logic" is attested in WW. JS spends some time in this discourse on this point of reason, a philosophical point that has many antecedents like Dow, beyond this possibly his experience with the Book of Abraham text where the "no beginning, no ending" idea is prominent (Book of Abraham 3:18). Webster's 1828 dictionary defines logic as the art of thinking and reasoning justly.

⁶ The reasoning here is clearly illustrative and not conclusive. JS has already stated that the information is revelatory, not deductive.

⁷ GM1 reads [The mind[^],^{or} of man the intelligen[^]ce t[^] part the spirit[^] which man possesses, ~~existed~~ ^{is} coequal with ~~and is as immortal as~~ God himself.]

⁸ GM1 reads [their spirits[^] which existed ~~coequal~~ with God, have left]. Here we see blunting of the source texts in terms of the permanence of persons, indeed the NBNE is virtually eliminated from this part of GM2, perhaps by Brigham Young in his editing session of GM1, 18 November 1855. By the time of the editing of GM1, there may have been some discomfort with JS's claims. The extrapolation of revelations like D&C 132 regarding the nature of life in heaven as may possibly be found for example in the 1845 Eliza R. Snow poem later set to music in the LDS hymn, "O My Father." [How much of Snow's ideas can be assigned to JS is a point of debate, however W. W. Phelps' late 1844 poem subscribes to similar ideas. See also JS's remarks of July 16, 1843 (a few days following the writing of the plural marriage revelation on July 12), reported by Franklin D. Richards:

"Joseph said July 16th All Blessings that were ordained for man by the Council of Heaven were on conditions of obedience to the Law there of. No man can obtain an eternal Blessing unless the contract or covenant be made in view of Eternity All contracts in view of this Life only terminate with this Life. Case of the woman & 7 husbands Luke 20-29 &c Those who keep no eternal Law in this life or make no eternal contract are single & alone in the eternal world (Luke 20-35) and are only made Angels to minister to those who shall be heirs of Salvation never becoming Sons of God having never kept the Law of God ie eternal Law The earthly is the image of the Heavenly shows that [it] is by the multiplication of Lives that the eternal worlds are created and occupied that which is born of the flesh is flesh that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." See also Woodruff, "Book of Revelations," February 1842 and chapter 2.

The quote shows Richards was well acquainted with JS's private instructions. Compare also JS's July 12, 1843 revelation, D&C 132:19, 20, 63. By 1842 Lorenzo Snow (February 14, 1842, Lorenzo Snow letter book typescript, CHL) had speculated that Celestial Parents would have spirit children born to them and by the summer of 1844 Orson Pratt (*Prophetic Alminac* 1844) had written the same idea for publication (outside of Nauvoo). (For an example of the eventual tension between the notions of procreation of spirits, and spirits or minds with no beginning see the Journal of Joseph Lee Robinson (chapter 2).

The naïve materialist bent of Mormon thought is illustrated by Brigham Young and his idea that Satan, his spiritual minions and the "sons of perdition" (a major topic in Follett) would become disorganized and their *spirit material* "recycled," see for example, *Journal of Discourses* 4:31-2; 7:282-85. Other Mormon thinkers subscribed to a similar anthropology: the substance of individuals was permanent, but individuals were created entities—consciousness has a beginning. With the advent of the publication of Joseph Smith's history as bound volumes in the first decade of the 20th century, the editor of the history, B. H. Roberts, integrated Follett into his LDS Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association Book of Mormon study manual for 1905-6. Follett had become somewhat institutionally invisible prior to 1905 though critics of Mormonism had not forgotten it as evidenced by the Presbyterian reprint of VOT in 1903. The Book of Mormon manual raised questions among some of the rank and file of the church, and Roberts was naturally assigned to answer those questions. Roberts' response appeared as an article in the *Improvement Era*, (April 1907) (*The Immortality of Man*, reproduced in Appendix B.) This response encouraged some opposition to Follett among church leaders, who had the sermon deleted from (the 1912) volume 6 of Roberts' *History of the Church* without consulting him. When Roberts discovered the deletion, he took R1 and had 10,000 copies printed in pamphlet form, which he eventually distributed to local leaders around the church. In parallel to Roberts' distribution of R1, Charles Penrose privately distributed a critique of Roberts' views to other general authorities. Church President Joseph F. Smith felt that a doctrine of uncreated souls undermined the sovereignty of God, his counselor Charles W. Penrose had developed an alternative theory years previously, which both he and counselor Anthon H. Lund preferred. Joseph F. Smith prevented publication of a John A. Widstoe theology text partly because it contained references to the Follett. Moreover, President Smith already felt Follett suspect on another account, the resurrection of little children (see chapter 3). When Joseph Fielding Smith produced his *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* in 1938, he took Roberts' pamphlet and essentially incorporated it wholesale into the text (chapter 4). When the *History of the Church* was reprinted in the 1950s, the R1 was reinserted, with Roberts' footnotes. Roberts' explanation in his 1907 article suggested a way of coming to terms with JS's thought as he understood it and gained a substantial following among Church

members and leaders (chapter 4). Variants of both the Penrose and Roberts traditions remain alive in LDS thinking. Follett and its antecedents remain challenging for many Latter-day Saints, as they did for JS's contemporaries (see for example Sidney Rigdon's evaluation of Follett in his statement found in his *Messenger and Advocate of the Church of Christ* (June 15, 1845): 225-27).

⁹ The phrase here was perhaps suggested by WR and WW.

¹⁰ RC, a paragraph symbol has been penciled here along with the number 18, a probable printers mark for DN.

¹¹ Woodruff's original word was "immutability" which is actually more suggestive of what is said in the other sources. However, the phrase "immortality of the spirit of man" is certainly reminiscent of other words in the texts. See note 3 above.

¹² Two lines following this are erased in the ms history. They were not recoverable.

¹³ The text following this has been curiously edited (see the following note) in GM1: [Is it logic^{al} to say that^e the intelligence of spirits is immortal, and yet that it had a beginning? ~~No because if~~ ^{The that} intelligence of spirits had no beginning neither ~~spirit has a beginning~~ it will ^{it} have an end; that is good logic[^] That which has a beginning may have an end. There never was a time when there were not spirits, for they are co-equal with our Father in heaven. I want to].

So GM1 originally read (i.e., GM0) here, "It is logic to say that a spirit is immortal and yet that it had a beginning? No because if a spirit has a beginning it will have and end; that is good logic". This statement is a much more accurate reflection of the source documents than the modified version.

¹⁴ "the intelligence of spirits." The editors may have added this phrasing to adjust the claims of the original texts to say that the abstract construct of intelligence is somehow the permanent part of man. For possible motivations for the change, see Appendix 1. It constitutes a significant variation from the source texts. Moreover the logical form of the argument is changed, the "no beginning" is unlinked from the "no end," whereas in the original texts the force of logic is claimed to lie in the proposition, "if something has no beginning then it will have no end;" also used is the form: "anything that has a beginning may have an ending" (among several examples see the WW and WR pericopae above). The form might be characterized as "for all x, if x has always existed then x must always exist" and "for all x, if it is not the case that x has always existed then it is not the case that x must always exist." Since the latter is equivalent to "for all x, if x must always exist then x has always existed," and this is the converse of the first statement, formally we have "for all x, x has no beginning if and only if x has no ending." This surely had variable application for JS. For example, JS clearly states here and elsewhere that God was not always God. Therefore, being God is not an *ontologically* permanent state in JS's thought. Indeed, at least some listeners took away this idea, that God *could* cease being God—and if that happened, the world would collapse since for JS, God constantly upholds the worlds in their orbits, etc. For JS, this would be separate from the proposition that God will always exist as a person. All persons are permanent. Their status however, is neither empirically nor logically necessary. While JS may have been seen this as a valid representation of his thoughts, it seems clear that many other believers found the implications difficult to ponder. This included a number of church leaders and members in the early twentieth century, (see Harrell, *This is My Doctrine* for early Mormon teaching on D&C 93). Aside from speculations regarding such matters, one conclusion easily drawn is that infinitely many spirits/intelligences must exist, otherwise the work of God (Moses 1:39) must cease at some point. JS's scheme does not imply however that any "intelligence" must wait forever to pass through the "plan of salvation," (the cardinality of the collection of spirits need only be countably infinite, assuming time is Archimedean): any given person will have the opportunity to change state (Book of Abraham, "estate") at some finite future date from the present time, and moreover this always has been the case. The main point for JS here was one of comforting the relations of the deceased: there should be no fear that these dead persons were non-existent—that would be a fundamental impossibility in JS's scheme. Aristides (ca 200 AD): "When I say that God is without beginning, this also means that everything which has a beginning will have an end," Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*,

9:264. Somewhat remarkably, JS has much more in common with African American Baptists, than say Catholicism, mainline or Evangelical Protestantism at this point. The belief that “in every man is a little man,” the “little man” which was not born and does not die is an obvious correlate to JS’s doctrine of eternal spirits. The belief of an eternal man in the earthly man, the “little John in the big John” who traveled to God in Heaven during ecstatic visions is clearly related to normative Mormonism. (Bloom, *The American Religion*, 240-43.)

¹⁵ This editorial addition to the discourse can be fit with the other editorial statements to say that spirits in general are a continuing part of the heavenly landscape, while not committing to the notion that individual spirits are without beginning or end (Appendix 1). Compare *Journal of Discourses* 7:333; 10:5, 18:293.