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The justification for this paper lies in the fact that since the 1860s the authorship of Section 132 of the Doctrine and Covenants has been questioned, and recent research has provided additional, if not necessarily new, light on some of the persistent problems involved. The LDS version of the origin of Section 132 is that after the revelation was recorded on July 12, 1843, the original was destroyed. Before it was, however, Joseph Kingsbury copied it and his manuscript became the source of the present section in the Doctrine and Covenants. However, the section was not included in the Doctrine and Covenants until 1876 when it replaced the 1835 Article on Marriage. These facts left the Church open to the charge (primarily from the Reorganized Church) that the document was not authored by Joseph Smith, but that Brigham Young or someone else forged it to promote an apostate doctrine--namely, plural marriage.

Challenges to the Joseph Smith authorship can be summarized under the following three headings: 1) stylistic differences; 2) internal problems with the revelation itself, those being primarily doctrinal and moral issues and supposed inconsistencies, and 3) historical questions. I shall briefly outline some of the issues involved under each of these headings and propose some solutions.
Stylistic Problems

The early literature of the debate over the authenticity of Section 132 does not rely to any great extent on stylistic arguments.\(^2\) It was perhaps Elder B. H. Roberts who first introduced the concept in his introduction to volume five of the History of the Church in 1930, where he argued that the style of Section 132 was definitely that of Joseph Smith. In 1962 however, Charles A. Davies historian of the RLDS Church, proposed a theory contrary to that of Elder Roberts on matters of style. Davies agreed that "there is ample evidence that there was a document of some kind in existence before 1844 and probably 1843" on marriage. He argues that the subject of marriage was under serious consideration at that time and some high-placed churchmen endeavored to bring "abberations" concerning "variations from the principles of pure monogamy" into the discussion. Therefore, Davies hypothesized that Joseph Smith inquired of the Lord and received a revelation on the subject. The content of the revelation was never made public he says, but since the scriptures declare plural marriage an abomination and since Joseph Smith and others denied that the Church countenanced the doctrine, he assures us that the revelation "could not" contravene these facts. To do so would make Joseph Smith a liar, deceiver and a hypocrite. Therefore, he concluded:

The document of 1852 (Utah Doctrine and Covenants, Section 132) is certainly not that document, and Brigham Young was wise enough not to claim possession of the original. This, if produced, would without doubt have proved his document a deliberate distortion.

There is evidence that Young used sufficient terminology of the original to bear some resemblance, but twisted it to convey the direct opposite.\(^3\)

Since about 1975 there has circulated a brief written report which states that RLDS scholar Dr. F. Mark McKiernan and a non-RLDS professor ran a computer analysis of the Book of Mormon comparing it with the writings of several early church leaders, samples of major writers of that period, the Articles of Faith, the Lectures on Faith and Section 132. The so-called report stated that it was determined that Joseph Smith did not write the Book of Mormon. It also revealed the interesting result that Section 132 was not authored by either Joseph Smith or Brigham Young, but by some person whose writings were not used in the study. It was claimed in the report that due to these negative findings regarding Section 132, the LDS Church interfered with the intended publication of the results and with the career of the non-RLDS professor working on the project with McKiernan. The report concluded that "the general public should not be denied the complete analysis of the study simply because the results embarrass Mormons who cling to the fallacy that Joseph Smith gave the false revelation on polygamy. RLDS have been saying that over 100 years. Time always vindicates the true prophets."\(^4\)

The report left many serious questions about the methodology of the study which I was going to raise in this paper, but which will no longer be necessary. In order to be fair to Dr. McKiernan, since the only report I had of the supposed study was a photocopy of a legal sized mimeographed sheet,
Dr. Kenneth Godfrey contacted him for me by telephone on January 2, 1980 to confirm the facts. In that conversation McKiernan said that many versions of this story are extant and that he has received inquiries from all over the country and world about it. He stated that he never did a serious computer study that cast doubt on the authorship of Section 132 and that he actually knows nothing of computers. Apparently the report came into circulation through a newsletter sent out among certain RLDS Seventies, and according to McKiernan the story had been reworked after the personal wishes of the Seventy who authored the account.  

However, if a computer study is conducted on Section 132, I would suggest that the most fruitful approach would be to compare it with other revelations known to have been written by Joseph Smith as well as his prose writings and the Book of Mormon. One student observed that there are certain similarities between Joseph's prose and his revelatory writings, but more importantly, that there were differences that should be taken into account also. She suggests:

The language of the revelations which became the Doctrine and Covenants differs in some ways from Joseph Smith's style in the Letters and journals. Scriptural language, references, and metaphors occur more frequently in the commandments. Certain words recur: "verily," "behold," "shew (eth)," "yey," and phrases: "like unto," "I say unto you." The second person singular (thy, thou) with the verb ending -eth is more likely to occur in the commandments than in other writings. Likewise the imperative mode is often used; for example: "let it be built," "let Zion rejoice" as well as the verbs "must," "will," "shall," "needs be," etc.

So until we have more information, the best analysis of the style of Section 132 available to us is still that of Elder B. H. Roberts. He identified in Section 132 seven characteristics of style that were found in other revelations given through Joseph Smith. They are:

1. The revelation was given in answer to the Prophet's inquiry--a characteristic of nearly all his revelations.

2. It possesses the characteristic of frankness in reproving the Prophet.

3. The evidence of the largeness of range in the revelation on marriage is characteristic. That is, the answer went beyond the question asked.

4. The evidence of identical phraseology in this and other revelations. He isolated at least thirteen phrases, several of which were quite peculiar in their usage, that recur in the Doctrine and Covenants.

5. The evidence of recurrence of principles in the revelation on marriage that are found in other revelations received through Joseph Smith.
6. The evidence of the particularization of ideas, or the use of lists to illustrate meaning.

7. The evidences of identity in grandeur of style.

Almost as though he were anticipating Mr. Davies' argument, Elder Roberts concludes:

It should be remarked, in conclusion, that these peculiarities of scope, structure, phraseology, re-appearance of principles, texture of composition and the like, which identify this revelation on marriage as the composition of Joseph Smith (under the inspiration of the Lord, of course) are not forced into the revelation. Its composition gives no evidence of being a conglomerate of Joseph Smith's thought-gems held together by someone else's clay. It is all one piece, it is not patchwork. Unity above all things is characteristic of it. Words, phrases, sentences, ideas all blend together, preserving strict unity of style and that style Joseph Smith's. No one else could have written it. The literary peculiarities of that revelation as readily proclaim it to be Joseph Smith's composition to those familiar with his literary style, as the contour of his face. . . .

In another but more recent analysis of the literary style of Joseph Smith, Elinore Partridge agrees with Elder Roberts' assessment and found additional characteristics to support his conclusion.

Doctrinal and Moral Issues

In 1875 Elder Jason W. Briggs of the RLDS Church wrote a small pamphlet in Salt Lake City attacking the authenticity of Section 132. Concluding his arguments on the basis of doctrine he wrote:

We have examined this document by comparing it with the revelations contained in the books and find that it contradicts them all, in nearly all the essential points contained in it; and must, therefore decide that it is spurious. We have also compared it with itself and find it equally contradictory, and again, must decide that it is spurious. That it originated in deception and fraud, there can be no doubt, as these characteristics apply at every step in the progress of the scheme which it ostensibly inaugurates.

The numerous issues raised by Briggs and others in this century-long debate are beyond the intended scope of this study. They have been dealt with consistently over the years in the sermons and writings of the brethren and
answers have been given to most of the objections raised. However, it will be useful to consider an example or two.

One example is the implications of verses 54 and 64 of Section 132. Here Emma is told that if she does not accept the doctrine and abide the commandment "she shall be destroyed." Briggs wondered aloud why Emma outlived her Prophet-husband, and there was no indication of divine wrath meted out on her. "Then we demand" he wrote,

What does it prove when, as the facts demonstrate that threatened destruction falls upon the head of the faithful Joseph, and the rebellious Emma, as the Elect Lady, is not even moved out of her place, but remains with her children a living monument of the original faith—a standing protest against the "damnable heresies" of the "seducing spirits," the real authors of this document in question.

Detractors also wondered if verse 41 didn't contain a lurking inference of polyandry (the practice of having more than one husband).

Moral issues included the question of the Church practicing plural marriage in the face of anti-bigamy laws in the midwestern states where the church population resided, when it was a tenet of the Church to obey the law of the land and submit to proper government. The biggest moral problem of all, of course, was whether plural marriage constituted adultery.

An interesting approach dealing with the doctrinal content of the revelation that merits a closer look was proposed by anti-Mormon Earl Larrue in his book, The Foundations of Mormonism. He compared the revelation with the statements made about it from the period when it was written by those who claimed to have read it or heard it read. He concluded that "these statements indicate clearly to all, except those who 'prefer' to believe otherwise that his revelation . . . was known to all these persons in the days of Joseph Smith. . . . There is no disagreement between it and the common understanding which was had concerning it by those who knew about it."

Perhaps Joseph Smith's own approach to the doctrinal and moral issues raised by Section 132 is the best one. In 1842 he proposed marriage to Nancy Rigdon, daughter of Sidney. She declined, apparently on "moral grounds." Shortly thereafter he wrote her a letter wherein he answered her objections. He explained to her that what is wrong in one circumstance is often right under another. This was not situational ethics, rather it was "the principle on which the government of heaven is conducted—by revelation adapted to the circumstances in which the children of the kingdom are placed. Whatever God requires is right, no matter what it is," he continued, "although we may not see the reason thereof till long after the events transpire." Then he explained to Nancy that the Christian world did not understand the true character of God. "Our heavenly [sic.] Father is more liberal in his views," he wrote, "and boundless in His mercies and blessings, than we are ready to believe or receive; and, at the same time, is more
terrible to the workers of iniquity, more awful in the executions of His punishments, and more ready to detect every false way, than we are apt to suppose Him to be." But the conclusion of the whole matter for the Prophet was that God would "be inquired of by His children." In other words, God would provide a testimony of the principles involved to those who would ask, seek and knock. Speaking on behalf of the Lord, Joseph wrote to Nancy the following:

... but no good thing will I withhold from them who walk uprightly before me, and do my will in all things— who will listen to my voice and to the voice of my servant whom I have sent; for I delight in those who seek diligently to know my precepts, and abide by the law of my kingdom; for all things shall be made known unto them in mine own due time, and in the end they shall have joy.18

Questions of History

It is my view, as we turn to the historical questions involved in whether Section 132 was authored by Joseph Smith, that they are the most significant of the three types. It appears that those opposing this revelation feel the same way. History is really the primary question, because if it can be shown that historical fact supports Joseph Smith's authorship of the document, then the other questions decrease in importance. On the other hand, if it can be shown that there is adequate reason to doubt his authorship of the document, the questions of style and theology become increasingly important and some other author has to be sought. My position is that there is convincing historical evidence for the traditional position of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as to the authorship and subsequent history of the revelation that became Section 132.

The story of the origin of the revelation is told by William Clayton, personal secretary to the Prophet during the period. In 1871 he publicly claimed that he wrote the revelation on the morning of July 12, 1843, as received by Joseph Smith. That year was one of intense crisis in the marriage of Joseph and Emma Smith.17 Clayton said that Hyrum Smith was present when the document was drafted and that it was at his insistence that it was recorded. The brothers came into the office in the upper story of Joseph's brick store on Water Street, near the bank of the Mississippi River. They were conversing about plural marriage, and Hyrum was importuning his brother to write the revelation so he could take it to Emma and try to convince her of its truth, thereby bringing "peace" to the Prophet's household. Joseph was not sure that Emma would be so easily convinced. But Hyrum insisted that the doctrine was so plain that he could "convince any reasonable man or woman of its truth, purity or heavenly origin." For some unexplained reason, perhaps to give it more authority, Clayton said Hyrum wanted the Prophet to use the same instrument with which he had translated the Book of Mormon to write the revelation. But the Prophet said "he knew the revelation perfectly from beginning to end," and thus dictated it from memory. Scribe Clayton read the revelation back to the Prophet, who then pronounced it
correct, adding that there was "much more that he could write, [sic.] on the subject, but what was written was sufficient for the present."

Hyrum then took the revelation to Emma Smith. Shortly thereafter he returned, saying that she was "very bitter and full of resentment and anger." The Prophet had expected as much. Later during the day, the revelation was reportedly read to several unnamed Church authorities. That evening Bishop Newel K. Whitney requested permission to copy the revelation. Joseph consented, and on the following day Joseph Kingsbury copied the revelation.18 Several days later Joseph told Clayton and others that "Emma had so teased and urgently entreated him for the privilege of destroying it" that it wearied him and he gave it to her.19 He knew full well he could rewrite it anytime and that a second copy had been made. Clayton said the Kingsbury copy was "carefully preserved by Bishop Whitney" and few knew of its existence until the Saints arrived at Winter Quarters on the Missouri River in 1846.20

Both William Clayton's and Joseph Smith's journals of the time verify the date of the recording of the revelation. In a diary kept for the Prophet by Willard Richards, we find under the date of July 12, 1843 the following entry: "Received a Revelation in the office in presence of Hyrum & Wm Clayton."21 Clayton stated in his own journal on that date that he had written a revelation consisting of "ten pages on the order of the Priesthood, showing the design of Moses, Abraham, David and Solomon having many wives, etc."22 Several people, including Brigham Young, Orson Pratt, and others, testified that Emma destroyed the original Clayton draft.23 Joseph's own journal is suggestive of difficulties with Emma following July 12, 1843. For his entry on July 13, says that he "was in conversation with Emma most of the day." He was also at home most of the fourteenth.24

The most important element of the story--the Kingsbury manuscript--finds substantial support from a number of sources. In 1870 Kingsbury swore to the accuracy of a deposition stating that he "wrote the Revelation on Celestial or plural marriage from the mouth of Bishop Newel K. Whitney as he read from the original, which was in his possession just before its reported destruction."25 Kingsbury confirmed additional details of the story on several other occasions when he was under oath.26 However, the most striking and conclusive evidence of the Kingsbury story is found in the document itself. Two manuscript copies of Section 132 are housed in the LDS Church Archives in Salt Lake City. One is in the handwriting of Willard Richards and the second has the chirography of Joseph Kingsbury. An examination of Kingsbury's journal, located in the University of Utah library, and of two letters signed by Kingsbury have facilitated identification of his writing. The fact that the lettering in the revelation is somewhat stronger and bolder than that of the 1878 correspondence, and is more deliberate and careful than that which appears in the journal extract, strengthens the notion that the revelation is the earliest of the three documents. According to handwriting specialist Dean Jessee of the Church Historical Department, there is a remarkable lack of deterioration in Kingsbury autography between 1843 and 1878.27
Additional verification of the existence of the revelation can be seen in evidence that it was read before the Nauvoo High Council in Hyrum Smith's office on August 12, 1843. This office is located on Water Street across from Hyrum Smith's home. David Fullmer, a member of the High Council at the time, said that Dunbar Wilson, another council member, prompted the reading with an inquiry relative to the rumors concerning polygamy in Nauvoo. Hyrum Smith went across the street to his home and soon returned with the revelation, which he read to the men assembled. Thomas Grover, another participant that evening, said Hyrum Smith read the revelation, then said, "Now you that believe this revelation [and] go forth and obey the same shall be saved, and you that reject it shall be damned." This episode is strongly corroborated in the minutes of the Nauvoo High Council. Under the date of August 12, 1843, they read: "Council met according to adjournment at H. Smith's office [...] No business before the council. Teaching by Preists. [Presidents] Hiram [sic.] Smith & William Marks." A search of the Council minutes from 1842 through 1844 reveals this as the only occasion on which Hyrum Smith addressed the council when no business was before it. The council met at Hyrum Smith's office at least ten times between March and October of 1843. On ten occasions between February 1843 and March of 1844 it had no pressing business and in each case adjourned. The August 12, 1843 meeting is unique in that "teaching" occurred when no business lay before the group. In 1869 four council members asserted that "the teaching... referred to in the minutes... was on the subject of said revelation endorsing the same and enjoining it on the council." Furthermore, it is known that three of the men present on this occasion rejected the revelation. They were: William Marks, stake president; Austin Bowles, counselor in the stake presidency; and Leonard Soby, high councilor. All three eventually left the Church, but Soby and Bowles affirmed the fact that the revelation was read to the high council on August 12, 1843.

The story of Leonard Soby's testimony is particularly interesting. In 1883 there was a debate in progress between Lyman O. Littlefield and Joseph Smith III, President of the Reorganized Church. In the course of the exchange, President Smith requested the names of those who were supposed to have been on the High Council and heard the reading. Soby's name was on the list, so Smith dispatched Zenos Gurley to visit him at his home in New Jersey. Apparently Gurley arrived with an affidavit already prepared for Soby's signature. It denied the whole story of the reading. Soby refused to sign the document, but offered to sign a corrected statement if Gurley would write it up. He did so and this affidavit was signed by Soby on November 14, 1883.

On January 5, 1886, the Ogden Herald reviewed the Littlefield-Smith letters, and a James Brooks took it upon himself to write to Soby for confirmation of the Gurley visit. The affirmative reply was dated February 26, 1886. In the meantime, James Hart and Samuel Harrison also visited Soby's home. Again he provided them with an affidavit which he signed March 23, 1886. In it he declared that, after reading the published version of Section 132, he was satisfied that it was the same one he had heard Hyrum Smith read in Nauvoo.
Additional evidence comes from early Nauvoo newspapers, printed before the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. The first and only issue of the Nauvoo Expositor carried an affidavit from the disgruntled Austin Cowles, former member of the Nauvoo Stake Presidency. He testified:

In the latter part of the summer, 1843, the Patriarch, Hyrum Smith, did in the High Council, of which I was a member, introduce what he said was a revelation given through the Prophet; that the said Hyrum Smith did essay to read the said revelation in the said Council, that according to his reading there was contained the following doctrines . . . 2nd, the doctrine of plurality of wives, yet in this they sinned not save in the matter of Uriah.38

To this must be added a synopsis of the remarks of Hyrum Smith made at the Nauvoo Municipal Council meeting the night that body decided to destroy the Expositor. The minutes read:

Councilor, H. Smith ... referred to the revelation read to the High Council of the Church, which has caused so much talk about a multiplicity of wives; that said Revelation was in answer to a question concerning things which transpired in former days, and had no reference to the present time.39

The revelation was also read privately to a number of individuals, usually with Hyrum Smith sharing the news. In a June 16, 1844 letter to her mother in England, Sarah Scott confirmed the rumor of Joseph's teachings on plural marriage in these words:

Joseph had a revelation last summer purporting to be from the Lord, allowing the saints the privilege of having ten living wives at one time. . . . Mr. Haven knows these statements are correct, for they have been taught in the quorum to which he belongs by the highest authority in the Church.40

In another letter to her parents written in July of 1844 Sarah Scott added this comment:

Mr. Haven told me last spring before I was married that those doctrines tried his faith very much till he heard Hyrum Smith explain them and now or then he thought it was right. But a few weeks before the murder Hyrum denied that he and Joseph had the revelation concerning it but said it referred to ancient times; and it was published in the Neighbor. After I saw it I said to Mr. Haven: "What do you think of that? Is it not a plain contradiction to what you told me? What do you
think of it?" He said that he supposed Hyrum saw what a
disturbance it was making and thought he would say it on
account of there being such an excitement.41

William and Jane Law also produced affidavits that were printed in the
apostate-controlled Expositor, testifying that Hyrum Smith had allowed them
to take a copy of the revelation home to read. William Law described the
document as containing a "revelation [which] authorized certain men to have
more wives than one at a time, in this world ..." and that was the law of
God. His wife was equally specific in saying it "sustained in strong terms
the doctrine of more wives than one at a time."42 According to Howard Coray,
Hyrum Smith had committed the revelation to memory and ten days after it was
written had rehearsed it to Coray and his wife while riding in a carriage.43
Bishop S. A. Wolley likewise claimed that he heard the revelation read in
his home the following October.44

The issue of secrecy and the denials raised by Sarah Scott has been
another bone of historical contention. Opponents of Joseph Smith's author-
ship of Section 132 claim that the many public denials during his lifetime
either prove that plural marriage was not countenanced by him and the
Church or else he was a liar. Since for them, the latter position is
untenable, these opponents affirm that the denials must be taken at
complete face value.

However, as Michael Quinn has pointed out, Joseph Smith institutionalized
both exclusiveness and secrecy as permanent characteristics of Mormonism. ..45
The presiding councils of the Church from the First Presidency down
to the Stake High Council meetings were all held behind closed doors. The
sacred temple ordinances and rituals were only available to worthy and pre-
pared church members. Possibly in some instances, even special worship
services were confined to selected believers.46 The apex of secrecy
surrounded the introduction of plural marriage and the formation and orga-
nizational councils of the Council of Fifty.47 In April of 1844, Sidney
Rigdon revealed the nature of secrecy in the Church and some of the criticism
it must have been receiving when he said: "Would you not be astonished if
even now we should tell the glories and privileges of the Saints of God; to
you and to the World? We should be ridiculed; and no wonder we shut it up
in secret. .. Do not be astonished, then, if we even yet have secret
meetings, asking God for things for your benefit." He assured the people,
"There was no evil concocted when we first held secret meetings, and it is
the same even now."48

Several factors explain this policy of secrecy about polygamy. Joseph
had encountered opposition at an early age, when he began to have spiritual
experiences. Disagreement with his views only seemed to intensify as
Mormonism grew and progressed. By the time the Saints gathered in Nauvoo--
the third or fourth home for many of the exiles--the Prophet must have
realized that an indiscriminate advocacy of plural marriage would only
intensify criticism and stiffen anti-Mormon opposition.
For that matter, he did not have to speculate on what might happen if critics heard that he believed in plural marriage. He had already been falsely tried in court for illicit relationships with women. And there is some evidence that he was attacked by an irate mob in Ohio because of a supposed intimacy with a fellow Mormon's sister. In addition, he had seen one of his closest advisors, Oliver Cowdery, leave the Church over the issue. So he had no illusions as to what moral conduct either outsiders or believers expected of one who claimed to be a Prophet of God.49

From Joseph's own point of view, one of his greatest difficulties in life was to break down the "traditions of men" which stood in the way of his teachings on marriage. On several occasions, he complained about the difficulty he had in teaching his own flock. Elder Wilford Woodruff recalled that "the Lord taught him Joseph many things by vision and revelation that were never taught publicly in his days; for the people could not bear the flood of intelligence which God poured into his mind."50 In a June, 1843 discourse, Joseph angrily criticized those who professed loyalty, but "the moment you teach them some of the mysteries of the kingdom of God... they will be the first to stone you and put you to death."51 On July 16, 1843 he spoke of secret enemies of his who were mingling with the Saints and "slightly touched upon the subject of the everlasting covenant, and showed that a man and his wife must enter into that covenant in the world, or he will have no claim on her in the next world; but on account of the unbelief of the people I cannot reveal the fulness of these things at present."52 Six months before his murder he depicted his dilemma in humorous words. To get things into the heads of the Saints he said, "has been like splitting hemlock knots with a corn-dodger for a wedge, and a pumpkin for a bottle."53 More serious tones reveal the frustrations of long years of inhibited teachings.

I have tried for a number of years to get the minds of the Saints prepared to receive the things of God; but we frequently see some of them, after suffering all they have for the work of God, will fly to pieces like glass as soon as anything comes that is contrary to their traditions; they cannot stand the fire at all.54

A fourth point needs to be considered here. How does a man who has been given an assignment from the Lord to introduce these doctrines into the Church in a discrete way and who encounters the opposition he did, deal with a direct head-on question or confrontation about the matter? To make an open declaration would intensify the opposition and perhaps violate the trust and charge he had been given. To sidestep or deny it would make him out a liar to future observers. Thus he faced the horns of a dilemma that condemned him if he did and condemned him if he didn't. There was no easy solution. The Prophet harbored two conflicting motivations. His impulse toward self-preservation and safety from public attack and his desire to protect the Church at times contradicted his desire to prepare his people to tolerate more liberal attitudes and practices. These vacillations created conditions which were readily utilized by zealous, ill-informed, and opportunistic non-LDS people to promulgate distorted and false notions about Mormonism.
They also caused confusion, doubts, and suspicions among many Latter-day Saints.\textsuperscript{55}

Efforts to maintain silence, to restrict knowledge of the marriage doctrine to trusted and worthy associates, and to avoid outside pressure only seemed to enliven charges of moral corruption against the Church. The bitterly anti-Mormon Nauvoo Expositor edited by repudiated ex-Mormons, was quick to point out "many items of doctrine" which it said were "taught secretly, and denied openly."\textsuperscript{56} Likewise, Sidney Rigdon later charged that the New Testament scriptures predicted the apostasy of the latter-day Church because it would privately introduce wicked practices and seek to maintain them by secrecy and lying if necessary.\textsuperscript{57}

Under such circumstances, Church leaders did deny the accusations of those who said that they countenanced immorality and corruption with respect to marriage. Most of these denials stressed semantical and theological technicalities. That is, the language of the defense was carefully chosen to disavow practices that did not accurately represent Church doctrines.\textsuperscript{58} As I have already pointed out, if one takes this position, then he must be ready to admit that the denials also conveyed the impression to the public that the leaders were condemning all non-monogamous marital systems, which would lead to some confusion among uninformed Saints as well as leave the Church open to the charge of prevarication by historians and later opponents of the doctrines of eternal and plural marriage.\textsuperscript{59} To summarize, I have tried to demonstrate that there is enough historical evidence to engender confidence that Section 132 of the Doctrine and Covenants was authored by the Prophet Joseph Smith under the inspiration of the Lord and that the manuscript copies extant in the Church Archives were copied from and accurately reproduce the original; that Brigham Young or others did not concoct it either from their own minds or in a "scissors and paste" fashion from the writings and statements of Joseph Smith. If this historical evidence is sufficient to accomplish this, then the stylistic and theological arguments become more matters of faith than anything else, although I think that sufficient research in these areas will also vindicate that Joseph Smith was the author of Section 132.
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