

ONE ETERNAL ROUND

A Magazine dedicated to Mormon History and Theology

MARCH 15, 2020

OREM, UTAH

ISSUE #10

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD

PART 1:
MALE PATRIARCHAL AUTHORITY

"For he that diligently seeketh shall find; and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded unto them, by the power of the Holy Ghost, as well in these times as in times of old, and as well in times of old as in times to come; wherefore, the course of the Lord is one eternal round." (1 Nephi 10:19)

Copyright © 2020
by
Jacob Vidrine
All Rights Reserved.

<http://OneEternalRound.org/>
Phone: (801) 882-4754
Email: Admin@OneEternalRound.org

INTRODUCTION

It is occasionally observed that in the Nauvoo period there was greater emphasis on the power and ordinances of the temple than was later taught in Utah Mormonism.

To this point, some modern authors have argued that the Temple Priesthood introduced in Nauvoo wasn't technically "priesthood" at all, but that it was merely a cosmological framework for heaven and eternity. These authors suggest that the temple rituals were only described as "priesthood" because these ordinances were an extension of the power of God, rather than being "priesthood" in the sense of ecclesiastical authority and ordained priesthood offices.

But was the priesthood of the temple merely seen as cosmological in nature? Or was this new "priesthood" introduced in Nauvoo seen as having real world authority and ecclesiastical significance?

That then is the purpose of this next issue of *One Eternal Round*: to document the Nauvoo teachings on the Temple Priesthood and the authority of Kings and Priests and Queens and Priestesses, as well as to identify how and when this authority was later minimized.

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD

PART 1:
MALE PATRIARCHAL AUTHORITY

by
Jacob Vidrine

In Nauvoo Joseph Smith began to secretly introduce a new order of priesthood. This priesthood was considered a “Temple Priesthood” because from the first Nauvoo period revelation mentioning this priesthood, it was stated that it properly should be conferred in a temple.¹ This was a priesthood of Kings and Priests and Queens and Priestesses, the “highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood” which pertained to family relations.

¹ “For there is not a place found on earth that he may come to and restore again that which was lost unto you, or which he hath taken away, even the fulness of the priesthood.” (D&C 124:28)

The *familial* nature of this authority was likely the reason that the Prophet Joseph Smith and others on occasion referred to it as “Patriarchal Priesthood.”

This order of priesthood traces its origins to a secret restoration of priesthood that occurred in the Kirtland Temple on April 3, 1836. On that occasion, Moses, Elias, and Elijah restored a higher order of the Melchizedek Priesthood, above the Melchizedek Priesthood which had been restored by Peter, James, and John.

While this priesthood restoration was a close guarded secret, the Prophet began to allude to it in Nauvoo. One example is an epistle he wrote on September 6, 1842:

“...and [the voices] of diverse angels from Michael or Adam down to the present time, **all declaring their dispensations, their rights, their keys,** their honors, their majesty and glory, **and the power of their Priesthood;** giving [us] line upon line, precept upon precept.”²

By the April 1844 General Conference Joseph Smith was okay with his brother Hyrum publicly stating that he held the “spirit” and “power” of Elias and Elijah to seal eternal marriages:

“The Lord has given Joseph the power to seal on earth and in heaven those who are found worthy; having the Spirit of Elijah and Elias, he has power to seal with a seal that shall never be broken, and it shall be in force in the morn of the resurrection.”³

² *History of the Church* vol. 5 <6 September 1842> page 152, emphasis and italics added.

³ Hyrum Smith discourse, 8 April 1844, LDS Archives.

Joseph Smith also told some close followers about this Restoration, likely in meetings of the “Anointed Quorum” (also called the “Holy Order”) in Nauvoo. Alpheus Cutler was a member of that body and one of the first individuals to receive the Fullness of the Priesthood. In a letter in response to an RLDS missionary on January 29, 1856, Alpheus Cutler wrote:

“At one angel to your authority, **it took seven to confer on Joseph what he held.** Mr. Strang also had [only] one angel; what better than him are ye? Please read Section 83 — paragraph 1, Book of Covenants, where Christ speaks to Joseph and six elders, making seven in all; answering to the **seven from Heaven, whom came in their order to confer on him (Joseph) his ordinations of Priesthood.**”⁴

A reference to *seven* angels who “came in their order” to give Joseph “his ordinations of Priesthood” clearly refers to the three restorations that occurred. John the Baptist (angel #1), Peter, James, and John (#2, #3, and #4), Moses, Elias, and Elijah (#5, #6, and #7), who came to “confer on Joseph what he held.”

⁴ Alpheus Cutler letter to Zenos Gurley, 29 January 1856, published in Rupert J. Fletcher and Daisy Whiting Fletcher, *Alpheus Cutler and the Church of Christ* page 267, emphasis added.

KINGS AND PRIESTS

Joseph Smith looked forward to the day that the Latter-day Saints as a people would receive this higher priesthood of being made Kings and Priests. On January 6, 1842, reflecting on the New Year, he wrote in his journal:

“The new year has been ushered in and continued thus far under the most favorable auspices, and the Saints seem to be influenced by a kind and indulgent Providence in their dispositions and [blessed with] means **to rear the Temple of the Most High God, anxiously looking forth to the completion thereof as an event of the greatest importance to the Church and the world**, making the Saints in Zion to rejoice, and the hypocrite and sinner to tremble.

Truly this is a day long to be remembered by the Saints of the last days, — **a day in which the God of heaven has begun to restore the ancient order of His kingdom unto His servants and His people**, — a day in which all things are concurring to bring about the completion of the fullness of the Gospel, a fullness of the dispensation of dispensations, even the fullness of times; a day in which God has begun to make manifest and set in order in His Church those things which have been, and those which the ancient prophets and wise men desired to see but died without beholding them; a day in which those things begin to be made manifest, which have been hid from before the foundation of the world, and which Jehovah has promised should be made known in His own due time unto His servants, to prepare the earth for the return of His glory, **even a celestial glory, and a kingdom of Priests and Kings to God and the Lamb**, forever, on Mount Zion, and with him the

hundred and forty and four thousand whom John the Revelator saw, **all of which is to come to pass in the restitution of all things.**"⁵

But what was so special about that day specifically? This may have been the first time the Prophet revealed and performed preliminary temple ordinances of the Highest Order of the Melchizedek Priesthood, involving Brigham Young and Agnes Smith.⁶

Five months later on May 4, 1842, the Prophet would meet again with Brigham Young and eight other men to teach about and confer upon them this "highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood" on them.⁷ Over the next two years before his death, he would introduce over 60 individuals to this "highest order of priesthood."

COSMOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD?

Some individuals have attempted to dismiss the Temple Priesthood introduced in Nauvoo as merely pertaining to heavenly cosmology and relationships, rather than having any ecclesiastical significance or authority in the present world. Yet Joseph Smith himself taught that it did have real

⁵ *History of the Church* vol. 4 <6 January 1842> page 492–493, emphasis added.

⁶ Brigham Young wrote cryptically in a masonic cypher in his journal that day that he "was taken into the Lodge" and indicated that Joseph was sealed to Agnes on this occasion.

⁷ Devery S. Anderson and Gary James Bergera, *Joseph Smith's Quorum of the Anointed, 1842–1845* pages 4–7.

world authority. Speaking of the authority of Kings and Priests he said:

“I want every man that goes [on an expedition West] to be a king and a priest. When he gets on the mountains, he may want to talk with his God; when with the savage nations have power to govern, &c.”⁸

So according to Joseph Smith being a King and Priest empowered a man to be more able to “talk with his God” and possess temporal authority to govern nations.

In the opening months of the Succession Crisis after the death of Joseph Smith, the authority of Kings and Priests was explained further. Brigham Young alluded that the apostles were Kings and Priests when he stated that they were “ordained and anointed” to “bear off the keys of the kingdom of God in all the world,” and so could “manage the affairs of the church and direct all things alright.”⁹ Yet President Young also recognized that others had received authority as Kings and Priests as well:

“Does this church want it as God organized it? Or do you want to clip the power of the priesthood, and let those who have the keys of the priesthood go and build up the kingdom in all the world, wherever the people will hear them? If there is a spokesman, **if he is a king and priest, let him go and build up a kingdom unto himself; that is his right and it is the right of many here,** but the Twelve are at the head of it. ...**In the**

⁸ *History of the Church* vol. 6 <23 February 1844> page 224.

⁹ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <8 August 1844> pages 232, 235.

priesthood you have a right to build up a kingdom, if you know how the church is organized.”¹⁰

Brigham Young would later detail that the “liberty” to “build up a kingdom” meant to “get men and women sealed to them,” a reference to enlarging their families through plural marriage and the Law of Adoption.¹¹

During the trial of Sidney Rigdon one month later, Heber C. Kimball also made strong statements indicating that the authority of Kings and Priests was *ecclesiastical* authority distinctly *above* the Church:

“Elder Rigdon after he came from Pittsburgh never attended council only when he could not avoid it. **He has no authority, only what he receives from the Church;** if he was one with us, why was he not in our councils? He was not in the council pertaining to the High Priesthood until just before he started for Pittsburgh. Brother Phelps was the means of bringing him in, but *he has not got the same authority as others;* **there are more than thirty men who have got higher authority than he has.** ... There are men here, **brethren who have got authority,** *but we don't want to mention their names, for the enemy will try to kill them.*”¹²

Similarly Brigham Young had commented a month earlier:

¹⁰ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <8 August 1844> page 235, emphasis added.

¹¹ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <16 February 1847> pages 179, 182.

¹² The Trial of Sidney Rigdon, 8 September 1844, published in *Times and Season* vol. 5 <1 October 1844> pages 663-664, emphasis and italics added.

“I know there are those in our midst who will seek the lives of the Twelve as they did the lives of Joseph and Hyrum. We shall ordain others and give the fullness of the priesthood, so that if we are killed the fullness of the priesthood may remain.”¹³

Even though Rigdon was a member of the First Presidency and had been considered “equal” to Joseph in holding the “keys of this last kingdom” in 1833,¹⁴ the keys of the kingdom held by members of the First Presidency in 1833 did not comprehend the “keys of the kingdom” restored by Moses, Elias, and Elijah in 1836.

Sidney Rigdon’s authority was “only what he receives from the Church” — indicating that there was priesthood authority *outside of* and *distinct from* the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. An 1848 statement by James Brewster’s newspaper *The Olive Branch* provides an exaggerated statement that Kings and Priests had authority above the Church as well:

“They had organized a quorum of authority, *not known in the law of the church*; this was **a council of fifty; ordained kings and priests**, *constituting an authority that no tribunal in the church could control.*”¹⁵

Another statement proving the ecclesiastical significance of this priesthood was made by Joseph

¹³ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <7 August 1844> page 230.

¹⁴ D&C 90:6.

¹⁵ *The Olive Branch* vol. 1 <August 1848> page 18, emphasis and italics added.

Smith to the Relief Society in 1842. He indicated that if all had gone according to plan, and had he lived to see the Nauvoo Temple completed, there would have been a fundamental hierarchal change in the Church structure:

“The Church is not fully organized, in its proper order, and cannot be, until the Temple is completed, where places will be provided for the administration of the ordinances of the Priesthood. ...I calculate to organize the Church in its proper order as soon as the Temple is complete.”¹⁶

The reason the Prophet told this to the Relief Society was because in the new order of priesthood women equally partook with the men in holding the keys and powers of the priesthood — as Queens and Priestesses, alongside their husbands who were Kings and Priests.¹⁷

MALE TEMPLE AUTHORITY IN TRANSITION

On August 8, 1844, Brigham Young not only stated that the Twelve had been given the keys of the kingdom and that others had been ordained Kings and Priests, he also instructed the saints that

¹⁶ *History of the Church* vol. 4 <28 April 1842> pages 603–604.

¹⁷ The subject of Women and the Priesthood will be addressed in the next pamphlet *One Eternal Round* #11 “The Demise of the Patriarchal Priesthood Part 2, Women and the Priesthood.”

they needed to complete the temple so that those who had this priesthood could give it to others:

“The Twelve have the power now — [yet] the seventies, the elders and all of you can have power to go and build up the kingdom in the name of Israel’s God. Nauvoo will not hold all the people that will come into the kingdom. We want to build the Temple so as to get our endowment; and if we do our best, and Satan will not let us build it, we will go into the wilderness and we will receive the endowment, for we will receive our endowment anyhow. ...We have all the signs and tokens to give to the porter at the door, and he will let us in.”¹⁸

A few months later President Young reiterated:

“Now if you will go and finish off the upper story of the temple you will have a place in which you can receive your washing and anointings and endowments. Would it not cost less to do this, than to build a hall from the start? ...Well then, go to work and finish off the upper room, and then you can get your endowment, and your priesthood.”¹⁹

The Nauvoo Temple was completed enough for the saints to be endowed the following winter. George Miller wrote about this in his history:

“In the course of the winters of 1845 and 1846, at the instance of Brigham Young, H. C. Kimball and Willard Richards, and others of the quorum of the Twelve, it was agreed upon by them in council that brethren who had been faithful in paying their tithing and could produce

¹⁸ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <8 August 1844> page 239.

¹⁹ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <6 January 1845> page 63.

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD 11

the proper vouchers that they have paid a full tithing of all their property, should receive an endowment of patriarchal priesthood, under the hands of the twelve apostles so soon as the upper room of the temple could be fitted therefor, and tithing gatherers were sent in every direction. Consequently there was an immense sum of money and property paid in, and the rooms in the temple were fitted up and the promised endowment began in the latter part of December, or there about, and was continued from day to day until February 1846.”²⁰

After Joseph Smith’s death, references to the Temple Priesthood as a new order of “Patriarchal Priesthood” disappeared, with the exception of two statements by George Miller in his personal history (including the statement quoted above).²¹ This language shift was likely due to issues with William Smith and Emma Smith and the reality that the apostles were not the Prophet’s patriarchal heirs.²²

But even though references to the Temple Priesthood as “Patriarchal Priesthood” in the post-Martyrdom period of 1844 to 1846 disappeared, there still were several important references made to

²⁰ George Miller letter to *The Northern Islander*, 1 July 1855, published in *The Northern Islander* vol. 5, 13 September 1855 and *Correspondence of Bishop George Miller with The Northern Islander* page 29.

²¹ This is not to say that the apostles stopped understanding temple authority as lineal and familial priesthood authority. But they did stop explicitly calling it “Patriarchal Priesthood.” However there is one Brigham Young statement where he contextually alluded to the temple ordinances as being Patriarchal Priesthood, on August 15, 1847 (see pages 20–22).

²² See *One Eternal Round* issue #8 “Patriarchal Succession and the Birthright of Joseph Smith.”

it as being the “highest order” and “fullness of” the priesthood.²³

In the Nauvoo Temple, Brigham Young explicitly taught that those who received all of their temple ordinances and were anointed Kings and Priests in the Second Anointing were given all the priesthood that one man could give another man:

“President Young said when he began again he should pay no respect to quorums. Every man that comes in is washed and anointed by good men and it makes no difference. Every man that gets his endowment, whether he is High Priest or Seventy, may go into any part of the world and build up the kingdom if he has the keys, or on to any island.

We have been ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood, **which is the highest order of Priesthood**, and it has many branches or offices. **And those who have come in here and have received their washing and anointing will be ordained Kings and Priests, and will then have received the fullness of the Priesthood, all that can be given on earth, for Brother Joseph said he had given us all that could be given to man on the earth.**”²⁴

²³ Two other examples I will not quote in this section are a statement Willard Richards authored in April 1845 that would eventually become the May 4, 1842 entry of the *History of the Church*, recalling that Joseph Smith taught them in that meeting about the “highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood.” William Smith in October 1845 referenced receiving his temple ordinances is what brought him into the “*highest* priesthood lodge.”

²⁴ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <26 December 1845> page 113, emphasis added.

This statement by Brigham Young marked the last time I am able to document that the authority of the temple was referenced as the “highest order of the priesthood.” Beginning in 1845 a new doctrine on the supremacy of the *Apostleship* as the highest priesthood authority began to grow and eventually supplant the Nauvoo teachings about Kings and Priests.²⁵

Yet over the next several years there were still occasions where the apostles continued to acknowledge the temple authority as the “Fullness of the Priesthood” and that it made recipients “equal” in holding the highest authority. Parley P. Pratt on one occasion stated:

“All the Twelve are alike in keys, power, might, majesty and dominion and the Seventy are equal, everyone in his place, and so are all who have the Fulness of the Priesthood, they are entitled to your faith and prayers and there is no middle nor higher nor lower family than those are who have the Fullness of the Priesthood. Some say I [am higher if I] go into Brother [John] Taylor’s family or some a little higher into [Wilford] Woodruff’s or Heber [C. Kimball]’s or Orson Hyde’s. [But here] there is no ‘Rigdonism’, ‘Strangism’, and every other ‘ism’. We are one, we are equal so far as our conduct is equal. You are not higher nor lower in one family than another. My mind is Brigham’s mind and my mind is the same as Heber’s.”²⁶

²⁵ This will be discussed in a future issue of *One Eternal Round*.

²⁶ Parley P. Pratt, Meeting of 23 May 1847, in Stephen F. Pratt, “Parley P Pratt in Winter Quarters,” *BYU Studies* <1984> pages 9–10, spelling and grammar corrected, emphasis added.

Apostle John Taylor similarly commented:

“The Seventies have the High Priesthood, and many of them have received ordinances in the temple, qualifying them to build up the Kingdom of God, if every other officer was dead or killed, and so have the High Priests.”²⁷

John D. Lee was one of those seventies who had received his Second Anointing in the Nauvoo Temple, and in his autobiographical “Life and Confessions” he recalled this understanding:

“I was among the first to receive my washings and anointings, and even received my Second Anointing, which made me an equal in the order of the Priesthood, with the right and authority to build up the kingdom in all the earth, and power to fill any vacancy that might occur. I have officiated in all the different branches, from the highest to the lowest.”²⁸

Yet after 1847 references to the “Fullness of the Priesthood” explaining that the ordinances of the temple conferred the highest priesthood one mortal could receive *disappeared* from Mormonism. In studying Brigham Young’s discourses, I have not been able to identify any public statements made by him after 1847 that utilize the terms “highest order of the priesthood” or “fullness of the priesthood.” Similarly, in searching early Utah sermons published in the

²⁷ *Millennial Star* vol. 9 <7 May 1847> page 325.

²⁸ *Mormonism Unveiled; or the Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop, John D. Lee* page 169.

Journal of Discourses, I cannot find a single reference to the “fullness of the priesthood” from the earliest sermons in 1852 until 1869 — when George Q. Cannon as a new church leader utilized the term.²⁹ Public references to the “fullness” after that time start to re-appear, but such references fail to offer the significant explanation of that authority’s *ecclesiastical* implications as can be found in the 1840s.

The last reference explaining that Kings and Priests were the highest priesthood that I can document comes from Orson Pratt in 1853. Pratt’s writings in *The Seer* were contemporarily viewed as independent and not in harmony with counsel of Brigham Young and the First Presidency. So it should not be surprising that his explanation of the authority of Kings and Priests also took liberty in being more open and explicit than any other church leader in the 1850s:

“Where the [Kingly and Priestly authority] are combined and the individual perfected, he has almighty power both as a King and as a Priest; both offices are then merged in one. The distinctions then, will be merely in the name and not in the authority; either as a King or a Priest he will then have power and dominion over all things, and reign over all. Both titles, combined, will then not give him any more power than either one singly. ...for when they are perfected they will have power to act in every branch of authority by virtue of the great, and almighty, and eternal Priesthood which they hold; they can then sway their sceptres as Kings; rule as Princes, minister as Apostles; officiate as Teachers: or act in the humblest or most exalted capacity. There is no branch of the

²⁹ *Journal of Discourses* vol. 13 <5 December 1869> page 49.

Priesthood so low that they cannot condescend to officiate therein; none so high, that they cannot reach forth the arm of power and control the same.”³⁰

Here Orson Pratt concedes that “perfected” Kings and Priests could “minister as Apostles” and act in *any* branch of authority whether “the humblest” or the “most exalted.” But could an apostle without his Second Anointing minister as a King and Priest? Certainly not.³¹

SCHISMATIC CLAIMS

It is worth noting that the apostles that followed Brigham Young were not alone in believing that the authority of Kings and Priests was ecclesiastical priesthood authority. Scholars also observe that an important aspect of Alpheus Cutler’s claim to authority is that Cutler had received his Second Anointing from Joseph Smith on November 15, 1843. While Cutler also importantly tied his authority to being a member of

³⁰ *The Seer* vol. 1 <October 1853> no. 10, page 145.

³¹ On March 4, 1886 President John Taylor commented that those who stood in proxy for deceased individuals to receive their Second Anointing “must be those who have already had that sacred ordinance.” (*The Development of LDS Temple Worship* <4 March 1886> page 56) Wilford Woodruff also agreed with this understanding that the Second Anointing was necessary to participate in that ordinance: “The reception of the endowment enabled a person to act in behalf of the dead in any of the ordinances in the house of the Lord, except the highest [i.e. the Second Anointing].” (*The Development of LDS Temple Worship* <23 June 1893> page 93)

“the Kingdom,” his claim to an ordination as a “Prophet” (Prophet, Priest, and King) and to all the “rights, keys, powers, privileges, and blessings” of the Melchizedek Priesthood was referencing his Second Anointing.³²

Similar to Cutler, Lyman Wight emphasized his membership in the “Grand Council” of the Kingdom and having been given “full authority to build up the Kingdom of God.”³³ George A. Smith understood this as an allusion to Wight receiving his temple ordinances, and retorted that Wight and other members of the Council of Fifty received “no more of the Endowment than any other people.”³⁴

Other Council of Fifty members indicated their belief that the temple ordinances bestowed priesthood authority above the priesthood of the Church. Peter Haws claimed that Lyman Wight and Almon Babbitt “held more power” than the apostles. Theodore Turley similarly claimed that the Prophet bestowed on him, less than a week before his death, “more power and priesthood than upon any other man in the Church.”³⁵

³² Devery Anderson and Gary Bergera, *Joseph Smith's Quorum of the Anointed* <15 November 1843> page 35; D. Michael Quinn, *Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* pages 204 – 205.

³³ Lyman Wight, *An Address by Way of an Abridged Account and Journal of My Life* <1848> page 3.

³⁴ Pottawattamie High Council Conference Minutes, 7 October 1848, LDS Archives.

³⁵ Pottawattamie High Council Minutes, 20 January 1849, LDS Archives.

REVEALING ELIJAH'S RETURN

After Joseph Smith's death the apostles revealed that this temple authority was the "priesthood of Elijah" — that Elijah had secretly returned to Joseph Smith and restored priesthood keys. The first allusion to the significance of the apostles holding the authority of Elijah was in a *Times and Seasons* article remarking on Brigham Young's August 8, 1844 speech that "every saint could see that Elijah's mantle had truly fallen upon the 'Twelve'."³⁶ Following this, in early 1845 the apostles began to write about Elijah's return and that the keys were restored to Joseph. In May 1845 Parley P. Pratt wrote:

"And if you will receive it, Elijah the prophet has been sent in these last days to man on the earth, and has conferred the keys of the sealing power that others might go forth in his spirit, power, and priesthood, and seal both on earth and in heaven."³⁷

Two months earlier, on January 1, 1845 Parley P. Pratt had written that Joseph Smith had conferred on Brigham Young "the keys of the sealing power, as conferred in the last days by the spirit and power of Elijah."³⁸ In an article published in August 1845, Parley P. Pratt's brother Orson also acknowledged that the "one" who presided over the

³⁶ *Times and Seasons* vol. 5 <2 September 1844> page 637.

³⁷ *Millennial Star* vol. 5 <May 1845> page 193

³⁸ Epistle of Parley P. Pratt "Proclamation" dated 1 January 1845, *Millennial Star* vol. 5 <March 1845> page 151.

priesthood held “the keys of the sealing power as conferred by Elijah.”³⁹

Yet besides these three remarks in 1845, the records seem to indicate that even though the return of Elijah was a dominant subject during the Nauvoo period of Joseph Smith’s life,⁴⁰ the apostles chose to generally remain silent about the return of Elijah. Richard E. Bennett also observed this in his book *Temples Rising*:

“...Brigham Young said relatively little about Elijah’s return, as modern dialogue dictates, but looked more to ‘the Angels’ usually in reference to the return of Peter, James, and John — as one of Joseph Smith’s greatest visions. ...Surprisingly, throughout most of Joseph Smith’s time in Nauvoo and Brigham Young’s tenure as President of the Church — that is throughout the late 1840s, 1850s, and 1860s — relatively little was recorded concerning the return of Elijah, Elias, and Moses — at

³⁹ *New York Messenger*, 25 August 1845, also in the *Journal History*, 25 August 1845, LDS Archives.

⁴⁰ Historian D. Michael Quinn observed: “From 1839 to his death in 1844 Smith’s sermons emphasized Elijah as restorer of supreme priesthood authority. For example, the prophet preached in October 1840: ‘Why send Elijah? Because he holds the keys of the authority to administer in all the ordinances of the Priesthood and without the authority is given, the ordinances could not be administered in righteousness.’ During these last five years Smith invoked Elijah’s restoration of priesthood keys as the authority for essential ordinances for the living and the dead. These included baptism, the ‘Holy Order’, preliminary anointing and endowment, the sealing of marriage for eternity, and the second anointing. The most incisive interpreter of Elijah’s significance has noted that after 1835 this Old Testament prophet ‘eclipsed’ the importance of Peter, James, and John.” (*The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* pages 35-36)

least not by name. ...during the 1850s and 1860s the doctrinal and historical justification for temple work centered on the return of the Angel Moroni and restoration of apostolic priesthood keys performed by Peter, James, and John, under whom almost all visions stemmed.”⁴¹

One example of this shift from Elijah to Peter, James, and John can be seen in the change in who restored the authority to bestow the ordinance of the Second Anointing or Fullness of the Priesthood. In March 1844 Joseph Smith commented that the priesthood of Elijah was the “power to hold the key of the revelations, ordinances, oracles, powers and endowments of the fulness of the Melchizedek Priesthood and of the kingdom of God on the earth.”⁴² So in this statement, Joseph Smith identified that the authority to bestow the “fulness of the Melchizedek Priesthood” — the Second Anointing — was restored by Elijah.

Heber C. Kimball acknowledged in Utah that even though he was already an apostle that he “never received any greater authority than that I received directly under the hands of Joseph Smith a short time previous to his death...He placed power into our hands, and all the keys and authority that he had received from God,”⁴³ referencing the keys and powers bestowed through the Second Anointing. Yet instead of explaining that this authority came from Elijah, he instead suggested

⁴¹ Richard E. Bennett, *Temples Rising* pages 160–161.

⁴² *History of the Church* vol. 6 <10 March 1844> page 251.

⁴³ Minutes of sermon of 23 March 1853, Heber C. Kimball Papers, LDS Archives.

that these highest “keys and power” were given to Joseph Smith by Peter, James, and John:

“I bear testimony of what brother Joseph said on the stand at Nauvoo, and I presume hundreds here can bear witness of the same. Said he, ‘These men that are set here behind me on this stand, I have conferred upon them all the power, Priesthood, and authority that God ever conferred upon me.’ ...The Twelve had then received their endowments. Brother Joseph gave them the endowments, and keys and power were placed upon them by him, even as they were placed upon him by Peter, James, and John, who ordained him.”⁴⁴

Why would the apostles choose to generally ignore the return of Moses, Elias, and Elijah and instead emphasize Peter, James, and John? For the same reason they incorporated Peter, James, and John into the Endowment ceremony — to bolster apostolic succession.⁴⁵

Admitting that the highest priesthood keys were restored by Elijah would naturally raise questions as to how the Quorum of the Twelve and office of Apostle, restored one year before Elijah returned, was the highest priesthood authority.

The last public statement by Brigham Young where he mentioned the fullness of the priesthood was on August 15, 1847. In this address

⁴⁴ *Journal of Discourses* vol. 1 <8 October 1852> page 206.

⁴⁵ “On the day general church membership began attending the [Nauvoo] temple, December 12, 1845, [Brigham] Young and others added the roles of the New Testament apostles, Peter, James, and John to the drama.” (Devery Anderson and Gary Bergera, *The Nauvoo Endowment companies*, Editors’ Introduction, page xxiv)

he spoke about the “patriarchal priesthood” of the office of church patriarch, as well as the restorations of Priesthood by John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John. Brigham then spoke about Elijah, yet interestingly left out any mention of Moses, Elias, and Elijah’s restoration of authority, instead indicating that Peter James and John were the ones who restored to Joseph Smith “every key, power, blessing, and privilege of the highest authority of the Melchizedek Priesthood”:

“I am going today to speak upon the subject of the Patriarchal Priesthood. ...The Priesthood is again restored on the earth to bring back. We do not receive all at once but we receive grace for grace. When Brother Joseph received the Priesthood, he did not receive all at once, but He was a prophet, seer, and revelator before he received the fullness of the Priesthood and keys of the kingdom. He first received the Aaronic Priesthood and keys from under the hands of John the Baptist.

He then had not power to lay on hands to confirm the Church, but afterwards he received the Patriarchal or Melchizedek Priesthood from under the hands of Peter, James and John, who were of the Twelve Apostles and were the Presidency when the other Apostles were absent. From those Apostles Joseph Smith received every key, power, blessing, and privilege of the highest authority of the Melchizedek Priesthood ever committed to man on the earth which they held.

I want this Church to understand from this day henceforth and forever that an apostle is the Highest office and authority that there is in the Church and Kingdom of God on the earth. From whom did Joseph receive his authority? From just such men as sit around me here (pointing to the Twelve Apostles that sat with

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD 23

him.) Peter, James and John were Apostles, and there was no noise about their being seers and revelators though those gifts were among them. Joseph Smith gave unto me and my brethren (the Twelve) all the Priesthood keys, power and authority which he had and those are powers which belong to the Apostleship.

Elijah spoke in the Bible that he should come in the last days to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the children to their fathers. The fulfillment of this scripture is manifest in establishing the Kingdom of God and Priesthood on the earth in the last days, and those who hold the keys of the priesthood and sealing power have the spirit and power of Elijah, and it is necessary in order to redeem our dead and save our children. There is much more importance attached to this than parents are aware of.

...What then can be done? I will tell you. A man that has embraced the gospel must be someone who has the Priesthood and keys and power of Elijah and must attend to ordinances for that child, even must be baptized for it as well as to have it sealed to him and then claim his child in the morning of the resurrection and the Lord will give it up to him.”⁴⁶

It should be observed that President Young was speaking on “patriarchal priesthood” and even though he avoided mentioning the Kirtland Temple restoration, he still spoke on the “keys and power of Elijah,” indicating that Brigham knew that the temple ordinances were Patriarchal Priesthood and restored by Elijah, even if he did not explicitly explain that they were. Brigham in other ways did

⁴⁶ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <15 August 1847> pages 240–241.

not tell the whole truth in this sermon, when he claimed that Peter, James, and John restored “every key, power, blessing, and privilege” of the highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood and spoke of the office of Apostle being the highest office.

Over the next several years Brigham Young made two other small comments acknowledging the keys of Elijah were committed to Joseph Smith: first on March 12, 1848 and then on February 2, 1851.⁴⁷ But after that, all of Brigham Young’s references to Elijah are vague and in passing.

⁴⁷ “The sealing are the keys that were committed that would turn the hearts of the children to the fathers and the fathers to the children. Joseph had the directing of building fonts, Elijah recorded them gladly and they were called Elijah’s keys. Those who knew, those keys were committed to Joseph and they are here. Consequently, if we are faithful, build temples and fonts, if our hearts turn to our fathers, don’t you see their hearts will be turned to us?” (*Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <12 March 1848> page 277)

Brigham Young mentioning the return of Elijah on February 2, 1851 was provoked by an individual claiming to speak for another man who was claiming to be Elijah the Prophet. Brigham Young retorted: “Many have arisen in these last days professing to be Elijah the prophet but they have brought forth nothing of interest to the people. Will any one tell me what the office of Elijah the prophet was to be to the earth when he come? The answer is to turn the hearts of the children to their fathers and the fathers to the children lest I come and smite the whole earth with a curse. In what way is this to be done? By sealing upon the head of the prophet Joseph those keys to remain in the Church and Kingdom of God until the winding up scene. The Elders of this Church know those keys were sealed upon the head of Joseph Smith and still remain in the Church.” (*Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <2 February 1851> page 418)

It may be suggested that while the apostles understood that Joseph had received the keys of Elijah, they might not have known the details of his return in the Kirtland Temple on April 3, 1836, and that is why they didn't speak about it in detail. Yet even after the account of the appearance of Moses, Elias, and Elijah was published in the *Deseret News* on November 6, 1852 and the *Millennial Star* the following year, it still was not spoken about in the early Utah period.

Similar to how Orson Pratt was the last church leader to explicitly talk about the authority of Kings and Priests, he also was the only apostle during the early Utah period to speak about the Kirtland Temple restoration in any detail. In his sermon announcing plural marriage to the world on August 28, 1852 he explained:

“So in these days; let me announce to this congregation, that there is but one man in all the world, at the same time, who can hold the keys of this matter; but one man has power to turn the key to inquire of the Lord, and to say whether I, or these my brethren, or any of the rest of this congregation, or the Saints upon the face of the whole earth, may have this blessing of Abraham conferred upon them; he holds the keys of these matters now, the same as Nathan, in his day.

...They are the sealing keys of power, or in other words, of Elijah, having been committed and restored to the earth by Elijah, the Prophet, who held many keys, among which were the keys of sealing, to bind the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers; together with all the other sealing keys and powers, pertaining to the last dispensation. They were committed by that Angel who administered in the

Kirtland Temple, and spoke unto Joseph the Prophet, at the time of the endowments in that house.”⁴⁸

One other rare exception where Elijah’s return was spoken of in detail was another sermon given by Orson Pratt in 1859:

“What is the testimony of the Prophet Joseph Smith? We believe him to be the Prophet of the Lord in this great and last dispensation. We Latter-day Saints believe this fact. What did he testify in the Kirtland Temple, after it was built and consecrated and dedicated unto the Lord of hosts? He testified that he, in connection with others, had the ministration of Elijah the Prophet, who appeared to them in great glory. You can read this in the History of Joseph Smith, the Prophet: we can read all the instructions that were given in relation to his particular mission.”⁴⁹

In this 1859 speech Orson Pratt went on to explain that Elijah’s mission was to perform a priesthood *ordination* on this occasion:

“We cannot suppose that that great Prophet [Elijah] is coming down upon the earth to wander about among the nations, and to continue in this wicked world. If he is sent at all, he will be sent with power and authority, like other angels sent from heaven, to bestow the same authority that is upon himself on some individuals on the earth, that they may go forth holding the same authority that Elijah himself held, having the same keys, receiving the same instructions, in regard to the Latter-day dispensation — a mission, in other words, sent from

⁴⁸ *Journal of Discourses* vol. 1 <28 August 1852> pages 63–64.

⁴⁹ *Journal of Discourses* vol. 7 <28 August 1859> page 78.

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD 27

heaven by Elijah as a ministering angel to seek out the chosen vessels, and **ordain them, and send them to administer to the inhabitants of the earth. This is the way the Lord commits dispensations: instead of sending angels to wander on the earth, he sends them to ordain others, to restore the authority, and set the work agoing.**

...The time had now arrived for other ordinances to be made manifest, for other things to be revealed, for greater light to shine forth, **for other keys, powers, and authorities to be bestowed upon chosen vessels of the Lord.**

...In the last dispensation of the fulness of times all other dispensations will be consolidated. It will be the winding-up dispensation of this earth, introduced before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. It will be a dispensation that will take hold of the fathers back to the earliest ages of the world. It will be a dispensation in which the keys that were committed to the Apostles in the ancient days will be delivered to chosen ones — a dispensation in which all the keys and powers held by all the ancient Prophets will be delivered — a dispensation that will **reach back unto the days of Moses**, and that will take hold of **patriarchal keys**, and the righteous institutions of those that lived in the days of the flood, and back to the days of our father Adam; and there will be keys and powers restored once revealed to him.”⁵⁰

It may be observed that Orson Pratt alludes to Moses and Elias, though he does not explicitly mention them. Furthermore Pratt describes these keys and powers as “patriarchal keys.” This

⁵⁰ *Journal of Discourses* vol. 7 <28 August 1859> pages 78–81, emphasis added.

reference to “patriarchal keys” was possibly an allusion to the keys of Moses, Elias, and Elijah being the keys to a higher order of Patriarchal Priesthood *above* the patriarchal priesthood of church patriarchs that was part of the Melchizedek Priesthood restored by Peter, James, and John.

Similar to how the Fulness of the Priesthood began to be mentioned again starting in 1869 by George Q. Cannon, near the end of the 1870s the return of Moses, Elias, and Elijah began to be mentioned and emphasized in church sermons. Orson Pratt was tasked with updating the *Doctrine and Covenants* in 1876. Orson Pratt included Moroni’s promise of the return of Elijah to reveal “priesthood,” as was written in Joseph Smith’s drafted *History* in 1838, as D&C section 2. Pratt also included the April 3, 1836 account of the return of Moses, Elias, and Elijah as section 110.

Orson Pratt mentioned all three individuals and their keys in detail in a sermon in 1877, and after Brigham Young’s death President John Taylor and other apostles began to speak about these keys in detail.

But why would the apostles feel comfortable speaking about the Kirtland Temple restoration, when earlier they did not? Possibly because all serious competitors to succession that had claims to the Priesthood of Elijah and temple ordinances had all declined to near extinction — the only major competing branch left was the RLDS Church, who did not concern themselves with the new priesthood orders and ordinances revealed in Nauvoo.

Another aspect as to why the apostles could have felt more comfortable talking about the

Kirtland Restoration may be that the doctrine of the Apostleship as the presiding authority over the Church and Kingdom had been so engrained into Utah Mormonism and the Temple Priesthood been minimized for decades made telling about the third restoration of priesthood of no consequence.

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD

Even though in 1844 Brigham Young spoke of individuals having the right to build up a kingdom unto themselves, only a few years later he changed his tone. By Winter Quarters he began to teach that the elders could not exercise this privilege because of their wickedness:

“Were I to say to the elders, ‘you now have the liberty to build up your kingdoms,’ *and get all they could to be sealed to them*, one half of them would lie, swear, steal *and even murder* and fight like the very devil to get men and women sealed to them.”⁵¹

By the early Utah period, only a few years later, the kingdom building doctrine had been relegated to being in “eternity” or “heaven” only:

“Every person in heaven is at liberty when they have the privilege to organize a kingdom for themselves, but unless they are submissive to their presidents on earth,

⁵¹ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <16 February 1847> pages 179, 182.

they never can have the privilege to the last day of eternity. If they are faithful here, they will be make gods in eternity.”⁵²

Even though the apostles still occasionally mentioned the authority of Kings and Priests, that authority was only explained as primarily being powers that pertaining to *after* the resurrection. Apostle Wilford Woodruff, for example, wrote in 1889 that the Second Anointing was primarily “an ordinance of the eternal world” which “belonged particularly to old men.”⁵³

When the apostles began to administer the Second Anointing again in 1868, one individual who received it in March 1868 recalled that while it would spiritually empower him to a greater degree,⁵⁴ he understood that primarily it was “setting apart for resurrection and power conferred to rise from the dead, and to raise others.”⁵⁵

This limited understanding of the Second Anointing was also explained in an article of the *Juvenile Instructor* in 1880:

“The question then arises, what is meant by the fullness of the priesthood? **It does not mean any special office above that of Apostles, but that there were powers**

⁵² *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <29 June 1851> page 440.

⁵³ *The Diaries of Abraham H. Cannon, 1889–1895* <7 October 1889> page 6.

⁵⁴ “I understood this second endowment would give me more power and I could fight the Devil with more force and power.” (“Experiences of Elder John Hawley,” published in *RLDS Journal of History* vol. 4 page 224)

⁵⁵ Letter of John Hawley in *Saints’ Herald*, Volume 31 <28 June 1884> page 412.

belonging to the different grades of priesthood which had not been conferred.

...These additional powers include all of the keys that belong to the holy priesthood on the earth, or were ever revealed to man in any dispensation, and which admit men and women within the veil. They enable them to pass the angels and the gods, until they get into the presence of the Father and the Son. They make of them kings and priests, queens and priestesses to God, to rule and reign as such over their posterity and those who may be given to them by adoption, in the grand jubilee of rest which is near at hand.”⁵⁶

While this article affirmed that the ordinance conferred upon individuals “additional powers” including “all of the keys” of the Priesthood, it limited their scope and usage by noting that this authority of Kings and Priests and Queens and Priestesses was just additional “grades of the priesthood” — not offices above the Apostleship, and that these offices only pertained to “the grand jubilee of rest,” referencing the Resurrection and the Millennium.

Leonard Arrington, who significantly noted that the Second Anointing gave women priesthood authority,⁵⁷ at the same time ironically denied that

⁵⁶ *Juvenile Instructor* vol. 15 no. 10 <15 May 1880> page 111, emphasis added.

⁵⁷ “There is a portion of the ceremony in which the wife goes through a symbolic ceremony of preparing the husband’s body for burial and for resurrection, and she uses her equivalent to the priesthood to anoint him and to seal him up for the resurrection. Because of this portion, some women in pioneer Utah, on the basis of their diaries and histories, apparently thought that the priesthood was being conferred upon them.

the ordinance gave men additional priesthood power in this life to utilize. He described it as only “potential power as gods and goddesses” rather than it conferring the priesthood of Elijah and sealing power to be used in mortality. In mentioning issues between Brigham Young and William Smith over the sealing power in Nauvoo, Arrington presented the later Utah understanding that the Second Anointing did not empower men in this life:

“It is my understanding that much of the trouble between Brigham Young and William Smith was over the issue of the authority which William Smith had been given in his Second Anointing. He thought he had the sealing power and wanted to seal people on his own authority. Brigham Young responded to him in a letter in our possession which recalls to him a conversation on the second floor of Joseph’s store about the matter, in which Joseph said that there was a difference between being granted a potential power as gods and goddesses, and being granted the keys of Elijah; only one person on earth, the prophet, has the keys of Elijah — this is not shared by a number of people and is not conveyed except potentially in the Second Anointing ceremony. And even the potential authority and power, which often could lead to misunderstanding, was removed in the 1920s by President [Heber J.] Grant.”⁵⁸

This is apparently not something which women in this century have assumed. But there must be something to the idea, since they are not only sharing in the symbolic ceremony as recipients but also actively performing an ordinance which involves sealing — performing this on authority which they receive during the ceremony.” (*Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington* vol. 2 <26 March 1979> page 756)

⁵⁸ *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington* vol. 2 <26 March 1979> page 757.

While it is true that Brigham Young and William Smith disagreed over who could exercise the sealing power, William had not received his Second Anointing. And while Joseph Smith and Brigham Young believed that the sealing power was presided over by the “One Anointed and Appointed,” that did not negate the fact that other men received the Sealing Keys of Elijah through the Second Anointing and could exercise that authority in union with the man who presided over it.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ For more on this see *One Eternal Round* #1 “The Nauvoo Priesthood Developments” pages 17–18, see also *One Eternal Round* #6 and #7 detail the history of the application of the office of the “One Anointed and Appointed” in Nauvoo and early Utah.

HIDING THE TEMPLE PRIESTHOOD IN EDITING THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

When the apostles completed the *History of the Church* in the 1850s they made a number of editorial decisions to minimize the Patriarchal Priesthood as it was introduced in Nauvoo. While key dates and several important statements were faithfully included about this priesthood, by not including other statements it makes it harder for individuals to fully grasp the significance of this priesthood as it was introduced — including the reality that women held the priesthood — especially in Utah Mormonism which had stopped teaching these concepts.

The account of the May 4, 1842 meeting where Joseph Smith first revealed and conferred the Patriarchal Priesthood was faithfully included in *History of the Church* vol. 5 pages 1–2. Yet without the heading added by Joseph Fielding Smith in *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, “Highest Order of Priesthood Revealed,”⁶⁰ individuals may be lead to believe that the apostles, being apostles,

⁶⁰ *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* <4 May 1842> page 237. Joseph Fielding Smith was one apostle in the 20th century who was very friendly to concepts about the Patriarchal Priesthood of the Temple. Likely as a historian for the Church he had access to material on the subject that we do not have today, and as a descendant of Hyrum Smith had reason to be interested in the Patriarchal Priesthood.

already held the “highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood” and that the “communication of keys” was just delivering to them authority that was merely an appendage to the Apostleship.

However several weeks before this meeting, when Joseph Smith began to teach the Relief Society about this priesthood, several significant statements about women and the priesthood were altered in the *History*. While the *History of the Church* to its credit retained some statements about women and the priesthood, they clearly modified others to make the statements less strong than they were originally.

On March 30, 1842 Joseph Smith told the Relief Society that “the Society should move according to the ancient Priesthood.” In the *History* “the Society” was left out of the remark, instead saying that “all” should move according to the ancient Priesthood. The statement that the Lord was “going to make of this Society a kingdom of priests as in Enoch’s day — as in Paul’s day” was also changed to instead read “The Lord was going to make of the Church of Jesus Christ a kingdom of Priests, a holy people, a chosen generation, as in Enoch’s day, having all the gifts as illustrated to the Church in Paul’s epistles and teachings to the church in his day.”⁶¹

At the meeting of the Relief Society on April 28, 1842 Joseph Smith told the Society “I now turn the key to you in the name of God and this Society shall rejoice and knowledge and intelligence shall flow down from this time.” Yet in

⁶¹ *History of the Church* vol. 4 <30 March 1842> page 570.

the *History* this was modified to say “I now turn the key in your behalf,” fundamentally altering the meaning of the Prophet’s statement.⁶²

Yet besides those three changes one can applaud the apostles for otherwise preserving many significant statements made by Joseph Smith about women and the priesthood.⁶³

In July 1843 Joseph Smith began to prepare the saints for this authority, and publicly alluded to how he was about to advance to higher priesthood offices *above* the being the President of the Church. He stated “I will advance from Prophet to a Priest, and then to a King — not to the Kingdoms of this earth, but of the Most High God.”⁶⁴ Yet while this sermon was included in the *History*, this key statement was left out.⁶⁵

To the apostles’ credit, in the *History* for August 1843 they included both a significant statement by Brigham Young as well as a sermon by Joseph Smith on this new order of priesthood. They included a statement by Brigham Young on August 6, 1843 that “if any in the Church had the fullness of the Melchisedec Priesthood, he did not know it. For any person to have the fullness of that priesthood, he must be a king and priest.”⁶⁶ Joseph Smith’s most extensive speech on the Priesthood of the Temple was also included — his “Three Grand

⁶² *History of the Church* vol. 4 <28 April 1842> page 607.

⁶³ For more on this see *One Eternal Round* #11 “The Demise of the Patriarchal Priesthood Part 2, Women and the Priesthood.”

⁶⁴ *Words of Joseph Smith* <23 July 1843> page 234.

⁶⁵ *History of the Church* vol. 5 <23 July 1843> page 518.

⁶⁶ *History of the Church* vol. 5 <6 August 1843> page 527.

Orders” speech he delivered on August 27, 1843 about three orders of priesthood he believed were mentioned in Hebrews chapter 7.

According to the amalgamation in the *History of the Church* the three orders were the “Fullness of the Melchizedek Priesthood” of being a King and Priest holding the “keys of power and blessing”, “Patriarchal Authority” related to the Temple, and the Aaronic Priesthood. While it probably was not deliberate, the amalgamation leads one to believe that the Fullness of the Melchizedek Priesthood and the Patriarchal Priesthood were two different orders of priesthood.

While to some modern readers both of these August 1843 entries may seem like a slam dunk that being a King and Priest was the highest priesthood authority, these statements actually only affirms that it is necessary to be a King and Priest to have the “fullness of the Melchizedek Priesthood.” By themselves, they can be erroneously interpreted as teaching that the authority of a King and Priest was merely *part of* the highest authority.⁶⁷

Joseph and Emma’s Second Anointing on September 28, 1843 was left out even though that meeting of the Holy Order was included in the

⁶⁷ This interpretation is suggested in the 1880 statement in the *Juvenile Instructor* about the Fullness of the Priesthood. It appears to also be implied in Joseph Musser’s pamphlet *A Priesthood Issue* attempted to argue for priesthood above the Church. In that pamphlet, Musser argued for a “higher Apostleship” based on harmonizing Nauvoo era priesthood comments and statements about the Last Charge with the early Utah statements that the Apostleship was the highest authority.

History of the Church.⁶⁸ Yet Hyrum Smith and his wife Mary Fielding's Second Anointing was interestingly included: "My brother Hyrum and his wife were blessed, ordained, and anointed"⁶⁹ — a reference that can be used to show that both men and women are "ordained" as part of the Second Anointing.

One glaring omission in the *History* is the absence of the events of Joseph Smith's "Last Charge" in March 1844. While the Last Charge was a major talking point for the apostles in 1844 and 1845, that was only inasmuch as the charge was really to the entire Council of Fifty and the apostles were the public face of the body.⁷⁰

Yet the apostles actually did briefly discuss whether to add an account of the Last Charge to the *History*. On September 30, 1855 Brigham Young and other leaders read and discussed a March 1845 account of the Last Charge written by Orson Hyde. They ultimately opted not to include it, because Brigham Young said he didn't "see that it adds or diminishes."⁷¹ To the apostles in the 1850s the Last Charge was not necessarily seen as helpful to their succession claims because other members of the

⁶⁸ The entry is *History of the Church* vol. 6 <28 September 1843> page 39.

⁶⁹ *History of the Church* vol. 6 <8 October 1843> page 46. While Brigham Young and the apostles' Second Anointings were included in the *Manuscript History of Brigham Young*, the apostles interestingly decided not to incorporate them into the *History of the Church*.

⁷⁰ For more on the Last Charge see *One Eternal Round* issue #4 "New Light on Joseph Smith's Last Charge."

⁷¹ Minutes, 30 September 1855, Historians Office General Church Minutes, LDS Archives.

Council of Fifty were arguing that the Prophet's instructions to the Fifty gave *all* of them authority to lead the Kingdom of God and build up churches.

In volume 7 of the *History of the Church* a number of important changes and omissions were made that would hinder a student of church history from discovering that it was membership in the Council of Fifty and receiving Temple Priesthood that gave the apostles their highest authority.

One significant change was that a statement was retroactively included that is not noted in any contemporary document of a meeting on July 30, 1844. At this meeting they discussed reorganizing the Church after the deaths of Joseph, Hyrum, and Samuel Smith. The *History* alleges that:

“Elders W[illard] Richards and George A. Smith met in council with Elder [John] Taylor at his house. Bishop George Miller and Alexander Badlam wanted them to call together the Council of Fifty and organize the church. They were told that the Council of Fifty was not a church organization, but was composed of members irrespective of their religious faith, and organized for the purpose of consulting on the best manner of obtaining redress of grievances from our enemies, and to devise means to find and locate some place where we could live in peace; and that the organization of the church belonged to the priesthood alone.”⁷²

While this meeting probably occurred,⁷³ it seems unlikely that these comments about the

⁷² *History of the Church* vol. 7 <30 July 1844> page 213.

⁷³ Several individuals in later meetings of the Council of Fifty recalled that Alexander Badlam approached them in July 1844 wanting to reconvene the Council of Fifty to re-organize.

Council of Fifty were made in 1844, as Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball both made strong comments in 1845 acknowledging the Council of Fifty was a priesthood body.⁷⁴ George A. Smith did not begin to make comments claiming that the Council of Fifty possessed no priesthood authority until he had to combat Lyman Wight in 1848 and Peter Haws' claims to authority in 1849.⁷⁵

In the original minutes of Brigham Young's August 8, 1844 speech it is recorded that Brigham stated "if you let the Twelve remain, the Keys of the Kingdom are in them, and you cannot pluck it out, [for] we have an organization that you have not seen."⁷⁶ In the *History of the Church* this was edited to instead read "if you let the Twelve remain and act in their place, the keys of the kingdom are with them and they can manage the affairs of the church and direct all things alright."⁷⁷ This change removed Brigham Young's most explicit reference to a secret priesthood organization relevant to

⁷⁴ See *One Eternal Round* issue #4 "New Light on Joseph Smith's Last Charge" pages 5–10.

⁷⁵ Peter Haws is reported to have said in February 1849 that "Twelve men had swallowed up thirty eight." (Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra T. Benson letter to Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards, 5 April 1849, LDS Archives, in *The Council of Fifty: A Documentary History* pages 188–189) Similarly, Lyman Wight wrote in a letter to his nephew several years later stating "...the Twelve constitute the number twelve of the Fifty — Now, Benjamin, do you not see that every one of the Fifty should have carried out the measures which Brother Joseph gave unto them." (Lyman Wight letter to Benjamin Wight, January 1853, RLDS Archives)

⁷⁶ Thomas Bullock Minutes, 8 August 1844, LDS Archives.

⁷⁷ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <8 August 1844> page 235.

Succession.

A final important reference to the Temple Priesthood that was left out of the *History of the Church* was a statement by Brigham Young on December 26, 1845: “Those who have come in here and have received their washing and anointing will be ordained Kings and Priests, and will then have received the Fullness of the Priesthood, all that can be given on earth, for Brother Joseph said he had given us all that could be given to man on the earth.”⁷⁸ Brigham Young’s comments immediately before this and after this were included,⁷⁹ yet this important remark that stated that the highest authority that Brigham Young received from Joseph Smith was his Second Anointing as a King and Priest was deliberately excluded. This statement likely was left out because it contradicted the doctrine of the Apostleship being the highest authority as was taught in early Utah.

SUBTLE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In spite of the Temple Priesthood no longer being taught plainly in early Utah, Brigham Young still retained knowledge of the truth that the temple ordinances conferred the highest authority one man could give another.

In 1866 Brigham Young reiterated the

⁷⁸ *Nauvoo Endowment Companies* <26 December 1845> page 192 also included in *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <26 December 1845> page 113.

⁷⁹ *History of the Church* vol. 7 <26 December 1845> page 553.

statement he made in the Nauvoo Temple about Joseph telling them he gave them “all that could be given to man on the Earth” via the temple ordinances. Only this time President Young did not plainly explain that those “keys of the kingdom” were from the highest temple ordinances:

“The kingdom of God was fully established in the days of Joseph, when he gave to a few their blessings pertaining to the sealing ordinances. He said to the Twelve apostles many times, ‘brethren, I have given to you the keys of the kingdom, even **all that can be given to man upon earth** while in the flesh.’ To me the prophet always seemed to be in a hurry in his ecclesiastical labors which pertained to the organization of the kingdom of God, and the introduction of the Gospel and its ordinances.”⁸⁰

Brigham Young also subtly incorporated the understanding of men receiving all the “keys” in the Lecture at the Veil in the Endowment ceremony, noting that Father Adam “had lived on an earth similar to ours; he had received the priesthood **and the keys thereof**, and had been faithful in all things,”⁸¹ — referencing that faithful men would eventually receive the keys of the priesthood for their family kingdom, exaltation, and dominion beyond this world.

President Young also alluded to this on another occasion, in stating that “one Elder” could hypothetically restore the entire Kingdom of God.

⁸⁰ *Complete Discourses of Brigham Young* <6 October 1866> page 2371, emphasis added.

⁸¹ L. John Nuttall Journal, 7 February 1877, in David Buerger, *The Mystery of Godliness* pages 111–112, emphasis added.

THE DEMISE OF THE PATRIARCHAL PRIESTHOOD 43

Brigham Young indicated earlier in the sermon that even though High Priests held the same priesthood that the Seventies, Twelve, and Presidency possessed, not all of them had received the highest temple ordinances bestowing upon them all the keys. Yet if they were faithful the time would come where they would receive “all the authority and power that it is possible for man to receive,” i.e. by receiving the Second Anointing:

“They [the High Priests] possess precisely the same Priesthood that the Seventies and the Twelve and the First Presidency possess; *but are they ordained to officiate in all the **authority, powers, and keys** of this Priesthood? **No, they are not.** Still, they are High Priests of God; and *if they magnify their Priesthood, they will receive at some time all the authority and power that it is possible for man to receive.*”⁸²*

To be continued...

⁸² *Journal of Discourses* vol. 9 <7 May 1861> page 88, emphasis and italics added.

Other Issues of *One Eternal Round*

Issue #1 — June 15, 2019 — The Nauvoo Priesthood Developments

Issue #2 — July 15, 2019 — The Kingdom of God in a Family Capacity

Issue #3 — August 15, 2019 — King and Priest Endowments and the Washing of Feet

Issue #4 — September 15, 2019 — New Light on Joseph Smith's "Last Charge"

Issue #5 — October 15, 2019 — The Prophet, Priest, and King over the Kingdom of God — That "One Man" Office in the Priesthood

Issue #6 — November 15, 2019 — The One Anointed and Appointed over the Sealing Power, Part 1: Nauvoo Sources

Issue #7 — December 15, 2019 — The One Anointed and Appointed over the Sealing Power, Part 2: Early Utah

Issue #8 — January 15, 2020 — Patriarchal Succession and the Birthright of Joseph Smith

Issue #9 — February 15, 2020 — Presiding Patriarch Lost Office of Mormonism

Issue #10 — March 15, 2020 — The Demise of the Patriarchal Priesthood, Part 1: Male Patriarchal Authority

Issue #11 — April 15, 2020 — The Demise of the Patriarchal Priesthood, Part 2: Women and the Priesthood

Issue #12 — May 15, 2020 — The Council of Fifty and its Activities