

REASONS WHY THERE HAD TO HAVE BEEN MORE THAN ONE SPALDING MANUSCRIPT:

Here are seven reasons why Spalding must have written more than one manuscript. (Can anyone produce seven equally credible reasons why he must have written only one?)

(1) Aron Wright to Hurlbut, August 1833: “*Spalding had many other manuscripts.*” (ref: Howe, 284)

(1a) Aron Wright, December 31, 1833: “Hurlbut is now at my store. *I have examined the writings* which he has obtained from [said] Spalding’s widowe[.] I recognize them to be the writings *handwriting of [said] Spalding but not the Manuscript* I had reference to in my statement before alluded to as he informed me he wrote in the first place he wrote for his own amusement and then altered his plan and commenced writing a *history of the first Settlement of America* the particulars you will find in my testimony dated ~~Sept 18~~ August 1833 . . . ” (ref: Aron Wright’s unsigned letter of December 31, 1833)

In order to successfully argue that Spalding produced only one manuscript, one must first convincingly impeach Judge Aron Wright’s testimony, yet there is absolutely nothing on record which would give reason to question either his accuracy or his honesty or to suggest that he was actively anti-Mormon. Wright’s testimony is crucial. If one cannot impeach Wright, the argument that Spalding only had one manuscript fails de facto.

(2) John N. Miller to Doctor Philastus Hurlbut, September 1833: “I was soon introduced to the *manuscripts of Spalding* and perused *them* as often as I had leisure. He had written *two or three books or pamphlets on different subjects*; but that which more particularly drew my attention was *one which he called the Manuscript Found.*” (ref: Howe, 282–83)

(3) Mrs. Matilda Spalding-Davison, November, 1833: According to Howe’s account, the widow Spalding informed Hurlbut that her

husband *“had a great variety of manuscripts,”* and recalled *“that one was entitled the Manuscript Found. . . .”* (ref: Howe, 287-288)

(4) Matilda Spalding McKinstry, April 3, 1880: “My father was in business there [Conneaut], and I remember his iron foundry and the men he had at work, but that he remained at home most of the time and was reading and writing a great deal. *He frequently wrote little stories, which he read to me. . . .* In 1816 my father died at Amity, Pennsylvania, and directly after his death my mother and myself went to visit at the residence of my mother’s brother William H. Sabine, at Onondaga Valley, Onondaga County, New York. Mr. Sabine was a lawyer of distinction and wealth, and greatly respected. We carried all our personal effects with us, and one of these was an old trunk, in which my mother had placed *all my father’s writings which had been preserved.* I perfectly remember the appearance of this trunk, and of looking at its contents. There were sermons and other papers, and *I saw a manuscript about an inch thick, closely written,* tied with some of the other stories my father had written for me, one of which he called, *The Frogs of Wyndham.* On the outside of the manuscript were written the words, *Manuscript Found.* I did not read it, but looked through it and had it in my hands many times, and *saw the names I had heard at Conneaut, when my father read it to his friends . . . The Manuscript Found,* she [my mother] said, was a romance . . . She had no special admiration for it more than *other romances he wrote* and read to her.” (ref: Statement given at Washington, DC, April 3, 1880)

(4a) Matilda Spalding McKinstry, November 2, 1886: “*I have read much of the Manuscript Story Conneaut Creek* which you sent me. I know that *it is not the Manuscript Found* which contained the words ‘Nephi, Mormon, Maroni, and Laminites.’ *Do the Mormons expect to deceive the public by leaving off the title page—Conneaut Creek and calling it Manuscript Found and Manuscript Story[?]”* (ref: McKinstry to Deming, Nov. 2, 1886, Chicago Hist. Soc.)

(5) Rachel Derby, daughter of John N. Miller, December 9, 1884: “Father told him [Hurlbut] that *the Manuscript Found was not near all of Spalding’s writings. . . .*” (ref: Deming, 1,1, col.7)

(6) L. L. Rice, May 30,1885: “there is no outcome of the quarrel, as the story is evidently unfinished, and stops abruptly.” (ref: Rice to James Fairchild, May 30, 1885) This in itself indicates *Manuscript Story cannot have been a copy of the manuscript that Spalding had prepared for the Pattersons*, because that manuscript was said to have been complete except for a preface and title page (see chapter 5 of our text).

(7) E. D. Howe to Elder T. W. Smith, July 26, 1881: “The manuscript you refer to *was not marked on the outside or inside Manuscript Found . . . it was not the original Manuscript Found.*” (ref; Howe to Smith, in Shook, 75-76)

FIVE ADDITIONAL POINTS:

(A) Benjamin Winchester’s premise that Hurlbut, motivated by a desire “to obtain revenge,”(ref: Winchester [1840], 6) concocted a notorious fabrication around Spalding and then sought to deceive the world with it, is *both illogical and untenable in light of Hurlbut’s subsequent behavior*. If he knew from the very beginning that the entire story of a Spalding-*Book of Mormon* connection was nothing more than the product of his own vengeful imagination, a creation deliberately designed to deceive, then it makes no sense whatsoever that Hurlbut would devote all of his energies over the next several months to seeking out the very manuscript which, once found and compared to *The Book of Mormon*, would not only destroy the theory he had striven so hard to promote, but would likely wreck whatever was left of his own reputation in the process. *In other words, the presumption that Hurlbut would actively promote a lie and then set out on a quest to uncover the one piece of evidence capable of exposing him as a liar is patently absurd.*

(B) In December of 1833, Hurlbut returned to Conneaut with Spalding's "Manuscript Story" in hand and proceeded to show it to Spalding's former neighbors, who verified that it was NOT the manuscript to which they had referred in their various statements. (ref: Howe, 288; Aron Wright's unsigned letter of Dec. 31, 1833) *In order to refute this, one must claim that Hurlbut initially manipulated his witnesses, and that the deception stuck even after they were shown the original manuscript containing the very same story about which their memories had allegedly been manipulated in the first place. Isn't it odd that, upon being confronted with Spalding's original, not one of them ever said, "Why yes, this is the story you were trying to get me to recall, and it's nothing like you coached me into saying it was"?*

(C) Concerning the existence of more than one Spalding manuscript, the words of Rev. Robert Patterson, Jr. are worth repeating (ref: Patterson Jr. to J.H. Fairchild, Sept. 22, 1885):

"When so many hearers of the story in different places concur in their recollections of names constantly recurring in the story, and when some of them heard it read again and again, it seems impossible that, after twenty years, they should confound it with a story [i.e. *Manuscript Story*]... in which not one of these familiar and unique names of persons and places did once occur. The memory of people who, at that period, read or heard very few romances, would be all the more tenacious of the few (it might be the only one) they did hear....

"Moreover, it is unitedly testified by these witnesses that before Spalding became a bankrupt, and when he wrote only to while away the hours of his illness, without any thought of making money by publishing his book, his purpose in the story they heard him read was to show (seemingly) that our Indians were descended from the ten lost tribes. He therefore started the colonists from Jerusalem. This was the *raison d'être*-- the very foundation-- of the whole fiction. How is it possible that such a story in 20 years became confused in the memory of those who heard it with a story which left the Jews out altogether?"

(D) The very physical appearance of the Oberlin manuscript itself virtually destroys the Mormon argument that this was the same work Spalding submitted to the Pattersons for their consideration.

First of all, **Story was never finished**. It progresses, howbeit fitfully, up to the point of a final war, devotes about forty pages to a description of that war, and then ends abruptly in the middle of a page just as the two opposing armies appear ready to begin the final battle.

Secondly, this manuscript cannot possibly have been the one Spalding took to the Pattersons, for **it is hardly fit for publication**. For example, a number of changes in the spellings of proper names occur throughout the text; *Siota* becoming *Sciota*, *Hadokam* changing to *Hadoram*, *Bombal* to *Banbo*, *Labarmock* to *Labamack*, *Lambon* to *Lambdon* (note the similarity to *Lambdin* here-- q.v. Chapt. IV), and *Mammoons* being later designated as *Mammouths*. In one especially confusing passage, two Kentucks who sneak into the Sciotan camp by night are identified as *Thelford* and *Hamkien* on one page, and as *Kelsock* and *Hamkoo* on the next. Later, even *Hamkoo* changes to *Hamko*” Aside from the fact that **the manuscript itself is incomplete**, can anyone imagine that Spalding actually submitted such a work to the Pattersons for their erudite consideration?

Furthermore, **Story begins as a first-person narrative** told by its hero Fabius, and remains thus **through chapter four**. In chapters five through eight however, only a few passages are in the first person; and **in all the remaining text (which comprises more than half the manuscript) everything is written in the third-person**. These chapters contain lengthy and often intimate conversations, but provide the reader with no explanation as to how Fabius could have obtained such information. “As Spalding neared the end of his story, he must have realized that he had no plausible way to return to his first-person account,” and that radical changes to his manuscript would be necessary in order to reconcile this difficulty.

Consider also the **circular logic used by Mormon writers** when they criticize supporters of the Spalding Enigma who hold that there must have been at least one other Spalding manuscript in

existence. The Mormons claim, of course, that Spalding wrote only one manuscript, the one which Hurlbut found in the trunk, *Manuscript Story-- Conneaut Creek*, which, as we have shown, is obviously unfinished and in no condition to be presented to a publisher. Yet **they do not question that Spalding took a manuscript to the Patterson brothers for their consideration. *If not this one, then which one?***

(E) Another piece of evidence indicating that *Manuscript Story* and *A Manuscript Found* were **not one and the same** can be found in the **recollections of Redick McKee and Joseph Miller, Sr.**, both of whom befriended the Spaldings during their residence at Amity between 1814 and 1816, and later recorded statements providing many details about Solomon, his family, and his manuscript. What is important here is the fact that both individuals recalled a certain specific detail about Spalding's *A Manuscript Found* which seems to have escaped prior notice.

According to Miller: "...When Mr. Spalding lived in Amity, Pa., I was well acquainted with him.... He had in his possession some papers which he said he had written. He used to read select portions of these papers to amuse us of evenings. **These papers were detached sheets of foolscap. He said he wrote the papers as a novel. He called it the *Manuscript Found*, or *The Lost Manuscript Found*.** He said he wrote it to pass away the time when he was unwell; and after it was written he thought he would publish it as a novel, as a means to support his family."(ref: Washington, PA, *Reporter*, April 8, 1869; Creigh, [1870], 89-93. Miller's statement is dated March 26, 1869) And, "...Mr. S. was poor but honest. I endorsed for him twice to borrow money. His house was a place of common resort especially in the evening. I was presenting my trade as a carpenter, in the village and frequented his house. **Mr. S. seemed to take delight in reading from his manuscript *written on foolscap* for the entertainment of his frequent visitors, heard him read most if not all of it, and had frequent conversations with him about it.**"(ref: *Pittsburgh Telegraph*, Feb. 6, 1879)

According to Redick McKee: **"One day when I called he [Spalding] was *writing upon foolscap paper*, taken from some old**

account book. My curiosity was excited, and I said to him, that if he was writing letters I could furnish him with more suitable paper. He replied that he was not writing letters, but... [a] **story he called *The Manuscript Found*.** It purported to give **a history of the ten tribes, their disputes and dissensions... etc.**”(ref: McKee to Deming, Jan. 25, 1886, in Chicago Hist. Soc.)

These memories constitute an extremely important detail because **foolscap was a very special kind of paper with particularly distinguishing and readily identifiable characteristics.** **An examination of the original manuscript of Spalding's *Manuscript Story*, conducted at our request by Roland M. Baumann, Archivist of Oberlin College's Mudd Library, revealed that no foolscap was employed in the creation of that work.**