

# Book of Mormon Study – Moroni 1-6

Online zoom Sunday School, 6 Dec 2020

([goto.jayball.name/bofm](https://goto.jayball.name/bofm))

*Moroni 1:4*

*Wherefore, I write a few more things, contrary to that which I had supposed; for I had supposed not to have written any more; but I write a few more things, that perhaps they may be of worth unto my brethren, the Lamanites, in some future day, according to the will of the Lord.*

Did you notice the absence of gentiles in this statement?

*Moroni 2*

*The words of Christ, which he spake unto his disciples, the twelve whom he had chosen, as he laid his hands upon them— And he called them by name, saying: Ye shall call on the Father in my name, in mighty prayer; and after ye have done this ye shall have power that to him upon whom ye shall lay your hands, ye shall give the Holy Ghost; and in my name shall ye give it, for **thus do mine apostles**. Now Christ spake these words unto them at the time of his first appearing; and the multitude heard it not, but the **disciples** heard it; and on as many as they laid their hands, fell the Holy Ghost.*

Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands is a gift that was given to *apostles* and Nephite *disciples*. Is there any scriptural justification for the practice of the Holy Ghost being given by any other than apostles?

Power is given that by laying on of hands to give Holy Ghost. Is there a difference between authority and power?

## Ordaining Priests and Teachers

*Moroni 3:1*

*The manner which the disciples, who were called the elders of the church, ordained priests and teachers*

Assume you know nothing of our current traditions or practices in the church and that you are reading these verses for the first time with no pre-conceptions of the meaning of the words used. There are three designations introduced in Moroni 3. Elders, who were the disciples, priests, and teachers. It does not indicate any more than that there were those who were ordained to such designation. There is no mention of priesthood. There is no mention of age or sex of the recipients. There is no indication that any other than the disciples do the ordaining. There is no mention that they were required to have been baptized before being ordained. They were ordained "to preach repentance and remission of sins through Jesus Christ, by the endurance of faith on his name to the end... according to the gifts and

callings of God unto men; and they ordained them by the power of the Holy Ghost, which was in them." Compare with D&C 20 where these offices and members are called "to warn, expound, exhort, and teach, and invite all to come unto Christ. (verse 59)" We visited the topic of offices in the church in our discussion of Alma 4:18.

In Moroni chapter 4 it is only the elders and the priests who administer the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church. Where in 3 Nephi, when Christ gave power to administer this ordinance, it was only given to one (3 Ne 18:5). Here, not only do all the disciples have this power, but so also do priests who have been ordained by them. The only difference we are given between the designation of priest and teacher is that teachers are not mentioned in the administration of ordinance of the flesh and blood of Christ.

In chapter 6 we read that "*elders, priests, and teachers were baptized.*" If they were baptized prior to being ordained, then this would be talking about a re-baptism. Just as Christ taught in 3 Nephi (11:23), there is a requirement for these being baptized (or re-baptized), "*and they were not baptized save they brought forth fruit meet that they were worthy of it.*"

Moroni reminds us that this requirement extends to all:

*Neither did they receive any unto baptism save they came forth with a broken heart and a contrite spirit, and witnessed unto the church that they truly repented of all their sins. And none were received unto baptism save they took upon them the name of Christ, having a determination to serve him to the end.*

Verse 4 continues:

*And after they had been received unto baptism, and were wrought upon and cleansed by the power of the Holy Ghost*

This reminds us of 2 Ne 31:13-14 and the discussion of what it means to speak with the tongue of angels.

### [A Look at Priesthood Authority in The Church](#)

In 2016 my sister in law, Judy Ball, together with her siblings, published a labor of love, a history of their ancestors from Nauvoo. I took opportunity to read it and in April of last year I wrote a 6 page book review on their book, Nauvoo Period Ancestors , and sent it to Judy. From the review:

*Page 416: Joseph William tells that when he was a boy working on the farm with his father he attended school "for about two years. During that time I was ordained a Deacon". Then he "worked on the farm with my father for a few summers. We worked on the Lewiston Canal to bring the water in until I was about 13 years old." This means he could have been ordained a Deacon at around 10 years old. That would have been 1874. Brigham Young's priesthood reorganization 3 years later in 1877 more clearly defined roles of the offices, but did not establish ages for the offices. William Hartley wrote an article in the Journal of Mormon History that explores the evolution of the established ages for Aaronic Priesthood.*

*"The earliest mention of ordained deacons is in the Painesville Telegraph on 25 October 1831. The first priests were fifty-nine-year old Joseph Smith, Sr., forty-seven-*

*year-old Martin Harris, and two thirty-year-olds, Hyrum Smith and Newell Knight. Among the first teachers were forty-nine-year-old Hezekiah Peck, thirty-two-year-old Christian Whitmer, thirty-year-old Hiram Page, and twenty-year-old William Smith. Titus Billings, one of the first deacons, was thirty eight. During the Church's first decade, Aaronic Priesthood offices were conferred on a few selected youths including William F. Cahoon, ordained a priest at seventeen, Don Carlos Smith, ordained to "the priesthood at 14," and Erastus and James Snow, teachers at fifteen and seventeen respectively. Such cases are few." (Journal of Mormon History Vol. 22, No. 1, 1996, pg 85 <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1026&context=mormonhistory>)*

*What caught my attention was that in Brigham Young's 1877 priesthood reorganization epistle it "clearly assumed that Aaronic Priesthood holders would be adults" (ibid pg 106), and that it wasn't common until a year later we begin to see an increased ordination of youths (pg 107). So Joseph William's ordination at around age 10 doesn't seem like it would have been common within the church at that time, but not taboo either.*

*After the 1877 priesthood reorganization the age of ordination of boys evolved. "[O]rdination was not linked to any particular age. In Hooper and West Weber Wards, leaders ordained 'all the boys above fourteen years.' 'The duties of a deacon are so easy,' a Tooele leader noted in 1881, 'that a boy of 12 or 14 years can do the duties.' Nineteenth Ward in Salt Lake City, during the 1870s and 1880s, ordained boys as young as nine and as old as nineteen. In 1887, Apostle Francis M. Lyman told Contributor readers that 'all our young men of fifteen years and upward receive some degree of the Priesthood.'" (pg 108)*

*By 1879 Joseph William writes, "When I became the age of 15, they ordained me an Elder."*

*Apparently, consideration for ordination must have been given more for maturity and circumstance than for age. "What Aaronic Priesthood ordinations [Brigham] Young's sons received, if any, are not known, but at least ten of his seventeen sons who survived childhood received Melchizedek Priesthood ordinations and endowments between the ages of eleven and seventeen, on average at 16.9 years. Apostle Wilford Woodruff, when called to a mission in 1849, ordained nine-year-old Wilford, Jr., a priest "so he could act in his father's absence to administer the Lord's supper to the family." (pg 100)*

This topic led me to pull out and read my line of authority yesterday.

*Rulon Ball Jr. received the Melchizedek Priesthood and was ordained an Elder on March 21, 1982, by Rulon S. Ball.*

*Rulon S. Ball was ordained a High Priest, April 16, 1968 by William J. Critchlow Jr.*

*William J. Critchlow Jr. was ordained a High Priest, December 16, 1934 by George F. Richards.*

*George F. Richards was ordained an Apostle, April 9, 1906 by Joseph F. Smith.*

*Joseph F. Smith was ordained an Apostle, July 1, 1866 by Brigham Young.*

*Brigham Young was ordained an Apostle Feb., 14, 1835 under the hands of the three witnesses, Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and Martin Harris.*

*The three witnesses were called by revelation to choose the twelve apostles and on Feb., 14, 1835 were blessed by the laying on of hands of the presidency, Joseph Smith Jr., Sidney Rigdon and Fredrick G Williams, to ordain the twelve Apostles. (History of the Church, Vol. 2, pp. 187-188)*

*Joseph Smith Jr. and Oliver Cowdery received the Melchizedek Priesthood in 1829 under the hands of Peter, James and John.*

*Peter, James and John were ordained Apostles by the Lord Jesus Christ. (John 15:16)*

From 1921 to 1945 under Heber J Grant, the decision was made to ordain brethren to offices in the priesthood in the church but not to confer the priesthood. For over two decades, ordinations were performed without conferring priesthood.

#### *CONFERRING THE PRIESTHOOD.*

*To prevent disputes over this subject that may arise over the procedure presented on page 169, we draw attention to the fact that until recently, from the days of the Prophet Joseph Smith, ordinations to the Priesthood were directly to the office therein for which the recipient was chosen and appointed, in form substantially as follows:*

*As to the Melchizedek Priesthood—V "By authority (or in the authority) of the Holy Priesthood and by the laying on of hands, I (or wee) ordain you an Elder, (or Seventy, or High Priest, or Patriarch, or Apostle, as the case may be), in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and confer upon you all the rights, powers, keys and authority pertaining to this office and calling in the Holy Melchizedek Priesthood, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, Amen."*

*As to the Lesser Priesthood—"By (or in) the authority of the Holy Priesthood I (or we) lay my (or our) hands upon your head and ordain you a Deacon (or other office in the Lesser Priesthood) in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and confer upon you all the rights, powers and authority pertaining to this office and calling in the Aaronic Priesthood, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ Amen."*

*In reference to the form of procedure mentioned on page 169, and that set forth in this addendum as adopted by the leading authorities of the Church from the beginning, our beloved and departed President, Joseph F. Smith, when questioned concerning them, decided, as of record, "It is a distinction without a difference," and "either will do."*

*Persons, therefore, who have been ordained in either way hold the right to officiate in all the duties of their respective offices in the Priesthood.*

*Heber J. Grant,  
Anthon H. Lund,*

*Charles W. Penrose,  
First Presidency [1919]*

During President Grant's tenure, ordination could be made to office without conferring priesthood, it being the view that ordination to office was enough. The issue had been controversial for two decades before President Grant decided the matter. Apostle Rudger Clawson wanted it resolved in 1902, when he brought it up for discussion among the First Presidency and Twelve.

President McKay changed the practice to confer priesthood first, then ordain to an office. The changes raise a question of whether, during the practices of that time period, a man was ordained to an office in the church without having priesthood conferred upon him; or instead if although ordained to an office without conferring the priesthood he nevertheless was granted priesthood. It was a matter of controversy before being settled. Most Mormons today are unaware the controversy ever existed. Now the view is generally entertained in the church that what happened in whatever form it happened was sufficient. It was a "distinction without a difference" and "either will do."

Now I'm curious to know when William J. Critchlow Jr. was ordained Elder (& priesthood conferred)? Researching the dates it looks like if he was ordained an Elder before age 29, he had priesthood conferred, and my line would not be broken by the decade's long interruption in priesthood conferral.

When Kelsey had moved in with us over 2 years ago, and Fredrick was still living here with us, I started focused attempt to hold Family Home Evenings. We started by opening up the Book of Mormon. One of the first lessons was a look at the Testimony of the Three Witnesses from the front material.

From my notes on this lesson we took note that 1838 was a terrible year for Joseph Smith.

*Oliver Cowdery was not alone in forsaking Mormonism and Joseph Smith in 1838. Many of the most prominent members and leaders of the church likewise abandoned Joseph that year.*

*David Whitmer, another of the Three Witnesses, resigned his membership in 1838, but was not formally excommunicated. His brother John Whitmer, the church historian, was excommunicated and took the history with him, refusing to return it to Joseph.*

*On July 4, 1838 Sidney Rigdon delivered the infamous "Salt Sermon," warning that dissenters were worthy of being "trodden, like salt that lost its savor" under the feet of the saints. Because of the talk, former close friends and church leaders Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, John Whitmer, W.W. Phelps and Lyman E. Johnson were warned to leave Far West or face "a fatal calamity." They became enemies of Joseph. Mormons were in turmoil. In response to the threats against these men, all but Phelps fled Far West.*

*Rigdon's Salt Sermon did not just threaten disaffected Mormons. He also threatened a "war of extermination" against the non-Mormons of Missouri if they did not stop annoying the Mormons. The threats ignited anti-Mormon opposition. Many of the disaffected Mormons changed sides and joined the Missouri mobs attacking Mormon*

settlements. These former leaders used their credibility as insiders to incite greater anger and hostility toward the church. The animosities soon turned into armed conflict and arson.

Many of these former Mormon leaders signed affidavits accusing Joseph Smith and his church organization of criminal and moral wrongdoing. Thomas Marsh, president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, signed an affidavit on October 24, 1838 condemning and blaming Joseph for causing all the violence. The Marsh allegations were endorsed by a second affidavit from fellow apostle Orson Hyde.

In calmer days, both Marsh and Hyde would recant their sworn affidavits. But in 1838 their statements were thought to be entirely truthful, and provided justification for the Missouri political leaders, militia and general population to see Joseph Smith and Mormons as a clear and present danger to them and their property.

While Avarad was acting in the role of a surgeon, the battle of Crooked River was fought on October 24, 1838. The Extermination Order was issued immediately after, on October 27, 1838. Three days later, October 30, 1838 at Haun's Mill, the Missouri Militia, led by Colonel William Jennings, Sheriff of Livingston County, massacred a group of Mormons. Some even after they surrendered. None of the Missouri Militia were killed. The Mormon dead totaled at least 17, including a 78 year-old Revolutionary War veteran, whose body was decapitated and dismembered after he had surrendered, and two boys, ages 9 and 10.

Joseph Smith was tricked by George Hinkle into surrendering at the city of Far West while it was under siege. He thought he was going to meet with Missouri Militia leaders to negotiate peace. Hinkle lied to Joseph and brought him and other leaders to the militia, to be immediately arrested for treason.

On November 1st Joseph was sentenced to death "at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning in a public square at Far West." Militia leader Donaphin refused to carry out the order, and Joseph's life was spared.

Joseph Smith wrote several documents while imprisoned in Missouri. Specific dissidents are named and their treachery explained in those documents.

Joseph wrote about the three witnesses to the Book of Mormon (David Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery and Martin Harris) along with William McLellin, John Whitmer, Thomas Marsh and Orson Hyde. All of these were identified in a condemnation written by Joseph in Liberty Jail. (see JSP Documents Vol. 6, pp. 307-308.)

Joseph was not fooled by these men. He recognized they were traitors and liars. But he revealed to his wife his own spirit of forgiveness about them. Writing from jail to his wife, after 5 months and 5 days of imprisonment, Joseph counseled Emma "neither harbor [sic] a spirit of revenge." (JSP, Documents Vol. 6, p. 405.) Joseph's advice to his wife contrasts sharply with the revealed word from the Lord to Joseph.

Early in 1839, after nearly a half-year of imprisonment, Joseph Smith wrote a letter from Liberty Jail to the saints. The letter included several revelations. In one the Lord said those men who bore false witness against Joseph "shall not have right to

*the priesthood nor their posterity after them from generation to generation[.]” Even as late as the 1830s it was possible for men to so offend God that He will curse both them and their posterity from any right to the priesthood.*

*Such a heavy cursing raises two questions: First, upon whom was this curse imposed? Second, what did they do to merit such a heavy burden?*

*The probable candidates who earned this cursing are those Joseph identified in his letters describing the lies and false testimony against him. They were: George Hinkle, John Corrill, Reed Peck, Sampson Avard, William McLellin, John Whitmer, David Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery, Martin Harris, Thomas Marsh, Orson Hyde and WW Phelps. Each of these men and their wrongdoings are mentioned by Joseph Smith in his correspondence from jail in Missouri.*

*The three witnesses to the Book of Mormon are in almost every priesthood line of authority throughout Mormonism. Think of the irony of that for a moment. They were cursed and “shall not have right to the priesthood nor their posterity after them from generation to generation” yet Mormons point to them as the source through which the priesthood authority has descended until today.*

On the topic of priesthood authority, the Roman Catholic Church and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints advance mutually incompatible propositions. If the Catholics have retained priesthood, there was no reason to restore it. If the Mormons had it restored to them, then it needed to return because the Catholics lost it. Catholic claims to priesthood are rejected by Mormons because we understand priesthood authority is not immutable, and it can be lost. If priesthood cannot be lost, then the Catholic claims are justified. If Mormon claims are correct, it is necessary for priesthood authority to recognize it can be lost by apostasy from the truth.

Briefly, Donatus was of the view that personal virtue was needed for one holding a priestly ordination to remain with authority. He believed his presiding Bishop who fled persecution and turned over his sacred writings to be burned, forsaking his flock and his faith, was unworthy to return to office once the persecution ended. Donatus was himself true to the faith and crippled by the torture inflicted upon him. Ultimately, the Catholic Church determined Donatus' teachings were heretical, and personal worthiness was not required. Augustine would rail against this "Donatist Heresy" because the human condition was inherently flawed, and ordination could not change that. Therefore, reasoned Augustine, for any person to hold authority, the authority must be held by a flawed man. As a result, personal worthiness became irrelevant. Good reasoning, to be sure. But profoundly false doctrine.

*Unless and until superior priesthood authority withdraws permission to exercise priestly functions, a legitimately ordained holder of the priesthood may continue to perform valid priesthood ordinances—however unrighteous he may personally be, however dead to spiritual promptings, and however unlikely it may be that he will ever actually exercise his priesthood. [Footnote: The ancient Christian church faced this problem in the form of the Donatist schism, which was finally declared heretical in ad 405. The Donatists held that unrighteousness in a bishop or priest invalidated any and all ordinances that he might have performed. However, the Synod of Arles*

*determined in ad 314 that the validity of baptisms and ordinations and the like did not depend upon the worthiness or merit of the officiator. (On the Donatists and the related Novatianist and Meletian movements, see David Christie-Murray, A History of Heresy [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989], 96–97.) Granted, the Christian church at this period was essentially apostate, but Latter-day Saints take basically the same position, and for good reason. If serious sin, as such, invalidated priesthood ordinances, we could never know whose marriage was legal, or who was really a member of the church. Did the man who ordained you to the priesthood have a secret, unrepented sin? Then your ordination is invalid. Your mission was illegitimate, any converts you baptized are actually nonmembers, and you are living in adultery since you should never have been admitted to the temple. Any of your converts who served missions and baptized are similarly fraudulent, and the consequences ripple onward and outward in utterly unforeseeable ways. How could we ever be sure of anything?]* (Peterson, Daniel C. *Authority in the Book of Mosiah*. Provo: FARMS Review, Vol 18, 1, 2006, p. 164-165.)

Now, I've pointed out some challenging things that gives rise to question our traditional view of priesthood in the church. I don't do this to make you question your testimony, but so that you understand there can be challenging things with church history. Many have left the church when they discover some challenging things with church history. This need not be the case. Better you hear it from me in this setting than to be confronted with it and surprised later from less trustworthy sources with intentions to lead you away.

There was a statement attributed to Joseph Smith, often repeated, "I have set up the Kingdom, no more to be thrown down forever nor never to be given to another people." (The comment comes from Dimick B. Huntington in 1878, thirty five years after it was supposed to have been said by Joseph). If the statement was accurately reported, the statement may not mean what we have come to claim. Moses was removed, and his priesthood with him, but Israel remained nonetheless "chosen." They were not "thrown down," nor was the Lord's work done by another people. They remained the Lord's people in a limited, condemned state. The church's preferred interpretation presumes the statement is accurate, and means we suffer from no such failing. But our interpretation contradicts the Lord's prophecy about the inevitable rejection of the fullness by the gentiles (3 Ne 16:10) as well as many other passages of the Book of Mormon that we have discussed in these lessons.

Each person should answer the question for themselves about how the Latter-day Saints' current standing before the Lord seems to them. Even if you give the most optimistic assessment of the restoration and current condition of the church, it can do nothing for the individual Latter-day Saint. We must all find salvation for ourselves. Each person must get their own covenant, their own promise of election directly from God, or find themselves departing this life uncertain of their eternal state. When the promise of salvation is given by the Lord directly to an individual, he can know for certain his standing. It appears from the explanation given in scripture that we must choose between relying on the arm of flesh and promises given by men, and the work do God spoken directly to us (see e.g. 2 Ne 28:31-32).



You look at Caiaphas prophesying that it is better that one man should perish than that the people should be destroyed, which he spoke not of himself but because the Spirit moved upon him to speak those words. That's confirmed in the gospels in Acts. That's confirmed. What that is saying, is that God is capable of using the guy who in his corruption intended to say, we have to kill Jesus because he's going to disrupt our culture, when others hearing that statement said, of course, Christ is going to die to redeem his people from their sins because he is the offering that all of those rites under the Law of Moses pointed forward to, and so he will be the offering of sin, so that the people are not lost. It doesn't have anything to do with preserving the Jewish hierarchy, the Sanhedrin, and the high priest in Jerusalem, it had to do with redeeming mankind.

The focus of attention on priesthood really does distort the whole picture. All of the miraculous things that Melchizedek accomplished – quenching the violence of fire, closing the mouths of lions, causing rivers to run out of their course – all of those things were accomplished by Melchizedek without the priesthood. When Paul goes through the list of things that got accomplished by faith he's talking about the power of faith; he's not talking about priesthood, or ordination, or office, or authority. The fact is that most of what we think belongs to the franchise called "priesthood" really should be viewed as the evidence or the absence of faith. Priesthood has a really limited bundle of rights and responsibilities that, at its most basic level, involves baptism and blessing the sacrament. At its most basic level.

#### *Moroni 3:4*

*And after this manner did they ordain priests and teachers, according to the gifts and callings of God unto men; and they ordained them by the power of the Holy Ghost, which was in them.*

Power of the Holy Ghost: Cross reference to 3 Ne 19:8-18

#### *Moroni 4:2*

*And they did kneel down with the church*

Compare:

*And the elder or priest shall administer it; and after this manner shall he administer it—he shall kneel with the church and call upon the Father in solemn prayer (D&C 20:76)*

If the practice of kneeling is plainly given in scripture, why do we not kneel when we do the sacrament today? Could the forsaking of this practice be considered a change to a holy ordinance? (see Isa 24:5)

#### *Moroni 5*

In 3 Ne 8:8 we read where Christ had the disciples administer the wine to the multitude. There is no mention of the blessing pronounced upon the wine. Here Moroni clarifies that it was blessed and provide us the words of His blessing.

*Moroni 6:7-8*

*And they were strict to observe that there should be no iniquity among them; and whoso was found to commit iniquity, and three witnesses of the church did condemn them before the elders, and if they repented not, and confessed not, their names were blotted out, and they were not numbered among the people of Christ. But as oft as they repented and sought forgiveness, with real intent, they were forgiven.*

We discussed church discipline in our study of Mosiah 26:21-39

*As often as they repented they were forgiven.* One profound example that comes to mind is Joseph Smith in Nauvoo. History is filled with all of the foibles of mankind's weakness. The amazing thing to me is that the closer I've looked at Joseph Smith the more he stands up to scrutiny. He had one enormous flaw. He tended to think that everyone has the same heart he has. Everyone was just as good and decent and penitent as he was. Joseph had liars lying to him and he accepted as though they were telling him the truth and he honored them as though they were telling the truth but they weren't, time and time again.

*Moroni 6:9*

*And their meetings were conducted by the church after the manner of the workings of the Spirit, and by the power of the Holy Ghost; for as the power of the Holy Ghost led them whether to preach, or to exhort, or to pray, or to supplicate, or to sing, even so it was done.*

Compare with this counsel from modern revelation:

*But notwithstanding those things which are written, it always has been given to the elders of my church from the beginning, and ever shall be, to conduct all meetings as they are directed and guided by the Holy Spirit. (D&C 46:2)*

In March I wrote on my blog:

*When the standard curriculum of church meetings and conferences does not go deeper than basic milk, and my craving for deeper life sustaining meat is filled by a personal study, how do I avoid the natural tendency to become prideful because I think I now know more than others? Joseph Smith eluded to this very dilemma in his letter to the church from Liberty Jail (words that belong somewhere between verse 25 and 26 of our Doctrine and Covenants section 121):*

*"How vain and trifling have been our spirits, our conferences, our councils, our meetings, our private as well as public conversations — too low, too mean, too vulgar, too condescending for the dignified characters of the called and chosen of God, according to the purposes of His will, from before the foundation of the world! We are called to hold the keys of the mysteries of those things that have been kept hid from the foundation of the world until now. Some have tasted a little of these things, many of which are to be poured down from heaven upon the heads of babes; yea, upon the weak, obscure and despised ones of the earth. **Therefore we beseech of you, brethren, that you bear with those who do not feel themselves more worthy***

*than yourselves, while we exhort one another to a reformation with one and all both old and young, teachers and taught, both high and low, rich and poor, bond and free, male and female; let honesty and sobriety, and candor, and solemnity, and virtue, and pureness, and meekness, and simplicity crown our heads in every place and in fine, become as little children, without malice, guile or hypocrisy.” (TPJS, p 137, emphasis mine)*

*In the end, when it comes to receiving light and truth from God, I don't believe education is of any real advantage. Humility is the only real, great advantage that any soul ever possesses. On this point, I have to admit, I don't feel in possession of any great advantage.*