

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for taking time to review this manuscript. I have deeply appreciated your critiques which I think have served to strengthen the manuscript and make it better reflect the reality of the data. I hope you appreciate the changes. If you have no further comments, I will publish this manuscript after removing highlighted text.

-frogontrombone

Overview of Changes (Relevant to all reviewers)

The vast majority of the changes were minor grammatical errors. These were mostly corrected without highlighting the manuscript to reflect the change. Multiple reviewers also suggested additional sources. These are now found in the manuscript.

In addition to these changes, in the course of preparing the manuscript and answering reviewer concerns, I significantly reworked several parts of the manuscript. Most of these are highlighted in blue text, but some are not. The following sections were heavily modified without changes being tracked.

- Section 1.1 – Criteria for Calling a Term “Derogatory” has been heavily modified, particularly toward the end.
- Section 2 – Results features several new sources. Most of the changes relating to this are highlighted, but the new quoted text is not highlighted. In particular, Alexander Campbell’s expose of Mormonism was included. In addition to this, I reformatted this section to remove the names of newspapers unless they were part of a sentence and added reference numbers and links for all quoted text.
- Section 2.2 Insider Uses of the Terms was completely rewritten. Most of the added sources are added to this section.
- Section 2.4 Outsiders Using the Term was heavily rewritten.

Review by Fuzzy_Thoughts / Reply by frogontrombone

Fuzzy_Thoughts provided a pdf.

This is uploaded along with this reply document. I have address his comments primarily through the use of highlighting in the revised pdf. His comments along with others are what spurred many of the overall edits highlighted above.

Review by MagusSanguis / Reply by frogontrombone

Your paper is excellent and was very informing for me. I never really thought about the church never giving themselves an actual name to go by officially until 1838. As far as conclusions go, you seem to be spot on of the term mormon initially being descriptive rather than derogatory. And it would be nice to see a couple of the

I only noticed a couple of grammatical errors and minor spelling mishaps. I'll go in order:

All grammatical and stylistic changes were implemented but left unmarked. Several sections were changed substantially, rendering the comments provided unaddressed in some cases.

1. Maybe needs a paragraph indent at the front of each section heading, but I am not sure if you just did that for style.
2. I am also used to seeing punctuation inside quotation marks. Apparently it is common in USA to have the punctuation inside quotation marks and in Europe to have punctuation outside. You are consistent throughout, which is important.
3. Abstract sentence 3:
 - a. "such as whether outsiders used the term to insult other outsider,"
 - i. Missing an 's' on the word 'outsiders.'
4. Introduction paragraph 3:
 - . President Russell Nelson of the Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints declared that he had received divine revelation that Mormons should no longer use the term "Mormon" to describe themselves, nor have outsiders refer to them as such.
 - . Maybe potentially soften this sentence by calling it the Brighamite branch or sect? The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints sounds a bit derogatory- even if it is true!
 - i. Change "nor have" to "nor should."
 1. I am not 100% sure of this
5. Introduction paragraph 3:
 - . Nelson later reemphasized his view in the October 2018 General Conference when he declared that using the term "Mormon" to describe the people or the church was "a major victory for Satan".
 - . Re-emphasize looks better with a hyphen IMO. And that would keep it consistent with other similar words you use like re-brand in the subsequent paragraph. (This recent effort to re-brand the church has spurred considerable...)
6. Section 1.1 sentence 1:
 - . A term is derogatory, pejorative, a slur, or an insult (hereafter, just "derogatory") when it the term implies negative meaning independent of any surrounding words that qualify its meaning.
 - . Change "when it the term implies" to "when the term implies."
7. Section 1.1 paragraph 5:
 - . though I personally view it as immoral to continuing to use the term when a group has asked to self-identify in a different way.
 - . Change "continuing" to "continue."
8. Section 1.1 paragraph 6:
 - . A key consideration is whether "Jonestown" is used by outsiders to insult other outsiders. Since the The above examples show general agreement
 - . This is separated into two paragraphs in the paper. Needs to be combined in to one.
9. Section 1.3 last sentence:
 - . I am uniquely positioned to see both points of view from as objectively as possible

.Get rid of the word “from.” Change to “I am uniquely positioned to see both points of view as objectively as possible.”

10. Section 2 Results, paragraph 2:

. In November 1830, several newspapers out of Palmyra, New York; Rochester, New York, and Painesville, Ohio

.Discard the semicolon and replace for a comma:

1. Palmyra, New York, Rochester, New York, and Painesville, Ohio

i.OR use semicolons consistently to separate each pair:

1. Palmyra, New York; Rochester, New York; and Painesville, Ohio

2. I **believe** that both are valid

11. Section 2.2 last paragraph

. Somewhat undermining Rigdon’s efforts, Joseph Smith started using the term “Mormon” to describe the people of the church in 1838, at least, and very frequently from 1842 onward.

.Do you happen to have the source for this? It wasn’t noted. It is definitely a matter of further scope and study to speculate why Joseph wouldn’t have discarded the name for the correct name that was re-emphasized by Nelson.

12. Section 2.2 paragraph 2:

. But what this quote underscores, however, is Harris...

.Change to “What this quote underscores, however, is Harris...”

13. Section 2.4 paragraph 2, sentence 6:

. The term “Jack Momron” has since shifted to refer to believing Mormons who do not live according to the strict lifestyle rules practiced by orthodox Mormons, but it is unclear from readily available sources when this occurred.

.Spelling error on “Jack Mormon.”

14. One final question that I have that I couldn’t find is when the first instance of the term mormon was used in an undoubtedly derogatory fashion. Did you find anything besides the potential first uses of the term in mormonism unvailed? Those seemed more descriptive than anything and I think that you are spot on in the analysis that Rigdon suggested that they backed away from the name mormon as a similar re-branding effort to the current re-branding that Nelson is doing.

On the last point, I am not sure when the first derogatory use of “Mormon” occurred. It is difficult to say when this occurred, because this is only considering common use, not individual cases of private conversations that would not have been recorded.

I loved your paper!! I thought it was extremely well done and I am impressed with your research.

Thank you!

Review by petitereddit / Reply by frogontrombone

So are you purely using HOW the name was used in newspaper articles to determine whether or not it was used in a derogatory way?

Yes. The justification for this is for two reasons. 1) It is uncertain if Sidney Rigdon himself coined the term, or the newspaper editors who were documenting his activities. There are no

church records from the time that use the term, strongly suggesting that it was likely coined by editors. 2) Newspaper articles will demonstrate a common-usage of the term. 3) This approach necessarily ignores private conversations that would have been unpublished. Newspaper articles are the only early source that I am aware of that we can analyze.

Did you read about the desire to distinguish the church and to avoid confusion?

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Name_of_The_Church_of_Jesus_Christ_of_Latter-day_Saints
Under "historical names of the Church. "

Yes. As far as I can tell, the sources in the link you provide are all secondary sources. I followed the sources for most of these, and found they lead back primarily to the History of the Church, Mormonism Unveiled, or the Evening and Morning Star publication. I have updated the manuscript to reflect these primary sources.

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=sc_dJ4pPOGIC&pg=PA44&lpg=PA44&dq=sidney+rigdon+1834+name+change&source=bl&ots=qC85EoQcg2&sig=5VtyFpF9S0ShLI-NnWvWDsRtuNk&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjY78DjobXeAhUKq48KHWa8AxkQ6AEwBnoECAMQAQ#v=onepage&q=sidney%20rigdon%201834%20name%20change&f=false

This talks about David Whitmer's view on the 1834 name change. He wasn't happy with it, and it seemed their desire was to find a suitable name for the church, rather than try to disassociate from "mormon."

I'm not sure I read Whitmer's statement as the church seeking a suitable name instead of disassociated from the term "Mormon". I've added primary sources to the manuscript the strongly suggest the motive was to dissociate the church from the term "Mormon". I view these sources as congruous with Whitmer's statement. It seems to me that Whitmer is simply stating that he didn't like the end result, regardless of why the change was being made.

https://www.shields-research.org/42_Questions/ques38.htm

Thank you for sharing this link! I've incorporated the information from it into the manuscript. I didn't add any commentary other than when it occurred.

Partial review by JohnH2 / Reply by frogontrombone

Your Jan 26 1831 Painseville Telegraph is not the first time that 'Gold Bible' is mentioned, Also, you don't mention Alexander Campbell's Feb. 7 1831 Delusions

I have now incorporated this source, quoting from it extensively. Thank you for it!

Review by japanesepiano / Reply by frogontrombone

From Section 1.3:

"I am uniquely positioned to see both points of view from as objectively as possible"

I would change this to something else – for grammatical reasons if nothing else. Try for example “being a former insider, I have attempted to view the data as objectively as possible”. Or “While some level of bias may be inevitable, I have attempted to provide findings based on the data alone and invite the reader to verify my findings”

I’ve reworked the sentence anyway to talk about the ability to see both perspectives, but I leave out any discussion of objectivity. See the highlighted changes in the manuscript.

I would recommend rewording the following paragraph to be 3rd person and clearly state speculative claims using words such as “perhaps” or “It seems likely” “It seems plausible that...”. Also, I would recommend steering clear of the Jamestown example because it is going to be inflammatory to believers, regardless of the context or intent.

Given the historical context and having both an insider and outsider perspective, **I hypothesize** that neither Rigdon’s account nor Mormonism Unveiled strike the likely motivation for this change. Rigdon’s proposal and Harris’s use of the word “Mormonite” suggest that Mormons had adopted the term previously, however reservedly, for self-identification. However, as the news market became overwhelmingly saturated with negative press for the church, **I believe** Rigdon proposed the change to escape the negative press. Rigdon showed advertising savvy during his mission in 1831 selling the new religion. And the idea that Mormons would see the negative press and conclude that their own name was held in ridicule among the rest of society would be true, even if the term were not derogatory. It would be a situation similar to the above example of Jonestown, where members of the cult would probably object to the term and the negative press about it, despite the term “Jonestown” being purely descriptive.

I’ve removed the discussion of Jonestown. I also reworked this section significantly to make it both come across as my hypothesis and be more coherent with the new sources I added.