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Toward Broader Interests?

As a member of the Mormon History Association whose interests focus on post-1890, non-institutional history, non-U.S. history, and on the biographies of those who are not key figures in institutional histories, I was somewhat disappointed in the summer 2005 issue of the Journal of Mormon History.

True, there were three articles about non-U.S. history: Malcolm R. Thorp, “Popular Mormon Millennialism in Nineteenth-Century Britain” (89–111) Michael W. Homer, “The Waldensian Valleys: Seeking ‘Primitive Christianity’ in Italy” (134–87), and James A. Toronto, “A Continual War, Not of Arguments, but of Bread and Cheese: Opening the First LDS Mission in Italy, 1849–1867” (188–232). However, they were all in the pre-1890s period.

There were no articles on post-1890 non-institutional topics.

Even though King Follett, the subject of a biographical article by Joann Follett Mortensen (112–33), was not a General Authority, he also lived and died before 1890.

The only individual in my period of interest was Leroy Robertson, featured in a book notice about his biography by Marion Robertson Wilson (270–71).

I realize that the Journal can publish only from what is submitted; and I suspect, especially in the sesquicentennial year of Joseph Smith’s birth, that there just wasn’t much research going on in the twentieth century. So I guess I’m disappointed about the state of Mormon history scholarship.

Oh, well. Perhaps next time?

Kent S. Larsen II
New York City
Donald Q. Cannon
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

JOSEPH SMITH AND THE GLOBALIZATION OF MORMONISM

Donald Q. Cannon

When I first learned that the Mormon History Association Conference during my term as president would be held in Vermont in 2005, I was very pleased. I believed I had something to say about this remarkable man. Having engaged in a lifelong study of Joseph Smith, I wish to share what I have learned.

My earliest experience with Joseph Smith came as I read a book by William A. Morton titled From Plowboy to Prophet. As I recall, I was about eight years old at the time. The book fully captured my attention with its poetic phrases. Listen, for example, to a few sentences about the First Vision:

The rest of the family were fast asleep, so, slipping quietly out of the house, Joseph made his way to a small grove not far from his father’s home. It was a beautiful spring morning. The sun was gilding the hill tops, the birds were singing their songs in the trees, and the air was scented with the fragrance of wild flowers. All nature seemed to say “God lives. God is good.”

As I read these words, my young mind became intrigued by this ordi-

DONALD Q. CANNON {donald_cannon@byu.edu} is a professor of Church history and doctrine at Brigham Young University. He has published more than sixty articles and twenty books in Mormon history. A recent work is his editing with Arnold K. Garr and Richard O. Cowan, of Encyclopedia of Latter-day Saint History (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2000). He first delivered this paper at the Mormon History Association annual
nary farm boy who became the founder of a great church.

While attending seminary at East High School in Salt Lake City, I entered a speech contest sponsored by the Sons of Utah Pioneers and, as a prize, received a copy of *Joseph Smith: An American Prophet* by John Henry Evans. Reading this book expanded my understanding of the prophet Joseph Smith even further. Just a sample quotation will illustrate:

> The Mormon leader came to know that there is no power in the world of men so great as the power of religion—of faith in God, in one’s own potentialities, and destiny, faith in a future life, for glorified man, faith in salvation from sin, faith in a never ending growth of the human spirit. He had seen this power at work in himself. “I was a rough stone,” he says in his frank, picturesque way, “till the Lord took me in his hand to polish me.”

These two books strongly influenced me, kindling my interest in Joseph Smith, but my first attempt at writing and publishing something about the Prophet occurred many years later. I had finished graduate school and started teaching a class in American colonial history at the University of Maine. Desiring to examine Joseph Smith’s New England origins, I researched and wrote an article on the Smith ancestral home in Topsfield, Massachusetts. My research convinced me that their New England experiences profoundly affected Joseph’s paternal ancestors. This study reflects the heavy influence of place, or geographic setting, in developing such characteristics as patriotism, diligence, and religiosity among his ancestors.

My scholarly interest in Joseph Smith has been broad-ranging, including both historical and doctrinal matters. Consequently, my study of the King Follett discourse included both doctrinal and historical themes. I published an article on the historical setting of the sermon and then, with Larry Dahl, a colleague at BYU, published a book which included a parallel text from the notes of those who first recorded the discourse alongside the familiar account in the *History of meeting in June 2005 at Killington, Vermont.*


the Church, as well as a modernized version. This most-published sermon of the Prophet illustrates the vast range of his interests. His sermon covered over 150 different topics. Here, I discovered how broad-ranging his knowledge was.\(^4\)

While doing research at the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, I discovered a previously unpublished diary by the Reverend George Moore which contained some insightful descriptions about Joseph Smith. A New Englander residing in Quincy, Illinois, Moore visited Nauvoo on several occasions and had some keen observations concerning Mormonism, Nauvoo, and Joseph Smith. After visiting Joseph Smith in the Mansion House on June 3, 1842, he noted: “As I came out, I found two large cannon, mounted in his yard. Can this be a prophet of God, thought I, who must have cannon for a guard, and must convert his followers into soldiers—into a Nauvoo Legion—and excite in them a warlike spirit?”\(^5\)

This information has been very useful in the Nauvoo Legion project that Susan Easton Black, Richard Bennett, and I are working on currently. We plan to publish a book on the subject.

In an article published in a Doctrine and Covenants commentary, I described the remarkable fulfillment of the prophecy on the Civil War contained in Section 87. Some thirty years before the war occurred, Joseph correctly foretold, in detail, the major facts concerning the war.\(^6\) Doing this research helped reinforce my earlier conviction that Joseph Smith had a powerful and prescient prophetic gift.

Another article dealing with revelation concerned Joseph Smith’s visit to Salem, Massachusetts, in 1836. At a time of dire financial distress, Joseph and several other Church leaders traveled to Sa-
lem to retrieve a treasure which a member of the Church had described. They failed to find the treasure, but Joseph’s honesty is shown in his willingness to include verses in the Doctrine and Covenants which called attention to their “follies” in coming to New England in search of treasure (LDS D&C 111:1).7

Other research showed that Joseph Smith played a major part in the founding of Nauvoo and surrounding settlements and in creating many institutions in the Nauvoo era, including the University of Nauvoo and the Nauvoo Legion. In this research I learned that he was not just a religious leader, but also a community builder, military leader, and fully involved participant in every aspect of Nauvoo life.8

During his lifetime, Joseph Smith spoke at many funerals. In an essay prepared for a festschrift honoring my friend and colleague Richard L. Anderson, I described the ideas and impact of funeral sermons preached by the Prophet. Here, I learned of Joseph’s great concern and compassion for people. In fact, I called the piece “Words of Comfort.”9 In another article, I attempted to describe the mind and personality of the founding prophet. This analytical article grew out of what I learned in collecting, editing, and publishing Joseph’s ideas in a collaborative effort called the Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith’s Teachings with my co-editor, Larry Dahl. One of the interesting things I learned concerned Joseph Smith’s devotion to his country: “As I studied these research materials on Joseph Smith, it became evident that he was a patriot in the best sense of the word. He frequently expressed his loyalty to the United States of America and often praised the Con-

---

stitution. Once, while pointing out some problems in that time, he nevertheless concluded, ‘With all our evils we are better situated than any other nation.’”

My lifelong study of Joseph Smith has taught me a great deal about both Joseph the man and Joseph the prophet. He enjoyed family and friends. He participated with pleasure in such athletic contests as wrestling and stick pulling. He studied and translated for hours on end. He received revelation from heaven. He organized a religious movement that has inspired several different groups, the largest of which has grown to more than 12 million members. Some scholars have called Mormonism a “new religious tradition.” In sum, this extensive study has deepened my appreciation of Joseph Smith. He was truly remarkable and accomplished much more than most of us even dream of.

My most recent focus of study has been international Church history and Joseph Smith’s involvement in the globalization of Mormonism. This new area of study began when the chairman of the Church History Department at BYU invited me to teach a course on the international Church. This course examines the history of the Church’s development and growth outside the United States of America. The scope of the course is very broad; indeed, it covers the whole world.

As I prepared for the new course, I encountered the concept of globalization. Recently, the study of globalization has mushroomed into a mega-discipline. A few statistics will show just how gigantic this field has become. In September 2004, Google showed 3,150,000 items under the heading globalization. As I began writing this speech in January 2005, I went back to the Google website, and the number had increased to 7,350,000 items. By June 2005, the number had risen to more than 22 million (www.google.com: “globalization”). Pointing to the rapid growth of the literature on globalization, Peter Dougherty in an article wittily titled “The Wealth of Notions: The Literature of Globalization,” declared: “Recently the literature on globalization has ballooned to the point that it is altering the general con-


tours of scholarly book lists.”

Just what is globalization? While it is most often tied to the integration of world economies, globalization is actually much broader. One expert has defined it this way: “Globalization constitutes a process of mutual interaction among different power networks over a long period of time.” I would also add that it involves the internationalization of a given institution. Thus, we see that globalization involves much more than economics. It also involves politics, culture, religion, and law.

My first scholarly venture into the field of globalization occurred on May 28, 1998, when I presented a paper on “The Globalization of Mormonism” in Istanbul, Turkey, at the seventh international conference of the Global Awareness Society International. This paper constituted my very first attempt to formally integrate globalization and Mormonism. The paper later formed the core of the introduction to the textbook Unto Every Nation, used in my international Church history class. This paper also paved the way for linking Joseph Smith with globalization.

Exploring the topic of Joseph Smith and globalization allows me to suggest some areas that need examination: (1) what the Prophet said about globalization, i.e., the international expansion of the Church; (2) the early missionaries Joseph Smith sent to foreign countries; (3) Joseph Smith’s own foreign missionary service; and (4) what has happened to the international Church since Joseph Smith’s time. I recognize the impressive international efforts of the Community of Christ, but my focus will be primarily on the LDS efforts except for the early period that we share in common.


Donald Q. Cannon and Richard O. Cowan, Unto Every Nation: Gospel Light Reaches Every Land (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003), ix–xxv.
The Prophet Joseph had a lot to say about the globalization of Mormonism within the framework of latter-day revelation and modern scripture. The preface to the Doctrine and Covenants reads: “Hearken ye people from afar; and ye that are upon the islands of the sea, listen together. For verily the voice of the Lord is unto all men, and there is none to escape; and there is no eye that shall not see neither heart that shall not be penetrated. . . . Wherefore the voice of the Lord is unto the ends of the earth, that all that will hear will hear” (LDS D&C 1:1).

One of the earliest statements of Joseph Smith concerning the international Church was part of a letter addressed to Freeman Nickerson, a Church member in Canada: “We are favored with frequent intelligence from different sections of our country respecting the progress of the Gospel, and our prayers are daily to our Father, that it may greatly spread, even till all nations shall hear the glorious news and come to a knowledge of the truth.”

The day after Wilford Woodruff first met Joseph Smith in Kirtland, he heard the Prophet make a remarkable prophecy about the international growth of the Church. According to Woodruff’s account on April 26, 1834, Joseph said: “I want to say to you before the Lord, that you know no more concerning the destinies of this Church and kingdom than a babe upon its mother’s lap. You don’t comprehend it. It is only a handful of Priesthood you see here tonight, but this Church will fill North and South America—it will fill the world.”

In February 1835, Joseph Smith explained that the Twelve Apostles “are called to the office of the Traveling High Council, who are to preside over the churches of the Saints among the Gentiles, where there is no presidency established; and they are to travel and preach among the Gentiles, until the Lord shall command them to go to the Jews. They are to hold the keys of this ministry, to unlock the door of the Kingdom of heaven unto all nations, and to preach the Gospel to every creature. This is the power, authority, and virtue

---

16Joseph Smith quoted by Wilford Woodruff, *Report of the Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, April 1898 (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, semi-annual), 57–58.
of their apostleship.”

Later that year, in November, he further instructed the newly called Quorum of the Twelve: “But when you are endowed and prepared to preach the gospel to all nations, kindreds, and tongues, in their own languages, you must faithfully warn all, and bind up the testimony, and seal up the law, and the destroying angel will follow close at your heels, and exercise his tremendous mission upon the children of disobedience; and destroy the workers of iniquity, while the Saints will be gathered out from among them, and stand in holy places ready to meet the Bridegroom when he comes.”

In 1836, Joseph Smith instructed the Saints further about the missionary role of the Twelve: “I then called upon the quorums and congregations of the Saints to acknowledge the Twelve Apostles, who were present, as Prophets, Seers, Revelators, and special witnesses to all the nations of the earth, holding the keys of the kingdom, to unlock it, or cause it to be done, among them, and uphold them by their prayers, which they assented to by rising.”

During the next year, 1837, an article in the Messenger and Advocate contained information on the international Church. While Joseph Smith did not function as editor, he clearly approved the material in this new publishing venture. The August issue alone contains indications of the missionary emphasis: Preaching the gospel, both in the United States and in foreign countries, had either gained new converts or stirred up persecution. Significantly, missionaries had just begun their labors in the British Isles.

In Nauvoo, Joseph Smith’s sermons often contained indications of the Church’s globalization. On May 12, 1844, Joseph Smith spoke of bearing the kingdom victoriously to the nations of the world when all nations would then “be under the necessity of obeying the gospel.” On July 19, 1840, he predicted that the nations of the earth would become enmeshed in wars but that the Elders of Israel would

---

17Joseph Fielding Smith, Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 74.
18Ibid., 92.
19Ibid., 109.
wake those nations.\textsuperscript{22}

Often Joseph Smith foretold that all nations would flock to the standard of the Church. In a First Presidency report at April 1841 conference, Joseph described the benign rays of the gospel penetrating nations afar off.\textsuperscript{23} Succinctly, he charged the Mormon missionary force: “Don’t let a single corner of the earth go without a mission.”\textsuperscript{24}

Perhaps Joseph’s best-known statement on the international Church appeared as part of the Wentworth Letter. I have chosen to present this statement in a broader context than is usually the case:

Persecution has not stopped the progress of truth, but has only added fuel to the flame. It has spread with increasing rapidity, proud of the cause which they have espoused and conscious of the innocence and of the truth of their system amidst calumny and reproach have the elders of the church gone forth, and planted the gospel in almost every state in the Union: it has penetrated our cities, it has spread over our villages, and has caused thousands of our intelligent, noble, and patriotic citizens to obey its divine mandates, and be governed by its sacred truths. It has spread into England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales: in the year of 1839 where a few of our missionaries were sent over five thousand joined the standard of truth, there are numbers now joining in every land.

Our missionaries are going forth to different nations, and in Germany, Palestine, New Holland, the East Indies, and other places, the standard of truth has been erected: no unhallowed hand can stop the work from progressing, persecutions may rage, mobs may combine, armies may assemble, calumny may defame, but the truth of God will go forth boldly, nobly, and independent, till it has penetrated every continent, visited every clime, swept every country, and sounded in every ear, till the purposes of God shall be accomplished and the great Jehovah shall say the work is done.\textsuperscript{25}

Joseph Smith followed up on this same theme in a \textit{Times and Seasons}.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 418, 416.
\textsuperscript{23}Joseph Fielding Smith, \textit{Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith}, 184.
\textsuperscript{25}Joseph Smith, “Church History,” \textit{Times and Seasons} 3 (March 1, 1842): 709.
sons editorial on January 1, 1844:

The little stone hewn out of the mountain without hands, has commenced its progress, and like a snow ball, it becomes more ponderous as it rolls along, gathering together the pure in heart among all people, and forming a nucleus around which shall gather the great, the virtuous, the benevolent, the wise, and the patriotic of all nations.

The work is still progressing in Canada, New Brunswick, England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and in the Isle of Man; and despite of the vast numbers that are constantly emigrating to this land, their numbers are continually on the increase. In Wales, native elders have been ordained, who are going forth and preaching in their own language, the great principles of eternal truth. We have elders preaching in New Holland and in the East Indies, and elders during the past year have been sent to islands in the South Sea. Elders Hyde and Adams, are also preparing to go on a mission to Russia in the spring.

**EARLY INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY EFFORTS**

The Prophet not only talked about preaching the gospel in all the world but also made a personal effort to see that it happened. He called and sent missionaries to preach in foreign nations, and he was sincerely interested in their success. As missionaries crossed the border into Canada—some even before the Church’s organization—that country became the first international mission in modern times. Joseph Smith explained: “Whilst the Book of Mormon was in the hands of the printer, we still continued to bear testimony and give information, as far as we had opportunity.”

One such opportunity arose in the winter of 1829–30, when Oliver Cowdery and Hiram Page traveled to Canada at Joseph’s request to seek money for the publication of the Book of Mormon. Although their fund-raising efforts produced few results, they followed Joseph’s counsel to preach the gospel. Joseph also encouraged his family to participate in spreading the gospel; and in September 1830, Joseph Smith Sr. and Don Carlos Smith visited some relatives in a few Canadian villages north of the St. Lawrence River.

After these early efforts, Joseph sent the first ordained elders to

---

27*History of the Church*, 1:75.
28Melvin S. Tagg, *A History of the Mormon Church in Canada*, (Leth-
Canada in the summer of 1832. Phinehas Young and five other elders preached, baptized, and organized four branches. Two of the most successful missionaries in Canada were John E. Page and Parley P. Pratt. Page’s calling clearly reflects the Prophet’s urgency and commitment about international missionary efforts. When Joseph extended the call, Page hesitated, protesting that he didn’t even have a coat to wear. Removing his own coat, Joseph responded, “Here, take this and the Lord will bless you abundantly.”

Joseph also encouraged Parley P. Pratt in his missionary responsibilities. During some personally challenging times, Pratt visited the Prophet who counseled: “Brother Parley, God bless you, go your way rejoicing, preach the gospel, fill the measure of your mission, and walk such things under your feet.” Pratt obeyed the Prophet’s counsel and, despite his trying circumstances, left for Canada where he baptized nearly a thousand members. Among them were future Church leaders such as John Taylor and Joseph Fielding. Between 1830 and 1850, about 2,500 Canadians from Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia embraced the gospel.

Deeply concerned about problems facing the Church and the direction the Church was heading, Joseph felt inspired in May 1837 that “something new must be done for the salvation of [God’s] Church.” Responding to these promptings, Joseph approached Heber C. Kimball in the Kirtland Temple and instructed: “Brother Heber, the Spirit of the Lord has whispered to me: Let my servant Heber go to England and proclaim my Gospel, and open the door of salvation to that nation.” In June, Joseph Smith and the other members of the First Presidency set Heber apart to preside over the British Mission. During the blessing, Orson Hyde was so moved that he immediately


29Tagg, A History of the Mormon Church in Canada, 11.


32History of the Church, 2:489.

33Ibid., 490.
repeated of some antagonism that he was harboring toward the Prophet and offered to accompany Heber. Joseph accepted and set him and five others apart as missionaries. Four of them—John Goodson, Isaac Russell, John Snider, and Joseph Fielding—had been converted in Canada by earlier missionaries. Some of them corresponded with relatives in England, thus paving the way for missionary work when they arrived there. In this way, the work in Canada opened the gospel door to the British Isles. Because certain members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles participated in this mission, it is often referred to as the “First Apostolic Mission.” Within a week of their arrival in Liverpool, they baptized their first converts in the River Ribble which flows through Preston. Nine months later, they had baptized a thousand members.

The Second Apostolic Mission took place in 1840–41, in fulfillment of a revelation that Joseph received in 1838 that the Twelve should “depart to go over the great waters and there promulgate [the Lord’s] gospel.” Seven members of the Twelve served in the British Isles, and Joseph took a keen interest in their success. The History of the Church records many reports that Joseph received from the missionaries. For example, while Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and other missionaries were at sea traveling to England in the spring of 1840, Joseph Smith received an encouraging letter from Elder John Taylor, who was already in England: “The little stone is rolling forth. . . . Brother Woodruff . . . is making Methodist preachers scarce” by baptizing so many. Joseph must have been very pleased with the report, for just a few days later, just before the main body of missionaries reached England, he stated, “At this time the work of the Lord is spreading rapidly in the United States and England—Elders are traveling in almost every direction, and multitudes are being baptized.”

This mission’s success has become legendary. Notable, of course, is Wilford Woodruff’s success in converting several hundred members

34 Ibid., 489–90.
36 History of the Church, 3:46.
37 Ibid., 4:96.
38 Ibid., 4:100.
of the United Brethren, many of whom were baptized in the pond on John Benbow’s farm. By 1850, 42,316 had been baptized in the British Mission. Missionary efforts in Britain demonstrate Joseph Smith’s prophetic ability. He realized that the Church needed to move outside North America to succeed. This success in the British Isles greatly accelerated the globalization of Mormonism.\(^{39}\)

The Church’s first foreign language mission was in French Polynesia. Joseph Smith called Addison Pratt, Benjamin Grouard, Noah Rogers, and Knowlton Hanks to the Pacific Islands in 1843, a time when missionary work was occurring only in North America and Great Britain. Addison Pratt’s earlier maritime experience and the time he spent in the Sandwich Islands certainly played a part in the call, but Joseph also had an expansiveness of vision shared by few. The missionaries left New Bedford, Massachusetts, on a whaling ship, the *Timoleon*, headed for the Society Islands. Their route took them around Africa, across the Indian Ocean and finally into the Pacific Ocean. They landed at the tiny island of Tubuai, 350 miles from Tahiti. Although they left in 1843, they did not begin their formal labors until April 30, 1844. Joseph Smith was assassinated before he could read the first reports from this mission, but his decision to send missionaries to such a foreign and distant land while the Church was still so young proved truly prophetic.\(^{40}\)

By July, Pratt had baptized enough converts to organize a branch on Tubuai. To teach more successfully, Pratt obtained an English-Ta'itian grammar; by September, he was preaching in Tahitian. Thus, he overcame one of the major obstacles facing most missionaries called to foreign countries.\(^{41}\)

While Pratt labored on Tubuai, Grouard and Rogers worked in Tahiti and nearby islands. Elder Rogers had little success, but Elder Grouard had amazing success in the Tuamotus, particularly on the island of Anaa. He had learned Tahitian and was able to modify it enough to be understood by the people there. In four months, he had baptized 620 islanders. When the missionaries held the first LDS con-

---

\(^{39}\)Ibid., 4:18–19.

\(^{40}\)Cannon and Cowan, *Unto Every Nation*, 135–40.

\(^{41}\)Ibid., 139–43. See also R. Lanier Britsch, *Unto the Islands of the Sea: A History of the Latter-day Saints in the Pacific* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986). Knowlton Hanks, one of the four missionaries called, died en route to the Pacific Islands and was buried at sea.
ference, French Polynesian Saints numbered 866.42

One of the most unusual foreign missionary efforts with which Joseph Smith was involved was Orson Hyde’s mission to Palestine in 1840. The idea of going to the Holy Land had been discussed for several years, but Joseph had known of Orson’s eventual mission even longer. Doctrine and Covenants 68:1, received in November 1831, revealed that Hyde would preach “from land to land, in the congregations of the wicked, in their synagogues.” In 1832, the Prophet gave Orson a blessing containing the prophecy: “In due time thou shalt go to Jerusalem, the land of thy fathers, and be a watchman unto the house of Israel; and by thy hands shall the Most High do a great work, which shall prepare the way and greatly facilitate the gathering together of that people.”43

Orson Hyde’s official call finally came in 1840. In connection with this calling, Joseph issued a declaration in which he called the gathering of the Jews to the Holy Land “an event involving the interest and fate of the Gentile nations throughout the world” and stated that Orson Hyde’s mission was “for the good of the human family.”44 John E. Page was called to accompany Elder Hyde; and when the two reached Indiana, they wrote to the Prophet saying that they had not fully appreciated the magnitude of their mission.45 Joseph responded: “Although [your mission] appears great at present, yet you have but just begun to realize the greatness, the extent and the glory of the same.”46

Hyde journeyed ahead of Page, planning to wait for him in the East, but the second missionary never arrived. Not knowing how to reach the two elders but feeling the urgency of the mission, Joseph Smith published a notice in the Times and Seasons stating: “Elders Orson Hyde and John E. Page are informed that the Lord is not well pleased with them, in consequence of delaying their mission, (John E. Page in particular) and they are requested, by the First Presidency, to
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hasten their journey towards their destination.”\(^{47}\) Hyde, feeling rebuked, felt that he had already waited too long and journeyed on alone.\(^{48}\) He spent three months with his brethren of the Twelve in England, before traveling to the European continent. He visited Jewish religious leaders in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and Frankfurt before journeying on to Palestine.\(^{49}\)

He arrived in Jerusalem in October 1841. After some missionary work which bore no fruit, he climbed the Mount of Olives, overlooking Jerusalem. There on October 24, 1841, he dedicated the Holy Land for the return of the Jews and the rebuilding of their temple. On his return trip home, he spent several months in Germany where he published a gospel pamphlet entitled *Ein Ruf aus der Wüste, eine Stimme aus dem Schusse der Erde* (*A Cry from the Wilderness, a Voice from the Dust of the Earth*). Hyde reached Nauvoo on December 7, 1842, having completed a journey of nearly 20,000 miles.\(^{50}\)

It is clear that Joseph Smith’s vision of global missionary work extended even beyond North America, the Pacific Islands, and Europe. He had proposed a mission to the Russian Empire, for example, but his death and the subsequent pioneer exodus of the Church forestalled this mission.

**JOSEPH SMITH’S PERSONAL MISSIONARY EFFORTS**

And what of Joseph Smith, himself? Did he ever serve on a foreign mission? Yes. In fact, he served two international missions, both to Canada, in 1833 and 1837. Joseph’s 1833 mission built on the solid

\(^{47}\) *History of the Church*, 4:274.

\(^{48}\) Barron, Orson Hyde, 115–17. Contrary to instructions and without notifying either the First Presidency or Orson Hyde, Page had decided to travel in the eastern states, preaching the gospel. His refusal to obey direction from Church leadership led to his disfellowshipping, and he was eventually excommunicated. Lawrence R. Flake, *People and Apostles of the Last Dispensation* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 2001), 380.

\(^{49}\) Church Education System, *Church History in the Fulness of Times* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1989), 235–36.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 236–38. See also Myrtle Stevens Hyde, *Orson Hyde: The Olive Branch of Israel* (Salt Lake City: Agreka Books, 2000).
foundation of other missionary efforts, as previously noted.\footnote{Tagg, \textit{A History of the Mormon Church in Canada}, 1–13.}

In the fall of 1833, Freeman Nickerson\footnote{Freeman Nickerson was born in South Dennis, Massachusetts, February 5, 1778. He emigrated to Vermont and married Hulda Chapman in Windsor County. After serving as an officer in the War of 1812, Freeman moved to Dayton, New York. There, Zerubbabel Snow baptized the Nickersons in April 1833. Freeman later served as a missionary near Kirtland, Ohio.} wrote a letter pleading with Joseph Smith to visit some of Nickerson’s relatives in eastern Canada. Joseph accepted his invitation, and on October 5, Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and Nickerson left Kirtland. Joseph’s diary records: “This day started and journey(ed) to the East came to Ahstibuly (Ashtabula, Ohio) stayed at ‘Lambs Tavern.’”\footnote{Dean C. Jessee, ed., \textit{The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2002), 23.} The next day, October 6, was a Sunday, and Joseph recorded that he “arrived at Springfield [Erie County, Pennsylvania] on the Sabbath found the Brotheren in meeting Brother Sidney [Rigdon] spoke to the people &c—and in the Evening held a meeting at Brother Ruds [John Rudd] had a great congregation good attention Oh God Seal our te[s]timony to their hearts Amen.”\footnote{Ibid., 23–24.}

They stayed at the Rudd home until the morning of October 8, when they traveled to Shadrach Roundy’s house on Elk Creek, where they spent the night. They stayed with Job Lewis the night of the 10th in Westfield, New York. There they held a meeting with members and friends and found the members strong in the faith. They visited with “an infidel by the name of Nash”\footnote{Ibid., 24.} in Westfield, reasoning with him but to no effect. On Saturday, October 12, 1833, they arrived at Freeman Nickerson’s home in South Dayton, Perrysburg Township, New York. Joseph Smith had been feeling homesick and worried about his family. In his diary he wrote, “The Lord is with us but [I] have much anxiety about my family &c.”\footnote{Ibid.} On this occasion the Prophet received a revelation, later published as Doctrine and Covenants 100. Given his concerns, the first verse is especially personal and comforting: “Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you my friends Sidney and Joseph,
your families are well; they are in mine hands, and I will do with them as seemeth me good; for in me there is all power.”

The revelation continues by stating their mission’s purpose and giving counsel for their missionary labors:

  Behold, and lo, I have much people in this place, in the regions round about; and an effectual door shall be opened in regions round about in this eastern land.
  Therefore, verily I say unto you, lift up your voices unto this people; speak the thoughts that I shall put into your hearts, and you shall not be confounded before men. (D&C 100: 3, 5)

Reassured, Joseph Smith held a meeting on Sunday, October 13, 1833. Joseph’s journal entry reads: “Held a meeting at freeman Nickerson’s had a large congregation Brother Sidney preached & bear record to the people the Lord gave his spirit in [a] marvellous maner for which I am thankful to the God of Ab[r]aham Lord bless my family and preserve them.”

The next day, Monday, October 14, 1833, Freeman Nickerson, Joseph Smith, and Sidney Rigdon continued their journey to Canada. That evening, they preached to a small congregation in Lodi, New York, and made an appointment for a meeting at 10 o’clock the next day in the Presbyterian meetinghouse. Unfortunately, when they arrived, the man with the key refused to unlock the door. Thus, they left without the opportunity to preach.

In these missionary experiences, we see Sidney Rigdon emerging as a spokesman for the Prophet. In Perrysburg revelation, the Lord instructed Sidney: “And it is expedient in me that you, my servant Sidney should be a spokesman unto this people; yea, verily, I will ordain you unto this calling, even to be a spokesman unto my servant Joseph” (D&C 100:9). Rigdon’s biographer, Richard S. Van Wagoner, commented: “Rigdon emerged as Joseph Smith’s foremost advisor, strategist, and divinely appointed spokesman.”

They continued their journey across the border into Canada, reaching the home of Eleazer Freeman Nickerson in Brantfield, prob-
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ably by Friday. Lydia Bailey, a guest in the home, described their arrival:

One day in October 1833 a wagon load of people stopped at the door and great was the surprise of all when the party proved to be old Mr. and Mrs. Nickerson and the youngest son, Levi who of course was Freeman’s brother. They had with them two strange men. Although so remote from the states, rumours of a new Prophet and a “golden Bible” had reached Mount Pleasant, Brant co., Canada and had been wondered over and commented upon. Freeman had been told that his parents had joined the new church and he was rather disgusted with the information. . . . These two brethren were the strangers who were with the aged parents. “Well father,” said Freeman when told who they were, “I will welcome them for your sake, but I would just about as soon you had brought a nest of vipers and turned them loose upon us.”

Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon preached at several villages in the area, including Brantford, Mount Pleasant, and Colborne. Descriptions of some of these meetings give us insight into their style and manner of preaching. Lydia Bailey describes a meeting in the Nickerson home:

As the evening drew near, Mr. Nickerson became anxious to hear something of the newcomer’s faith.

“Oh,” he said to his wife, “just let him talk; I’ll silence him, if he undertakes to talk about the Bible. I guess I know as much about the scriptures as he does.”

As soon as supper was over, he invited his visitors and family to go upstairs to the parlor, where he said they would have some talk. “Now Mr. Smith,” he said, “I wish you and Mr. Rigdon to speak freely. Say what you wish and tell us what you believe. We will listen.”

Turning to his wife, he whispered, “Now you’ll see how I will shut him up.”

---

61 Quoted in Gordon Douglass Pollock, *Northern Voices: A Folk History of Mormonism among British Americans, 1830–1867* (Halifax, Nova Scotia: Kelso Associates, 1995), 8–9. Raised in Massachusetts, Lydia Bailey had married at age sixteen and suffered through an abusive marriage to an alcoholic husband. She left her husband at age twenty and came to live with the Nickersons to try and put her life back together. Later she married Newell Knight, a widower. Therefore, she is often referred to as Lydia B. Knight.
The Prophet commenced by relating the scenes of his early life. He told how the angel visited him, of his finding the plates, and the translation of them, and gave a short account of the matter contained in the Book of Mormon.

As the speaker continued his wonderful narrative, I was listening and watching him intently. I saw his face become white and a shining glow seemed to beam from every feature.

As his story progressed, he would often allude to passages of scripture. Then Mr. Nickerson would speak up and endeavor to confound him. But the attempt was soon acknowledged even by himself to be futile.

The Prophet bore a faithful testimony that the priesthood was again restored to the earth, and that God and his Son had conferred upon him the keys of the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods. He stated that the last dispensation had come, and the words of Jesus were now in force: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

Elder Rigdon spoke after the Prophet ceased. He related some of his early experiences, and told those present that he had received a testimony for himself of the truth of what Joseph had said. “God,” said Elder Rigdon, “is no respecter of persons, but will give to all that ask of Him a knowledge of the things Joseph Smith has declared unto you, whether they are true or false, of God or man.”

After both men were through speaking, many questions were asked by all present, for information. The listeners were honest-hearted people, and when truth is told to such they are constrained to accept and believe.

“And is this, then,” said Mr. Nickerson, “the curious religion the newspapers tell so much about? Why, if what you have said is not good sound sense, then I don’t know what sense is.”

A feeling of agreeable disappointment was felt by Mr. Nickerson and family, that these strange men were so different from the various representations of them.

Next day, notice was sent out that there would be public preaching in the Nickerson Brothers’ new store-house. A large and attentive audience was present. Elder Sidney Rigdon spoke to the people with great clarity on the first principles of the gospel, and closed with a strong testimony to the truth of so-called “Mormonism.”

The Prophet then arose and poured forth a golden stream of words, many of which were verily pearls without price, setting forth the restoration of the gospel and the great work that had commenced on the earth. With power he exhorted everyone who was present to seek for the truth of his and his companions’ words from the source of all light, all truth, and all religion, and a knowledge of the truth of the same should surely follow.
Great was the excitement among the peaceful dwellers in Mount Pleasant.

The day following, a meeting was again held, and after it was over the Prophet baptized twelve persons, including myself, Mr. Nickerson and all of his household. I, who was always sober and full of reflection, received the glad message with trembling joy. I was filled with a bright, peaceful influence and was full of gratitude that God had spared me to hear and accept His glorious gospel. As a lonely girl, I had thought of death and its rest with a longing heart. But here was life—life eternal. After I was baptized, I was constrained to cry aloud, “Glory to God in the highest. Thanks be to His holy name that I have lived to see this day and be a partaker of this great blessing.”

This meeting reveals several important aspects of Joseph’s and Sidney’s preaching. First, they did not confine themselves to the Bible. Second, they used a method similar to the one missionaries still use today—usually one gives the main message and the other bears testimony. Third, it was quite unusual for Joseph Smith to talk directly about his experience with the restoration of the priesthood, the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and angelic visitations.

As result of their preaching, several people requested baptism. Joseph organized a branch, ordained Eleazer Freeman Nickerson an elder, and called him to preside over the Saints in that part of Canada. The Nickersons were true pioneers in building the Church in Canada. Freeman Nickerson’s role in converting members of his own family is evidence of the significant influence of family and kinship in the growth and globalization of the Church.

The Prophet was pleased with their success and wrote about the attentive audiences and the ministrations of the Spirit. However, opposition arose, especially among the Wesleyan Methodists and particularly with one of their ministers, Reverend Henry Wilkinson. The Methodists, who had held revivals in the area and were well established among the people, now felt threatened by the success of Joseph
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Smith and Sidney Rigdon.  

On October 20, 1833, Joseph Smith and his companions left for home. They traveled via Buffalo, reaching Kirtland on November 4. Joseph’s first mission to Canada had been a positive move forward for the new church.

Four years later, Joseph undertook his second mission to Canada. He recorded in July 1837: “I started from Kirtland in company with elders Rigdon and Marsh, for the purpose of visiting the Saints in Canada.” Actually, their departure was delayed by a threatened lawsuit against the Prophet. They departed the day after the matter was resolved, traveling first to Ashtabula, then by boat to Buffalo, reaching Toronto on July 30. Interestingly, on the same day they entered Canada, nine converts were baptized in the River Ribble in Preston, the first baptisms in England.

During his second mission to Canada, Joseph Smith worked with John Taylor who had briefly visited him in Kirtland. This visit gave them time to become better acquainted. John Taylor benefited from traveling with the Prophet and later wrote: “This was as great a treat to me as I ever enjoyed. I had daily opportunity of conversing with them, of listening to their instructions, and of participating in the rich stores of intelligence that flowed continually from the Prophet Joseph.” Their better acquaintance no doubt influenced John Taylor’s call to the apostleship the next year, 1838. In fact, before Joseph Smith left Canada, he ordained John Taylor a high priest and appointed him to preside over the Saints in Canada.

The American missionaries held conferences with the Saints and also preached to nonmembers. A sizeable crowd gathered to hear them in a large barn owned by Edward Lawrence. Joseph and Sidney remarked how that message caused the Saints to rejoice and new con-
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verts to come into the Church.\footnote{72}{Ibid.}

On their way back from Canada, Joseph and his party secured a wagon and team in Buffalo to carry them to Kirtland. In Painesville, Ohio, the Prophet was threatened by a mob—something that plagued him throughout his tenure as Church president. He and Sidney Rigdon managed to escape and arrived safely in Kirtland but were exhausted from the ordeal. The next morning, however, Joseph Smith preached a powerful sermon.\footnote{73}{George Q. Cannon, \textit{Life of Joseph Smith the Prophet} (1888; reprinted, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986), 229.}

The Prophet’s second mission to Canada had been a great success. He felt good about his work in converting new members and strengthening the branches of the Church. Summarizing the Prophet’s work, Parley P. Pratt later published a poetic tribute in the \textit{Millennial Star}:

\begin{quote}
He has organized the kingdom of God.—We will extend its dominion.

He has restored the fulness of the Gospel.—We will spread it abroad.

He has kindled up the dawn of a day of glory.—We will bring it to its meridian splendour.

He was a “little one” and became a thousand. We are a small one, and will become a strong nation.

In short, he quarried the stone from the mountain; we will cause it to become a great mountain and fill the whole earth.\footnote{74}{Parley P. Pratt, “Proclamation,” \textit{Millennial Star} 5 (March 1845): 151–52.}
\end{quote}

\textbf{INTERNATIONALIZATION SINCE JOSEPH SMITH’S DAY}

What has happened in the globalization process since the days of Joseph Smith? Time permits only a brief outline of this process and the status of the international Church today. While I am writing primarily about the Utah Church, it should be noted that this was also a time of growth and internationalization for the Community of Christ.

From Canada, the gospel spread to the British Isles, from the British Isles to Europe, and from there, across the world. In February 1996, the balance of population shifted, with more members of the LDS Church outside than inside the United States. Most of this glob-
alization took place in the last half of the twentieth century. World War II seemed to be a watershed event, moving the Church into many new places around the world.\textsuperscript{75}

Today, the LDS Church is found on every continent with members residing in 143 countries.\textsuperscript{76} More and more the Church is calling the members in foreign countries to serve as missionaries in their homelands, rather than relying on missionaries from the United States. For example, 50 percent of the missionaries serving in Mexico’s nineteen missions are Mexican nationals.\textsuperscript{77} More astonishing is the number of temples. Mexico now has twelve, more than any country outside the United States. Furthermore, there are more than a million members in Mexico, almost 10 percent of the Church population.\textsuperscript{78}

Rapid growth has not come without some cost. Often retention rates (the number of members who remain active in the Church) have been very low. Providing leadership for an exploding Church population is also a huge challenge.\textsuperscript{79}

As the Mormon church has spread across the earth, cultural problems and differences have also emerged. Things could simply not be done according to the Utah model. Two examples will illustrate. When my son Brian went on a mission to Tahiti in 1980, he wore his suit on the plane going down and when he returned. During his time in Tahiti, a short-sleeved white shirt, slacks, and sandals, all allowed by mission policy, let him work more effectively than the traditional dark suit.\textsuperscript{80} In the Philippines, massive air-conditioning systems were installed in LDS meetinghouses in the 1980s. The local membership could not afford even the electrical bills to operate these

\textsuperscript{75}Cannon and Cowan, \textit{Unto Every Nation}, 510.
\textsuperscript{76}2004 \textit{Church Almanac} (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 2004), 260–412.
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\textsuperscript{78}\textit{Church Almanac}, 345.
\textsuperscript{79}\textit{Teachings of Gordon B. Hinckley} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1997), 531–32.
\textsuperscript{80}Cannon and Cowan, \textit{Unto Every Nation}, xxiv. These examples also demonstrate the flexibility of Mormonism as described in F. LaMond Tullis, ed., \textit{Mormonism: A Faith for all Cultures} (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young
systems and found the cold air uncomfortable. Louvered windows soon replaced these expensive systems and adequately met the members’ needs.81

In spite of problems and challenges, the globalization of Mormonism has moved steadily forward. Looking back in this era of progress at Joseph Smith’s prophetic statements is a stimulating exercise. Take, for example, part of his statement in the Wentworth Letter: “No unhallowed hand can stop the work from progressing; persecutions may rage, mobs may combine, armies may assemble, calumny may defame, but the truth of God will go forth boldly, nobly, and independent, till it has penetrated every continent, visited every clime, swept every country, and sounded in every ear, till the purposes of God shall be accomplished and the great Jehovah shall say the work is done.”82

Mormonism has penetrated every continent, visited every clime, and continues its sweep into more countries. Joseph Smith got it right in his prophetic statements about the globalization of Mormonism. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has, indeed, become a global church.
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"We are a peculiar people," President Joseph Young informed a group of “brethren and sisters” in July 1855. “Our circumstances have been trying and vexatious all the way through.” By that date, Mormons had adopted the phrase as an emblem. One might marvel at their audacity, given the more invidious connotations of “peculiar.” The word’s basal sense of “distinguished in nature, character or attributes from others,” hence “particular” or “spe-
cial,” can edge towards the pejorative implications of “unusual, out-of-the-way,” thus “strange, odd, ‘queer.’” Joseph Capron insinuated this last set of meanings when he informed Mormon-debunker Philastus Hurlburt that Joseph Smith Sr.’s family were “really a peculiar people—fond of the foolish and the marvelous . . . addicted to vice and the grossest immoralities” while pretending “to piety and holy intercourse with Almighty God.” An alternate definition relating to property holding—a “peculiar” object or person belongs “exclusively to” one or more owners—took on equally negative connotations in antebellum discourse by being linked with slavery, the South’s “peculiar institution,” yet even that association did not deter Mormons from embracing the word. Speaking the day after his colleague, Brigham Young explained that God had “introduced” plural marriage—slavery’s “twin relic of barbarism,” the Republican Party declared—to raise up “a royal Priesthood, a peculiar people.” By denominating themselves “peculiar” despite its more unflattering nuances, Mormons thrust their outlandishness into contemporaries’ collective craw.

Mormons claimed scriptural warrant rather than common English usage for so fashioning themselves. Although neither the Book of


3 Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. “peculiar,” A.2–4; Eber D. Howe, Mormonism Unvailed [Sic]: Or, a Faithful Account of That Singular Imposition and Delusion from Its Rise to the Present Time . . . (Painesville, Ohio: Printed and Published by the Author, 1834), 232. The extended pejorative sense does not appear in Noah Webster’s dictionary of 1828, but Catron’s usage indicates that the meaning “odd or weird in an unacceptable way” was certainly current colloquially. See An American Dictionary of the English Language, 5th ed., prefaced by Rosalie J. Slater (San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1987; facsimile of New York: S. Converse, 1828), s.v. “peculiar.”

Mormon nor the Doctrine and Covenants employs “peculiar people,” the King James Version (KJV), whose cadences resonated in virtually every nineteenth-century American church and parlor, uses it four times. The first two occur during Moses’s pronouncement of the Deuteronomic law, where Israel’s distinctiveness issues from its covenantal status as God’s nation pledged to obey his commandments. Saints noticed the connection quickly; among the inaugural Mormon references to “peculiar people,” which appeared in the early 1840s, as far as I can tell, some pertained exclusively to the Jews.

Visiting a London synagogue in 1841 as a missionary, Heber C. Kimball, his “mind” rendered “unusually solemn” by the service, observed that Jews “seem to be a peculiar people, and can readily be distinguished from all other Nations.” The end point of Mormon interest in such matters was not Jews’ standing, however, but their own; and two New Testament passages provided the material for appropriating the title. By far the more important for Mormon exegesis—Brigham Young’s defense of plural marriage quoted above contains a truncated version of 1 Peter 2:9, which explicitly spells out a peculiar people’s qualities: they are “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation,” fit vessels to “show forth” God’s “praises.” Although in context the biblical author addresses only churches of Gentile Christians in Asia Minor, parsing the verse in isolation can universalize it.

As early as 1841, Brigham Young and Willard Richards laid out the logic: God, the two apostles stated, “chose the children of Israel to be his peculiar people,” and to them “belong the covenants and promises.” These “blessings” descended to the “generation of Gentiles” contemporary with Peter and thus also became available to all who “stand


6After proscribing pagan mourning rites, the prophet tells Israel that “the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself” (Deut. 14:2); and, at the presentation’s climax, he affirms that “the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people” (Deut. 26:18)—contingent, of course, on their continuing to “walk in his ways” (v. 17).
by faith.”

Joseph Smith’s first followers took these names “quite literally,” Jan Shipps has observed, for, as inaugural Saints, “they became the very embodiment of a chosen generation.” The epithet “peculiar people” designated Mormons as the Lord’s covenanted folk.

In 1870, the annotator of “Wild Bill” Hickman’s tell-all autobiography about his murderous exploits as “Brigham’s avenging angel” swung Mormons from the scaffold of their self-proclaimed specialness. Their literature “for the past forty years,” J. H. Beadle maintained, can be “compressed to just this: ‘We are the Lord’s people, His chosen people, His peculiar people . . . we know of a surety that our religion is right, and everybody else’[s] wrong.’”

In the final reckoning, though, the real significance of the phrase “peculiar people” lies not in whether one prefers the Mormons’ or Beadle’s valuation of its adjective but rather in their shared agreement about the substantive validity of its noun. Latter-day Saints may not have actually called themselves “peculiar” until the 1840s, but by then they had fleshed out a theological concept—the “Mormon people”—more than a decade old. I use this term heuristically, for the individuals to whom it applies called themselves something else, most usually, “Saints.”

The term does not impose on the evidence, however, but rather derives from and reflects Mormons’ own sense of belonging.

---


10 The phrase “Mormon people” does appear in early Mormon writings, but usually as the equivalent of “Mormons,” not in the sense I develop. For one example, see Joseph Smith Jr., Letter to Isaac Galland, March 22, 1839, in *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, compiled and edited by Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 419.
to something other than a group defined on the basis of ethnicity, cultural traits, geographical concentration, or discrete religious observances. By the “Mormon people,” I mean that body of individuals whose collective self-representation includes both their entering into covenant with the Lord under the new dispensation revealed by the Prophet Joseph Smith and their articulating sociological boundaries that set them apart from everyone else. I invoke the label to spotlight the dual dimensions of this identity as well as the Jewish and Christian scriptural ruminations on the meanings of “people” that inform it.

The Mormon people strode from the Saints’ holy books. Reinterpreting (Mormons would say, “restoring”) both Israel’s assertion of being God’s people in the Tanakh (the Hebrew scriptures) and the Christian community’s appropriation of that claim in the New Testament, the Mormon scriptures generated a powerful semantic field that kept even self-professed Christians outside the covenant until they were grafted into the House of Israel.11 Thus signified theologically, the Mormon people were incarnated sociologically as Latter-day Saints gathered their church, suffered their neighbors’ hostility, and entrenched themselves amid Deseret’s arid beauty. The Mormon people presided over its institutional advent on April 6, 1830, when Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery ordained each other elders of the nascent Church of Christ, and its construction had finished by the time the temple in Salt Lake City began to rise; but by “Mormon people” I intend something more than a religious organization and its members. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is the Mormon people in its ecclesiastical aspect, if you will, but the Church is not itself the Mormon people. To characterize the Latter-day Saints as merely a denomination among denominations fails to appreciate how they do not—and, as importantly, how they do—fit into nineteenth-century American history.12 Although stressing Mormons’ peculiarity, I will do so by emphasizing their theological deployment of


the Jewish and Christian scriptural traditions and their sociological self-definition vis-à-vis their contemporaries. We can fathom the construction of the Mormon people only by situating them within the intellectual and historical contexts they strove to reshape and escape. Mormonism is too important for understanding religion in America to study hermetically.

Accepting at face value Mormons’ professions that they comprehended a peculiar people by whatever name allows us to rethink their place in American history. If the Saints comprised a palpably new Israel, as they certainly thought they did, then their Zion contravened normative antebellum notions about the American Revolution’s settlement of religion, the mass of constitutional and political arrangements developed at the federal and local levels to configure relationships between religion and the state. The “revolutionary settlement” as it operated in the early nineteenth century presumed that America was both a democratic republic and a Protestant domain, a polity whose mechanisms of governance protected liberty by implementing the “Moderate Enlightenment’s” love of checks and balances, but many of whose citizens deemed themselves the pious children of a deity jealous to expand their country’s borders. For some, the United States provided a haven of religious freedom; for others, it stood as a Christian nation in covenant with God.¹³

Mormons roiled the settlement’s consensus at several points. Consonant with its policy of toleration, they insisted upon their right to worship as they wished, but their practices turned out to be a *sui generis* variant of Christianity whose promulgation of a triune scripture, among other oddities, ostracized them from the mainstream as surely as if each Saint had sprouted a third eye.¹⁴ Against pronouncements that the United States was a Christian nation, they claimed divine mandate to build a material New Jerusalem; and when outraged


adversaries frustrated their plans, they quit Gentile America to establish a state church within a theocratic republic—the Great Basin’s analogue to ancient Israel. Stockaded behind the Wasatch Front, irrigated by faith and mountain streams, the Mormon people challenged the foundations of the Revolution’s “religious settlement” and insulted the sovereignty of the United States.

***

The identity of any self-selecting group depends on what attributes confer membership and how rigorously insiders patrol their boundaries against outsiders. The characteristics of the Mormon people were (and are) defined theologically—Saints are those who enter the new and everlasting covenant through baptism into God’s restored church; and the boundaries are set sociologically primarily in relationship to three main groups: Jews (understood by Mormons as descended from the inhabitants of the land of Judah), Lamanites (a kindred Israelite people) and Gentiles (all non-Israelites).

Jews and Lamanites have blood ties with a fourth group, the Kingdom of Israel’s inhabitants, who were “scattered to and fro upon the isles of the sea” (1 Ne. 22:4) after the Assyrians invaded. The lost tribes of Israel figure importantly in Mormon theology; Christ will show himself to them (3 Ne. 17:4), the covenant includes them (Eth. 13:11), and they will join Zion’s restoration in America (Articles of Faith 10). Mormons believe that many converts, perhaps most, belong to these lost tribes, especially Ephraim. Nevertheless, during the mid-nineteenth century, the scattered Israelites did not figure in establishing the Mormon people’s boundaries sociologically. Diffused among the Gentiles, they were invisible collectively and recognizable individually only as revealed by a patriarchal blessing; hence, they receive little attention here.

The scriptural underpinnings of the Mormon people and the dynamics of its boundary-formation hark back to biblical Israel. In its


16I am not arguing that the Ten Tribes of Israel do not matter in salvation history—only that they did not figure much in constructing the Mormon people’s sociological boundaries. One might note that the Book of Mormon is “written” explicitly to Jews, Lamanites and Gentiles, but not to the Israelites (although, of course, their existence in the audience is presumed).
most profoundly religious sense, “Israel” identifies the people of God
whatever their political standing of the moment. Tanakh employs
two terms to denote “people,” a dual usage that likened Israel to its
neighbors in possessing certain national characteristics while singling
it out on the basis of its exclusive covenant with God. The first, ‘am,
in its primary collective sense designates a clan, conveying strong over-
tones of a “people” united on the basis of its members’ consanguinity.
‘Am can intend “the people as a whole” as well as civic bodies or
troops of soldiers, but it assumes a specifically religious connotation
in relation to the cultic assembly of the faithful, one of whose names is
‘am ṭôhîm (“the people of God”). The second term, gôy (pl. gôyîm),
comes closer to the modern sense of “nation,” persons conjoined on
the basis of racial origin, shared government, or possession of terri-
tory. The meanings of ‘am and gôy overlap in some instances but not
all. Gôy can describe both Israel and its neighbors, but Israel recog-
nized itself as a nation possessing “unique moral, political, and reli-
gious obligations,” the only gôy in covenant with God, though, of
course, the Lord rules the other gôyîm, too. At the same time, gôy,
unlike ‘am, never appears in conjunction with a deific name, nor, with
few incidental exceptions, does Tanakh utilize ‘am to designate any
nation save Israel.

These usages ground the possibility of conferring ‘am in the
sense of “the Lord’s covenantated people” exclusively on Israel, reser-
ving gôy for all other polities, whose inhabitants worship their own na-
tional deities but not the Lord. The later books of Tanakh move in
just this direction. The post-exilic Priestly passages diminish Israel’s
identification as a gôy, magnifying the word’s association with the

17H. J. Zobel, “יִשְׂרָאֵל,” Theological Dictionary of the Old Testa-
ment, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck et al., translated by John T. Willis et
18E. Lipiński and W. Von Soden, “דָּעַ ‘אָם,” Theological Dictionary of the
Old Testament, 11:169–70, 174–77. Other names are ‘am qīdōš (“holy peo-
ple”), or, simply ha’am (“the people”). This section owes much to the help of
my colleague Ronald Troxel.
19Ronald E. Clements and G. Johannes Botterweck, “גּוֹי,” Theolog-
20Clements and Botterweck, “גּוֹי,” Theological Dictionary of the Old
Testament, 2:427; Lipiński, “דָּעַ ‘אָם,” ibid., 11:177; Clements and Botter-
“foreign” nations, while the Deuteronomic literature intensifies earlier reflections that the gôyîm are not neutral borderers but hostile heathen nations.\textsuperscript{21} As the people Israel suffered a succession of defeats culminating in their conquest and dispersion, they came to regard their neighbors with unrelenting enmity and hardened the semantic boundaries around themselves. Hellenistic Jewish literature and the Septuagint, the third-century B.C.E. Alexandrian translation of Tanakh, reserved the Greek equivalents of gôy exclusively for foreign nations, now unqualifiedly regarded with fear and loathing. Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism drew a clear dichotomy between God’s people and the gôyîm, pagan oppressors who were politically dangerous and morally comatose.\textsuperscript{22}

The sociological and covenantal boundaries in Tanakh between Israel and the gôyîm are relatively impermeable.\textsuperscript{23} The New Testament recognizes the ethno-political borders between nations while transforming the dichotomy between Israel and the rest of the world into a trichotomy that distinguishes God’s covenedanted people from both the Jews and the “foreign nations.” Tanakh’s distinction between ’am and gôy remains, rendered as, respectively, laos and ethnē (pl. ethnē). Particularly in the Lucan writings, laos carries the typical Greek meaning of “a crowd or group of people”; but under the Septuagint’s influence, the word attaches to Israel,\textsuperscript{24} setting “laos Israel” apart from the heathen multitude. Ethnos originally means a “mass” or “host” bound together by distinctive cultural features; but it, too,


\textsuperscript{23}The Book of Ruth provides a notable exception of love’s ability to conquer xenophobia.

\textsuperscript{24}Cf. Acts 4:10 and 13:24
takes on a more specific sense, replicating ἔθνος and its pejorative connotations.  

The New Testament also distinguishes between two particular peoples, Jews and Greeks, in ways that are important for salvation history but that do not parallel the opposition between “Israel” and the “foreign nations.” Tanakh hardly recognizes the “Jews,” originally a political designation for members of a tribe, a kingdom, or a Persian province. God covenanted with “Israel,” not “the Jews.” By New Testament times, the term had become self-referential in the Hellenized Diaspora but not in Palestine, whose denizens presented themselves to outsiders as “Jews,” an ἔθνος, while greeting each other as “Israel,” ἀμ ἀλαχίμ. Christian authors, however, rejected the idea that redemptive Israel was still coterminous with what were now inhabitants of Roman Judea, the Ioudaioi. They dissociated true Israel, those (including Jews) who accept Christ, from “Israel after the flesh” (1 Cor. 10:18), the Ioudaioi, regarding them sometimes benignly (as real or potential brethren in Christ) and other times antagonistically (as persecutors) but always through a Christian glass and never as unique heirs of God’s promises. The New Testament’s use of Ἑλλήν, “Greek,” was a bit more straightforward. The term and

---


its variants appear most frequently in Acts and the Pauline Epistles. It can narrowly designate Greek Jewish Christians; but more commonly, it intends non-Jewish Hellenized inhabitants of the Roman Mediterranean, approximating *ethnos*. Paul’s formula “Jews and Greeks” is shorthand for the totality of persons whom preachers like himself must evangelize.\(^{28}\)

Paul’s slogan points to how the New Testament explodes the old dichotomy between Israel and the nations. It transfers the covenantal relationship from the Jewish people Israel to the Christian community, which is recruited from among both *laos Israel* and the *ethnē, Ioudaioi*, and *Hellenes*. This new aggregation draws from and overlaps the Jews and Greeks sociologically while, as followers of the risen Lord, transcending them soteriologically. Yet though scripture records what one might regard as the ethnogenesis of the Christian people, it does not endow them with national and ethnic characteristics as opulently as it does Jews and Greeks. Indeed, it does not provide them with a single name around which such characteristics might cluster, certainly not “Christian”—an anachronism that is, however, nearly impossible to do without. The New Testament uses *christianos* and its plural a bare three times, only one of which is self-referential.\(^{29}\) “Scripture instead calls the disciples of Jesus by a variety of appellations, such as “saints,” followers of “the way,” “saints and faithful brethren in Christ,” or the “body of Christ, and members in particular.”\(^{30}\) To the extent that Christians did comprise a *laos* established by their accepting the

---


291 Pet. 4:16. The other verses are Acts 11:26, 26:28. “Christian” was originally a term of contempt that, as so often happens, the objects of derision eventually embraced.

new covenant, they did so metaphorically. Moreover, in striking contrast with the Book of Mormon, the New Testament gestures only faintly at equating the Christian community with “Israel.” Only by the end of the second century C.E. did polemicists in the context of distinguishing the church from the synagogue assert that Christians composed a “third race,” the original Israel specially endowed with divine favor as opposed to Jews and Greeks.

I have forced you to endure my vocalizing languages all of which, whatever their etymologies, are Greek to me in order to avoid introducing English terminology prematurely. The tripartite division between Christians, Jews, and Greeks entered the world of Joseph Smith through the King James Bible. Steeped in its idioms, Smith, as Philip Barlow has told us, considered its style “sacred language”; and though he questioned the text’s accuracy enough to depart from it and ultimately to retranslate it, “his speech and thought patterns had been profoundly influenced by the common version of the day.” KJV overwhelmingly translates ‘אָm and λαος with “people.” For גוים it predictably utilizes “nations,” but it also introduces “Gentiles,” a word derived from the Latin gens, “nation.”

Jerome employs variations of gens throughout the Vulgate, from which “Gentile” entered biblical English. William Tyndale’s inaugural New Testament, published in 1526, used “Gentile” to signify “any or all nations other than Jewish,” and his diction informed the heroic age of Tudor-Jacobean translation. KJV strongly conveys the trichotomy differentiating the Christian community from all others,

---


34 Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. “Gentile,” A.I.1, B.I.1 and examples; F. F. Bruce, History of the Bible in English, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University
but while translating “Yisrâ’êl” and “Ioudaioi” with their English cognates, it uses “Gentiles” to represent “gôy,” “êthnos,” and, on five occasions, even Ἰλλήνες, thereby foregrounding that word as the preeminent designation for “other nations.”35 Mormon terminology elevates “Gentile(s)” to even greater prominence.

* * *

The theological construction of the Mormon people took shape against these shifting definitions. Mormon scriptures retain the nomenclature of Jews and Gentiles but radically reinterpret it in three ways. The first departs from the New Testament, where Christians can preserve their identities as Jews or Gentiles (Paul continues to relish aspects of his “Jewishness”36) but can become “true Israel,” God’s people, only after accepting Jesus as their savior. In Mormon writ, on the contrary, Jews and Gentiles constitute categories already populated by God’s people, who do not, however, know themselves to be “true Israel”—even if they believe that they have already accepted Christ—until they discover their real identity by joining the Latter-day Saints. Two other formulations evoke Tanakh.

The latter-day gospel neither refers to the Christian community by name nor takes over any of the New Testament’s euphemisms like “the way” or “body of Christ.” Instead, it re-identifies God’s people with Israel. Indeed, “Christian” in the singular appears only as the forename of one of the eight witnesses, and in the plural merely four times (Alma 46:13, 15, 16; 48:10). Moreover, Mormons discarded the New Testament’s figurative reconstruction for a robust proclamation that situates the Saints in “the literal Israel of the Old Testament,” as Jan Shipps has stated, rather than as “the symbolic Israel that came into existence in the Graeco-Roman world of early Christendom.”37 This assertion of Israel’s tangible restoration instilled into Mormon self-identification a sense of comprising a holy people in the flesh...
that emanates as acutely as any found in Deuteronomy or Isaiah. In certain uses of “people” and in titles like the “House of Israel,” Mormon scriptures unite the ethno-political meanings of גויים and Αέθνος with the covenantal nuances of ‘אָם and לאוס, except that the Mormons’ restored Israel embraces a far more extended people—demographically as well as theologically—than anything Tanakh imagines.

Mormon holy writ uses “people” in various ways, although the term ultimately unites the covenantal and sociological meanings conveyed by separate words in Hebrew and Greek. The general usage is strictly ethno-political, carrying senses like “all human beings” or “a body of persons living under a national government.” Roughly 15 percent of the time, “people” is paired with the possessive “my,” and these cases divide into two equal sets. In the first, a human being refers to his own group in national or cultural terms. The prophet Mormon can, for instance, write about having as a ten-year old been instructed in “the learning of my people” (Morm. 1:2). Some of these instances develop more salvific connotations, as when Nephi records that his writings “should be kept for the instruction of my people, who should possess the land, and also for other wise purposes” (1 Ne. 9:3). In the second category, a divine presence—God the Father, Jesus, or a prophet speaking under revelation—addresses an audience;


38 For various sense, see Omni 1:22 (“all human beings”), Omni 1:14 (“a body of persons living under a national government”), Hel. 3:9 (“a group sharing cultural traits”), Hel. 1:6 (“the mass of ordinary persons as distinguished from their rulers”), and Words of Mormon 1:12 (“subjects of a specific ruler”).

39 “My people” appears in 252 of the 1,689 different verses in the Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and Pearl of Great Price (1981 LDS edition). Of the 276 specific instances (the phrase appears twice in two dozen verses), 139 are spoken by an individual and 137 by a divine presence. In 1 Nephi 19:3, “possess the land” refers to God’s covenantal promise; for “other purposes,” see D&C 3:19.
and the phrase always references a covenantal relationship: “I shall prepare, an Holy City,” God tells Enoch in the Book of Moses, “that my people may gird up their loins” (Moses 7:62). Such expressions invest the phrase “my people” with the same meaning conveyed by ‘am ‘elōhîm and lâos Isrâ‘êl, a sense intensified by the phrase’s association with the title “House of Israel.”

Although the King James Bible uses “House of Israel” far less often than “Children of Israel,” Mormon scriptures, beginning with the Book of Mormon’s title page, feature it as one of the central designations for God’s people. Like “Israel” in Tanakh but accoutered with distinctive doctrines such as the gathering of the elect and the material (rather than spiritual) realization of the New Jerusalem, the term “House of Israel” rehearses the “covenant which the Father made with your fathers,” and which descends from Abraham, in whose seed “all the kindreds of the earth” will be blessed (3 Ne. 20:25).

Various texts emphasize that the Lord’s covenants have been proclaimed across the dispensations: They were “spoken unto the Jews, by the mouth of his holy prophets” (2 Ne 9:12), preached by the “twelve apostles” (1 Ne. 13:24) and, according to a revelation Joseph Smith announced in 1831, embodied in the gospel “set forth in these

---

40 The phrase “House of Israel” appears 146 times in KJV, 83 times in Ezekiel alone with another 20 in Jeremiah. These figures replicate the underlying Hebrew beit Yisrâ‘êl in Tanakh. It appears 126 times in Mormon scriptures (118 in the Book of Mormon text plus twice on the title page, six times in the Doctrine and Covenants, but not in the Pearl of Great Price.) Since the Book of Mormon alone is roughly one third the size of the complete Bible (Barlow, Mormons and the Bible, 28), a percentage not changed substantially by adding the Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price, the Mormon usage is considerably greater. In contrast, the KJV employs “Children of Israel” 641 times, all but 14 in the Old Testament; in comparison, the Book of Mormon has only 8 appearances, the Doctrine and Covenants another 8, and the Pearl of Great Price none. In Frank J. Johnson and Rabbi William J. Leffler, Jews and Mormons: Two Houses of Israel (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing House, 2000), 148–49, Johnson, a Mormon high priest (ix), links “House of Israel” for modern Mormons to the general revelation granted Smith and Oliver Cowdery at Kirtland on April 3, 1836 (D&C 110:11–12, although, as Johnson notes, v. 11 speaks only of the “gathering of Israel,” not the “House”) and to more specific references given in patriarchal blessings. However that may be, “House of Israel” is rife in the Book of Mormon.
last days,” which has been “sent forth to recover my people, which are of the house of Israel” (D&C 39:11). Mormon scriptures record many instances of covenants between individuals or between individuals and God, but the central promise—that, as God tells Nephi, “inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments, ye shall prosper, and shall be led to a land of promise” (1 Ne. 2:20)—recapitulates the pacts already made with Abraham and Moses.  

Smith’s revelation that the Lord has “done away” with “all old covenants” in favor of “a new and an everlasting covenant, even that which was from the beginning,” re-establishes an old agreement rather than inaugurating a new one (D&C 22:1-4).

The covenant is conditional: “O ye house of Israel whom I have spared,” Christ promises, “how oft will I gather you as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, if ye will repent and return unto me with full purpose of heart” (3 Ne. 10:6). That conditionality has resulted in ruptures throughout human history; the Jews broke the covenant by spurning Christ, and the House of Israel frequently departs from its obligations. For such transgressions, Christ assures them, “the places of your dwellings shall become desolate” (3 Ne. 10:7). Nevertheless, the promises remain sure. Israel will be barred from its homelands only “until the time of the fulfilling of the covenant to your fathers,” for God mercifully “remembereth the house of Israel, both roots and branches” (3 Ne. 10:7; Jac. 6:4). The Lord’s people will be “gathered together to the lands of their inheritance” (1 Ne. 22:12), and a New Jerusalem built upon that soil (Eth. 13:6).

How and when the House of Israel comes together in history is a complicated matter. The covenant belongs to all of Abraham’s seed; but as time proceeds, particular peoples rise and fall, receiving and, all too often, breaking, their covenantal promises. The seed of Nephi and his brethren, for example, will inhabit the “land of promise” (1 Ne. 12:1); but as Nephi knows prophetically, his own lineage will suffer extermination. In the wake of both that genocide and the gospel’s

---


42Frank Johnson, in Jews and Mormons, 147–48, rightly points out that Smith’s vision of 1820, like Moses’s upon Sinai, was a theophany, and in that sense it represents a new and distinct event.
falsification by the “abominable church” (1 Ne. 13:6) soon after the Lamb of God promulgates it, the House of Israel can be gathered only after a “choice seer”—Joseph Smith—shall bring them “knowledge of the covenants” (2 Ne. 3:7). Mormon scriptures pay particular attention to three peoples from whom Saints gather: Jews, Lamanites, and Gentiles.

The Jews’ connections to the House of Israel in Mormon scriptures accord substantially with the New Testament’s picture, albeit with a unique Christological emphasis. The Book of Mormon is avowedly written to “Jew and Gentile” (title page), both potential members of God’s people, and its pages recite Jewish history as the paradigmatic story of fall and redemption. Jews are God’s “ancient covenant people” (2 Ne. 29:4), the Messiah’s kin (1 Ne. 10:4) through whose “testimony” the world gains “knowledge” of the Savior (D&C 3:16). Nevertheless, their “works of darkness” have led them to reject and crucify the Messiah, for which iniquities God has destroyed and scattered them (2 Ne. 25:2, 12–13, 9, 15). The Lord never forgets them, however; and in the latter days, they will return to their ancestral lands, rebuild Jerusalem, and recognize their salvation in Christ’s wounds (1 Ne. 15:19–20; D&C 77:15, 45:51).

The Mormon scriptures emphasize Jesus’s Jewishness: Nephi foretells that God will raise “a Savior of the world” from “among the Jews” (1 Ne. 10:4)—while reiterating Jews’ responsibility for his death. Mormon 3:21 compacts their bipolar relationship with Jesus into a single verse: they are “the covenant people of the Lord” who “slew” Christ. Here and elsewhere, the reminders that Jews killed God are expiatorily gratuitous, since Mormon scriptures neither rehearse Jesus’s last days nor inscribe their own Passion narratives, but they are theologically cogent taken with the equally strong reminders of Jews’ covenantal status, reinforcing Jews’ intimate if tortured ties with the Redeemer. Moreover, the statements about deicide do not degenerate into an accusation of blood-guilt as in Matthew 27:25.43 Indeed, the Lord chastises the Gentiles for having “cursed” and “hated” His “ancient covenant people,” promising to “return all these things upon

---

43Cf. Wilford Woodruff’s comment that the Jews “said if we let Jesus alone he will come and take away our state and Nation so they crusifyed [sic] him shed his blood and said let it be upon us and our Children,” Wilford Woodruff’s Journal, 1833–1898, typescript, edited by Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983–85), 2:425.
your own heads” (2 Ne. 29:5). Jews are the “first” covenant people to whom the Lamb manifested himself and the “last” who shall be grafted in (1 Ne. 13:42; Jac. 5:63; Eth. 13:12), Christological witnesses more than ordinary historical actors. Dispersed and stateless, they do not—unlike the Lamanites and Gentiles—threaten the Saints militarily.

In contrast with the Jews, the Lamanites have no obvious analogues in either Tanakh or the New Testament. In Tanakh, the Ishmaelites have a kin relationship with Israel descending from their eponymous ancestor, Abraham’s child by Hagar, but they do not belong to ‘am ʾlōhîm and have little intercourse with Israel other than selling Joseph to the Egyptians. The Philistines do besiege the Israelites constantly, but no blood ties connect them. The New Testament’s disinterest in particular national histories depicts opposition to the gospel as theological, philosophical, or moral rather than as political or ethnic.

The Lamanites, however, are a “remnant of the House of Israel,” as well as its inveterate enemies. They can “repent and come to the knowledge of the truth,” as did the Anti-Nephi-Lehies (Alma 23:15–18); and in the aftermath of Christ’s appearance in the New World, the Nephites and Lamanites enjoy a sustained period in which “the love of God . . . did dwell in the hearts of the people” to such a degree that they dropped all tribal identities to become a single entity, “children of Christ, and heirs to the kingdom of God” (4 Ne. 1:15, 17). The Book of Mormon is “written to” them also (title page); and in modern times, Mormon prophesies, the Gentiles will take them the gospel (Morm. 5:15). For the most part, however, the Lamanites reject efforts to convert them. Enos blames his mission’s failure on “their evil nature,” which impelled them to become a “wild, and ferocious, and a blood-thirsty people, full of idolatry and filthiness” (Enos 1:20).

The Lamanites scourge the Nephites implacably throughout the Book of Mormon, for which rebellion against their brethren God darkens their skins, a curse that remains unless they repent (Alma 3:6, 9–10, 14, 23:18). Even after the Lamanites have been “led about by Satan,” the Lord will remember his covenant and the “prayers of the righteous” offered for them (Morm. 5:18, 20, 21), but until they reform, they remain “a dark, a filthy, and a loathsome people” (Morm. 5:15), culturally and racially inferior, likely to join the House of Israel only if heavily proselytized.

Gentiles do not enjoy a covenant promise through lineage, but “as many” of them “as will repent” can join the House of Israel (2 Ne.
Christ is manifested to them through the Holy Ghost, a “light” (3 Ne. 15:23; 1 Ne. 21:6) whose restored gospel will dispel their “blindness” (1 Ne. 13:32). Gentiles in the Mormon scriptures enjoy a salvific role accorded them neither by Tanakh, where the göyim never belong to the people of Israel, nor the New Testament, where they help constitute the Christian community but do not gather it. More than any other people, including the Nephites, the Gentiles function in Mormon holy writ as gospel agents, bringing the word to the Lamanites, the Nephites’ seed, and the Jews (Morm. 5:15; 3 Ne. 21:5; 1 Ne. 13:39). Twice Nephi poignantly likens the Gentiles’ activity to that of loving parents, “nursing” fathers and mothers (2 Ne. 10:9) who “nourish” his brethren’s scattered descendants and carry them “in their arms and upon their shoulders” (1 Ne. 22:8).

For their deeds, the Gentiles receive temporal rewards in an American realm of milk and honey, where they will “prosper and obtain the land for their inheritance” (1 Ne. 13:15), in the process displacing the Lamanites (Morm. 5:19). Their conquered domain “shall be a land of liberty” with “no kings upon it,” fortified “against all other nations” (2 Ne. 10:11–12). Nevertheless, Gentiles possess no greater virtue than any other set of human beings; in “the last days,” Nephi prophesies, “they will be drunken with iniquity and all manner of abominations” (2 Ne. 27:1). Flushed with “pride,” they forsake the gospel to “preach up unto themselves their own wisdom and their own learning” (2 Ne. 26:20). They brutalize Nephi’s seed, laying them “in the dust” (2 Ne. 26:15), but these depredations have a providential cast. Like the Assyrians and Babylonians in Tanakh, the Gentiles act for the Lord, smiting the House of Israel when it falls away. What makes them “mighty above all unto the scattering of my people,” Jesus tells the Nephite multitude, is “the pouring out of the Holy Ghost through me” upon them (3 Ne. 20:27). Without such a “blessing,” they wield no such power; and in ultimate retribution, the House of Israel will “tear” them like “a young lion” among “sheep” (3 Ne. 21:12). Until then, though, they comprise the Saints’ greatest menace. In Joseph Smith’s day, Gentiles tore through Mormon flocks far more readily than did Lamanites.

* * *

Once the Book of Mormon burst into print, the Mormon people began to take sociological shape. Newly minted Saints clustered in Kirtland, Missouri, and Nauvoo, while missionaries journeyed into
“Indian country” and Great Britain. To some degree, early Mormon recruitment followed the course anticipated in scripture, targeting primarily Gentiles and Lamanites and, for the most part, ignoring the Jews, though Orson Hyde consecrated Jerusalem for their eventual return. With few exceptions, Mormons accepted the theological cartography that dispersed Saints-to-be-gathered among the world’s populace, but the sociological construction of the Mormon people did not conform exactly to that map. Virtually all who joined the House of Israel during the first few decades gathered from among the Gentiles. Jews remained aloof, Lamanites indifferent or intermittently hostile.

Meanwhile, the mass of Gentiles proved more feral than even Nephi could have predicted. Those facts profoundly influenced the Saints’ self-identity. Mormons’ sense of being a people depended not only on their own appropriation of covenantal promises but also on how they stood in relation to the outside world. To Saints risking baptism before a crowd yelping “‘the Mormons have got them,’” relationships with Jews, Lamanites, and Gentiles played out more messily than the theology of identity presumed. Although the concept of the House of Israel called Mormons into a special category from the outset, persecution and flight hardened the boundaries between them and the “foreign nations.” By the 1850s, Mormons had defined themselves as a people by stressing their distinctiveness from the Gentiles.

Converts began to construct themselves as Saints by joining the House of Israel. Ezra T. Benson heard Elder John Page preach “upon the gathering of the House of Israel, which was very interesting to me.” Shortly after Page had confuted some “college bred” Presbyterians over the location of the Lost Tribes, Benson and his wife

---

44 One was Alpheus Cutler’s repudiation of the Gentiles because they had murdered Joseph Smith; see Danny L. Jorgensen, “The Old Fox: Alpheus Cutler,” in Differing Visions: Dissenters in Mormon History, edited by Roger D. Launius and Linda Thatcher (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 170.

accepted baptism. Ritual events, sermons and patriarchal blessings articulated that identity and helped cement Saints in it. As part of the dedication of the Salt Lake Temple’s baptismal font in 1856, Heber C. Kimball and Jedediah M. Grant sealed Brigham Young as “prophet seer & revelator in the church & kingdom of God & over the House of Israel.” Responsibility for prosecuting “the great & mighty Events which are rushing upon us with the rapidity of lightning,” Apostle Wilford Woodruff preached a year earlier, lies “at your hands O ye Latter Day Saints.” Woodruff—Mormonism’s Samuel Pepys—took those duties seriously; charged with platting the Young party’s route one afternoon during the great trek of 1847, he confided to his voluminous journal that “we are piloting A road for the House of Israel to travel in for many years to come.”

Patriarchal blessings certified an individual’s membership. During the last days of the “City of Joseph,” John Smith, the martyred prophet’s uncle, placed upon Norton Jacob “the Priesthood and power which was given to the house of Israel,” telling Jacob’s wife, Emily, that her children would be “honorable” within it and thereby “strengthen[ing]” her faith. Saints looked forward to inheriting the land promised by God, whether the site lay near Kanesville, Iowa, which Reuben Miller felt sure had long been designated “the gathering place of the house of Israel,” or in Deseret, about which Eliza Roxcy Snow, the poet laureate of early Mormonism, sang:

A choice land of old appointed
For the house of Israel’s rest;
You have found and consecrated,
Through your blessing ‘twill be blest.

Jews played a critical role in constructing the Mormon people,

48Norton Jacob, “Autobiography,” typescript, 26, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, in Backman and Perkins, Writings; Reuben Miller, “Letter to Sabey [Henry Eriksen], November 16, 1848,” family typescript, 2, in ibid.; Eliza Roxcy Snow, “Hail to the Twelve and Pioneers,” ll. 9–12. All quotations from Snow’s work come from materials graciously provided by Jill Mulvay Derr, then director of the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute, who is compiling
functioning, in Armand Mauss’s felicitous phrasing, “as a kind of ‘theological alter ego.’” Mormons knew much about Jews in the history of salvation. They were God’s ancient covenant people, the prototypic Israel, and would have a critical millennial role even if, as Arnold Green has pointed out, the Saints did not agree on what the sequence of events might be. Jews rejected Christ’s offer of the Kingdom of Heaven, however. Hence, for centuries they have wandered the earth, taxed by Gentiles “beyond their endurance” and persecuted “unto death.”

“It is evident, that the Jews did forsake the Lord, and by that means broke the covenant,” wrote missionary and apostle David Patten. Such “apostacy,” versified Eliza Roxcy Snow, stripped Jews of their “high tone/Of character, that superhuman stamp—/That strict, unyielding rectitude,” until

at length, their hands were purple stain’d
In the Messiah’s blood! Then, the curse
Of the eternal God, soon follow’d on!

According to Wilford Woodruff, the Jews were not satisfied merely “with killing Jesus Christ, but must thrust a spear into his side,” after which they sought to cover up the resurrection by “brib[ing] the guard[s] to say that while they were asleep his disciples [sic] stole him away.” Saints also knew, however, that the Jews would return to Jerusalem. Joseph Holbrook received “many good ideas which has [sic] proven a blessing to me” from his grandfather, who hoped that Holbrook “might live to see” them restored. Snow imagined them converging “In litters and in chariots, on mules, /
On horses and upon swift footed beasts,” to “rebuild / That fav’rite city.” Mormons’ valuation of the Jews took place within the supersessionist expectation of their ultimate conversion and readmission into the House of Israel. Jews had been and would become again what Mormons now were and would always be.

In contrast to their theological importance, however, Jews were sociologically negligible. During Mormonism’s three formative decades, Saints had at best perfunctory acquaintance with them. Joshua Seixas’s two-month stint in early 1836 teaching Hebrew to as many as 120 students at Kirtland was never replicated. America’s Jewish population had reached only fifteen thousand by 1840, most of it far from the Mormon heartlands. Then, just as that number more than tripled in eight years, Mormons fled into the Intermountain West, where Jews seldom trod. Occasionally, travelers dropped in to see the “Mormon experiment,” while the most frequent interactions occurred when Jewish merchants set up shop in San Bernardino and Salt Lake City. Most antebellum Mormons who had not lived abroad never met a Jew; consequently, their characterizations can ap-


pear abstract and self-referential, reeking of theological expectation rather than experience, as in Louisa Barnes Pratt’s lament at leaving Nauvoo’s “beautiful temple” behind: “I felt inclined to say as the poor Jews said of Jerusalem, ‘When I forget thee, Oh Nauvoo, let my right hand forget her cunning, if I prefer not thee above my chief joy’.”

By most accounts, relationships between Jews and Mormons were cordial, though friendship did not translate into conversions; a bare handful followed Alexander Neibaur’s pioneering baptism in 1838, both because Jews themselves spurned the Mormon gospel and because certain strains of Mormon thought suggested that such efforts would prove futile before the last days. Still, millennial expectations that Jews would be regrafted into the House of Israel coupled with their unreceptiveness to proselytization and their inability to persecute Mormons indicated that Jews were neither redemptively incorrigible nor politically minatory. Jews’ relatively amicable relationships with Mormons did not force Saints to rethink their identity.

More frequent interactions with another of the House of Israel’s lineage people had a similarly negligible effect. Mormons did meet Lamanites in the flesh; Helen Mar Kimball Whitney, for one,

---

60 Louisa Barnes Pratt, “Autobiography,” in Heart Throbs of the West, compiled by Kate B. Carter, 12 vols (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939–51), 8:237, in Backman and Perkins, Writings; grammar standardized.

61 Cf. Glanz’s conclusion, Jew and Mormon, 332: “Mormonism appears as the conqueror of old Christian-European inhibitions vis-à-vis Judaism and as the creator of a new relationship to the old Bible people and its religious world.” Corroboration from a negative direction comes from Frederic Cople Jaber, A Scapegoat in the New Wilderness: The Origins and Rise of Anti-Semitism in America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), who mentions only a single instance of Mormon prejudice (240), which may have been brought by British immigrants. See also Benjamin, Three Years in America, 2:224, and Seymour Cain, “The Mormon Quest for the Kingdom of God,” Midstream 37, no. 8 (1991): 27.

had seen them “occasionally” during her youth in Nauvoo. William Clayton, clerk of the Camp of Israel, described Kanesville, Iowa, in 1846 as “composed of Lamanites, half breeds and a few white folks.”63 At root “Lamanite” equivalenced “Indian.” When he was nineteen, Jacob Hamblin’s family moved to Wisconsin Territory, an “unsettled wilderness inhabited only by a few Indians or Lamanites”—but the words carried different associations, as John Whitmer intimated when castigating Mormon enthusiasts’ physical exhibitionism: “Some would act like an Indian in the act of scalping,” he railed, “some would slide or scoot on the floor, with the rapidity of a serpent, which [they] termed sailing in the boat to the Lamanites, preaching the gospel.”64 Indians scalp; Lamanites are subjects to evangelize.

In antebellum Mormon usage, “Lamanite” tends to appear in religiously charged contexts involving proselytism or sacred history. Having migrated to Utah, Jacob Hamblin was chosen in 1854 to “till the earth, teach the Lamanites, our brethren, how to do the same, learn their language and preach the gospel to them.” Wilford Woodruff meditated upon “the Lamanites in these last days” wandering about “cast down & dejected with nothing more than a blanket upon their naked bodies & without the light of the gospel of Jesus Christ or a knowledge of there [sic] forefathers,” but he was fortified by the thought that God had “promised” them the “blessings of the Everlasting gospel,” which he anticipated would come soon. Orson Pratt was similarly optimistic in foreseeing the day “when the Lamanites will build a city called the New Jerrusalem [sic].”65 Lamanites, as the Mormon scriptures said, were remnants of the House of Israel.

“Indians,” by contrast, populate Mormon narratives as mem-

64Jacob Hamblin, “Autobiography,” typescript, 2, Perry Special Collections, in Backman and Perkins, Writings, grammar standardized; John Whitmer, “A Book of John Whitmer Kept by Commandment,” 8, typescript by Pauline Hancock, Perry Special Collections, in ibid.
bers of recognizable tribes—Ute, Shoshone, Cheyenne, Crow—acting in secular, not prophetic, time. They can function as friends, allies, and trading partners. In August 1846, Brigham Young informed a band of Omahas that the Camp of Israel wished to winter in tribal territory and offered to have Saints “do some work for them make them a field & fix there guns &c.” In return, Big Elk allowed the band to stay two years, in addition offering “young men” to “watch your cattle,” opportunities to exchange goods, and notice of hostile Indians. Ten years later, three Arapahoes “By sign” warned the James G. Willie Emigrating Company of a probable Sioux attack.

More often, however, Indians conform to stereotypes: “enquir[ing]” for whiskey, begging in an “annoysome” way, pilfering whatever they could grab, and wantonly killing whites. As a Mormon party moved beyond Winter Quarters in mid-June, 1847, “three naked Indians sprang up out of the grass,” Sarah Rich recounted, “shot Brother [Jacob] Wetherby,” and disappeared. Indians, Oliver Cowdery once opined, were a “rude, wild, revengeful, warlike and barbarous race.” Mosiah Hancock called them “duskees,” a colloquialism, like the parallel term “darkies” applied to African American slaves, redolent with racism.


Mormons’ dual terminology of “Lamanites” and “Indians” reflects a bifurcated consciousness, the former term carrying a salvific significance of which the latter is devoid. This division quarantined doctrinal expectation from grimy reality. As Will Bagley has aptly observed, “Fear of the hidden raiders who continually threatened [Mormons’] stock soon proved a more compelling teacher than theology.” Despite Mormons’ fervor for converting the heathen, their efforts were at best sporadic, as Armand Mauss has demonstrated, and the natives maddeningly refractory. “I tried to teach the Indians the book of Mormon,” Mosiah Hancock volunteered, “but they seemed incapable of learning any good things.”

But if particular Indians failed to convert, scripture reminded Mormons that Lamanites might join the House of Israel in the future. The absence of annihilative conflict sustained that hope; although Mormons and Indians did fight each other, their broils never degenerated into the merciless warfare that had ravaged Anglo and Native American communities for more than two centuries. Mount Timpanogos never stood in for Hill Cumorah, nor the Jordan River for Sand Creek. In the mid-nineteenth-century construction of the Mormon people, the conceptualization of the Lamanites cum Indians segregated gospel hopes from historical disappointments, preventing a lineage people’s transgressions from betraying the possibility of their redemption. The psychological space it afforded secured Mormons in their sense of being peculiar while keeping the sociological boundary open.

Along the Gentile border, however, Mormons came to raise adamantine walls. To be sure, Saints’ reminiscences of contacts with Gentiles were not unrelievedly bleak. Farming twenty acres in Hancock County, Illinois, William Draper lived “on good terms with my neighbors although the most of them were gentiles.” Clarissa Wilhelm found herself in 1851 “hundreds of miles from my relatives, [my] children dying, and my husband likely to die and me in a strange land

69 Oliver Cowdery, “Letter VII to W. W. Phelps,” Latter-day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate, 1, no. 10 (July 1835), 158; Hancock, “Autobiography,” 34.

among Gentiles, but I must say,” she admitted, “they was very kind to me.”

Saints also recognized Gentiles’ redemptive role. During the 1830s, Mormon missionaries regularly proclaimed it; and barely a month after Smith’s death, Joseph Kingsbury received a patriarchal blessing from John Smith in Nauvoo indicating that he would “preach to the Gentiles,” Jews, and Lamanites.

Under persecution’s weight, however, such affirmations dwindled; if Mormons were not well acquainted with Jews, they had rubbed elbows with Gentiles too many times, and what they knew, they despised. Two years after a mob pulled down his house and demolished his press in Independence, W. W. Phelps wrote his wife that the generality of Gentiles had been “more or less cursed, with harlots, whoremonger[s], adulterers, maimed children, ungodly wretches, &C.” Small wonder, then, that the dying Edmund Ross implored John Lowe Butler to “fetch him” so that he would not “have to be buried among the Gentiles,” where he would lie “all alone.” Butler complied.

On the road to Zion, Eliza Roxcy Snow agreed that “we’d better live in tents and smoke / Than wear the cursed Gentile yoke,” and, like a Mormon Miriam, celebrated the Saints’ deliverance:

Tho’ we fly from vile aggression

---


We’ll maintain our pure profession—
Seek a peaceable possession,
Far from Gentiles and oppression.74

This torrent of aversion, disgust, and visceral hatred swept a
pregnant ambiguity into Mormons’ collective self-identity, washing
away any necessary congruity between its theological and sociological
borders. In the face of overwhelming Gentile antagonism, Saints
collapsed the Christian trichotomy situating Israel over against Jews
and Gentiles, returning instead to the older Jewish dichotomy in
which Israel stood alone against the “foreign nations.” Mormon dis-
course always possessed—and still retains, as Arnold Green has dem-
onstrated—capacities for universalism; but in the Mormon people’s
formative years, centrifugal forces of persecution and exodus over-
came centripetal tendencies to inclusiveness, flinging the Saints to
Zion and permanently complicating the meaning of “Gentile.”75 “We
have cut the Gentiles off from the Church for they have killed the
prophets,” Joseph Hovey declared in 1845; and though that statement
was theologically dubious—Hovey had no standing to void God’s cove-
nant—it was lexically prophetic.76

From the mid-nineteenth century on, the meaning of “Gentile”
became polysemous. The Oxford English Dictionary and the En-
cyclopedia of Mormonism concur that “Gentile,” to quote the Oxford English

74Eliza Roxcy Snow, “The Camp of Israel (Written on the Journey
from Nauvoo to the West),” ll. 9–10. The printed version first appeared in
Millennial Star 10 (May 15, 1848), 160; its chorus (ll. 5–8) reads: “Tho’ op-
pression’s waves roll o’er us,’ / We will praise our God and king; / We’ve a
better day before us— / Of that day we proudly sing.” The version quoted ap-
peared in Snow’s manuscript journal and can also be found in Eliza R.
Snow, Biography and Family Record of Lorenzo Snow, One of the Twelve Apostles
of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News
Co., 1884), 86. It is reprinted in Women’s Voices: An Untold History of the Lat-
ter-day Saints 1830–1900, edited by Kenneth W. Godfrey, Audrey M.
Godfrey, and Jill Mulvay Derr (Salt Lake City: Desert Book, 1982), 152.

75Arnold H. Green, “Gathering and Election: Israelite Descent and
Universalism in Mormon Discourse,” Journal of Mormon History 25, no. 1

76Joseph Grafton Hovey, “Autobiography of Joseph Grafton Hovey,”
typescript, 29, Perry Special Collections, in Backman and Perkins, Writings.
Dictionary, has a specialized import “as used by Mormons: Of or pertaining to any [my emphasis] outside the Mormon community.”

The Encyclopedia recognizes a meaning that “include[s] ‘not Jewish’ and ‘not Lamanite,’” but only as an extension of the more general signification, “‘not Latter-day Saint.’” Jews, according to this calculus, can be Gentiles, a reflection of the term back onto the people who coined it in order to distinguish themselves from the “foreign nations” that Jews find ironic, to say the least. What the Encyclopedia points to, without making the analytical distinction, is the difference between theological and sociological definitions. “Gentile” in Mormon nomenclature can never refer to Jews in God’s realm—their identity as His “ancient covenant people” is unequivocal—but it can encompass them in earthly streets and shops. This dual usage has resulted from historical circumstances that led the Saints to emphasize their utter singularity, even over against a lineage people. By 1860, the sociological sense of “Gentile” to designate “anyone except a Mormon” had penetrated to the heart of the Mormon people, where—contested continually—it nevertheless remains.

***

77 Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. “Gentile,” A.I.1.b. The example cited comes from 1851, e.g.: “The Endowment House . . . [.] and all appertaining to it is carefully concealed from Gentile eyes and ears.”


79 For a recent example of contestation, see Shipps, “Signifying Saints,” 168–69. Seth Ward, “Appendix: A Literature Survey of Mormon-Jewish Studies,” in Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism, edited by Jospe, Madsen, and Ward, 197, argues that, in his “classic study of Jewish-Mormon relations,” Rudolf Glanz “carefully avoids saying ‘Jews were gentiles.’” That appraisal does not entirely catch Glanz’s position. Glanz, Jew and Mormon, 62–63, does take pains to disparage what he calls “the big joke of the century, that in Utah the Jew is a Gentile,” contending that “there is little to prove” such expression. Nevertheless, Glanz can also say that, in “pursuit of his economic goal in American life[,] he thereby became a carrier of the ‘Gentile’ principle. In this case the ‘Gentiles’ acted through
The construction of the Mormon people, I have been arguing, involved merging a theological conceptualization with a sociological process. The former was relatively whole by 1830: the Saints comprised the House of Israel, God’s covenant people who would restore Zion in America. The latter occurred as missionaries recruited Latter-day Saints. Arguing that the idea of the Mormon people preceded its realization on the ground reverses the usual sequence of group identity-formation, in which individuals cobble together a sense of commonality through sharing customs and experience. Mormons stand out because of the rapidity with which they came to know themselves as a peculiar people, the specificity of the term’s meaning, and the implications this construction has had for their history. In trying to make sense of that past, scholars have categorized Mormons as a “culture area,” an “ethnic group,” or a “church.” Each of these formulations provides insights, but each is incomplete because none of them takes Mormon self-representation into adequate account, a desirable approach because no other ante-bellum movement defined itself against both religious competitors and the American republic so

him and would be hurt by his being treated as a ‘Gentile’” (67). Glanz wants to emphasize that Mormons recognized Jews as “an independent non-Christian community” (3)—i.e., a religious or theological distinction—but that recognition in and of itself did not mean that Mormons could not collapse the sociological boundaries between Jews and Gentiles. Glanz himself provides an excellent example: the Mormons’ reaction to the creation of Zion’s Cooperative Mercantile Institution (188–213). Moreover, Glanz himself presents evidence demonstrating that Jews themselves thought that Mormons were viewing them as Gentiles (210–13). See also Cain, “Mormon Quest,” 25; Annegret Ogden, “Mormons, Gentiles & Jews: The Voice of Eveline Brooks Auerbach, Part II,” Californians 11, no. 2 (1993): 37–38, and, for a twentieth-century instance, Hanna Bandes, “Gentile and Gentile: Mormon and Jew,” Midstream 27, no. 2 (February 1981): 10.

80Cf. Ethan Yorgason, “Creating Regional Identity, Moral Orders and Spatial Contiguity: Imagined Landscapes of Mormon Americanization,” Cultural Geographies 9 (2002): 450: “The creation of moral orders depends on the human ability to reflect on action. In a strictly originary sense, practice is ontologically prior to moral orders.” By “moral order,” Yorgason means “a set of definitions regarding what is proper to do and what can reasonably be expected from others, or the sense of what people feel they owe one another as members of a community.”
starkly and rigorously. Overlooking the intensity with which the Saints trumpeted their peculiarity, scholars have tried to wedge a round Mormon peg into square analytic holes.

Since D. W. Meinig’s classic statement forty years ago, geographers have found the concept of a “Mormon culture area” fruitful for understanding the Intermountain West. “As a group,” Meinig argued, “Mormons constitute a highly self-conscious subculture whose chief bond is religion and one which has long established its mark upon the life and landscape of a particular area.” The essay precipitated a protracted debate over the landscape’s elemental characteristics; the current consensus, according to William Norton, accepts such attributes as the centrality of the village layout, unusually wide streets, roadside irrigation ditches, and buildings decorated with unique religious symbols, a panorama dotted with the kinds of vernacular structures Dell Upton illuminated in the 2004 Tanner Lecture. Given Norton’s list, however, one might ask just what exactly is “Mormon”—a religious designation—about features that are primarily agricultural and architectural. The literature on the Mormon culture area does not spotlight ecclesiastical edifices as the most salient features of the built environment either quantitatively or qualitatively; indeed, authors sometimes assume rather than demonstrate the influence of Mormon religiosity, as if it were derivable from the landscape’s stolid facts. Although asserting “the integrity of Mormon culture as a distinctive pattern of life,” Meinig never quite explains how religion bound the Saints to each other and the landscape.

Others have posited more explicit connections: that Mormons’ identification with Israel sponsored furious activity on the land, a

84 Meinig, “Mormon Culture Region,” 192. Richard H. Jackson, one
sense of stewardship, and a conservation ethic; that a communitarian approach to resource management contrasting with regimes developed elsewhere issued from homogeneous values, including the doctrine of the gathering and the sacralization of the Rocky Mountain region; and that the LDS hierarchy actualized those values through vigorous oversight. These points are well taken, but the question of what made Mormons “a highly self-conscious subculture” in the first place remains. The concept of the Mormon “region” or “culture area” calls attention to and explains certain features of the built and cultivated environment, but to designate Mormons a “culture” on this basis does not take us as far as we might wish.

Neither does the classification of them as an “ethnic group” put forward by Thomas O’Dea and Dean L. May, who assigned that cate-

of the foremost students of Mormons and their physical environment, early in his career posited that the landscape qualified as “Mormon” “because it was settled and occupied by Mormons” but that “the value system underlying it” derived from “American agrarianism.” Jackson, “Religion and Landscape in the Mormon Cultural Region,” in Dimensions of Human Geography: Essays on Some Familiar and Neglected Themes, edited by Karl W. Butzer (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1978), 100–127, quotation p. 126. Norton, “Mormon Identity,” 39–40 and passim, disputes Jackson. See also Jeanne Kay and Craig J. Brown, “Mormon Beliefs about Land and Natural Resources, 1847–1877,” Journal of Historical Geography 11, no. 3 (1985): 253–67, who, while asserting the “implications” of Mormon “religious teachings for their landscape attitudes, allocation practices, and management” (254), also acknowledge that early Mormon villages “apparently took their compact form from practical community concerns, such as access to education, defense, and cooperative irrigation projects,” with the design then reiterated by “force of habit” (258).


gory to Mormons on the purely empirical grounds that they exhibited such shared characteristics as communal economic regimes or suspicion of “intellectual activity” for its own sake.\(^{87}\) Rightly rejecting this atheoretical approach, Armand Mauss has questioned the category’s validity, citing confusion about its meaning. So-called “soft” definitions limit themselves to identifying an ethnic group on the basis of cultural characteristics alone, whereas “hard” ones include genetic and kinship criteria. Mormons cannot have an ethnic identity in the latter sense, Mauss contends, because their claimed descent from Israel is scientifically unverifiable and their genetic makeup increasingly diverse; nor will a soft application avail because “trying to set aside a special category” for the Saints only “further” confuses “the already fuzzy boundaries of ethnic taxonomies.” In rebuttal, Keith Parry has attempted to turn the “hazy profusion” of soft definitions “to advantage,” since “each phrasing of the concept offers a particular view of the Mormon reality.” Shared cultural differences, the inheritability of group membership through the practice of baptizing the dead, and a tendency to be “self-segregating” make Saints’ ethnicity visible.\(^{88}\)

Patricia Nelson Limerick likewise discerns it in a “new” worldview, pattern of family organization, set of ambitions, sense of common bonds and obligations, and definition of peoplehood laid down “by religious belief” even before Joseph Smith’s murder, then “catalyzed” by the “move to the Great Basin.”\(^{89}\) Neither Parry’s nor Limerick’s position is wholly satisfactory, in my opinion, because in asserting ethnicity’s categorical importance, they overlook religion’s. Although


\(^{89}\) Patricia Nelson Limerick, “Peace Initiative: Using the Mormons to Rethink Culture and Ethnicity in American History,” in Limerick, *Some-
Parry rightly criticizes O’Dea and May for not explaining “how the ethnic and the religious are to be distinguished,” he fails to do so himself, while Limerick implies that Mormon peoplehood came into existence by experience—what I have called its “sociological incarnation”—without fully crediting its prior manifestation, which was theological. However cogent the concept of “ethnicity” may be, in the Saints’ case it at best muddles and at worst submerges the primacy of the Mormon people as a religious construction.

Compared to geographers and social scientists, historians of American religion have spent far less conscious effort slotting Mormonism into categories. Situating it within the “antebellum spiritual hothouse,” they have noted how it manifested the era’s hallmark millennial, perfectionist, and primitivist tendencies while also emphasizing some particular element. For Sidney Ahlstrom, Mormons represented the period’s “most powerful example of communitarian aspiration”; for Edwin Gaustad, they gave “utopianism a good name” by “avoiding the sacrifice of a religious vision to an economic one”; and for Grant Wacker, they “formed the largest and most influential example” of a restoration movement. Echoing Laurence Moore, Mark Noll has described them as religious “outsiders,” though hardly the only alternative to “mainstream Protestantism.”

Evincing terminological catholicity if not precision, these historians have tagged

---


90Parry, “Mormons as Ethnics,” 356.


Mormonism as a movement, sect, and new religion. Ahlstrom accounts it “a sect, a mystery cult, a new religion, a church, a people, a nation, or an American subculture,” concluding that “at different times and places it is all of these.”⁹³ In the end, however, Mormonism’s permanence has, albeit implicitly, earned the ultimate sobriquet: “church.” Still, nineteenth-century Saints harbored millennial aspirations to be accomplished within a very earthly Zion. That aspiration, its representation in the Mormon people, and its near-fulfillment have made them something more.

To my mind the most satisfactory categorization of Mormons is the one they devised for themselves. Mormons were (and are) both a peculiar people and a people in a peculiar way. If accepting the Saints’ own term seems insufficiently objective, one can substitute apt analytical approximations. “Religious nation” insinuates the primacy of theological reflection, while against the biblical background, the Hebrew locution ‘am Mormôn rings even truer. The strong force binding Mormon nuclei was not fundamentally cultural, linguistic, economic, or even ecclesiastical but theological—generated by the certainty that Saints were restoring the House of Israel. To denominate them simply a church without citing their peoplehood misses how differently they understood themselves from other churches; to call them a culture or an ethnic group without foregrounding their religious self-identity misses what made them cohere.

The rationale for designating Mormons a “religious nation” comes into clearer focus when we recall that ‘am Yisrâ’êl, God’s chosen people, also took political forms—including a confederation, a united kingdom, and a divided monarchy—claiming a covenantal relationship with God focused devotionally and spatially around a holy site.⁹⁴ By gathering the Saints into consecrated places and building temples wherever they congregated, Mormons believed that they were reproducing Israel’s holy

---

ground; in erecting the Kingdom of God in Deseret, they sought to reinstantiate its state. To be sure, their political theology venerated the federal Constitution and American republicanism; but as Klaus Hansen, Marvin Hill, and others have taught us, the plan to erect a sacred polity based on theocratic principles had a trial run in Nauvoo before emerging fully in Utah. One can only wonder why, when the Saints finally built their capital, they gave it the topographically prosaic name “Salt Lake City” instead of the theologically correct one—“Jerusalem.” Perhaps that toponym awaits the final gathering in Missouri (D&C 57:1–3).

Mormon hierarchs aimed to segregate Utah from effective federal intervention as long as they could manage. No government claiming sovereignty from sea to shining sea could possibly have countenanced such shenanigans, however; and once the United States could gird its loins, it marshaled every legal, political, and moral tactic it

---


could muster to subdue them. In this battle between a territory and the continental republic to which even Saints admitted it belonged, David yielded to Goliath. The Saints’ effort to restore Israel as a polity ended with Utah’s statehood, at which point, scholars tell us, Mormons “assimilated,” becoming good citizens culturally almost indistinguishable from their neighbors.  

The round pegs, it would seem, have been planed almost into squares. Twentieth-century Mormons, like eighteenth-century Anglicans and nineteenth-century Congregationalists, relinquished establishment status to discover that they could thrive under the American Revolutionary “settlement of religion” after all. In ceding plural marriage, they gained sufficient leverage to secure the Gentiles’ toleration.

Yet however much Mormons may have come to resemble the “foreign nations,” they retain their distinctive sense of peoplehood, fortified by memory, myth, and a “common story” that includes inhabiting an autonomous Zion. Moreover, as long as the Saints insist upon their revealed identity as the House of Israel, they will always patrol their sociological boundaries. That my own Mormon students reveal themselves only guardedly suggests their alertness to

---


similar sentinels scouting the border’s other side. To fit squarely into the American cultural pegboard, Mormons will have to give up the sense of who they know themselves to be. I do not see them doing so anytime soon.
ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION in the 1970s, Leonard Arrington, the founder of this organization, told me I should write a psychological sketch of Joseph Smith. Leonard was probably thinking of Fawn Brodie’s brief analysis of Joseph in the second edition of No Man Knows My History. Brodie thought Joseph might conform to a psychological type, “the imposter,” described by psychoanalyst Phyllis Greenacre. A few years earlier, I had spent two years studying psychoanalysis, and Leonard probably thought I was as well prepared as anyone to write about Joseph Smith’s psychodynamics. Arrington could not have foreseen the assortment of psychological studies that would begin appearing after 1976 by T. L. Brink, Jess Groesbeck, William D. Morain, Robert D. Anderson, and Lawrence Foster, most of them describing the Prophet as suffering from one psychological disease or another. After all this work, none of it particularly satisfying to Mormons, Leonard has

---


earned the right to a hearty “I told you so.”

I held back because, in the 1970s, I was on the rebound from a psychoanalytic period in my career. After completing my study of Connecticut society and culture published as From Puritan to Yankee, I was contemplating work on political and religious ideology in the mid-eighteenth century. I thought that the descriptions of the tyrannical king in political discourse and of the oppressive Calvinist God in religious writings resembled one another psychologically and might have their roots in an overarching struggle with authority. As I began the project, Erik Erikson’s psychoanalytic study, Young Man Luther, and Alexander and Juliet George’s Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House were the talk of the profession, and a number of historians were contemplating an alliance with psychology. In his 1957 presidential address to the American Historical Association, William Langer argued that “The Next Assignment,” as he called it, was for historians to integrate psychological analysis into their studies. Thinking that depth analysis might help with my project on authority, I plunged in.

In 1963 I received a post-doctoral fellowship for interdisciplin-
ary study at Brown University. Barnaby Keeney, then president of Brown and soon to be the first director of the National Endowment for the Humanities, had devised a two-year program for scholars wishing to explore another field. In the first year the fellows were to give a course in their own fields to establish contact with students and faculty and, in the second year, offer a new course combining their old field with the new. My seminar, combining history and psychology, was entitled “Varieties of American Character.”

To prepare myself, I applied for a seminar at Harvard offered by Erik Erikson, fresh from his Luther book and working then on Gandhi. Erikson personally interviewed all the applicants to the seminar. A tall Dane with pink cheeks, a high forehead and swept-back hair, he had a preternatural gift for discerning the inner workings of people’s psyche. His effect on me was to dissolve me into my various psychological particles. During our interview, I felt called upon to forewarn him that I might attack him in class. I had spent a semester in the seminar of Harvard political theorist Louis Hartz and found myself repeatedly challenging the thesis he had developed in *The Liberal Tradition in America*. At one point in the class, Hartz turned to me and demanded, “Why do you feel obliged to attack every word I say?” I had no idea but thought there must be psychological reasons. During the interview with Erikson, I tried to warn him of what was ahead. He looked at me calmly and said serenely, “I feel perfectly safe in your hands.”

Erikson attracted social scientists from all over the Boston area interested in psychoanalytic insights. Robert Coles, soon to publish the first of his many books on children, participated for a year. My paper for the seminar examined the journal of Jonathan Edwards from a psychoanalytic perspective. I thought I saw an overpowering superego or conscience in Edwards that constantly punished him for the slightest infraction and which, for the most part, caused him intense suffering. Only when he could placate his superego by abasing himself mercilessly could Edwards enjoy peace of mind—and then he was ecstatically happy. Edwards called it conversion, I thought it was psychodynamics. In a slightly different vein, I did a study of Benjamin Franklin the next year in connection with the seminar on American character at Brown. In this case, I noted Franklin’s tendency as recorded in his
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autobiography to avoid confrontation. His tactic was to pull back when he came up against opposition and negotiate a resolution that would help him gain advantage for himself without a struggle. I observed this pattern not only in simple happenings in his childhood but also in his life as a diplomat on the public stage. I speculated about the origins of this strategy in relations with his mother.9

I believed what I wrote about Edwards and Franklin. I thought I had been true to the historical record and to psychoanalytic insight; and yet, in the end, I was dissatisfied. In each case—especially with Edwards—I had taken an influential, energetic, highly effective person and reduced him to a patient on a doctor’s couch. The power and vitality of the two men disappeared in my search for the inner structures of their personalities. Each one was so much more than I had made of him, and yet my method did not allow me to account for their strengths. The very use of medical terminology made them both seem sick. In dissecting the frog, I had killed it. This failing may account for the fact that psychological studies fade rapidly. My work on Jonathan Edwards played no part in George Marsden’s recent prize-winning biography of the great theologian, and Reformation historians tell me that Erik Erikson’s biography is now viewed as an historiographical artifact with little influence in the field.10

Ironically, Erikson’s method was designed to avoid the very trap I had fallen into. He was termed an “ego psychologist” by the profession at that time. He believed that the ego had more strength than other psychoanalysts had credited it with. It was thought that, in the struggle between the id (the dark source of passions and drives) and the superego (the conscience that attempts to drive the id back into its lair), the ego (the “I” which has the job of negotiating between the two) was generally trampled upon. Contrary to the prevailing orthodoxy, Erikson believed the ego had strengths of its own in forming an identity, and he gave credit to its work. In Erikson’s scheme, the ego’s task was to blend the shape of the psyche as it developed in childhood with the options offered by the culture. From this negotiation of inner
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and outer came the person’s social and psychological identity. To understand Luther and Gandhi, Erikson delved deeply into German and Indian culture. His studies were a blend of history, culture, and personality. Understandably, historians found Erikson’s variety of psychohistory to be more useful than the historically shallow investigations of most psychoanalysts. Instead of implicitly calling people with problems sick, he honored them for their success in integrating the contending forces within their personalities.\(^\text{11}\)

Most important for historians—and for this paper—Erikson developed a view of historical leadership. The people who confronted the underlying tensions of a period and offered a resolution were precisely the ones who exercised influence. He thought Luther spoke to his generation because he confronted the deep issues of his time. In a sense, Luther was a sick man, but he suffered from the sickness of the age. Without having suffered, he could not have led. That he came through these trials and created a functioning psycho-cultural identity made his life story therapeutic. He was listened to because he spoke out of the struggles of a people. Luther did not necessarily solve the problems, but his life and teachings offered hope. His experience gave him a compelling authenticity.\(^\text{12}\)

Although I knew all this, somehow I lacked Erikson’s deft touch when I worked on Edwards and Franklin. Disappointed with the results, I backed away from studying Joseph Smith or anyone else psychologically. The application of psychological language seemed to me to obscure historical subjects and even worse, in my estimation, reduced strong figures to patienthood. I wanted to recover all of my subjects’ powers and strengths and not leave them lying haplessly on the couch.

And yet, with all these reservations, after completing the biography of Joseph Smith last year, I realized that the wily old master had worked his influence upon me. Without taking thought, I had introduced psychological themes into my account of Joseph


\(^\text{12}\)Erickson, *Young Man Luther*, 251–67.
Smith, and, what is more, given them an Eriksonian treatment. I had come to believe that Joseph was influential because of his personal struggles. He confronted the issues of his time and, if he did not find solutions, dealt with them in his life and teachings. He was an Eriksonian example of a person leading from weakness transformed into strength. Without intending to, I had accepted Leonard’s invitation after all. At least I had an inkling of the inner Joseph when it came to two issues—fatherhood and the sealing of families—which can serve as examples of Erikson’s method. Both of these were personal to Joseph Smith and, at the same time, essential to his doctrine. In fatherhood and sealing, I found instances of the psychological, the religious, and the historical interacting as Erikson said they must.

In a television interview soon after the publication of The Beginnings of Mormonism, a reporter asked me who was most influential in Joseph Smith’s life, his father or his mother. I balked at this unanswerable question; but if asked again, I would probably say his father. Joseph Jr. was invariably loyal to Joseph Sr. Joseph Jr. went to such pains to honor his father that one wonders if he was compensating for some underlying shame. He called Joseph Sr. to be Patriarch to the Church and sat him in the highest place in the ascending pulpits of the Kirtland Temple. In a blessing, Joseph said his father would sit with the great patriarchs of the Bible in the last day, and in a vision of “the celestial kingdom of God, and the glory thereof” that he had in 1836 while his father was still alive, he saw Joseph Sr. (along with Lucy, brother Alvin, “Father Adam, and Abraham”) as one of the “heirs of that kingdom” (LDS D&C 137:1, 5, 8).

Joseph Jr.’s love may have gone back to the leg operation when he had said he could bear the pain if his father would hold him in his arms. Joseph Sr. must have been an attractive man, tall, straight, and handsome. Lucy once imagined him as a tree swaying in a field with a band of burnished gold surrounding him. Irresistibly drawn to him, Joseph Jr. stood by his father in all his trials. When Lucy and three of the children joined the Palmyra Presbyterian Church in the 1820s, Joseph Jr. and the others stayed home with Joseph Sr. 13

Joseph Jr. shared his father’s low opinion of the churches. Joseph Sr.’s five religious dreams opened onto a desolate landscape

---
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where religion and salvation were not to be found. He was wandering, alone, and endlessly seeking. In real life, he periodically tried to attend church with Lucy but then pulled back, repelled by some lack or fault. His dreams show him desperately hungry for salvation but incapable of finding it. By age twelve, Joseph Jr. shared his father’s opinion. Even before the First Vision, Joseph Jr. had concluded that humankind “had apostatised from the true and living faith.” Both father and son were confused about religion, wanting salvation but unsure where to look. Although offering no leadership himself, Joseph Sr.’s example kept Joseph Jr. from joining the Presbyterian Church with Lucy.

Joseph showed more emotion at his father’s baptism on the day of the Church’s organization than at any other time in his life. Lucy said that Joseph Jr. grasped his father’s hand as he came from the water and cried out, “Oh, my God! have I lived to see my own father baptized into the true church of Jesus Christ!” According to Joseph Knight, Joseph Jr. “bast out with grief and Joy and seamed as tho the world Could not hold him. He Awent out into the Lot and appear'd to want to git out of site of every Body and would sob and Crie and seamed to Be so full that he could not live.” Knight and Oliver Cowdery went after Joseph and finally brought him back to the house. “He was the most wrot upon that I ever saw any man,” Knight said. “His joy seemed to Be full.”

The incident not only spoke of the bond between father and son but also shows that Joseph Jr. had taken responsibility for his father’s salvation. A few years later in an unguarded moment, Joseph told his brother William that “I brought salvation to my father’s house, as an instrument in the hands of God when they were in a miserable situation,” one of the few instances when Joseph acknowledged that his fa-

---

*Prophet,* and Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling.*


ther had been a failure.\textsuperscript{16}

Joseph Sr. was no more successful economically than religiously. He had begun life auspiciously with a farm provided by his father Asael and a thousand dollar nest egg from Lucy's brother Stephen and Stephen's partner, but he lost both through bad judgment and the villainy of a business partner. For fourteen years, he moved from one tenant farm to another. With the help of his growing sons, he tried again in Manchester to purchase a farm but failed to make the payments and lost the property. While his grandfather Samuel was a respected farmer and town leader at the peak of Topsfield society, Joseph Sr. dropped into the lower ranks of rural society in Vermont and New York.

At age fifty-four, he had nothing. He had failed in the primary responsibility of farm fathers in those days: to support his family from day to day and at the same time accumulate enough in addition to give his sons and daughters a start in life. Families hoped to get ahead of their everyday needs in the years when the older boys were still working for their fathers before striking out on their own. Joseph Sr. had the boys but overextended himself in building a frame house to replace their log house. He could not make the payments on both house and land, and by trying for too much, he lost all. His own father, Asael, had given his boys farms as they came of age in Vermont; Joseph Sr. had nothing to give. Instead, he was reduced to living with Hyrum and his wife. As he entered his declining years, he had neither religion nor land to offer his family.

Broken by circumstances and bad luck, he turned to drink and to treasure-seeking. His drinking was not excessive for his time; it was period of increasing alcohol consumption, resulting eventually in the temperance movement of the 1830s. The critical neighbors' affidavits never implied that he led his family to wrack and ruin as happened in the worst cases. But his drinking was a source of shame and added to his feeling of failure. At first, he was not ashamed of his treasure-seeking, even though some neighbors ridiculed him for it. Joseph Sr. may have felt that his son's gifts for seeing in a stone gave him

an advantage in the search for lost treasure, the resort of the poor all over New England in those times. For four or five years after 1822, when Joseph Jr. found a seerstone in a well, Joseph Sr. pressed his son to help with the expeditions, doubtless hoping to recover from his losses in farming. Finally in 1826, Joseph Sr. acknowledged that here, too, he had gone astray; Joseph Jr.’s marvelous gifts, he said at his son’s 1826 trial, should be used for higher purposes.17

Joseph Sr.’s was a sad story, but not an uncommon one. It was an age of failed fathers. We celebrate the westward movement and the growth of cities as signs of American optimism and enterprise, but they were more often than not the outcome of failed farm families. Fathers could not accumulate sufficient land to provide for their children, and so they were forced to sell out and move on. In Indiana settlers squatted on fresh land for twenty years and at the end still lacked the cash to purchase the land they had worked, compelling them to move again. In Rhode Island fathers put their wives and children into the spinning mills to make the money the farm could not provide. In Massachusetts daughters worked in the mills while their mothers ran boarding houses after the family farmsteads were lost through debt. Every move to the city, every trek west was more likely than not to indicate that the old system was broken. Fathers could not provide for their children in towns where their ancestors had lived for generations.

Thomas Lincoln, the father of Abraham, began with three farms in Kentucky when his son was young. In 1816 (the same year the Smiths moved to Palmyra), faulty titles forced Thomas to sell the land at a loss and move across the Ohio to Indiana. There he worked a backcountry farm with the help of his children, but that operation failed and he moved to Illinois. At that point, young Abraham bailed out. He could see that his father’s fortunes were running down hill and that he would have little to offer his son. Abraham left the family and moved into storekeeping, politics, and law where there were brighter prospects. He attended to his father as best he could but had little hope for his economic recovery. Lincoln subscribed instead to the Whig program of bolstering the market economy—canals and roads, protective tariffs, and a national bank. Only by turning to commercial agriculture, Lincoln believed, would men like Thomas Lin-
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coln get ahead. Losing patience with his family’s frequent requests for loans, Abraham refused to visit his father in his final illness and did not attend his funeral.  

Joseph Sr.’s prospects were even dimmer than Thomas Lincoln’s, but Joseph Jr. never gave up on his flawed, lovely father. In late 1833 or 1834, Joseph ordained his father as patriarch.  

Although couched in formal language, Joseph’s blessing on Joseph Sr., expressed the feelings of a son for a father who had suffered repeated defeats. This was a man who had lost two farms and, at age fifty-eight when the Church was organized, was back in tenancy, with no house or land to call his own. Defeated by the rigors of the economic order, he was told by his son he would be a prince over his posterity. “Blessed of the Lord is my father,” Joseph said, “for he shall stand in the midst of his posterity and shall be comforted by their blessings when he is old and bowed down with years, and he shall be called a prince over them.” Like Adam, he would assemble his children—his one undoubted accomplishment—and “sit in the general assembly of patriarchs, even in council with the Ancient of Days when he shall sit and all the patriarchs with him—and shall enjoy his right and authority under the direction of the Ancient of Days.” Whatever else Joseph Sr. lacked, “his seed shall rise up and call him blessed. . . . His name shall be had in remembrance to the end.”

Joseph Sr. seemed to understand that his sons had redeemed his life. When he blessed Joseph and Hyrum in December 1834, he
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19There is a dispute over whether the ordination was in December 1833 or December 1834. The earlier date, the most generally accepted, is based on an entry in December 18, 1833. D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), 47, chief critic of the December 18, 1833, date, points out that Joseph Sr. did not give blessings to his children until December 9, 1834, a puzzling year-long lapse before exercising his office if he had been ordained a year earlier. The traditional chronology is laid out by Irene M. Bates and E. Gary Smith, *Lost Legacy: The Mormon Office of Presiding Patriarch* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 34–37.
20Patriarchal Blessings, Book A, p. 9, Archives, Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
thanked them for enduring the hardships of their early lives. Hyrum, Joseph Sr. said, had “borne the burthen and heat of the day” and “labor[ed] much for the good of thy father’s family.” As a father, he expressed gratitude for Hyrum’s kindness and tolerance: “Thou hast always stood by thy father, and reached forth the helping hand to lift him up, when he was in affliction, and though he has been out of the way through wine, thou has never forsaken him, nor laughed him to scorn.” Joseph Sr.’s candid words bespeak the sorrows of a failing father in a cruel time. Besides his business failures, his intemperance had further weakened him and could have exposed him to the scorn of his own children, but his sons had not mocked him: “For all these kindnesses the Lord my God will bless thee.” In return, he could bless Hyrum with “the same blessings with which Jacob blessed his son Joseph, for thou art his true descendant.” He could not give his son wealth, but he could say that “thy posterity shall be numbered with the house of Ephraim, and with them thou shalt stand up to crown the tribes of Israel.”

Joseph Sr. could make these promises because Joseph Jr. had given him priesthood, while the father had given his son only hardship. Joseph Sr.’s blessing on Joseph Jr. acknowledged: “Thou has suffered much in thy youth, and the poverty and afflictions of thy father’s family have been a grief to thy soul.” Joseph Jr. had mourned his family’s humiliations and assumed responsibility for lifting them from their low state. “Thou has stood by thy father, and like Shem, would have covered his nakedness, rather than see him exposed to shame.” He alludes to what must have been at least one episode of public humiliation—“when the daughters of the Gentiles laughed,” but Joseph Jr.’s “heart has been moved with a just anger to avenge thy kindred.” The words may explain why Joseph joined his father in money-digging ventures despite his reluctance, why he stayed home from church when his mother took the other children to Presbyterian meetings, and why Joseph wept when his long unchurched father was baptized into the Church of Christ on its day of organization. He had made his father’s pain his own. Now, at last, the father could bless his son “with the blessings of thy fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.” Joseph Sr. had given his son nothing for a worldly inheritance, and Joseph Jr. had met this lack by giving his father the power
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to bless his sons.22

Joseph Sr.’s blessings suggest the personal meaning of priesthood to early members. Whether weak or strong, rich or poor, priesthood holders could now bestow priesthood on their sons. The 1835 priesthood revelation named the patriarchs who received the priesthood from father Adam: Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, and Methuselah. As a later revelation was to say, the priesthood “came down from the fathers” (Abr. 1:3). Priesthood was a father’s legacy to his son, counting for more than lands and herds.

Moreover, in the overall plan, material possessions also had a part. Zion promised an “inheritance” to all who migrated there. Fathers in Zion who lacked the wealth to provide for their children, as many did in this fast-moving age, were promised land in the holy city. The word “inheritance” for describing properties in Zion expressed a father’s wish to bestow a legacy on his children.23 In restoring priesthood, Joseph restored fatherhood.

I first became aware of Joseph’s intense relationship with his father in reading Joseph Knight’s account of Joseph Sr.’s baptism where Joseph Jr. “bust out with gread and Joy.” It was obvious from that incident alone how much the son’s life was bound up in his father’s. I began to examine sealing, my second psycho-historical theme, after a close reading of the priesthood marriage revelation.24 I was struck by the concern about family relations coming to an end. “All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations”—in short, every kind of human relationship—“are of no efficacy, virtue, or force, in and after the resurrection” unless “entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed.” Though ordained by “thrones, or principalities, or powers” every worldly relationship not sealed by God “shall be thrown down, and shall not remain after men are dead” (D&C 132:7, 13).

To me, the revelation showed a fear of termination and an intense desire to stabilize human relationships. According to its principles, husbands who are sealed to their wives will attain to unimagi-
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24Doctrine and Covenants 132. All quotations in this article are from the current (1981) LDS edition, cited parenthetically in the text.
able glory, while those who are not sealed will remain alone. Glory is juxtaposed against loneliness. The letter announcing the principle of baptism for the dead, written in September 1842 (D&C 128), makes much the same point. Joseph was thrilled to discover that by baptizing and recording he could seal human relationships after death. “The nature of this ordinance,” the letter said, “consists in the power of the priesthood, by the revelation of Jesus Christ, wherein it is granted that whatsoever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.” Creating these ties, the letter went on, was of utmost importance. “It is sufficient to know,” Joseph wrote, “that the earth will be smitten with a curse unless there is a welding link of some kind or other between the fathers and the children, upon some subject or other.” Joseph seems to be saying that the situation was desperate. He had written earlier that unless the hearts of the children turned to the fathers and those of the fathers to the children “the whole earth would be utterly wasted at his [the Lord’s] coming” (D&C 128:8, 18; 2:3). Families had to be welded or all was lost.

Especially in the closing years of his life, Joseph talked often of death and separation. He worried that people would lose track of one another in the resurrection. He proposed to build a tomb for all his family so that they could rise together and clasp hands. “If I had no expectation of seeing my mother Brother & Sisters & friends again my heart would burst in a moment & I should go down to my grave. The expectation of seeing my friends in the morning of the first resurrection cheers my soul,” and enabled him “to bear up against the evils of life.”25 One of the advantages of gathering to Nauvoo was the opportunity of being buried near one another, “that in the morn of the resurrection they may come forth in a body. & come right up out of their graves, & strike hands immediately in eternal glory & felicity rather than to be scattered thousands of miles apart.”26 Joseph seemed to visualize what it would be like: “If to morrow I shall be called to lay in yonder tomb. In the morning of the resurrection, let me strike hands with my father, & cry, my father, & he will say my son, my son.”27 Joseph had a passion for family. He did not lust for wives so much as for kin. The priesthood marriage revelation promised him “an hundred-
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fold in this world, of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and land, wives and children” (D&C 132:55). He wanted them all around, bound to him forever.

Joseph could not bear to be alone. When forced into inactivity away from the company of the Saints, he grew morose. When he was stalled for a month en route from Missouri while Newel Whitney’s broken leg mended, he wrote plaintively to Emma in 1832 of how sorrows flooded over him and his willingness to die for Christ. In hiding from officers seeking his extradition in 1842, he could only fight off “melancholy and the dumps” by talking to a companion. He pleaded with the Whitneys to visit him “in this my lonely retreat.” Emma seemed to understand his need to be surrounded by company. When W. W. Phelps suggested to Emma, beleaguered at every meal with guests, that “you must do as Bonaparte did have a little table, just large enough for yourself and your order thereon,” Emma replied out of long experience, “Mr. Smith is a bigger man than Bonaparte. He can never eat without his friends.”

The sources of this desire for connection and the fear of separation perhaps can be glimpsed in Joseph’s family’s experience. The deaths of Lucy’s two older sisters, Lovisa and Lovina, shadowed all her childhood memories. “Seldom do I meet with an individual with whom I was even acquainted in my early years,” she wrote later in life, “and I am constrained to exclaim the friends of my youth! Where are they? The tomb replies, Here are they!” Lucy lost her first son as an infant, another who was born in 1810 and lived only eleven days, and her favorite, Alvin, when he was twenty-five. The entire family suffered from Alvin’s death. He had been Joseph Sr.’s chief support, cosigning the note for their Manchester property as if he were an auxiliary father. Since the whole family depended on Alvin’s earning power, his death partly accounts for the loss of the farm. Joseph Jr.’s vision of Alvin in the celestial kingdom showed that he was on the family’s mind more than a dozen years after his
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death. Joseph experienced the deaths of four children, before his namesake son, Joseph Smith III, was born and survived babyhood. Altogether, Joseph and Emma lost six of their eleven children in childbirth or infancy, making death and separation common occurrences in their lives.

Such fatalities had been a constant in family life from time immemorial, but the separations caused by American mobility were a new factor in Joseph’s time. The same phenomenon that bore so harshly on fathers, westward migration and urban growth, also disrupted families. Each departure for the city or for the West meant separation. Family members went off, perhaps never to return. Letters linked people for a time, but they usually petered out and knowledge of a son or daughter or father was lost. The prodigious response to the gold rush indicated how loosely tied people were to their moorings. They left in an instant when the promise of easy wealth presented itself. Lewis Bidamon left Emma for a year shortly after their marriage to seek riches in California. Bidamon returned, but many did not. The narrowing of opportunity at home and the rumors of opportunity abroad meant that American family life was a series of farewells, departures, and separations.

Joseph’s grandfather, Asael, was the first in the Smith line to feel these pressures in America. The Smiths had lived in Topsfield for nearly a century when Asael’s father, Samuel, died in 1785. Asael was the first of the sons to leave, moving first to New Hampshire, then to Vermont. The Smiths were probably no more dependent on one another than most rural families, but it is evident that their chief associations were with each other. No other institution came close to rivaling family for providing comfort, religion, work, financial security, and education.

Asael seemed to sense the dangers of dispersal in the “Few words of advice” he wrote his children in 1797: “My last request and charge is that you will live together in an undivided bond of love,” he wrote them. “You are many of you, and if you join together as one man, you need not want anything. What counsel, what comfort, what money, what friends may you not help yourselves unto, if you will all as one contribute to your aids.” When they separated as he knew they would, he urged them to “send to and hear from each other yearly and oftener if you can. . . . And when you have neither father nor mother
left, be so many fathers and mothers to each other.”

Perhaps in consequence, the Smiths made heroic efforts to stick together. Joseph Sr. took news to his brothers and sisters of Joseph Jr.’s visions, and many of the Smiths joined the Church and moved to Kirtland. But all along the line, family members dropped away, not to be heard from again. In the face of these losses, Joseph Jr.’s search for a method of sealing families together for eternity came in a direct line from Asael’s words of advice to “live together in an undivided bond of love.” Priesthood sealings were a theological solution to a social problem: how to bind families together in a mobile society. The priesthood marriage revelation spoke of eternity but the meaning of sealing for people also lay in their lives in the here and now.

Does it detract from the divinity of a revelation for it to resolve personal and social problems? Does it make eternal marriage less heavenly if it calmed a deep fear of termination and separation in this life? Surely we want revelation to be relevant, to save us in the present, and not just in the hereafter. Baptism for the dead had an immediate appeal to the Saints. Joseph announced the doctrine in a funeral sermon in September 1840 that was not even recorded, but the principle immediately caught hold. The Saints began baptizing each other on behalf of their dead in the Mississippi River almost at once. In the following year, six thousand of these proxy baptisms were performed. The leadership could scarcely keep up with the demand. They began teaching the doctrine in conferences, but not until September 1842 in a letter to the Church did Joseph fully elaborate it. By then one of the greatest incentives for finishing the Nauvoo Temple was retaining the right to baptize for the dead. The threat of baptisms being stopped until the temple was complete drove the Saints to even greater exertions. The Church as a whole, and not just Joseph, was searching for a welding link. He was not the only one to want a permanent seal on family relationships.

Can we speculate that the relevance of the doctrine to common, deep problems may account partly at least for Joseph’s influence? He did seem to experience certain issues acutely and, by supplying a theological response, offered a salve to the wounds of a generation. Fathers in Zion recovered their dignity in the priesthood. They could give sons with no other inheritance the powers of the priesthood and
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the promise of an inheritance in Zion. Sealing and baptism for the
dead brought together families broken up by immigration and death.
Without having consciously diagnosed the strains on his generation
of Americans, Joseph spoke to their needs.

Leonard Arrington probably had a different kind of psychology
in mind when he called for a sketch of Joseph Smith. But if an
Eriksonian version of psychohistory will satisfy Leonard then I can,
partially at least, answer his call. I believe in any event that we should
follow Erikson’s lead in our psychological investigations, examining
how personality, doctrine, and society interact. By combining all the
elements, the full force of the teachings is more perfectly appreciated.
Shakespeare among the Saints

John S. Tanner

As a boy growing up in Whitemud, Saskatchewan, a small frontier town on the Canadian plains, Wallace Stegner was shocked to find several volumes of Shakespeare in the town dump, casually “thrown out to flap their stained eloquence in the prairie wind.” This find was particularly disturbing, recalls Stegner, because these volumes had “belonged to a set that my father bought before I was born” and were thus “relics of my own life tossed out there to rot or blow away.” His family had carried Shakespeare’s plays “from town to town” like the sacred artifacts Aeneas rescued from Troy: the icons of a more refined civilization and implements by which to recreate it in the wilderness: “They were the lares and penates, part of the skimpy impedimenta of household gods we had brought with us into Latium.” Yet after being stained in a house fire, the volumes had been “thrown out for me to stumble upon in the dump . . . a symbol of how much was lost, how much thrown aside, how much carelessly or of necessity given up, in the making of a new country. . . . Finding those three

John S. Tanner {john_tanner@byu.edu} is academic vice president and professor of English at Brigham Young University. He presented an earlier version of this paper as a plenary address for the evening banquet of the 2001 Mormon History Association conference in Cedar City, Utah, home of the annual Shakespearian Festival.

For Stegner, the memory of Shakespeare casually consigned to a frontier town dump symbolized all that had to be discarded of high culture by those who settled the West. This image contrasts dramatically with the role Shakespeare in fact played in frontier Utah. Far from being jettisoned to the junk heap, Shakespeare has been vener-

\[2\text{Ibid., 9.}\]
ated in Mormon country from pioneer times until today. He has been a “muse of fire” among us (Henry V, Prol. 1), inflaming the hearts, minds, and imaginations of Latter-day Saints. Let me briefly sketch the story of some keepers of the flame among the Saints. It is a story, principally, of actors, teachers, preachers, and parents who have kept love and knowledge of the Bard burning bright in the hearts of Latter-day Saints.³

**Shakespeare on the Stage**

The first all-LDS performance of Shakespeare, as well as the first professional drama of any kind to be performed by Mormons, took place in Philadelphia in 1842, soon after a missionary named George J. Adams taught the gospel to his brother-in-law, Thomas A. Lyne.¹ Lyne was a professional actor “of wide and fair repute” who “had played lead support to Edwin Forrest, the elder Booth, Charlotte Cushman, [and] Ellen Tree”—in short, to the premier American actors of his day.⁵ Inspired by the message of Mormonism, Lyne determined with Adams to raise money for the Restoration cause by staging scenes from Richard III, with Lyne playing Richard and Adams,
also a good actor, performing Richmond. The week-long performances reportedly raised a “handsome profit,” which Adams used to rent a hall for preaching the gospel.\(^6\)

Lyne subsequently came to Nauvoo and there staged several plays in the city’s Masonic Hall as well as up and down the Mississippi, until he became disaffected with the Church. Unfortunately, I have found no record of Lyne’s giving Shakespearean recitations in Nauvoo, much less of his mounting a full Shakespeare play there. Rather, Lyne performed in and directed the romantic tragedies and melodramas so popular at the time, such as Richard Sheridan’s tragedy *Pizarro, or the Death of Rolla*, in which Brigham Young acted the role of Peruvian high priest.\(^7\) Evidently, Young performed his part well; Helen Mar Kimball Whitney, then fifteen, wrote that “no part in


‘Pizarro’ was better played than the priest by Brigham Young.”

8 Years later, Lyne quipped that he regretted having cast Brigham for the part because “he’s been playing the character with great success ever since.”

Apart from the early performance of Richard III in Philadelphia, I have not been able to document any other productions of Shakespeare’s plays among the Saints until after the Social Hall was dedicated in Salt Lake in 1853. Nor have I been able to corroborate Fred Adams’s romantic story that Hiram B. Clawson organized performances of The Taming of the Shrew and The Merchant of Venice among the pioneers as they trekked west. Adams imagines pioneers memorizing lines from handwritten scripts, “when they weren’t pushing or pulling,” and rummaging for costumes and props in their wagons for evening entertainments around the campfire. Unfortunately, I have found no evidence in journals by Clawson or others in his company that they gave dramatic performances of Shakespeare on the trail.

We do know that Clawson was an energetic early LDS thespian, capable of organizing dramatic productions and readings, who had been personally placed under Lyne’s tutelage in Nauvoo by Joseph Smith. By 1850 Clawson and others had organized the first dramatic society in Salt Lake, drawn primarily from among those associated with the Nauvoo Brass Band and were performing plays in the Old Bowery—called by Orson F. Whitney “the original Thespian temple of Utah.” However, there is no record that the Bard was ever performed in the Bowery, which of course was also used for religious services.

Shakespearean performance awaited the erection of the terri-

8Quoted in Smith, “Reading across the Lines,” 23.
9Lindsay, Mormons and the Theatre, 6–7.
12Quoted in Myrtle E. Henderson, A History of the Theatre in Salt Lake City from 1850 to 1870 (Evanston, Ill.: N. pub., 1934), 22.
tory’s first theater. In 1852, the Deseret Musical and Dramatic Society was reorganized as the Deseret Dramatic Association, and Brigham Young commissioned Truman O. Angell to build the Social Hall because, as Brigham quipped, he no longer wished to mix his religion and entertainment “like a dish of succotash.”

The Social Hall was dedicated on January 1, 1853. Crowning the arch over its stage, the Saints placed a gilded bust of Shakespeare, signaling both his preeminence and their cultural aspirations. Replicas of this bust can be seen in the reconstructed Social Hall at This Is the Place Heritage Park and at the site of the original Social Hall in downtown Salt Lake City, now commemorated by a skeletal steel and glass structure in the shape of the old Social Hall covering exposed archeological excavations and displays. Among the exhibits are drawings of the Social Hall and a picture board about “Utah’s First Theatre.”

\textsuperscript{13}Quoted in Smith, “Reading across the Lines,” 135.
The founders of the [Deseret Dramatic Association] emphasized the educational value of the ‘best plays of the English language,’ those by William Shakespeare and other English playwrights. To emphasize this focus on historical drama, they placed a bust of Shakespeare over the stage.” A replica of the bust sits in a display case, and next to it is a copy of the playbill for Othello, which was performed in the Social Hall that first season.

The original bust is in the Daughters of Utah Pioneers Memorial Museum in Salt Lake City. The museum also holds an entire roomful of memorabilia from yet another—and far grander—theater in which Shakespeare’s plays were frequently performed: the famous Salt Lake Theatre, constructed in 1862 and lamentably torn down in 1928. Among other items, the impressive drop curtain from the old Salt Lake Theatre hangs prominently in the museum’s main gallery, and an ornately carved gilded gold throne used in Hamlet and
Macbeth sits regally among such artifacts as a playbill for Edwin Booth’s performance in Hamlet on April 13, 1887.

What is more, the museum not only houses memorabilia from the Salt Lake Theatre but itself stands as a grand monument to the playhouse, having been built upon the plan of the Salt Lake Theatre. When one looks at its exterior, one sees the shape of a now-vanished romantic “Old Playhouse.” Likewise, the Pioneer Memorial Theatre on the University of Utah campus at once commemorates and continues the pioneer theatrical tradition. The connection is suggested by its name, its architecture (its façade echoes the Salt Lake Theatre), and the lobby displays, which contain images of Maud May Babcock, Maude Adams, and other early Utah thespians.

It is, however, the original bust of Shakespeare in the Social Hall that most intrigues me. The practice of placing Shakespeare’s image over the stage was not unusual in nineteenth-century theaters. Shakespeare’s head also crowned the stage of the theater built at Camp Floyd in the late 1850s, although this image was drawn in chalk rather than sculpted. Where did Truman Angell get a model bust in 1852 Utah? Its provenance is unclear. One history says that Angell himself carved it, but I doubt this. Angell never mentions carving it in his journals; and as far as I can determine, his talent for drawing and designing did not extend to sculpting. An examination of the original bust in the So-

---

14Henderson, History of the Theatre in Salt Lake City, 57–58.
cial Hall reveals that it was cast in plaster from a mold, then gilded with gold paint, now fading to gray-green. Perhaps some early pioneer bought the bust or the mold in the East and bore it hundreds of miles across the plains. I like to think so, imagining this bust as one of the lares and penates of high culture that the founders of a Great Basin kingdom carried into the wilderness to establish their new Troy.

By whatever route this icon came to grace the Social Hall’s proscenium arch, it provides evidence that the Mormon pioneers shared the “Bardolatry” of the Victorian age. It is one thing, however, to admire Shakespeare in the abstract as a famous figure in the literary pantheon; it is yet another actually to read, attend, or perform his plays. One wonders how often the Bard’s bust, in fact, presided over his own plays. Which Shakespeare plays were performed in pioneer Utah? How frequently and how well? Considered in aggregate, popular farces and sentimental melodramas dominated the theater in pioneer Utah as they did elsewhere in nineteenth-century America. Still, to judge from the history of the Salt Lake Theatre, while popular melodrama and farce were easily the most common genres performed, Shakespeare was the single most frequently staged author on pioneer boards. Because it was difficult to mount Shakespeare for local actors who had other day jobs, during the stock company period of the Salt Lake Theatre (1862–75) “almost all the productions of Shakespeare’s plays were done during guest star engagements. The stock company rarely produced Shakespeare when performing

---


alone.” Even so, the stock company gave ninety-three performances of Shakespeare by 1875, the most popular plays being *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. According to Leland H. Monson, between 1863 and 1897, there were fifty-nine separate productions of nine different Shakespeare comedies, the most popular being *The Merchant of Venice, The Taming of the Shrew* (and its adaptation *Katherine and Petruchio*), and *As You Like It*; thirty-three productions of five different histories, *Richard III* being most popular; and 121 productions of six tragedies, dominated by *Hamlet, Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet, and Othello*, in that order—for a total of 213 performances of Shakespeare’s plays. Salt Lake City far exceeded Denver in both the number and variety of Shakespeare productions during a comparable period, even though Denver’s population by the mid-1870s was larger than Salt Lake City’s.

Moreover, contemporary reviews suggest that the plays were generally well attended, particularly during LDS general conference times. “[A] regular attendant to the Salt Lake Theatre during the week of general conference,” according to Monson, “could have witnessed five productions of *Macbeth*, two of *The Merchant of Venice*, two of *Richard III*, six of *Hamlet*, four of *Othello*, three of *Julius Caesar*, and one performance each of *The Taming of the Shrew, Katherine and Petruchio, As You Like It, Romeo and Juliet*, and *Much Ado About Nothing*.”

---

20 Therald Francis Todd, “The Operation of the Salt Lake Theatre, 1862–1875” (Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon, 1973), 107. The load these stock company actors carried was truly staggering. Todd illustrates this by listing the roles that David McKenzie, the company’s leading man, had to work up between November 17 and April 13, 1866–67. He performed in thirty-seven different roles (three from Shakespeare), fifteen new and twelve others he had not played in two years (pp. 236–38).

21 Ibid. Todd calculates that from 1862 to 1875 the stock company performed *Hamlet* nineteen times, *Macbeth* eighteen, *Richard III* fourteen, *Romeo and Juliet* fourteen, *Othello* ten, *Merchant of Venice* nine, *Much Ado about Nothing* four, *Henry IV* four, *As You Like It* three, *King John* two, and *King Lear* one (p. 107). The selection of plays was largely determined by which roles the stars knew.


23 Ibid., 719.
And this does not count professional dramatic readings of Shakespeare of the sort that Thomas A. Lyne gave, as recorded in the following notice from the Salt Lake Reporter in 1870:

The veteran of the Utah stage will reach Corrine next Monday evening on a professional trip. He will give one or more readings, and then see what can be done with our home troupe. . . . If there is anyone in the mountains who can take our raw material and with it create an active corps of theatricals, Mr. Lyne is the man. Mr. Lyne will give a series of readings from Henry IV, As You Like It, Hamlet, Merchant of Venice, King Lear, and selections from standard dramas.

As this anecdote suggests, one did not need to travel to the Salt Lake Valley to see Shakespeare in pioneer Utah. Shakespeare was performed across the territory, both by professional traveling actors and by local dramatic associations. Such associations were common in Mormon villages prior to the advent of movies, providing an avenue for entertainment, fund raising, fellowship, and cultural refinement—all well suited to LDS communal structure and cultural aspira-

24Ibid., 721.
25Salt Lake Reporter, October 10, 1870, 5, quoted in Markworth, “Prominent Teachers of the Speech Arts in Utah,” 15.
tions. While melodrama and farce dominate rural productions in pioneer Utah, Shakespeare was occasionally included in the form of full plays, selected scenes, or oratorical readings. Shakespeare thus may have been performed on frontier stages that included boweries, churches, school houses, a hotel/saloon (Provo), dance halls, “opera houses,” and council houses. He was even staged in the upper room of Morris Rosenbaum’s two-story mercantile establishment in Brigham City.

A wonderful story has been preserved about this Brigham City production, likely representative of similar humorous incidents as the Saints tried to stage these plays in small-town frontier Utah.

27 Geary, “Dramatics in Castle Valley,” 225–26, 230, 254, notes that community theaters, though prevalent in Mormon farming towns, were uncommon in non-Mormon towns like Green River and in mining towns generally. Towns without their own acting companies were served by local and professional traveling troupes. The distinctively LDS character of Utah’s early regional theaters suggests that Mormon teaching (which celebrated drama) and Mormon social cohesion (which facilitated community undertakings) likely enabled theater to flourish on the Utah frontier more than it did elsewhere. At the same time, theater brought together disparate elements in the community. The Salt Lake Theatre was famous for serving as one of the few places in the city where Mormons and non-Mormons mingled comfortably. Doubtless, the same was true of local dramatic productions in small Utah towns.

28 In general, local dramatic companies stuck with popular farces and melodramas, leaving Shakespeare to professional touring companies. And even then, Shakespeare was relatively rare in most rural towns. For example, Geary, “Dramatics in Castle Valley,” 47, 239, 287, identifies only one local production of Shakespeare: Merchant of Venice (Castle Dale) and two by a touring company: Taming of the Shrew and Othello (Orangeville). After the final performance, the company sold its properties to the town. Shakespeare performances may have been somewhat more common elsewhere. As previously noted, Adams mentions a very early local performance of Shakespeare in Parowan. Similarly, a student in Pardoe’s compilation mentions that all or parts of King Lear, Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and Merchant of Venice were performed in Manti. Pardoe, Drama in My Town, 160.

29 For descriptions of several early Mormon theaters, see Kate B. Carter, comp., “History of Drama in the West,” in Heart Throbs of the West, 12 vols. (Salt Lake City: Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, 1943), 4:104–16. See also sundry student reports in Pardoe, Drama in My Town.
Charles W. Nibley tells of playing the ghost in *Hamlet* one cold night in this store during the winter of 1868–69: “[Professor] Moench took the part of Hamlet and I took the part of the ghost,” writes Nibley. The ghost was supposed to prowl barefooted, but “it was very cold” so he waited for his cue wearing big black overshoes. “At the hearing of the line where I was to enter, I forgot that I had the overshoes on and went stalking in . . . with a white sheet on me and black overshoes on my feet.”

This anecdote suggests that there may have been considerable unintended humor as the Saints tried to stage Shakespeare on the frontier. One is tempted to surmise that the quality of all pioneer productions, in Salt Lake City as well as in the outlying settlements of Utah, might have been ludicrously low; but such an inference is not sustained by contemporary reviews. Rather, it is likely a product of our twentieth-century experiences with amateur church dramatic productions. Or it may reflect the influence of Mark Twain’s famous satiric account in *Huckleberry Finn* of a bombastic, bumptious “duke” performing before uncouth and undiscriminating small-town audiences: “To be, or not to be;” declaims the duke in an uproariously garbled version of Hamlet’s most famous soliloquy. “That is the bare bodkin / That makes calamity of so long a life.”

To be sure, some reviews of pioneer performances of Shakespeare in Utah note a degree of ineptitude in early productions. For example, a review of an 1864 performance of *Richard III* complained about actors who require constant prompting: “Some persons scarcely make their appearance before staggering over to the vicinity of the prompter . . . [whose] helping whisper is heard all over the house.” Note, however, that the critic expects better. The truly scornful reviews generally come from jaundiced sources, who were already prone to view all aspects of life on the Mormon frontier with disdain and who were writing for audiences with similar prejudices.

A good example of such a review was penned by William

---

30 Johnson, “Drama in Corrine and Brigham City,” 82.
Chandless, an English observer in the 1850s who panned an early production of *Othello* in the Social Hall—but even he sandwiched grudging praise for the leading male actors into his criticism:

“The performance will commence with”—who could have thought it?—“*Othello: Act III!*” Shakespeare [sic] in Utah! And what a moral for such a people! the murder of a fond and falsely-suspected wife; and the act chosen . . . in which the husband’s suspicion is first aroused. Mormonism might take lessons from a worse teacher than Shakespeare, and read them out of a better edition than the representation I saw; fortunately, it was but one act. The parts of Othello and Iago were, for the place, not badly filled; but Desdemona . . . was a tall, masculine female, with cheeks painted beyond the possibility of a blush. . . . Even worse was Emilia; an old dowdy she looked, who might have been a chamber-maid at a third-rate hotel for a quarter of a century and then attended for five or ten years more a deaf elderly lady. I fear I shall always associate the loss of the handkerchief with their acting.34

Similarly, Charles Burnham, a critic for the *New York Herald* and *Saturday Evening Post* and a theater historian, reports that “some of the old troupers who played the town [Salt Lake City] on their way to the

coast” described the Mormon acting company to be of “unrivalled badness.”

Most reviews, however, including those by outsiders, were far more laudatory—especially after the grand Salt Lake Theatre began to draw star actors from the East to perform leading roles, complemented by a supporting cast of increasingly sophisticated local talent. This was called the “Star System.” Beginning with the return from Denver of Thomas A. Lyne in 1862, the Salt Lake Theatre attracted a host of celebrated Shakespearean actors—including such luminaries as George Pauncefort, Julia Dean Hayne, Charlotte Crampton, George Chaplin, Thomas W. Keene, and Edwin Booth. Many performed leading Shakespearean roles. In the process, they also educated local actors and audiences in Shakespeare so that both came to appreciate different nuances in interpretations of Macbeth, Richard III, Hamlet, and so forth. The British star George Pauncefort, for example, brought a new naturalistic style to Shakespeare, which contrasted with the old oratorical style practiced by Thomas Lyne and his mentor Edwin Forrest. Audiences noticed and commented immediately on the difference. Pauncefort also trained local actors in Shakespearean performance. One local actor remembered a rehearsal in which Pauncefort coached a dull Horatio who was to play opposite his Hamlet: “The actor playing Horatio was to pick up Hamlet’s cloak and follow the two off stage. Mr. Pauncefort called him back and said, ‘Joe, Good Lord don’t go off like that, you’re not going for a glass of beer; you have seen a ghost. Put some ginger in it, there’s a dear


36 Maughan, Pioneer Theatre in the Desert, 115–19; Todd, “Operation of the Salt Lake Theatre,” 248–62. Todd notes that Brigham Young originally opposed having “gentile” actors on the stage, preferring instead to cultivate Mormon talent and thereby increase “native refinement and grace” (p. 248). But the stars came, and in ever increasing numbers after the railroad made Salt Lake City a convenient stopping place on cross-country journeys (p. 258).


boy.”

In such ways, stars elevated the quality of Shakespearean drama and encouraged critical comparison and connoisseurship, as audiences saw actors perform the same Shakespearean roles. Ila Maughan observed: “People enjoyed comparing the merits of one actor with those of another,” in such plays as Richard III “and [thereby] they learned to judge the value of plays.”

M. B. Leavitt, who had managed theaters all across the country for over fifty years, wrote: “I do not believe that theatre has ever rested upon a higher plane, both as to its purpose and its offerings, than at Salt Lake City. . . . I witnessed many performances there that would have been a credit to any theatre in America.”

While Leavitt’s appraisal may be somewhat hyperbolic, it is fair to say that the high standards set by the Salt Lake Theatre provided crucial cultural education for the community through its Shakespearean performances.

---

40Maughan, Pioneer Theatre in the Desert, 141.
41Ibid., 147.
ean repertoire. As a contemporary reviewer wrote in a tribute to Thomas A. Lyne, who both staged the first professional LDS performance of Shakespeare in Philadelphia in 1842 and subsequently performed and directed Shakespeare frequently in Utah: “His representation of Shakespearean roles more than anything else first educated our community in a love and appreciation of the immortal bard.”42 Through talented thespians such as Lyne, early Utah developed a remarkably vital tradition of Shakespearean performance—one that pervaded the dramatic offerings in Salt Lake City and penetrated even hamlets in the hinterlands. It is clear that, up through the turn of the century, the Bard was kept alive in Utah principally on the boards. The “muse of fire” first burned brightest among nineteenth-century Saints in the footlights.

Moreover, the light from this pioneer dramatic tradition is reflected in Utah theater even today, most especially through the Tony Award-winning Utah Shakespearean Festival in Cedar City, Utah. Begun in 1962, this festival perpetuates a pioneer tradition begun more than a hundred years earlier by the hardy souls called to establish the Iron Mission. Indeed, when Fred Adams, the festival’s founder, selected plays for the inaugural season, he chose *The Merchant of Venice* precisely because it was the first Shakespeare play to be performed in Iron County, having been performed in 1853 by the Parowan Dramatic Association, which itself had been founded two years earlier, in 1851, the *first year* of the settlement’s colonization.43 I find it at once inspiring and almost incredible that Mormon pioneers, the same year

42“Pioneers of the Drama,” *Christian Herald* (Salt Lake City), 36, quoted in Markworth, “Prominent Teachers of the Speech Arts in Utah,” 24.

43Adams, “History of Mormon Drama,” 12–13. Although I have not yet been able to independently verify the date Adams gives for this pioneer production of *Merchant of Venice*, Luella Adams Dalton’s chapter on “Dramatics in Cedar City” confirms that *Merchant of Venice* along with *As You Like It* were among many plays performed in early Cedar City. *History of the Iron County Mission and Parowan the Mother Town* (Parowan, Utah: N. pub., 1962), 169. Dalton further notes that the pioneers not only organized the Parowan Dramatic Association in the first year of the town’s colonization but also built a stage in the Log Council House to accommodate the association’s productions. To be sure, these early productions were primitive. “The first plays,” Dalton observes, “were put on with quilts and blankets for want of
they settled what was then called the Little Salt Lake Valley, hundreds of miles from Salt Lake City and thousands from the centers of American culture on the East Coast, organized an acting association; and that two years later, while still living in log homes and fighting an Indian war, they staged a Shakespeare play! Given this history, it is not as incongruous as one might have supposed at first that a replica Globe Theatre should grace the site of the old Iron Mission, nor that thousands of Latter-day Saints should flock there each summer to watch actors re-create Shakespearean green worlds amid the red rocks of Zion.

**Shakespeare in the Classroom**

Actors were not the only ones to keep Shakespeare’s “muse of fire” burning bright among the Saints. Teachers also kindled and fed the flame. Some of these early teachers were also performers—most notably elocution teachers such as Maud May Babcock at the University of Utah and Miriam Nelke at Brigham Young University. Shakespeare provided staple readings for elocutionists in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. As Babcock wrote near the end of her life, “The choice of literature for interpretation is extremely vital. . . . There is no excuse for using inferior literature. Selections from such writers as Browning, Milton, and Shakespeare are excellent when the student is prepared for them.” Consistent with this advice, Babcock included curtains and scenery” (p. 35). Yet the pioneers were not without incentive to improve. Parowan’s association vied with Cedar City’s for preeminence. Gustive O. Larson et al., *Iron County Centennial: 1851–1951* (N.p.: N. pub., 1951), 22. These local productions evidently enjoyed wide community support—though, of course, they were the only game in town. Even so, “almost all the [Deseret Iron Company] workers contributed to the company dramatic association” by agreeing to have part of their wages garnered to pay for the theater’s support. Morris A. Shirts and Kathryn H. Shirts, *A Trial Furnace: Southern Utah’s Iron Mission* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2001), 275.


**45**Maud May Babcock, “Interpretation As I Taught It,” speech to National Speech Association, November 1950; “Appendix C” in Markworth,
several Shakespeare selections in her own high school reader,\textsuperscript{46} even if Shakespeare and other canonical authors did not figure as prominently in her own practice as this high-minded advice suggests they might have. Babcock included no Shakespeare selections in a companion college textbook and rarely staged his plays, preferring instead popular contemporary playwrights like Arthur Wing Pinero.\textsuperscript{47} Nevertheless, as speech and drama teachers, both Babcock and Nelke exercised considerable influence in promoting the study of Shakespeare in early twentieth-century Utah.\textsuperscript{48} In fact, one of Babcock’s students, N. A. Peterson, went on to teach Shakespeare at the State Agricultural College in Logan, Utah.\textsuperscript{49} Fittingly, each woman has a theater named after her where Shakespeare continues to be performed in Utah: the Babcock Theatre at the University of Utah and the Nelke Experimental Theatre at Brigham Young University.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Shakespeare began to be the subject of academic literary study in American colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{50} This period witnessed the decline of the classics and rhetoric and the rise of departments devoted to profes-

\begin{flushright}
“Prominent Teachers of the Speech Arts in Utah,” 140.
\end{flushright}


\textsuperscript{47}Ibid.; see also Keith M. Engar, “History of Dramatics at the University of Utah from the Beginning until 1919” (M.A. thesis, University of Utah, 1950), 197, 207–8, 22; and Sondra Lees, “History of Dramatics and the University of Utah from September 1919 to September 1932” (M.A. thesis, University of Utah, 1959), app. 2.


\textsuperscript{49}Markworth, “Prominent Teachers of the Speech Arts in Utah,” 95.

sional study of modern literatures, newly organized by period and author. 51 Consistent with this national trend, in 1887 the University of Utah offered the first literature course specifically in “Chaucer and Shakespeare,” reconfigured the next year as “Shakespeare and Milton” to allow for the addition of yet another great authors course, “Chaucer and Spenser.” 52 These curricular changes were prompted by a fundamental program change: the addition of a new “Literary Course” (i.e., major), owing to low enrollments in classics and to dissatisfaction with the alternatives—namely, courses of study in either “normal” or “scientific.” 53 By 1893, the university offered, for the first time, an entire course devoted to the “study of the poems and plays of Shakespeare” 54—as part of a new major in English classics. Consistent with national developments, the program change also coincided with the hiring of George M. Marshall, the first faculty member with a Ph.D. in English literature (Cornell, 1887) and apparently the first faculty to teach the new Shakespeare course. Marshall also became the first chair of a soon-to-be-organized Department of Modern Languages. 55

Brigham Young Academy offered its first Shakespeare class in
1894, taught by Alice Louise Reynolds. Reynolds came to Shakespeare and literature by way of the theater and elocution. Her famous father, George, had managed the Salt Lake Theatre for a time while Alice was growing up. This, along with instruction in elocution that included reciting passages from Shakespeare from readers, attuned her ear to and piqued her interest in Shakespeare and in the study of literature generally. Subsequently, Alice chose to pursue formal literary study in English at the University of Michigan. After two years, she returned to Brigham Young Academy prepared to teach classes in

---

55 See Chamberlin, *The University of Utah*, on the rise of departments at the university (174–80) and for a brief biography of George M. Marshall (588).

great authors and literary periods. Her knowledge of and love for the Bard was further strengthened by subsequent trips to Stratford, England.

Reynolds was solely responsible for Shakespeare at the Brigham Young Academy until Alfred Osmond arrived in 1903 with a new A.B. from Harvard University, whose English Department was especially strong in Shakespeare. Osmond soon took over the Shakespeare course. He also chaired the English Department for almost thirty years (1905–33). During this time, he conveyed his passion for Shake-

57 Cornell, Michigan, and Harvard—the alma maters of Marshall, Reynolds, and Osmond, respectively—were all early centers for the academic study of Shakespeare in the late nineteenth century. McManaway, “Shakespeare in America,” 516. By the turn of the century, Harvard was at the forefront of academic Shakespeare in America. To my knowledge, Osmond is the first Utahn to have received a diploma in English from Harvard.
Shakespeare not only through classroom instruction but also in highly dramatic Shakespeare recitations, which he rendered in his classes and in public performances across Utah and southern Idaho. Two of Osmond’s daughters, Nan Osmond Grass and Irene Osmond Spears, eventually joined the literature faculty at BYU where they passed on their father’s love for Shakespeare to their own students. As one of Grass’s students, I have singled out Alfred Osmond to represent countless influential Shakespeare teachers, both because Osmond indirectly transmitted the “muse of fire” to me through his daughter (he died long before I was born) and also because he, more passionately and whole-heartedly than any teacher of his generation, devoted himself to teaching Shakespeare.

Alfred Osmond discovered Shakespeare at age eleven when he picked up a volume of Shakespeare’s plays to read on his breaks with the threshing crew. That night when it began to get dark, the crew noticed that Alf was missing. It turns out he had spent the day in the barn completely engrossed in Shakespeare—so much so that he lost all track of time, reading well past supper time and until it was too dark
to see words on the page.\textsuperscript{58} From that day on, Osmond fell under Shakespeare’s spell, and his plays became Osmond’s life-long passion. He had read all the major plays by age thirteen and spent hours memorizing Shakespeare until he could recite virtually whole plays without a text. Daughter Nan, as a child, would “follow him into the darkness of our study[:] and seated there unbeknownst to him, I would listen to him recite from memory hour after hour passages from Shakespeare’s plays.”\textsuperscript{59} He could become so absorbed in these stirring recitations that, according to Nan, he once failed to notice that the bell had rung and the classroom had emptied of students.\textsuperscript{60} So passionate and notorious was Osmond’s love of Shakespeare that to many he became known as “Mr. Shakespeare.”\textsuperscript{61} Occasionally, students mistakenly addressed him as “Brother Shakespeare” or “Professor Shakespeare”—much to his delight.\textsuperscript{62} His biography contains numerous testimonials from students and audiences whose love for Shakespeare he kindled.\textsuperscript{63} In this quality, he represents many teachers of his time, both college and secondary.

Alfred Osmond taught Shakespeare not merely by performing dramatic readings but by subjecting the texts to literary analysis. He thus bridges the two principal avenues through which knowledge of Shakespeare has been transmitted among the Saints—on the stage and on the page. His daughter Irene provides a detailed account of what his Shakespeare classes were like.\textsuperscript{64} From her account and the student recollections she collects, it is evident that Osmond brought three great passions to his literary analysis of

\begin{flushright}

59Nan Osmond Grass with Carol Grass Winkler, “\textit{The Radiance of the Morning}”: \textit{Nan Osmond Grass} (N.p.: Privately published, 1992), 52; text in my possession.

60Ibid., 52. Irene Osmond Spears recounts this same story in “Alfred Osmond: A Personal Reminiscence,” in \textit{They Gladly Taught: Ten BYU Professors}, 2:170.

61Grass, “\textit{Radiance of the Morning},” 51.
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Shakespeare in the classroom: First, he loved to analyze Shakespeare’s language. This accords with the reigning philological methods of his day, which he had acquired at Harvard under the tutelage of George Lyman Kittredge. Second, he also loved to analyze Shakespeare’s characters in the manner of the great turn-of-the-century Shakespearean critic A. C. Bradley. It was as if they were, for Osmond, living, breathing companions. Tellingly, Osmond once gave his wife, Annie Elizabeth Lloyd Osmond, a volume of Shakespeare before a period of prolonged separation so she would never want for friends in his absence. Third, above all, Osmond loved to analyze and explicate Shakespeare’s “moral universe.” He regarded the plays as perpetual founts of profound wisdom, capable of helping attentive readers acquire virtuous moral character. His daughter Irene writes that, even after sixty years, the moral maxims her father drew from Shakespeare still “come back to me with great force.”

Osmond’s strong sense of Shakespeare as sage deeply informed the way his daughters taught Shakespeare to subsequent generations of students. It also accords with the way Shakespeare was treated in popular culture in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America, as manifested in books like Bartlett’s Familiar Quotations and in the widespread Bardolatry of the day. And it conforms with the way he was and, in the main, still is viewed by ordinary Latter-day Saints from their pulpits, in their periodicals, and within their homes. All alike have typically treated Shakespeare as an almost inexhaustible fount of moral wisdom.

**Shakespeare from Pulpits, Periodicals, and Parents**

Along with actors and teachers, LDS preachers, pamphleteers, and parents have helped keep Shakespeare’s “muse of fire” burning

---

66Spears, In the Process, 147.
67Ibid.
68It should be remembered that John Bartlett also authored a Shakespeare concordance. It is no coincidence, therefore, that Shakespeare is far and away the most frequently cited author in Bartlett’s famous collection of quotations. Bartlett’s enormously influential book at once validated and perpetuated Shakespeare’s reputation as source of timeless wisdom.
bright among the Saints. References to Shakespeare became more common from the pulpit and in Church periodicals as the level of formal education rose among Mormons in the twentieth century. Furthermore, knowledge of Shakespeare has been promulgated from the pulpit, page, and hearth specifically as a way of promoting greater cultural refinement among the Saints. This motive lies behind the publication of several essays on Shakespeare’s birthplace and literary accomplishments that appeared in the *Improvement Era* between 1900 and 1916, the year of the Shakespeare tercentenary. Illustrative of these early efforts to promote refinement through the study of Shakespeare are remarks made by Margaret Caldwell at the June MIA Conference in 1916: “I am here to remind you that any man who studies Shakespeare is getting very much more out of life than one who does not. It may not be essential that one shall study Shakespeare in order to get into heaven . . . but the man who does know Shakespeare has an inspiration and an uplift which will help him get into heaven.”

Similarly, in the mid twentieth century, “cultural refinement” materials in Relief Society regularly featured selections from Shake-
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speare, adduced with precisely the same design—i.e., to educate and refine LDS women. A good example of this may be seen in the five-volume series Out of the Best Books, published for use with Relief Society “cultural refinement” lessons from 1964–69. Authored by two English professors, these books make frequent reference to Shakespeare’s plays and sonnets.\(^{71}\) Shakespeare likewise featured prominently in the predecessor to the Out of the Best Books series. From 1949 to 1964, Briant S. Jacobs authored regular lessons in English literary history for the Relief Society Magazine. Many of these lessons dealt with a single Shakespeare play or explored a particular theme of Shakespeare’s work.

At about the same time, Marion D. Hanks and Elaine Cannon selected nuggets of Shakespearean wisdom for the “Era of Youth” sec-

tion of the *Improvement Era*. These were designed to inspire LDS youth and to promote character development. To this end, the Shakespeare citations were organized topically around morals and manners, including such topics as goals, friends, honesty, speech, service, self-control, love, and prayer.72

One of its selections, “Action,” pieced together lines from *King John* (5.5.21–22) and *Antony and Cleopatra* (4.4.20–21) to yield the stirring verse:

The day shall not be up so soon as I  
To greet the fair adventure of to-morrow.  
To business that we love we rise betime  
And go to’t with delight.

My sister Athelia Tanner Woolley learned the quatrain from a missionary companion and, for years, roused her children in the morning by quoting this verse to them.

Understandably, extensive allusions to Shakespeare in LDS periodicals and manuals have not survived correlation nor the internationalization of the Church. Nevertheless, Shakespeare is still regularly quoted from the pulpit by General Authorities to reinforce gospel lessons. An electronic search of Church periodicals published between 1971 and 2005 yielded 201 hits for “Shakespeare.” The majority of Shakespeare citations are from the current First Presidency: Gordon B. Hinckley, Thomas S. Monson, and James E. Faust. Prior to 1971, Shakespeare was also a favorite author of David O. McKay. As one would expect, Polonius’s advice to Laertes, “to thine own self be true,” appears quite frequently over the pulpit—and rarely with any recognition of its being ironically undercut in context. But in general the Shakespeare quotations are apt and the range of references is, on the whole, rather remarkable.

No doubt many Shakespearean quotations pronounced from Mormon pulpits are drawn from speaker’s guides, like *Bartlett’s Familiar Quotations,* rather than from intimate personal familiarity with the plays. But this is not uniformly the case. Certainly, it is not true of President Hinckley who, after receiving a B.A. in English, deepened his love for British literature and culture on a mission to Great Britain.

At the 1998 University of Utah commencement exercises, President Hinckley dramatically held up an obviously well-worn and much-loved copy of Shakespeare’s plays and declared, “I brought a book with me today, my old Shakespeare text from which I read so long ago in English 171. It is filled with wisdom.” Then he proceeded to base his advice to the graduates on passages from *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest*. Likewise, at the banquet establishing a chair of British Studies in his name at the University of Utah, President Hinckley once again held up his worn copy of Shakespeare in tribute to the Bard and other British authors who had enriched his life and the lives of all English speakers. At the same time, his daughter Virginia Hinckley Pearce verified that her father “frequently quotes Shakespeare [at
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Presumably, President Hinckley learned many of these passages not only at school but in his own home under the tutelage of his parents, Bryant and Ada Hinckley, whose “children were all influenced to one degree or another by their parents’ love of literature. . . . Each learned to recite some of Bryant and Ada’s favorite poems and passages from the classics.” Such literate LDS parents have helped keep Shakespeare’s muse aglow around Zion’s hearths. President Hinckley’s childhood home contained an extensive library, “filled with more than a thousand books,” including “a complete set of Shakespeare.” More important, it contained parents who read these books, valued education, and loved language and literature. President Hinckley’s father, Bryant Hinckley, was a speaker and writer renowned for his lucid, literate style, while his mother, Ada Bitner Hinckley, was a former English teacher known by her children as a strict grammarian. They invited their children into the family library, shared “favorite poems and passages from the classics,” and encouraged their children to memorize them.

This expectation that children memorize passages of literature has been a crucial way parents and teachers have transmitted knowledge of Shakespeare. It was a part of many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century homes, including Mormon pioneer homes with exceedingly meager libraries. Children in such homes were nevertheless exposed to exemplary purple passages from great literature and expected to commit many such passages to memory. The texts were generally drawn from didactic readers, such as William Scott’s Lessons in Elocution, from which Abraham Lincoln memorized “long passages of Shakespeare” that “stayed with him to his death,” and William H. McGuffey’s famous readers, which contained “a dozen or more fa-

76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 Dunn, Shakespeare in America, 225–34.
mous passages” from Shakespeare. 79 The literary horizons of pioneer homes were profoundly shaped by McGuffey’s moralistic readers, as President Hinckley reminded the Church: “Their textbooks were few. They had the McGuffey readers, those remarkable books put together by William Holmes McGuffey beginning in 1836. The McGuffey reader used works by Shakespeare, Thoreau, Tennyson, and others considered too difficult to read today. But added to the wonderful language of these master writers, those simple textbooks unabashedly taught lessons on honesty, fairness, morality, and the work ethic.” 80 Literary selections from such readers not only colored LDS pulpit and periodical rhetoric, they also graced our forebears’ everyday conversation with family and friends because many passages had been committed to memory.

In our day, regrettably, few children learn poetry by heart. Likewise, seldom are those once referred to as “great authors” held up by parents or teachers as sources of wisdom. Source books like McGuffey’s and Bartlett’s have been largely replaced by books like Especially for Youth. And the discipline of memorization has been widely (and wrongly) disparaged in schools and abandoned as a common practice in the home. I am, however, aware of at least one LDS-authored quote book that deliberately counters this trend. Entitled Inspired Quotes from the Pen of Shakespeare, it culls wit and wisdom from the Bard in an effort to help its readers adorn their discourse and enrich their daily lives with Shakespeare. 81 I know, too, of several teachers of LDS youth, myself among them, who still require students to

81 Inspired Quotes from the Pen of Shakespeare, compiled by Deanne M. Muir, Kayleen M. Scott, and Marie Wahlquist, 4th printing (Salt Lake City: Publisher’s Press, 1991). I suspect that this book circulates mainly among family and friends. It was presented to me by one of its compilers after I spoke at the funeral of Nan Grass, who had taught both of us. Privately published, the book is dedicated to the compilers’ families. In the foreword, Muir’s husband expresses his hope that the enlightenment contained in the book will be passed on “that our family may be blessed.” This book thus may be seen as an instance of the influence of Shakespeare within an extended family.
memorize poetry, including Shakespeare. In addition, I have tried in my own family to keep alive the dying practice of memorization by inviting my children to give me recitations rather than other gifts for birthdays, Father’s Day, and Christmas. Each child has, on occasion, chosen to recite Shakespeare.

President Hinckley memorized poetry for his parents as well, and this may be one source for the passages of Shakespeare yet “floating around in his head.” He thus inherited from his parents not only a marvelous library and love for reading but a feel for the beauty and rhythm of the English language that comes best from memorizing and imitating those who have used it best, like Shakespeare or Abraham Lincoln. There is a felicity of phrase in President Hinckley’s style, as there was in his father’s, that marks them both as bibliophiles. They evidently have enjoyed the “intellectual companionship” of great writers. Bryant S. Hinckley once claimed:

To create in the minds of young people a taste for good reading is one of the first obligations of the home, the school and the church. Books are treasure houses of knowledge. They hold in their keeping the wisdom of the ages, and through them we become the inheritors of all the conquests, creations, and achievements that stand to the credit of the race.

If Milton will cross my threshold and sing to me of Paradise; if Shakespeare will reveal to me the world of imagination, and Franklin enrich me with his practical wisdom, I shall not pine for intellectual companionship.

By providing their children with the “intellectual companionship” of Shakespeare and like authors, Bryant and Ada Hinckley exemplify all the bibliophilic LDS parents who have bequeathed to their posterity the precious patrimony of love for good books. Given this legacy, it is not surprising that their son eventually became an English major, nor that he would one day wave a precious old volume of Shakespeare from the podium and proclaim, “It is full of wisdom.”

The fate of President Hinckley’s tattered school text—purchased
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82In a Christmas devotional, President Hinckley told how his father would pay him “now and again to memorize a poem or a piece of scripture.” Ensign, February 2001, 70.

at considerable sacrifice during the Depression, lovingly preserved over many years, and finally presented by a prophet before the world as an object of veneration—stands in sharp contrast to that of the Stegner family’s volumes of Shakespeare, ignominiously cast out on a frontier town dump. In its way, this contrast symbolizes the remarkable fortunes of Shakespeare among the Saints. Far from being suppressed, as drama was in some religious communities on the American frontier, or discarded, as he was in other hard-scrabble settlements, Shakespeare was borne by the Saints into the wilderness as an icon of LDS cultural aspirations. To be sure, Mormons past and present have neither embraced nor, perhaps, even recognized the scurrilous, bawdy, subversive dimensions of the Bard. Rather, for Mormons he has embodied high art and high ideals. Yet also, as President Hinckley observed, wisdom. The wisdom that Shakespeare offers arises not simply from moral maxims but from profound exploration of good and evil, and everything in between. It arises from an insistence on confronting life in all its complexity and messy particularity.

—During these days of the Depression it was not easy [for Hinckley] to stay in school. . . . Textbooks were expensive, and when possible he did without, though he purchased his Shakespeare textbook and hung onto it throughout his life.” Dew, Go Forward with Faith, 47.

To the degree that these elements were recognized, they likely were suppressed. At the dedication of the Salt Lake Theatre, Brigham Young famously even disapproved of tragedy in general: “Tragedy is favored by the outside world; I am not in favor of it. I do not wish murder and all its horrors and the villainy leading to it portrayed before our women and children.” At the same time, Young opened the door for dramatic depictions of evil: “Upon the stage can be represented in character, evil and its consequences . . . the weakness and follies of man. . . . The stage can be a maid to aid the pulpit in impressing on the minds of the community an enlightened sense of a virtuous life, also a proper horror of the enormity of sin and a just dread of its consequences.” Brigham Young, March 6, 1862, Journal of Discourses, 26 vols. (London and Liverpool: LDS Booksellers Depot, 1854–86), 9:245, 243. Young further expressed his view on theater in “Theatricals,” published in Salt Lake’s Daily Telegraph, January 11, 1865. Tragedies were, in fact, regularly performed in the Salt Lake Theatre as they had been in the Social Hall from its opening season, including Shakespearean tragedies. Young’s daughter Alice even played alongside Thomas Lyne as the heroine in the tragedy Virginius. Roberta Reese Asahina, “Brigham Young and the Salt Lake Theater, 1862–1877” (Ph.D. diss., Tufts University, 1980), 169.
Above all, it arises from a deep understanding of the human condition, so richly imagined in the vast and varied pageant of Shakespearean drama.

Tellingly, it is precisely this aspect of Shakespeare’s art that John Lindsay singled out to explain the enduring preeminence of the Bard among the Mormons a century ago. For Lindsay, Shakespeare’s perennial popularity on Mormon stages cannot be explained by mere snob appeal. In a concluding chapter devoted entirely to Shakespeare, Lindsay argues in *The Mormons and the Theatre* that Shakespeare has been “so highly prized” among the Latter-day Saints because “he got closer to the human heart than any and all other authors. . . . The heart of man, that secret repository of so many contending passions . . . that fountain whence so many varying emotions spring . . . was to him an open book. . . . He understood life in all its phases.”

I suspect that Lindsay is right: Shakespeare’s lasting appeal among the Saints derives from the fact that his works are simply wittier and wiser than those that have competed for attention on the stage and page. Surely the extensive exposure—garnered over many years in Utah theaters, classrooms, pulpits, and homes—to an author whose genius lies in his profound understanding of the human condition, has added appreciably to the store of wisdom possessed by Latter-day Saints. Mormon life and language would have been more impoverished, and Mormon history less rich and colorful were it not for the presence of this “muse of fire” among us.

---

86 Lindsay, *Mormons and the Theatre*, 178.
DIFFERENT DRUMMERS:  
THE DIVERSE HYMNODY OF THE  
REORGANIZATION

Richard Clothier

WHEN THE NAUVOO HIGH COUNCIL met on October 27, 1839, a musical concern was on its agenda. Three weeks earlier, the general conference had voiced the urgent need for more hymnals and more hymns to meet the demands of the rapidly growing

RICHARD CLOTHIER {rclothier@mchsi.com} is Emeritus Professor of Music at Graceland University, Lamoni, Iowa. Members of the Mormon History Association, John Whitmer Historical Association, and others will remember the festivals of historic hymns he has presented in recent years at Kirtland, Nauvoo, Lamoni, and Independence. He served for a time as a member of the committee that produced Hymns of the Saints.

Musical examples are reproduced with permission from Hymns of the Saints (Independence: Herald Publishing House, 1981), except for “All Is Well” (“Come, Come, Ye Saints”), which is reproduced from The Saints’ Harmony (Lamoni, Iowa: Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1889). All texts and tunes are in the public domain with the exception of the texts of “Send Forth Thy Light, O Zion” (Hymn 317), “The Cause of Zion Summons Us” (Hymn 314), and “Let Us Give Praise to the God of Creation” (Hymn 398). Copyrights for these texts are held by the Community of Christ Copyright Corporation. Used by permission.

young church. Emma Smith, Joseph Smith’s wife, had published the Church’s first hymnal in response to a divine commandment delivered through her husband in July 1830; but evidently only about a thousand copies of that compilation of ninety hymn texts had come off the presses in Kirtland.

The concern expressed by the 1839 conference was not new. Brigham Young had proposed the preparation of a new hymnbook; and David Rogers, a wealthy New Yorker, had published a substantial revision of Emma’s work, albeit without permission. The action of the October 1839 general conference directed that “a new edition of Hymn Books be printed immediately, and that the one published by D. W. Rogers be utterly discarded by the church.”

At its October 27 meeting, the Nauvoo High Council, presumably with the 1830 mandate to the Prophet’s wife in mind, stipulated “that Sister Emma Smith select and publish a hymn-book for the use of the Church, and that Brigham Young be informed of this action and he not publish the hymns taken by him from Commerce.” As it turned out, the attempt to bar Young from publishing a hymnal did not succeed; and by the following July, the apostles then in Europe, including Young, printed three thousand copies of a new hymnal in Manchester, England.

The Nauvoo High Council could not have foreseen that the hymnal they had asked Emma to produce would be supplanted by the somewhat more distinctive apostolic collection, while her work would go on to become the basis for the hymnody of a future branch of Mormonism, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, known today as Community of Christ. For its part, the 1840 Manchester hymnal would travel to the Salt Lake Valley with its editors, Parley Pratt, John Taylor, and Brigham Young, along with their followers, tenaciously endure twenty-five revisions over seventy-two years, and be-
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3 RLDS D&C 24:3b; LDS D&C 25:12. Unless otherwise noted, all further quotations from the Doctrine and Covenants are from the Community of Christ 2004 edition.


6 *History of the Church*, 4:17–18.
come the fountainhead of hymnody for the Utah church.

In his important history, *Music and Mormonism*, Michael Hicks suggests that the Manchester hymnal succeeded because it was “better suited to the expanding theology of Joseph’s last years”—including such new doctrines as baptism for the dead and celestial marriage—than Emma’s more mainstream-leaning Nauvoo compilation, eventually published in 1841. Joseph’s “expanding theology” may have made Emma’s hymnal “obsolete” for the Utah-bound church, as Hicks contends; nevertheless, her collection was embraced twenty years later as the model for the first hymnal of the Reorganization, sometimes referred to as the church of the “moderate Mormons.”

Hicks cites several examples of the “shift in emphasis” of the Nauvoo hymnal compiled by Emma Smith as compared with the Manchester work published a year earlier. John Newton’s “Amazing Grace” and Isaac Watts’s “When I Survey the Wondrous Cross” both appear in Emma’s work, but not in that of the apostles. It should be noted also that these two hymns are included in today’s Community of Christ hymnal, but not the present LDS hymnbook. Additionally, distinctive texts from subsequent editions of the Manchester hymnal, such as “Praise to the Man Who Communed with Jehovah,” and “The Glorious Gospel Light Has Shone,” with its theme of baptism for the dead, can still be found in the current LDS hymnal. The latter hymn has never appeared in Reorganization hymnals; but “Praise to the Man” was added in an appendix in the 1864 edition of Emma’s Reorganization hymnal, and it appeared in the 1870 and 1889 RLDS hymnals in an altered form which began, “Praise to the Lord for the great restoration.”

Over a period of 140 years, the eight major hymnals published by the Reorganization have been remarkable in the diversity and variety they have demonstrated, both among themselves, and also in com-
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8Ibid., 29.
10Hicks, *Mormonism and Music*, 28–29. Hicks’s statement that “Redeemer of Israel” was absent from Emma’s 1841 hymnal is inaccurate. It was simply omitted from the index.
parison with the collections of the LDS Church. A number of studies of Mormon hymnals have been made over the years, but rarely have they made reference to hymn collections other than those of the Utah church. This commentary attempts to fill in part of “the rest of the story.”

**Making a Start**

Not long after Joseph Smith III agreed to head a “new organization of the church” essentially gathered from “the remnants” in the Midwest, the question of hymnals came to the fore. In fact, a conference held nearly a year prior to the official organizational meeting of April 6, 1860, had taken action to provide for the publication of a hymnal “based upon the hymns published in a former edition, selected and compiled by Sister Emma, the wife of Joseph the Seer.” After she became formally identified with the new organization, the conference of October 1860 moved the project forward by requesting that “Sister Emma Smith Bidaman [sic] be appointed to make a selection of hymns, to make a hymn-book.” The obvious rationale for this action was spelled out in the October issue of *The True Latter Day Saints’ Herald*: “Sister Emma Smith Bidaman was appointed by a revelation in July, 1830, to make a collection of sacred hymns . . . . She has therefore been re-appointed to the performance of this work.”

When *The Latter Day Saints’ Selection of Hymns* was published in Cincinnati in 1861, it was apparent that the collection was, as had been implied in the 1859 request, patterned closely after Emma’s 1841 Nauvoo collection. In fact, all but twelve of the 249 hymns were common to that previous collection, among them seventy of the ninety hymns from her 1835 hymnal (actually printed in early 1836). In 1864, an enlarged edition was published, which added thirty-seven hymns, including eight by David Hyrum Smith, the youngest son of
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11Hicks, *Mormonism and Music*, 32, lists several theses and dissertations on Mormon hymnology.


Emma and Joseph Smith. David, born less than five months after his father’s assassination, was a sensitive young man with a strong artistic bent, notably revealed in his painting and his poetry.

While many of the hymns in Emma’s first Reorganization hymnal are still sung today by the Community of Christ, only one of the additional thirty-seven in her second edition continues to be in use, and it is one of those by David H. Smith. It is a poem that demonstrates, in gracefully lyrical language, the young man’s love of the beauties of nature and the fellowship of the Saints. It begins:
You may sing of the beauty of mountain and dale,  
Of the silvery streamlet and flowers of the vale,  
But the place most delightful this earth can afford  
Is the place of devotion—the house of the Lord.

**EXPANDING THE REPERTOIRE**

As the young movement grew in numbers, once again the need was felt for a new collection of hymns. Only five years after the publication of Emma’s expanded hymnal, the annual conference held in St. Louis on April 6, 1869, reported the following action: “The compilation of a new hymn book was authorized by resolution, and Joseph Smith appointed on the committee of compilation, he to choose his associates. He chose M. H. Forscutt and David H. Smith, and also appointed Norman W. Smith to act in case D. H. Smith was gone on his mission before the completion of the work.”

All four of these committee members were already active in writing or composing hymns. Joseph, like his younger brother David, was a published poet, and Norman W. Smith (no relation to the Church’s first family) had often been called upon by Joseph to write music for the hymns he composed. But it was Mark Forscutt who would become the driving force in RLDS hymnody during the next two decades. Born in England, Forscutt was converted to Mormonism in 1853 against the strong desires of his family. His total dedication to the movement caused him to give up a place at Cambridge University and take up a mission in his native land. One of the elders had convinced him that “the Lord did not want educated men, as He would put into their mouths the words He wanted them to speak.”

Foregoing a Cambridge education was a decision he later regretted. Before long, Forscutt was persuaded to join “the gathering,” and he sailed with his new bride for America in March 1860. After pushing a handcart from Nebraska to Salt Lake City, this talented individual served for a time as private secretary to Brigham Young. He
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soon became disillusioned, partly, according to his daughter, because of the pressure he felt to practice plural marriage.\textsuperscript{17} For a time he joined with the Morrisite group in Utah and was ordained an apostle in that movement. Eventually, he came in contact with the Reorganized Church and was baptized into that fellowship in Salt Lake City on New Year’s Day 1865. Forscutt soon returned to the Midwest, where he became a close friend of Joseph Smith III. A gifted orator, he was selected by Joseph to give the eulogy for Joseph’s mother, Emma, at the memorial service the Church held in Plano, Illinois, on July 15, 1879.\textsuperscript{18} His command of language, as well as his self-training in music, would find expression in the Church’s next two hymnals.

When he was appointed to head the new hymnal committee, the

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 81 (January 30, 1934): 143.
\textsuperscript{18}Emma died on April 30, 1879, in Nauvoo, and a local service was held on May 2, prior to her burial beside her husband in an unmarked location near the old Homestead in Nauvoo. Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, \textit{Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith} (Garden City, N.Y.:
workaholic Forscutt had already anticipated such a project and had filled several notebooks with hymns, some of which he remembered from England and some of which he composed himself. Thus, in 1870, only one year after the conference authorization, the Church published *The Saints’ Harp*. This remarkably ambitious work filled 792 four-by-six-inch pages and included no fewer than 1,120 texts. It retained more than two-thirds of the texts in Emma’s Reorganization hymnal and added hundreds of texts from a variety of sources including eighty-eight by Forscutt himself, forty-nine by David H. Smith, and thirty-four by Joseph Smith III.

Two of Forscutt’s texts remain in the current hymnal of the Community of Christ. One is a humble prayer of praise, “Heavenly Father, We Adore Thee!”

In its preface to *The Saints’ Harp*, the committee noted that “a very respectable number of our brethren and sisters have desired that we should furnish tunes with this book of hymns.” It explained that this would have made the book too expensive for many members and cited the problem of differing musical tastes in the Church, so that “while we might please many, we should not please all.”\(^1^9\) Thus, it suggested that a separate committee on music be appointed for a future hymnal. A year later the conference of September 1871, held near Council Bluffs, Iowa, passed just such a resolution.\(^2^0\) Mark Forscutt was again appointed to head the editorial committee.

For the next decade and a half, because of a number of changes in the committee and even Forscutt’s release while he served a mission in Europe, the project of composing music for the hymnal languished.\(^2^1\) In 1887, Joseph III gave inspired counsel to the Church that settled questions about the use of music in the Church and encouraged members to cultivate “the gifts of music and of song.” The document stated, “The service of song in the house of the Lord with humility and unity of Spirit in them that sing and them that hear is blessed, and acceptable with God.” The use of instruments was acceptable “as wisdom and choice may direct,” with the exception that
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\(^1^9\) *The Saints’ Harp* (Lamoni, Iowa: Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1870), iv–v.

\(^2^0\) *History of the Reorganized Church*, 3:629.

\(^2^1\) Ibid., 4:621–22, details numerous changes in personnel responsible for the project between 1871 and 1898.
instruments were to “be silent when the Saints assemble for prayer and testimony.” The same counsel urged that “those to whom the work of providing a book of song has been intrusted [sic] may hasten their work in its time” (D&C 119).

In April 1888, Mark Forscutt was reappointed hymnal editor, and The Saints’ Harmony was finally published in 1889 in Lamoni, Iowa, then Church headquarters.\(^{22}\) The Harmony was a curious work, made up of split pages, with more than 700 tunes on the top half, and the 1,120 texts from The Saints’ Harp on the bottom. Instead of a pocket-size volume, like previous hymnals, this massive book measured 8½ by 11 inches, and was 1½ inches thick. In addition to the hymns, it included seven anthems, twenty-seven pages of indices,\(^ {23}\) and even a twelve-page short course in music theory, no doubt an attempt to aid the Saints in learning to read the Harmony’s music. The feeling of accomplishment Forscutt must have felt in the completion of this ambitious project is reflected in his long preface to the book, which reads in part: “We may surely be pardoned if we rejoice that in The Saints’ Harmony about four hundred and fifty compositions are published for the first time to the world, that five hundred and two pieces are published for the first time in America, and that three hundred and ninety-three of these are original contributions by our own composers, written with the intention of their being first published in The Saints’ Harmony.”\(^ {24}\)

Mark Forscutt had produced a book that was by far the largest collection of hymnody in the history of all Latter-day Saintism. The reader cannot help being amazed by a later paragraph in the preface in which Forscutt reveals that he had “contemplated a more extensive” work!

No fewer than 127 of the tunes printed in The Saints’ Harmony were composed by Mark Forscutt himself, using his own name and

\(^{22}\)The year 1889 also saw the publication in Utah of the Latter Day Saints’ Psalmody, the first hymnal to contain original LDS tunes for a number of texts in the Manchester hymnal.

\(^{23}\)Characteristic of Forscutt’s thoroughness, indexes were included for subjects, first lines (with authors), meters, tunes alphabetically (with composer), tunes by meter, composers, and musical terms.

\(^{24}\)The Saints’ Harmony (Lamoni, Iowa: Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1889), preface.
nine pseudonyms. Only two of these tunes are in current use in the Community of Christ’s *Hymns of the Saints*. One of them, the tune Forscutt named “Norman,” is an especially beloved one with a unique story, recounted by his daughter, Ruby C. Faunce:

In the year 1885 or 1886, Father was holding meetings at Pitts-burgh, Pennsylvania. It was when he was alone in his room one night about ten o’clock, that he heard beautiful music. His room opened into the hall which led past the room where an hour before he had conducted a preaching service. And as he listened, he thought sure the lady of the house was playing on the piano in the church room.

The music continuing, plainly, clearly, a few moments, father decided to go to the room and see who was playing. On his way he met the sister at whose house he was staying and who offered shelter for the meetings.

“I thought that was you playing, Brother Forscutt!” she gasped.

---

25 The creative pseudonyms of this English-born Nebraska resident included “A. Nebraskan,” “M. English,” “A. Unicorn,” “Fetteri,” “Hilliare,” “M.**,” “Marcellus Ostracis,” “Mareschal,” and “Mu Phi.”
“And I thought it was you.”

Realizing that heavenly influences were about them, they entered the room, and father played the melody from memory, the sister verifying that this was what she had heard. This tune Father named “Norman,” and to it we sing in our Hymnal the words, “Blest Be Thou, O
God of Israel.”

In addition to music Forscutt remembered from his English upbringing, several of the tunes he included in The Saints’ Harmony came from his Utah days, including thirty-one of the tunes of John Tullidge. He even included the great hymn of the Mormon exodus, “Come, Come, Ye Saints,” although his arrangement seems an unnecessarily dramatic one.

Unfortunately, Mark Forscutt’s monumental work was not well received by the Saints, for reasons that do not seem surprising today. In addition to being large and cumbersome, the book was expensive for the time at $2.50 per copy. Furthermore, most people could not read music, so it seems unrealistic to expect that ordinary congregations could effectively learn so many unfamiliar tunes, especially since many of the tunes were either newly composed, newly arranged, or of European origin. As a result, six years later, at the 1895 conference, a resolution initiated by the St. Louis District was accepted that set out a detailed plan for a new hymnal that would avoid the problems of The Saints’ Harmony. It was to be a “smaller and more convenient” volume, priced at “not more than fifty cents each,” and containing not more than 250 hymns chosen by an immediate poll of the branches. The resolution even named three musicians to serve as a committee to compile the book. Mark Forscutt was not among them.

LISTENING TO THE PEOPLE

In an amazingly short time, the 1895 Saints’ Hymnal was published in Lamoni. This time the words were printed between the two musical clefs, as is now the standard practice. Essentially an abridgement of The Saints’ Harmony, this collection was a much more usable volume that faithfully met the criteria of the conference mandate.

During this same period at the turn of the century, in response to

26Faunce, “Biography of Mark Hill Forscutt,” The Saints’ Herald 81 (July 31, 1934): 970. The text, “Blest Be Thou, O God of Israel,” is a paraphrase of 1 Chronicles 29:10–12, attributed to Henry U. Onderdonk. In The Saints’ Harmony, this text was paired with the tune, “Rathbun,” while Forscutt’s tune, “Norman,” was suggested for use with three other texts.

27History of the Reorganized Church, 5:296–98. The three individuals were Ralph G. Smith, Lucy L. Ressegue, and Arthur H. Mills.
a new initiative, another very different kind of hymnal was published as a supplement to the new Saints’ Hymnal. The Sunday School movement had been spreading throughout the Church, along with a Religious Society for youth; and at the urging of the General Sunday School Association, a committee was appointed to prepare a supplemental songbook that would better suit these activities. In 1903, a collection of 232 musical compositions, primarily lively assembly songs and gospel hymns, was published under the name Zion’s Praises.  

Many of the hymns were the products of popular gospel hymn authors and composers of the day, such as Fanny Crosby and Ira Sankey. Although most of these are today considered too sentimental or dated, a few, such as Charles Gabriel’s “Great and Marvelous Are Thy Works,” have survived as favorites in the current Community of Christ hymnal.

Along with songs in the gospel style, the publication of Zion’s Praises presented an opportunity for the inclusion of several new hymns recently written by members of the Church. One of these is among the four hymns by Joseph Smith III which continue to be sung by the Community of Christ. Throughout his lifetime, the prophet experienced the deaths of an unusually large number of family members, experiences that sorely tried his faith over a considerable length of time. One of his hymns is a powerful, personal expression of despair turned to triumph through unfailing trust in God. It is known by its first line, “Tenderly, tenderly, lead thou me on.” (See p. 130.)

Another hymn that first appeared in Zion’s Praises must also be mentioned. Written by Vida E. Smith, daughter of Alexander Hale Smith and Elizabeth Kendall Smith, and set to music by her cousin, Audentia Smith Anderson, daughter of Joseph III and Bertha Madison Smith, it has become arguably the most beloved hymn ever to

28 Responding to the same movement, Deseret Sunday School Songs was published in Salt Lake City six years later in 1909.

29 Donald P. Hustad in Jubilate II (Carol Stream, Ill.: Hope Publishing, 1993), 234, defines the gospel song as a style “related to solo secular forms, and certainly to one of its immediate predecessors—the ‘spiritual song’ of the campmeeting tradition. Basically, the poetry was simpler than that of a hymn—limited in theological scope, less challenging to the imagination, and more repetitive, with an inevitable refrain. The music was characterized by a simple lyric melody, inconsequential harmony, and usually sprightly rhythm, in the style of other popular music—camp or marching songs and parlor piano music.”
PRAISE

Great and Marvelous Are Thy Works
Psalm 97:1, 6, 12
Romans 16:25-27

SING OF HIS MIGHTY LOVE L.M. with refrain

**Unison (or harmony)**

1. Great and mar-vel-ous are thy works, O Lord of hosts, al-might-y One!
2. Thou hast fash-ioned with thine own hand The earth be-low, the heavens a-bove;
3. O thou in-fi-nite, liv-ing God, Up-on us now thy Spir-it pour;

Earth and fir-ma-ment speak thy praise, Thy name is writ-ten in the sun.
Oh, how won-der-ful is thy power, And yet how ten-der is thy love.
We would wor-ship thee, laud and praise Thy ho-ly name for-ev-er more.

**Refrain**

Sing of his might-y love, for it is won-der-ful;

Let his praise through all the earth re-sound; Hon-or and maj-es-ty

now and for-ev-er be Un-to God whose love and mer- cy have no bound.

*Text: Charlotte G. Homer.*
*Tune: Charles H. Gabriel, 1856-1932.*
FAITH AND TRUST

146 Tenderly, Tenderly, Lead Thou Me On

Isaiah 42:16
I Nephi 6:40

TENDERLY LEAD THOU ME ON 10.10.10.10.D.

1. Tender-ly, ten-der-ly, lead thou me on, On o'er the way where my
   Sau- vior hath gone; Bright on his path-way the sun-light hath shone;
   Ten-der-ly, ten-der-ly, lead thou me on. Close to his hand I so
   trem-bling-ly clung; Faint were the songs I so doubt-ing-ly sung.

2. Faith-ful-ly, faith-ful-ly, hold-ing my hand, On therough, slip-pery heights
   safe-ly I stand, Look-ing a-way to the heav-en-ly strand;
   Ten-der-ly, ten-der-ly, he leads me on. Now has my weak- heart grown
   Bro-ken-ly trust-  ing- ly strong; Ways have grown short that seemed once to be long;
   fall-ing from fal-ter-ing tongue; Ten-der-ly, ten-der-ly, lead thou me on.

Text: Joseph Smith III, 1832-1914.
Tune: Norman W. Smith, 1833-1917.
come forth from the Reorganization.

Vida Smith tells how on one Sunday morning she sat in the old “Brick Church” in Lamoni and listened as the speaker began his sermon using the text from Jeremiah 6:16: “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein.” Smith immediately “tuned out” and began contemplating the meaning of that scripture. She says: “[The speaker] soon faded from my realization as my eyes rested on the swaying branches of the trees outside and the soft clouds against the blue sky, and I felt the nearness of congenial friends. I felt at home in the house of God and I felt at ease before his mercy seat. The glory of the message of the ancient prophet flooded my soul and opening my quarterly I wrote on the fly-leaf the words of the song exactly as they appear in the [hymnal].”

During that hour of worship was born “The Old, Old Path,” an eloquent expression of the treasure of close companionship with good friends and with the Master. (See p. 132.)

At this point, then, in the early twentieth century, there were two hymnals, The Saints’ Hymnal and Zion’s Praises, in concurrent use in the Church, and a desire emerged to combine selections from both of them into a single volume. A committee of musicians was appointed in due course; and responding to surveys of preferences from among the membership, 442 hymns from the two books were chosen and published in 1933, continuing the use of the name, The Saints’ Hymnal.

One of the most interesting and revered hymns to come from this period is one that had been introduced in time for inclusion in the 1933 Saints’ Hymnal but passed over due to its origin. In 1907, physician and apostle Joseph Luff stood during a prayer service at the Stone Church in Independence and delivered a prophetic message in song. Had he employed the usual spoken manner, the message would no doubt have been soon forgotten. However, since he chose the musical idiom, today, nearly a century later, most members of the Community of Christ can sing every word of it from memory. The failure to include this hymn in the 1933 hymnal was due to a policy that forbade inspired messages given locally from being published to the Church at large. This policy was no doubt a reasonable one; however,

---

in this case many congregations decided to copy and paste this inspiring hymn into their hymnals anyway. It has been included in subsequent hymnals of the denomination. Sung to the familiar tune, “My Redeemer” (the same tune used by the Utah Church for “O My Father”), the “Hymn of Admonition” (“O my people, saith the Spirit”) is another of the treasures of the early Reorganization.

**RAISING THE STANDARDS**

In 1943, Franklyn S. Weddle, an accomplished musician, became the first person appointed to full-time leadership of the denomination’s music and worship life. His primary goal became the all-encompassing one of raising the level of music and worship throughout
1. O my people, saith the Spirit, Hear the word of God to-day;
2. Time is ripe! My work must hasten! Whoso will may bide the hour.
3. Love ye me and love all people—Love as I have loved you;
4. Get ye up, then, to your mount, Zion of this closing day!

Be not slothful but obedient, 'Tis the world's momen-tous day!
Naught can harm whom God pro-tects—El-e-men ts confess his power.
This your call—this my pur-pose—Thus be my disci-ples true.
For the glo-ry of my com-ing Waits to break up-on your way!

Un-to hon-or I have called you—Hon-or great as an-gels know;
Up ye, then, to the high places I have bid you oc-cu-py!
Then in this ex-alt-ed sta-tion Your com-pa-nion I will be;
Forth from thence your tes-ti-mony Shall to trem-blings na-tions go,

Heed ye, then, a Fa-ther's coun-sel, And by deeds your pur-pose show.
Per-il waits up-on the heed-less, Grace up-on the souls who try!
Ev-ery prom- ise of my Scrip-tures Will be ver-i-fied in thee.
And the world con-fess that with you God has res-i-dence be-low. A-men.

Tune: James McGranahan, 1840-1907, alt.
the Church, including the publication of a new hymnal with elevated musical and theological standards. A new committee was appointed in 1950 which included not only musicians, but also pastors, missionaries, teachers, writers, theologians, and Church administrators. The result of their efforts, a collection of 583 hymns titled simply The Hymnal was published in 1956. Weddle summarized its goals: “The committee has endeavored to maintain a high standard for both words and music, without becoming too stilted or formal. Hymns have been chosen not only for their emotional qualities, but for poetical excellence, musical quality, doctrinal soundness, and such other qualities as would promote dignity, order, and true reverence in worship.”31

As the committee worked to apply these higher standards, it abandoned many of the more sentimental, toe-tapping gospel hymns, which often contained repetitive texts and questionable or shallow theology. A number of old favorites were retained, however; and twenty-nine new tunes and forty-six new texts by RLDS members appeared for the first time, along with new hymns from other denominations. The desire to include several hymns from the Church’s heritage that would not meet the new standards was accommodated by adding an appendix of Historical Hymns in the back. Included in this section was the legendary LDS hymn, “Come, Come, Ye Saints,” minus the verse about finding a place in the West. The 1958 World Conference nevertheless voted to delete the hymn entirely.32 The Reorganized Church was still concerned about the distinction between the two denominations. It might be noted, however, that “We Thank Thee, O God, for a Prophet,” in a slightly revised version, continues to be a favorite of many Community of Christ members, most of whom do not realize it was written with Brigham Young in mind.

The higher standards of musical and theological integrity set by the committee brought about a number of changes in The Hymnal. For example, hymn tunes in the straightforward chordal style of the classical chorale were favored over the more rhythmically driven, repetitive gospel-style tunes. The committee also gave careful attention to ensure that the message of each hymn text was compatible with current beliefs. This point was held to be an important one, and it has long been felt that the beliefs of a people are not only expressed, but to a

large measure *shaped*, by the hymns it sings. Since the Community of Christ is a church without a formal creed, it can be argued that the hymns of the Church have, down through time, served to fill that particular role. As another student of hymnology has put it, “Hymns encode our specific beliefs, and also provide a spectrum of belief within which we discover both learning and accommodation for our own perception. For RLDS, they are often liturgical and substitute for a written creed.”

**SINGING THE FAITH**

As the corporate understanding of certain doctrines has evolved over the years, this evolution has been reflected in its hymn texts. Illustrating this point, Karen Troeh has traced the changing concepts of Zion in the Reorganized Church as demonstrated in its hymnody. In the earliest years of Mormonism, several variations of this concept can be identified: Zion as the city of God or Enoch’s perfect city (Genesis 7, Inspired Version; and Moses 7, Pearl of Great Price); Zion as a city of refuge or a place of safety (D&C 45); Zion as the “gathering” in Independence, Missouri (D&C 57 and subsequent sections).

Troeh finds evidence of each of these concepts in Emma’s first hymnal of 1835. The first is reflected in John Newton’s hymn, “Glorious Things of Thee Are Spoken,” particularly as “corrected” by W. W. Phelps in lines such as “... Zion, city of our God, ...” and “... On the Rock of Enoch founded.” The second concept is evident in the hymn, “Guide Us, O Thou Great Jehovah,” in lines such as “Keep us safe on Zion’s hill,” and “Guard us in this holy home.” The third concept is expressed in another hymn in that collection. In “There Is a Land the Lord Will Bless,” Phelps defines the place where “Israel gathers home” as the “fields along Missouri’s flood. ...”

Emma’s Nauvoo hymnal of 1841, along with her first Reorganization hymnal, dropped “There Is a Land the Lord Will Bless,” with its reference to Missouri, and added a new image of Zion—that of being an ensign to the world. This is perhaps best illustrated in the hymn

---

ZION AND THE KINGDOM
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Send Forth Thy Light, O Zion

Psalm 43:3, 4
D. and C. 16:3c, 4e

LANCASHIRE 7.6.7.6.D.

1. Send forth thy light, O Zion! Out from thy towers shall go
2. Send forth thy love, O Zion! Thy call is from above,
3. Send forth thy life, O Zion! Not for thyself alone

The radiant beams a people
In tune with God can know.
To make on earth incarnate
Christ’s sacrificial love.
Have come life-giving powers
By which the soul has grown.

Upborne by higher concepts
Of God’s eternal call,
For by the saints outreach ing
To those their lives can bless
Thy promise builds a people
Well-skilled in mind and hand.

Let shine afar the guide-lights,
Revealing God to all.
Shall come Zion ic witness
To heal earth’s broken ness.
Thy life is like a leaven
Of hope in every land.

Tune: Henry Smart, 1813-1879.
that begins:

Behold, the mountain of the Lord
In latter days shall rise
On mountaintops above the hills
And draw the wond’ring eyes.

The third stanza is even more pointed:

The beam that shines from Zion’s hill
Shall lighten ev’ry land . . . (emphasis mine).

This hymn was retained in Emma’s Reorganization hymnal of 1861 and in Mark Forscutt’s collections. It reappeared in an altered form without the third verse in the 1956 *The Hymnal* but is not included in the present *Hymns of the Saints*. It can, however, be found as No. 54 in the current (1985) LDS hymnal. Mark Forscutt’s hymnals, and by extension the *Saints’ Hymnals* of 1895 and 1933, continue to express the strong desire for the gathering. A particularly apt example is the adaptation of a well-known hymn of the time, “Shall We Gather at the River,” to read, “Shall We Gather Home to Zion?”

In 1909, the Reorganized Church received new instruction on the concept of Zion through Joseph Smith III. Section 128 of the Doctrine and Covenants affirms that Zion has no single geographic location and that Saints are called to live in interdependence with non-members in their communities. Thus, *The Saints’ Hymnal* of 1933 does not refer to a specific location for Zion, although the concept of the gathering is still mentioned. In *The Hymnal* of 1956, the concept of Zion as an ensign to the world, a “city on the hill,” is stressed. This is perhaps best expressed in an original hymn by Roy Cheville, “Send Forth Thy Light, O Zion!”

Dr. Cheville served as professor of religion and campus pastor at the Church’s college, Graceland College (now Graceland University), in Lamoni, Iowa, for many years. His teaching, along with his numerous books and articles, helped the Church mature in its theological understandings. In many of the worship services he planned, he could not find a hymn that was “just right,” so he would simply write one himself. Thus, his contribution to *The Hymnal* consists of ten texts and three revisions of existing texts. Cheville’s hymns typically used the language of strength and vitality, often resulting in
masculine imagery, which has been revised in the current hymnal. As an example, in “Send Forth Thy Light, O Zion,” the phrases, “God’s eternal call . . . / Revealing God to all,” were originally written as, “God’s eternal plan . . . / Revealing God to man.” And the current hymnals revision of the second stanza, seen in the musical example presented here, provides a particularly good illustration of the more inclusive concept of Zion offered by today’s Community of Christ. As originally written, this stanza read (emphasis mine):

Send forth thy love, O Zion!
Thou hast been called apart
To make on earth incarnate
The love in God’s own heart.
For only saints outreaching
To those their lives can bless
Shall dwell in the protection
Of Zion’s holiness.

**Exploring Diversity**

The present hymnal of the Community of Christ, *Hymns of the Saints*, was introduced in 1981. There had existed some feeling that, regardless of the statement in the preface of the previous hymnal, a number of its hymns did tend to be too “stilted and formal.” After testing the waters in 1974 and 1976 with two small booklets of hymns in various styles, a new committee set about the task of compiling a hymnal with greater stylistic diversity. They described the challenges they felt in their preface: “The task of hymn selection has been a formidable one. The committee recognized that since the early 1960s organized religion, including our own church, has passed through a sort of crucible characterized by changing theological concepts, the searching eye of historical research, shifting modes of expression, and increased sensitivity to the sanctity of personhood. The committee was also very much aware that the range of musical taste in the church had widened considerably during the past two decades.”

In their extensive deliberations over a period of ten years, the committee attempted to come to grips with the diversity they felt existed in the membership. The “wider range of musical taste in the

---

church” prompted them to include in *Hymns of the Saints* a variety of musical styles, including folk and lyrical-style melodic songs. These accompanied-melody songs, meant to be sung in unison, appear alongside the traditional hymn tunes in four-part chordal style which had inspired the long-standing RLDS tradition of robust part-singing. Even a few of the better old hymns and gospel songs from *Zion’s Praises* and other earlier collections were brought back, and the committee introduced several new hymns in the contemporary classical style along with songs of diverse national origins.

Another challenge mentioned in the preface, the “increased sensitivity to the sanctity of personhood,” was a reference to the problem of inclusive language. In this regard, the committee endeavored to implement the “Policy of Inclusive Language in Church Publications and Other Written Materials” adopted by the First Presidency in 1978. Whenever possible, it attempted to avoid gender-exclusive language (for example, the use of “men” to refer to “humankind”). As a result of this effort, to cite two examples, “Rise Up, O Men of God” became “Rise Up, O Saints of God,” and in the Christmas hymn, “O Little Town of Bethlehem,” the phrase, “peace to men on earth” became “peace, good will on earth.” As another example, in the previously cited “Great and Marvelous Are Thy Works,” the final phrase was changed from the original “Unto God alone wherever man is found” to “Unto God whose love and mercy have no bound.” This particular case illustrates one of the problems of altering words in well-known hymns, for since this phrase was part of a familiar refrain typically sung from memory, it took some time before congregations discovered the new words and were able to sing them with unanimity.

Other alterations to hymn texts were made in an effort to update archaic language or questionable theology. Thus, for example, in Parley P. Pratt’s “Come, O Thou King of Kings,” “all the chosen race” was altered to include “saints of every race.” And the hymn, “For All the Saints,” was revised to include living Saints, and its antiquated imagery such as “through gates of pearl streams in the countless host” was updated to the more expansive “from age to age resounds the countless host.” Among the revisions to “We Thank Thee, O God, for a Prophet,” mentioned earlier, the assertion that “the wicked who fight against Zion will surely be smitten at last,” was changed to the more positive declaration, “The Saints who will labor for Zion will surely be blessed at last.”
The Cause of Zion Summons Us

1. The cause of Zion summons us To claim a distant dream:
   The love of God in every place, The will of God supreme.
   The vision calls us to our task. Foraking self and pride,
   We love and reconcile with Christ The world for which he died.

2. The cause of Zion celebrates The victory over fear,
   The witness of the kingdom's power, New life already here.
   Although fulfillment seems remote, The journey just begun,
   The Kingdom has already come; The victory is won.

3. The cause of Zion prophesies The future yet to be,
   When men and women everywhere Shall walk in dignity.
   We now anticipate the day When pain and tears shall cease,
   When man-kind shall live as one In righteous-ness and peace.

Text: Geoffrey F. Spencer, 1927. Copyright 1960 Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Tune: William Croft, 1678-1727.
The desire to substantially upgrade the content of the hymns of the Church resulted in the composition of several new texts, some of them by committee members. One member discovered a latent talent for the poetic expression of profound concepts. Geoffrey F. Spencer was able to articulate beautifully many of the convictions and evolving doctrines of the Church—for example, the previously discussed concept of Zion. One of his hymns reflects a new understanding of Zion as a cause for which to labor, rather than a finite goal to be completed. It begins:

The cause of Zion summons us
To claim a distant dream;
The love of God in every place
The will of God supreme.
The vision calls us to our task,
Forsaking self and pride,
We love and reconcile with Christ
The world for which he died.

Another of Spencer’s eleven hymns in *Hymns of the Saints* is notable for his efforts to capture in a few verses what he felt was the essence of Restoration theology. Spencer explains how the hymn came into being:

Frequently in my contacts in the field, I would encounter the question, in one form or another, “What does the church believe today?” What I attempted to do here was to incorporate into the text what I believed to be foundational beliefs of the Restoration. With this in mind, I referred briefly to the concepts of: (1) restoration; (2) the living presence of divine power for the task; (3) the sacredness of all things; (4) the unity of spirit and element; (5) the ongoing search for truth; (6) men and women together in ministry;36 (7) the role of the church as sin-bearer; (8) the power of our heritage; and (9) the experience of the God who calls us into the future. In the course of working up the text, I found other ideas pressing for inclusion, or so it

---

36The Reorganized Church accepted the ordination of women in 1984.
Let Us Give Praise to the God of Creation

1. Let us give praise to the God of creation,
2. Persons are agents by God’s gracious willing,
3. All things are sacred, for use with thanksgiving,
4. Giftedness flows from the fount of creation;
5. Now let the saints hail so rich a foundation,

Lord of all history and source of all power,
Blessed with assurance of ultimate worth,
Boundless resources for each to employ;
Truth from all sources demands discipline;
Forged in our heritage, living today;

Calling us now to the world’s restoration;
Power is within us for history’s fulfilling;
Strength for the body and soul’s fuller living;
Women and men sharing skill’s dedication,
God who persists in the promised salvation

Granting us strength for the needs of this hour.
Stewards of all the resources of earth.
Spirit and element bonded in joy.
Bearing the burdens of sorrow and sin.
Goes on before us and shows us the way.

Tune: Lowell Mason, 1792-1872.
seemed, but resisted the temptation to add other stanzas.\textsuperscript{37}

These nine concepts were incorporated succinctly into the five stanzas of Spencer’s hymn, “Let Us Give Praise to the God of Creation.”

During the past ten years, the diversity of the Church’s musical repertory has increased even more with the publication of two small supplemental hymnals. In 1994, in response to the emphasis on peace encouraged by President Wallace B. Smith, a collection of forty-six hymns on that topic appeared under the title, \textit{Sing for Peace}. In 1999, the Church responded to pressure from some of the membership\textsuperscript{38} to recognize the popular “contemporary Christian music” style by publishing \textit{Sing a New Song}, a collection of fifty-two titles, including praise choruses and informal songs, twenty-three of them by Church members. A few of the better-known titles in this collection include “Awesome God,” “Shine, Jesus, Shine,” “As the Deer Panteth,” and “On Eagle’s Wings.”

As I noted earlier, most studies of Latter-day Saint hymnody have focused on publications of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. However, William Leroy Wilkes Jr., a non-RLDS researcher, has illuminated this topic in an especially interesting way by comparing LDS hymnody with that of the Reorganized Church. Examining various hymnals of both churches, he commented on both the “catholic outlook and self-definition” of the RLDS collections.\textsuperscript{39} In contrast to “the close-knit sacred-secular culture of Mormonism in early Utah, where uniformity and orthodoxy absorbed variety,” Wilkes suggested that the acceptance of diversity in the hymnody of the Reorganization has been a result of the smaller organization’s need for accommodation, and for a degree of “unity which did not demand uniformity.”\textsuperscript{40}

One of the important challenges facing today’s Community of Christ is to discover how to channel, in the most beneficial manner, the inherent tension which arises from the desire to offer ministry to a

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 61–62.
widely diverse body of people in today’s world while at the same time honoring and building upon its distinctive heritage. It is a challenge that permeates every aspect of Church life and one that will be felt quite directly by the next hymnal committee of the Church, already overdue for appointment, according to the publication pattern of former years.
MORMON HYMNODY:  
KIRTLAND ROOTS AND  
EVOLUTIONARY BRANCHES

Nancy J. Andersen

Religious beliefs for all traditions are expressed powerfully in hymnody. Former Mormon Tabernacle Choir conductor J. Spencer Cornwall declared, “Hymnology is the terse essence of the religious life coupled with the enhancement of reverential song.”  

Although some early nineteenth-century American churches viewed congregational singing as evil, in July 1830, at the aptly named Harmony, Pennsylvania, Mormon scripture likened “the song of the righteous” to prayer, promising the congregation a “blessing upon their heads” (LDS D&C 25:12). Numerous scriptural passages expound the virtues of music and song, but this is the only instance where modern scripture directed the compilation of a hymnal.

B. H. Roberts, a nineteenth-century LDS historian and member of the First Council of the Seventy, wrote: “Since it is natural for man to express his highest emotion, perhaps, in music . . . it would be ex-
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1J. Spencer Cornwall, Stories of Our Mormon Hymns (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1963), xxiv.
pected that the highly religious emotions attendant upon the religious events of the church of the New Dispensation, would . . . give birth to an hymnology . . . of a somewhat special kind.”

Nevertheless, the recurring challenge for Mormon hymnists has been, in the opinion of musicologist Michael Hicks, “to appeal to the masses the church hopes to save, yet maintain the church’s distinct cultural identity.” Many have endeavored to achieve this goal, each with a worthy motive.

Attempts to produce suitable LDS music during the nineteenth century resulted in six principal hymnals, while the twentieth century produced three major publications, with multiple editions of most hymnals. This article traces the evolution of these collections by exploring their similarities and differences, highlighting the main contributions of each to the musical identity of the Latter-day Saints.

EMMA SMITH’S 1835 HYMNAL

The religious music of early nineteenth-century Ohio was predominantly that heard at the great revivals and camp meetings. Latter-day Saint converts from numerous Protestant backgrounds likely brought their hymnals to Mormon meetings, for using borrowed music was a common practice for many new religions. Mormons of the time were not alone in awaiting the second coming of Christ, in believing in the necessity of baptism, or in longing for the millennium. These themes appeared in other religious music of the day, but finding such distinctive LDS messages in existing hymn literature as the existence of living prophets or new scripture, while not unheard of, would have been rarer. Although the most distinctive doctrinal developments came during the Nauvoo period, the need to express Latter-day Saint beliefs in song would certainly encourage the creation of a Mormon hymnal to sustain the hopes and beliefs of the Saints who were joining themselves to the restored church.

Following divine mandate (D&C 25:11), Emma Hale Smith began gleaning beloved, traditional songs from published hymnals of the day. Her challenge was to produce a collection of hymns that would appeal to worshippers from many previous religious affilia-

---


3 Michael Hicks, Mormonism and Music (Chicago: University of Illinois, 1989), 145.
tions yet reflect the newly restored gospel. William Wine Phelps was appointed to revise the texts to reflect LDS doctrines and arrange them for printing.

Publication of the new book was stalled by geographical separation, for Emma Smith resided in Kirtland and W. W. Phelps in Independence. Phelps, who was publishing the Church’s monthly paper, the *Evening and the Morning Star*, in Independence, began publishing hymn texts in it. Thirty-three had appeared before the destruction of the printing press in July 1833 suspended further publication until December of that year. The *Star* resumed publication for about ten months, after which it was renamed the *Latter-Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate*. Nine more hymns appeared.4  By May 1835, Phelps had moved to Kirtland5 to help typeset the Book of Commandments under the direction of Frederick G. Williams who had charge of the new church publishing company.

After that project was completed, the Kirtland High Council, on September 14, 1835, repeated the earlier revelatory authorization for Emma Smith to “make a selection of Sacred Hymns, according to the revelation” while Phelps was “appointed to revise and arrange them for printing.”6 *A Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Church of the Latter Day Saints* appeared in early 1836, just in time for the dedication of the Kirtland Temple.7 Of the six songs from this hymnal sung at the dedication,8 three still appear in the current (1985) LDS hymnal: “Now Let Us Rejoice,” “The Spirit of God,” and “This Earth Was

4Ibid., 42.
Once a Garden Place,” all written by Phelps. Based on existing records, the third hymn, known today as “Adam-ondi-Ahman,” was sung more frequently than any other hymn in LDS meetings during the first five years of Mormon hymnody.\(^9\) Emma Smith’s hymnal was divided into eight sections: “Sacred Hymns,” “Morning Hymns,” “Evening Hymns,” “Farewell Hymns,” “On Baptism,” “On Sacrament,” “On Marriage,” and “Miscellaneous.”

Considering non-Mormon sources of hymns in Emma’s hymnal, Isaac Watts (1674–1748), an independent English hymnist, contributed the most—sixteen. A prolific author of over 600 hymns, Watts is known as the father of English hymnody. He rewrote Psalms and other scriptures as metrical songs in the language of a Christian, making them easier to understand and sing.\(^10\) A dissenter from the Church of England, Watts was criticized by those who thought it wrong to sing “uninspired hymns.” He countered: “If we can pray to God in sentences that we have made up ourselves, then surely we can sing to God in sentences that we have made up ourselves,” a philosophy very compatible with Mormonism. His belief that Jesus Christ and God the Father were separate beings and that Jehovah was the being who appeared to the Old Testament prophets also made his


hymns appropriate for Emma’s collection. Phelps altered the wording in only three of Watts’s texts.\(^{12}\)

One of the unchanged texts is Watts’s adaptation of Psalms 90:1–2. The original reads:

“Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations.
Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.”

The Watts version reads: “O God, our help in ages past, / Our hope for years to come, / Our shelter from the stormy blast, / And our eternal home.”\(^{13}\)

Next to Watts, Baptist hymns were most frequently represented with thirteen selections followed by the Church of England (eight); three unknown; two each from the General Convention of Christian Churches, Methodists, and Presbyterians; and one each from Congregational, non-denominational, Shaker, and Unitarian movements.\(^{14}\)

Latter-day Saints contributed about forty original hymns addressing such concepts as agency, baptism by immersion, the Second Coming and millennium, the creation, the restoration, the City of Enoch, and the establishment of Zion.\(^{15}\) Phelps authored three fourths (about thirty) of them. Since hymns have the ability to instruct as well as uplift, Phelps’s texts, including his reworkings of borrowed hymns, shed considerable light on the Saints’ understanding of new doctrines. Other lyricists were Parley P. Pratt (three); one each by Eliza R. Snow, Edward Partridge, Thomas B. Marsh, and Philo Dibble; and three of unknown authorship.\(^{16}\) Perhaps Emma Smith wrote some of them herself. Mormon composer Lowell Durham commented on Mormon hymns generally:

In contrast to music generally used by the churches of that day, the Mormon-produced hymns were as light to darkness, and of brightness to gloom. All the old expressions of fear and sorrow, the terrible


\(^{13}\)Hymns of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 31.


\(^{15}\)Ibid., 33.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., 52–56.
confessions and lamentations over sin, the constant dwelling upon the sufferings of the Crucified Savior, and the eternal torture in store for sinners, gave place in the songs of the Mormon church to expressions of hope, joy, and the sense of sins forgiven. More emphasis is placed upon His love and glorious conquest than upon His earthly sufferings.”

Phelps edited lyrics for some of the fifty non-Mormon hymns to more accurately reflect LDS doctrine. For instance, Isaac Watts’s words, “He dies, the friend of sinners dies,” became “He died, the great Redeemer died.” In verse 4, “The rising God forsakes the tomb” was changed to “The rising Lord forsook the tomb,” clarifying that it was Jesus Christ who rose from the dead.

Another editing pattern was from private devotion to communal worship. William Williams’s “Guide me, O thou great Jehovah,” was rewritten as “Guide us . . .” Phelps also rewrote Joseph Swain’s “O thou in whose presence my soul takes delight, / On whom in affliction I call, / My comfort by day and my song in the night, / My hope, my salvation, my all.” Phelps’s version is the more communal “Redeemer of Israel, our only delight, / On whom for a blessing we call, / Our shadow by day and our pillar by night, / Our king, our companion, our all.” (By the 1889 printing of the Manchester edition, “companion” had become “deliverer.”)

The first hymn in Emma’s book was a text by Sally Swey, a Free Baptist, containing a powerful affirmation of agency and religious freedom: “Know then that ev’ry soul is free, / To choose his life and what he’ll be; / For this eternal truth is given, / That God will force no man to heaven.” The hymnal ended with “The spirit of God like a fire is burning, / The latter-day glory begins to come forth,” W. W. Phelps’s energetic six-verse hymn written for the Kirtland Temple dedication. In addition to being a popular congregational hymn, arrangements of it have been sung at the dedication of every LDS temple since then.

The hymnbook did not contain titles or tunes, but the texts were all sung to familiar Christian and popular tunes. This method was necessary, because no Mormon-composed tunes existed. Singing familiar worship music probably helped the converts assimilate the new doc-

trinal messages of the lyrics. The research of Mormon musicologist Michael Hicks reveals that some texts were sung to five- or six-note folk tunes, often in minor modes. Others were sung to brighter and more varied tunes based on a full major scale. Congregations generally sang in unison and a capella (without accompaniment).

Each text indicated a meter pattern referring to the number of lines in a stanza and the number of syllables voiced in each line. The pattern for CM (common meter) was 8,6,8,6; SM (short meter) was 6,6,8,6; and LM (long meter) was 8,8,8,8. Four-line stanzas based on identical metrical patterns could be sung to any tune with a matching meter. Hymn tunes were more fixed for texts designated as PM, meaning “peculiar meter,” later called “particular meter.” The poetic meter for these songs varied greatly, and their associated tunes were generally not interchangeable. (See Appendix A.)

With such a variety of tunes possible for a single text, some favorites naturally emerged. “O God, th’ Eternal Father,” usually a sacrament hymn in contemporary LDS services, and “From Greenland’s Icy Mountains” were both sung to the lively tune for “Come, All Whose Souls Are Lighted.” This juxtaposition reveals the contemporary equation of “reverent” with “slow and solemn.”

The preface of the 1835 hymnal expressed the hope that these hymns would “answer every purpose till more are composed, or till we are blessed with a copious variety of the songs of Zion.” Evidently, Emma Smith foresaw that Mormon music would expand over time.

**1840 Manchester Hymnal**

Mormon missionaries reached the British Isles in 1837. Three years later, a conference in April 1840 at Preston, England, passed a resolution authorizing Brigham Young, Parley P. Pratt, and John Taylor to compile, revise, and publish a hymnal. Brigham Young explained to Joseph Smith: “Concerning the Hymn Book—when we arrived here, we found the brethren had laid by their old hymn books,

---


20. Instrumental accompaniment was not introduced until later in Nauvoo. A solo violin, bass, or flute would play the melody while the congregation sang. Brass bands played in some meetings, but not keyboard or chord instruments. Hicks, “What Hymns Early Mormons Sang,” 13.

and they wanted new ones; for the Bible, religion and all is new to them. When I came to learn more about carrying books into the states, or bringing them here, I found the duties were so high that we should never want to bring books from the states.”

Since Pratt was in Manchester where the actual printing was done, he assumed responsibility for most of the editing. Working at a feverish pace, he revised borrowed hymns, both Mormon and non-Mormon, and wrote forty-four of his own texts. Pratt also added many texts based on standard meters from British composers like Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley.

In just eleven weeks, *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs* was published and ready for distribution. Brigham Young’s preface read: “The Saints in this country have been very desirous for a Hymn Book adapted to their faith and worship, that they might sing the truth with an understanding heart, and express their praise, joy, and gratitude in songs adapted to the New and Everlasting Covenant.” The volume contained 271 texts, including seventy-eight from Emma’s 1835 hymnal. Although Joseph Smith would have preferred that the new hymnal emerge from Nauvoo, after reviewing a copy on July 19, 1840, he wrote, approving the British missionaries’ efforts.

The Manchester hymnal opened with Pratt’s stirring “The morning breaks, the shadows flee / Lo! Zion’s standard is unfurled! / The dawning of a brighter day / Majestic rises on the world.” The twelve divisions were “Public Worship,” “Dismission—Doxologies,” “Sacramental Hymns,” “Baptismal Hymns,” “Funeral Hymns,” “On Priesthood,” “Second Coming of Christ,” “Gathering of Israel,” “Morning Hymns,” “Evening Hymns,” “Farewell Hymns,” and “Miscellaneous.”

As usual, the texts were sung to familiar melodies appropriate for the designated meter. An example from the life of President David O. McKay illustrates the practicality of this custom. As a young missionary in 1897, Elder McKay admitted that he was not very musical, but he knew three songs from the Manchester hymnal that he and a companion could sing to tune of “Israel, Israel, God Is Calling.”

---

22 *History of the Church*, 4:120.
23 *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs* (Manchester, England: Printed by W. R. Thomas, 1840), preface.
When holding public meetings on street corners in Scotland, he and his companion would sing these three songs every night:

Taking our place without any audience, we started out with an appeal for people to come and listen, “Israel, Israel, God is Calling, / Calling thee from lands of woe. . . .” After the prayer, we appealed for help, “O My Father, thou that dwellest, / In that high and glorious place. . . .” Then before we closed the meeting, we bore testimony to the restoration of the gospel, so it was appropriate to sing “What was witnessed in the heavens? / Why an angel earthward bound. . . .” It made no difference—the repetition of the melodies—because we didn’t have the same audience at the conclusion as we did at the beginning.25

As the Saints left Nauvoo in 1846, British emigrants took along their hymnals. Not only was this collection better known but also, according to Hicks, “it was the work better-suited to the expanding theology of Joseph’s last years.”26 In 1871, its fourteenth edition was the very first book to be printed from movable type manufactured in Utah Territory.27 At the time of statehood, 1896, Utah’s population was roughly half British, which no doubt encouraged the use of the English collection. Twenty-five editions of this Manchester volume were published between 1840 and 1912, and it remained in general use throughout the church until 1927.28

**1841 Nauvoo Hymnal**

Shortly before the publication of the Manchester hymnal, the Saints had relocated in Nauvoo, Illinois. According to Helen Macare, a scholar of Mormon hymnody, by July 1839, a new standardized collection was discussed, since some individuals had printed unauthorized hymnals. Letters from missionaries and from Saints in outlying areas all stressed the need for a hymnal. Diaries indicated that a missionary needed a Bible and a hymnbook even more than he needed

25 Claire Middlemiss, Cherished Experiences from the Writings of David O. McKay (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1955), 131–32.
26 Hicks, Mormonism and Music, 31.
27 Sterling D. Wheelwright, “The Role of Hymnody in the Development of the Latter-day Saint Movement” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1943), 78.
the Book of Mormon. Emma Smith was asked to compile another hymnal. *A Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints* containing 304 hymns was as hastily prepared as Pratt’s 1840 hymnal had been, for not until November 1840 did Emma Smith publish a call for hymns, and the book was completed by March, just four months later.\(^{30}\)

As a nucleus, Smith used her 1835 edition. She borrowed seventy-seven texts from Pratt’s Manchester hymnal, now available in Nauvoo in its fourth edition. The remainder were largely from non-Mormon sources, both English and American, but again Watts was most represented with twenty-four texts. According to Hicks, the 1841 hymnal revealed “a retreat from Zionism; a revivalist, grace-oriented phraseology; an intimacy with Jesus on the cross; a personal rather than communal tone; and a confessional rather than rejoicing spirit.” He attributes this shift in emphasis to the absence of Phelps’s influence. Excommunicated in 1839, he had been restored to fellowship in 1841 and sent on a mission.\(^{31}\)

Hicks commented that “the retrenchment implicit in Emma’s 1841 selection came at an unpropitious moment in the evolution of Mormon doctrine.”\(^{32}\) Between 1842 and 1844, Joseph began teaching about vicarious ordinances for the dead, emphasized the resurrection, and instituted temple ordinances, including celestial marriage. In view of these new doctrines, as well as the popularity of the Manchester hymnbook with British emigrants, the Nauvoo hymnal soon lost its appeal.

### 1844 Little and Gardner Hymnal

Adding hymn tunes began in 1844 when Jesse C. Little and George B. Gardner of the Eastern States Mission published *A Collection of Sacred Hymns for the Use of Latter Day Saints* in Bellows Falls, Vermont. It was actually a singing school book containing a section on the rudiments of music theory. According to music scholar Robert K. Briggs, musical literacy in the United States was highest in New England where the drive for national music education was in its infancy. He notes that Little and Gardner keenly felt a need for printed music in their locality


\(^{30}\)Ibid., 268.


\(^{32}\)Ibid., 29.
to support vocal training and to enhance the worship services of their congregations. Mormon branches were being established throughout New England, and the diverse hymnody backgrounds of new members required steps toward musical unification.  

Little and Gardner’s hymnbook marked the beginning of several hymnals published for specific missions or regions. They borrowed texts from other LDS publications, including seven from the 1840 Manchester hymnal and fifteen from the 1841 Nauvoo hymnal. The hymnal included hymn titles (a first) and melody and bass lines (another first) for thirty-one of the forty-eight texts. All the tunes were in major keys, in contrast to many hymns of this period sung in minor keys. Twenty-seven of the texts were authored by Mormons. Twenty-one of the texts with tunes were from Protestant sources. The seventeen texts without musical notation, all written by Mormons except one, were sung to popular tunes of the day.

Three of the tunes first printed here remain essentially unchanged in the 1985 edition: “The Spirit of God,” “Adamondi-Ahman,” and “From Greenland’s Icy Mountains.” Since Little and Gardner were both New Englanders, perhaps the tunes in this volume were already being used by the eastern Saints.

1857 Psalmody

In the main, the Saints who followed Brigham Young to the Salt Lake Valley continued to use the Manchester hymnal. Mormon hymnody still depended on borrowed tunes until British music professor and composer John Tullidge produced his Latter-Day Saints’ Psalmody in Liverpool, England, in 1857. He insisted that the “freshness and vigor of the Mormon spirit demanded something better, compatible with praise from full and grateful hearts.”

Tullidge’s small book contained original settings for thirty-seven hymns. His musical notation of four vocal parts was written on two staves using complete seven-note scales, all in major keys.

---
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with lively tempos. Tullidge’s compositions were impressive but proved so difficult for untrained congregations to sing that this collection had no lasting impact.

1889 Psalmody

The next major publication in LDS hymnody occurred in 1889 when, with the approval of President John Taylor, a committee consisting of professional British musicians Ebenezer Beesley, George Careless, Joseph Daynes, Thomas Griggs, and Evan Stephens, began writing and collecting original tunes. Named after Tullidge’s *Latter-Day Saints’ Psalmody*, their work provided music for every hymn in the Manchester hymnal.

According to the preface, it was “the largest and most important work yet published in Utah or for the Church. . . . The original music, with some few exceptions, is the production of our ‘mountain home’ composers.” Of the 330 hymns, 70 percent were composed by Mormon musicians.

Each hymn provided a tune name and meter designation, referenced to the hymn number in the Manchester hymnal. Composers’ names were indicated for the first time. Notation for four vocal parts was written on three staves (indeed challenging for organists), with tenors singing notes on the top line. The compilers did not explain this odd musical typesetting; but according to Michael Hicks, tenors traditionally sang the melody in common tunebooks of that century, even though the melody line was actually assigned to sopranos in the 1889 hymnal. Such an arrangement implies a compromise between older (American) and newer (British) traditions.37

Unfortunately, this collection was also choir-centered and largely unsuitable for congregational singing, a “weakness in early Mormon hymn settings.”38 The need for congregational-friendly musical resources encouraged publications by the auxiliary organizations.

Other Noteworthy Publications

After the Sunday School was established in 1866, a weekly hymn practice was instituted which fostered the writing of many hymns. Eventually, the Deseret Sunday School published many of its own col-
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lections—between 1880 and 1940—featuring dozens of new songs. Several were a collaboration of lyricist Joseph Townsend and composer William Clayson, two associates in the Payson, Utah, Sunday School, who were also talented song writers. Such spirited Sunday School songs as “Hope of Israel,” “Improve the Shining Moments,” “The Lord Is My Light,” “Did You Think to Pray,” “The Iron Rod,” “Joseph Smith’s First Prayer,” “Count Your Blessings,” “Love at Home,” and “Let Us All Press On” became standards in all Mormon meetings.

A significant work compiled by nine U.S. mission presidents, published as Songs of Zion in 1908, was originally designed for congregations outside of the Rocky Mountain region. This song book incorporated numerous popular Protestant gospel hymns such as “Put Your Shoulder to the Wheel,” “Do What Is Right,” “Dear to the Heart of the Shepherd,” and many others which had previously appeared in the Deseret Sunday School Song Book. The Songs of Zion soon gained wide appeal throughout the Church, including in Utah. This favored collection, according to Hicks, “foreshadowed the spirit of the 1920s, a decade of churchwide consolidation . . . led by new church president Heber J. Grant.”

**LATTER-DAY SAINT HYMNS (1927)**

President Grant appointed a General Music Committee in 1920 to produce a revised, standard, uniform hymnbook to serve the entire Church membership for all occasions, “intended to take the place of the Latter-Day Saints’ Psalmody, Songs of Zion and the small hymn book [Manchester hymnal], being a combination of the best to be found in these three books.” Rather hopefully, it claimed, “But all hymns that have been proved of real value and benefit in our worship are retained.”

This committee discarded many hymns dating back to Emma Smith’s original hymnals and reduced the numbers of tunes and words borrowed from other denominations. *Latter-Day Saint Hymns* had largely become a product of its own people. Seventy-four percent (308 of its 419 texts) were written by Latter-day Saints. Furthermore, a remarkable 86 percent of them were set to Mormon-composed tunes.

---
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The new texts in this hymnal dwelt on personal spiritual experience, the meaning of life’s trials, and even the majesty of the Mormon landscape, while retreating from the themes of community and the Millennium so popular in Mormonism’s earliest days. In an attempt to promote better relations between the Church and the nation, the committee tactfully edited a number of old texts. “Praise to the Man,” which previously contained the words “Long shall his blood . . . stain Illinois” was changed to “Long shall his blood . . . plead unto heaven.” In “O Ye Mountains High,” “On the necks of thy foes thou shalt tread” became “Without fear of thy foes thou shalt tread.” Additionally, “The Spirit of God” had two verses removed, possibly because of too-explicit temple imagery.

Supplied by Church headquarters in sufficient quantities for all Mormon congregations, this hymnal was the first to make printed music available for every worshipper. Consequently, an author’s need to rely on familiar tunes that used the three standard meter forms (common, short, and long) decreased. Lyrics with varied meters fostered the creation of more interesting melodies, and vice versa. Musical notation appeared in the familiar two-staff format, certainly a relief to Church members with limited musical expertise. Authors’ names and metronome markings were included for the first time. A five-fold index of authors, composers, first lines, meters, and subjects was the most extensive yet provided. The book contained more congregational selections than the Psalmsody, but still favored choir renditions. Despite the noble intentions of the committee, LDS congregations had difficulty relinquishing their old hymnals.

**Hymns (1948)**

An ambitious project to compile three new books was underway during 1947, the centennial of the pioneers’ arrival in the Salt Lake Valley, even though it was not completed until 1948. *Hymns: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, for adult gatherings, *Recreational Songs*, for youth, and *The Children Sing*, for youngsters, were to replace all other musical congregational offerings for Mormon gatherings, “to make a clear separation between legitimate adult devotional music and . . . music clearly intended for children but still being

41George D. Pyper, *Stories of Latter-day Saint Hymns: Their Authors and Composers* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1939), introduction.
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sung by adults.” About half (54 percent) of the texts were authored by Mormons. Several outdated gospel songs and choir tunes were dropped, yet substantial numbers of old Protestant favorites reappeared, such as “Come, Thou Fount of Every Blessing,” missing from the 1889 and 1927 publications. The music committee, chaired by Tracy Y. Cannon, wrote the preface, but the First Presidency (George Albert Smith, J. Reuben Clark, and David O. McKay) signed it.

The hymnal featured seven divisions: “Closing,” “Funeral,” “Gospel Principles,” “MIA and Sunday School,” “Praise and Assurance,” “Sacrament,” and “Special Days.” The entire volume was generally, though not exclusively, arranged alphabetically. Thus, *Hymns* began with “Abide with Me! Fast Falls the Eventide.”

Response to the book was unenthusiastic, and a substantial revision appeared in 1950. “Battle Hymn of the Republic” was deleted, while “A Mighty Fortress,” “A Poor Wayfaring Man of Grief,” and “Choose the Right” reappeared from the 1927 hymnal. This edition also added an index of authors, composers, and song meters. This revision furnished the Church with congregational worship music for the next thirty-five years.

*Hymns (1985)*

When Harold B. Lee became Church president in 1972, he authorized the formation of a “Church Music Department” that was five times larger than the one it replaced, with nine subcommittees, one of which was responsible for preparing a new hymnal. This committee met for the first time just eight days before Lee’s unexpected death.

The hymnbook committee proposed the project to the new First Presidency, under Spencer W. Kimball, emphasizing the need for songs that would “proclaim the revealed truth in this day and time and . . . that are most meaningful to the present-day worldwide Church.” Although the project was authorized to continue, after more than three years of work, review, and discussion, still without a completed project, the committee was disbanded in 1977 and replaced by a smaller “Music Division” headed by Michael F. Moody.

---
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Not until 1983, after the new editions of the scriptures had been completed, did the First Presidency ask the Music Division to proceed with a new hymnbook. The instructions revealed a certain skepticism about the committee members’ professionalism, since they included the caution to “put aside their musical training when it came to matters of taste,” and “discern what the masses in the Church . . . needed and wanted.” One adviser quipped pointedly that the committee had “only one disability; they knew too much about music.”

The committee set to work and, in August 1985, on the 150th anniversary of the Church’s first hymnal, _Hymns of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints_ was published with a total of 341 selections. The First Presidency (Spencer W. Kimball, Marion G. Romney, and Gordon B. Hinckley) wrote the preface, which expounded on the power of music not only in Church meetings, but in homes and personal lives, and emphasized the value of using hymns to lift spirits and evoke righteous thoughts and actions. According to Moody, criterion for the new hymnal had been “to select music that people would want to hum as they walk down the street and go about their daily work.”

This hymnal simplified many accompaniments, eliminated seldom-sung hymns and choir anthems, but maintained separate sections for men’s and women’s arrangements. About a fourth of the selections were new—seventy-nine hymns and a few (twelve) children’s songs. One of the new hymns was a popular evangelical song, previously, “How Great Thou Art,” included at the request of then-senior Apostle Elder Ezra Taft Benson, who often requested its singing at meetings over which he presided. New tunes were written for thirteen existing texts, “resulting in a distinct melody for every hymn.”

A first-time feature was a suggested introduction for the accompanist, indicated by brackets above the music score. Two scriptural references were furnished for each hymn to facilitate deeper contemplation of the lyrics. Extensive indexes of seven types gave this hymnal unprecedented value as a teaching tool. An eight-page appendix, “Us-
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ing the Hymnbook,” offered suggestions on utilizing this collection effectively. Authors and composers were listed alphabetically, their names asterisked, if they were LDS, with all their contributions grouped together.

Each tune was given a separate name, different from the title of the text. Knowing the tune name allowed organists to locate arrangements in other published sources for use as prelude music or special accompaniments. Reviving a useful feature from earlier collections was the return of a song meter index, once again making possible the interchanging of hymn lyrics and tunes.

Other modifications included the editing of some lyrics to reflect a worldwide society of Saints. According to Karen Lynn Davidson, who served on the committee, a comparison with the previous hymnal would reveal that “we no longer expect all our converts to gather to Utah, we no longer see the world around us as hostile, our commitment to missionary work continues, and we wish to emphasize our devotion to such important ideals of family, service, and obedience.”

Hicks observed a shifting to gender-inclusive language for the titles of two hymns (38 and 39) where the words “Sons of Zion” became “Saints of Zion.” These two hymns were removed from the male section of the former hymnal and relocated in the congregational section of the new edition to encourage more frequent use in general worship services.

**CONCLUSION**

To Emma Smith’s credit, twenty-six of the ninety hymns in her original collection have endured the test of time, appearing in every major collection to the present (1835, 1840, 1844, 1889, 1927, 1948, 1985). Although some hymns are more popular than others in the modern Church, their abiding relevance over time cannot be debated.

Mormon hymnody shows a marked pattern for preference over time for the same writers. (See Appendix B.) Those most popular in the nineteenth century are still quoted in the greatest number in the twentieth century. Isaac Watts remains the time-honored non-Mor-
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mon writer in all major publications, with nine of his hymns still appearing in the 1985 hymnal, followed by Charles Wesley, British co-founder of the Methodist movement.

W. W. Phelps is the paramount LDS author, with fifteen of his original texts still sung by modern Saints. Parley P. Pratt’s contributions dominated the 1840 and 1927 hymnals; however, only ten are included in the 1985 hymnbook. The number of Eliza R. Snow’s lyrics rival Watts, Wesley, Phelps, and Pratt in all but Emma’s 1835 and 1841 hymnals. The most prolific poets of twentieth century texts are Evan Stephens, Joseph Townsend, and Orson F. Whitney.

Mormon composers show a more checkered pattern. (See Appendix C.) Extensive use of worship music from other Christian sources (whether tunes or texts) “unites the Saints to a larger fellowship of believers,” which Mormon hymnody has implemented throughout its existence. (See Appendix D.) The 1985 hymnal includes only two of John Tullidge’s hymn tunes surviving from the thirty-seven he wrote for the 1857 Psalmody. They are “An Angel from On High” and “Come, All Ye Saints of Zion.” Ebenezer Beesley, George Careless, Joseph J. Daynes, Thomas Griggs, and Evan Stephens collectively accounted for 49 percent of the 1889 Psalmody and 47 percent of the 1927 Latter-day Saint Hymns. George Careless, Mormon Tabernacle Choir conductor from 1865 to 1880, was the most prolific composer represented in the 1889 hymnal (sixty-four tunes); but Evan Stephens (Tabernacle Choir conductor from 1890 to 1916) accounted for eighty-six tunes in the 1927 edition. No single notable Mormon composer comes close to this record, although Tracy Y. Cannon, William Clayson, Edward P. Kimball, Leroy Robertson, A. C. Smyth, and Alexander Schreiner made significant contributions.

Appendix E suggests some of the conservatism of modern Mormon musical tastes. Every new hymnal built on a core of hymns retained from predecessor editions. I have selected 193 hymns out of the current 325 titles, grouped according to the edition in which each first appeared. The results suggest how musical styles and tastes changed over the decades.

Currently, Latter-day Saint hymnody is diverse. According to Michael Moody, “It includes simple American hymns, appealing gospel songs, noble hymns sung by the early English Saints, hymns borrowed

from other religious traditions, unique LDS choir hymns of the late 1800s, and other hymns created by Latter-day Saints.”

With the Church expanding into all parts of the world, global Mormon hymnody is both necessary and challenging. The meter of hymns makes the poem pleasurable because it is intrinsically delightful, but it is also part of the total meaning—a feeling that is easily lost when a poem is paraphrased or translated. Church leaders have desired to bring the music of Zion to LDS congregations of all cultures. However, David Frischknecht, managing director of the Church Translation Department, recognizes that “language doesn’t translate word for word, much less syllable for syllable.” Therefore, the Church’s goal is to have the translated hymns convey the same message, be doctrinally correct, and maintain poetic artistry. The Church Music Division reports that, as of January 2006, the Church has published twenty international hymnals based on the 1985 edition (nine in production), each containing at least 200 hymns. Seventy-one collections of selected hymns are available with sixteen more in production, representing 116 foreign languages.

The Church’s Music Division’s goal is to provide hymnals in 200 foreign languages, providing musical resources for Mormons throughout the world.

The Church Music Division sponsors an annual hymn-writing contest, averaging about 200 entries. In recent years, compositions have been received from such countries as Russia, France, Netherlands, Germany, Argentina, Spain, and Brazil. Moody predicted that “eventually, other cultures will have their own contributions to make, and new hymnbook editions will be compiled to serve future generations of Latter-day Saints throughout the world.”

Considering all that has transpired since the Lord commissioned Emma Smith “to make a selection of sacred hymns . . . to be had in my Church” (D&C 25:11), the evidence confirms that hymns are indispensable in congregational and private worship. The devel-

---

56David Frischknecht, quoted in “Artistic Touch Needed to Translate Hymns” (editorial), Church News, March 31, 2001, 11.
57Ibid.
58Ibid.
opment of Mormon hymnody has been a challenging process of defining and redefining LDS culture through its music. Revised hymnals became necessary as Latter-day Saints’ musical identities conflicted with social, cultural, and political circumstances, resulting in modified hymns, melodies, meters, and rhythms. Also influential were trends in devotional music or needs presented by a worldwide church. New hymnals have liberally adopted fresh works by talented individuals from within and outside the LDS faith. As Roberts expected, “the Church of the New Dispensation [has given] birth to an hymnology of a somewhat special kind.” Indeed, present-day Mormon congregations are “blessed with a copious variety of the songs of Zion,” which Emma Smith envisioned more than 170 years ago.

APPENDIX A
EXAMPLES OF METER PATTERNS

Common Meter (CM, 8 6 8 6)
O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope in years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.
—Isaac Watts

Long Meter (LM, 8 8 8 8)
He died, the great Redeemer died,
And Israel’s daughters wept around.
A solemn darkness veiled the sky;
A sudden trembling shook the ground.
—Isaac Watts

Short Meter (SM, 6 6 6 6)
Come, we that love the Lord,
And let our joys be known.
Join in a song with sweet accord,
And worship at his throne.
—Isaac Watts
Peculiar/Particular Meter (7 7 4 4 7 7 7)
Gently raise the sacred strain;
For the Sabbath’s come again
That man may rest,
That man may rest,
And return his thanks to God
For his blessings to the blest,
For his blessings to the blest.
—W. W. Phelps

APPENDIX B
CONTRIBUTIONS OF EARLY AUTHORS TO MAJOR HYMNALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>1835</th>
<th>1891*</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. W. Phelps</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parley P. Pratt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza R. Snow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Watts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wesley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orson F. Whitney</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The indexed twentieth edition of the Manchester hymnal.

APPENDIX C
NUMBERS OF HYMN TUNES BY COMPOSER IN MAJOR EDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1889*</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer Beesley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Y. Cannon</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Careless</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clayson</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph J. Daynes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Griggs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward P. Kimball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Robertson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Numbers of Hymn Tunes by Composer in Major Editions (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1889*</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Schreiner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. C. Smyth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Stephens</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tullidge</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contained accompaniments for every hymn in the Manchester hymnal.

### Appendix D

**Mormon/Non-Mormon Contributions to Hymnals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDS</th>
<th>Non-LDS</th>
<th>LDS</th>
<th>Non-LDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>40 (44%)</td>
<td>50 (56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840*</td>
<td>137 (37%)</td>
<td>232 (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>308 (74%)</td>
<td>111 (26%)</td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>308 (74%)</td>
<td>111 (26%)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>171 (54%)</td>
<td>144 (46%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>187 (55%)</td>
<td>154 (45%)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1891 indexed 20th edition Manchester hymal
**music for Manchester hymnal

### Appendix E

**First Appearances of Hymns in 1985 Edition by First Lines**

1835 *Kirtland Hymnal*
- Come all ye sons of Zion
- Come let us sing an evening hymn
- Come all ye saints, who dwell on earth
- Earth with her ten thousand flowers
- From Greenland’s icy mountains
- Gently raise the sacred strain
- Glorious things of thee are spoken
- Great God! to thee my evening song
Great is the Lord; ‘tis good to praise
Guide us, O thou great Jehovah
He died! the great Redeemer died!
How firm a foundation
I know that my Redeemer lives
Jesus, mighty King in Zion
Joy to the world! The Lord will come!
Know then that ev’ry soul is free
Let Zion in her beauty rise
Now let us rejoice in the day of salvation
Now we’ll sing with one accord
O God, th’ eternal Father
O God! Our help in ages past
Redeemer of Israel
The happy day has rolled on
The Spirit of God like a fire is burning
This earth was once a garden place
We’re not ashamed to own our Lord

1840 Manchester Hymnal
A poor wayfaring man of grief
An angel from on high
As the dew from heaven distilling
Come, O thou King of kings
Come, ye that love the Lord
Father in heaven, we do believe
From all that dwell below the skies
Glory to God on high
God moves in a mysterious way
Jesus, once of humble birth
Lord, dismiss us with thy blessing
Praise God from whom all blessings flow
Sweet is the work, my God, my King
The morning breaks, the shadows flee
Truth reflects upon our senses
With all my power of heart and tongue
Ye simple souls who stray

1841 Nauvoo Hymnal
Awake! ye Saints of God, awake!
Behold the mountain of the Lord
Christ the Lord is risen today
Come thou fount of every blessing
1889 Psalmody
Again we meet around the board
Arise, O glorious Zion
Come, listen to a prophet’s voice
Come, let us anew
Come, follow me, the Savior said
Come, thou glorious day of promise
Come, come, ye Saints
Do what is right
For the strength of the hills
Hail to the brightness
High on the mountain top
How great the wisdom and the love
If you could hie to Kolob
Israel, Israel, God is calling
Lord, we come before thee now
O my Father, thou that dwellest
O ye mountains high
O say what is truth
Praise to the man
Praise ye the Lord, my heart shall join
Prayer is the soul’s sincere desire
Should you feel inclined to censure
Sweet is the peace the gospel brings
The time is far spent
Truth reflects upon our senses
Up, awake, ye defenders of Zion
While of these emblems we partake
Ye Elders of Israel
Ye who are called to labor
Zion stands with hills surrounded

1927 Hymnal
Abide with me! fast falls the eventide
Before thee, Lord, I bow my head
Brightly beams our Father’s mercy
Come, ye children of the Lord
Does the journey seem long
God, our Father, hear us pray
I need thee every hour
It may not be on the mountain height
Jehovah, Lord of heaven and earth
Jesus, lover of my soul
Jesus of Nazareth
Let us oft speak kind words
My country! 'tis of thee
Nearer, my God, to thee
O say, you see
O Lord of hosts, we now invoke
Onward, Christian soldiers
Our mountain home so dear
Reverently and meekly now
Rock of ages
School thy feelings, O my brother
Sweet hour of prayer
The wintry day, descending to its close
Though deep’ning trials
Truth eternal, truth divine
We thank thee, O God, for a prophet
We’ll sing all hail to Jesus name

1948 Hymnal
All creatures of our God and King
Behold, a royal army
Come, ye thankful people, come
Come unto Jesus
Dear to the heart of the shepherd
Ere you left your room this morning
Far, far away on Judea’s plain
Father, thy children to thee now raise
Firm as the mountains around us
God loved us so he sent his son
God of our fathers, whose almighty hand
God of power, God of right
God of our fathers, we come unto thee
God of our fathers, known of old
God be with you ‘til we meet again
Great King of heaven, our hearts we raise
Hark! The herald angels sing
He is risen
Hope of Israel
How gentle God’s commands
How beautiful thy temples, Lord
I stand all amazed
I heard the bells on Christmas day
I have work enough to do
Improve the shining moments
In memory of the crucified
In a world where sorrow
In humility our Savior
It came upon a midnight clear
Jesus, the very thought of thee
Jesus, my Savior true
Lead, kindly light
Lead me into life eternal
Let us all press on
Lord, accept our true devotion
Lord, we ask thee, ere we part
Master, the tempest is raging
Mine eyes have seen the glory
More holiness give me
Nay, speak no ill
Nearer, dear Savior, to thee
Now thank we all our God
O beautiful for spacious skies
O holy words of truth and love
O come, all ye faithful
O little town of Bethlehem
O thou kind and gracious father
O thou rock of our salvation
O what songs of the heart
O come, all ye faithful
O how lovely was the morning
Praise the Lord with heart and voice
Rejoice, ye Saints of latter days
Rejoice, the Lord is King
Rise up, O men of God
Shall the youth of Zion falter
Silent night, holy night
Sing we now at parting
Sing praise to him who reigns above
Thanks for the Sabbath School
The Lord be with us
The day dawn is breaking
The first noel
The Lord my pasture will prepare
The Lord is my shepherd
The world has need of willing men
There is sunshine in my soul today
There is an hour of peace and rest
There is a green hill far away
There is beauty all around
They the builders of the nation
Thy spirit, Lord, has stirred our souls
’Tis sweet to sing the matchless love
To Nephi, seer of olden times
Today while the sun shines
Upon the cross of Calvary
We are sowing
We ever pray for thee
We give thee but thine own
We gather together
We love thy house, O God
We are all enlisted
Welcome, welcome, Sabbath morning
When in the wondrous realms above
When the rosy light of morning
When upon life’s billows
While shepherds watched their flocks
Who’s on the Lord’s side?
You can make the pathway bright
Law and Order in Winter Quarters

Edward L. Kimball and Kenneth W. Godfrey

Before day’s end on September 2, 1847, Hosea Stout, chief of police in Winter Quarters, wrote a lengthy entry in his diary:

This morning Councilor Phineas Richards [a member of the high council and city council] came to me and wanted Henry Boly’s ox arrested for damages done in Richards’ garden. I sent [officers] Meeks & Gardner, who took the ox, but Boly and his [twenty-three year old] son attempted to rescue the ox by violence, which caused quite an uproar in the Town. When they menaced the officers,
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Gardner and Meeks drew a pistol and told them to stand back and if they had objections [to the seizure of the ox] to go to the Council.

The pistol stopped the Bolys, but young Boly swore he would shoot them for it.

The ox was brought to the stray pen and a charge was laid against young Boly before Bishop Calkins for threatening to shoot. We went to arrest him but found he had gone to the prairie for hay. We overtook him about 4 miles away. He refused to come back till night at first but at last did come. The bishop put off the trial till 7 P.M. and released Boly until then while we prepared for trial.

At 7 o’clock we went to the trial and, after a full investigation that lasted till about eleven, the charge was sustained and Boly was fined five dollars. He manifested a very bad spirit after the trial.

This article provides an overview and analysis of criminality and justice in Winter Quarters, relying primarily on the journal of Hosea Stout, who served both as captain of the police guard and, between October 23, 1846, and May 2, 1847, as clerk of the city/high council court. Because of Stout’s close involvement with the courts and law enforcement, we believe him to be relatively complete and accurate in his reporting. However, because he was a protagonist in several incidents, we have tried to be cautious about accepting his view uncritically—a caveat that applies to other contemporary journals.²

We also reviewed the minutes of the Winter Quarters High Council, which tried most of the cases.³ Both Stout and the minutes allude to cases not reported further, meaning that the criminal and court record for Winter Quarters is not complete. Other sources include some alternate minutes, charging documents, and notes of witness testimony.

Names are spelled variously among and sometimes within the various documents. Sometimes the handwriting is difficult to make


³Winter Quarters High Council, Minutes, 1846–48, Archives of the Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter LDS Church Archives). These minutes are hereafter cited as “High Council” by date.
out. We have used what we believe is the most likely spelling, knowing that we may sometimes be in error. Sometimes the records fail to provide full names.

**THE ESTABLISHMENT OF WINTER QUARTERS**

Nauvoo, Illinois, where Hosea Stout had also been the chief of police only a few months earlier, had been a substantial city, with a state charter, militia, elected officers, a significant number of non-Mormons in the population, a police force that, at its peak, numbered more than 500, and a municipal court system. In contrast, pioneer companies on the trail, were organized in quasi-military fashion, and relied on summary justice to deal with behavioral problems.

Between these extremes are interim camps, temporary but established long enough to take on some of the character of towns. Such was Winter Quarters, a temporary Mormon settlement on Indian lands outside organized territory of the United States.

At Garden Grove and Mount Pisgah in what is now Iowa, the first companies of Saints to leave Nauvoo in February 1846 planted crops and built shelters to help the refugees following them. By mid-June the advance companies, of what would eventually number about 12,000 Saints, reached the western boundary of Iowa Territory and established temporary headquarters near Mosquito Creek, a few miles east of the Missouri River on Pottawattamie Indian land. Some five hundred wagons gathered there; and by the end of June, the Mormons had built their own ferry and their wagons began to cross the

---


5Richard E. Bennett, *Mormons at the Missouri, 1846–1852: “And Should We Die”* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 31. The “Camp of Israel” moving across Iowa in 1846 was organized in companies, with captains over tens, fifties, and hundreds. Each company was to have a clerk, a historian, and commissaries.

6Except in quotations, we use this spelling for the name of the tribe,
Missouri. It was obviously too late in the season to set off across the plains, and Brigham Young and the Twelve received permission from the Pottawattamie to settle temporarily on their lands east of the Missouri, and from the Omaha tribe permission to locate west of the river for up to two years.\(^7\) Documents identified Winter Quarters as located in the Omaha Nation in Indian Territory.

About fifteen miles downstream was one of the few white settlements, Point-aux-Poules (also Trader’s Point) on the east bank, connected by ferry to Sarpy’s trading post and the French and Indian village of Bellevue on the west bank. The U.S. Army maintained Fort Kearny downriver and about sixty miles south.\(^8\) It was from these temporary settlements that the U.S. Army, in response to Brigham Young’s request for government aid, enlisted hundreds of LDS men into the Mormon Battalion to serve in the war with Mexico, that had just been declared on May 13, 1846.\(^9\) Part of the agreement was the acceptance of the enlisting army officer’s of the Winter Quarters settlement arrangements.\(^10\)

Brigham Young and several wagon companies camped first at Cold Springs (now in South Omaha, Nebraska) in early July, then moved on August 4 to Cutler’s Park on the bluffs about three miles back from the river. Here Stout caught up with the company during the first week in August. A month later, the camp relocated to a sub-

---

\(^7\)The government enforced the two-year limit, and in April and May 1848, Winter Quarters residents not going west moved east across the river to Kanesville or other settlements. Kanesville, later renamed Council Bluffs, remained a major Mormon settlement for several years. The Nebraska Territory was organized in 1854.

\(^8\)The present Fort Kearny, Nebraska, was not established until 1848; the earlier post by the same name was at present-day Nebraska City, Nebraska.


\(^10\)Although Captain James Allen, acting for the government, accepted this arrangement, the Indian agents were reluctant to recognize it, especially after Allen’s death by fever on August 23, 1846. However, by then it was largely *fait accompli*. Leland R. Nelson comp., *Journal of Brigham Young* (Provo, Utah: Council Press, 1980), November 1, 1846.
Map 1. Winter Quarters area, ca. 1846–48, in what are now Nebraska and Iowa. Miller’s Hollow became, successively, Kane, Kanesville, and Council Bluffs after the Mormons who did not go west by 1848 occupied it. Simplified version redrawn from Richard E. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 48,
stantial plain below the bluffs, close to the Missouri, and this settlement became Winter Quarters. The city, laid out in blocks, extended from Turkey Creek on the north (a stream that could provide water power for a mill) to a second creek on the south. The town was three-quarters of a mile long by perhaps 600 yards wide. South of the town were gardens and fields.\footnote{Bennett, \textit{Mormons at the Missouri}, 73–76.}

The Cutler’s Park civic organizations also transferred to Winter Quarters: a high council that simultaneously served as a municipal council, a marshal, and a temporary guard of twenty-four men to keep the cattle safe from straying and theft (August 9–10, 1846).

A census in late 1846 showed 3,483 inhabitants in Winter Quarters. Most lived in more than 600 cabins or huts; some lived in dugouts or tents. A few small satellite groups also lived on the west bank; but across the Missouri to east, scattered over southwestern Iowa, another seven thousand refugees settled for the winter in more than
Map 2. Most of Winter Quarters’s original blocks were divided into twenty lots. The community’s gardens and fields lay south of the town.
eighty small clusters. A ward on the Iowa side fell under the jurisdiction of the Winter Quarters High Council.

Full Winter Quarters blocks were divided into twenty small lots each and the city was divided into wards—first thirteen wards and then twenty-two—with a bishop in each, responsible primarily for aiding the poor, conducting religious services for ward members, and holding court as “a judge in Israel.”

Supplies had to be purchased in Iowa, northern Missouri, or St. Louis, since settlement came too late to raise crops. Mormon men sought work in Missouri or freighted. Some residents made and sold willow baskets. During the winter of 1847–48, many hundreds died from scurvy (caused by lack of vegetables), chills and fever, other diseases, and accidents. Many who died were infants born to malnourished women. It was a difficult time, with the focus on survival, yet order prevailed.

---

12Ibid., 89. While Winter Quarters was properly the name of just the settlement on the west bank, the term is sometimes loosely used for the whole area on both sides of the Missouri River where Mormons awaited the move west. Richard E. Bennett, “Winter Quarters,” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 4:1569.

13Stout, October 2, 1846. Some blocks were incomplete because they ran into the bluffs on the west or ran down to the river on the east. See Stout, July 17 and October 4, 1846, for laying out the wards and appointing bishops; Nelson, *Journal of Brigham Young*, October 4, 1846. Bennett, *Mormons at the Missouri*, 74–75, says each full block was five acres and contained twenty lots, 72 by 165 feet, with no more than five wells per block. Woodruff records that his group of forty families received only one block, so that two families shared each lot. *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal, 1833–1898*, typescript, edited by Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983–85), 3:85, September 23, 1846 (hereafter cited as Woodruff by date, volume, and page). Conrey Bryson, *Winter Quarters* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986), 66–67, lists the boundaries and bishops of the twenty-two wards.

Winter Quarters is a convenient subject of study because it is limited in space (a compact planned village of nearly 700 homes) in population (fewer than 4,000), in duration (two years), and in religious diversity (nearly all were either Mormons or their immediate relatives). Winter Quarters had contact with non-Mormons from Missouri or Iowa and Oregon-bound travelers, but it stood outside any state or organized territory of the United States. Because of the Mormons’ separateness, the governing norms were Mormon norms, making little distinction between theocratic and traditional civil institutions. The only Gentile oversight was the federal Indian agent, who had no real control, and an Army post many miles away.

**Governance at Winter Quarters**

*The High Council*

The Quorum of Twelve Apostles under Brigham Young’s strong leadership stood as the supreme authority in Winter Quarters, governing primarily by persuasion and moral authority. During the grueling ordeal of that first winter, most of the discouraged or unbelieving Church members left. Those who remained generally recognized the Twelve’s authority willingly, although some, like the very poor or families of Battalion members, may have felt constrained to stay regardless of personal preferences. The apostles, absent much of the time on various assignments, appointed a resident high council of twelve men who served simultaneously as the local religious leaders and as the municipal council. In both church and state capacities, this high council exercised legislative, executive, and judicial powers. There was no stake president or mayor and no separate court. They

---

15 Highest Council, August 7, 1846; July 12, September 25, and October 2, 1847; Stout, November 26, 1846; September 25, 1847. Original council members were Alpheus Cutler (president), Reynolds Cahoon, Daniel Russell, Albert P. Rockwood, Jedediah M. Grant, Benjamin L. Clapp, Winslow Farr, Thomas Grover, Samuel Russell, Ezra Chase, Alanson Eldridge, and Cornelius P. Lott. On November 26, 1846, the seventies in this group (Grant, Rockwood, Clapp, and Samuel Russell) were replaced by high priests Henry Sherwood, George Harris, Isaac Morley, and Phineas Richards. Daniel Russell was dropped from the council, either because he confessed to serious transgression or because he “had lost his privy members & was an eunuch,” or both. By July 1847 Grover, Chase, Eldridge, and
made executive decisions, established rules, administered them, and sat as a court to enforce them, but always subordinate to the Twelve. When any of the apostles were in town, they usually sat as additional members at the regular council meetings every Sunday at 6:00 P.M. There is no doubt that their opinions carried extra weight.

When Brigham Young spoke out, the council members seem to have considered the matter settled. For example, Newel Knight brought an accusation against Bishop John Murdock, and “the charge would have gone against Bro. Murdock had not the Pres. trimmed out the council for not doing their duty.” When Andrew Lytle and his wife claimed that John D. Lee had not given her merchandise equivalent in value to the money Andrew had deposited with Lee some months earlier, Lee claimed that he had given her more. At the trial before Bishop Isaac Clark, Brigham Young testified that Lee kept careful books and should be believed; but if he were Lee, he would forgive the debt rather than have hard feelings. Lee immediately withdrew his claim, and Young then berated the Lytles—her for lying and him for believing her lies.

Much of the council’s time went to tasks like building a mill, assigning responsibility for the cattle, and overseeing sanitation and commercial arrangements with outside sellers. However, this article focuses on the council’s function in resolving disputes and enforcing community regulations. Brigham Young instructed the council to “decide in matters of difference between all members of the church, that some had already transgressed . . . and should be brought to jus-

Sherwood were replaced by Aaron Johnson, Fred Cox, Levi Richards, and William Major. Stout last mentions a council meeting on April 22, 1848. A separate high council was appointed July 21, 1846, to oversee the Iowa settlements under the direction of Apostle Orson Hyde. Woodruff, 3:62, July 21, 1846; Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 82.

16Stout, August 9, 1846.
17Kelly, Lee Journals, March 14, 1847; see also High Council, March 14, 1847; Woodruff, 3:141, March 14, 1847.
19See, e.g., High Council, October 2 and December 2, 1846; Stout, March 26, and October 4, 25, and 29, 1846; Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 117.
tice.” The high council also had probate jurisdiction.20

When the question came up of whether it could do business if only five were present, two apostles, Willard Richards and George A. Smith, said: “If there is only one member of the High Council present, he has a right to try cases—cut off—and make whiskey laws.” That is, he could decide between litigants, excommunicate unilaterally, enact ordinances, and enforce them. Generally, a substitute was called to participate if a councilor could not attend; if the councilor came late, he could not displace the substitute.21 In addition to its regular Sunday meeting, the council also met during the week for trials or to deal with urgent matters. Council decisions “which immediately concern the Saints” were “made publick by reading them on the stand before the congregation at the erlyest oppertunity”; and before Brigham Young’s vanguard company departed in April 1847, a meeting was called “to lay the Acts and resolves of the different councils from time to time before the people for their approval or disapproval that there might not be any grumbling after the Twelve were gone.”22

The full council did not sit on all matters; sometimes they referred cases back to bishops or to a committee of two or three high councilors for resolution.23 In one notable instance, Brigham Young instructed that the Nathanael P. Warden divorce case be referred to committee of two or three because “such cases are involved in nonsense, folly, wickedness, and baby actions and I don’t believe it is necessary for twelve men to talk reason and argue about such nonsense.”24

No particular rules of evidence applied in trials—in one rare case, the council “wanted facts and not hearsay”—but when the council complained that the police were not charging all offenders, the po-


21 High Council, January 10 and March 21, 1847; Stout, January 10, 1847.

22 High Council, August 23, 1846; Stout, March 26, 1847.

23 See, for example, High Council, May 30, June 2, and July 18 and 25, 1847.

24 High Council, November 7, 1847.
lice in turn protested that in cases where it was a policeman’s word against a defendant’s, the council seemed unwilling to sustain the charge. The council then decided as a matter of policy to prefer the policeman’s testimony in such cases.25

On appeals from the bishop’s court, sometimes the council heard the cases again, and sometimes it simply reviewed the propriety of the bishop’s action.26

The council sought resolution of disputes more than adjudication of right and wrong. A verdict of “acquittal” usually meant that, although guilty, the offender had confessed, asked forgiveness, and received pardon.27 In cases where the council declared guilt and passed sentence, the offender had three choices: to appeal to the Twelve with little likelihood of success,28 submit, or leave the community, hoping the police would not enforce the penalty before he got away.

Even though the high councilors served without pay, operating the court had costs. Bebee v. Bostick, a case involving a dispute over two horses, resulted in a judgment for $39.78½ with costs assessed as follows: 25 cents summons; $1.50 bishop’s court; 50 cents notice and order of attachment; $1.50 marshal’s attachment of two horses; $1.50 appeal to the high council; and $3.50 marshal’s boarding horses pending a decision. The costs thus added more than 20 percent to the sum owed.29 If the court levied a fine and the offender refused to pay it, the police seized property and sold it to satisfy the judgment, often assigning the surplus to the poor fund. For example, when Jack Redding successfully sued merchant J. M. Strodes for failure to pay Redding’s freight charges, the police sold Strodes’s merchandise at retail value to satisfy the judgment.30

---

25Kelly, Lee Journals, July 18, 1847; Stout, July 30, 1847.
26High Council, February 12, 1848.
27See, for example, the case of Edwin D. Woolley, the first author’s great-grandfather, discussed below.
28According to Woodruff, 3:267, September 6, 1847, John Benbow was allowed to appeal to the Twelve.
29High Council, September 5, 1847.
30Stout, March 11, 14, and 15, 1848; Cleland and Brooks, A Mormon Chronicle, March 18, 1848. In two cases, the police benefited. Jesse M. Crosbey/Crosby/McCauslin refused to pay for the damages caused by his
The Bishops

The bishops, acting under the high council, also combined religious and secular functions. They and their counselors had responsibility for the spiritual and physical welfare of the people living in their block. Bishops often tried minor cases themselves. For example, Henry Boly’s son was charged with threatening to shoot the police who were taking his father’s ox to the stray pen. The officers took him before Bishop Luman Calkins (who was also a policeman) who scheduled a trial for the next evening, and released young Boly in the meantime. Calkins found Boly guilty and fined him five dollars.31

Issues of jurisdiction arose a few times. At one bishop’s court for J. M. Strodes, a storekeeper in Winter Quarters, the defendant claimed that, because he lived across the river, the Winter Quarters bishop had no right to call him to account. The bishop ruled against him on the jurisdiction question and found him guilty.32 John Lowe Butler objected to being tried before a bishop not his own.33

Aside from aiding the poor and judging disputes, the bishops had other civic responsibilities: to approve of and attend dances, to control liquor sales, and to certify that those bound for the West were prepared for the journey, had paid their taxes, and had done their share of communal work in Winter Quarters.34

stray calf and the police killed it, divided the meat, and applied its $2.14 value to their wages. They also drew lots for a cow in their possession, perhaps an unclaimed stray. High Council, September 20, 1847; Stout, November 11, 1847. See also High Council, June 2, July 11, November 16 and 29, and December 12, 1847; Stout, June 20 and December 7 and 9, 1847.

31Stout, September 1 and 2, 1847.

32Stout, March 11, 1848. Strodes, not a Mormon, complained to Brigham Young and threatened to involve the troops at Fort Kearny, but to no avail.

33High Council, August 22, 1847. The result is unknown. John Scott refused to appear in Bishop Isaac Clark’s court, asserting that he lacked jurisdiction. The bishop ruled against Scott, who appealed to the high council. The high council sidestepped the jurisdiction question but ruled in Scott’s favor on the case. High Council, June 20, 1847; Isaac Clark, Record Book, 1846–53 (MS 794, LDS Church Archives), July 14, 1847.

34High Council, May 23, 1847: “Voted. that those who go over the mountains pay their taxes.” Mary Richards wrote: “Those who are gone and
The Seventies

Soon after the establishment of Winter Quarters, Brigham Young instructed the seventies quorums, which had grown to thirty-three in Nauvoo, to identify which members were still in Winter Quarters and which had enlisted with the Mormon Battalion, and to care for their own poor, including the families of battalion members.35

The presidents of the seventies, headed by Joseph Young, Brigham Young’s brother, also adjudicated cases—some of them crimes—but the existing records do not mention fines or other secular penalties. According to Wilford Woodruff, Brigham Young gave the seventies ecclesiastical powers only: they were not to engage in law enforcement, but could try offenders for their membership.36 For example, when one seventy was tried for theft by forgery, he was threatened with excommunication.37

John Pack charged Hosea Stout before the seventies for making abusive statements about him before the high council. In the J. M. Strodes store where dissidents gathered, Hosea Stout scuffled with and choked Isaac Hill because Hill’s persistent abusive language against the Church leaders so enraged him that he “determined to stop or kill” Hill. John Lytle prevented Stout from injuring Hill. Hill preferred charges against Stout before the seventies quorum for assault (a criminal charge), profanity, and other unchristianlike conduct (ecclesiastical concerns). The case was referred to the high council where Brigham Young “gave us all a first rate dressing out after which the Council decided that we should stop all further difficulties.

35Stout, November 8 and 11, 1846, describes these meetings. Brooks’s introduction, 3 note 1, gives the number of quorums.
36Woodruff, 3:330, May 17, 1848; see also December 9, 1847.
37Stout, March 13, 1847.
&c which we did."\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{The Police}

External security loomed large as a concern in Winter Quarters. The Mormons had been forced out of Nauvoo by mobs, dealt with frequent thefts from their hungry Indian neighbors, and were not far from hostile Missouri. Unfounded rumors in the summer of 1846 that the U.S. marshal from Missouri was coming to arrest the Twelve, presumably for counterfeiting, precipitated near panic and the hurried creation of a scaled-down version of the Nauvoo Legion.\textsuperscript{39} This military force protected the settlement and maintained scouts in the surrounding country. The high council rejected a proposal that each of the then-thirteen wards supply its own guards and instead built a stockade against the Indians, appointed Horace S. Eldredge as marshal, and established a “Regular Standing Police” guard of about twenty men, who chose Hosea Stout as their captain.\textsuperscript{40} Stout’s policemen, many of whom had served under him in Nauvoo, and Eldredge were assigned responsibility for suppressing Indian theft and keeping the peace in Winter Quarters, by then a settlement of nearly four thousand.\textsuperscript{41}

Typically five policemen patrolled the city during the first half of the night while another five took second shift. They rode out as posses to deal with Indian threats and to search for missing livestock. They also dealt with accidents, quarrels, stray animals, fire hazards, violations of city ordinances on liquor and dancing, and other miscon-

\textsuperscript{38}High Council, Woodruff, 3:329–33, and Stout, March 17, 1848; Stout, February 6–10, 1848. Orson Hyde advised the high council to establish a rule against profanity, but the record does not show that it did. Ward, \textit{Winter Quarters}, 149, June 20, 1847. Robert King was excommunicated for profanity: “I’ll be Dam’d if I’ll be a Mormon any longer.” Pottawattamie High Council, Minutes 1846–52, July 24, 1847, LR 176421 (hereafter Pottawattamie High Council).


\textsuperscript{40}Stout, October 18 and November 15 and 19, 1846.

\textsuperscript{41}Stout mentions varying numbers of police: twenty-five, thirty-two, and nineteen on November 17, November 19, and December 24, 1846. See also John Lee Allaman, “Policing in Mormon Nauvoo,” \textit{Illinois Historical Journal} 89 (Summer 1996): 85.
duct. Except for Indian theft, impounding stray animals proved to be the largest single police problem, often leading to minor violence.

The police themselves were a rough bunch, drinking and sometimes insulting and threatening people. Stout records, with no apparent disapproval, incidents in which policemen made serious threats to dissenters and unruly individuals. The high council assigned its president, Alpheus Cutler, to labor with Stout concerning his “overbearing Spirit”; and Wilford Woodruff recorded Brigham Young’s concern about drunkenness and lack of seriousness among the police. Stout’s “b’hoys” (rowdies) occasionally held kangaroo courts among themselves, all in the name of fun, fining each other for being lucky, unlucky, late, or ignorant. For example, Stout was allowed a pint for trying to catch his horse but fined a quart for getting thrown off; the group also had “sport at the expense of Brother I. C. Haight”; “hoaxed Martindale for waring the crown of Baalam”; and “had Langley tried tonight at Woolly store for not holding the truth sacred as we called it & fined Woolly one gallon all in fun.” The fines were invariably paid in liquor, and Stout reports being sick with “headache” in the mornings with suspicious regularity. When they found a hidden jug of whiskey, they simply confiscated it. Possession of liquor was not illegal, but Stout believed the jug was one “which the B had hid out to glut their brutish appetites with, acting at the same time with as much contempt as they could towards the guard who were close by.”

Many residents of Winter Quarters heartily disliked the some-

---

42High Council, November 18 and 22 and September 26, 1847; Stout, August 15, 1847.
43Stout, September 6, 1846; January 14 and April 2, 1848; High Council, July 12, 1847; Woodruff, 3:332, March 17, 1848.
44Stout, February 24, May 12, and June 3, 1847; January 26, 1848. The 1847 vanguard company similarly amused itself with mock trials. For example, James Davenport was tried “for blockading the highway and turning ladies out of their course.” Clayton called these courts “amusing enough and tend among other things to pass away the time cheerfully during leisure moments.” William Clayton’s Journal, May 22, 1847. Less amused, Brigham Young criticized the “trials and lawsuits upon evry nonsensical thing.” Woodruff, 3:187, May 29, 1847.
45Stout, March 18, 1847. The “B” are not identified, but Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 2:653 note 21, says that Webster’s dictionary gives “be’hoy” or “b’hoy” as rowdies or gang members.
times overbearing police; but their loyalty to the Twelve was unquestioned, and the leaders were willing to privately approve irregular actions, so long as they had a desirable outcome. For example, just before the establishment of Winter Quarters, when no trial mechanism existed, Stout recorded that Brigham Young and Wilford Woodruff authorized him and a few others to severely flog three young men for alleged sexual misconduct. Several days later Brigham Young publicly approved the whippings, although he claimed, “I did not know of it till after it was done.”

The Twelve presumably decided that a police force seen as near-vigilantes would be effective in restraining law breakers. Joseph Fielding wrote a rare appreciation:

> It is plain that nothing but the strictest laws enforced with what some call rigor, altogether considered by many in the Camp, oppressive, and has been a Source of much Evil and hard feeling, yet if we had not had such Laws a great Part of our Corn, etc. would have been destroyed. Some of the Police would at times give way to Passion, and would swear like Blackguards. . . . I have heard them call their Brethren . . . damned infernal Liars, etc. The Office of Policeman is no desirable one. If there be any rough ones, they have to deal with them, and they are likely enough to be rough, too.

The high council followed the lead of the Twelve in sanctioning the police’s summary punishments. For example, they approved when Stout reported that Henry Phelps had received “a severe caining” on the spot for seeking to recover a stray. The police likewise whipped boys who made too much noise in the streets at night and herd ers who allowed cattle to graze in pastures reserved for oxen plowing the community farm. They arrested James Tremain, known to be a thief, led him to believe he would be killed, but agreed to let him escape if he would “go away and never more be heard of in this mormon territory.” He took this offer and fled. Stout called

---


48Stout, February 14, May 12, and August 7, 1847; High Council, February 14, 1847.
their action “banishment.”

Because police work was basically a full-time job, the high council levied a personal property tax of 0.75 percent on each person and business in the town. The police were to receive 75 cents for each tour of duty and the captain 75 cents per day for supervision, but the tax was so unpopular and so infrequently paid that police payment was often in arrears. The fact that the police helped collect the taxes made them even more unpopular. In the spring of 1847, Hosea Stout asked the ferry operator Isaac Higbee “not to take anyone over who had not paid his tax for there were now great numbers going off through disaffection.”

Besides enforcing community rules, the police were assigned many miscellaneous tasks. For example, they searched a nonmember named Long for evidence that he was spying on the Mormons for Fort Kearny but found nothing. A week later, Stout was outraged to learn that Phineas Young had warned Long of the impending search. Then Long eloped with the stepdaughter of Bishop/policeman Luman Calkins. Calkins’s fellow officers would have tracked the couple down but had no idea where to look, and Brigham Young advised Calkins to simply let his daughter go. It turned out Long and Miss Calkins had gone to Fort Kearny; and Long, showing little instinct for self-preservation, returned to Winter Quarters in a couple of weeks accompanied by four soldiers who were hunting an army deserter, whom Stout’s officers

---

49 Stout, March 13 and April 2, 1848.
50 Nelson, Journal of Brigham Young, December 24, 1846. The first assessed value of Winter Quarters property was just over $100,000. Stout and High Council, December 24, 1846. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 119, indicates that the tax was also to compensate herdsmen, road builders, cemetery workers, the marshal, and the camp historian. The high council, November 8, 1846, levied a separate road tax, payable in labor or cash, and a tenth-day requirement to gather wood and help the poor during the settlement’s early months. Stout and High Council, November 25, 1846.
51 High Council, November 29 and December 31, 1846, and January 10, 1847.
52 Stout, April 27, 1847.
53 Stout, December 22 and 30, 1847.
helped find.\textsuperscript{54} Irritated by Long’s boasts that he had outwitted the police in eloping, the police captured him, held him for hours in the bitter cold, and threatened him with death. Finally, about midnight, they offered to let him escape if he would buy them four gallons of whiskey (worth $3.75). When he agreed, they explained that they really cared nothing about the elopement but wanted to make sure he knew he could not outwit the police. Stout reported this episode to Brigham Young, as he routinely did irregular police activities. Astonishingly, Long was baptized three months later.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{The Law}

Although geographically within the boundaries of the United States, the Mormons on Indian lands were, for all practical purposes, free to apply their own concept of law. Orson Pratt told the high council on August 13, 1846, that the Saints should abide “a celestial law as much as our circumstances admit. . . . We must obey all the council of the priesthood . . . and do the best we can for the general good of the whole.” On the Iowa side, in contrast, the Saints were subject to the law of Iowa Territory.\textsuperscript{56}

The Mormons held as part of their Anglo-American culture a concept of “common law,” the unwritten but binding social contract that behavior such as murder, arson, rape, and theft would be severely punished even without specific laws to forbid the conduct.\textsuperscript{57} In addition to these commonly shared assumptions, the Winter Quarters High Council created ordinances specific to that settlement, but with

\textsuperscript{54}Stout, January 13–14, 1848.
\textsuperscript{55}Stout, April 20, 1848.
\textsuperscript{56}The first author’s great-great uncle, John Gheen, shot and killed Lilace Conditt in the non-Mormon town of Point-aux-Poules and was tried for murder in Iowa City. He was acquitted, presumably on the grounds of accident or self-defense. The Pottawattamie High Council had earlier excommunicated him for “Violent & Shameful Conduct in St. Josephs.” Cleland and Brooks, \textit{A Mormon Chronicle}, April 16, 1848; Stout, April 15, 1848, May 10, 1858; p. 209 note 74; \textit{William Clayton’s Journal}, April 15 and May 10, 1848; Woodruff, 3:339, 343, April 7 and 15, 1848; Pottawattamie High Council, August 29, 1847.
\textsuperscript{57}The Utah Territorial Legislature tried unsuccessfully to abolish the common-law notion that past decisions provide precedents and asserted that Church courts did not feel bound by rules of Gentile law. Michael W. Homer, “The Judiciary and the Common Law in Utah Territory, 1850–61,”
considerable limitations as spelled out by Brigham Young, who announced in November 1847: “This Council has no right to make laws to stand as precedents to this people for the future. This Council is only to make laws for the time being, . . . but you can’t make laws to guide this people for three months.”

Municipal ordinances created by the high council included:

1. Indians caught stealing should not be killed but might be whipped. White men who killed an Indian would be turned over to the Indian’s tribe. The second rule seems never to have been applied.

2. Individuals could not trade with the Indians, punishable by a fine of $1 and forfeiture of the traded article.

3. Stray animals would be impounded and the owner would forfeit $1 per cow, ox, mule, or horse, and 25 cents per sheep running loose in the town, gardens, or community fields.

4. Dances should not be held without the consent and presence of the bishop.

5. Firearms should not be discharged after sundown.

6. No timber should be cut within twenty miles without council permission.

7. No stray dogs should be shot without order of the marshal.


58 High Council, November 7, 1847.

59 Stout, October 18 and December 24, 1846; May 9, June 13, August 15, and November 14, 1847; January 4 and March 25, 1848; High Council, December 24, 1846; January 24, June 13, August 1, and September 26, 1847; and March 26, 1848; Nelson, Journal of Brigham Young, December 24, 1846, and March 25–26, 1847; Woodruff, 3:79, September 13, 1846.

60 Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 94–95, identifies whipping as the penalty for selling liquor to Indians. According to Nelson, Journal of Brigham Young, January 17, 1847, Brigham Young told the council that anyone selling whiskey to the Indians should be handed over to the Indian agent for prosecution under federal law. The 1834 Indian Intercourse Act defined a $500 penalty for such sales. U.S. Statutes at Large, 4:729, sect. 20.

61 Brigham Young did not forbid dances but wanted bishops to control them to avoid bringing in “all manner of people.” When preparations for departure were fully underway, the high council approved Young’s motion to “discountenance all parties and Fidling and dancing.” High Council, March 11, 1848.
8. The amount of hay stored in town is limited because of the serious fire risk it poses.

9. Only bishops could sell liquor in Winter Quarters and only to those who could afford it without hardship to their families. The profits would be used to aid the poor.62 The ferryman received instructions not to transport whiskey barrels without authorization from the council. Dealers who voluntarily gave up their stock of liquor to the bishops would be reimbursed, but those who resisted or continued selling liquor would have their supply confiscated.

Twenty boot and shoemakers on both sides of the river petitioned the high council to forbid the sale of footwear not manufactured locally. The council did not.63

Some religion-based principles set additional bounds on conduct. For example, although no formal ordinance prohibited gambling, the police stepped in to prevent the establishment of a gambling operation.64 When Joseph Frances de declined to pay tithing because he considered supporting a relative’s children an adequate substitute, the high council refused to accept this excuse and ordered him either to work one day in ten or to pay the cash equivalent.65 He could, however, expect help in supporting the children. Thieves had to make fourfold restitution, which Brigham Young said was “the law to Israel and you may write it.”66

In the background, above the common law and city ordinances

---

62 In 1837, the Kirtland High Council asked the local tavern keeper not to sell liquor to people who got drunk and to inform the council which Church members were drinking. *History of the Church*, 2:520. See also Stout, January 4, 1848; Thomas G. Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 260. Adherence to the Word of Wisdom fluctuated greatly in early Mormonism. Drinking in moderation brought no condemnation, although drunkenness did.

63 High Council, January 21, 1848.


65 High Council, September 13, 1847.

66 Journal History, August 11, 1846. In fact, Exodus 22:1, 4, requires
was “the law of God.” Doctrine and Covenants 42, given in 1831 as “the law of the Church,” stated that a killer should die by the law of the land and a thief or a liar should be turned over to the law of the land, while also being subjected to Church discipline along with the sexually immoral and generally unrighteous. Leaders used the rhetorical threat of death as an example of what would happen to wrongdoers in the future, when the “kingdom of God” would be more fully established. References to the law of God were almost always “if” and “when.” Brigham Young warned the people “what the law would be” when the Saints “got far enough [away] to keep them [the offenders] from running back to the gentiles.” This concept of law almost surely came from teachings in the Council of Fifty that when the political kingdom of God, a secular world government dominated by priesthood leaders, flourished, the law’s demands would be strict. In Nauvoo, Joseph Smith had announced: “I’ll wring a thief’s neck off if I can find him, if I cannot bring him to justice any other way,” and in 1844 Sidney Rigdon said, “There are men standing in your midst that

five oxen as compensation for a killed ox, four sheep for a killed sheep, and only two for an ox, ass, or sheep recovered alive. Winter Quarter cases of fourfold restitution involved a horse, blanket, sides of pork, and bogus gold. Ibid., January 17 and 25, 1848; High Council, January 17, 1848; Stout, December 25, 1847; January 25, 1848; Watson, *Manuscript History of Brigham Young*, 309, August 11, 1846.

67 Stout, December 20, 1846.

68 Charles W. Penrose, *Blood Atonement* (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1884), 10–11, 21, 24, wrote: “When the time comes that the law of God shall be in full force upon the earth, then this penalty will be inflicted for those crimes by people under covenant not to commit them.” Penrose was later a counselor in the First Presidency. For background on the Council of Fifty, see D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), 105–41; Andrew F. Ehat, “‘It Seems Like Heaven Began on Earth’: Joseph Smith and the Constitution of the Kingdom of God,” *BYU Studies* 20, no. 3 (Spring 1980): 253; D. Michael Quinn, “The Council of Fifty and Its Members, 1844 to 1945,” *BYU Studies* 20, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 163; Klaus J. Hansen, *Quest for Empire: The Political Kingdom of God and the Council of Fifty in Mormon History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974).
you can’t do anything with them but cut their throat & bury them.” References to this law reflect the sense that the Saints were coming “out of Babylon” and would be living by a higher law.

**THE CASES**

We do not have a complete picture of litigation in Winter Quarters. But by combining several sources, we have a good idea of both the range and number of cases brought before the high council. We include also three cases that began and ended in a bishop’s court.

In addition to cases originating before the high council, the high council also heard many appeals from bishops’ courts, whose records are spotty and incomplete. Isaac Clark, bishop of Fifteenth Ward, mentions approximately two dozen cases between April 1847 and April 1848, most involving unpaid debts, damage to property, and

---


70 Joseph Fielding, Diary, 145, wrote, “We have the Kingdom of God among [us] and no one can take it from us. We must take it to a Place where we can establish it and execute its Laws, which could not be done in the Midst of the Gentiles.”

71 The high council minutes do not always identify the charge or outcome. For example, in the case of Newel Knight v. Bishop John Murdock, the charge was dropped because of Brigham Young’s intervention, but Knight was awarded money on his claim for caring for a sick man. High Council, March 14, 1847; Kelly, *Lee Journals*, 120. The case of Stephen Markham v. John Scott was laid over with “no blame . . . attached to Brother Scott.” High Council, November 22 and 26, 1846. The case of [Gilbert?] v. Eddings was referred to Bishop Calkins. High Council, January 3, 1847. The charge was not sustained in John Richards v. Francis M. Pomeroy. High Council, January 14, 1847. E. Duget/Edward Duzett/Dusette v. Nathan Tanner was laid over. High Council, February 4, 1847; Brooks, *On the Mormon Frontier*, 146, 242. In the case of Houtz and Shurtleff/L. A. Shirtliff/Vincent Shirtliff v. Punca [Ponca] Branch council, the high council advised the parties to settle and later told the plaintiffs to pay $250 and interest and costs according to their agreement. Stout, September 14, 1846; High Council, May 9 and June 2, 1847. This case was also called D. Spencer and E. Hunter v. Houtz and Vincent Shirtliff. High Council, June 2, 1847. The charge against “Sister Mayberry” was dismissed. High Council, July 18, 1847.
disputed property ownership. Only the few serious cases were appealed to the high council.

**Violence and Threats**

While we believe Winter Quarters had a low level of violence compared to other frontier communities, a number of incidents involved actual or threatened violence but were apparently taken less seriously than they would be today.

Joseph F. Herring while drunk “swore he would kill Wilford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Cases</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly or insulting behavior</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disloyal speech</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited liquor sale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray pen problems</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt and property disputes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous or unknown subject matter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodruff” and that he would not follow the Twelve. Hosea Stout perceived the threat as genuine and reported it to the Twelve. The next day Herring also got into a dispute with John H. Blazzard and tried to stab him, but the police intervened. No effort was made to prosecute him. That night he slept off his intoxication at Hosea Stout’s home and left town the next day. A week later Herring was back, again drunk and threatening Woodruff. Stout again gave him a bed. But this time Herring was excommunicated. He left town and later reiterated his threats in a letter. When he returned to Winter Quarters after more than a year, an unidentified assailant killed him.

Nathaniel Thomas Brown, another dangerous person, came to

---

73 Stout, January 8, 1847. Woodruff, 3:124, January 28–29, 1846, says that “Joseph Hortion” had threatened his life. Herring was a Mohawk and an LDS elder. He and his brother George had been friendly with the Church and Stout since Nauvoo. A team was loaned for their use in moving to Winter Quarters. Brigham Young urged they also be lent a team to fetch their sister and her family from the Cherokees to Winter Quarters. George and Joseph were adopted into the Pottawattamie tribe. Journal History, November 5, 1846; Stout, September 9 and 24 and October 29, 1845; and August 5, 1846; High Council, September 9 and December 15 and 31, 1846; January 7, 1847.

74 Stout, January 17, 1847. Stout assigned a special guard to Woodruff. When he discovered that the guard (unnamed) had left his post four nights in succession, Stout fired the derelict officer and refused to pay his back wages of $19.75. Stout, January 30, 1847; see also Stout, March 5–6, 1847, for a similar case.

75 Nelson, Journal of Brigham Young, January 18, 1847. Woodruff does not mention the excommunication, although about that time he twice dreamed of being attacked by Indians. January 7 and 9, 1847.

76 Stout, April 2, 1847.

77 Stout, April 7, 1848. The Twelve agreed that Herring was subject to “the law of the Lord to be administered in righteousness,” meaning presumably that he should be killed before he could kill Woodruff. Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 226 note 22 and 308 note 72; Woodruff, 3:342, April 9, 1848. Hickman, Brigham’s Destroying Angel, 46–47, in a much later exposé of uncertain reliability, said that he killed Herring when “Brigham Young’s boys had got after him, but could not catch him.”
Winter Quarters and threatened the Twelve.\textsuperscript{78} He was at the time wanted for the 1845 robbery and brutal murder of John Miller, a Mennonite preacher, and his son-in-law, Henry Leisi. Stephen and William Hodge, brothers, had been hanged for these crimes July 15, 1845, in Lee County, Iowa, but Brown had eluded arrest.\textsuperscript{79} Despite his threats against the Twelve, Brown ultimately went west with the first pioneer company in 1847, joining it on the plains after its departure.\textsuperscript{80} The record does not show that he caused any disturbance en route; but when he returned in late summer 1847 to Winter Quarters in the Norton Jacob company, Captain Jacob found him “as profane as any [soldier].”\textsuperscript{81} Brown soon got “himself shot to death in a Council Bluffs brawl.”\textsuperscript{82}

There were other rumored plots. William Clayton described the passionate enmity between him and Hosea Stout and believed that Stout planned to kill him after the Twelve left in the first company for the Rocky Mountains.\textsuperscript{83} When Clayton reported his concerns to Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball, Brigham had him come with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{78}Stout, February 12, 1847.
\item \textsuperscript{79}There were also two other Hodge brothers. Amos Hodge was a Mormon; his brother Irvine/Irwin was murdered in Nauvoo in 1845. Quinn, \textit{The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power}, 228, says the executed Hodge brothers were Mormons, but Quinn, \textit{The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power}, 427 note 169, cites the denial in the \textit{Nauvoo Neighbor} that Stephen and William Hodges were ever Mormons. See also Godfrey, \textit{“Crime and Punishment in Mormon Nauvoo,”} 214.
\item \textsuperscript{81}Ibid., 125; Norton Jacob, Journal, August 22, 1847, MS 9111, LDS Church Archives.
\item \textsuperscript{82}Stegner, \textit{The Gathering of Zion}, 126, calls Brown a Mormon. Hickman, \textit{Brigham’s Destroying Angel}, 47, wrote that he killed “a notorious horse thief, who had sworn to take the life of Orson Hyde.” This individual might have been Brown. However, Andrew Jenson, \textit{LDS Biographical Encyclopedia} (Salt Lake City: Andrew Jenson History Company, 1936) 4:695, says Brown “was accidentally shot at Council Bluffs, Iowa, in February, 1848, just as he was preparing to return to Salt Lake Valley with President Young, who was much distressed by the tragedy and remarked that Bro. Brown’s old shoes were worth more than the whole body of the man who killed him.”
\item \textsuperscript{83}William Clayton’s Journal, November 11, 1847. The source of the
\end{itemize}
the first company, partly to be out of harm’s way.\textsuperscript{84}

William L. Cutler stood trial before the seventies for whipping a boy,\textsuperscript{85} and the police, as already described, quickly resorted to physical measures.

Other than the cases cited, nearly all the violence and threats in Winter Quarters grew out of enforcing the laws against straying animals. Strays posed a major problem, but the laws were highly unpopular.\textsuperscript{86} Sheep, cattle, and dogs often got loose and ran at large, especially at night.\textsuperscript{87} Cattle got into private gardens and public fields that were important for the community’s survival.\textsuperscript{88} The police impounded strays and were also authorized to order any able-bodied man to take stray stock to the stray pen. If the fine was not paid within twenty-four hours, the stray was put in the community herd.\textsuperscript{89}

Some paid willingly,\textsuperscript{90} others refused, and sometimes the resistance led to actual or threatened violence. The case of Boly’s ox has been related. In another case, John H. Blazzard “was tried today for


\textsuperscript{84}William Clayton’s Journal, April 11, 13, and 14, and November 13, 1847. Clayton left with the pioneer company on a half-hour’s notice. Quinn, \textit{The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power}, 749, asserts that there were other such unexecuted plots.

\textsuperscript{85}Stout, September 12, 1847.

\textsuperscript{86}Stout, April 15, May 17, June 20, August 18 and 24, and September 6 and 21, 1847. W. W. Phelps complained that the stray law was “an unjust law.” High Council, November 28, 1847.

\textsuperscript{87}Stout, August 8, 1847.

\textsuperscript{88}Stout, June 13 and 14, 1847. Ward, \textit{Winter Quarters}, 169: “There is a noble large field plowed and part planted, and the brethren are plowing and planting every day when the weather will admit. [T]hey have covenanted not to make short furroughs, or furrows in order for every man to plough his own pieze of land, but to commence on one side of the fild and plough through to the other, no matter whither it be their own land or their Bretheren’s for we ar all one family.” There was no private ownership of these Indian lands, but individuals were allocated areas for their use, based on their pledging participation in fence construction and other improvements. High Council, December 19, 1847.

\textsuperscript{89}High Council, June 13, 1847; Stout, June 13–15, 1847.

\textsuperscript{90}Stout, September 6, 1847.
wrestling an ox out of the possession of the guard which [ox] had been taken out of the corn field, and threatening to fight for it.” The council fined him $2, not just for trying to rescue the ox but for “rebellion” and “casting reflections” on the police. When he failed to pay, the council authorized the police to seize his property.\footnote{Stout, June 20, 27, and July 11, 1847, and January 28, 1848; High Council, June 27, 1847. The name is also spelled Blizzard, Blissard, Blossard, and Blosard. Blazzard later told Stout that he had no hard feelings over the incident.}

At Summer Quarters (“Brigham’s Farm,” eighteen miles north of Winter Quarters but under its jurisdiction\footnote{Brooks, \textit{On the Mormon Frontier}, 270 note 50; Stout, August 23, 1847.}), John D. Lee and others of Brigham’s adopted sons farmed 600 acres for him and themselves. Lee’s ox trespassed on the cornfield there and was tied up as a stray. Lee was told he must pay a fine of $20 in cash or butter. He said he would pay in corn or other goods, then tried to take the ox, which precipitated a fight with Charles Kennedy. Lee beat up Kennedy, with whom he was already angry since Kennedy had defiantly taken one of Lee’s wives with him to Winter Quarters.\footnote{High Council, September 12, 1847; Stout and High Council, October 3–4, 1847; Brooks, \textit{John Doyle Lee}, 121.} The Winter Quarters High Council found Lee guilty and ordered him to apologize to Kennedy and “the whole group.” George D. Grant, as part of this incident, charged Lee “with using violent conduct and threatening the lives of men and children and abusive language towards men and women.”\footnote{High Council, September 25, 1847.} Lee admitted to “a little fracas between James Woolsey an adopted member of his family and himself” and apologized, but did it so grudgingly that the council asked for another, more satisfactory, expression of regret, but he refused. Rather than excommunicating Lee, the council postponed the matter until Brigham Young returned.\footnote{Stout, December 9, 1847; Woodruff, 3:296, December 9, 1847.} Young confirmed the council’s decision and further ordered that his wives and adopted sons be free from any commitments to Lee, a major undercutting of the still unsettled practice of adop-
tion of adults who covenanted to belong to one’s “family.”

After a fight over cattle being driven to the stray pen, Charles W. Patten charged policeman Hosea Stout and his brother Allen with abusive conduct toward Patten and his family; and as part of the same incident, Hiram Murdock charged that Stout’s unnecessary violence with a club had seriously injured Murdock’s arm. The Stouts asserted that they had acted in self defense while performing their duty. Patten’s complaint was amicably settled, but the council referred Murdock’s charge to Bishop Isaac Clark. Clark found that Stout had used excessive force and ordered him to pay a $3 fine and apologize to Murdock. Stout appealed to the high council, which concluded that he had acted within the scope of his duties, a decision Brigham Young later confirmed.

When Daniel Russell’s horse got into the community field, guard Elias Gardner placed the horse in his stable overnight before

---

96 Stout, September 22 and October 3–4, 1847; Brooks, John Doyle Lee, 122–23; William Clayton’s Journal, December 9, 1847. Cleland and Brooks, A Mormon Chronicle, March 18, 1848, is somewhat confusing and their interpretation seems wrong. Apparently, the police complained that Lee and others had resisted impounding strays. When the high council heard that Brigham Young had advised suspending the use of the stray pound, the council dismissed the complaint. But problems at Summer Quarters persisted. Charles Kennedy, George B. Teeples, and Josiah Arnold requested an investigation because they are “dissatisfied With the proceedings of the Police here in this place.” High Council, March 11, 1848.

As to freeing wives and adopted family, see Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 277 note 52 and 290 note 59. The law of adoption then in force generally involved adult men with families of their own who made a covenant of allegiance to and became part of the “family” of Brigham Young, Heber Kimball, or some other apostle. Woodruff, 3:117–19, January 16–19, 1847; Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 178 note 50 and 290 note 59; Gordon Irving, “The Law of Adoption: One Phase of the Development of the Mormon Concept of Salvation, 1830–1900,” BYU Studies 14, no. 3 (Spring 1974): 291. This practice ended with Woodruff’s revelation in 1894 that people should be sealed to their biological parents.

taking it to the stray pen. Russell’s son took the horse from Gardner’s stable, calling him “a damned thief.” Russell backed up his son, threatening to kill Gardner and accusing him of lying about the circumstances. Russell was a member of the high council, but the council found against him and, because of this incident and others, dropped him from membership.98

The greatest theft problem was the persistent stealing of livestock by the often starving Omaha and Pawnee. The total is uncertain, but the Mormons certainly lost hundreds of animals.99 Brigham Young and an Omaha spokesman agreed that Indians caught stealing cattle or other property of the Saints should be whipped, not shot. Parley Pratt reiterated the instruction (“give them a good whipping, which would do far more good than it would to kill them”) and urged that Indians should not be allowed in the city.100 The Omaha, who sometimes stole livestock, then returned the animals for a reward, negotiated an agreement to stop killing cattle in exchange for $200 worth of corn.101

Although there were few prosecutions of Mormons for theft, undoubtedly more thefts occurred.102 Arza Adams and Henry W. Miller, from the east side of the Missouri, openly took a wagon load of

98Stout, September 17 and October 2, 1847; High Council, September 19 and October 2, 1847.

99By October 1846 Indians had already killed about fifty oxen and many sheep. Journal History, October 24, 1846. Stout, April 18–19, 1847, said an “incredible” number had been killed over the winter. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 114, estimates that the Mormons owned more than 10,000 head of cattle, kept mostly in four locations, one of them near Winter Quarters and another six miles away. For the Indians’ plight, see Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 96; Woodruff, 3:336, April 3, 1848.

100Stout, May 9, 1847; Ward, Winter Quarters, 122–23, May 9, 1847: “I want the Brethren to take care of their Cattle, and not lett the Indians kill them all off, to build up the pickets round the City to prevent them from coming in to your houses and insulting your Women & Children or robbing your tables while they are out tending their gardins, &C.”

101Stout, October 18, 1846; April 22, 25, May 25, and June 30, 1847; Nelson, Journal of Brigham Young, October 18, 1846, and March 26, 1847.

102Brigham Young “began by speaking of several Evils existing in the
buffalo robes, leggings, lodges, and other things from the place where Sioux had killed seventy-five Omahas. They may have seen the items as free for the taking, but the Omaha came to Winter Quarters, angry at the sacrilege. Adams and Miller did not live in Winter Quarters, but the council sent them a letter by special messenger asking that they return the robes to the Omahas and make satisfaction, which they did.

Rodney Badger was owed money by one Missourian, but he took a horse from a different, “innocent” Missourian. The high council ordered him to “return the horse and make satisfaction,” even though it recognized that Badger could face prosecution in Missouri. The high council thought that failing to return the property might increase the risk that Missourians would attack Mormons in revenge.

James Tremain, a less penitent horse thief, was found guilty by Bishops Miller and Perkins. The court ordered thirty-nine strokes with a rod on his bare back, fourfold restoration to the owner, and

---

103 Stout, October 14, 1846. According to the Journal History, August 7, 1846: “The Indians frequently deposited their dead in the branches of trees, wrapped in buffalo robes and blankets, leaving with them arrows, pipes and other trinkets, which they considered sacred, and they [Mormons] should not remove them.”

104 Stout, February 1, 1847. Brigham Young instructed that the goods be returned. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 97.

105 Stout and High Council, April 1, 1847. Perhaps a “non-innocent” Missourian would have been treated differently. The Pottawattamie High Council, January 1, 1848, prescribed that a non-Mormon thief living among the Saints in Iowa must make satisfaction and receive up to thirty-nine lashes; for stealing from a Mormon, recompense should be fourfold plus up to thirty-nine lashes. In Nauvoo some had urged that taking Gentile property was no crime. Godfrey, “Crime and Punishment in Mormon Nauvoo,” 201, 205, 211. In Utah Badger served as counselor to a bishop and as a deputy sheriff; he drowned heroically attempting to save an emigrant family crossing the Weber River. Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 245 note 39.
payment of costs.\footnote{106}{Journal History and High Council, January 17, 1848; Stout, March 13, 1848. Tremain had already been whipped for theft in Miller’s Hollow.}

Some young men stole Amasa Lyman’s fishing canoe and hid it two or three miles downstream, intending to go off in it during the night. The council adjourned in expectation of getting more evidence, but in the meantime the young men fled.\footnote{107}{Stout, July 28, 1847; High Council and Stout, July 30, 1847. The young men responsible were Horeth[?] and Edward Pool. They may have been planning to escape pending charges, since Pool was excommunicated within a week for “unchristianlike conduct.” High Council, July 25 and August 1, 1847.} Jonathan T. Packer was excommunicated for stealing a brace of six shooters by using a forged order.\footnote{108}{Nelson, \textit{Journal of Brigham Young}, March 6, 1847: “I knew that bro. Packer had lied to the meeting in the name of the Lord.” Puzzlingly, Packer came before the Seventy a week later to determine whether he should be cut off and Stout urged he be given another chance. Stout, March 13, 1847. Stout’s journal gives the middle initial P, but it should probably be T for Taylor. Packer went west with the 1847 pioneer company and became a bishop in the 1870s.}

A man surnamed King was convicted of stealing a blanket and the council made him pay fourfold.\footnote{109}{Stout, December 25, 1847.} Bushrod W. Wilson stole a considerable amount of pork from storage, and the bishop hearing the complaint case made him repay fourfold and return the pork.\footnote{110}{Stout and Journal History, January 25, 1848. The Pottawattamie High Council, March 15, 1847, disfellowshipped Daniel Wood for stealing a cow and expressing contempt for Church leaders.}

In other actions, Charles Drown was acquitted of stealing, and police searched Samuel Savary’s house for stolen goods but found none.\footnote{111}{Stout and High Council, July 18, 1847; Stout, March 8, 1848. Orson Hyde asked the high council to hand over Jack Redding and other suspected thieves; but because the request was based on rumor, the Winter Quarters High Council (Brigham Young participating) decided to let it “pass over” as not worth the fuss. Stout, March 14, 1848; Woodruff, 3:335, March 26, 1848. Dayton was also charged with taking Stewart’s property,}

John Richards refused to give up two pistols and a sword that be-
longed to the public (presumably to the Nauvoo Legion), resulting in a charge of contempt of court. Only after he was “very near being cut off the church” did he reluctantly comply.\textsuperscript{112}

We have record of only one instance where a woman in Winter Quarters was accused of an offense other than involvement in sexual immorality. John D. Lee told Jacob Woolsey that Lucinda (no surname given) had stolen a black silk skirt and other clothing from Brigham Young’s daughters. She denied the accusation, and no formal charge appears in the record.\textsuperscript{113}

*Sexual Immorality*

Just before the establishment of Winter Quarters, three young men and two young women were accused of sexual immorality,\textsuperscript{114} but thirteen months elapsed before there was another case involving sexual misconduct. “I have heard of no report of adultery in this place since the affair last fall or summer with the three young men,” Hosea Stout commented five months later.\textsuperscript{115} The following autumn, however, Daniel Russell, a member of the high council who was already accused of violence and lying about a strayed animal, was accused of “some unbecoming things between him and a Sister Hart.” Sister Hart and Russell’s own family provided evidence.\textsuperscript{116} Russell confessed, apologized, and, as al-

\textsuperscript{112}High Council, January 14, 1847. Richards had defied an order of General Charles C. Rich. Stout, July 4, 1847.

\textsuperscript{113}Cleland and Brooks, \textit{A Mormon Chronicle}, March 31, 1848.

\textsuperscript{114}The three were non-Mormon Daniel Barnham/Barnum/Banan, Peletiah/Pelatiah Brown, and Jack Clothier. Eighteen-year-old Sarah Brown and seventeen-year-old Caroline Barton were Wilford Woodruff’s plural wives. He divorced them, but they were not otherwise punished. Woodruff, 3:65–81, August 2, 8, 26, and 29, and September 6 and 13, 1846; Stout, September 4–7 and 12–13, 1846; Thomas G. Alexander, \textit{Things in Heaven and Earth: The Life and Times of Wilford Woodruff, a Mormon Prophet} (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1991), 135.

\textsuperscript{115}Stout, January 2, 1847.

\textsuperscript{116}Russell may have been encouraging Sister Hart to leave her troubled marriage and become his plural wife. Brother Hart testified that, if his wife left him, he would rather she become Russell’s plural wife than any other man’s. High Council, September 28, 1847.
ready noted, was dropped from the high council.117

While W. W. Phelps and Henry B. Jacobs pursued a mission in the East, Phelps persuaded three young women to become his plural wives and Jacobs performed the marriages in St. Louis. When they all returned to Winter Quarters, Brigham Young asserted that Jacobs lacked authority to perform the marriages. The high council convicted Phelps of adultery and excommunicated him, though specifying that he was eligible for rebaptism.118 The council also “silenced” Jacobs for his part in the marriages.119

Milo Andrus was tried for living with a woman not his wife.120

Benjamin Jones volunteered, “I hereby prefer a charge against myself before your honorable body for taking a woman [Rosanna Cox] & living with her unlawfully.”121 Because of his penitence, the high council, on Brigham Young’s recommendation, forgave Jones.

---

117 High Council and Stout, September 28 and October 2, 1847.
118 Stout, November 30 and December 9, 1847; Woodruff, 3:62, July 24, 1846. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 197, 303 note 47, citing meeting minutes of the Twelve and Seventy, says that Phelps was married to two women in Niagara County, New York, by a local elder, excommunicated, and reinstated within a few days, with an authorized plural sealing already scheduled. Phelps had been excommunicated in Far West on March 10, 1838, and again in Quincy, Illinois, March 17, 1839, when he refused an invitation to reconciliation. History of the Church, 3:284. Walter Dean Bowen, “The Versatile W. W. Phelps” (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1958), 131–38, does not mention the marriages.
119 Stout, November 30, 1847, reports Jacobs’s “silencing.” That term is still used in the RLDS Church (now the Community of Christ) for the suspension of priesthood functioning. Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Church Administrator’s Handbook (Independence: Herald Publishing House, 1987), 49–51. Although the term is not now used in LDS practice, the same effect may be achieved by conditions of formal or informal probation.
120 Stout and Woodruff, 3:297, December 21, 1847. “Andrews” turned his wife away and married another without permission. Both he and the woman were excommunicated. Andrus evidently repented since, in 1856, he became a bishop and later still a patriarch. Brooks, On the Mormon Frontier, 231 note 29. Stout, July 29, 1847, says Hyrum Dayton was tried for “taking” Stewart’s wife.
121 High Council, February 26, 1848.
Brigham sealed the couple that same day.122

Stout received a report that Benjamin Covey was “practising a wicked and abominable thing,” and Brigham Young requested an investigation. It showed “that he is guilty of seducing two girls not over twelve years of age.” The council tried him, convicted him, excommunicated him, and released his wives and children from any obligation to him.123

Disorderly Conduct

As general instructions, the high council ordered the police captain to bring in disorderly characters, and approved, both after the fact and for the future, whipping boys who persisted in night-time rowdiness and horse-racing in the streets. Young James Clayton, who fired pistols on the Sabbath, was reprimanded but apologized and was “acquitted.”124 Verbal quarrels could also lead to trials, even if they did not reach the level of threats and violence.125

Lying

When W. W. Phelps let an animal stray, he lied in an attempt to

122High Council and Stout, February 26, 1848. Jones and his wife, Anna Stout Jones, had already separated but agreed to settle their differences. Three years later, they divorced, ending their marriage of seventeen years. Stout, July 8, 1847, and February 7, 1850. The council also heard George B. Teeples complain that Solomon Wixom had lied, engaged in unchristianlike conduct, and “stolen” his seventeen-year-old daughter, Harriet. Since Wixom had been sealed to Harriet, presumably by Brigham Young, no wrong had been committed and Teeples withdrew his charge. High Council and Stout, January 29, 1848.

123Stout, January 28 and 31 and February 2, 1848; March 11 and 12, 1849; High Council, March 9 and 11, 1848. Lorenzo H. Hatch “prefer[red] a charge against Benjamin Covey for missuseing Adeline Hatch a sister of mine, and Sleeping with her unlawfully.” Covey later became bishop of a Salt Lake ward.

124High Council, July 30, 1847; Stout, July 18, 1847; Stout and High Council, February 14 and 21, 1847.

125In addition to the cases already described, on December 12, 1847, the high council ordered Hosea Stout and John Scott to settle their differences. W. W. Phelps was forgiven after apologizing to the police for his harsh words, and Solomon Freeman’s bishop reported to the high council that Freeman had asked forgiveness for insulting Brigham Young. High Council, January 3 and November 16, 1847.
avoid paying the fine and also insulted Officer Luman Calkins when he tried to collect. Calkins sued W. W. Phelps for the debt and the insult, also insisting that Phelps acknowledge to the high council that he had lied in an effort to avoid paying what he owed. Phelps did.\footnote{Stout, November 22, 23, and 28, 1847.}

Daniel Russell lied about having paid his police tax and was required to confess.\footnote{High Council, September 20 and 25, 1847.} Hyrum (?) Dayton was tried for falsely accusing a man surnamed Stewart of apostasy and of having stolen a team belonging to Hosea Stout.\footnote{Stout, July 19, 1847. Stout implies that Dayton was convicted.}

\emph{Disloyalty}

The physically difficult experience in crossing Iowa and settling temporarily at the Missouri, coupled with continuing uncertainty about Church leadership and emerging polygamy, led to widespread grumbling, criticism, dissension, outright apostasy, and threats by individuals against the leaders. Richard Bennett estimates that at least two thousand Saints at the Missouri failed to go west.\footnote{Bennett, \textit{Mormons at the Missouri}, 206, 223–27, 314 note 63, 300 note 67. Many joined the RLDS Church. Barbara J. Bernauer, “Gathering the Remnants: Establishing the RLDS Church in Southwestern Iowa,” \textit{John Whitmer Historical Association Journal} 20 (2000): 5. Stout commented on March 14, 1848, that dissension was as bad as he had ever seen it, and about three thousand had already defected in Nauvoo between 1844 and 1846. Bennett, \textit{Mormons at the Missouri}, 227.}

As a refugee society, the Mormons placed a high value on loyalty. Disloyalty in the form of disparaging statements could be the basis for court action. Bishop Newel K. Whitney and merchant Edwin D. Woolley told Heber C. Kimball that some Saints complained that the Twelve were enriching themselves. Kimball urged the bishops to speak to the people about the corrosive effect of such complaining. Woolley charged that Lemuel Lewis used abusive language about Church leaders, and Lewis was given the choice of confessing that he had expressed contempt for the authorities and paying a $5 fine to benefit the poor, or being cut off.\footnote{High Council, October 17, 1847. Lewis was also charged with
against the Council and authorities of this place.” The president of the council proposed that a huge fine of $100 be imposed, but the other council members disagreed. Nearly all agreed that the charge was sustained, but some of the council members thought the fine too heavy, and half wanted only an acknowledgment of wrongdoing. They prevailed. Brigham Young then proposed that Stout withdraw his charge, which he did after making a speech explaining that he had brought the charge to draw attention to “the dark cloud of dissatisfied and murmuring feeling.” Young and Kimball then preached about the need for unity, and good feeling finally prevailed.  

The fight in Strodes’s store between Stout and Isaac Hill, already mentioned, emerged from a bishop’s decision in March against Strodes, a Gentile, in a contract dispute that produced much grumbling and fault-finding by the non-Mormons and half-hearted Mormons who gathered in his store.  

Liquor

Selling liquor to the Indians was a serious matter. Brigham Young instructed the high council that anyone found engaged in such trafficking would be handed over to the Indian agents “to be dealt

smearing Woolley’s house and door with manure.

131Stout, January 21, 1848; Stout and Woodruff, 3:313, January 24, 1848. There is no doubt that some at Woolley’s store did make seditious remarks. Isaac Hill reportedly said, “Brigham was elected by the people and they would be damned if they would not make a private of him.” High Council, January 21–22, 1848; Stout, January 19–21, 1848. Woolley denied disloyalty but testified: “You cant find such laws in History as are passed here they are unjust unwriteious & tyrannical for I never knew such a law as a man was to pay for his own cattle getting into his own Corn and I . . . will have a party when I please at my house and no Bishop nor High Council can rule me for they are not big enough nor good enough.” He complained also that as a merchant was not allowed to sell liquor although the bishop could. The council unanimously accepted Woolley’s confession and acquitted him. In Salt Lake City Woolley was a high councilor, bishop, and Brigham Young’s business manager. Woolley’s daughter Olive married Heber C. Kimball’s son Andrew; their son was Spencer Woolley Kimball.

132Stout, March 11, 14, and 17, 1848.
with according to the law of the United States.”

After a period of laxity, stricter enforcement of the restriction on liquor sale by others than bishops returned. A man named McCauslin (presumably Younger McCauslin), turned over his whiskey to the police on demand; but Alonzo Jones, a man surnamed Ferris/Ferres, and John Pack all refused. The police took their whiskey by force. Pack filed a charge against Bishop Daniel Carns for seizing his barrel of whiskey but withdrew the charge after it became clear that the council believed the bishop had acted according to law. Pack later petitioned the council for compensation for his whiskey, but the petition was “burnt,” presumably as an emphatic denial.

An effort to charge Jesse P. Harmon for selling liquor on the east side of the river failed because “he had done no particular wrong.” That may mean either that he did not sell whiskey or that the Winter Quarters rules on whiskey did not apply across the river. Curiously, near the end of the Winter Quarters experience, Younger McCauslin, disabled by rheumatism, petitioned the council for permission to sell liquor so he could earn enough to go west with the Saints. The high council rescinded its rule allowing only bishops to sell liquor.

**Dancing**

Dances could not be held unless the bishop was present. A few days after the rule was passed, officer Luman Calkins found no bishop at a dance at Lucius N. Scovil’s home and ordered the dancers to disperse. They obeyed.

Two months later, police broke up a dancing party at Daniel Russell’s home “which was got up contrary to orders” and broke up

---


134Stout, January 4 and 19, 1848; High Council, January 21, 1848; High Council and Stout, February 5 and 12, 1848.

135Stout, February 15, 1848. The Pottawattamie High Council, January 18 and February 5, 1848, established a $1 fine for being drunk or having liquor near the Tabernacle during Jubilee and a fine of up to $5 for selling liquor on Pottawattamie lands.

136High Council, March 11, 1848.

137Stout, November 14, 1847.

138Stout, November 20, 1847. The law had been adopted a few days earlier.
yet another dance the very next night. 139 According to Mary Haskin Parker Richards:

The Police came in and told the Company that the Party was not according to Order that they had aught to have a Bishop to preside over them, and without one they must not dance &c some unpleasant words past between the police and the Company, but a Bishop [Isaac Clark] was soon obtained and the party went on in order for a time, then the PO came again by order of Bishop Knight (the Bishop of this ward) to break up the party (the latter had been asked to come and preside but refused because they were not willing to give him 3 Bits a Couple) and also to inform Bishop Clark that he was out of place (as this party was not in his ward). [T]he Company was then dismissed by Bishop Clark with good feelings toward him, whom they gave some reward for his service. 140

Debt, Divorce, and Property Disputes

Disputes about property, debts, and domestic relations arise in every community. Some cases heard by the Winter Quarters high council involved a simple claim for money owed. 141 Others concerned property ownership or damage to property. 142 And some disputes arose out of commercial transactions, such as freighting, storekeep-

---

139 Stout, January 17–18, 1848.
140 Ward, Winter Quarters, 187, January 18, 1848. A month later, the police were called out to another dance at Daniel Russell’s. The bishop was present, and Stout’s diary (February 19, 1848) is ambiguous about whether they stopped the dance or allowed it to continue.
141 William A. Bebee recovered $39.78½ owed him by Hirum/ Hyrum Bostick. High Council, September 5, 1847. After Clark heard John R. Robinson’s suit against Charles Chapman for debt, the parties compromised before the high council. Stout, December 18, 1847; High Council, December 9, 1847, and January 15, 1848. The council also ordered Hyrum Dayton to pay his debt to George W. Langley, although one councilman dissented, on grounds of Dayton’s poverty. High Council and Stout, February 19, 1848; High Council, February 9, 1848. Cf. Stout, January 11, 1848: He “went to settle a Debt between E. Warner & T. Tanner.”
142 Daniel H. Wells won a dispute with William Young over ownership of a span of mules, but the case was referred to a high council committee, which decided in Wells’s favor. Stout and High Council, July 25, 1847; High Council, October 19 and November 14, 1847. When Ray Harvey sued
ing, and sale of property by agents.\textsuperscript{143}

Sometimes domestic disputes resulted in divorce. Archibald Beers “abused his family and turned his wife out of tent last evening in

Alpheus Cutler for a cow, the high council referred it to a committee, who decided in Harvey’s favor. High Council, December 19, 1847, and January 2, 1848. Laid over was Warren Lyfette Ball’s suit against Cynthia Shirtliff for refusing to turn over a horse he claimed was his. High Council, February 26, 1848.

John Everts sued Clayton for failing to pay for a team and wagon. The case was referred to a bishop. High Council, August 17, 1846. Cornelius P. Lott recovered a wagon from Milo Andrus. High Council, March 28, 1847. John Bills loaned a wagon to Isaac Butterfield who sold it to Frederick W. Cox. The case was referred to a temporary committee for settling such disputes, and Bills withdrew his claim. High Council, July 25, 1847; High Council and Stout, August 1, 1847. John Lowe Butler demanded that John Scott relinquish a house that Butler had bought from Scott. Scott asserted that the sale had been conditional and the council agreed with him. High Council, June 20 and August 22, 1847.

Leve [Levi?] Simonds and Ezra Clark sued Daniel Russell for the corn his cattle ate. The high council, July 4, 1847, ordered the parties to settle the dispute. John Berry sued John D. Lee, his son-in-law, for the value of a horse that disappeared while in Lee’s custody. The high council concluded that the loss resulted from unavoidable circumstances. High Council and Stout, July 18, 1847; Kelly, \textit{Journals of John D. Lee}, 189–93. William Leany loaned a horse to someone from whom it was stolen. Leany sued the man for the animal’s value. The high council heard the case June 2, 1847, but no outcome is noted. William Meeks sued Harvey Green for taking away part of a fence. Bishop Clark ruled that they should shake hands and repair the fence together. Stout and Clark, Record Book, August 14, 1847.

\textsuperscript{143}Bishop Calkins heard Jack Redding’s claim against merchant J. M. Strodes for money owed for transporting merchandise. Strodes had opened a store in Winter Quarters two weeks earlier. Similarly a man named Hartwell sued three Gentile merchants for unspecified services. Stout, February 23 and March 11, 14, and 15, 1848; Cleland and Brooks, \textit{A Mormon Chronicle}, March 11 and 18, 1848.

I. C. Bidamon sued James E. Furness/Furnace over the sale of goods. High Council, March 18 and 21, 1848. As already described, Andrew Lytle and his wife claimed that John D. Lee had shorted them in the value of merchandise; Lee counterclaimed. Brigham Young said he believed Lee but suggested that Lee forgive the debt rather than have hard feelings.
the rain.” His wife, afraid to return, stayed with friends. When the
council considered the case a month later, it took only the action of di-
viding the family property, treating the case as one of informal di-
vote. But ten days later the couple had reconciled, “living together in
seeming friendship again as if nothing had happened.”

One case involved a claim of nonsupport. Agnes Taylor, who
had been sealed to Bishop John Benbow in the Nauvoo Temple, sued
him for support of her and her children. Parley P. Pratt and the counc-
il ordered Benbow to provide for her and see to her emigration west-
ward or be disfellowshipped.

The degree of separateness of spousal property is illustrated in
Lucinda Callahan’s suit against a man named Holton for taking her
cow. Holton claimed that he took it because Lucinda’s husband owed
Holton money. Brigham Young said, in that case, Holton should col-
lect from the man, not his wife.

On behalf of the community, police sued to collect fines for fire

---

Parley P. Pratt’s (unnamed) wife sued Ezra Bickford for money
Bickford had received from selling the Pratts’ property in Nauvoo. Bickford
claimed a large share of the sale price for his expenses, but the council ruled
against him. High Council, September 19, October 1, and December 29,
1847.

144Nelson, *Journal of Brigham Young*, November 6, 1846; Stout, No-

vember 5 and 6 and December 1 and 11, 1846; High Council, December 1,
1846. Mrs. Beers had brought $450 to the marriage, so she should receive at
least that much in the property division. Beers was to keep his tools and bed-
ning. Neither was to marry again without Brigham Young’s permission. In
another divorce case, the high council designated the marshal and bishop
to divide the property of Lewis Hults/Hulse and his wife. High Council,
January 3 and 7, 1847. Brigham Young said the divorce of Nathaniel P. Warden
and his wife did not warrant the council’s time, and it was referred to a
committee. High Council, November 7, 1847.

145High Council, May 26, 1847. John Taylor took $300 from Benbow
for his sister. The Twelve accepted appellate jurisdiction and voted that the
high council in the Salt Lake Valley should take charge of the property in
dispute, then discharged Benbow of any further obligation to Agnes

146High Council, October 2, 1846.
Particularly difficult problems were raised by the dissolution of the James Emmett group that had for a time established a separate camp many miles distant in Nebraska. It had operated on “common stock principles”—meaning that its members deeded to the group title to all their property—but those who left were reluctant to leave their property behind. One departee, Thomas Wilson, took oxen from John Riddle, another member of the company and went to Winter Quarters. On appeal from the bishop’s decision, the high council said Wilson was entitled to relief, but only from the Emmett Company, not from Riddle individually.\(^{148}\)

Similarly, Samuel Coon/Coons, sought to reclaim property which he had deeded to the Emmett group. In dealing with the dispute, police seized a cow, a horse and cart, and miscellaneous property from Sampson Emmett, so that the council could determine rightful ownership. After a long trial, Brigham Young said such a covenant was binding only if established by duly authorized priesthood leaders and that Emmett had no such authority. The high council therefore ruled that all the property in dispute between Emmett, Coons, and any other members of the Emmett group should be returned insofar as possible to the people who contributed it, with the balance going to the Church.\(^{149}\)

In a related case, the council ordered that widow Martha Akes should recover or be reimbursed for blacksmith tools her husband had given to the Emmett company. The obviously exasperated council then announced that it would not consider any further cases arising out of the Emmett company’s dissolution.

\(^{147}\)Phineas Richards, Daniel Russell, and Frederick W. Cox were fined $1 each for creating a fire hazard. High Council, September 26, 1847. William Meeks sued John Scott for nonpayment of stray tax of $3.25. On appeal, the high council sustained the bishop’s ruling. High Council, November 29 and December 12, 1847; Stout, December 7 and 9, 1847. For other cases involving strays, see High Council, May 30 and June 20, 1847.

\(^{148}\)High Council, May 2, 1847.

\(^{149}\)Stout, December 9 and 12, 1847, and January 5, 1848; High Council, December 12, 1847, and January 2, 5, and 6, 1848. Brigham Young said that Coon’s claim was against Emmett or his company, not against Emmett’s son, from whom Coon apparently took the cow. Emmett reclaimed his horse and wagon, Coon his cow.
Other Disputes

Various other cases involved vague charges like “unchristianlike conduct,”\textsuperscript{150} or neglect of duty.\textsuperscript{151} When Hannah Jones was “troublesome,” the high council referred the case to the bishop.\textsuperscript{152} Incomplete records on other cases fail to identify the point in dispute or the outcome.\textsuperscript{153}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences in High Council Cases, Excluding Debts and Property Disputes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled by confession and apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquittal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Possibly the Joseph Herring case belongs here. See p. 196

Judgment

The council and the bishops responsible for enforcing the rules of conduct in Winter Quarters had a wide range of sanctions available.

The death penalty was not formally imposed in Winter Quarters, even though it was threatened as a future application of “the law of the Lord” when the Church had full political independence. William A. Hickman’s lurid memoirs claim that he conducted several au-

\textsuperscript{150}High Council, July, 25 and 28 and August 1, 1847; January 15, 1848.

\textsuperscript{151}For example, herdsmen Hector C. Haight, Madison D. Hamilton, and Peregren [Perrigrine] Sessions were charged with such negligence that one animal died. They were exonerated, however, except for one who spoke harsh language to the herd boss, John Tanner. High Council, October 4 and 7, 1846.

\textsuperscript{152}High Council, October 17 and 24, 1847.

\textsuperscript{153}High Council, September 4 and November 25, 1846; and November 14, 1847.
thorized but informal executions of malefactors; and as already dis-
cussed, Stout and his police officers felt free to threaten bodily harm
and death to assure repentance or to scare away an undesirable.

The council decreed that anyone who killed an Indian, even an
Indian caught stealing horses or cattle, would be turned over to his
tribe for punishment, to avoid Indian retribution on innocent peo-
ple. 154 No such cases are reported.

Winter Quarters had no jail, so imprisonment was not an op-
tion. 155 The court ordered flogging once for horse theft; but as
noted, at other times the police flogged without court order for sex-
ual misconduct, neglect of duty as herders, rescue from the stray pen,
and youthful unruliness.

But the most frequently imposed penalties were economic, par-
ticularly fines and forfeitures. Some penalties were set by ordinance,
but the court otherwise set the fine according to what it considered
fair, depending on the offense and the offender’s means. 156 Thieves
were required, when possible, to return stolen property, often four-

154 Stout, March 26, 1847.

155 Nauvoo also had no jail, but the jail in Carthage and the Illinois
state prison had been available for serious offenders. Godfrey, “Crime and
Punishment in Mormon Nauvoo,” 201; James L. Kimball Jr., interviewed by

156 John H. Blazzard, fined $2 for trying to rescue his ox from the po-
lice and threatening them, was reportedly—after the Saints had been almost
a year in Winter Quarters—“the first man fined by the High Council.” Stout,
June 27, 1847. The council president proposed fining Edwin D. Woolley, a
well-to-do merchant, $100, a huge sum. He apologized instead, thus avoid-
ing the fine. Clark paid $1 for two horses in the corn field but agreed to pay
$1 each if it happened again. High Council, June 20, 1847. When Daniel
Russell had twenty-two head of cattle in the cornfield, he appealed the pen-
alty and the council referred his appeal to the police. They left it “to his own
conscience & magnanimity.” He paid 10 bushels of corn and 10 of buck-
wheat. Stout, July 5, 1847. A. P. Rockwood successfully asked remission of
the fine for allowing his yoke of cattle to wander home alone, but he was or-
dered to pay for damage the cattle caused along the way. High Council,
April 1, 1848. G. D. Russell and J. C. Wright asked for remission of fines
owed by the poor and widows. High Council, February 12, 1848.
Even the police might be fined for use of excessive force.

Although some grumbled and resisted, most of the people paid the fine in cash or grain, but if fines went unpaid, the police could seize property to satisfy the obligation.

Refusing ferry service occasionally served as a means of control. For example, in April 1847, Stout instructed the ferryman not to carry passengers who had not paid their police tax. Brigham Young gave instructions not to ferry Jacob Woolsey until he delivered a wagon box he owed to John D. Lee. Brigham Young commented, “If a man apostatizes his property need not apostatize” and, in this case, the high council forbade the ferrying of Benjamin Jenny’s team, since he was planning to take his family and leave.

Many of the penalties could be called spiritual or psychological. The ultimate ecclesiastical sanction was to be “cut off,” which could mean either disfellowshipment (a kind of probationary state) or excommunication (complete severance from Church membership). One who had been cut off but was still a believer would typically confess his wrongdoing and thus be well on the way to reinstatement. For such a person excommunication was a preliminary to returning to the fold. But those who truly rebelled nearly always simply left the community, since there was otherwise little reason to remain in Win-

157 This precedent carried over into Utah where Firmage and Mangrum, *Zion in the Courts*, 361, cite an 1849 case of a thief required to pay the owner four times the value of the stolen iron, pay the court a $10 fine and costs, and be disfellowshipped.

158 Stout, April 27, 1847. There was, of course, a Gentile ferry some miles downriver at Sarpy’s Post.

159 Cleland and Brooks, *A Mormon Chronicle*, April 10, 1848.

160 High Council, November 7 and December 13, 1847.

161 In an unusual case, Orson Hyde and the council voted four to two to disfellowship all the members of the branch in Garden Grove, Iowa, apparently for sheltering thieves and counterfeiters, although there were no specific charges and no trial. Two weeks later the Garden Grove leaders reached Winter Quarters and established that they were victims of slander. They had already excommunicated nine troublemakers for theft and for running a bawdy house. The branch at Garden Grove was thereupon reinstated to full fellowship. High Council, July 10 and August 4, 1847; Stout, July 18 and 25 and August 4, 1847; Brooks, *On the Mormon Frontier*, 262 note 43.
ter Quarters, a temporary settlement slated for dissolution in 1848. Being cut off from the Church merely formalized their alienation.

The risk of excommunication might come as much from a recalcitrant attitude as from the sin or crime that brought about the trial. Almost anything could be forgiven except stubbornness. At John Richards’s trial for refusing to give up two pistols that belonged to the public, he “was very near being cut off” from the Church before he complied.”

As noted, the high council frequently required confession and apology. But it had to be acceptably humble. In addition to the John D. Lee case already noted, which required a double apology, the high council listened to Daniel Russell state: “If I have hurt . . . feelings I am sorry for it.” The council responded: “That Sort of Confession amounted to nothing.” Council president George Harris then obtained permission to confess on Russell’s behalf and offered the police a full and humble statement of contrition for his misconduct and lies. Russell wisely agreed: “This is the confession I meant.”

**CONCLUSION**

The system of control in Winter Quarters stood somewhere between that of Nauvoo, a chartered city in Illinois that followed very closely the form of government in other American cities, and Mormon wagon companies on the trail, that generally adopted a military

---

162 High Council, January 14, 1847.
163 W. W. Phelps was forgiven on Brigham Young’s recommendation, after he apologized for entering into an unauthorized plural marriage. Brigham said, “If a man comes to me with a good spirit and willing to confess, and say I have done wrong—I am willing to meet him half way, and more. Now this will do good as Bro Phelps says. there are many looking for a hog hole to creep out by, and when they see that Bro Phelps can’t creep out they won’t try. I ain’t too big yet to creep out. Bro: Phelps has done wrong. I know it, and he knows it. and when he confesses let it be dropped let it pass—and go along as if nothing had happened.” High Council and Stout, November 28, 1847. Public confession and ready forgiveness were relatively common. Edward L. Kimball, “Confession in LDS Doctrine and Practice,” BYU Studies 36, no. 2 (1996-97): 42–49.
164 High Council and Stout, September 28 and October 2, 1847.
165 Unusual provisions in the Nauvoo charter were that the mayor and aldermen also served as judges, the city could organize its own militia, and
model. In all three there was a theocratic overlay.

Winter Quarters had no charter and no status under federal, state, or territorial government. It was organized temporarily by the Church in Indian territory, without any real government oversight. The governing body was the high council/municipal council, appointed by the Quorum of the Twelve. It mingled legislative, judicial, and executive functions, subject to overriding power in the Quorum of the Twelve, led by Brigham Young. This was no democracy; people had only the choice of submitting to the appointed officers or leaving. Bishops were not only religious and public welfare officers within their wards, but also magistrates. The courts operated with great informality, but took their responsibilities seriously. The Winter Quarters police force protected the people against Indian theft and enforced both formally enacted ordinances and ad hoc norms.

The inhabitants of Winter Quarters lived under great strain. It was unsettling not to know what they might have to eat, to constantly face death from illness, accident, or disease, and to wonder when, how, and to what destination they would go. For go they knew they must. Under such stress, the people appear to have been highly volatile, quick to anger but also quick to forgive. When charged with wrongdoing, public confession and apology were expected and, in a large share of cases, brought almost certain reconciliation. Despite their difficulties, the believers seem to have been remarkably optimistic, feeling themselves in God’s hands.

Winter Quarters appears to have had a very low level of criminality. Respect for law, both God’s and man’s, ranked high in the Latter-day Saint scale of values, although the fallibility of Saints still left substantial work for the mechanisms of law to attend to.

---


Reviewed by Mary Lythgoe Bradford

As one who has committed a number of autobiographical acts, I am intrigued by this study that is both scholarly and readable. Laura Bush claims that it is the first “sustained discussion” by a literary scholar “that distinguishes the purposes and conventions of Mormon autobiography in general and Mormon women’s autobiography in particular” (2).

She notes that autobiography has become the preferred genre of Mormon writers and credits the late Gene England for recognizing this phenomenon. When he helped found *Dialogue*, he depended on the “Personal Voice” for much of its power, and subsequent publications have followed suit. Even official publications like the *Ensign* publish personal life writing. Bush disagrees with England when he argues that much of Mormon fiction is really personal essay. (At the time of her death, Virginia Sorensen was debating Gene’s crowning of her as the “mother of the Mormon personal essay.” Although her stories were based upon her own experience, they were nonetheless fiction.) It is impossible to ignore, however, that the genres are bleeding into each other and are confidently crossing lines so rigidly set by critics and teachers many years ago.

Laura Bush’s “cross-overs” are especially useful because she analyzes these six works by women according to conventions of professional biography while recognizing them specifically as religious Mormon works. She makes a convincing case for the theory that Mormon biographies begin with Joseph Smith and his vision in the grove. The writers discussed—Mary Ann Hafen, Annie Clark Tanner, Juanita Brooks, Wynetta Willis Martin, Terry Tempest Williams, and Phyllis Barber—follow their brothers in formatting their life histories according to certain Mormon conventions.
In her introduction, Bush identifies five patterns that most Latter-day Saint life writings follow: (1) They testify of God and their personal experience with their faith. (2) They establish their own authority to explain doctrine. (3) They describe the Mormon culture and background. (4) They defend their faith and their Church membership. (5) They write in a style that appeals to readers outside of their community.

These narratives, often called “spiritual autobiographies,” are part of a proud tradition, dating back to seventeenth and eighteenth Puritan and Quaker diary writing. These and their Mormon counterparts also strove to write accurate histories. They were careful to “recite ancestry, exact places of birth, carefully marking and researching . . . the progression of the story until ending the story with a formal testament of faith and the Restoration of the gospel” (9). Bush believes that this understanding of family lineage and interaction with God is the key to understanding Mormon life writing.

As Mormon women without priesthood ordination, they must establish their authority to explain, critique, or defend their own actions within the faith. The communal nature of Mormon life is especially important to Mormon writers: “They assume that their individual narrative will reflect on their family and religious community for generations to come” (12). They accept, then, an “imperative to demonstrate mostly the good about their lives and correct outsiders’ misconceptions” (13). Bush chooses to focus on Mormon women “whose continued affiliation with the LDS Church requires them to negotiate many personal, intellectual, religious and writing challenges” (15). Each of her subjects has remained faithful to a standard of Mormon biography and to Mormon cultural heritage. Their “transgressions” come in their “revisions of that tradition . . . in content or form” (16). Bush sees transgression not as a sin, but as a border crossing. In some cases, the transgression may be compared to Eve’s transgression—the breaking of a lesser law in service to a higher law.

Each of these writers has trusted her individual conscience in expressing her own ideas even when they seem to violate a doctrinal or cultural rule. As a feminist literary critic, Bush examines how women steeped in a Victorian, male-dominated society chose to structure their own lives. She argues for the complicated reality of Mormon women’s lives, so different from the stereotypical image of the submissive, overburdened, and unthinking woman. All six women have had troubles with the authorities in their lives, and all six “mean to authorize and legitimize their lived experience and opinions” (21).

Mary Ann Hafen, a survivor of the Martin Handcart Company, and Annie Clark Tanner write to show that their choice to live in polygamy was legitimate and that it also gives them the right to criticize their way of life. Juanita Brooks, Hafen’s granddaughter, provides a bridge from the first to
the last half of the twentieth century. Her experiences with Indians and her love of the land foreshadow the works of Martin and Williams. Of course, her most famous “transgression” was her telling of the great secret: documenting what happened at the Mountain Meadows Massacre.

In her autobiography, *Quicksand and Cactus*, she expresses a longing for the “untraveled wide world,” a desire for adventure that is echoed by another Nevada native, Phyllis Barber, in *How I Got Cultured*. “Both Brooks and Barber strain against Mormon ideals that keep them safely at home and away from freedom and experience other than motherhood” (22). Williams discusses the issue of woman’s obedience to hierarchy, and Barber dares to look at female sexual expression with its many taboos.

Wynetta Martin, an African American convert before 1978, defended her church against racism, viewing her conversion as a remedy for race and religious prejudice. The fact that her text is accompanied by an introduction from an authoritative male voice, notes Bush, “has much to say about the historically subordinated position of nonwhite members of the Mormon Church” (21).

If these analyses don’t pique the reader’s interest, chapter headings will: “Narrating Optimism: Faith and Divine Intervention” (Mary Ann Hafen), “Defending and Condemning a Polygamous Life” (Annie Clark Tanner), “Truth Telling about a Temporal and a Spiritual Life” (Juanita Brooks), “Remedying Religious Prejudice” (Wynetta Willis Martin), “A Home Windswept with Paradox” (Terry Tempest Williams), and “Training to Be a Good Mormon Girl while Longing for Fame” (Phyllis Barber).

I had read all of these autobiographies except the Martin story, which was new to me and very moving. Each has contributed to my personal history in meaningful ways, but Bush has shone a bright light on connections and convictions I had not noticed. I commend her for this significant bridge between history and literature and for her courage in applying the personal voice to academic scholarship.

MARY LYTHGOE BRADFORD {marybradford@adelphia.net} committed her own autobiographical act in *Leaving Home: Personal Essays* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1977), and Lowell Bennion’s in *Lowell L. Bennion: Teacher, Counselor, Humanitarian* (Salt Lake City: Dialogue Foundation, 1995).

In the preface to *Equal Rites*, Clyde R. Forsberg Jr. writes: “The Book of Mormon can be seen as a well-crafted defense of Christian Masonry.” His thesis is that Joseph Smith “hoped to outflank the Evangelical opposition by making the secret ritual world of manhood available to women, first in book form and subsequently in an androgynous Masonic raising ceremony indoors. What the Mormon prophet hoped to accomplish was the restoration of a beleaguered Masonic political order (looking backward and forward) that promised to end sectarian rivalry, reestablish social harmony, guarantee economic equality, and avoid racial discord through a carefully monitored system of polygamist mixed marriages” (ii). In support of his thesis, Forsberg discusses many aspects of Mormonism and Masonry, including the history of Freemasonry, its growth and decline in antebellum America, and its eventual contact with the founders of Mormonism.

Forsberg claims that Joseph Smith, unlike his father and brother Hyrum, was “unlikely to gain entrance to the lodge through the regular channels” since he was physically impaired (the youthful operation on his leg). Because of this hypothesized disqualification, Smith “would follow his own star, publishing a Masonic monitor and discreetly calling it the Book of Mormon, a literary spring board for yet another democratization of manhood in the spirit of Morgan and others” (22). Forsberg rejects the characterization of the Book of Mormon as an “anti-Masonic document.” Instead, he writes that “the Book of Mormon can be seen as Masonic (hi)story or fiction” (82). According to Forsberg: “In 1830 Smith published the history of a people who had started a Grand Lodge on American soil centuries earlier with God’s help and yet of their own accord. He had in the Book of Mormon a fictive Masonic ‘legal precedent,’ to be sure, but more important a template for a widespread patriarchal retrenchment movement. The fact that his First Vision accords so perfectly with the visions of Lehi and Nephi in the Book of Mormon and that all this has a Masonic subtext suggests that Mormonism did not fall far from the acacia” (73).

Forsberg’s interpretation of the Book of Mormon is predictably contrary to the orthodox position that the Book of Mormon is a translation of an ancient record and really has nothing to do with anti-Masonry during the nineteenth century. But it also departs from the position of those who believe that Smith wrote the book and that its references to “secret combinations” reflect the anti-Masonic fervor prevalent in the United States in the aftermath of William Morgan’s disappearance. Although admitting that “the Book of Mormon attacks secret societies” (73), Forsberg maintains that one must examine the entire Book of Mormon—and not just selected references—to fully appreciate its allusions to “various fraternal rituals and em-
blems.” He asserts that “its manifold corrections of and departures from the King James Version can be seen as Masonic, aimed at a very specific antebellum audience . . . in a decidedly anti-Evangelical key” (102). Although these conclusions are dubious, Forsberg is closer to the mark when he argues that “as a rule Masons, not Evangelicals, used the phrase ‘secret combinations’ to describe and ridicule their enemies” (75) and that such terminology refers to “shattered remains” of Freemasonry in which “secret combinations” existed within regular Masonic lodges (109–11).

Forsberg next hypothesizes that a “Masonic reading of the Book of Mormon suggests that it was meant as a fraternal Ark of the Covenant and thus temporary literary abode of Masonry (in the wake of the Morgan affair), until more permanent and spacious surroundings could be erected” (135). Forsberg posits that after writing the Book of Mormon Smith attempted to revitalize Masonry by becoming a Master Mason “and then instituting an androgynous lodge of his own (of the radical European and French kind) in the succeeding months” (51). According to this thesis, “the temple would ultimately steal the Book of Mormon’s thunder, the latter becoming simply and exclusively a missionary tool that, read out of context, gave new converts entirely the wrong impression of what was in store for them and to what they had indentured themselves—a consequence, perhaps, of Smith’s Fesslerian aversion for fiction” (88). The temple, according to Forsberg, essentially created the ultimate Christian degree: “Smith’s journey from village seer to prophet of God can thus be seen as both a departure and a mere taking of Masonry to its logical conclusion, climbing the Masonic mystical ladder to its highest level, Mormonism being the most Christian of the Masonic Degrees yet” (131). But Forsberg’s Masonic thesis gets lost between Palmyra and Nauvoo. The author makes no attempt to explain why, if Smith actually intended to transfer his new brand of Masonry from book to temple, he did not do so earlier in Kirtland.

Forsberg also concludes that women received the priesthood through temple worship. He believes that Smith’s rejection of Freemasonry’s prohibition against female membership was extremely significant in his efforts to outflank Evangelical Christianity. “Early Mormonism brushed all this aside and simply opened the doors of its lodge to women. Since both sexes were ‘priests after the order of the Son of God,’ according to the Mormon endowment ceremony, it followed that their relationship at home would be ‘more equal, though not totally’ (93–94). “Mormonism,” he continues, “was not the first or only adoptive ritual in Masonic history, but it was the first of its kind in the United States” (96).

Nevertheless, Forsberg fails to discuss other rationales which have been advanced for the inclusion of women in temple ceremonies. These include Smith’s intent to establish a full partnership between men and women,
the contrary notion that he was institutionalizing women’s subordinate role to men, and finally that he wanted to ritualistically obligate women to keep the practice of polygamy a secret. The use of ritual to preserve the secrecy of an institution, such as polygamy, would have been consistent with the history and development of the oaths and obligations of Freemasonry. In eighteenth-century France, where Freemasonry was made a felony by law, French Masons developed most of their higher degrees and, more significantly, organized female lodges, under the direction of regular male lodges, with their own rituals and oaths. Given the political climate it was just as essential that the ladies became “sufficiently skill’d in Masonry as to keep a secret” (as Joseph Smith later told the Nauvoo Relief Society) as it was for the men (Relief Society Minutes, September 8, 1842, recording an epistle read on March 30, 1842).

The most interesting part of Forsberg’s book is his discussion of the priesthood ban which “kept African men and women from going through the temple and being sealed as husband and wife for time and all eternity” (203). Forsberg connects the ban with the completion of the Nauvoo Temple. Both Joseph Smith and Brigham Young believed that the temple ceremony was a restoration of a ritual practiced in Solomon’s temple and that blacks, who were descended from Cain, were not allowed into the Temple of Solomon as evidenced by the rituals and teachings of Freemasonry. Forsberg thus connects the LDS practice of denying blacks the priesthood with the restoration of rituals originally practiced in Solomon’s temple: “The debate over whether the priesthood ban was a practice or a doctrine, whether Smith—who ordained a few black men—would have approved or disapproved, may indeed be somewhat beside the point. If the temple is the priesthood, then those who contend for a gentler, kinder Smith on the issue of blacks in priesthood do not have even a single leg to balance on” (220).

According to Forsberg:

Mormonism could and would discriminate against men of color in good faith as the cursed offspring of Cain and the apostate priesthood—sons of perdition. That Smith ordained black men to offices of the priesthood but drew the line at the temple suggests that he and Young were in agreement. Men of African (Cainite/Cainanite/Canaanite) descent were apostate Masons and thus to be barred from priesthood. For Smith, however, the priesthood was the temple. Under Young, it was extended to include the offices of deacon, teacher, priest, elder, seventy and high priest. Young’s was not a harder line but rather a broader one that can be seen to contravene the adoptive spirit of the Book of Mormon, denying women of color even the most nominal claim to what was rightfully theirs if they wanted it: a place in the kingdom of God as a plural wife. (222–23)
Although there is consensus among most Mormon historians that the priesthood ban was not institutionalized until after the completion of the Nauvoo Temple, there is disagreement concerning whether Smith or Young started the practice. Prior to the completion of the temple, the Church had ordained blacks and allowed them to participate in the Kirtland Temple even against the background of Smith’s early belief—articulated in 1831 by anti-Mason W. W. Phelps—that Africans were descended from Ham, reinforced eleven years later by a passage in the Book of Abraham that Ham’s descendant, the “Pharaoh” was cursed “as pertaining to the Priesthood.”¹ Soon after the completion of the Nauvoo Temple in 1845, virtually every worthy member of the Church was allowed to participate in a ceremony that had been reserved for Smith and his closest confidants since 1842. Forsberg makes a convincing argument concerning why blacks—even those who were already ordained—were not permitted to enter the newly completed Nauvoo Temple and why this temple ban effectively prevented any further ordinations. The rituals of the Craft, which Church leaders believed were “remnants” from an earlier time when masons were temple workers, influenced Joseph and his successors in their understanding concerning temple eligibility.

If Forsberg is correct that the priesthood ban was connected to the Nauvoo Temple, then it is particularly ironic that, when the Church decided to reverse the anachronistic and increasingly confused policy of priesthood denial, it was also done in the context of temple building. When Spencer W. Kimball announced in 1974 that his Church would build a temple in Brazil, no one in Church leadership was a Mason; and unlike his paternal grandfather, he would not have connected the origins of LDS temple worship with Freemasonry. Thus, when the Church was grappling with the increasingly difficult task of determining whether Church investigators had black ancestry, it was no longer apparent to Church leadership why the practice of denying blacks access to the temple had originated. Although the policy was rightfully reversed, to the relief of most Church members, the historical context and religious underpinning of the practice are still not fully understood or briefed. Forsberg has fostered our understanding of these events.

Nevertheless, Forsberg’s attempt to reinterpret other important events in Mormon history ultimately fails because he does not make convincing arguments to support the theses set forth in the preface. Equal Rites

sometimes lacks focus when the author chases every nuance which he believes supports his theses or when he digresses into minutiae that are ultimately not relevant to his argument. Both Mormon and Masonic historians will also identify numerous factual mistakes as well as faulty connections and parallels. His conclusions concerning the Masonic text of the Book of Mormon are often counterintuitive, even if one assumes that Smith wrote the Book of Mormon. It would indeed be strange if no contemporary observer recognized that book as a “defense of Christian Masonry,” if that is what it really was. But Forsberg does make distinctions, often overlooked in studies of the anti-Masonic context of the Book of Mormon, between anti-Masonic terminology and other words and phrases which are assumed to be anti-Masonic but which can be interpreted otherwise. Still, his parallels between the Book of Mormon and Nauvoo Temple make little sense when one considers events in Mormon history from 1830 to 1846, and his rationale for the inclusion of women in the temple lacks a sophisticated understanding of the origins of Mormon polygamy. Forsberg’s discussion about the prohibition against blacks holding the priesthood for more than 130 years is the most significant contribution of this book.

MICHAEL W. HOMER {m homer@sautah.com} is a trial lawyer in Salt Lake City. He is the author of “Masonry and Mormonism in Utah, 1850-1984,” Journal of Mormon History 18 (Fall 1992): 57–96; and “Similarity of Priesthood in Masonry: The Relationship between Freemasonry and Mormonism,” Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 27 (Fall 1994): 1–113, and the recipient of the Lowell L. Bennion Editor’s Award, the T. Edgar Lyon Award of Excellence, and the John Whitmer Historical Association Best Article Award.


Reviewed by Dan Wotherspoon

Gary Topping is passionate about history because it “leads to self-understanding by functioning as the memory of a society, in the same way that individual self-understanding is grounded in individual memory” (6). Utah Historians and the Reconstruction of Western History is a comprehensive study of Bernard DeVoto, Dale L. Morgan, Juanita Brooks, Wallace Stegner, and Fawn McKay Brodie, five historians, none of whom was professionally trained in that field, and all of whom emerged after World
War II. Why did Utah produce this “remarkable number” whose work made them shapers of an important revival in western historical writing? Topping speculates that “the creative tension with their native culture was the combustible material that ignited and propelled their careers” (4).

This book is the first instance to analyze their historical methods, philosophies, and achievement as a group. Topping states:

Their strengths were twofold: They were industrious researchers who tirelessly exploited existing sources and discovered and published others in a relentless drive to establish an accurate factual record of the past. Also, they were excellent writers, DeVoto, Stegner, and Morgan among the best the historical profession can boast. On the other hand, they interpreted their findings with remarkable ineptness. That ineptness occurred at two polar extremes: DeVoto, Brodie, and Stegner advanced extravagant interpretations, sometimes nothing short of metaphysical and running far ahead of what their sources could sustain; whereas Morgan and Brooks fell far short of the interpretive potential of their sources—Morgan asserting that the facts would somehow convey their own meaning without any help from him, and Brooks refusing to follow her sources to conclusions that might embarrass her church. (6)

Topping is eminently qualified for this study and level of analysis. He is an associate professor of history at Salt Lake Community College, archivist of the Catholic Diocese of Salt Lake City, and former curator of manuscripts at the Utah State Historical Society. He is Catholic, which, for someone of lesser talent and experience may have been a problem since this study focuses on historians who “operated to one degree or another within a Mormon cultural environment.” Of this challenge, he makes a graceful framing statement which, I hope, in another, less defensive generation, will be unnecessary:

My readers are free to disagree with my interpretations, but I hope they will see that the problems I am exploring here oblige me to examine and comment on Mormon ideas. But I must ask those readers, whatever their religious affiliation, to accept my assurance that I offer my criticisms purely as an intellectual exercise, with no conscious awareness of ill will toward the Mormon people or the Mormon culture within which I have happily lived and worked for the past thirty years. (11)

Topping manages the religious boundary well. I never sensed any rancor toward Mormon ideas and even found his “outsider’s” candor refresh-
ing. For instance, he expresses dismay about how Juanita Brooks, who has a well-developed critical eye in weighing evidence and judging the credibility of sources, can present “with a wide-eyed straightforwardness as historical fact” (202) certain aspects of the “enchanted world” in which John D. Lee (and Brooks herself) lived in. In Brooks’s writing, Topping observes, “some kind of miraculous manifestation of God’s hand pops up, if not on every page, certainly in every chapter” (201). “It takes nothing away from [her] reputation to recognize that her courage had its limits in her unwillingness to risk church disapproval. Nor does it taint her achievement to point out that the intellectual framework of the Mormonism in which she was reared placed limitations on her interpretive resources” (225–26).

However, I am not fully persuaded by Topping’s analysis that fear kept Brooks from “following her data” to their logical conclusion. To someone who was obviously a believer and who obviously valued membership in the Church, Brooks could have made a complicated strategic decision that balanced multiple values in a way that a simple dichotomy between “truth” and “fear” misrepresents. It seems more valuable to judge her by insider standards: by her effectiveness with many audiences on many levels.

Topping gives Dale Morgan his due as the chain linking all five together. Although deaf, he was the only person well known by all the others and carried on a voluminous and valuable correspondence. “It was Morgan, more than any other person, who taught the generation that matured in the 1940s how to write history, and his strengths and weaknesses as a historian were also their strengths and weaknesses,” observes Topping (113–14). However, “Morgan’s books lack the sense of history as a cultural activity, as an avenue to understanding, as an ever-changing process of conceptual reconstructions, a means by which each generation answers its own questions about the nature of the world it inhabits rather than just corrects the factual errors of past historians. He who most scorned academia was most in need of what academia could have provided” (131).

Because Topping obviously sees failure to interpret the sources fully as the greatest historical sin, I sense that he has great affection for DeVoto, despite his excesses in that direction. Scholarship, for DeVoto, was combat. “One of the abiding satisfactions in life,” he reportedly remarked, “is annoying the right people” (61).

Topping, himself a gifted prose stylist, continues: “His cavalier rounding off of history’s rough edges and leapfrogging of inconvenient chasms may have frustrated and even outraged the scholars whose careful research had disclosed unsettling complexities, but DeVoto’s histories made sense to the general reader. They explained things, and he quickly tapped into a public that was hungry for clear meanings and read to grasp them while leaving the scholar to pan the gold dust out of history’s finer sands” (61). It is true,
however, that “DeVoto . . . was famously inclined to express a one-watt idea in hundred-watt language” (172).

Space precludes more than giving a nod to Topping’s interesting critique of Stegner’s habit of wanting his historical figures to carry more weight and fulfill more of Stegner’s own agenda than the sources can bear. He also notes Stegner’s dual focus: While nervously denying professional competence in the field of history, he nevertheless wanted his writing to be taken seriously as historical exposition (279). Where Brodie is concerned, Topping sees her brandishing truth like a weapon against what she considered the deception of Mormonism (333) and hypothesizes interestingly, though not completely persuasively, that the “cocktail-party psychology” that she practiced in her biographical writing was driven by a need to exorcise many of her own demons, beginning with Joseph Smith, “the First Liar of her life,” then Thaddeus Stevens, Sir Richard Burton, and Thomas Jefferson (320, 327).


This book is a must for someone building up a Utah or western history library. How I wish I’d had it during the many years I worked at Benchmark Books. Many readers and collectors have a strong desire to own and study the best books but are less certain about where their time and money will be best spent. I would have loved to have been able to point them to Topping’s book.

DAN WOTHERSPOON {dan@sunstoneonline.com} is editor of Sunstone magazine and executive director of the Sunstone Education Foundation, Inc.
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Reviewed by Matt McBride

Researchers should thank Kofford Books for this lovingly produced, full-size, photo-mechanical reprint of The Wasp, predecessor to the Nauvoo Neighbor. It will be a welcome addition to any research library. To
date, researchers have been obliged to squint at poor microfilm copies—the film copies in the LDS Church Historical Department Library in Salt Lake City and at the Lee Library, Brigham Young University, in Provo are exceptionally bad. Kofford has painstakingly photographed a bound copy of *The Wasp* that belonged to Wilford Woodruff. Woodruff’s copy is in remarkable shape, and this reprint makes reading and researching in this periodical much more enjoyable and comfortable.

*The Wasp* was essentially a Mormon political organ, though the early issues might more properly be termed anti-anti-Mormon than pro-Mormon. It found its motivation in the columns of another Hancock county paper, the *Warsaw Signal*, and its anti-Mormon editor, Thomas C. Sharp. *The Wasp’s* equally acerbic editor, William Smith, used the columns of the weekly as a platform from which to launch brickbats at Sharp and his anti-Mormon cohorts. Sharp was only too happy to fire back, and the two engaged in as caustic and downright nasty an exchange as Mormon history has seen. Smith frequently stooped to name-calling and personal attacks.

For example, on May 30, 1842, Smith reprinted a notice from the *Warsaw Signal* concerning an anti-Mormon convention to be held in Carthage, then commented:

> The above is from the *Warsaw Signal* of the 5th Inst., and contains the dying groans of the ASSES of that ignoble print—Thom-ASS C. Sharp and Thom-ASS Gregg (we do not call them ASSES on account of the length of the ears of those two beautiful animals, but in consequence of the length of the nose of the senior ASS.) GREAT MASS CONVENTION INDEED!!! Who ever heard the like! A great mass convention, composed of three jack-asses and a mule! that was the amount of the preliminary convention, in Carthage, and in the ultimate there will probably be the addition of two Thom-ASS-es, and the story is told.

William Smith’s comportment only exacerbated the conflict with Sharp and must have been an embarrassment to many in Nauvoo. As Peter Crawley notes in his concise but informative introduction, the fourth number, issued on May 7, 1842, contains an “Apology” from Smith and marks the apparent end of William Smith’s direct editorship. While he remains the nominal editor until December 3, 1842, John Taylor’s editorial influence on the paper’s content is evident. Subsequent issues become decidedly less vitriolic (though, frankly, less entertaining).

In addition to contributing to our understanding of Thomas Sharp’s attitudes toward Mormonism, *The Wasp* contains a wealth of material on the 1842 Hancock County elections, John C. Bennett’s excommunication and subsequent activities, the attempted extradition of Joseph Smith to Mis-
Missouri on charges relating to the attempted murder of Governor Lilburn W. Boggs, and the efforts of the state legislature to repeal the Nauvoo Charter. It is also chock-full of ads, anecdotes, scraps of quotidian news, and other curiosities—the stuff that makes periodicals so rich a source of historical information. It was succeeded on May 3, 1843, by the more congenially styled *Nauvoo Neighbor*, edited by John Taylor.

The binding of the Kofford edition is sturdy (if not terribly handsome), a must for such a large tome. The digitally enhanced presentation of the pages is flawless. But inexplicably, the last line of the first page of Crawley’s introduction ends several inches left of the right margin, with the interrupted sentence continuing on the next page. This anomaly along with the use of French spacing (double-spacing after periods) in the introduction are the only minor blemishes on this otherwise well-executed reprint. As a bonus, the book comes with a CD-ROM containing the page images created for the print edition.

MATT MCBRIDE {mmcbride@deseretbook.com} is a programmer and online editor for DeseretBook.com. He lives in American Fork, Utah, with his wife and four children. He is the author of *The Nauvoo Temple: A House for the Most High* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2006).


Reviewed by Will Bagley

English journalist Simon Worrall has used his flair for storytelling to create an interesting look at the tales of Mark Hofmann, the forger and murderer whose reckless career in the early 1980s caused havoc in Mormon history circles. Hofmann’s forgeries have already been the subject of four major books, but Worrall uses the story of the sociopath’s fabrication of a poem by Emily Dickinson (called, ironically, “That God Cannot Be Understood”) as the focus of his investigation.

The hero of Worrall’s story is curator Daniel Lombardo, whose Jones Library in Dickinson’s hometown in Amherst, Massachusetts, purchased the forged poem at a Sotheby’s auction in 1997. Document collector Brent Ashworth soon notified Lombardo that he had warned Sotheby’s that he suspected the poem was Hofmann’s work. Despite his realization that, if Ashworth’s suspicions proved true, Lombardo “would be remembered as the curator who took $21,000 of the library’s money and spent it on a fake”
(41), he pressed ahead to learn the truth.

As the title, lack of annotations, and no index indicate, Worrall’s book belongs more to the “true crime” genre than to formal history. The author, however, takes his readers on a compelling romp through the worlds of high-end auction houses, literary studies, isochrony (broadly, rhythmic regularity in writing), and the history of forgeries and their detection. He also shows how Hofmann was able to break into the national document market using techniques he had perfected while creating Mormon forgeries.

Devout Mormon historians will cringe at Worrall’s outsider perspective and his rough handling of their religion’s historical claims. He characterizes the Book of Mormon as “a cross between Tolkien’s Lord of the Rings and the most long-winded sermon you have ever heard” (69), states that “Joseph Smith had what we would call today a sex addiction,” and charges that Smith suffered from megalomania (71, 73). Critics can take comfort in Worrall’s many mistakes. In slightly more than ten pages, he claims that Mormons learn to recognize each other by secret signs and symbols “from an early age” (79); places Logan at “the bottom of one of Utah’s most remote canyons, Cache Canyon” (87), and asserts that the Church “outlawed” polygamy in 1890 with the Second Manifesto (89). Nevertheless, those who labor to create a more complex interpretation of Smith’s character should remember that, for most people, the simple conclusion that “Smith was a con man and master manipulator who used magic and forgery to hoodwink the gullible into believing he was a prophet” (73–74) is entirely adequate. The book’s flaws extend to poor copy editing. On the same page (203) we encounter both “Kurt” and “Curt” Bench.

Still, the book has merit. In many ways, it does more to explore Hofmann’s motives and twisted personality than anything yet written. Worrall’s analysis that Hofmann’s alienation from Mormonism grew from his feeling “trapped in an authoritarian society where illusion was truth and truth was illusion” (9–90) is on the mark.

Worrall contrasts the intentions of the poet and the murderer. “Hofmann labored to deceive others. Emily Dickinson wrote to record the truth, however shocking, about herself,” he concludes. “Hofmann turned to forgery because he was a coward. As a young man he had wanted to write a book on the early history of the Mormon Church, but he had not the courage to carry the project through. Instead, he turned to falsehood. But deceit ensnares the deceiver as well as the deceived, and after a lifetime manipulating others Hofmann became entangled in his own web of lies. By facing down her demons, Emily Dickinson found inner freedom and peace of mind” (257).

Hofmann, Worrall insightfully observes, “was successful because he understood how flimsy is the wall between reality and illusion, and how will-
ing we are, in our desire to believe something, to embrace an illusion” (xiv–xv). It is a warning well taken. Ironically, it was Mark Hofmann himself who expressed the best policy for historians dealing with subjects as controversial as religion: “The truth is the most important thing” (91).

WILL BAGLEY {wlbagley@xmission.com} is an independent historian. He moderated a September 2002 symposium on Mark Hofmann’s forgeries for Ken Sanders Rare Books.


Reviewed by Mario S. De Pillis

Devout Latter-day Saints now have a new instant classic in spiritual reading: the memoirs of F. Enzio Busche. Not since the old classics of the Faith Promoting Series of the 1880s have we had a book so free of kitsch and sentimentality (though he flirts with the latter more than once).

Church members owe a debt of gratitude to Tracie A. Lamb, who compiled and edited Busche’s talks, memories, his incomplete autobiographical manuscript, and other materials. She has constructed a loosely organized but very readable book. Having served as a missionary under Busche when he was president of the Germany Munich Mission in the early 1980s, she never forgot his spiritual power and kind leadership and retained notes on his talks for many years.

Born in 1930, just three years before Hitler came to power, Busche has said, both in this book and in interviews, that the shock of the war and its consequences “created in me a sharp awareness of the need for understanding. Who is man? Is there a God? What is the purpose of our mortal experience? What happens after death?” (1).

The first part of the book is autobiographical. Blessed with a loving family life and a comfortable home in Dortmund, Enzio and his sisters survived the Nazi regime rather well. Busche believes that Hitler had created a “mock Zion” (33). In later life, he felt that Hitler and the rest of the Nazi leadership had betrayed the best of German feelings and ideals, thoroughly hoodwinking the innocent people who had welcomed the promise of order, law, jobs, and idealistic goals.

His history is somewhat simplistic, but there is a touchingly evocative and revealing snapshot of Enzio, age five, with a middle-aged neighbor on a
gray wintry street in Dortmund in 1935. He is standing ramrod straight, proudly clutching his “money drum.” They were canvassing for contributions to the nationwide Winterhilfswerk. (This was a Nazi charitable organization that was supplanting the Christian charitable organizations.) A few years later at age nine, he couldn’t wait for his tenth birthday, so that he could wear the uniform of the Hitler Youth. Enzio was extremely idealistic and fully believed the party’s message that young people would “bring righteousness, honesty and dignity to mankind” (8). That intense idealism found a wonderfully constructive outlet in Mormonism. With his new religious optimism and intense faith, Busche overcame many personal and professional challenges.

His first and most important challenge was surviving as a fourteen-year-old in the chaos and starvation of the last days of the Nazi regime. His family had fled to Bavaria after a British bomb destroyed their home. In the last desperate days of defeat, Enzio and his youthful companions, pressed into military service, buried the guns they had never been trained to use near the Czech border, then tried to find their families. As a soldier of the occupation only four years older than Enzio, I was quite familiar with his devastated urban landscape from Bavaria to Westphalia. His accounts ring true, except for the assertion that we Americans threatened to shoot on sight any person walking the dark streets after curfew. At the time there was just as much danger to occupation soldiers from diehard young Nazis with weapons.

In subsequent chapters, Busche tells the complicated spiritual story of his conversion, his father’s printing business, his marriage, and above all his flourishing life in the Church. (Oddly, he omits any mention of his university studies at Freiburg and Bonn.) But the heart of the book is the rich and varied stories of spiritual experiences. Significantly, his spiritual life began even before his conversion. A central experience in his search for the living God was his five-month hospitalization for a near-fatal liver disease. A flash of light entered his room, frightening him into numbness and shock, and a loud voice told him (in German): “If you can pray now, you will recover” (52). He did pray and was instantly cured and spiritually transformed, ready, he believed, for his conversion and baptism. He wanted to dance, jump, and sing, but still had no answer to his basic questions.

A nun in the Catholic hospital, “the most angelic human being one could ever imagine,” told him the sad truth that “the Catholic Church is a church of dead traditions” (57–58). After his discharge from the hospital, he briefly joined a local Protestant church, whose minister told him that his penchant for the supernatural required a psychiatrist.

Dates are sparse in the book, but Busche apparently reached a low point of “self-defeating melancholy” around 1956. In that year two Mormon missionaries presented themselves and began teaching him. After intense
thought and much resistance, he prayed to God to forgive his hesitancy. A little voice whispered, “Yes, I understand that” (87). These kinds of promptings and whisperings of the Spirit, often with a homely intimacy, punctuated every aspect of his life. Elder Bob Thompson, who was to baptize him the next day, warned him that he must get a testimony for himself. No dawdler in matters spiritual, Busche prayed to Heavenly Father about Joseph Smith and asked for a testimony independent of his teachers. Thereupon, in a magnificent vision “the whole dimension of the work unfolded before my mind . . . and bore witness to the truthfulness of it and of the Prophet Joseph Smith. The vision overwhelmed me to the core of my being” (91). He finally accepted baptism in 1958. He had found his answers, and the rest of his spiritual life is one of irrepressible optimism.

Busche instantly turned to God whenever faced with an enormous problem and even when facing minor inconveniences. Talking to Heavenly Father gives him courage to speak in Church; the Holy Ghost guides him in organizing a youth conference; Heavenly Father helps him deal with a hostile young man and responds directly when Busche encounters family problems.

More impressive are the miracles, especially those connected with the construction of the first chapel in Dortmund in 1964–65, and again in the late 1980s with the construction of the Friedrichsdorf Temple, the first in West Germany. In Dortmund, for example, the Lord provided choice building land; the main anti-Mormon in city government hindering the Mormon building project died; angels helped raise money; men in white suits, working at night helped finish the chimney by a next-day deadline; and the chapel was finished in the prophesied time of exactly one year (August 1964 to August 1965).

Just before completion of the new building, a local Protestant minister organized a protest aimed at tearing it down. But a final miracle saved the day when Busche faced a hostile crowd of 300 in the minister’s own church hall. “The Holy Ghost,” he remembered, “came into the congregation. I do not know just how long I spoke [but] after I finished the minister stood there quite paralyzed. He could not move. . . . I felt it appropriate to dismiss the meeting.” Having displaced the minister on his own turf, Busche received referrals from thirty protesters, several of whom were baptized. The Dortmund Saints completed their chapel and, from that time on, he writes, “the Church developed a high reputation in our city” (130).

In Friedrichsdorf, several miracles came together to overcome the implacable opposition of the townspeople. Busche adds some fascinating details to the story of that bitter battle. But he writes mainly of the spiritual richness and happiness of his life as the first president of the Friedrichsdorf Temple.
There was much more to Busche’s spiritual life; and in the last three or four chapters, he writes less about his own direct experiences and more about his encounters with great spiritual manifestations in Hawaii, Eastern Europe, and North America. Toward the end of the book he writes that the most sacred experience in his life was having to deal with a young missionary who had been possessed by an evil spirit and was trembling in fear. Following scriptural passages in both the New Testament and the Book of Mormon promising that “perfect love casteth out fear,” he was able to cast out the evil one by expressing love and good humor. “The Lord’s power,” he concludes, “is a gentle sense of humor [and] the adversary cannot deal with a sense of humor” (269).

Some of Busche’s experiences, like conversion stories, conform to well-known Mormon models. But others, despite a certain folksy tone have immediacy, originality, and power. Many a Saint will find the book inspiring, and historians will gain an insight into the nature of the new international church. I am confident that Busche’s work will enjoy a long life.

MARIO S. DE PILLIS {depillis_sr@depillis.org} is a past president of the Mormon History Association and is currently at work on spiritual manifestations in Mormonism.


Reviewed by Ronald E. Romig and David J. Howlett

In this very creative work, cultural geographer Craig Campbell analyzes the ways in which various groups related to the Mormon tradition have viewed and constructed the sacred space around the “temple” land tract in Independence, Missouri. Campbell argues that, while sacred space has had contested meanings in places like Jerusalem or Kosovo, post-colonial North America is relatively devoid of such religious-ideological contestation over sacred geography (293). In less than two centuries, though, the Mormon temple tract in Independence has developed a multitude of contested meanings.

As Campbell demonstrates, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Community of Christ, the Church of Christ (Temple Lot), the Church of Jesus Christ with the Elijah Message (and its related expressions), the Remnant Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, the Restoration Branches movement, and many more groups all have competing definitions
of the meaning of the temple tract. Thus, Campbell provides an important interpretation of the diverse ways in which sacred space may be used by related but separate religious groups. In the process, Campbell demonstrates the relevance of his study far beyond the realm of those interested only in Mormon history; cultural geographers, religious studies scholars, and American historians all may beneficially relate to his insightful work.

Campbell pursues his task by unpacking ten contexts from which to examine the origins and perceptions of the New Jerusalem: (1) Origins of the American Jerusalem: From Edenic to Industrial; (2) The Missourians and the Saints; (3) The Displacement of Zion; (4) A Splintering and a Return [Church of the LDS Diaspora]; (5) Views of Jackson County from Utah, 1845–1900; (6) LDS Views since 1900: Millenarian Taciturnity; (7) The Community of Christ: Ideological Transition; (8) Narrow [Spatial] Views of Zion [The Church of Christ Temple Lot and its varieties, Restoration Branches, and other living expressions of the movement]; (9) Independence Classified: World Precedents; and (10) In a Coming Day: Amelioration and Pseudo-Ecumenicalism. Without directly naming every group, Campbell’s analysis is broadly inclusive of both the provenance and the ecclesiastical anticipations of Zion.

As authors, Ron belongs to the Community of Christ and David to the Restoration Branches movement. We find Campbell’s descriptions of our respective movements a bit harsh at points. At the same time, however, we find real scholarly value in how Campbell, as an interested observer, views each ecclesiastical expression. In Chapters 4 and 8, he provides brief descriptions and analyses of noted groups. Clearly, these groups are richly diverse both internally and in their relationships to other groups—too diverse to be reduced to neat packages.

We are also suspicious of Campbell’s use of the term “factional.” An emotionally laden term, it carries specific and often pejorative meanings among various groups. Everyone considering this issue has a struggle in front of him or her, and we would prefer the more neutral term, “ecclesiastical expression.” Nevertheless, this volume furnishes a good introduction to the religious landscape of Independence.

Due to his location at Youngstown State University, Ohio, as one might expect, Campbell incorrectly interprets some of the particulars of his study, at least when viewed from a local lens. For example, Campbell overestimates the influence of fundamentalist RLDS publisher Richard Price among Restorationists and other emerging ecclesiastical followings. He also relies on questionable source material for his description of the now defunct group, Ephraim’s Camp. In fairness, we admit that it is difficult to compile a survey like this; data quickly go out of date. Campbell also assigns inordinate value to information gleaned from casual scraps of conversa-
tion. For example, it is surprising to see one’s ideas, mentioned in casual talk, turn up in print as part of a scholarly work. Because of his disconnection, Campbell may have been forced to formulate arguments drawn from an insufficient sampling of data about attitudes and values within representative religious bodies.

Furthermore, Campbell sometimes seems to ignore his own research findings. In Chapter 2, Campbell explains the expansive nature of the space that evolved for temples at the center of Smith’s City of Zion plat between 1831 and 1833 (51–53). But in his conclusion, he reverts to an exclusive point of view of the appointed space: “When the traditional Temple lot could not be acquired . . . the RLDS Church finally chose an alternate, less sacred site right next to the old authentic one” (348). This leaves us wondering who defines “traditional” and “authentic” symbolism for the movement? Perhaps “traditional” symbolism is still evolving. Yet such errors of nuance or bias can be forgiven as, on the whole, Campbell does a credible job discerning discordant perceptions of the center place (New Jerusalem) as well as offering alternative futures for the religiously contested space.

Within his text, Campbell seems to be hardest on the LDS Church, pointing out inconsistencies and paradoxes within their views of the “center place.” In Chapter 6, “LDS Views since 1900,” Campbell includes a section titled “The Reluctant Taking of the Center Stake” and another titled “The Paradox of Temple Location,” pointing out that, despite its historical significance, the density of LDS wards in the Kansas City area is greater “than some [cities in the central United States] that already have temples” (182). Campbell’s exploration of the counter tensions that characterize LDS attitudes about this sacred ground is instructive. Fears of signaling an anticipated time of gathering to “Independence” necessitate moderation by Church leaders. “After the modest LDS construction [visitors’ center and stake center] in Independence throughout the early 1980s, the Church again returned to a more reserved attitude toward the New Jerusalem. This official stance of silence has become even more pronounced at the turn of the millennium” (184).

Appraisals of this book should include the reactions of other groups, but we have chosen to respond to Campbell as members of the RLDS tradition. One of Campbell’s strong statements about the Community of Christ is:

Kenneth Foote has discussed how the sanctification of space involves a “ritual process in which sacred sites are delimitated and consecrated.” ¹ While other Latter Day Saint groups have had difficulty sanctifying space in Independence, in many ways the non-

¹The citation is to Kenneth E. Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America’s
millennialization of the Temple lot area is the opposite. The [Community of Christ] is desanctifying space, perhaps because, consciously or unconsciously, it feels [that] the history of the Saints, especially Missouri history, is too difficult to reconcile with modern culture trends. Thus a change has transpired either to a more acceptable liberal religious organization or something completely different—a result vaguely Latter Day Saint but too disjointed to be mainstream Protestant. (237)

The Community of Christ language for the tendency Campbell describes is deconstruction, rather than desanctification. We agree with many of Campbell’s observations of the Community of Christ; it does appear to be intentionally engaged in a process of deconstructing peripheral religious elements once held sacred. For example, the Community of Christ has eliminated some of its affiliated institutions (e.g., the Church-owned Independence Regional Health Center, Park College, and Farm Operations) over recent years. Perhaps following Campbell’s mode of thought, the Community of Christ is unconsciously purging itself by acting out its own version of an envisioned cleansing of the Center Place.

However, we think that many of the Community of Christ’s efforts have been involved in reconciling a past that is at times uncomfortable with an uncertain future that is focused on becoming. Like Joseph Smith Jr., seeking to resolve religious tensions in his own nuclear family, the Community of Christ has sought out religious common ground, looking for acceptance, rather than triggering a repetition of the social rejection associated with its earliest years. Yet the concept of “deconstruction” implemented by Community of Christ should not be understood as a wanton destruction of past tradition or understandings. Rather, “deconstruction” in its postmodern literary sense is the intentional questioning of a text and previous assumptions in order to evoke new meanings or understandings that may have been missed. Sacredness, then, may be realized in new ways which have real connections to the world of the “text” (in this case, the temple tract). “Deconstruction” may have a positive valence for those engaged in the task with intentionality and self-awareness.

Campbell quotes Foote’s identification of “the process by which a tragedy site is put right and used again” as “rectification” (324). Campbell observes, “Beyond 1838, the Saints had to reconcile the stigma of accepting Jackson County as ultimately the most sacred place imaginable with the fact that violent means had been used to expel them from their millenarian

homeland.” Physical and emotional rectification of this traumatic memory “has been an achingly slow process compounded by the complexities of schism” (324, 325).

Respective expressions of the movement have dealt with the rectification process differently. In Campbell’s view, the Community of Christ “has tried to rectify early losses by continually treading a road more in tune with, or even beyond, mainstream American protestant attitudes” (325). Despite Campbell’s suggestion that the Community of Christ is simply running toward mainstream Protestant liberalism, we believe that something much more complex and potentially important may be occurring. While outside observers may see only social adjustments, the Community of Christ defines the process as a profoundly spiritual attempt to better discern God’s calling and its relevance in a rapidly changing world. Part of our practice has been to take the world as we find it and work to make it sacred. In the realm of sacred theology and geography, Community of Christ members are now struggling to more fully embrace some four thousand years of Jewish and Christian mastercode or meta-narrative. Rather than desacralizing its context as Campbell suggests, this process could represent a reclamation of heritage and an expansion of sacred geography.

In his 1995 dissertation, cultural geographer Richard A. Waugh provides an alternate view of the Community of Christ’s sense of sacred space. Waugh enfolds Campbell’s interpretation of clashing meanings assigned to sacred space with an overarching and integrating concept termed “heterotopia.” “Heterotopia exists in the absence of some universalizing metanarrative, and is instead born out of the local narratives of local communities. . . . Foucault (1980) notes that heterotopia refers to coexistence in an ‘impossible space’ of a ‘large number of fragmentary possible worlds.”

This is a helpful construction of the “religiously contested space” that Campbell describes as a “place of temporal betweenness” (298).

Waugh points out that the movement began living in its first “fragmentary possible world” when Joseph Smith was denied access to the New Jerusalem. Smith had to “respatialize the sacred.” The Community of Christ represents one of multiple fragmentary possible worlds rooted in the “center place.” Currently, the pressures of coexistence have resulted in a Community of Christ strategy of reinterpreting the ideal. Community of Christ member Sue McLaughlin explains this reexamination: “As we have embraced a more inclusive view of God’s activity in the world and become

more modest yet realistic in the faith claims we make about ourselves, we are faced with examining our sacramental practices and whether or not they are congruent with an evolving identity that is becoming more conscious of our similarities with other traditions rather than our differences.  

Certainly not every member of the Community of Christ would echo these perceptions; however, many recognize that we cannot continue as we have.

Waugh affirms Campbell, observing that the Community of Christ is decentralizing the symbolic meaning of Zion. Yet he does not see this action as negative: “Today most people in the church [the Community of Christ] accept the decentralized models of Zion, and see their identity as a member of the church in working in their communities. . . . In the decentralized postmodern Zion, Saints still find identity in the sacred space embodied by the temple. . . . Even as Zion is decentralized to local communities, those communities are made sacred in part by the connection the church feels to Independence, the traditional heart of the modern Zion.”

Waugh acknowledges the Community of Christ’s contradictions of identity. For example, “that the Temple was built at all completes a modernist dream for the church in Independence,” while the Church’s evolving postmodern identity is one of a decentralized Zion.  

Waugh suggests that believing now entails the considerable additional work of evaluating the meanings of premodern, modern, and postmodern constructs. Postmodern-oriented believers are exploring the meaning of the movement’s stories for themselves. Some question the movement’s meta-narratives while encountering meaning in their own authentic mini- or micro-narratives. Such people are choosing to act as their own agents while questioning the importance of all influences and persons who would act as agents for them. “Most postmodernists would uphold individual or community religious expression that was born either from tradition or personal experience, rejecting the modern propensity for institutionalizing such experience into a logocentric power structure.”  

Perhaps yet another alternative lens for understanding Campbell’s narrative may be seen in a question asked by sociologists of religion: “What
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5Ibid., 501.
6Ibid., 58, 60.
do organizations do when prophecy appears to fail?” Scholars have argued that few religious groups ever proclaim that a predicted prophecy has not come to pass. Prophecy may appear to “fail” to outsiders, but to insiders prophecy “never fails.” Instead, groups usually reinterpret a prophecy, spiritualize its meaning, reaffirm their commitments to each other, and/or may proselyte for new adherents. Still, members may experience a great deal of “cognitive dissonance” in the whole process.⁷

Clearly, all of the groups Campbell portrays have more or less exhibited this behavior over the past 170-odd years. The Community of Christ and its sister movements are faced with the uncomfortable realization that things are not turning out exactly as Joseph Smith seemed to envision. As a result, movements have had to make understandably drastic adaptations to the religious cosmos centered on Independence. Of course, the more definite the boundaries in a movement, the less willing members are to admit that anything in their perceptions has actually changed.

From a confessional perspective, we might ask: If Joseph Smith visited the site today, would he likely be more encouraged to find organizations that reflect the ideas of his lifetime or organizations that endeavor to keep pace with what they perceive that God is attempting to accomplish in the world today? From our perspective, Joseph Smith was creative and adaptable. Throughout his brief life, he constantly renegotiated circumstances as offered, reshaping them to his best perceptions of God at work. We believe Smith would be disappointed in seeing how rigid the Church has become without his ongoing creative proclivities. But the larger question facing the ecclesiastical expressions of the Restoration Movement that are rooted in Jackson County is what Jesus Christ would think experiencing a first-person visit to our beloved “New Jerusalem.” Would he weep or shout hosanna?

In the end, there may be as many views of the “center place” as there are interested observers. Despite Campbell’s minor ethnographic errors and our own alternative interpretations of his data, we recommend this book and are glad that Craig Campbell has intentionally elevated this discussion. Still, much more work seems warranted in this field.
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Reviewed by Jed Woodworth

The historiography of assassination conspiracies follows a well-cut trajectory. The interpretations usually start small, with a lone renegade gunman, and grow over time to include a widening circle of accomplices. As facts about the case become known, the story gets more complex, the planning more deliberate. John Wilkes Booth becomes the front man for a Confederate collusion. Lee Harvey Oswald operates for the Soviet Union. Instead of a solitary figure acting out of merely personal interest, the triggerman becomes one link in an intricate web of political corruption often involving powerful people in high seats of government. Plots expand from the personal to the regional, the corporate, the national, and the transnational. Historians want to say something new and eclipse what has gone before. Conspiracies accrue over time.

Early reports out of Carthage, Hancock County, Illinois, where the Mormon prophet Joseph Smith was murdered with his brother Hyrum on June 27, 1844, spoke of the spontaneous uprising of an angry, well-armed mob. In time the histories dropped the spontaneity for a calculated effort. The militia stationed near the jail had plotted to kill the Smiths all along. The conspiracy expanded over the years. By the time Dallin H. Oaks and Marvin Hill published *Carthage Conspiracy: The Trial of the Accused Assassins of Joseph Smith* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), the deed had expanded to include the leading citizens of Hancock County. The jurors who exonerated the assassins had defended popular sovereignty and protected community will. By concealing the identity of the murderers, the entire community in effect became part of the conspiracy.

In *Junius and Joseph: Presidential Politics and the Assassination of the First Mormon Prophet*, Robert Wicks and Fred Foister take the next step along the
trajectory. Wicks, an art historian at the University of Miami, and Foister, an independent historian from Hamilton, Ohio, are newcomers to Mormon history. They venture out with a bold thesis, claiming to present “incontrovertible evidence that the effort to remove the Mormon leader from power and influence extended well beyond Hancock County . . . thereby transforming his death from an impulsive act by local vigilantes into a political assassination sanctioned by some of the most powerful men in Illinois” (5).

Mormons have long suspected that Thomas Ford, Democratic governor of Illinois at the time of the murders, was involved in the conspiracy. From the beginning they hurled invective at Ford for breaking an alleged promise not to leave the Smiths under the protection of the militia at Carthage; his exit from Carthage on the day of the murders made him appear to be in league with the mob. The semi-official History of the Church included an 1855 affidavit sworn by a former Nauvoo marshal saying that Ford had agreed to have the Smiths sacrificed to settle the tempers flaring over Mormon political dominance in western Illinois. Wicks and Foister, who call themselves “practicing Latter-day Saints” (ix), include Ford in the murder conspiracy but enlarge the plot well beyond him to include powerful Whig operatives in Illinois. Junius was the name Whigs used to sign anonymous editorials affirming the party cause. By pairing Junius with Joseph in the book’s title, the authors implicate both major political parties at the highest levels of Illinois government in a plot to bring down the Mormon prophet.

Wicks and Foister’s chief contribution to the historiography is to place the assassination within the larger context of presidential politics. In this well-paced narrative history the heart of the conflict lies in clashing visions of the ideal American polity: “For Joseph and his followers, the prospect [of the American presidency] was glorious: a heavenly-inspired theocratic democracy where ‘God and the people [would] hold the power to conduct the affairs of men in righteousness,’ a literal fulfillment of the Christian prayer for God’s kingdom to become established ‘on earth as it is in heaven.’ To Joseph’s opponents, the prospect of merging church and state in America meant a frightening, and unacceptable, repudiation of a cornerstone of the constitution” (1).

In the authors’ view, Joseph Smith’s campaign for the presidency forced the Illinois Whigs to take notice. Fearful that the Mormon vote would keep their candidate, Henry Clay, the retired Kentucky senator, out of the White House, prominent Illinois Whigs like Abraham Jonas, Orville H. Browning, and Thomas J. Hardin conspired with party apparatchiks to take Smith out of the picture. “Joseph Smith’s assassination is best described as the deadly result of a Whig-backed conspiracy that arose when it was determined that the Mormon prophet’s candidacy might well disrupt the outcome of the 1844 bid for the American presidential election” (5).
It is not hard to identify reasons why Illinois Whigs might want to eliminate Smith from the race. The Whigs were locked with the Democrats in one of the tightest—and wide-open—presidential races in American history. A third-party candidate could decide the election. The Mormons had swayed elections in the past. Illinois Whigs cried foul when the Mormons switched allegiance at the last minute in the Congressional race of 1843 by voting for Democrat Joseph Hoge. Everyone knew the Mormon vote gave Hoge the victory. If the Mormons could decide a state election, could they also decide a national one? In January 1844 the chairman of the Illinois Whig Central Committee planned for the worst when he told Hardin, the Whig Congressman from Illinois, that the Mormon vote “will about turn the scale in the state” (83).

Clay did not have Illinois locked up. He ended up losing both the state and the national election (by sixty-five electoral votes); but in a close race, it was easy to suppose that Illinois’s nine electoral votes could tip the scale from victory to defeat. When Joseph Smith declared his nonpartisan candidacy in February 1844, he took the Mormon vote with him, votes the Whigs desperately needed. Smith had to be put out of the race.

Like most conspiracy theories, the paper trail here is thin. The evidence must be pieced together to arrive at the high directives. The overall picture must be induced. Because Wicks and Foister have no document laying out the entire plan, they work hard to show the links (or “ties”) prominent Illinois Whigs had to both Mormons and Henry Clay. Jonas, a Whig committee member in Illinois’s Fifth District, supplied the press for the anti-Mormon Nauvoo Expositor. He and Clay, both prominent Masons, were “old friends” (57). Browning, a Quincy trial lawyer and leading Whig, defended the men accused of the assassination in court. He met “secretly” with Clay in July 1844 (267). Congressman Hardin arranged for two of the accused murderers to be released from custody. Hardin was Clay’s step-nephew. The links attempt to connect anti-Mormonism, on the one hand, with pro-Clay sentiments, on the other. All of these connections, when taken together, the authors say, add up to a grand conspiracy (270).

Wicks and Foister stop short of implicating Clay in the plot. They say repeatedly that Clay’s involvement is unknown (268, 269). But neither do they go out of their way to exonerate the Great Compromiser. For example, they claim that Smith’s assassination was “looked upon favorably by Clay,” their damning evidence being his public silence on the murders (264–65). When they introduce the main Whig assassin at Carthage, John C. Elliott, a deputy U.S. marshal from Ohio, they ask the leading question, “Is it coincidence that Elliott departed Ohio [for Hancock County] shortly after Henry Clay received Joseph Smith’s presidential inquiry?”, as if to suggest that Clay sent Elliott (259). Near the end of the book, a sociogram showing the com-
plex web of interrelationships puts Joseph Smith and Henry Clay at the center (266, 270).

The sociogram highlights the constructed nature of conspiracy theories. A conspiracy does not appear in the links connecting one person to another; the larger plot must be ascertained by taking all the links together. But in *Junius and Joseph*, every link interpreted to imply a conspiracy can also imply the absence of one. Jonas sold the press to the Nauvoo dissidents weeks before the Smiths were murdered in Carthage. Nothing in the evidence suggests that the action was part of a larger plan to murder the Smiths. The secret meeting between Browning and Clay turns out to be two men talking alone together for the first time. The topic of conversation is unknown. “Secrecy” is implied.

The authors waver on John J. Hardin’s role. At one point he is listed as one of the “major Illinois players in the assassination conspiracy and cover-up.” Later the authors back away, concluding that the extent to which Hardin was aware of the plot is “an open question” (5, 265, 269). The authors likewise vacillate on the extent of the plot. The book begins by saying the conspiracy “extended well beyond Hancock County” but ends by saying it “extended well beyond the state of Illinois” (5, 271). Hardin’s exact role, as with the other Whigs, is always one document away. The explanation for the absence is the classic line in conspiracy histories: “The men engaged in the conspiracy to murder Joseph Smith were careful to destroy any written documentation that might tie them to the crime” (265). This is all fanciful supposition.

The search for the master plan leads Wicks and Foister to John C. Elliott, the shadowy deputy U.S. marshal who was said to have answered a “secret national call” in May 1844 to leave Ohio for Illinois to murder the prophet. The quoted words have the ring of conspiracy. But they too, like so much else in this book, prove slippery. The words come from a biographical sketch of Elliott found in a history of Hamilton, Ohio, published fifty years after the assassination and thirty years after Elliott’s death. Whose words are they? The author of the sketch, Stephen Cone, said he drew from “standard authority” coupled with “reminiscences” from Elliott himself. But as one of the mobbers at Carthage, Elliott is hardly a credible witness. The reference to a “national” call serves to release Elliott from wrongdoing for joining the mob. The portrait is also self-serving: “Bold, courageous and brave, a man perfectly devoid of fear, [Elliott] was summoned to Nauvoo.”

What the sketch does not say is that Elliott was in Illinois months before Joseph Smith declared himself a candidate for the presidency. In December 1843, Elliott was arrested for kidnapping and whipping two Mormons. Wicks and Foister say Elliott came to Green Plains, Illinois, posing as a schoolteacher; but if the mission is secret, why would Elliott change his profession and not his name? Why jeopardize the big mission with a petty kid-
napping? The details do not add up to a convincing story.

The closest thing to a smoking gun comes, curiously enough, from the Mormons themselves. In an 1856 letter long known to historians of early Mormonism, one of Joseph Smith’s bodyguards, Stephen Markham, remembered stumbling onto a meeting in Carthage where a conspiracy to kill the Smiths was being discussed the night before the murders. Markham said, “There were delegates in the meeting from every state in the Union but three.” Wicks and Foister interpret the statement to mean delegates from the East had converged on Carthage as part of the “secret national call” mentioned in the Elliott sketch. But a grand conspiracy is not the only possibility. It is equally plausible that Hancock County, located at the western edge of settlement, was filled with anti-Mormons born in “every state in the Union but three.” The county’s Anti-Mormon Party is known to have held a meeting in Carthage that night, and the meeting could have easily attracted outsiders who heard of the Mormon trouble in the newspapers and spontaneously converged on Carthage to join the cause. Moreover, Markham recounted the incident in Utah at a time when the national parties were politicizing Mormonism and Mormons themselves were suspecting national officials of conspiring against them; he could have easily read a national conspiracy back into a local anti-Mormon meeting. In Carthage, a meeting of anti-Mormons whom Markham did not recognize does not require the hypothesis of an organized national conspiracy.

One would think that a national call to take out the Smiths would be manifest in sources created at the time and not merely in local histories produced many years after the fact. Are we to suppose that a grand plot involving agents converging from every point of the compass could have been kept secret for decades when the Whig party was just a few years from splintering into sectional rivalries? Other historians who have gone over the sources carefully have picked up no irregularities. The standard histories of the Whig party have nothing to say about Smith’s role in the campaign of 1844. Michael F. Holt’s massive history of the party never mentions Smith’s name, and neither does Charles Sellers’s long history of the 1844 election. Smith receives only passing mention in Clay’s incoming correspondence, the very
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place we would expect Joseph’s name to appear if his candidacy really had generated serious concerns. Given this absence, Smith’s significance to the parties seems overstated. A national conspiracy seems highly unlikely.

If there was a large conspiracy, newspaper editors, both Whig and Democrat, would have sensed the same threat that brought powerful people to risk so much in conniving against the Smiths. A collective sigh of relief should have appeared in the reports of the murders. That relief is absent. Instead of rejoicing, there was almost universal disdain for the mob. The words “cowardly” and “disgraceful” were often used. Joseph Smith was still called an imposter, but the assassins were called worse. If the Whig conspiracy spoke for the nation, the nation was in deep denial. Thomas Sharp, the Warsaw editor whose fiery editorials spearheaded the violence, admitted two weeks later that Joseph Smith’s summary execution had “brought upon us the severest censure of nearly the whole newspaper press” (“To the Public,” Warsaw Signal, July 10, 1844).

Neither does a murder conspiracy fit with the ethos of the Whig Party. The Whigs hated violence. The preservation of order and law were their hallmarks. Clay was a mild man who sought compromise to avoid conflict at all costs. His operatives would only betray that vision to the party’s peril. Violent clashes between Native peoples and Irish Catholics in April and May of 1844 had made the entire country nervous, and more violence was not in anyone’s interest, including Thomas Ford’s. Why a Democrat would league with Whigs is never satisfactorily explained. The accounts implicating Ford and the Whigs in a large-scale murder conspiracy ignore their consistent public and private calls for lawfulness in the days and months leading up to Carthage.

The Whigs had no need to kill Joseph Smith. The local Anti-Mormon Party had Smith right where they wanted him: in jail, awaiting court in an unfriendly county seat on a charge of treason. If convicted, he faced certain death. Smith’s destruction of the *Expositor* press, widely deplored in the East, had already doomed his candidacy for president. A hearing on the charge of riot was imminent. It was easier for the Whigs to await the unraveling of Smith’s campaign than it was for them to risk the sure destruction of their own party by issuing national calls for an assassination. Only locals whose blood had been boiling for months over perceived Mormon illegalities had the temerity to transform the calls for lawfulness into a call to take the law into their own hands.

The trajectory of conspiracy theories usually peaks with the grand plot. In time, conspiracies tend to arc downward to more modest pretensions. Far-reaching conspiracies often fall flat for lack of evidence. Oswald returns to being the lone gunman with an unrelated Soviet connection, Booth the idea man among a small circle of Southern sympathizers. The as-
JED WOODWORTH {jlwoodworth@wisc.edu} is a Ph.D. student in American history at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. With Reid Neilson, he coedited Believing History: Latter-day Saint Essays, by Richard Lyman Bushman (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).


Reviewed by Michael Hicks

A book tie-in to the PBS documentary of the same title by Lee Groberg, this “commemorative portrait” came on the heels of the Winter 2002 Olympics in Salt Lake City and the seventy-fifth anniversary of the choir’s broadcasts. Both occasions demanded some kind of commemoration, since they jointly symbolize the choir’s—and hence the Church’s—crossing the prairie of American culture into a new, state-sanctioned promised land. For decades, of course, the choir has been a well-known phenomenon of American life—a cliché, really, one referred to in countless jests, comedic monologues, television sitcoms, ad infinitum. The Mormon Tabernacle Choir had already been “America’s choir” in all the vernacular senses, but not quite the high-minded nationalistic orthodoxy this book commemorates. How that has happened and, indeed, what the Mormon Tabernacle Choir really represents to the proverbial common American might be more interesting than the hyper-reverent story told by this book.

Its nine glossy, colorful, photo-packed chapters (plus Introduction, “Prelude” and “Encore”) effectively take the reader on his or her own tour with the Tabernacle Choir of today. Two chapters treat the choir of the nineteenth century (though always peppered with current anecdotes). Another chapter treats the Tabernacle itself and still another the Tabernacle Organ. Fully three chapters survey twentieth-century choir tours, one considers choir broadcasting, and another choir recordings. Overall, the book paints the choir’s commemorative portrait as the group journeyed from the frontier to national renown, a journey strewn with fortunate accidents, miracles, some would say: the rise of broadcasting, for example, which enabled the choir to blanket the nation’s airwaves with its zealous singing.

In telling this story, Swinton’s book shows the Tabernacle Choir as the chief public relations arm of its sponsoring church. Swinton also shows it as a
social group making its trek to the national stage to become “America’s Choir,” a term given it by Ronald Reagan. The book abounds with anecdotes supporting the thesis that this is America’s choir in all the Reaganesque ways: folksy, fun, dedicated, inspiring, even heroic. It is not “America’s Choir” in the more solemn and provocative terms of the Revolution (or indeed of old-time Mormonism): independent, progressive, brainy, feisty. This is about the choir of the modern American empire, not that old, foundling America dedicated to the overthrow of empire.

In many ways America’s Choir recapitulates its predecessors: J. Spencer Cornwall’s A Century of Singing: The Salt Lake Mormon Tabernacle Choir (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1958), Gerald A. Petersen’s More Than Music: The Mormon Tabernacle Choir (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1979), and Charles Jeffrey Calman’s The Mormon Tabernacle Choir with photography by William I. Kaufman (New York: Harper and Row, 1979). While at first glance it might seem mostly a photobook—there are only two photoless pages—it does contain lively historical vignettes, anecdotes, biographical sidebars, and so forth. Like Cornwall’s and Peterson’s books, it focuses mainly on the contemporary choir—lacking the historical panache of Calman’s—but does so with concrete, often terse prose such as this:

Six states, ten cities, nineteen days, eleven concerts. Ten busses with friendly drivers. Three charter airplanes left Salt Lake International Airport at staggered times. Fifteen hundred pieces of luggage were pulled from midnight to 3:00 A.M. by strong-armed volunteers—who double as tenors and basses at concerts. Three hundred thirty-five singers, twenty-five instrumentalists, two organists, two conductors, and even the volunteer seamstresses, librarians, and historian were on board. Each woman traveled with three concert gowns, each of the men with a tux and a suit. Hotel rooms for 565, scrambled eggs, and box lunches; all-night trains to make back-to-back engagements; sightseeing from a bus as it pulls into the parking lot of the concert hall. Rain, hail, and heat in midsummer. That’s a Tab Choir tour. (89–90)

In its overall design, layout, and presentation it surpasses the earlier books in visual appeal. It is a USA Today amid a batch of small metropolitan newspapers. And that makes it both classier and more disposable, classier in that the reader can enjoy its high production values and polished professionalism, but more disposable in that those traits try to compensate for a poverty of analysis and real historical digging. As vast as the resources are for Tabernacle Choir scholarship—detailed minutes, personal journals, oral histories, scrapbooks, audio and video recordings—precious little spadework has been done, in this book or elsewhere. I include in that assessment my own treatment of the choir in Mormonism and Music: A History (Urbana: Univer-

As a history, this book presents a good, though by now somewhat shop-worn, summary of the choir as an LDS institution. The dates and personnel are there, the events and itineraries, praise from Church leaders and Gentile critics. These are framed in the usual paradigms: the pioneers’ love of high culture, the Utah choir’s startling triumph at the Chicago World’s Fair, its conquest of primitive broadcasting, then of hi-fi recording, etc. In this, as in earlier commemorative portraits, all conductors are heroes and all singers missionaries.

What is missing is the tangled narrative of events and personalities that make up any choir, and especially a church choir. In a real history of the Tabernacle Choir one would expect to see, for example, a discussion of the critical debates about the choir’s repertoire and sound quality. Hearsers inside and outside the Church, especially professional musicians, have always divided on the choir’s merits as a musical institution. To understand that division, one would have to consider the history of choirs in America (and indeed in the world), not just the history of choirs in the LDS Church. And beyond critical debates, there are the complex stories of prominent people in and around the choir. There are the ones who are tougher to discuss: Evan Stephens, Richard Condie, Jay Welch, Spencer Kinard. But even the more genial ones—J. Spencer Cornwall, for example—have the complexity of mind that must accompany any human being bold enough to direct hundreds of people’s voices week after week. Beyond the “stars” of the choir, what about the rank and file? Thousands of achingly human back-stage stories await telling. A choir is a society, a family. And everyone knows how complicated those institutions are, how deeply they defy the pat imagery of public relations.

Nevertheless, some strictly ecclesiastical questions remain: How does the LDS First Presidency use the choir to proselyte? Is it for mass appeal or for heightened standards? How does a member’s calling to the Tabernacle Choir—up to twenty years in the group with no other Church calling—affect musical leadership at the ward and stake levels? Why does the choir function completely apart from the Music Division of the Church? Is “America’s Choir” de facto one more sign to the world that Mormonism = Americanism? And how does that affect its public relations mission?

What I miss perhaps most in this book, and its predecessors, is a history of the choir as a musical institution. Someday, for example, someone will write a history that treats the choir’s repertoire. How has it evolved (or devolved)? This choir has sung Handel and Beethoven admirably, not to mention sophisticated Americana by Randall Thompson and Howard Hanson. According to an acquaintance who is a member of the choir, it has also sung “We Are the World” on Japanese television, swaying in time to that
acrid pop song. (Only a decade earlier, to my personal knowledge, the Church Music Committee had complained to the First Presidency about the propriety of the choir singing “Shenandoah.”) How have the changing utilitarian functions of the choir dictated what it sings? Does the choir serve the Church and the art of music to similar degrees? Has that changed—and how might it continue to? And how has the choir’s sound changed (and why)? Recordings of the choir from at least as early as 1910 exist. So one can consider not only its repertoire, but its changing tempi, tone colors, and so on.

Such questions suggest that scholars should start to consider the Tabernacle Choir as, in fact, a choir. There is much to learn about America’s choirs by doing so. And there is much to learn about the “more than music” of this particular choir by starting with the music they sing.

The verdict on this book? It is a fitting encore to its forerunners, though, for readers like me, it is not enough of what it could be and too much of what we’ve already seen. While it hits its mark, I’m anxious for someone to set up new targets of inquiry for the choir—musicological, for one (or even truly sociological, for another). This book and others like it have documented to the hilt the choir’s prestige and celebrity status. But that status may suggest that it is time to honor the choir with a different kind of commemoration, the kind that flows from a careful, resourceful historian’s patience.

MICHAEL HICKS {michael_hicks@byu.edu} is a professor of music at Brigham Young University. A modernist composer, he is also the author of three books, including Mormonism and Music: A History (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), and dozens of articles on American and contemporary music as well as Mormon history.


Reviewed by Cherry B. Silver

Dr. Emmanuel Abu Kissi and his editor, Matthew K. Heiss, make a remarkable contribution to contemporary history in telling Ghana’s story of gathering. Few areas of the LDS Church have local writers intelligently creating an insider’s history. The title refers to a Ghanaian expression, meaning “alive and well,” that reflects Dr. Kissi’s positive outlook.

The story begins with West Africans originating their own congrega-
tions and, from 1962 on, writing letters to Church headquarters asking for missionaries and recognition. The story describes years of slow progress, then exciting developments, bumps in the road, and a regularizing of the status of Ghana, so that the country now has a mission and five stakes. It climaxes in the dedication of the Accra Ghana Temple by President Gordon B. Hinckley in January 2004.

Walking in the Sand is organized chronologically; but since the book is based on many diary entries and documents, the reader may find the format rather uneven.

Dr. Kissi introduces Ghanaian pastors who organized congregations they called Latter-day Saint, among them rather colorful characters: Dr. Raphael Abraham Frank Mensah in 1962, Joseph William Billy Johnson in 1964, and Rebecca Mould, the “Mormon Prophetess,” in 1965. These Ghanaians wrote letters to Church headquarters and met Church educators and businessmen working in Ghana like Virginia Cutler and Merrill J. Bateman. When official missionaries Rendell and Rachel Mabey, and Edwin Q. (“Ted”) and Janath Cannon arrived in early December 1978, they found a Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Ghana Mission already registered in the names of local trustees, including Mensah and Johnson, with their congregations ready to be baptized (35–37).

Differences naturally arose between these independent churches and the new formal structure; some problems were reconciled, others not: “For example, in Sekondi the members were uncertain about why Sister Rebecca Mould could not sit on the stand with the branch presidency during Church meetings. There were also meetings during the week to raise money to support Sister Mould and pay her for the use of her building as the Church’s meetinghouse. At these meetings, drums were frequently played, which was the Pentecostal way of worshipping and a tradition many members were accustomed to” (40–41). The first full-time missionary couple, Reed and Naomi Clegg, recorded that Prophetess Mould eventually took back her “spacious block cement building. . . . She had depended on the income from her congregation [but] as District Relief Society president she had no income when she joined the Church. She went back to her old status” (52). In quoting these lines, Dr. Kissi raises matters of paid ministry, women’s roles in leadership, and music, all still pertinent issues in African churches.

After converting to the Church in England in 1979, Dr. Emmanuel Kissi and his wife, Benedicta Elizabeth, returned to Ghana where they established a clinic, Deseret Hospital, and led out in supporting the Church, its members, and its missionaries. In a book Kissi and Heiss might have cited in their bibliography, The Dawning of a Brighter Day: The Church in Black Africa (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990), Alexander B. Morrison commends “Brother Kissi’s generous, loving heart and deep compassion for those who
In the middle of positive growth, the government slammed Latter-day Saints with a lock-out from their buildings and worship which members labeled the “Freeze.” It lasted from June 14, 1989, until November 30, 1990. When the Church was restored to its legal status, LDS Church leaders faced other obstacles in trying to build a temple. Stalling tactics by government officials under pressure from competitive religious groups required great patience and persistence on the part of the Area Presidency. Before the magnificently designed temple could be erected, national parties changed power and a new president, John A. Kufuor, replaced Jerry Rawlings. Dedication of the Accra Ghana Temple took place on January 10, 2004, eleven years after Gordon B. Hinckley, then a counselor in the First Presidency, came looking for a temple site (268–69, 296).

Dr. Kissi became an actor in an intense struggle for religious tolerance within a culture of bias. His anxiety was real that losses during the shutdown of the Church would be permanent. He wrote arguments and campaigned for reversal. Church Public Relations filmed him, along with Julia Mavimbela of Soweto, in a documentary, *Lives of Service*, to illustrate the positive effects that black Church members were having in their native countries (202). He and his wife personally suffered. Indeed, he dedicates the book to his fourteen-year-old son Eric, who died in a car crash at the beginning of, and somewhat because of, the “Freeze.” In June 1989, Dr. Kissi planned to drive his two sons home from boarding school for summer holidays. Called instead to attend a special planning meeting on the crisis with the mission president, he delegated his son, George, to collect the two younger boys. An accident on the trip home sent the three to the hospital, where Eric died of a head injury (193–95).

He reprints official statements and newspaper charges against the “cult” of Mormonism and includes rebuttals he has written to the government and press. He also comments ironically, “Whether these actually got to [the Chief of National Security] or not still remains unknown as there was no feedback and as they could have been easily removed by any one of the agents of the persecution campaign who were close to the powerhouse of unrighteousness. . . . None was ever published” (216), at least until this volume appeared.

In his eyes, the heroic contest between good and evil in 1989 and 1990 led to noble acts and folkloric deliverances, cited in metaphorical language like “the Silent Mission.” Dr. Kissi reports:

Elder and Sister J. W. B. Johnson, who were in the mission field at the time of the announcement that stopped the Church’s activities, were still at post, but they had changed their mode of operation from
missionary work to strengthening the Saints. Wherever the acting mission president [Emmanuel Kissi] visited, there was evidence of a tour by the Johnsons of the Silent Mission. There had been a welcome encouragement that the lone couple had been giving to the disheartened flock, who were as sheep without a shepherd.

The police and the Civil Defense Organisation (CDO), which was the PNDC government’s presence at the grassroots, had the responsibility of the security of Church properties. The CDO, in addition, was to monitor Church members’ activities. On a few occasions, Latter-day Saints were arrested and kept in police cells overnight on charges of holding illegal meetings.

With the understanding by government leaders that the Latter-day Saint meetinghouses radiated very strong spiritual power, much effort was made to desecrate the buildings by smoking, drinking, and flirting there. Some of these dirty activities elicited miraculous responses. Security guards from the CDO on guard duty at the OLA/University Branch meetinghouse at Cape Coast heard a distinct voice of warning to “stop smoking in this house.” Following this warning, they deserted the meetinghouse (207–8).

Limitations in this book arise from the very closeness of Dr. Kissi to his material. Although the documentary record is strong, the book would have benefited from more commentary on and assessment of events, and from comparing the LDS Church’s development with the progress of other denominations in Ghana. He also hints at strained relations that occurred between Ghanian members and Church officials over issues of trust, adapting to the native culture, and setting up and selling off farms, and welfare projects, but Dr. Kissi does not scrutinize those themes. I judge that the text treads softly so as to appear reasonable and supportive to Latter-day Saint readers in the western world.

A touching story speaks in a subtle way to the theme of recognition of local leaders. Although Dr. Kissi was serving as stake patriarch in the Accra Ghana Stake, he and his wife felt underutilized. Then in April 2002 he was called by the First Presidency “to be a Seventy, to belong to the Third Quorum of Seventy, and to serve in the area. I was overwhelmed. I loved it! My wife said, ‘Oh, the Lord remembers us still after all.’ . . . We love it!” (311–12).

As to culture, even though native African religions with their elements of magic have a strong influence on local people, Dr. Kissi has not treated native beliefs directly in this chronicle. However, he records that the temple “makes a lot of difference” because of covenants. “Most of the Ghanaians had no idea about what keeping covenants would be like. They could only imagine. It was just like in the earlier church in Ghana where the ‘would-be Saints’ imagined a spiritual church with Pentecostal orientation, beating big
bass instruments and doing that kind of thing” (270) Dr. Kissi might help readers understand whether temple ceremonies have satisfied African cultural expectations or if its quiet covenants are seen as western and thus alien.

Emmanuel Kissi acts as chronicler and lecturer on Ghana to the larger Church as well as a founding leader in his own territory. We can be grateful for his sense of mission in collecting and preserving important documents and in publishing them with logic and personality. This notable book invites further historical study.

CHERRY BUSHMAN SILVER {cherry.silver@att.net} has worked as a research historian with the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History at Brigham Young University and continues to annotate the Emmeline B. Wells diaries. In November 1988, she and her husband, Barnard, flew to Accra, Ghana, from Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire, to warn the Ghanaian mission leaders of terrorist threats on the lives of missionaries and members. At that time, they visited Dr. and Sister Kissi at his Deseret Hospital, as well as touring Church buildings and missionary quarters.


Reviewed by Devery S. Anderson

A little-known incident in U.S. and Mormon history, the explosion of the steamboat *Saluda* on the Missouri River on April 9, 1852—Good Friday—was a tragedy that dramatically changed the lives of both those who survived and those who witnessed the explosion. It is relevant to the history of LDS immigration, since many of the passengers on the *Saluda* were Mormons en route to the Church’s Zion in the west. Yet, it is not exclusively a Mormon story, and this book serves as a tribute to everyone involved—passengers, crew, rescuers, and the community of Lexington, Missouri, where the explosion took place.

William G. Hartley and Fred E. Woods, authors of the book, are both professors of history at Brigham Young University. They independently became fascinated with the story of the explosion and its aftermath by reading first-hand accounts, then undertook the project of research and writing jointly. They completed the task within ten months—in time for the tragedy’s sesquicentennial commemoration held in Lexington in 2002. The result is a thorough study, but one that they insist is open to further investigation into the lives of as-yet-unknown passengers whose lives were changed or ended by the explosion.
In eighty-six pages, the authors have provided a study that they divide into six chapters, an epilogue, two appendices, and a bibliography. By mixing the overall narrative with personal accounts of the passengers and witnesses, a compelling story comes to life.

The authors first provide important contextual information on steamboat travel in general and the risks that passengers often took in boarding a riverboat, especially when the vessel had already been damaged, as the *Saluda* had. Such travel was especially risky on the Missouri, or “Big Muddy,” as it was called. “I will remind you that steam navigation on the Missouri is one of the most dangerous things a man can undertake,” Hartley and Woods quote Father Pierre-Jean DeSmet, a Jesuit missionary, as saying. “I fear the sea, but all the storms and other unpleasant things I have experienced in four different ocean voyages did not inspire me with so much terror as the navigation of the somber, treacherous, muddy Missouri” (19). At least 289 steamboats sank in the nineteenth century after 1819, usually because of being holed by snags and rocks. The other major risk—and the one that caused the *Saluda* catastrophe—was boiler explosions. This problem caused at least twenty-seven reported explosions between 1819 and 1852 (19–20).

The authors did their best to identify all of those who had boarded the 220-ton *Saluda* on its final run up the Big Muddy: “Quickly, a mass of human beings, each with a name and personality and life story, began loading themselves and belongings into the aging craft, unaware that by so doing, they were heading for an infamous date with history” (5). The *Saluda* carried about 200–250 passengers and crew that day. Appendix B lists 172 of them by name—the most complete list yet published. John S. Higbee and Abraham O. Smoot had previously estimated that, when the *Salada* left St. Louis, between 100 and 115 passengers, just under half, were Latter-day Saints (113–14).

An engineer accidentally allowed a boiler on the *Saluda* to boil dry. When cold water was pumped into this super-heated chamber, “the hull disintegrated. Timbers, splinters, pieces of boilers, engine parts, fragmented chimneys, bales, freight, and bodies were propelled skyward. A blossom of steam, smoke, and flying objects filled the air” (33). Witnesses in Lexington said: “The noise of the explosion resembled the sharp report of thunder, and the houses of the city were shaken as if by the heavings of an earthquake.” Colonel James Hale said that the boat’s safe was found seventy yards from where the explosion occurred, and that “chained to it [was] a dead yellow spotted pointer dog” (33). The exact number of fatalities are not known. Hartley and Wood place the estimated range at no fewer than twenty-six and probably no more than 100.

A particularly ironic story is that of the William Dunbar family, Mormon immigrants from Britain. They had missed boarding the vessel in St.
Louis but caught up with it in Lexington and succeeded in boarding it. Their seeming good luck proved tragic. William survived, but his wife and children were killed. The authors’ focus on the Dunbars and others on board personalizes the story, which also stresses human compassion.

Immediately after the explosion, doctors were called to the scene and a nearby building was used for a hospital. Local women nursed the injured and were kept busy “laying out the dead, and securing protection for the children who were saved.” The *Lexington Express* published the names of the known dead and condition of many of the injured (44–45).

To be sure, early Mormonism is often the story of tragedy, with religious persecution as its root. What makes the story of the *Saluda* explosion unique among “pioneer stories” is that the enemy is the dangerous Missouri River, where Mormon and non-Mormon suffer alike, while the non-Mormons of Lexington are saviors for the suffering passengers. As the authors state, “The town council had no emergency plan for dealing with the likes of this catastrophe, but the people saw immediately they had to somehow respond. The dead and dying, the scalded and torn, the orphaned and shocked, all needed help” (43). Dunbar was “treated with much hospitality and kindness” in the home of a man who “admitted that he was one of those who years ago had shouldered his gun to help drive the ‘Mormons’ out of Missouri” (44). Abraham O. Smoot said: “I shall never forget the kindness of the citizens of Lexington in caring for the living and burying the dead. The Lord certainly inspired them to do all that sympathy and benevolence could suggest in aid of the afflicted” (53). In the end, religion made no difference, reminding us that nineteenth-century Gentiles were not always one-dimensional characters who hated the Saints.

The *Saluda* tragedy changed the lives of its survivors in countless ways. In addition to those who died, survivors often sustained permanent physical injuries and untold emotional trauma. Many continued their journey to Utah, but without the family members who had begun the journey with them. Hartley and Wood, aware of local traditions that some Mormon orphans were adopted by Lexington families, scoured census and other records. They determined that three of the four accounts were accurate. The fourth, Kate Boulware, was also an adoptee but not a *Saluda* survivor (50–51).

They occasionally overlooked an editing opportunity, such as the redundancy of: “At 7 A.M. in the morning…” (31). Some may also criticize the moments when the narrative recounting the *Saluda* disaster makes it sound like a strictly Mormon tragedy, but it is clear that Hartley and Woods are not writing from such a bias. “Thus far our searches, which continue,” they note, “have turned up few accounts by the non-Mormon passengers” (x). In contrast, many *Saluda* survivors kept journals or wrote personal histories, and
these and other such sources made their way to LDS archives, where the authors would have been remiss if they had ignored them. Surely if there are more personal accounts written by others aboard the vessel, the authors want to know about them.

If the explosion of the Saluda usually appears as a footnote in Mormon history (when it is mentioned at all), here we are reminded that where lives are lost or altered, where there is tremendous triumph over tragedy, the record is incomplete when such accounts are overlooked or minimized. Perhaps this “footnote” will inspire historians to dig into others like it to see what amazing stories emerge.
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Reviewed by John D. Gustav-Wrathall

D. Michael Quinn’s Same-Sex Dynamics among Nineteenth-Century Americans: A Mormon Example ends with a description of Apostle Boyd K. Packer’s October 1976 speech in the priesthood session of general conference condoning physical violence against homosexuals (382–83). I heard the live broadcast of this address in my local LDS stake center in Rochester, New York. Age thirteen at the time, I was just beginning to struggle with my own feelings of same-sex attraction, and Elder Packer’s words had a profound impact. Not long afterward, my high school health instructor described a brutal beating of a gay man and asked what the class thought of this kind of behavior. I promptly raised my hand and, paraphrasing the message I took away from Elder Packer’s address, announced: “Perhaps if it helped him to realize the error of his ways, it was for his own good.” The teacher and most members of my class were mortified, but I stuck to my guns, confident that, even if everyone else was against me, I was on the Lord’s side. Packer’s words haunted me years later as I contemplated sui-
cide, believing that, as a gay man, my life had no value.

Whether one agrees with Packer’s condoning of violence, most Mormons and non-Mormons today take it for granted that his view is consistent with a long history in the LDS Church of viewing homosexuality as an extreme and especially abominable moral transgression. But according to Quinn’s monumental study of same-sex dynamics in early Mormonism, which received the prestigious Herbert Feis prize from the American Historical Association, such an assumption is incorrect. Quinn provides compelling evidence that nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Church leaders from Joseph Smith through George Albert Smith were fully aware of the existence of homosexual behavior. But if they considered it a sin at all, they consistently treated it more as an embarrassing indiscretion or minor vice than as a serious sin or as a crime—far less serious than heterosexual adultery or even masturbation. Nineteenth-century Mormon Church leaders, jurists, and legislators persisted in excusing and ignoring homosexual behavior; and if they punished it at all, they did so only lightly.

As startling as this different cultural landscape may seem, most of Quinn’s book describes exactly how such attitudes—so counter-intuitive in today’s Mormonism—were possible in the nineteenth-century “world we have lost” (3).

Despite its many peculiarities, nineteenth-century Mormon culture was thoroughly American in its same-sex dynamics. Like other Americans of that time, Mormons valued and manifested extensive social interaction, emotional bonding, and physical closeness of males with males and females with females. Also, like other Americans of that time, the shared religious fervor of individual Mormons intensified their same-sex friendships to the degree that they were indistinguishable from what Americans today call “romantic love.” There was a “homocultural orientation” of pre-1900 American society of which Mormon culture was simply one example. (401)

In his introduction, Quinn begins by overviewing in lay terms some of the historical debates over social constructionism and essentialism that have shaped scholarship on the history of sexuality, and then by clarifying his own assumptions. Chapter 1 places same-sex dynamics in cross-cultural context and speculates on the possible impact on Mormons of contacts in the American West, in Polynesia, and in Africa with cultures where different gender identities were embraced and same-sex eroticism existed without stigma. Chapters 2 through 5 examine different aspects of same-sex dynamics in nineteenth-century American and Mormon contexts: the “homosocial,” referring to the pervasively gender-segregated social interactions of the nineteenth century; the “homopastoral,” referring to contexts in which members
of the same sex forged intense bonds by ministering spiritually to each other; the “homotactile,” referring to contexts in which intimate (though not explicitly erotic) physical touch was permissible; the “homoemotional” and “homoromantic,” referring to intense emotional bonding and friendship; and the “homomarital,” referring to the establishment of long-term domestic relationships between same-sex couples.

In this “homosocial” world, Joseph Smith could declare himself figuratively “married” to another man (136), Brigham Young could organize male-only dances in the Nauvoo Temple without raising eyebrows (86), and General Authorities traveling on official assignments together might, in the words of Joseph Smith, sleep in the same bed “locked in each other[’s] embrace talking of their love” (87, 89–81). In all of these contexts, Quinn emphasizes that the vast majority of Americans and Mormons participated in some or even all of these aspects of nineteenth-century homosocial culture—including the “homomarital” aspects—without ever engaging in explicitly erotic activity.

But if nineteenth-century Mormons tended to ignore, excuse, or dismiss homosexual behavior, Quinn demonstrates that, by the end of the nineteenth-century, a growing community of individuals in Utah saw themselves as different from the majority in that their bonds to members of the same sex extended beyond the merely social or emotion into the sexual and “homomarital.” Chapters 6 and 7 move on to an analysis of early same-sex relationships and the emergence of a gay community in Utah.

While historians of sexuality have long drawn on Utah Mormon lesbian Mildred J. Berryman’s 1920s study of the gay and lesbian community in Salt Lake City as a source on early U.S. gay and lesbian communities, Quinn is the first to examine it in its uniquely Utah Mormon context. He also draws on turn-of-the-century census data to examine same-sex domestic partnerships and residence patterns in Salt Lake City. Finally, in Chapter 8, Quinn documents the public “coming out” in 1919 of three prominent Mormons, Evan Stephens, beloved director of the Tabernacle Choir from 1890 to 1916, and Primary president Louie B. Felt and her counselor and life companion, May Anderson.

While Berryman’s study and the history of gay-affiliated organizations in Salt Lake such as the Salt Lake Bohemian Club suggest that many self-identified gay and lesbian Mormons either did not feel comfortable or welcome in the LDS Church, Quinn’s analysis of the “coming out” of Evans, Felt, and May suggests that at least some gays and lesbians were active Latter-day Saints who valued their callings and their membership in the Church, maintained a positive, well-integrated self-image, and sought to promote tolerance of same-sex-oriented individuals and appreciation of their contributions to the Church and to the larger society.
Chapters 9 and 10 examine judicial, ecclesiastical, and medical responses to homosexuality, demonstrating how leniently nineteenth-century Mormons generally dealt with “homosexual” transgression. Finally, Chapter 11 chronicles, without explaining, the rise of homophobia in the twentieth century, contrasting the relative tolerance of nineteenth-century leaders with the virulent homophobia of twentieth-century leaders.

Quinn emphasizes that the purpose of his study is primarily to “describe and analyze” (8). As his study approaches the transition from the relatively tolerant, “homosocial” world of the nineteenth century to the relatively intolerant, “homophobic” world of the twentieth, Quinn refrains from offering explanations about why this transition takes place, contenting himself simply with demonstrating that “reaching adulthood in the twentieth century seemed to be the crucial factor in the decline of tolerance” (375). Yet historians of sexuality will naturally seek to extract from the compelling data provided by Quinn an explanation about why a relatively tolerant nineteenth-century culture changed into a homophobic twentieth-century culture.

Some historians have argued that same-sex-oriented individuals themselves drove this change as they formed distinct communities in America’s urban centers. Quinn’s study certainly offers evidence of this dynamic at work in the American heartland in fin-de-siècle Salt Lake. Others have argued that homosexuality was “invented” by a nascent medical establishment trying to convince society of its usefulness. Quinn also accepts that the “medicalization of homosexuality” could have had an impact on prominent Mormons who were aware of new theories of sexual orientation presented at the International Conference of Women Physicians in 1919 (244–45). The “medicalization” argument is also not inconsistent with Quinn’s case that the Mormon leadership resisted adopting homophobic attitudes until after the 1950s, much longer than the broader society (366).

But Quinn opens a tantalizing window on a third explanation for the rise of homophobia that is full of irony, especially for those conservative Mormons who identify “traditional family values” with the suppression of homosexuality. Quinn describes the intensity of religious conflict in the late nineteenth century occasioned by the federal campaign against polygamy, when he suggests that nineteenth-century Mormon leaders had suffered from “post-traumatic stress syndrome” as a result of bigamy prosecutions and anxiety regarding the Church’s financial insolvency in the wake of the Edmunds-Tucker confiscations (321–22). He shows how increasingly harsh sentences for sodomy convictions appeared to have nothing to do with rising public consciousness of homoerotic behavior, such as that provoked by the publicity surrounding the trial of Oscar Wilde (315). Rather, non-Mormon judges were imposing light sentences on non-Mormons and harsh sentences
on Mormons (282, 286), while Mormon judges were imposing harsh sentences on non-Mormons and lightening or dismissing charges against Mormons (315–16).

Quinn suggests that one possible explanation for the rising severity of sodomy sentences was that, once the federal campaign against polygamy had been won, moral crusaders in need of a cause began to focus on homosexuality (283). Though he does not explicitly draw far-reaching conclusions, his analysis could suggest that rising homophobia was linked to antagonism between Mormons and non-Mormons in their struggle to define the nation’s moral values. As I describe in my book on the YMCA, Anglo-Saxon Protestants were in the process of defining American moral values in sexual terms—through anti-prostitution campaigns, the anti-polygamy campaign, and later through anti-homosexual campaigns. I could not help wondering if one explanation for the rise of homophobia among Mormons in the twentieth-century might be that Mormons, seeking to distance themselves from their polygamous past, consciously sought to prove their moral uprightness by attacking homosexual Latter-day Saints and joining with the Protestant religious right in social and political campaigns against gay rights.

The first half of Quinn’s study draws extensive comparisons between Mormon culture and the broader American culture, while the last half of the study tends to focus more exclusively on the Mormon experience. I would have welcomed a more detailed comparison of the Mormon culture region and the rest of the country from 1900 to 1950 when the “homosocial” culture began to break down. Such a comparison might have illuminated a process that, for historians of sexuality, is still somewhat murky. Nevertheless, this book advances two important historical projects: first, making gays and lesbians more visible in the American past; and second, situating Mormon history in the broader context of American religious and social history. In looking at the intersection of Mormon and gay experience, Quinn has made an invaluable contribution to scholarship in both fields. His portrait of “the world we have lost” is compelling and moving, even as it poses larger questions about the world we have gained.

JOHN D. GUSTAV-WRATHALL {jwraithall@youngstranger.com} received his Ph.D. in American history from the University of Minnesota. He is the author of Take the Young Stranger by the Hand: Same-Sex Relations and the YMCA (University of Chicago Press, 1998).

Newell Bringhurst and Lavina Fielding Anderson have edited a valuable collection of bibliographical essays on various periods and significant topics in Mormon history, each one written by an expert in the area. The history of the LDS Church is covered in six chronological essays on Mormon origins (Roger D. Launius), the Church in Missouri (Stephen C. Le-Sueur), Nauvoo (Glen M. Leonard), Utah until the Manifesto (Craig L. Foster), the great transition, 1890–1945 (M. Guy Bishop), and the recent period, 1945 to the present (Jessie L. Embry).

The topical essays are on growth and internationalization, (Kahlile Mehr, Mark L. Grover, Reid L. Neilson, Donald Q. Cannon, and Grant Underwood), early Mormon conflict and schism (Danny L. Jorgensen), the Community of Christ (Mark A. Scherer), women (Todd Compton), polygamy (Martha Sonntag Bradley), Mormon biography (Newell Bringhurst), historical novels (Lavina Fielding Anderson), and three essays on culture (Klaus J. Hansen, David L. Paulsen, and Davis Bitton).

Some of the essays overlap, but that is not usually a problem, because most chapters stand on their own as overviews of their subject. Some books like Marvin Hill’s *Quest for Refuge*, Leonard J. Arrington’s *Great Basin Kingdom*, and Robert B. Flanders’s *Nauvoo: Kingdom on the Mississippi* are cited by several authors, reflecting the great respect these works enjoy. But no one mentioned Marvin Hill’s 1958 “Historiography of Mormonism” in *Church History*, an important early article in the New Mormon History.

The key characteristics of the New Mormon historian, in my view, are that their works are professional and they avoid the biases of both the pious and the hostile historians. Therefore some works which are recent and written by Ph.D.’s do not qualify as New Mormon History. Roger D. Launius’s outstanding essay, “Mormon Origins: The Church in New York and Ohio,” epitomizes the characteristics of the New Mormon History. He gives an excellent overview of the literature and is more willing than the other authors to offer critical comments both on works that are critical of Mormonism and on those which I refer to as “pious histories.” Launius includes interesting quotations by Gordon B. Hinckley and Jeffrey R. Holland expressing the “either/or” view of Mormon origins (63). Elder Holland is quoted as saying, “Accept Joseph Smith as a prophet and the book as the miraculously revealed and revered word of the Lord it is or else consign both man and the book to Hades for the devastating deception of it all” (63). Referring to the First Vision, Elder Hinckley is quoted as saying, “It either occurred or it did not occur. If it did not, then this work is a fraud” (63).

Wayne Ham’s 1970 article, “Problems in Interpreting the Book of Mormon as History” and Grant Palmer’s 2002 book, *An Insider’s View of Mormon Origins* are good examples of works by believers in the Community of Christ
and the LDS Church, respectively, who hold to middle-ground positions. Maybe we shouldn’t be surprised that a Church so committed to history controls access to historical sources and tries to control conclusions reached by scholars, even excommunicating or disfellowshipping scholars who step on the wrong toes. Apparently there is no middle ground for Church leaders.

Stephen Le Sueur contributed an excellent essay on “The Mormon Experience in Missouri, 1830–39.” He was the obvious choice for this essay, since his The 1838 Mormon War in Missouri was a balanced approach which official Church historians sometimes have difficulty achieving on this sensitive subject. Le Sueur raises two fundamental questions when looking at the Missouri period—and other periods in Mormon history for that matter: “Why did Mormonism elicit such strong hatred? And what was it about American society that would allow—and perhaps even encourage—the violent reaction against the new religion?” (108) It is not adequate to say, as we often have, that they were inspired by Satan.

Certainly the obvious choice for the chapter on Nauvoo was Glen M. Leonard, since Robert Flanders has not continued to do active research on Nauvoo. Like Leonard’s 2002 book, Nauvoo: A Place of Peace, A People of Promise, his essay is very informative. But I do have questions. I regard Todd Compton’s In Sacred Loneliness, which focuses on Joseph Smith’s plural wives, as the most valuable book on Mormon polygamy. He has done us an invaluable service by looking at “the principle” from the perspective of those women. But Leonard comments only that In Sacred Loneliness has “drawn sharply divided reviews” (121). Leonard is gracious to Paul Edwards, observing that his 1991 book “included a new reading for the Community of Christ of plural marriage in Nauvoo” (120). However, Edwards, who prepared Our Legacy of Faith on assignment from the First Presidency, side-stepped a direct admission that Joseph Smith practiced “the principle” by saying only that the Prophet “was aware of the existence and practice of polygamy in Nauvoo” (Edwards, Our Legacy of Faith, 110).

I also wish that Glen Leonard had briefly explained his reference to the “increasing polarization of Mormon history” (121). What does he see as the causes? Is not at least one major cause the LDS Church’s control of access to sensitive sources, excommunications and firings of scholars who come to nontraditional conclusions on sensitive subjects, threatening statements by General Authorities like Boyd K. Packer, and the defensive role played by FARMS? Understandably, many LDS historians, particularly those employed by the Church, have tended to be more cautious and faith-promoting, which in turn has led historians less vulnerable to ecclesiastical action to raise strong criticisms. The paragraph in which Leonard notes the polarization, however, gives the impression that historians like Roger Launius and John Hallwas are responsible for the polarization because, while the docu-
ments in their *Cultures in Conflict: A Documentary History of the Mormon War in Illinois* offer a variety of perspectives, “the editors bias the readings with their commentary, which is grounded in the 1840s non-Mormon view that the Latter-day Saints wrongly perceived themselves as persecuted innocents” (121). That is hardly a fair characterization of the reasons for Launius and Hallwas’s interpretation.

Leonard can be identified as a faithful historian when he calls theological developments in Nauvoo “new doctrinal insights” (132). From my tradition (Community of Christ), these “insights” are seen as “heresies.” And can’t faithful Church members profit as much as others by reading history that does not have, in Leonard’s words, a “revelatory perspective?” (131) Don’t they lose by not reading such works? Do the Saints have to limit themselves to books whose conclusions are known before the reading begins?

Leonard’s *Nauvoo* (2002) was written primarily for an LDS audience, and he went about as far as he could go in expressing independent judgments of the Church and its first Prophet. But that wasn’t very far; and in *Excavating Mormon Pasts*, he is writing for the scholarly community, yet refrains from criticizing the obvious shortcomings of apologetic institutional historians like RLDS author Inez Smith Davis or LDS author William E. Berrett (118). Meanwhile Leonard is unfairly harsh on Fawn Brodie (119), as are others in this collection. Leonard dismisses her as merely resurrecting “many of the issues hammered by the older antagonistic works” (119). But these are issues that won’t go away, and the New Mormon historians cannot avoid them.

A refreshing contrast is Jessie Embry’s “The Church in the United States since 1945,” an honest account of recent LDS history. She mentions, for example, Ezra Taft Benson’s embarrassing anti-civil rights, anti-communist, John Birch Society activity (192) and deals candidly with other Church problems and dilemmas.

In contrast, Craig Foster’s, “Mormonism on the Frontier: The Saints of the Great Basin,” sounds more like an institutional history. He names Arrington’s *Great Basin Kingdom* (1958) as the first book published in the New Mormon History, thus overlooking the prior claims of Juanita Brooks’s significant *The Mountain Meadows Massacre* (1950) and Brodie’s *No Man Knows My History* (1945). In my opinion, both should be seen as reflecting the philosophy that drives the New Mormon History. Both were published by highly respected secular publishers. Both women were criticized by the Church. Brodie was excommunicated, and Brooks was threatened with it. Brooks receives her due from Guy Bishop (“Mormonism in Transition, 1890–1945), who identifies her as a New Mormon historian and writes that “Brooks’s legacy to the New Mormon History is one of sound research and unmitigated historical honesty” (177). Foster says Brooks’s *Mountain Meadows Massacre* was criticized “by certain well-meaning Latter-day Saint spokes-
men” (153). Bishop quotes a critic—I don’t know if he was a Church spokes-
man—who called her book “the most vicious thing published against the
Church since the days of Nauvoo apostate John C. Bennett and William
Law” (177). Was this one of the critics whom Foster called “well-meaning”? Obvi-
ously, there is an active but sliding scale of degrees of approval or opp-
robrium, bewildering to an outsider like me.

Foster is the only author who acknowledges Jon Krakauer’s Under the
Banner of Heaven: A Story of Violent Faith, but he does so to denounce. In
Krakauer’s epilogue, he acknowledges his personal lack of belief in God.
Without this admission, I would not have known whether he is a theist or
not, since I saw nothing in his book that couldn’t have been written by a
devout Christian. But Foster seized on this admission to accuse Krakauer of a
“profound anti-religious bias” and “ignorance of basic Mormon history”
(153). A more reasonable interpretation would be that Krakauer, as an out-
sider and non-historian, oriented himself quickly in the field by reading the
most important works on Mormon history. His historical errors were minor
and inconsequential.

Finally, Foster incorrectly states that Jan Shipps, in her Mormonism:
The Story of a New Religious Tradition “argues that Mormonism is not a de-
nomination, sect, or cult” (139). In fact, Shipps did label Mormonism a cult,
but did it so gently (Mormonism, 48), comparing Mormonism to the Jesus
movement, that she made it sound all right.

I learned a great deal from Guy Bishop’s review of the literature on the
transition years in the LDS Church, 1890–1945. Perhaps there is no way of
knowing why Spencer W. Kimball “rather dramatically terminated the office
[of Presiding Patriarch] in October 1979” (176). Bishop is no doubt right
in calling Brodie’s No Man Knows My History “likely Mormonism’s most de-
tested book of her generation” (177). But a historian who acknowledges
Brodie’s lack of popularity among Mormons should also ask why non-Mor-
mon historians have found Brodie the most useful book on Mormon origins.

“Growth and Internationalization: The LDS Church since 1945” is the
only chapter not written by a single author, and the subject is the one that I
knew least about. The works on internationalization discussed by Mehr and
his associates seem to have been written mostly by faithful members who
tend to emphasize the positive. The title of Donald Q. Cannon’s and Rich-
ard O. Cowan’s recent book illustrates this point: Unto Every Nation: Gospel
Light Reaches Every Land (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003).

The two chapters on other-than-LDS movements were understandably
the ones I knew the most about. Community of Christ Church Historian
Mark Scherer (“Community of Christ Contributions to the New Mormon
History Movement”) and Danny L. Jorgensen (“Studies of Mormon
Fissiparousness: Conflict, Dissent, and Schism in the Early Church”) have
covered their subjects well. Jorgensen, a sociologist, tends to judge works by whether they present their information in a sound sociological framework. He laments: “Too little has changed since 1953 when Dale Morgan called the problem of schism to scholarly attention and recommended that: ‘Historically, many of these bodies [Mormon schisms] deserve extended individual treatment’” (251). Jorgensen seems puzzled that, among the early post-martyrdom splinter groups, James J. Strang’s movement has received the most attention, because he sees Strang’s claims as among the weakest of the would-be successors to the prophet (247). But Strang produced revelations and dug up plates and translated them. Unlike so many others who claimed to be the true successor, Strang stressed monogamy during his first five years as prophet, also a major appeal. But he shattered the faith of many of his disciples when he embraced polygamy, by embracing Elvira Field.

It is well that Roger Launius was not assigned the Community of Christ chapter, as a large number of the significant historical works on the Community of Christ are his. Mark Scherer came to the office of Church Historian a decade ago without a background in Church history. But he has been a quick study and has produced some good work. Scherer’s predecessor, Richard P. Howard, comes off well in Scherer’s essay and in Launius’s—deservedly so. Howard’s 1983 John Whitmer Historical Association Journal article admitting, though cautiously, Joseph Smith’s involvement in polygamy was itself a significant event in Community of Christ history. Howard also deserves high praise for his historical writing on latter-day scriptures, including the Book of Abraham, and for his courage and candor when he, in his two-volume The Church Through the Years criticized President Wallace B. Smith for ruling out of order a motion that conservative Saints brought to the 1986 World Conference calling for the Church to rescind Section 156 (building a temple and ordaining women to the priesthood), adopted by the 1984 conference.

Scherer is correct in saying that the John Whitmer Historical Association is independent from the Church, and “has allowed for free scholarly exploration of historical issues” (269), but I would qualify that statement. I regretted its journal’s decision to reject a high-quality paper on prophetic infallibility by David John Buerger, which I had arranged for him to deliver at Graceland, because it might offend LDS Church leaders. As a past book review editor for the JWHA Journal, I also regretted institutional concerns that influenced the rejection of some book reviews and decisions to replace members of the editorial staff. In short, the Whitmer association has not always been as independent as it sought to be, although these actions occurred before Scherer became Church Historian.

I particularly appreciated Scherer’s courage and candor in publicly referring to Joseph Smith’s polygamy as “ministerial abuse” in his presidential
address at the JWHA meeting in Council Bluffs in September 2004. Scherer was even bolder when he responded to a question about polygamy from Newsweek reporter Elise Soukup, a BYU graduate, that Joseph Smith “figured out a way to commit adultery and to do it sacramentally” (“The Mormon Odyssey,” Newsweek, October 17, 2005, p. 60). He told me that he had received a number of comments from unhappy members and administrators; but I heard from another source that Church leaders felt no need to ask him to explain the statement. The Church’s official website responds to the question, “What position does Community of Christ take on Joseph Smith Jr.’s alleged involvement in polygamy?” by saying the Church does not take positions on issues of history. Members are encouraged “to explore all issues pertaining to its story in an open atmosphere” and “draw their own conclusions.”

Todd Compton has written an excellent and important chapter on “The New Mormon Women’s History.” Compton is one of those historians of Mormonism who know that traditional Mormon historical writing—just as traditional historical writing generally—has woefully neglected the role of women. The reader can hardly help wondering if Claudia Bushman would today stand by her 1978 statement: “In most cases repression [by the Church] is more often imagined than real” (288). One asks how she knew that was true in 1978 or how she would see the situation today.

Martha Sonntag Bradley tackles the ever-controversial subject of polygamy in “Out of the Closet and into the Fire: The New Mormon Historians’ Take on Polygamy.” Bradley justly praises Richard Howard’s “The Changing Response to RLDS Polygamy: A Preliminary Analysis,” published in the 1983 John Whitmer Historical Association Journal, for acknowledging and providing a context for Joseph’s engagement in polygamy, even though, as she notes, he was cautious in interpreting it as somewhat accidental, resulting from a variety of factors (308). However, Howard’s first draft was much more forthright, as I know from interviewing both Howard and Grant McMurray in 2002, and by reading the first draft (1983). Howard had written it on assignment from President Wallace B. Smith. To his credit, President Smith thought it should be published (while other Church leaders did not), but not in an official venue. The result was a watered-down version approved by the First Presidency and published in the independent JWHA Journal. Howard received much criticism for it, and the First Presidency never acknowledged their approval of its publication.

A very interesting chapter is Newell Bringhurst, “Mormon Biography: Paradoxes, Progress, and Continuing Problems,” which overlaps significantly with other chapters, because virtually every biography fits into one or more of the other chapters. But biography is worth looking at by itself. A skilled biographer, Bringhurst is overly humble when he calls Leonard Arrington’s American Moses the most important biography of Brigham
Young. I would give that status to Bringhurst’s *Brigham Young and the Expanding American Frontier*. While Arrington’s book is much longer and far more detailed, he avoided some sensitive areas—such as race and gender—where Young’s views are an embarrassment now.

I am uncomfortable with the statement, often made, that biographies like those of Brodie, Robert Anderson and William Morain are lacking because their books are secular portraits of a religious man (327). Such biographies have much to teach us. Bringhurst cites Anderson’s statement, which I applaud: “I therefore exclude the ‘hand of God’ from consideration” (327). The historian, acting as historian, cannot discern “the hand of God.”

Lavina Fielding Anderson, “Fictional Pasts: Mormon Historical Novels,” deals with a topic that could have been excluded, but I am pleased that it was not. Maybe it is hard to draw a line between Mormon history and fiction because Anderson notes that Mormons read “quite a bit of fiction in their history” (367). For me it was the most interesting chapter, maybe because I know so little about Mormon fiction. The only Mormon fiction I can recall reading are Levi Peterson’s *Canyons of Grace* and *The Backslider*, neither of which is historical fiction, the focus of Anderson’s essay. Anderson quotes Charles S. Peterson who deplored the fact that not a single LDS leader has spoken publicly in favor of the New Mormon History (389), which made me appreciate anew former Community of Christ President Wallace B. Smith’s support of the John Whitmer Historical Association and the annual free-wheeling Theology Colloquy held at Graceland University. However, I disagree with Peterson’s belief that the New Mormon History has failed as an intellectual movement because of a lack of Church support. Church support is nice, but I don’t see it as necessary. Churches do change whether the leaders spearhead, resist, or deplore innovation.

For me the only unnecessary overlap was the inclusion of three essays on Mormonism and culture: Klaus Hansen’s “Mormon History and the Conundrum of Culture: American and Beyond,” David Paulsen’s “The Search for Cultural Origins of Mormon Doctrine,” and Davis Bitton’s “Mormon Society and Culture.” One would have probably been sufficient; and for my money, it would have been Hansen. He quotes Richard Bushman: “Mormons have felt little incentive to understand cultural and social influences” (5), a focus of particular interest in Bushman’s new biography of Joseph Smith, *Rough Stone Rolling*, which is subtitled on the cover: “A Cultural Biography of Mormonism’s Founder.” Hansen acknowledges that he wrote his essay in 1998 (23) and has added a “Postscript” (23–26) in which he comments on recent works. I believe it would not have been a difficult task for him to integrate the recent material into the original essay. Hansen quotes a letter from Bernard DeVoto to Dale Morgan which he characterizes as an “eruption of temper” (1)—not at all my reading of its tone. Hansen clearly
likes Jan Shipps’s *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition*, but it is a stretch to call it “undeniably brilliant” (22). In my opinion, some of Shipps’s chapters don’t seem to have much bearing on the central theme, the book reads more like a collection of essays, and her tone, to my ear, sometimes sounds like an apologetic Mormon. In short, although a good and important book, it is not unflawed.

Both Hansen and Paulsen (“The Search for Cultural Origins of Mormon Doctrine”) make an issue of the fact that Alexander Campbell in 1834 endorsed the Spaulding Theory (4, 30), as if that negates Campbell’s 1831 assertion that the Book of Mormon addressed many of the theological controversies of Smith’s day. Campbell’s two assertions are not contradictory. Paulsen labels Wesley Walters, H. Michael Marquardt and other unidentified writers as “anti-Mormon” (44, 48), an appellation suggesting that he is operating from a pre-New Mormon History framework. I recommend a permanent moratorium on “anti-Mormon.” It substitutes for evaluation, is a way to discredit someone’s work, and is often hurtful to those who are committed Mormons. I have heard it applied to Val Avery, Todd Compton, and even to Leonard Arrington. There is a continuum of writers from one extreme of the pious faithful who ignore every problem that arises in Church history to the other extreme, the Mormon-hater who can impute nothing but evil motives to Joseph Smith and all Church leaders. The New Mormon History rejects both extremes.

An extremely valuable feature is a comprehensive forty-eight-page index, a real asset for so complex a book. Another nice feature is the inclusion of seventy-two full-page photographs of the covers of many of the books discussed.

WILLIAM R. RUSSELL {russell@graceland.edu}, a past president of the Mormon History Association, is chair of the Division of Social Science at Graceland University, Lamoni, Iowa, where he teaches political science, religion, and sociology. He is preparing a manuscript on the post-1984 schism in the Community of Christ.

“Sanpete is a white, Mormon county,” assert the authors, but with “an interesting set of polarities. There are insiders and outsiders, Mormons and non-Mormons, natives and transplants, middle class and poor, anglo and ethnic, polygamists and monogamists, conservatives and progressives, newcomers and old times, urbanized and rural, young and aging, traditionalists and bohemians, locals and tourists, professionals and laborers, local workers and commuters, leaders and citizens, preservationists and developers and so on” (349–50).

The county is also, according to architectural historian Tom Carter, “the best representation still existing of early settlement life in Utah” (333), a comment that MHA members who enjoyed the day-long bus trip in connection with the 2004 conference will heartily endorse.

The county was settled first by 1849 settlers from Salt Lake City, and then by Scandinavians who began arriving in the mid-1850s until, by 1870, the population “was 80 percent first- or second-generation Scandinavian while . . . Ephraim was 94 percent” (viii). Chapter 3 presents an excellent overview of the 30,000 Scandinavian LDS converts who immigrated to Utah. Major interruptions were the Walker War (1853–54) and the Black Hawk War (1865–72), about which the authors comment sympathetically: “Chief Walker himself was baptized in 1850; but even granting the best of intentions the cultural gap proved too great to breach . . . Coexistence, with each culture intact, was impossible; compromise seemed unattainable; for the cherished ideals of one culture were the unpardonable sins of the other. Thus the battle was engaged” (65).

The chapters on the nineteenth century are filled with vivid examples of Mormon pioneer life: an 1850 rattlesnake hunt that killed an estimated 300 the first night (77); coyote hunts that were still going on in 1914 ("Upwards of 100 coyotes per month were not an uncommon toll," 41); the plight of bachelor James Van Nostrand Williams, who cleared and farmed four different plots, only to have the bishop give them to other settlers or add them to his own holdings (29–31), and an excellent discussion of the trial and error by which the settlers learned the land’s carrying capacity (chap. 2).

Key cultural institutions are Wasatch Academy in Mount Pleasant, “the oldest private boarding school in Utah,” founded by Pres-
byterian missionaries during the late 1870s, Snow College in Ephraim, founded in 1888, and the Manti Temple and its “Mormon Miracle Pageant” that draws more than 100,000 visitors annually (viii).

Of particular interest to Mormon historians is the “Swedish Apostasy” beginning in 1862 (165–71). Chapters 9 and 14, recounting the history and present status of different denominations, including LDS, in the county are rewarding reading. “Religion is perhaps the strongest presence in the county,” note the authors, “providing a backdrop for nearly every aspect of social life” (278). The percentage of Mormons has dropped from 90 percent in 1979 to 77 percent in 1998, with an activity rate of 63.8 percent compared to 60 percent of Salt Lake Mormons (278, 351 note 4). Motives for the county’s four homicides in the 1990s were “family revenge, armed robbery, religious execution, and lovers’ quarrels” (314).

Another chapter in the county’s religious history was the Jewish community of Clarion, a back-to-the-land experiment for urban Jews that lasted from about 1911 to 1915, with the last settlers leaving in 1920 (362–64).

Closely related to religion is Chapter 10 on education. Snow College was saved from extinction in 1931 when the Church gave other stake academies to the state because P. C. Peterson, son of legendary stake president Canute Peterson, reportedly bribed his fellow legislators to vote for retaining the school with legs of lamb. Even so, “the bill passed by a single vote—cast by Peterson himself” (206).

The chapters on economic history recount unending struggles against limited water, harsh climates, and tricky markets but memorably describe temporarily successful experiments with sugar beets: “Among the first, and certainly the most, persistent and vocal advocates of sugar-beet cultivation was Gunnison’s remarkable Bishop C. A. Madsen” (105). Orange Seely, “a well-known Indian war veteran, pioneer, and church leader,” gets a paragraph of tribute for his meticulous sheepherding records (111). Also documented are chickens and above all turkeys. “The only domesticated animal in Sanpete that did not arrive with the pioneers in 1849,” it had been introduced by 1867 to hold down the grasshopper population. Sanpete still raises “5 million edible birds per year,” making it “one of the top ten turkey-raising counties in the United States” (119, 317).

This volume in the county histories series draws on several sources: excerpts from earlier histories by the coauthors, sections by the Utah State Historical Society staff, community histories by local contributors, and a lively chapter on the contemporary county by Maxine Hanks.