



Maxwell Institute Publications

---

2000

## The Disciple as Witness: Essays on Latter-day Saint History and Doctrine in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson

Stephen D. Ricks

Donald W. Parry

Andrew H. Hedges

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/mi>



Part of the [Religious Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ricks, Stephen D.; Parry, Donald W.; and Hedges, Andrew H., "The Disciple as Witness: Essays on Latter-day Saint History and Doctrine in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson" (2000). *Maxwell Institute Publications*. 84.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/mi/84>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maxwell Institute Publications by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

# Introduction

Andrew H. Hedges

In 1996 Richard Lloyd Anderson celebrated his seventieth birthday and retired from the Religious Education faculty at Brigham Young University. To commemorate both events, as well as recognize Anderson's contributions in teaching and researching both the ancient and modern church, BYU's Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) teamed up with Religious Education to sponsor a Festschrift in Anderson's honor. A call for papers was issued, a conference entitled *Pioneers of the Restoration* was planned and announced, and selected papers were presented on 8 March 1997 to an audience of several hundred in the auditorium of BYU's Joseph Smith Building. The papers delivered that day, as well as several others, were subsequently reviewed and edited, at which point it was decided to publish them in two volumes—one (this volume) to contain papers dealing with the history of the restored church, and the other, *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, comprised of articles on the ancient world.

Our desire to publish this particular volume of essays reflects the enormous impact Anderson's work has had on the study of LDS Church history. Trained as both a historian and lawyer, the cautious, probing, analytical approach he brought to the field more than forty years ago revolutionized the way scholars have researched and written about Joseph Smith and the church he restored. Taking nothing for granted, Anderson reexamined the sources we thought we all knew, asked questions we never considered, and mined archives we never knew existed. The result was nothing short of spectacular, as the publications resulting from these efforts have largely rewritten our understanding of many of the seminal experiences of the early church and her founding prophet.

Anderson's legacy in the field of LDS Church history extends beyond his groundbreaking books and articles. A devoted teacher, careful writer, and perfect gentleman, Anderson has interjected a much-needed professionalism and dignity into a field plagued with scathing accusations, rancorous debates, and emotional responses. Eager to collaborate and ever willing to share, he has influenced many who have come under his tutelage toward a career in church history and education, at the same time building bridges of trust and respect with many whose personal beliefs about Joseph Smith and the restoration differ markedly from his own.

This volume of essays is both evidence for, and a tribute to, Anderson's continuing influence in the field. In one way or another—as teacher, mentor, colleague, or friend—each contributor to this volume has been touched by the kindness of his personality and the caliber of his work. The breadth of topics these essays cover and the quality of their research and writing reflects Anderson's own work, thus our desire to share them with him and others.

Appropriately enough, the volume begins with an essay on Joseph Smith. In “Second Only to Christ: Joseph Smith in Modern Mormon Piety,” James B. Allen discusses “the role of Joseph Smith in the religious life of the Mormon community.” Drawing on both personal experience and the records of those who knew Joseph personally, Allen concludes that even with the Prophet's human imperfections glaringly manifest at times, church members continue to find in Joseph Smith and his teachings a life in harmony with the Savior's example to a degree no one else has ever attained. A lifelong member of the church and a renowned historian, Allen discusses the church's view of Joseph with a sensitivity all can appreciate.

In “The Ram and the Lion: Lyman Wight and Brigham Young,” Davis Bitton chronicles and explains the apostle Lyman Wight's disaffection with—and ultimate excommunication from—the church following the martyrdom. Fiercely loyal to Joseph Smith, and missing out—as a result of circumstances beyond his control—on opportunities

to bond with Brigham Young and other members of the Quorum of the Twelve, Wight (Bitton argues) was unable to support Brigham after Joseph's death and find his niche in the postmartyrdom church. Bitton's insights and conclusions are based on several years' study of Wight and constitute a significant addition to the literature on this sad but important chapter in church history.

In "The Tomb of Joseph," Susan Easton Black presents evidence suggesting that she has found the tomb Joseph Smith apparently made to house his and his family's earthly remains. Teaming up with stonemason Robert L. Christensen and documenting her find with pictures by photographer John Telford, Black presents evidence that the walled-in cavern she found while serving as a missionary in Nauvoo in 1995 predates the Nauvoo Temple and could be the tomb mentioned prominently in church annals. While the evidence is far from conclusive, it is clear that the topic of Joseph's tomb and the cavern Black found deserve further study.

Donald Q. Cannon, in his article, "Words of Comfort: Funeral Sermons of the Prophet Joseph Smith," reminds us that "Joseph Smith taught some of the most profound doctrines of the restoration in funeral sermons." Drawing on the eight funeral sermons of Joseph for which a written record has survived, as well as various comments that the Prophet made about others he knew who had died, Cannon delineates the important doctrines Joseph introduced and amplified in these moments of reflection. A longtime student of Joseph's doctrinal teachings, Cannon concludes that these sermons, "taken together, testify of the divine calling of Joseph Smith."

In "Richard Lloyd Anderson and Worldwide Church Growth," Richard O. Cowan reminds us that Anderson not only studied church history, but played a conspicuous role in the history himself. Cowan traces the development, outlines, and impact of Anderson's famous "Anderson Plan" for missionary work, which he developed while serving in the navy during World War II and as a missionary in the Northwestern States Mission following the war. While methods of proselyting have evolved since that time, Cowan notes that the Anderson Plan "laid important foundations on which subsequent missionary programs have been built" and constitutes a watershed event in the history of the church's eminently successful missionary program.

Using sources hitherto unavailable for study, Scott Faulring's article, "The Return of Oliver Cowdery," adds materially to our understanding of the steps leading to Oliver Cowdery's rebaptism in November 1848. Tracing Cowdery's continued contact with various church members after his excommunication in April 1838, Faulring brings to light how eagerly the church's leadership sought Cowdery's repentance and rebaptism. He also demonstrates Cowdery's own yearning to have his reputation cleared and to be numbered again among the Saints. Faulring's article builds on Anderson's own work on Cowdery and constitutes an important addition to our understanding of this significant figure in our history.

In "Eyewitness, Hearsay, and Physical Evidence of the Joseph Smith Papyri," Egyptologist John Gee applies Anderson's rigorous standards of assessment to statements concerning the extent of the Joseph Smith Papyri and Joseph's understanding of the papyri's content. Gee finds that many of the surviving statements about the papyri and Joseph's use of them come from secondhand sources and hearsay rather than from eyewitnesses and cautions against drawing firm conclusions about the papyri from such sources. Gee concludes by arguing that the firsthand accounts, used carefully, suggest a number of important things about the papyri and their translator—for one, that the well-known Kirtland Egyptian Papers have virtually nothing to do with the translation of the Book of Abraham and, for another, that the Book of Abraham came by revelation rather than Joseph employing modern Egyptological methods of translation.

Setting a poem by Dr. Arthur Henry King to music, Gary P. Gillum here presents a new missionary hymn entitled “Every Kindred, Tongue, and People” in honor of Anderson’s influence on missionary work. Feeling both the words and music to be inspired, Gillum finds the hymn a fitting tribute to Anderson’s continuing involvement in missionary work, and “a testimony to all who seek the gifts of the Spirit.”

Kenneth W. Godfrey, like Gee, urges a caution in his article, “David Whitmer and the Shaping of Latter-day Saint History.” Godfrey points out that while historians have been quick to pick apart Joseph’s own writings, they have often accepted David Whitmer’s accounts at face value, even though most were recorded years—even decades, in some instances—after the event, and often deal with events with which Whitmer was not involved. Illustrating his point, Godfrey notes inconsistencies within Whitmer’s own accounts of his introduction to Joseph Smith, the translation of the Book of Mormon, the restoration of the priesthood, and other important events, as well as inconsistencies between his version of events and what others reported.

In “Pleasing the Eye and Gladdening the Heart: Joseph Smith and Life’s Little Pleasures,” Andrew H. Hedges shows how Joseph Smith’s appreciation for the natural world, physical exercise, and the society of his friends was somewhat of an anomaly on the early American religious scene. Comparing Joseph’s lifestyle and teachings with a variety of popular religious pamphlets and readings of the time, Hedges concludes that the “contrast between Joseph Smith and the nineteenth-century ideal of a religious man could not have been greater.”

In an effort to help the reader better appreciate the “obscure and humble beginnings” of the church, Kent P. Jackson highlights a variety of church history sites and artifacts in his photo-essay, “Scenes from Early Latter-day Saint History.” Drawing on his extensive private collection of photographs, Jackson provides images and explanations of locations and relics—some quite famous, others less known—of significant restoration events. Illustrating the mobility of the early church and its missionaries, Jackson’s fifteen photographs cover sites in Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, and England.

In his article, “Antiquities, Curiosities, and Latter-day Saint Museums,” Glen M. Leonard traces the rationale for, and history of, church-sponsored museums. Noting that the collection and exhibition of antiquities for church purposes began with Joseph’s displaying Michael Chandler’s Egyptian mummies in Kirtland, Leonard suggests that the impulse to collect received fresh impetus in connection with the Nauvoo revelation calling for the Saints to bring “all your antiquities” to help build and decorate the Nauvoo temple (D&C 124:26). Viewing museums as an important component in fulfilling the Saints’ mandate to learn “of things both in heaven and in the earth,” the Nauvoo Saints (Leonard argues) articulated the arguments that would inform the church’s sponsorship of museums through the Winter Quarters era, early Utah, and the twentieth century.

Robert J. Matthews’s article, “The Role of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible in the Restoration of Doctrine,” culminates a lifetime of study on the Prophet’s work with the Bible. Deploring LDS scholars’ traditional lack of appreciation for the Joseph Smith Translation in restoration scripture, Matthews reminds us of the Bible’s incompleteness and of the problems facing scholars attempting to recover its original text and meaning. Drawing on his years of work with the original manuscript of the Joseph Smith Translation, Matthews then shows how Joseph first learned about several important, uniquely LDS, points of doctrine while translating the Bible rather than from the Book of Mormon or other sources; he concludes that “the Prophet’s translation of the Bible is a primary source for much of the doctrinal content of the church.”

Noel B. Reynolds revisits a topic that has occupied and divided scholars for years in his article, “The Authorship Debate concerning *Lectures on Faith*: Exhumation and Reburial.” Accepting the impossibility at this point in time of

determining with exactness who authored the *Lectures on Faith*, Reynolds reviews the authorship debate, possible historical reasons behind the *Lectures'* content, and the rhetorical style of the *Lectures* in light of 1830s Protestantism to conclude that Sidney Rigdon rather than Joseph Smith probably played the leading role in their production.

Royal Skousen puts the Book of Mormon's original typesetter to the test in "John Gilbert's 1892 Account of the 1830 Printing of the Book of Mormon." Skousen compares Gilbert's recollection of how he set the type for the Book of Mormon—a recollection he made sixty-three years after the fact—with evidence about the printing contained in surviving records and finds that Gilbert's memory was remarkably accurate for the thirteen specific details he mentioned. In the process of vindicating ninety-year-old Gilbert's memory, Skousen provides the reader with many little-known details about the printing of the Book of Mormon.

In "Historical Perspectives on the Kirtland Revelation Book," John A. Tvedtnes looks for clues about the "textual development of the written revelations of Joseph Smith." Tvedtnes summarizes the contents of the Kirtland Revelation Book (KRB)—a manuscript record of forty-eight revelations from the Kirtland era, forty-four of which are in our current Doctrine and Covenants. Next he argues from the dates of the revelations, the handwriting, and the order in which they were recorded that at least some of the entries are originals rather than copies. Tvedtnes's painstaking analysis yields other suggestions as well about the role the KRB played in the preservation of Joseph's revelations and the production of the Doctrine and Covenants. Tvedtnes's article is a fascinating addendum to Robert J. Woodford's well-known study of the historical development of that important book of scripture.

John W. Welch reminds us in "Oliver Cowdery's 1835 Response to Alexander Campbell's 'Delusions'" that even in the church's infancy, debates about the legitimacy of the restoration centered around the Book of Mormon. Welch briefly reviews Alexander Campbell's well-known 1831 critique of the Book of Mormon and then analyzes Oliver Cowdery's less-known response of four years later, published in the *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* in Kirtland. Welch notes that Cowdery avoided the temptation to respond to Campbell's critique point by point, opting rather for a more sophisticated approach based on affirming and defending three fundamental tenets of the restored gospel. Welch concedes Cowdery the victor in this particular exchange and commends his methods to modern defenders of the Book of Mormon.

As a further tribute to Anderson's influence on missionary work, David J. Whittaker reviews both scholarly and church literature relating to the history of Latter-day Saint missionary efforts in "Mormon Missiology: An Introduction and Guide to the Sources." Whittaker begins this monumental task by providing a general overview of LDS mission history and then discusses sources ranging from general overviews of missionary work to church-sponsored manuals for missionaries to histories of missionary work in specific locales. Given the central role missionary work has played in the history of the restored gospel, Whittaker sees its study as fundamental to understanding the church as a whole and concludes by suggesting several related topics that deserve further study.

We acknowledge the efforts of Stephen D. Ricks and Donald W. Parry in issuing the call for papers that resulted in these articles, and the efforts of M. Gerald Bradford, Richard O. Cowan, and Andrew H. Hedges in organizing the conference where some of these papers were originally presented. We also wish to recognize the efforts of several other people, without whose involvement this volume would never have been completed: Shirley S. Ricks, who managed the editing process from beginning to end; Jessica Taylor, who lent her typesetting and editing skills to the completion of this volume; Alison V. P. Coutts, who shared her multitude of organizational and editorial talents in bringing this project to fruition; Reed D. Andrew, Daniel L. Belnap, Rebecca M. Flinders, Marc-Charles

Ingerson, and Robyn Patterson, who spent many hours source checking; Josi J. Brewer, Rebecca S. Call, Wendy H. Christian, Whitney Fox, Melissa E. Garcia, Paula W. Hicken, and K. Laura Sommer for their proofreading in various stages; and Sherrie M. Johnson for creating the indexes. We thank these many individuals who have aided in the process of honoring Richard Lloyd Anderson.

—*Andrew H. Hedges*

# Second Only to Christ: Joseph Smith in Modern Mormon Piety

James B. Allen

Something gave me pause as I tried to figure out how to approach the subject of Joseph Smith in modern Mormon piety. How could I stand back, as scholars are supposed to do, and take a detached look at the matter when my whole life had been so much a part of this tradition? How could I be objective about it? The answer, of course, was simply that I could not. I am, after all, one of those lifelong Mormons whose whole value system has been influenced by a half century of intensive exposure to the very influences I will talk about. My objectivity includes personal experience, and this personal experience has helped determine my selection of examples. When I suggest that some idea or story is deeply imbedded in the Mormon tradition, it is not only because I have run across it in the mass of sermons, books, and articles I have read, but also because I have heard it, or something like it, time and time again, and because I personally believe in the divine mission of Joseph Smith. My own life, then, becomes one of my primary sources as I attempt to evaluate the role of Joseph Smith in the religious life of the Mormon community.

At the same time, let me not mislead you about the implications of some of the stories I will relate. Just because I believe in Joseph Smith does not mean I accept every interpretation or believe every story about him that comes across the Mormon pulpit or through the Mormon press. An essential and very rewarding part of my career has been the need to stand back frequently and reevaluate the historical Joseph Smith in light of whatever information I may discover or documents I may have a chance to examine. Various elements of my understanding change frequently, and I suspect that every Mormon who studies his own history has a similar experience from time to time. But my concern here is not with the validity of Joseph Smith's teachings, the authenticity of his divine manifestations, or the truth or falsity of any story about him. It is, rather, with the image of Joseph Smith in the Mormon mind and the role that image plays in Mormon patterns of worship and devotion. For the purposes of this discussion I am primarily concerned with what Mormons believe about Joseph Smith. After all, it is what people believe to be true that motivates them, and it is Joseph Smith's role in the Mormon belief system that we are dealing with here.

Around 1952 I had a fairly commonplace experience that, for some strange reason, has stayed with me—maybe because it helped me crystallize for myself the place of Joseph Smith in my own piety. I was a university student, spending the summer working as a transportation agent in the lodge at the north rim of the Grand Canyon. Just across the lobby from my desk was the registration desk, and one of the clerks there was a divinity student. One day I saw him talking to two young Mormon girls who were also employed at the lodge for the summer, and they seemed somewhat agitated. I tuned in as well as I could from across the near-empty hall and heard him telling the girls that Mormons were not Christians—they did not believe in Christ and did not know what it meant to accept him as their personal Savior. The Mormons, he said, had replaced Christ with Joseph Smith, for it was from Joseph, not Christ, that they got their doctrines, and it was through Joseph Smith, not Christ, that they expected to be saved. This was a reference to the Mormon belief that the priesthood (i.e., the authority to act in the name of God) can exist only in one church, that because of apostasy and transgression since New Testament times it was lost from the earth, and that now, in the latter days, it has been restored through Joseph Smith and exists only in the church founded by him. In an instant my experience as a missionary for two years flashed through my mind, and suddenly I wanted to shout across the hall, "Hey, you, you're wrong! We don't worship Joseph Smith—we worship Christ. The Book of Mormon testifies of Christ, Joseph Smith taught of Christ, the whole church is a living witness of the reality of Christ, even though we understand him a little differently than you do." I literally boiled inside at

the suggestion that we had replaced Christ with Joseph Smith. I restrained myself, however, from shouting across the hall, and when the girls came to ask me about it all, I explained as best I could. “Joseph Smith,” I said, “certainly will never take the place of Christ. Nor is it possible that we will ever worship him—but in terms of what he has done for us, he is certainly second to Christ.”

I might have said “second only to Christ,” for there, in a nutshell, was an expression of the role of Joseph Smith in the religious life of the Mormons. He was the founding prophet—and more. Through him came the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price—books that Mormons consider scripture, reading and quoting from them as much as they would the Bible. Through him came the distinctive doctrines and practices that set Mormons apart from other denominations, including the sacred temple ordinances that provide a special relationship explicable only to Mormons who have experienced them. Joseph, we Mormons believe, talked with God and angels in order to prepare himself for the task of restoring not only the ancient truths that had been lost but also the ancient church itself, with its exclusive priesthood authority. He was the prophet of the restoration, foretold as such by ancient prophets, and those who accept all this can hardly help but view him as second only to Christ in terms of his role in their personal salvation.

All this is fundamental to the faith, at least so far as I understand and believe. At the same time, other images have built up in the Mormon mind that have become part of what might be called a popular piety. None of these tangential interpretations are official, but for many Latter-day Saints they are part of their personal belief system. Joseph Smith has been endowed with heroic traits and accomplishments far beyond what he himself would have asked for, to the point that it becomes difficult even for the faithful to separate the historic Joseph from his heroic image. For my own part, I am not greatly alarmed at this, for, as someone has said, “It is the quality of great men that they continue to live long after they are gone,”<sup>1</sup> and it is simply natural that their virtues rather than their vices live on with them. My only concern, as a church member and teacher, is that the faith of my students is not so dependent on the sometimes exaggerated, mythical qualities portrayed in some popular images of the Prophet that their faith is hurt when they suddenly discover some human characteristic or failing that seems incongruous with what they have been led to believe. I am not so vain as to think I know the historical Joseph any better than anyone else, but I am fully convinced that the reality was impressive enough that he can admirably survive any human frailties revealed in an honest attempt to present a balanced image.<sup>2</sup>

How did this popular piety emerge in Mormonism? During his lifetime Joseph Smith’s closest associates certainly saw him as a fallible, though great, human being. They believed his prophetic utterances, but they also saw him as a man who had failings, who could make mistakes, and who did not feel it necessary to play the traditional role of “prophet” one hundred percent of the time. He readily confessed his own human frailties, was sometimes chastised by revelation for his personal follies, and when people commented on some of his unprophet-like actions he emphatically declared that “a prophet was a prophet only when he was acting as such.”<sup>3</sup> His closest friends saw some of his prophecies and revelations fail to be fulfilled and even heard him admit that “Some revelations are of God: some revelations are of man: and some revelations are of the devil.”<sup>4</sup> They saw him in every mood—from joyful elation over some great success to the despondency of great discouragement. Brigham Young, one of his closest associates, reported fifteen years after Joseph’s death: “He had all the weaknesses a man could have when the vision was not upon him, when he was left to himself. He was constituted like other men, and would have required years and years longer in the flesh to become a Moses in all things.”<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, his disciples saw him as a living prophet—and it was in his role as prophet that Joseph Smith’s pedestal in Mormon piety was created. Significantly, it was those who knew him best who created both the



pedestal and the heroic figure that occupied it after he was dead, though even during his lifetime the creation process was well on its way. In 1836, at the height of Joseph Smith's economic difficulties in Kirtland, Ohio, church members lost confidence in him by the droves and some even threatened his life. Brigham Young was among those who braved the storm to declare their continuing belief that, come what may, Joseph was still a true prophet.<sup>6</sup> In July 1843, preaching at a Sunday meeting in Pittsburgh on the importance of the "gathering," Brigham declared: "Who is the author of this work of gathering? Joseph Smith, the Prophet, as an instrument in the hands of God, is the author of it. He is the greatest man on earth." In December, while presiding over a prayer meeting in the absence of Joseph Smith, Brigham "instructed the brethren upon the necessity of following our file leader, and our Savior, in all his laws and commandments, without asking questions."<sup>7</sup> This was the sentiment that soon characterized the role of Joseph Smith in Mormon piety.

If leaders such as Brigham Young were thus laying the foundation for Joseph's historic pedestal during his own lifetime, so were more ordinary disciples, such as William Clayton—one of the Prophet's faithful scribes who never made much of an impact on the pages of history. But his steady faith represented that of thousands of historical unknowns who were the brick and mortar with which the Prophet built the earthly kingdom of God. Clayton first arrived in Nauvoo late in 1840, when it was still struggling to be born, and was immediately overwhelmed by its founding father. His awe quickly turned to personal idolization, and he soon reported his impressions to his friends back home in England. "He is *not* an idiot," he wrote as if to combat some vicious tale, "but a man of sound judgment, and possessed of abundance of intelligence and whilst you listen to his conversation you receive intelligence which expands your mind and causes your heart to rejoice." He then described all the Prophet's greatest qualities and poignantly added, "He says 'I am a man of like passions with yourselves,' but truly I wish I was such a man."<sup>8</sup>

Within a year, however, Clayton saw many of his fondest expectations shattered. Church leaders asked him not to stay in Nauvoo but, rather, to settle across the Mississippi River in Iowa where, Joseph Smith had prophesied, the city of Zarahemla would rise with as much greatness as Nauvoo. But in Zarahemla Clayton found nothing but disappointment. His efforts to be a farmer failed; his investment in a steamboat with the Prophet's apostle-brother failed; he found too many unsaintly Saints; and, worst of all, Joseph's prediction concerning Zarahemla failed: not only did the settlement fail to rival Nauvoo, but in the end it was totally abandoned by the church. But William came back across the river, went to work for the Prophet as a scribe, and in less than four months could write to his friends in England: "My faith in this doctrine, and in the prophet and officers is firm, unshaken, and unmoved; nay, rather, it is strengthened and settled firmer than ever." He went to great lengths to refute charges then circulating of wrongdoing and intemperance on the part of Joseph, then added: "The more I am with him, the more I love him; the more I know of him, . . . [the more I] am sorry that people should give heed to evil reports concerning him, when we all know the great service he has rendered the church."<sup>9</sup>

Clayton had ample opportunity over the next two years to observe the Prophet as a man. Most of Joseph's time was spent in activities not normally considered prophetic, such as business and civic affairs. Clayton was by his side most of the time. He saw him struggle with personal and family problems, place trust in untrustworthy men, fail in some business efforts, and do many more things that are the lot of ordinary human beings. But none of this mattered, for he also felt the love of the Prophet, sat at his feet as he received revelation and taught the doctrines of the kingdom, felt a profound inner confirmation that Joseph's doctrines were true, and witnessed firsthand his numerous accomplishments and successes. In addition, a kind of spiritual pragmatism in the Mormonism of that day helps explain how pedestals are built in spite of potentially undermining influences. The Saints looked at prophecy, for example, not just as prediction but also as their own personal challenge. They were obligated to

make it work, and if they failed in that effort it was not necessarily a sign that the Prophet was not a true prophet. “Verily, verily, I say unto you,” the Lord had told them through Joseph Smith in January 1841,

that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might and with all they have to perform that work, and cease not in their diligence, and their enemies come upon them and hinder them from performing that work, behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings. (D&C 124:49)

Thus the Saints could rationalize some prophetic failures. They could also rationalize human frailties in their prophet, since he himself had told them of his weaknesses and had said that a prophet did not always act as such. But the failures and frailties tended to be forgotten when, in the long run, the personal influence the disciples had felt in their lives became paramount. For disciples like Clayton, the Prophet was always an example, never a scapegoat.

The hero of Mormon piety was already being created, but it was his death that elevated him to his final pedestal. In some ways what happened to Joseph Smith after death is reminiscent of what Merrill D. Peterson has characterized as the apotheosis of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. It seemed a miracle to Americans that they both died on 4 July 1826, as the nation was celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Already they were statesmen-heroes, but the fact that both lived until this important memorial day made their dramatic deaths “a fable of the republic.” Says Peterson, it

brought men into a community of loyalty and belief, and turned the nation’s loss into a triumph. It was the creation of a pervasive national faith reaching for justification and here finding it. Providence, Union, Heritage: these were three of the emotion-laden ideas composing the patriotic faith. In the “double apotheosis” of 1826 they were confirmed with awesome finality, and formed into a fabled story of America.<sup>10</sup>

President John Quincy Adams, son of the dead statesman, issued an official proclamation declaring this wonderful event to be heaven-directed. It provided a “new seal” to the belief that the nation was under the special care of Providence. “In this most singular coincidence,” the president declared, “the finger of Providence is plainly visible! It hallows the Declaration of Independence as Word of God, and is the bow in the heavens, that promises its principles shall be eternal, and their dissemination universal over the Earth.”<sup>11</sup>

Joseph Smith did not die peacefully of old age, as did Jefferson and Adams. Rather, he and his brother Hyrum were brutally murdered in Carthage, Illinois, in the prime of their lives. But if the deaths of Jefferson and Adams became a miracle in the patriotic faith of America, the massacre of Joseph and Hyrum was a sacred moment to the Mormons and became the “fabled story” of their faith. In the tragedy at Carthage, the Smith brothers sealed their testimonies in blood and achieved the eternal crown of martyrdom.<sup>12</sup> For Joseph, this crown would forever assure his place on the second highest pedestal in Mormon piety.

The creation of the imagery began almost immediately as the martyrdom spawned a flurry of hymns, poems, songs, and essays, all celebrating the mission and greatness of Joseph Smith. In due time came hymns such as “Oh, Give Me Back My Prophet Dear,” and “The Seer, Joseph, the Seer,” by John Taylor; “Praise to the Man Who Communed with Jehovah,” by William W. Phelps; “We Thank Thee, O God, for a Prophet,” by William Fowler; and several others that have since become permanent fixtures in Mormon worship.<sup>13</sup>

Significantly, much of the new literature celebrated and culturally enshrined the martyrdom itself. It reminded the Saints that Joseph was not just a prophet, but God's greatest prophet—an idea that Joseph himself did not stress, but one that naturally flowed from the impact he had on his disciples. The literature also told of the blood that still stained Illinois, crying to God for vengeance. The idea of vengeance is no longer characteristic of Mormon piety, but in the aftermath of the shocking murder at Carthage the cry seemed only natural to Joseph's stunned disciples.

Typical of the immediate reaction was Eliza R. Snow's poem, "The Assassination of Generals Joseph and Hyrum Smith," which fairly reeked with the emotion of a devout believer who was not only shocked by the murder but also expected God somehow to repay the perpetrators:

Ye heav'ns, attend! Let all the earth give ear! Let Gods and seraphs, men and angels hear: The worlds on high—the universe shall know What awful scenes are acted here below! Had nature's self a heart, her heart would bleed; At the recital of so foul a deed; For never, since the Son of God was slain, Has blood so noble, flow'd from human vein, As that which now on God for vengeance calls From "freedom's" ground—from Carthage prison walls! Oh! Illinois! thy soil has drank the blood Of Prophets martyr'd for the truth of God. Once-lov'd America! what can atone For the pure blood of innocence, thou'st sown?<sup>14</sup>

All the elements for the creation of a cultural hero were there: noble blood, second only to that of the "Son of God"; a wicked earth that rejected and spilled it; and the assurance that heaven would take note of the awful tragedy. The martyr image sank deep into Mormon culture and in the end was officially adopted by the canonizing of a statement that is still one of the most oft-quoted passages from modern Mormon scripture. Written by John Taylor, the apostle and close friend of Joseph Smith who himself received near-fatal wounds during the attack on Carthage Jail, it portrays as well as any statement could the awesome mission and achievements of the Mormon Prophet:

Joseph Smith, the Prophet and Seer of the Lord, has done more, save Jesus only, for the salvation of men in this world, than any other man that ever lived in it. In the short space of twenty years, he has brought forth the Book of Mormon, which he translated by the gift and power of God, and has been the means of publishing it on two continents; has sent the fulness of the everlasting gospel, which it contained, to the four quarters of the earth; has brought forth the revelations and commandments which compose this book of Doctrine and Covenants, and many other wise documents and instructions for the benefit of the children of men; gathered many thousands of the Latter-day Saints, founded a great city, and left a fame and name that cannot be slain. He lived great, and he died great in the eyes of God and his people; and like most of the Lord's anointed in ancient times, has sealed his mission and his works with his own blood; and so has his brother Hyrum. (D&C 135:3)<sup>15</sup>

Joseph Smith's lasting charisma was tellingly illustrated in a letter written by Ursulia B. Hascall, while she camped on the plains of Iowa after the tragic Mormon exodus from Nauvoo in 1846. "If I had been in Nauvoo when I received your letter," she told her sister, "I would have sent some of Joseph's hair. All that have any here is in their bosom pins finger rings &c."<sup>16</sup> We may wonder how much hair was cut from the head of the dead prophet in 1844, but it is significant that in their awe of him many Saints clamored for even a tiny lock to keep in their private possession.

Mormonism now had its martyr and hero, but that was not the end of the story. Like that of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and other historical figures, Joseph's popular image would soon be molded

and shaped to suit a variety of needs and fit a multitude of interests. Taken as a whole, the literature of Mormon piety took the image of the founding prophet in several directions—some that he may have anticipated but others that he probably did not.

Consider, for example, the story of Joseph Smith's first vision. The Prophet bore solemn testimony that sometime in the early spring of 1820 he became confused in his quest for religion and so retired to a grove to pray for guidance. After an intense struggle with the powers of darkness, his faith was rewarded with the appearance of two personages "whose brightness and glory," he said, "defy all description, standing above me in the air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name and said, pointing to the other—This is My Beloved Son. Hear Him!" The message he received was that none of the sects was right, but he was promised that "the fullness of the Gospel should at some future time be made known unto me."<sup>17</sup> For several years after the organization of the church Joseph did not relate this sacred experience widely, until 1838 when he prepared it for publication. By the time he died it was well-known in the church. No evidence exists that Joseph himself used the account of the vision for any purpose other than to establish his initial prophetic calling. In later years, however, church members began to use it for a variety of devotional and instructional purposes. As with Joseph Smith himself, the vision became immortalized in art and literature. In addition, its impact grew to the point that it was used to illustrate for the faithful literally dozens of official doctrines or religious concepts.<sup>18</sup>

Just as the meaning of the vision went through a historical metamorphosis, so did the popular image of Joseph Smith himself. In a way it was all symbolized by the official celebration at Sharon, Vermont, on 23 December 1905—the one hundredth anniversary of the Prophet's birth.<sup>19</sup> There at his birthplace church leaders, members, and townspeople assembled to see the unveiling of a 38 1/2-foot granite shaft erected to his memory, each foot representing a year of Joseph's life. After several appropriate speeches and a dedicatory prayer by Joseph F. Smith (nephew of the Prophet, and then president of the church), the congregation fervently sang the song that, more than any other, symbolized what the Saints thought of the Prophet:

Praise to the man who communed with Jehovah! Jesus anointed that Prophet and Seer. Blessed to open the last dispensation, Kings shall extol him, and nations revere.

Chorus: Hail to the Prophet, ascended to heaven! Traitors and tyrants now fight him in vain.  
Mingling with Gods, he can plan for his brethren; Death cannot conquer the hero again.

Praise to his mem'ry, he died as a martyr; Honored and blest be his ever great name! Long shall his blood, which was shed by assassins, stain Illinois<sup>20</sup> while the earth lauds his fame.

(Chorus)

Great is his glory and endless his priesthood. Ever and ever the keys he will hold. Faithful and true, he will enter his kingdom, Crowned in the midst of the prophets of old.

(Chorus)

Sacrifice brings forth the blessings of heaven; Earth must atone for the blood of that man. Wake up the world for the conflict of justice. Millions shall know "Brother Joseph" again.<sup>21</sup>

The Joseph on the pedestal has many manifestations, for his modern disciples see him in many patterns and circumstances. A favorite image, based on Joseph's personal experiences, is the uneducated, untrained boy-farmer-turned-prophet. *From Plowboy to Prophet* is the title of a popular book for young people printed in 1912,<sup>22</sup> but the sentiment repeats itself regularly in Mormon expressions of faith. "The story of Joseph's life is the story of a miracle," declared then Elder Gordon B. Hinckley in a 1977 general conference address. "He was born in poverty . . . reared in adversity . . . driven from place to place . . . and . . . murdered at the age of thirty-eight. Yet in the brief space of twenty years preceding his death he accomplished what none other has accomplished in an entire lifetime."<sup>23</sup>

The most poignant and well-known statement employing such imagery came from John Henry Evans, in an introduction to a biography first published in 1933:

Here is a man who was born in the stark hills of Vermont; who was reared in the backwoods of New York; who never looked inside a college or high school; who lived in six States, no one of which would own him during his lifetime; who spent months in the vile prisons of the period; who, even when he had his freedom, was hounded like a fugitive; who was covered once with a coat of tar and feathers, and left for dead; who, with his following, was driven by irate neighbors from New York to Ohio, from Ohio to Missouri, and from Missouri to Illinois; and who, at the unripe age of thirty-eight, was shot to death by a mob with painted faces. Yet this man became mayor of the biggest town in Illinois and the state's most prominent citizen, the commander of the largest body of trained soldiers in the nation outside the Federal army, the founder of cities and of a university, and aspired to become President of the United States.<sup>24</sup>

The statement continues with several very broad assessments, some of which may be exaggerated, yet as part of a symbol they represent an important element of popular Mormon piety. It is still quoted often in Mormon circles.

Some Mormons delight in telling stories of great men who stand in awe of Joseph Smith. Leo Tolstoy is credited with telling an American diplomat that Joseph Smith was the founder of the American religion.<sup>25</sup> John Henry Evans tells of a famous surgeon from Vienna (who is not named) who declared that America had produced only one great man—Joseph Smith, and that he was great because of his ideas.<sup>26</sup> And hardly a Mormon has not heard the oft-quoted statement from Josiah Quincy, mayor of Boston, who visited Joseph Smith in 1844:

It is by no means improbable that some future text-book, for the use of generations yet unborn, will contain a question something like this: What historical American of the nineteenth century has exerted the most powerful influence on the destinies of his countrymen? And it is by no means impossible that the answer to that interrogatory may be thus written: Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet.<sup>27</sup>

If great men were impressed by Joseph, they were also baffled by him. Though the less complimentary portions of Josiah Quincy's commentary are forgotten, Mormons do not forget his final statement: "I have endeavored to give the details of my visit to the Mormon prophet with absolute accuracy. If the reader does not know just what to make of Joseph Smith, I cannot help him out of the difficulty. I myself stand helpless before the puzzle." John Henry Evans said that "[Joseph Smith] wrote a book which has baffled the literary critics for a hundred years," and it is still not uncommon to hear how he startled the world with one idea or another.<sup>28</sup>

It would be an exaggeration to say that in Mormon piety Joseph Smith becomes the greatest of almost everything. But the variety of things the founding prophet is said to have excelled in is amazing. In the introduction to a

popular book entitled *The Journal of Joseph*, the compiler leaves the impression that everything in the book comes directly from Joseph's personal diary, which he kept or dictated religiously.<sup>29</sup> The problem with this is that virtually none of Joseph Smith's history, from which the book was copied, was either written or dictated by Joseph—it was compiled by his scribes from a variety of journals and other sources. But such misdirection hardly matters in the minds of some—Joseph was great at so much, why not at this task, too? It all fits together so well.

Another popular book is filled with nothing but stories designed to prove that Joseph Smith had “uncommon courage,” was a great missionary, had the ability to speak with “remarkable power,” was “truly a great soul. . . almost no heavenly principle was too large or complex to be comprehended by his mind,” and was a man of “astonishing humility.”<sup>30</sup> My own acquaintance with Joseph Smith convinces me that he really did have these qualities, but such unrestrained and unqualified emphasis on them hardly leaves room for the other human being who was also there. This author seemed to leave the door just slightly ajar, however, when he compared Joseph with Jesus Christ. “Joseph Smith was a man,” he said, “—a distant second, but second, which places him in a remarkable position.”<sup>31</sup> Elsewhere we are told that Joseph Smith possessed all the qualities of a great leader—intelligence, zeal for learning, faith in a living God, power of introspection, and love of people. Another author defined his leadership qualities as great knowledge, courage, energy, and high character.<sup>32</sup> Whatever the real characteristics of a leader are, Joseph had them—almost any Mormon from Joseph's day to the present will tell you so. Every young Mormon also knows that Joseph was a fine athlete and was frequently seen wrestling with the strongest men in Nauvoo, “stick-pulling,” and engaging in other sports.

One book of selected readings, compiled in 1946 by a prominent political scientist, is entitled *Joseph Smith Prophet- Statesman* and is designed to demonstrate Joseph Smith's great insight into the political issues and political philosophy of his day.<sup>33</sup> Another work, by a well-known Mormon scientist who also became an apostle, is entitled *Joseph Smith as Scientist*.<sup>34</sup> This author recognizes that Joseph had no scientific training at all, but this very fact fits the plowboy-to-prophet pattern beautifully. He taught principles, explains the author, that were consistent with the best scientific philosophy of his day as well as ours, and this is merely another evidence of his divine calling. In 1955 another prominent Mormon gave an address to the Brigham Young University student body entitled “Joseph Smith, Ph.D.” He admitted that the title was “sheer irony,” but he proceeded to show that Joseph Smith's great intellect, knowledge, and accomplishments made him equal or superior to any man.<sup>35</sup> More recently, a 1993 anthology of Joseph Smith, published by the Religious Studies Center at Brigham Young University, carried numerous laudatory articles, many of which pictured Joseph Smith as excelling in one thing or another.<sup>36</sup>

Much of modern Mormon piety sees Joseph Smith as in almost constant communication with God and angels. He received revelation on almost everything, including city planning,<sup>37</sup> temple building, politics, and social and economic organization. He knew Gods and angels personally, and some writers have taken pains to compile impressive lists of all the heavenly beings he met and conversed with over the years.<sup>38</sup> Joseph Smith himself may have been amused at the number of things on which he is said to have received divine guidance. During his lifetime he tried valiantly to persuade his followers that at least some of his ideas were his own. “The Lord has not given me a revelation concerning politics,” he declared during the heat of the 1843 election. “I have not asked him for one.”<sup>39</sup> But at least one aspect of modern piety forms the basis for a Mormon fundamental that Joseph would fully agree with. As Daryl Chase once explained, “Nothing has ever given the Church of Christ—ancient or modern, more hope and zeal than the assurance that in their midst were men who could say in truth, ‘Thus saith the Lord.’”<sup>40</sup> Joseph himself knew he was not “always a prophet” and that often he spoke without the benefit of revelation, but

he also made it clear when he was speaking by revelation, and in those cases his “Thus saith the Lord” became binding on the church. As he stands on his pedestal, however, some modern Mormons (including those of us who are historians) hesitate to take it upon ourselves to distinguish when he was or was not speaking for the Lord. It seems so natural to assume that this was the norm.

In an article entitled “Which Thomas Jefferson Do You Quote?” Clinton Rossiter once showed that this great American hero had been quoted on almost every side of almost every issue, and was still being quoted by liberals and conservatives alike to support their particular views of the world. This happens to cultural heroes—they are adopted by any and everyone to support almost any cause. Within Mormonism something similar has happened to Joseph Smith. The phenomenon is not as extreme as in the case of Jefferson, but it exists nonetheless. Liberals, conservatives, and people promoting a variety of social and political causes have found support in the writings of Joseph Smith.<sup>41</sup>

In 1919, for example, Utah was bitterly divided during the League of Nations debate. It became a religious issue, and in the public discussions even church leaders quoted the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants on both sides of the question. The president of the church himself, though he supported the League of Nations, finally had to declare publicly that Mormon scriptures could not be used in that argument.<sup>42</sup>

A year later, early twentieth-century feminists no doubt felt a tremendous boost when Susa Young Gates wrote an article in the official church magazine arguing that Joseph Smith’s first vision had paved the way for women to take their rightful place alongside, not behind, men. “Can you conceive,” she asked, “what the vision meant to woman? It meant in civil, religious, social and finally, financial matters, the right of choice; it meant women’s free agency, the liberation of her long-chained will and purpose.”<sup>43</sup> Gates did not explain just how all this was achieved, but suddenly the founding prophet’s great theophany was an argument for everything Gates and her colleagues had been working toward for years.

However, quoting Joseph Smith is more fundamental to piety than simply getting his support on miscellaneous public issues. What is more significant is the fact that in a strictly religious setting, such as a general conference of the church, Joseph Smith is quoted with great regularity on religious, moral, and ethical issues. If he is second only to Christ in Mormon piety, the frequency with which he is quoted in conference amply demonstrates the point. Church leaders who addressed the April 1997 General Conference, for example, used or cited about 270 passages from either the scriptures or the religious writings of Joseph Smith. Less than one-third (80) came from the Bible, while the rest (190) came from modern Mormon scriptures or other writings of Joseph Smith.<sup>44</sup> That says something important about the continuing role of Joseph Smith in Mormon religious worship.

Some Mormons delight in amassing external evidence that the prophetic claims of Joseph were true. Much is written about the fulfillment of his prophecies, even though in some cases the authors must strain considerably in order to make the historical facts fit the prophecy.<sup>45</sup> Other writers attempt to prove his calling on the basis of such phenomena as the greatness of his ideas, the wholeness of his religious philosophy, or scientific evidence for the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. One writer devoted almost an entire book to a discussion of the fate of the persecutors of Joseph Smith, demonstrating that they died horribly, ignobly, or in poverty. Somehow this was supposed to prove that God had taken vengeance, and therefore that Joseph was his prophet.<sup>46</sup> More recent Mormon writers, however, tend to downplay the idea of vengeance, and the leading book on the trial of the accused assassins of the Prophet demonstrates that most of those who were directly accused of the killing went on to live comfortable, productive lives.<sup>47</sup> The authors of this book were not trying to demonstrate anything with

regard to Joseph, but as individuals they could be classed with other Mormons who are not too highly concerned with external “proofs.” In private conversation, such Latter-day Saints often ask nonbelievers to pray, with the assurance that the truth of Joseph Smith’s divine calling can be made known, by the power of the Spirit, to anyone who asks in sincerity. The Joseph Smith piety is, in part, a missionary piety, and it is often infectious.<sup>48</sup>

I hope, with all this, I am not presenting a distorted view of what the Mormons think of Joseph Smith. His image is that of a prophet, but it is not that of a dreary, overly pious, or humorless leader. Joseph pictured himself as having a jovial temperament, and his good humor, even temper, and love of wholesome entertainment are all well documented in Mormon literature and in the Mormon mind. As Leonard Arrington wrote in the church’s magazine for youth:

Because of this spontaneity, joviality, and combination of seriousness of purpose and good humor, everybody was quickly attracted to Joseph Smith. . . . Certainly the calling of prophet was one of such high seriousness that its responsibilities could well have weighted down a less vital mind. But it was humor that helped Joseph to dispose of conflicts and problems that did not really matter. The Prophet was deeply serious, but he was not solemn; he believed an unduly solemn person has lost something of the image of his Creator.<sup>49</sup>

Nor do the Mormons completely ignore the fact that Joseph, like the rest of us, had his human failings. Often, however, the faithful tend to obscure this fact behind the overwhelming dominance of the heroic image, and many young people are not prepared for the man behind the image—outstanding as he was—when he suddenly steps out to meet them. This leads to another significant element of Mormon piety—the hours spent by teachers like me trying to help inquiring students develop both a balanced and a faithful view of the Prophet and the church he restored.

As Merrill Peterson characterized the image of Thomas Jefferson in the American mind, he discussed three agents for perpetuating that image: the shrine, the academy, and the temple. The shrine was Monticello—Jefferson’s home that told so much about him and his ideals. The academy was the University of Virginia, which represented the “civilized man,” while the temple was the magnificent Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C. “Monuments of this majestic pomp are not built to the living, only to the dead,” he wrote, “and thus the Jefferson Memorial was the most important thing to happen to Jefferson since July Fourth 1826.”<sup>50</sup>

The image of Joseph Smith is not exactly comparable, but the symbolism of the shrine, the academy, and the temple is useful in depicting some aspects of popular Mormon piety. The shrine could well be the city of Nauvoo. Each visitor will see something different there, but for the Mormon, Nauvoo represents the great spiritual as well as external achievements of Joseph Smith. Many of its buildings have been restored by Nauvoo Restoration, an organization closely affiliated with the church, and others have been restored by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Each year tens of thousands of visitors (mostly Mormons, I assume), see Joseph’s homes, his brick store, the site of the temple, and various homes that were complete before the Mormon exodus. The restoration is not the genuine historic Nauvoo, for only certain buildings have been restored, but the effort is to portray what Joseph built. For Mormons, the visit is a religious pilgrimage.

Joseph Smith has no academy like that of Jefferson, but in a symbolic sense the living church is his academy. All who speak of his accomplishments usually speak of the grandeur of the church itself, and so its ideas, influences, and achievements become one of his monuments just as much as Jefferson’s university is one of his.



The Mormons also have temples, many of them, that serve sacred functions quite different from regular meetinghouses. But in the symbolic sense we are considering here, Joseph Smith's temple is found in a kind of union between the Sacred Grove in New York and the jails in Liberty, Missouri, and Carthage, Illinois. It is commonplace among Mormons to make pilgrimages to these spots, which they regard as sacred. As they stand in the grove in New York, they try to relive the sacred experience of 1820 and are frequently seen weeping—especially after they may have joined with friends in a private religious service somewhere in the grove. When they go to Liberty, Missouri, they find a replica of the jail where the Prophet languished for many months, but where some of his most touching and spiritually important revelations were received. The guides, in fact, depict it as a temple, and it is housed in a domed building that only adds to the shrinelike aura. Around the walls of the room housing the jail, like the walls of the Jefferson Memorial, are quotations from the deeply moving revelations Joseph received in Liberty's dungeon. And finally, as the visitor goes to Carthage, he experiences all the pathos and sorrow that attended the death of the Prophet. Many Mormon visitors (myself included) are moved to tears if they have studied very deeply the sad scenes of that fateful day in 1844. The blood of Hyrum Smith that once stained the floor of the room has practically faded away; the guides are not even sure they can identify where it was. Perhaps that is symbolic of the fact that the old desire for vengeance has also disappeared, but what remains among the Mormons is an overwhelming love for the Prophet that is only enhanced by the imagery of what happened that day.

Joseph Smith, then, is the hero of Mormon piety. I have tried to give some insight into how his heroic image was attained—how followers have placed him on a pedestal that he will always occupy with all the grace and dignity of a great man. But, as scholars, we are never sure we know all the reasons why great men occupy such pedestals. Sidney Hook has suggested three. First, he says, is the “need for psychological security.” If great men think of themselves as the fathers of countries or movements, their followers develop patterns of dependency and look at the great men as their father figures. A second factor is the tendency of people to seek vicarious satisfaction of their own yearnings through a leader's presumed traits or achievements. If they cannot do all the things they want to do, or be all the things they want to be, they can at least share these dreams imaginatively through their hero. Finally, Hook suggests that some people flee from responsibility, grasping for simple answers to complicated problems by surrendering the decision-making process to their leaders.<sup>51</sup>

I am sure that by diligent investigation we could find elements of all these factors among the followers of Joseph Smith. But other, more fundamental, forces also affect Mormon piety—especially the piety of some Mormon academicians. It is our lot in life to get personally involved in whatever documents remain from the days of Joseph Smith, to analyze in detail what they say—not just about Joseph the Prophet but also about Joseph the man. As we do so, he seems to step down from his pedestal for a while and to walk and talk with us somewhat as he did with the Saints of his own day. We see him in all his strengths and human frailties. Perhaps as much as anything else, his human qualities leap out at us like a jack-in-the-box when the lid that hides him is suddenly removed. We see his business failures, his sometimes poor choice of friends and confidants, the failure of some of his prophecies, the social and nonrevelatory sources of some of his ideas, the impracticality of some of his proposals, the incompleteness of his education, the anger he could sometimes display, the too sudden precipitousness of some of his actions, the glass-looking and other strange affairs of his youth, and his disappointments with himself. But that is not all. We also see his success as both religious leader and community builder, the responsible and respectable people who became his permanent friends and confidants, the plans and prophecies that were fulfilled, the all-encompassing nature of his mind that allowed him to deal with a multitude of far-reaching concepts and ideas, the uniqueness of many of his doctrines and the profound meaning they have always had for Latter-day Saints, his deep love for his fellowmen, his thirst for knowledge, his friendly nature and his readiness to forgive quickly, his

personal recognition of his youthful follies and the effective way he overcame them, and his ability to bounce back promptly from disappointment or despair.

Finally, as we become better acquainted with both his “strictly human” and his prophetic sides, we also feel something else—possibly because of our continuing will to believe, perhaps because of our personal experiences with the results of belief. We see him as an authentic prophet, and even though he has stepped down from the pedestal to let us examine all his flaws, we are not dismayed when he steps back up.<sup>52</sup> Our experience with the Prophet, in all his strengths and weaknesses, still allows us to say, along with William Clayton, “The more I am with him, the more I love him; the more I know of him, . . . [the more I] am sorry that people should give heed to evil reports concerning him.” “He says ‘I am a man of like passions with yourselves,’ but truly I wish I was such a man.”

## Notes

Author’s note: This essay is clearly a personal statement, though it is hoped that the reader will also recognize its scholarly underpinnings. The first-person approach is a result of the setting in which it was initially presented, a symposium on “Joseph Smith and the Mormons,” sponsored by the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Indiana, Bloomington, 4–5 December 1981. People attending the symposium included several Mormon historians, non-Mormon historians from religious studies departments at various universities, and a cross-section of Mormons from Indiana. This was one of a series of such symposia designed to help scholars of American religion better understand specific religious movements. I was invited to address the group on “Joseph Smith and Mormon Piety,” and I felt at the time that a personal approach to such a topic would be the best. This essay is a slightly edited version of what I presented in 1981. I appreciate the opportunity to have it published as part of the Richard L. Anderson Festschrift, for I consider Anderson one of the foremost scholars on Joseph Smith.

1. Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), 14.
2. This, it seems to me, is one of the personal responsibilities of the believing teacher—to present a balanced view of the Prophet that will help students maintain an equable and viable faith and at the same time prepare them to deal honestly with all the historical and intellectual problems that may confront them. My personal experience over four decades of teaching convinces me that students respect such an approach more than one that tries to hide or ignore any problems that may have occurred. I will never forget, for example, the personal satisfaction I received when one student told me that my church history class had replaced the unstable “rug” under her “testimony” with “pillars” that could never be shaken. When I asked for an explanation she said that up until she had taken that class, almost anything she heard that seemed incongruous with her traditional, Sunday School images of church history disturbed her and weakened her faith, but that when she heard the “problems” discussed openly and frankly, in an atmosphere of both faith and honesty, she developed an attitude toward potential problems that she would always be able to use. It is in the development of perceptions, attitudes, and methods for meeting problems that the religious teacher makes his greatest contribution—not just in the “answers” he gives to particular problems. And this contribution is made only if students recognize the personal efforts at scholarly integrity made by the teacher himself.
3. *History of the Church*, 5:265.
4. David Whitmer, *An Address to All Believers in Christ* (Richmond, Mo.: Whitmer, 1887), 31, as cited in *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 1:163.

5. Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 7:243 (1859, September 1859).

6. During one meeting some people proposed deposing the Prophet. As recorded by Brigham Young: “I rose up, and in a plain and forcible manner told them Joseph was a Prophet, and I knew it, and that they might rail and slander as much as they pleased, they could not destroy the appointment of the Prophet of God, they could only destroy their own authority, cut the thread that bound them to the Prophet and to God, and sink themselves to hell.” Brigham Young, *Manuscript History of Brigham Young*, ed. Elden J. Watson (Salt Lake City: Smith Secretarial Service, 1968), 16.

7. *Ibid.*, 140, 156.

8. William Clayton to the Saints in Manchester, 10 December 1840, William Clayton collection, LDS Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah, as quoted in *BYU Studies* 18/3 (1978): 478, 479. The rest of this quotation contains more impressive comment on the Prophet:

He is very familiar, and delights to instruct the poor saints. I can converse with him just as easy as I can with you, and with regard to being willing to communicate instruction he says ‘I receive it freely and I will give it freely.’ He is willing to answer any question I have put to him and is pleased when we ask him questions. He seems exceeding well versed in the scriptures, and whilst conversing upon any subject such light and beauty is revealed I never saw before. If I had come from England purposely to converse with him a few days I should have considered myself well paid for my trouble. He is no friend to iniquity but cuts at it wherever he sees it and it is in vain to attempt to cloke it before him. He has a great measure of the spirit of God, and by this means he is preserved from imposition (*ibid.*, 478–79).

9. William Clayton to William Hardman, 30 March 1842, as printed in *Millennial Star* 3 (August 1843): 74–76, and reprinted in *BYU Studies* 12/1 (1971): 123.

10. Peterson, *Jefferson Image*, 5.

11. *Ibid.*, 5–6.

12. For important insight into the impact of the martyrdom on Mormons as well as non-Mormons, see Davis Bitton, “The Martyrdom of Joseph Smith in Early Mormon Writings,” *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* 3 (1983): 29–39; Davis Bitton, *The Martyrdom Remembered: A One-Hundred-Fifty Year Perspective on the Assassination of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Aspen Books, 1994). See also Kenneth W. Godfrey, “Remembering the Deaths of Joseph and Hyrum Smith,” in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1993), 301–15. For more insight into Joseph Smith’s general image among both Mormons and non-Mormons, see Davis Bitton, *Images of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Aspen Books, 1996); Davis Bitton, “Joseph Smith in the Mormon Folk Memory,” *Restoration Studies* 1 (1980): 75–94.

13. These include the following hymns published in the current Mormon hymnal: “Come, Listen to a Prophet’s Voice,” “Come, Sing to the Lord,” “Joseph Smith’s First Vision,” and “Now We’ll Sing with One Accord.”

14. Eliza R. Snow, *Poems, Religious, Historical, and Political* (Liverpool: Richards, 1856), 142–43, first printed in *Times and Seasons* 5 (1 July 1844): 575.

15. The rest of the quotation is just as powerful a statement of the Mormon view of Joseph Smith and the significance of his death. It continues, in part:

Henceforward their names will be classed among the martyrs of religion; . . . They lived for glory; they died for glory; and glory is their eternal reward. From age to age shall their names go down to posterity as gems for the sanctified. They were innocent of any crime, . . . and their innocent blood on the floor of Carthage jail is a broad seal affixed to “Mormonism” that cannot be rejected by any court on earth, and their innocent blood on the escutcheon of the State of Illinois, with the broken faith of the State as pledged by the governor, is a witness to the truth of the everlasting gospel that all the world cannot impeach; and their innocent blood on the banner of liberty, and on the *magna charta* of the United States, is an ambassador for the religion of Jesus Christ, that will touch the hearts of honest men among all nations; and their innocent blood, with the innocent blood of all the martyrs under the altar that John saw, will cry unto the Lord of Hosts till he avenges that blood on the earth. Amen. (D&C 135:6–7)

16. Ursulia B. Hascall to her sister (in a letter addressed to Col. Wilson Andrews), 19 September 1846, “Letters of a Proselyte: The Hascall-Pomeroy Correspondence,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 25 (April 1957): 150.

17. See Joseph Smith’s official account of his first vision in the Pearl of Great Price, Joseph Smith—History 1:11–20; the “Wentworth letter” in *History of the Church*, 4:536.

18. See James B. Allen, “Emergence of a Fundamental: The Expanding Role of Joseph Smith’s First Vision in Mormon Religious Thought,” *Journal of Mormon History* 7 (1980): 43–61. For an interesting discussion of how the first vision has been pictured in stained glass, see Joyce A. Janetski, “The First Vision and Mormon Stained Glass,” *Stained Glass* 75 (spring 1980): 47–50.

19. The proceedings of the dedication of the monument are published in a pamphlet entitled *Proceedings at the Dedication of the Joseph Smith Memorial Monument, at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, December 23rd 1905* (n. p., n. d.).

20. The phrase *stain Illinois* was changed in the Mormon hymnal in 1927 in order to be in harmony with the “good neighbor” policy of the church and nation, so that it now reads *plead unto heav’n*.

21. “Praise to the Man,” *Hymns*, 1985, no. 27.

22. See William A. Morton, *From Plowboy to Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Sunday School Union, 1912).

23. Gordon B. Hinckley, “Joseph the Seer,” *Ensign* (May 1977): 64–66.

24. See introductory page to John Henry Evans, *Joseph Smith: An American Prophet* (New York: Macmillan, 1940).

25. For an interesting discussion of this tradition, the problems connected with it, and its possible origin, see Leland A. Fetzer, “Tolstoy and Mormonism,” *Dialogue* 6/1 (1971): 13–29.

26. John Henry Evans, *The Leadership of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: General Boards of the Mutual Improvement Associations, 1934), 5–6.

27. From Josiah Quincy, *Figures of the Past*, as quoted in *Among the Mormons: Historic Accounts by Contemporary Observers*, ed. William Mulder and A. Russell Mortensen (New York: Knopf, 1958), 131.
28. See Quincy, as quoted in *Among the Mormons*, 142; Evans, *An American Prophet*, introductory page; George Q. Cannon address of 7 October 1883 in *Journal of Discourses*, 24:340, in which Cannon says that “the religious world stood aghast at the ideas advanced by the Prophet Joseph Smith, and those associated with him.” Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1966), 286, reports that Joseph Smith’s first vision rocked “the whole religious foundation of the Christian world.”
29. See Leland R. Nelson, comp., *The Journal of Joseph: The Personal Diary of a Modern Prophet* (Provo, Utah: Council Press, 1979).
30. Leon R. Hartshorn, *Joseph Smith: Prophet of the Restoration* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970), passim.
31. Ibid., 121. The same tone is repeated in many books, including, for example, John J. Stewart, *Joseph Smith: Democracy’s Unknown Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Mercury, 1960), 118–19, where Joseph is credited with being “the most influential American of the 19th century, or of any century.”
32. William E. Berrett, “Joseph Smith—Five Qualities of Leadership,” *New Era* (June 1977): 40–43; Evans, “Qualities of Leadership in Joseph Smith,” in *Leadership of Joseph Smith*, 13–20.
33. See G. Homer Durham, *Joseph Smith Prophet-Statesman: Readings in American Political Thought* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1946).
34. See John A. Widtsoe, *Joseph Smith as Scientist: A Contribution to Mormon Philosophy* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1964).
35. Dix W. Price, “Joseph Smith, Ph.D.,” address to BYU student body, 5 April 1955, copy located in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University. Joseph Smith’s translation of the Book of Mormon in ninety days; his study of law and of ancient and modern languages; his founding of a university at Nauvoo; his study of such things as religion, history, and geography; and his promulgating to the world the “startling revelation” concerning the eternal nature of man’s intelligence and knowledge—all these things are used as evidence of his profound knowledge and educational attainments, even though he had never been to college.
36. See *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, ed. Black and Tate. Some of the titles of articles that illustrate this point are: Daniel W. Bachman, “Joseph Smith, a True Martyr,” 317–32; Alexander L. Baugh, “Joseph Smith’s Athletic Nature,” 137–50; Alvin K. Benson, “Joseph Smith on Modern Science,” 151–67; Arnold K. Garr, “Joseph Smith: Man of Forgiveness,” 127–36; Robert J. Matthews, “Joseph Smith—Translator,” 77–87; Royal Skousen, “Joseph Smith: Gifted Learner, Master Teacher, Prophetic Seer,” 65–75. See also Bruce A. Van Orden, “The Compassion of Joseph Smith,” in *To Be Learned Is Good If . . .*, ed. Robert L. Millet (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1987), 43–57.
37. See comments by Dan Farr, an LDS architect, in Question and Answer section of *New Era* (May 1974): 32.
38. For example, see Ronald V. Jackson, *The Seer, Joseph Smith, His Education from the Most High* (Salt Lake City: Hawkes, 1977), which is devoted entirely to a long list of angels who appeared to Joseph Smith. Much of the list is based not on Joseph Smith’s own writings, but on what people later said about Joseph. Robert J. Woodford, in “Book of Mormon Personalities Known by Joseph Smith,” *Ensign* (August 1978): 14, does a similar thing and quotes

the early apostle John Taylor to the effect that Joseph Smith “seemed to be just as familiar with the Spirit World, and as well acquainted with the other side, as he was here.”

39. *History of the Church*, 5:526.

40. Daryl Chase, *Joseph the Prophet: As He Lives in the Hearts of His People* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1944), 79.

41. On the conservative side, see Richard Vetterli, *The Constitution by a Thread* (Salt Lake City: Paramount, 1967), and Jerreld L. Newquist, comp., *Prophets, Principles and National Survival* (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1946). On the more liberal side, see David S. King, “Democratic Party Principles Are Compatible with L.D.S. Principles,” address to the Young Democrats Club, Brigham Young University, 1962, copy in my possession. A note of balance was achieved by Durham in his *Joseph Smith Prophet-Statesman*, ix: “Finally a word of warning may be issued to those Mormon readers who may combine religious fervor with partisan zeal. Joseph Smith was not a ‘reactionary Republican,’ nor was he a ‘New Deal Democrat.’ Any effort to make him out as such is foredoomed to failure. He met the problems of his day. We are free to meet the problems of ours. Joseph Smith’s constant effort, in his own mind, was to influence the world of men toward an ideal of the kingdom of God.”

42. See James B. Allen, “Personal Faith and Public Policy: Some Timely Observations on the League of Nations Controversy in Utah,” *BYU Studies* 14/1 (1973): 77–98.

43. Susa Young Gates, “The Vision Beautiful,” *Improvement Era* (April 1920): 542–43.

44. These figures are arrived at by simply counting the references in the conference address, as published in the *Ensign* magazine.

45. See Nephi L. Morris, *Prophecies of Joseph Smith and Their Fulfillment* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1926); Duane S. Crowther, *The Prophecies of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1963); and Evans, “Major Prophecies of Joseph Smith,” in *Leadership of Joseph Smith*, 60–67.

46. See N. B. Lundwall, comp., *The Fate of the Persecutors of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1952).

47. See Dallin H. Oaks and Marvin S. Hill, afterword to *Carthage Conspiracy: The Trial of the Accused Assassins of Joseph Smith* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), 217–21.

48. One fairly obvious element of Mormon piety is an underlying commitment to the proposition that even though historical evidence will ultimately support the faith, final “proof” of Joseph Smith’s prophetic mission is not to be found in such evidence but, rather, in the “testimony of the Spirit.” Some may consider this to be mere “blind faith,” or even fanaticism, but, I submit, most Mormons I know, including respected Mormon scholars, will tell you that it would be asking too much to expect purely empirical, scholarly methodology either to prove or disprove the spiritual claims of Joseph Smith, including the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. Such studies may help, but the evidence is usually circumstantial and often produces conflicting results. The ultimate test is spelled out in the Book of Mormon itself—Moroni 10:4: “And when ye shall receive these things, I would exhort you that ye would ask God, the Eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost.” Recognizing the purely subjective nature of such evidence, most Mormon scholars will explain the basis for

their faith to anyone who asks, but will refrain from entering into fruitless efforts to “prove” the Joseph Smith story by traditional objective means.

49. Leonard J. Arrington, “Joseph Smith and the Lighter View,” *New Era* (August 1976): 11, 13.

50. Peterson, *Jefferson Image*, 379.

51. Sidney Hook, *The Hero in History: A Study in Limitation and Possibility* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1945), 24–25.

52. For some insight into the way a few well-known Mormon scholars have portrayed Joseph Smith in recent years, see Thomas G. Alexander, “‘A New and Everlasting Covenant’: An Approach to the Theology of Joseph Smith,” in *New Views of Mormon History: Essays in Honor of Leonard J. Arrington*, ed. Davis Bitton and Maureen Ursenbach Beecher (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987), 43–62; Leonard J. Arrington, *Faith and Intellect as Partners in Mormon History* (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1996); Leonard J. Arrington, “Joseph Smith,” in *The Presidents of the Church*, ed. Leonard J. Arrington (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986), 3–40; Richard L. Bushman, “How Did the Prophet Joseph Smith Respond to Skepticism in His Time?” *Ensign* (February 1990): 61–63; Richard L. Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Truman G. Madsen, *Joseph Smith the Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989); Robert L. Millet, *Joseph Smith: Selected Sermons and Writings* (New York: Paulist, 1989); Thomas F. Rogers, “Thoughts about Joseph Smith: Upon Reading Donna Hill’s *Joseph Smith: The First Mormon*,” in *By Study and Also by Faith: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley*, ed. John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990), 2:585–618. For a recent and respected non-Mormon evaluation of Joseph Smith, see Jan Shipps, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985).

# The Ram and the Lion: Lyman Wight and Brigham Young

Davis Bitton

At his death in 1877, Brigham Young was honored by more than 115,000 Latter-day Saints and was known as a great colonizer. Lyman Wight, leader of a rapidly diminishing group of less than a hundred followers, died in 1858 on the trail in Texas, having abandoned his last effort to establish a foothold there. Yet in the 1830s, soon after the church was organized, this ultimate wide discrepancy would not have been predicted. In fact, at first Lyman Wight seemed to have some preeminence. Among the earliest converts to Mormonism, he was baptized in Ohio in late 1830 and ordained an elder by Oliver Cowdery; he presided over the branch at Kirtland, was ordained a high priest in June 1831, and served on a council of high priests in Missouri in 1832. When Zion's Camp was organized in 1834, Wight was its general (second only to Commander in Chief Joseph Smith). He remained an important leader in Missouri, serving on the high council of the stake there, and traveled to Ohio for such special occasions as the dedication of the temple. When Joseph Smith fled Kirtland and moved to Missouri, he inevitably had a close relationship with Lyman Wight, ordaining him a member of the stake presidency. Wight was also an indefatigable missionary.<sup>1</sup>

What about Brigham Young during these years? To quickly trace the trajectory: Young joined the church in 1832, was a member of Zion's Camp in 1834, and then was called as one of the Twelve Apostles in 1835 and became president of the Twelve in 1840, a development extremely relevant to later events. Brigham too was a zealous missionary.<sup>2</sup>

From our present perspective, it might appear that his ordination to the Twelve immediately established the supremacy of Young over Wight. Perhaps so, but the importance of the Twelve Apostles, "the twelve traveling councilors" (D&C 107:23), was not as obvious at first as it became later on, as some saw their jurisdiction to be outside the established stakes.<sup>3</sup>

In the meantime, between 1835 and 1841, Lyman Wight was not ignored or relegated to the periphery. Squarely in the middle of the Missouri war, he led the Mormon militia and accompanied Joseph Smith to Liberty Jail. After the prisoners escaped, Wight was considered sufficiently courageous and faithful to be called to a stake presidency in Iowa. Then, in 1841, he too became an apostle. Both Wight and Young had demonstrated courage and faithfulness, and now they were colleagues as apostles of the Lord.

But through no fault of his own, Lyman Wight did not participate in two of the experiences that helped the Twelve to forge their unity and establish their leadership role. First was the migration from Missouri to Illinois. While Wight and his fellow prisoners languished in jail, Brigham Young and a few of the apostles directed a move and resettlement that called forth all their abilities of organization and leadership—a dress rehearsal, if you will, for the great organized exodus that Young would direct in 1846.<sup>4</sup>

Even more important was the mission of the Twelve to England. Launching a gathering that would provide an infusion of fresh blood for the Saints at Nauvoo and later in Utah, this mission was also significant for the leadership experience it provided—in publishing books, pamphlets, and periodicals, organizing branches, judging disciplinary cases, raising funds, supervising emigration, and developing an esprit de corps among the apostles that



would never leave them. In *Men with a Mission*, historians James B. Allen, Ronald K. Esplin, and David J. Whittaker have spelled out the details of this remarkable, shared apostolic experience in Great Britain.<sup>5</sup>

At April conference in 1841 at Nauvoo, when Lyman Wight was named one of the Twelve Apostles and ordained by Joseph Smith, the other apostles were still in England. Was Brigham Young consulted on this calling or did he find out about it after the fact? If the other apostles saw Lyman as an interloper, they gave no sign of it. Most of them returned to Nauvoo in the summer and fall, and Wight's name is included among the signatories of epistles of the Twelve in October, November, and December 1841, and March and April 1842. The church was small in those days. Wight and the other apostles had all known each other, and one likes to think that they worked harmoniously together. In time, as they accumulated shared experiences and as new apostles replaced those who died, Wight might have overcome his handicap in not having shared the Missouri exodus and British mission experiences.

Instead, however, he began a pattern of long absences from Nauvoo by assignment, which prevented meeting with his brethren of the Twelve. One such absence was his long journey to Ohio and New York from September 1842 to June 1843. After his return, he had been home only slightly more than a month when, on 21 July 1843, he set out with his family for the Wisconsin pineries, the logging and sawmill operation that provided needed material for Nauvoo construction.<sup>6</sup> It was these absences that help to explain his exclusion from the sacred ceremonies and meetings of instruction that took place in the upper room of Joseph Smith's Red Brick Store. That Wight was not included in the initial endowment on 4 May 1842 is not surprising, as that momentous meeting was limited to only a few persons. When others of the Twelve received their endowments in late 1843, he was away. Finally on 14 May 1844, Wight received the initiatory washing and anointing ordinances, similar to the form of "endowment" he had received in the Kirtland Temple, but never, according to Andrew Ehat, received the fulness of the priesthood ordinances.<sup>7</sup> His wife, Harriet Benton Wight, did not receive her endowments, and Lyman Wight is not among those apostles who took plural wives before the death of Joseph Smith.<sup>8</sup> It was the historical accident of his absence, it seems, that kept Lyman Wight on the outside, something less than a full participant with the other apostles. Andrew Ehat has given the most thorough treatment of the inner "Quorum," of which Wight was not part, and has drawn a Venn diagram clearly illustrating who belonged to the inside group and who did not.<sup>9</sup> Had Joseph Smith lived longer, that situation might well have changed. Wight's name was included among the membership of the Council of Fifty in early 1844 even though he was away and unable to attend its earliest meetings. It cannot be said that he really functioned in it. Having sounded out Joseph Smith on the advisability of leading a colony to Texas and receiving approval, Wight was in Nauvoo not more than three weeks when, on 21 May 1844, he left with about one hundred missionaries (including Brigham Young and most of the other apostles) to travel and promote Joseph Smith's presidential candidacy.

Wight participated conscientiously in this mission from late May until 9 July, when he heard of the Prophet's death. For all church members, and especially the traveling apostles, the news was crushing. Wight was certainly not affected any less than the others. Who had known Joseph Smith longer? Who had been closer to him than Wight was in Liberty Jail? It was decided that the itinerant apostles would gather in Boston, thence to return to Nauvoo. On 18 July they were all in Boston except Wight. After he arrived, they all departed on 24 July and in a journey of nearly two weeks made their way by steamboat, stagecoach, and riverboat back to Nauvoo, arriving on 6 August 1844.

What was said in the conversations among members of the Twelve from the time they first heard the news until their arrival in Nauvoo? One extremely important utterance had already been made when Brigham Young, in the presence of Orson Pratt, slapped his hand on his knee and proclaimed, "The keys of the kingdom are right here

with the Church.”<sup>10</sup> If we can trust his later recollection, Wight was not impressed by such declarations. Wilford Woodruff tells of one conversation on the boat: “As to Elder Lyman Wight we were always on good terms. We had an interesting time together. We talked over old times and looked forward to new ones. He informed me that Joseph told him while they were in Joal [jail] that he should not live to see forty years but told him not to reveal it until he was dead. Br Wight as well as the rest of us feels his death deeply.”<sup>11</sup> Speaking of being in Young’s company during these weeks, Wight wrote: “I do not recollect of hearing him use the pronoun we when speaking of the twelve for the first time but got the pronoun I so completely to perfection that I considered myself out all together.”<sup>12</sup> If Wight was indeed reacting in this way at the time, it is hard to believe that he could have been completely successful in concealing his antipathy, and the other apostles did not seem to bridle at Young’s collegial leadership. If Wight indicated his intention to continue with his preparations for the journey to Texas, it occasioned no great argument during the trip. It is more likely that they were all wondering what they would find when they reached Nauvoo.

Immediately after the apostles’ arrival in Nauvoo, the leadership question came to a head. Sidney Rigdon had arrived five days earlier and advanced his claim. The three apostles who were there at the time had a preliminary meeting with him and arranged an appointment for the next day. Rigdon did not keep this appointment but did appear in the Sunday worship meeting on 4 August to address the Saints. Although he wanted to move quickly, the next meeting was deferred until Thursday, 8 August. Fortunately Brigham Young and his colleagues arrived on the evening of 6 August.<sup>13</sup>

Three important meetings were now held. On the morning of 7 August, the apostles gathered at the home of John Taylor. That afternoon, a larger meeting took place, consisting of “all the apostles that were in Nauvoo”—presumably including Lyman Wight—along with Nauvoo stake leaders and an unknown number of high priests. Rigdon and Young both presented their case. The next day, 8 August, Rigdon addressed the assembled Saints in the morning, and Brigham Young, in an address that profoundly affected those there, spoke in the afternoon, carrying the day, as the leadership of the Twelve was accepted by the congregation.<sup>14</sup>

Where was Lyman Wight? B. H. Roberts wrote in one place that “all the apostles that were in Nauvoo, excepting John Taylor,” were in attendance at the 7 August afternoon meeting. In describing the 8 August afternoon meeting, he lists seven apostles in attendance, omitting Lyman Wight.<sup>15</sup> Writing later, Roberts accounts for absences as follows: “Of the absent ones, John Taylor was confined to his home, not yet recovered from his wounds. Orson Hyde, John E. Page, and Wm. Smith had not yet arrived in Nauvoo; and Lyman Wight was still in the east.”<sup>16</sup> Wight was in Nauvoo, as Roberts himself stated two pages earlier, but, whether sick or sulking, apparently he did not attend the 8 August meetings. If he had been there and refused to raise his hand to sustain Brigham Young, it certainly would have been noticed, and if he did sustain Young he would later have been reminded of it. Whether he would have witnessed the “transfiguration” of Brigham Young later recalled by many at the meeting or had already acquired a negative attitude that precluded such a realization, we will never know.<sup>17</sup>

In any case, three days later Wight, apparently recovered from any fatigue and illness, was preaching about the company he was going to lead to Texas. This may have rankled Brigham. Yet when the Twelve met the next day, on 12 August, they agreed that Wight could go to Texas “if he desired.” The words signaled that a cooling had occurred—not “you must go” or “we encourage you to go,” but the somewhat reluctant concession “you may go if you desire.”<sup>18</sup>

Only six days later, on 18 August, Brigham Young again addressed the Saints. He wanted to make one thing clear: Only Lyman Wight and George Miller had permission (along with their families and the existing company at the pineries, one presumes) to leave. Young had no desire to see several hundred people leave Nauvoo. Moreover, he added, if Wight and Miller act “contrary to our counsel, and will not act in concert with us, they will be damned and go into destruction.”<sup>19</sup> Had Lyman Wight already made comments suggesting an unwillingness to “act in concert”?

On 24 August, at a meeting of the Twelve with the Temple and Nauvoo House committees, the signal was changed. Lyman was now “counseled” to go to the pine country “rather than” to Texas.<sup>20</sup> Why, then, did he persist? We can only guess at his rationalization. Did he stoutly assert, as he did later, that his orders were from the Prophet Joseph and could not be countermanded? Or did he simply consider Young’s “counsel” something short of an order? He had, after all, received official permission a few days earlier from the Twelve. Furthermore, he might have reasoned, he could go to both the pineries and Texas by preparing his group in Wisconsin and then leading them southward. The fact remains that he would have to have been deaf and blind to miss the strong desire of Brigham Young and the other apostles that he not persist in the Texas venture. Not to be deterred, Wight gathered his family and belongings and, still proclaiming Texas as the ultimate destination of his group, headed up the river to the pineries.

That Wight had not dutifully agreed to abandon the Texas venture is clear. On 8 September, at the trial of Sidney Rigdon, Brigham’s lead-off address mentioned Wight:

I have frequently thought lately of Paul’s words when he said “much every way,” “some for Paul, some for Appollos, some for Cephus and some for Christ;” and I believe there are a great many here for Christ. I will make the application of Paul’s words to us: “Much every way.” Some for Joseph and Hyrum, the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants, the Temple and Joseph’s measures; and some for Lyman Wight, some for James Emmett and some for Sidney Rigdon, and I suppose some for the Twelve.<sup>21</sup>

Of course the framing of the issue was all-important. In the process of setting off Rigdon’s course against that of Brigham and the Twelve, Young and other speakers did some grouping. It was not simply Rigdon versus the Twelve but Rigdon versus Joseph Smith/Hyrum Smith/ the Book of Mormon/the Doctrine and Covenants/the Temple/Joseph’s measures. If you were true to the latter, taken as a package, you would of course have to reject Rigdon and his claims. Significantly, Lyman Wight, although an apostle, is not included with the Twelve. There is every suggestion that, in Brigham Young’s mind, following Wight was tantamount to following Rigdon or Emmett, thus leading to schism. As Young’s discourse continued, decrying Rigdon’s erratic and secret course, he insisted that Joseph Smith had never embarked on such ventures as Rigdon’s “without consulting his brethren, and especially the Twelve, if they were present.”

Other speakers at Rigdon’s trial emphasized Joseph Smith’s last charge to the Twelve, the vote of the church—at the conference convened on 8 August—to sustain the Twelve, and especially the importance of completing the temple in Nauvoo. Although not in attendance at the trial of Sidney Rigdon, Wight could have benefited from reading a transcript and reflecting on the thinking of the speakers. He would have to tread very carefully to avoid finding himself in schism.

About a month later at October conference Wight was sustained as one of the Twelve.<sup>22</sup> But Brigham Young’s displeasure again spilled out. Wight, he said, had gone away “because he [is] a coward, but he will come back and

his company.”<sup>23</sup> A report of Young’s colorful language must somehow have reached Wight, for in 1857 he was still fuming as he wrote the following to Wilford Woodruff:

I started in all good faith, had but just got out of hearing before I was accused from the stand by who would be big of beging [sic] the mission of Br Joseph who to passify [sic] me gave his consent and that I run away from Nauvoo to get rid of fighting and that he could chase me all over Nauvoo with a plug of tobacco, I acknowledge I am afraid of tobacco but should have no fear of the person for I believe he was too lazy to have chased me all over Nauvoo, he pitched into me largely on many occations [sic] but I care very little about the whole.<sup>24</sup>

There was little love wasted between Brigham Young and Lyman Wight. *Who would be big*—such an expression was not complimentary. “Big shot” came to be a standard equivalent for one who strutted around and thought far too highly of his own importance. Young no doubt considered Wight’s mulish refusal to follow the counsel of his brethren of the Twelve in similar terms. Interestingly, when the first apostles were called in 1835, including Young but not Wight, humility was a prime requisite. At that time Young was surprised to be called to such an important leadership position until he concluded that the alternative to simple, humble men like himself were “Big Elders” who were unteachable.<sup>25</sup> In general, Young’s leadership style was not that of the authoritarian on the throne who simply gives orders.

It was in a December 1844 letter that W. W. Phelps assigned nicknames to the Twelve Apostles. Brigham Young was “the lion of the Lord,” while Lyman Wight was “the wild ram of the mountains.”<sup>26</sup> These fanciful labels are not, I think, uniformly felicitous, but perhaps Phelps had discerned something about the character of these two.

By early 1845 Lyman Wight was approaching age forty-eight. He had been a Latter-day Saint for fourteen years. His record of service was strong. Brigham Young was forty-three years old and had been in the church about thirteen years; he had also accumulated an impressive record of achievement, had faced down the enemy, and was now ready to lead. Both men had sacrificed, both had been courageous, both were seasoned, both loyal to Joseph Smith. They should have been marching shoulder to shoulder. But by heading up the river Wight had embarked on a voyage that would lead them far apart. It was one of those “crucial cubic centimeter” decisions—a small difference at a key juncture leading to a huge divergence later on. Let us trace the sad devolution, or downward movement, as it now continued its fateful course.

As early as 4 February 1845 Wight was dropped as a member of the Council of Fifty.<sup>27</sup> Apparently he did not find out about this until sometime after 1848, all the while assuming that he had some kind of prerogative as a member of the Fifty, which actually fell under the control of the Twelve and, contrary to the grandiose expectations of some, devolved into little more than “a debating school.”<sup>28</sup>

On 7 April 1845, Wight was replaced as a trustee for the Nauvoo House Association.<sup>29</sup> At the annual church conference held that day, during the sustaining of officers in the morning session, Heber C. Kimball, who was the presiding officer, recommended patience with Wight. “We should let him remain for the present, probably hereafter there may be a time that he will hearken to counsel, and do much good which he is capable of—for he is a noble-minded man.”<sup>30</sup> Unbeknownst to Kimball, Wight and a company of about 150 were already traveling southward from the pineries down the river toward Davenport, Iowa.

For about a month Wight and his company were at Davenport making preparations for their overland voyage to Texas. Then Brigham Young and the other apostles found out where he was.<sup>31</sup> That there be no misunderstanding, they sent Samuel Bent, senior member of the Council of Fifty, to read a letter aloud to Lyman. After a glowing description of activity and prosperity at Nauvoo, the letter explained:

And now, dear brethren, if you will hearken to our counsel you will give up all idea of journeying west at present. If you go westward before you have received your endowments in the Temple you will not prosper. And when you meet with trouble and difficulty let no one say that the counsel [sic] of the Twelve brought them into it, for we now in the name of the Lord counsel and advise you not to go west at present. We desire, dear brethren, that you should take hold with us and help us to accomplish the building of the Lord's houses. Come brethren, be one with us, and let us be agreed in all of our exertions to roll on the great wheel of the kingdom.<sup>32</sup>

If Lyman Wight had misunderstood the desires of his colleagues and leaders before, or somehow rationalized his actions, this letter would seem to remove all doubt. But who knows? He may have said to himself, "I am going to the South, not the West," or "This is still only counsel, not an order." In any case, Samuel Bent had to return and report that Lyman Wight refused to rejoin his brethren of the Twelve in Nauvoo.

At conference on 6 October 1845, during the sustaining of officers, Almon Babbitt spoke against Lyman Wight as follows:

I cannot conscientiously give my vote in his favor. My reason is this: If there is a council in this church that ought to be united, and act in unison as one man, it is the Council of the Twelve. If the head is sick, the whole body is afflicted. If I am rightly informed concerning Brother Wight's conduct, for the past year, he has not acted in unison with the Twelve, nor according to their counsel. The last year has been one of affliction, persecution and sorrow, when the adversary has continually sought to destroy and mutilate the church; and it has required all the faith, prayers, and perseverance of the leaders, to save this people from the grasp of the destroyer. If the counsel of Brother Wight had been followed, this Temple would not have been built, nor the baptismal font erected. He has sought to draw away a part of the force, which we ought to have had to build this Temple. His teachings have been contrary to the counsel of the church, and his conduct calculated to destroy it. Under circumstances of this kind, I cannot conscientiously vote to continue him in his standing, until he retracts, and makes satisfaction. Brother Wight's course has been calculated to divide the church, and prevent those things being accomplished which were commanded of God by the Prophet Joseph.<sup>33</sup>

This was the blunt case against Lyman Wight. If there may have been some personal ambition behind it on the part of Babbitt, it is probably pretty close to the facts of the matter as seen from Nauvoo. Without a report of Wight's reaction, we can assume that he would take issue with two key words: *church* and *calculated*. "It is not the counsel of the *church* that I have rejected," we can hear him say, "but that of Brigham Young." And "I have not *calculated*, nor intended, to divide the church or destroy it but simply to carry out the mission assigned me by the Prophet Joseph Smith and later approved by the Twelve."

The remarkable thing, after all, is that Heber C. Kimball responded immediately to Babbitt by saying:

It is well known that Brother Wight's case was had before the conference last spring, and that he was dropt, and then again retained; that is, that we would let him be, and see what he would do, and what

course he would take. He has been away ever since; and is with a small company somewhere; we cannot tell what he is doing; he may in his own mind, be acting in concert with the rest, and he may be acting for the good of this people. It would be my mind, to let his case lay over for the present, until we can learn something from him.<sup>34</sup>

Kimball so moved; the motion was seconded and voted for unanimously by the congregation. Kimball, the other apostles, and the Saints in conference assembled were willing to give Wight the benefit of the doubt, to grant that his motives might be pure, and even that his actions might be “for the good of this people.” Wait and see—this was the moderate decision, which continued through 1846, 1847, and most of 1848.

During these years, under the direction of the Twelve, the majority of Nauvoo Mormons were moving through Iowa, thence across the remaining plains to Utah, and getting established. Wight’s little group, in the meantime, pursued its tortuous search for a stable settlement in Texas, establishing itself successively near Austin, at Zodiac on the Perdenales, subsequently at Hamilton Springs, and finally near Bandera.<sup>35</sup>

In October conference of 1848, Wight was sustained as usual, but less than two months later he was cut off. In early 1849 he was replaced as an apostle. Why had the climate changed during the closing months of 1848? Specifically, what occurred between 8 October and 3 December to change the continued formal acceptance of Wight as an apostle to rejection?

During 1847 Brigham Young made two efforts to gather precise information about Wight’s situation and his attitude. First, Young sent emissaries Peter Haws and Lucian Woodworth to Texas, who returned and reported not only Wight’s total disinclination to affiliate with Young and the rest of the church, but also his pathetic drunkenness.<sup>36</sup> The latter condition may have been misunderstood, or exaggerated, but the former seems emphatic. Once these reports reached headquarters and were discussed, it would have been quite possible to drop Wight on behavioral grounds.

At the end of 1847, something happened that, given his enmity toward Brigham Young, would have troubled Wight—the reorganization of the First Presidency, with Young becoming not merely president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles but president of the church. After some initial opposition from individual apostles, the Twelve quickly fell into line, and the reorganized First Presidency received the unanimous sustaining vote of the conference in Council Bluffs, Iowa, and later in Utah. Wight had already made it abundantly clear that he would go his own way, that the apostles held no claim on him. The reorganization of the First Presidency might have served as a catalyst for an act that definitively cut the rope.

It was during 1848, probably in the late spring, that Wight published his pamphlet, *An Address by Way of an Abridged Account and Journal of My Life*.<sup>37</sup> In this work he made clear his rejection of Young’s leadership. The Twelve, he said, were “consummately ignorant of all things pertaining to Time and Eternity.” They had no power to replace him (Lyman Wight) with “a long eared Jack Ass to fill a place which has never been vacated.” When copies of the pamphlet arrived at Kaneshville, Iowa, in the fall of 1848, an outraged Orson Hyde wrote a harsh rejoinder. Wight, he said, “is not yet so high that the voice of the Council [of the Twelve] cannot reach him and bring him down, and even put another in his place if they deem it necessary.”<sup>38</sup> The Pottawotamie High Council met to consider his case on 7<sup>th</sup> October. Led by apostles George A. Smith, Ezra T. Benson, and president of the Seventy, Joseph Young, the council refused to fellowship Wight as an apostle.<sup>39</sup>

The October conference held in Salt Lake City at the same time sustained Wight's continuation in office for the simple reason that they did not yet know of the pamphlet and were willing to continue the status quo. In fact, in early November Brigham Young sent another delegation—Preston Thomas and William Martindale—to Texas to call upon Wight. "We want you to learn his purposes and intentions," Young said, "and if he does not come up right soon, the spirit of the Lord will say, 'Clip the thread' and he will go down at once."<sup>40</sup> It would be many weeks before Thomas and Martindale could complete the trip and return with a highly negative report of Wight's recalcitrance.

Ultimately, however, their mission had no impact on events. For on 30 November 1848, Captain Allen Compton and three other brethren arrived in Salt Lake bringing mail from Kanesville. In the same packet was a copy of Wight's pamphlet *An Address*. Three days later, on 3 December, the disfellowshipment action was taken.<sup>41</sup> There should be no doubt of the cause-effect relationship in view of the following statement signed by Brigham Young and his two counselors: "Lyman Wight's manifesto was received at the same time [30 November], which clearly demonstrated to the Saints that he was not one with us, consequently [*sic*] the Church dis-fellowshipped him, and all who shall continue to follow him."<sup>42</sup> The lion and the ram had come to a final, official parting of the ways.

Here I will not give a detailed analysis of Wight's authority claims and the response of Brigham Young and the apostles.<sup>43</sup> A summary would include Wight's claim to priority as a high priest; his assertion that the Council of Fifty superseded the Twelve; a vague claim to authority based on the term *Baneemy* (my elders);<sup>44</sup> insistence that young Joseph (Joseph Smith III) had been designated by his father to lead the church; and private conversations in which Joseph Smith had instructed Wight what to do, including the establishment of a colony in Texas. These are not foundation stones of equal mass. Each was challenged. The claim to authority based on private conversations is, of course, calculated to open the gates of anarchy. This does not mean that Wight was insincere, although he may have been unduly influenced by a vindictive George Miller, who had rejected the leadership of the Twelve to go to Texas in 1848. For those with a predisposition to reject Utah Mormonism, Wight's claims may have had a certain plausibility for a while, but they were pregnant with trouble for any group who might take him in as an ally.

Most basic is the narrow understanding of *obedience* in the parlance of Wight. He took second place to no one in putting his life on the line, in responding to the different calls placed on him. But his obedience was to his prophet, Joseph Smith. He never saw his position in the Twelve as requiring the same obedience to Brigham Young. Others made the transfer rather easily, seeing obedience to Smith and then Young as quite compatible and unidirectional. After the martyrdom, they came to see Young as the heir, deserving of the same kind of allegiance earlier granted to Joseph Smith. But Lyman Wight, his own man now that the Prophet was dead, did not intend to be clay in the hand of any potter named Brigham Young.<sup>45</sup> From the beginning Mormon missionaries had chastised those who readily accepted dead prophets (the Bible) but showed no willingness to listen to a living prophet (Joseph Smith). Ironically, in a way he would not have recognized, Wight was facing the same challenge.

I do not wish to claim that Brigham Young handled everything perfectly. What if he had responded with even greater magnanimity? A letter to Wight might have been worded something like this: "Dear fellow apostle. We follow with great interest your company and your colony. Any success you have we know has the sanction of our beloved brother Joseph. As you know, he instructed us to move to the Rocky Mountains. Your brethren of the Twelve are all with us. We should work in concert. We know you will rejoice in our successes, as we rejoice in yours. Keep us informed. Perhaps we can be of assistance. We remember the old days as we preached the gospel and faced the bullets in Missouri. Let us carry on the work."



Or, when it became obvious that Wight, not realizing that he had been dropped, attached supreme importance to the Council of Fifty, one might imagine an addendum: “We are enclosing a brief letter from Uncle John Smith, president of the Fifty.” Such a letter might well have instructed Wight to continue his efforts, to report on his activities to the church leadership in Salt Lake City, and perhaps, with the failures in Texas, to come to Utah.<sup>46</sup>

But on the whole Brigham Young deserves high marks. Of course he was irritated at Wight’s insistence on leading his colony to Texas, especially after sending a forthright appeal through Samuel Bent in 1845. But through the difficult years of 1845, 1846, 1847, and most of 1848 Young had patiently waited. He gave Wight the benefit of the doubt. Not knowing what was in Lyman’s mind, Young sought information through messengers, allowing Lyman full opportunity to express goodwill or loyalty. No such expression was forthcoming. Only when Lyman threw down the gauntlet by publishing his pamphlet, did Brigham take decisive action.

Even then efforts to win Lyman Wight back did not cease. He must have had visits from different Mormon missionaries and letters from his nephews in Utah. In 1855, he received and responded to a long letter from Sanford Porter.<sup>47</sup> In 1857–58 he exchanged letters with Wilford Woodruff.<sup>48</sup> Before he had received Woodruff’s second letter, he died.

If Brigham Young’s patience can be attributed to the advice of those close to him, he deserves credit for listening to them. It was especially Heber C. Kimball, Young’s close friend and counselor, who defended Wight as “noble hearted” and counseled patience. We do not have all the comments made about Lyman Wight, but thanks to the faithfulness of Wilford Woodruff in keeping a detailed journal we can eavesdrop on one conversation held in 1859. Wight had died the previous year, but the word may or may not have yet reached Utah. In any case, here is what Heber C. Kimball said: “I always believed Lyman Wight would be saved. I never had any but good feelings about him.”<sup>49</sup>

The parallel lives of Lyman Wight and Brigham Young are instructive in many ways. That their respective authority claims were ultimately incompatible seems clear enough, but just how early Wight locked himself into immovable opposition is more questionable. Some would define the problem as largely one of communication. Others would emphasize the personalities—the two strong egos that could not play on the same stage. I see tragedy in the blasted hopes of the wild ram. I also see a profound truth in Young’s succinct warning: “All that want to draw away a party from the church after them, let them do it if they can, but they will not prosper.”<sup>50</sup>

## Notes

1. See Jermy Benton Wight, *The Wild Ram of the Mountain: The Story of Lyman Wight* (Bedford, Wyo.: privately printed, 1996).

2. See Leonard J. Arrington, *Brigham Young: American Moses* (New York: Knopf, 1985).

3. On magnifying of the role of the Twelve, see R. Kent Fielding, “The Growth of the Mormon Church in Kirtland, Ohio” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1957), and especially Ronald K. Esplin, “The Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830–1841” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1981).

4. See Esplin, “Emergence of Brigham Young,” chaps. 7–9.



5. See James B. Allen, Ronald K. Esplin, and David J. Whittaker, *Men with a Mission, 1837–1841: The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in the British Isles* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992).
6. See Dennis Rowley, “The Mormon Experience in the Wisconsin Pineries, 1841–1845,” *BYU Studies* 32/1–2 (1992): 119–48.
7. See Andrew F. Ehat, “Joseph Smith’s Introduction of Temple Ordinances and the 1844 Mormon Succession Question” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1982), 102–3.
8. See Danel W. Bachman, “Plural Marriage before the Death of Joseph Smith” (master’s thesis, Purdue University, 1975).
9. See Ehat, “Joseph Smith’s Introduction of Temple Ordinances,” 194.
10. Arrington, *Brigham Young: American Moses*, 111.
11. *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal, 1833–1898*, typescript edition, ed. Scott G. Kenney (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983), 2:432 (28 July 1844).
12. Lyman Wight to Wilford Woodruff, 24 August 1857, as published in Ronald G. Watt, “A Dialogue between Wilford Woodruff and Lyman Wight,” *BYU Studies* 17/1 (1976): 108.
13. See *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 2:414.
14. See *History of the Church*, 7:228–42.
15. See *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 2:414–16.
16. *History of the Church*, 7:231n.
17. See Reid L. Harper, “The Mantle of Joseph: Creation of a Mormon Miracle,” *Journal of Mormon History* 22/2 (1996): 35–71. This sets forth some of the questions about the historicity of the event but, to my mind, presents the alternatives too starkly. The most comprehensive analysis is found in Lynne Watkins Jorgensen and *BYU Studies* staff, “The Mantle of the Prophet Joseph Passes to Brother Brigham: A Collective Spiritual Witness,” *BYU Studies* 36/4 (1996–97): 125–204.
18. *History of the Church*, 7:249.
19. *Journal History*, 18 August 1844. The *Journal History* is a compilation of primary sources maintained by the Historical Department, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.
20. *Journal History*, 24 August 1844. See also *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal*, 2:452 (24 August 1844): “It was thought best for Br Wight to go north with his company and not south.”
21. *Times and Seasons* 5 (15 September 1844): 647.
22. See *History of the Church*, 7:295–96.

23. Ibid., 301–2.
24. Watt, “A Dialogue,” 110.
25. *Journal of Discourses*, 8:173.
26. Phelps to William Smith, 25 December 1844, in *Times and Seasons* 5 (1 January 1845): 761.
27. See D. Michael Quinn, “The Council of Fifty and Its Members, 1844 to 1945,” *BYU Studies* 20/2 (1980): 196.
28. Ibid.
29. See *History of the Church*, 7:394.
30. Ibid., 392.
31. Thus begins the letter of the Twelve to Lyman Wight: “We the Council of the Twelve being assembled and having learned your present circumstances and situation and also your future calculations with regard to your journey west, cannot feel justified without giving you a word of counsel and advice together with some information relative to our present prospects.” Ibid., 400.
32. Ibid., 400–401.
33. Ibid., 459–60; *Times and Seasons* 6 (1 November 1845): 1009.
34. *History of the Church*, 7:460.
35. The successive settlements are traced in Wight, *The Wild Ram of the Mountains*, and, more concisely, in Davis Bitton, “Mormons in Texas: The Ill-fated Lyman Wight Colony, 1844–1858,” *Arizona and the West* 11/1 (1969): 5–26.
36. See George A. Smith to Parley P. Pratt, 31 October 1848, *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 14; Bitton, “Mormons in Texas,” 5–26. Wight’s son later said that his father had an addiction to opium. It could have been both. See also Davis Bitton, ed., *The Reminiscences and Civil War Letters of Levi Lamoni Wight* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1970), 85–86.
37. Lyman Wight, *An Address by Way of an Abridged Account and Journal of My Life from February 1844 up to April 1848 with an Appeal to the Latter Day Saints* (Austin, Texas: privately published, 1848), LDS Church Archives.
38. Orson Hyde, *To the Saints Scattered Abroad* [1 August 1848], LDS Church Archives.
39. See Pottawotomie High Council Conference Minutes, 7 October 1848, LDS Church Archives. See also *History of the Church*, 7:528.
40. Daniel H. Thomas, *Preston Thomas: His Life and Travels*, BYU Special Collections, 32.
41. This may be a good place to sort out the technicalities. Three actions involving Wight are potentially involved. Disfellowshipment is a discipline that allows one to retain church membership while being deprived of some of its

privileges. Excommunication is severance from church membership. Third was depriving him of the apostleship, which could be done while leaving him a member of the church.

Against that backdrop of possibilities, then, what did occur? At the October 1848 conference in Iowa, Lyman Wight was not sustained as an apostle, but this was a local reaction, inasmuch as Salt Lake City was the site of general conference. On 3 December 1848 in Salt Lake City he was “disfellowshipped,” but the term may not have been used with precision. Brigham Young’s manuscript history reads: “I attended public meeting in Great Salt Lake City on the 3rd when the hand of fellowship was withdrawn from Elders Lyman Wight and George Miller.” B. H. Roberts’s footnote states: “For his insubordination Lyman Wight was excommunicated from the church, the action being taken at Salt Lake City in 1848.” *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 2:436. In a later letter Wight wrote: “I soon learnt that I was cut off from the church but never learnt what it was for.” Wight to Wilford Woodruff, 24 August 1857, LDS Church Archives. In effect, then, the 3 December 1848 action was excommunication and was so understood by all concerned, including Wight when he heard about it. When a replacement apostle was installed and sustained on 12 February 1849, no separate defrocking action was required. Wight’s position in the Twelve had been vacated on 3 December 1848.

42. James R. Clark, ed., *Messages of the First Presidency* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965), 1:351. Compare the following: “You was cut off from the Church in the latter part of 1848, the subject was brought up on the receipt of a pamphlet which you published against the Authorities of the Church.” Wilford Woodruff to Lyman Wight, 30 June 1858, Historical Department Letterbooks, LDS Church Archives.

43. I have done this in preliminary fashion in Bitton, “Mormons in Texas,” and more extensively in an unpublished paper.

44. *History of the Church*, 2:110.

45. For a contrast, see Davis Bitton, “Heber C. Kimball’s Authoritarian Imagery,” in *Conference on the Language of the Mormons* (Provo, Utah: BYU Language Research Center, 1974), 2–5.

46. If such words seem unlikely in the real world of egocentric human beings, let us remember the beautiful balancing act performed by Joseph Smith in 1839. While effectively reprimanding Wight for his political statements published in the *Quincy Whig*, he carefully avoided wounding Lyman’s self-esteem. See Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 1:106–7.

47. See Lyman Wight to Sanford Porter, 7 December 1855, LDS Church Archives.

48. See Wilford Woodruff to Lyman Wight, 1 July 1857 and 30 June 1858, LDS Church Archives. See also Watt, “A Dialogue,” 108–13.

49. *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal*, 5:298 (23 February 1859).

50. *History of the Church*, 7:232.

# The Tomb of Joseph

Susan Easton Black

The writings of Richard Lloyd Anderson are an indispensable resource for scholars of church history. Although he will be remembered for authoring *Understanding Paul* (1983) and *Joseph Smith's New England Heritage* (1971), my personal favorite is *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses* (1981). In this Latter-day Saint classic Anderson leans on his Harvard Law School background (1954) to interrogate the Three Witnesses as if he were a prosecuting attorney and their testimony were in question. He is a master sleuth in ferreting out the truth from alleged statements made by Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris. As he cross-examines supporting documents “to get the whole story” he reminds the reader of the “courtroom oath: not only ‘tell the truth,’ but ‘the whole truth.’”<sup>1</sup> With dogged determination he examines “original manuscripts and then follow[s] [the Witnesses’] careers in civil records and newspapers of each county where they lived.”<sup>2</sup> It is not until he exhausts his sources and completes his interrogation that he concludes, “After years of working with their lives and their words, I am deeply convinced that their printed testimonies must be taken at face value.”<sup>3</sup>

For the past twenty years Richard Lloyd Anderson has been my colleague, neighbor, and friend. Our association leads me to conclude that his interest in ascertaining the truth has not abated. I present this article of discovery as my gift. In courtroom style the gift unfolds one layer at a time, beginning with the procession of the martyrs’ remains into the city of Nauvoo on 28 June 1844 and the “mock burial” one day later. The mystery unfolds as the bodies are secretly buried in the basement of the Nauvoo House and then exhumed—not once, but twice. Although reburied in different locations in Nauvoo, the bodies have never been interred in the tomb of Joseph, which was built for that purpose. The question that needs to be answered is “Where is the tomb?” Two sites have been identified and two answers tentatively reached. But the case of the tomb of Joseph is far from being solved.

## The Background

Since 1844 the events following the martyrdom of the Prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum have been exhaustively investigated. When the first official message reached Nauvoo, men had already gathered at the Mansion House to discuss rumors of the martyrdom stemming from Carthage. A subsequent message from Willard Richards admonished the Saints living in Nauvoo, “Be still, be patient, only let such friends as choose come here to see the bodies.”<sup>4</sup> Governor Thomas Ford, believing the Mormons would pillage Carthage, advised citizens of that small community “to disperse, as he expected the Mormons would be so exasperated that they would come and burn the town.”<sup>5</sup>

Retaliation was not the issue for most Latter-day Saints on 28 June 1844; however, Allen Stout’s journal entry may typify the anguish of some: “I there and then resolved in my mind that I would never let an opportunity slip unimproved of avenging their blood. . . . I knew not how to contain myself. . . . I feel like cutting [the murderers’] throats.”<sup>6</sup> The issue for the gentler Saint was lamentation and preparation for the return of the cortege to Nauvoo.

About 8:00 a.m. on Friday, 28 June, the remains of Joseph and Hyrum were placed in rough boxes, put into two wagons, and then covered with prairie hay, blankets, and bushes to protect them from the hot sun. A guard of eight soldiers led by Samuel H. Smith and accompanied by Willard Richards was detached to escort the remains to Nauvoo. Between 2:30 and 3:00 p.m. the procession had reached Nauvoo and was moving along Mulholland Street, where the assembled Nauvoo Legion, the city council, and thousands of mourners vented their sorrow.

Mary Rich witnessed the scene. “The inhabitants were all out in the streets, on the house tops and every where to see if they could get just a glimpse of him. But he was in a new wagon, which had no cover other than green bushes which had been laid over the top of the box. Hence, they could not see him.”<sup>7</sup>

The procession moved slowly into the city, passing by the unfinished Nauvoo Temple, where additional crowds had gathered. Sarah Leavitt observed, “Such mourning and lamentation was seldom ever heard on earth.”<sup>8</sup> George Morris penned, “Such a time of mourning I never witnessed, neither before nor since.”<sup>9</sup> Dan Jones descriptively wrote, “Oh, the sorrowful scene to be seen in Nauvoo that day! There has never been nor will there ever be anything like it; everyone sad along the streets, all the shops closed and every business forgotten.”<sup>10</sup>

The procession proceeded down Main Street to the Mansion House, where the bodies were taken into the dining room and the door closed. “As they drove around to the Mansion,” Mary Rich reported, “the people were almost frantic to get one little glimpse of him, but they were driven back by the marshal. The wagon was driven inside of the back gate and the gate was locked. No one was allowed in the yard except the guards and the Prophet’s special friends.”<sup>11</sup>

The eight to ten thousand Saints assembled near the Mansion House heard brief remarks from church leaders. Most remembered were the words of Dr. Richards, who “pledged his honor, and his life for their good conduct.” The people “with one united voice resolved to trust to the law for a remedy of such a high-handed assassination, and when that failed, to call upon God to avenge them of their wrongs.” Richards concluded, “O, Americans, weep, for the glory of freedom has departed!”<sup>12</sup> Those assembled were admonished to go home quietly and promised that beginning at 8:00 in the morning of 29 June 1844 the remains of the martyrs could be viewed by all.

Meanwhile, inside the Mansion House the bodies were washed by Dimick B. Huntington, William Marks, and William D. Huntington in preparation for the private and public viewing. Camphor-soaked cotton was placed in each gunshot wound and the bodies dressed in “fine plain drawers and shirt, white neckerchiefs, white cotton stockings and white shrouds.”<sup>13</sup>

After this had been accomplished, the bodies were viewed first by remaining family members. Their tears were “enough to rend the heart of an adamant,” wrote Vilate Kimball.<sup>14</sup> At 7:00 a.m. on Saturday, 29 June, the bodies were placed in white cambric-lined coffins covered with black velvet and fastened with brass nails. Over the face of each corpse was a lid, hung with brass hinges, that held a square of glass. At 8:00 a.m. the public viewing began. Sarah Rich reported, “Thousands came from all quarters to take a last look; and steamboats loaded with strangers came from Burlington, Quincy and many other places, to look upon their dead bodies.”<sup>15</sup> It was estimated that “over ten thousand persons visited the remains” from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., entering at the west door and exiting at the north door of the Mansion House.<sup>16</sup> “[The martyrs’] heads were placed to the north. As we came in at the door,” penned Mosiah Hancock, “we came to the feet of the Prophet Joseph, then passed up by his left side and around his head, then down by his right side. Next we turned to the right and came to the feet of Hyrum, then up by his left side and around his head and down by his right side, then we filed out of the other door.”<sup>17</sup>

“This afternoon the Bod[i]es of the Marters arived in town,” wrote Zina Jacobs, “I saw the lifeless speechless Bod[i]es of the [two] Marters for the testimony which they held. Little did my heart ever think that mine eyes should witness this awful seen [scene].”<sup>18</sup> Dan Jones wrote, “Each in his turn the thousands made their way forward, sad and desirous of having the last look at their dear brethren whose solemn counsels and heavenly

teaching had been music in their ears, lighting their paths and bringing joy to their hearts on numerous occasions.”<sup>19</sup> At 5:00â€p.m. the Mansion House was cleared of the mourners and the family was invited to make their final farewells.

The coffins were then concealed in a bedroom closet in the northeast corner of the Mansion.<sup>20</sup> Carefully placed into the awaiting hearse were rough pine boxes filled with bags of sand in place of the martyrs’ remains. When the mock funeral procession began, the cortege moved down Main Street, passed by the temple, and stopped at the burial vault. A “mock burial” was conducted inside the vault located just south of the temple. William W. Phelps preached the public funeral sermon near the temple.<sup>21</sup>

About midnight on 29 June, long after the mourners had retired, the coffins containing the bodies were taken from the Mansion House by Dimick B. Huntington, Edward Hunter, William D. Huntington, William Marks, Jonathan H. Homes, Gilbert Goldsmith, Alpheus Cutler, Lorenzo D. Wasson, and Philip B. Lewis. These men were guarded by James Emmet. They carried the coffins through the Mansion House garden, around the pump, and to the Nauvoo House.<sup>22</sup> The bodies were interred in the basement story of the uncompleted structure. After the burial the ground was flattened and covered with chips of wood, stone, and other rubbish to camouflage the site. That evening a violent rainstorm removed any trace of the burial.

### **Exhumation of the Bodies**

The bodies remained in the basement of the north wing of the Nauvoo House until fall 1844, when they were removed by Dimick B. Huntington, William D. Huntington, Jonathan H. Homes, and Gilbert Goldsmith at the request of Joseph’s wife Emma Smith. They were next interred near the Mississippi River, where they were “buried side by side.”<sup>23</sup> The location of this reburial was thirty-eight feet south and twenty feet west of the southwest corner of the Homestead, under the floor of a small shed called a “bee house” or “spring house.”<sup>24</sup> According to Samuel O. Bennion, they were buried deep in unmarked graves.<sup>25</sup>

After the death of Emma Smith in 1879 and the demolition of the bee house that had once sheltered the graves, conjecture arose over the exact location of the martyrs’ burial site.<sup>26</sup> Family members could not point with confidence to where the bodies were laid. Joseph Smith III reported, “I didn’t see the bodies buried. I saw them dig them up. I saw them take a knife and cut a lock of hair off of Joseph and give to Emma, but I didn’t follow over and watch them bury them.”<sup>27</sup> David Hyrum Smith, youngest son of Joseph Smith Jr., composed “The Unknown Grave”:

There’s an unknown grave in a green lowly spot,  
The form that it covers will ne’er be forgot.  
Where haven trees spread and the wild locusts wave  
Their fragrant white blooms over the unknown grave,  
Over the unknown grave.

\* \* \*

The prophet whose life was destroyed by his foes  
Sleeps now where no hand may disturb his repose,  
Till trumpets of God drown the notes of the wave  
And we see him arise from his unknown grave,  
God bless that unknown grave.<sup>28</sup>

When the waters of Lake Cooper threatened to flood the area where the graves were thought to be, leaders of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints decided to locate the bodies and remove them to higher ground and to place an appropriate monument over their graves. W. O. Hands was appointed to direct a small group of surveyors and engineers to search for the missing graves. They began digging on 9 January 1928, and on 16 January they found them. The remains of Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum, as well as those of Emma, were exhumed from their resting place. The remains were arranged in silk-lined wood boxes that were placed side-by-side seventeen feet north of where the bodies of Joseph and Hyrum had been exhumed. Then the bodies were reburied on Friday, 20 January 1928, and the graves were marked.

On 21 January 1928 Samuel O. Bennion, president of the Central States Mission, wrote to President Heber J. Grant and his counselors about the “exhuming of the bodies of the Prophet and his brother Hyrum.” In his letter he reported asking Frederick M. Smith, president of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, “Why didn’t you let the bodies of these men rest where they were?” In response, he was told, “[I] wanted to find out if the graves of these men were down by what was once called the Spring House.” President Bennion wrote, “It is my impression brethren that he had heard reports that Brigham Young took the bodies of Joseph and Hyrum to Utah and that he wanted to prove it untrue.” Bennion stated, “I could hardly keep the tears back.”<sup>29</sup>

In 1991, under the joint direction of leaders from the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, new tombstones marking their remains became the focus of a gardenlike cemetery near the Homestead in Nauvoo. On 4 August 1991 the newly renovated cemetery was dedicated by Wallace B. Smith, great-grandson of Joseph Smith and president of the RLDS Church. Elder M. Russell Ballard, a great-great-grandson of Hyrum Smith, represented the LDS Church.

## Joseph’s Tomb

The tomb of Joseph is not an untold story, but it is one that has been obscured by time. A few years before his tragic death, the Prophet built a limestone burial vault on the south side of the temple block and called it the “tomb of Joseph.” The first reference to the tomb in the *Personal Writings of Joseph Smith* appears on 23 August 1842, in reference to Joseph Smith Sr. The Prophet said of his deceased father, “Sacred to me is his dust and the spot where he is laid. Sacred to me is the tomb I have made to encircle o’er his head. Let the memory of my father eternally live.”<sup>30</sup>

Joseph Smith Sr. hadn’t been buried in the tomb, but it is apparent his son wanted him to be. “I will tell you what I want,” said the Prophet, “if tomorrow I shall be called to lie in yonder tomb. In the morning of the resurrection let me strike hands with my father, and cry, ‘My father,’ and he will say, ‘My son, my son,’ as soon as the rock rends and before we come out of our graves.”<sup>31</sup> Joseph Smith also said, “Let my father, Don Carlos, and Alvin, and children that I have buried be brought and laid in the tomb I have built. Let my mother, and my brethren, and my sisters be laid there also; and let it be called the tomb of Joseph, a descendant of Jacob; and when I die, let me be gathered to the tomb of my father.”<sup>32</sup>

John Taylor spoke of the tomb of Joseph in the Salt Lake Tabernacle in 1870:

I knew a man, whom many of you knew, who built a tomb for himself in the city of Nauvoo. His name was Joseph Smith, and many of you heard him say what I shall now relate. Said he, “I expect when the time of the resurrection comes to rise up in my tomb there, and strike hands with my brethren, with my father

and with my mother, and hail the day when we shall burst from the barriers of the tomb and awake to immortal life." Have you never heard him talk thus? I have.<sup>33</sup>

Brigham Young added his confirmation that Joseph Smith wanted to be buried in the tomb he had built south of the temple. "While Joseph was alive he said, 'If I am slain in battle or fall by the hands of my enemies I want my body brought to Nauvoo and laid in the tomb I have prepared.'"<sup>34</sup> It was Brigham's desire to carry out the Prophet's wish. He planned to place the remains of the martyrs in the tomb of Joseph before the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo. At general conference in October 1845, Brigham Young remarked, "Joseph once said, with outstretched arms, 'If I fall in battle in Missouri, I want you to bring my bones back, and deposit them in that sepulchre—I command you to do it in the name of the Lord.'"<sup>35</sup> Knowing that the Prophet's wishes to be buried in the tomb of Joseph had not been fulfilled, Young declared,

We are determined also to use every means in our power to do all that Joseph told us. And we will petition Sister Emma in the name of Israel's God, to let us deposit the remains of Joseph according as he commanded us. And if she will not consent to it, our garments are clear. Then when he awakes in the morning of the resurrection, he shall talk with [her], not with me; the sin shall be upon her head, not ours.<sup>36</sup>

The remains of the Prophet and Patriarch were never laid in the tomb. "The sepulchre was prepared for them but as yet they are not interred in there," penned Joseph Hovey.<sup>37</sup> The only known remains to be buried in the tomb were those of Caroline, wife of William Smith, on 24 May 1845. Orson Pratt preached a sermon at her funeral to a large assembly; the *History of the Church* tells us "her remains were deposited in the tomb of Joseph: she has left two children to mourn her loss."<sup>38</sup>

## Where Is the Tomb of Joseph?

The question is not whether there was a tomb, but where the tomb was located. In 1875 the *Deseret News* reported, "When the Mormons began to rear their gorgeous temple, two tombs of hewn stone were built on the west side of the edifice, one for Joseph Smith and the other for Sidney Rigdon. These vaults were both completed."<sup>39</sup> Ten years later, on 27 June 1885, church historian Franklin D. Richards wrote a letter to Eliza R. Snow reporting his visit to one tomb. "It was within my recollection that the Prophet Joseph had caused the building of a stone burial vault at the south side of the Temple block where were to be interred the bodies of his family. We sought out the spot and found the vault included within a building, where it is used for a wine cellar."<sup>40</sup>

The newspaper account reported two tombs on the west side of the temple, and Elder Richards reported one tomb south of the temple, which is consistent with early historical records (see fig. 1). However, the theory of a west tomb was revisited in the summer of 1973. Arlene Robinson of Provo, Utah, visited Nauvoo and contends that the tomb was on the west end of the temple block about six feet from the southwest corner of the temple foundation. She observed the demolition of a house on the southwest corner of the temple site and watched a bulldozer open up a large old wine cellar at the temple foundation. She climbed down into "the cellar, which had been cemented up for many years, and picked up some bits of pottery (post Mormon), until ordered out by NRI [Nauvoo Restoration, Inc.] officials." Within minutes the bulldozer broke into the cellar and covered it with dirt. "I didn't quite know what to think of the find, and its sudden end," wrote Arlene Robinson.



It was not until Robinson returned to Utah and read *Nauvoo the Beautiful*<sup>41</sup> that she learned that Brigham Young was upset with Emma Smith for refusing to let church authorities bury Joseph Smith in his tomb. She then mused,

I began to wonder if this might have been part of the tomb. The walls that I saw were obviously built of temple rubble, which would have made them post Mormon period, and not a possible tomb. However, there was such an accumulation of dirt on the floor, probably two to three feet deep, plus another two to three feet of rusty tin cans, that it was impossible to see what the lower levels of stone or the floor looked like, to see if they were polished stone, or more temple rubble.

Robinson concludes with a hope “that someday in the future the exact location of the tomb might be located. Until that time we can but wonder. Did [I] really enter the tomb of Joseph?”<sup>42</sup>

## **The Process of Discovery**

On 24 March 1995 I attended the weekly Religious Education Friday Faculty Forum at Brigham Young University and listened to Robert J. Matthews present a lecture on the funeral and burial of Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum. In his presentation he said, “You can walk over very holy ground and not even know it is holy. And you can walk right past sacred buildings and not even know they are sacred if you don’t know some of the history about them.” Near the end of his presentation he reminded his listeners that the Nauvoo “temple faced west. The tomb of Joseph would be . . . close to the front but on the south side.”<sup>43</sup>

One month later, in April 1995, I arrived in Nauvoo as a church service missionary for the spring and summer months. The words of Brother Matthews’s informative presentation kept returning to my mind. I began to look for caves, wine cellars, and, yes, even the tomb of Joseph. From the deacons in the Nauvoo Ward to the local history buff, Michael Trapp, I questioned all about caves, dugouts, and wine cellars. Despite an aversion to snakes, which often nestle in such secluded caverns, I began to visit the sites. I roamed from the caves in Warsaw that secreted fugitive slaves to the wine cellars built by the Icarians in Nauvoo, discrediting each one as being the possible tomb of Joseph.

However, one cave or wine cellar located a block south of the temple site was particularly compelling to me during my frequent visits throughout the summer (fig. 2, p. 74). It is found near the crest of the bluff, twenty feet off the road that intersects at Bluff and Ripley Street, lots eight and nine in block three of Kimball’s Addition in Nauvoo.<sup>44</sup> The cave begins where the bluff has a downward slope and faces north. It would have faced the Nauvoo Temple.

The measurements of the original cave cannot be exactly determined, since through the years the ceiling has eroded, creating a rubble effect. The arch or entrance to the cave is built against the hillside. The arched entrance is six feet across and nine feet in height. The arch is formed of sixteen stones equally divided by a keystone in the center. Above the keystone is a large flat stone that appears to have been engraved; however, I was unable to decipher any of the letters on it. Loose stones were placed around the arch. These stones differ from the stones in the arch in that they were not “fine” cut by stonecutters (see fig. 3).

The interior of the cave is approximately thirty-two feet in length, eighteen feet across, and twelve feet high. The cave has five ventilation holes, two on each side and one at the far end. These holes are an indication that the vault may have been used as a wine cellar (see fig. 4).

Before leaving Nauvoo, I took Robert L. Christensen, a missionary serving with Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., to the cave. Elder Christensen was called to be a missionary in Nauvoo because of his expertise in stone masonry. He had worked as a stone and brick masonry contractor in northern California for twenty-four years. For eight years he had served as the Licensing Deputy Registrar for the State of California responsible for issuing licenses to those who qualified to be stone and brick masonry contractors. I asked Elder Christensen to analyze the stones in the alleged tomb by comparing them with other structures in Nauvoo. On 16 September 1995 he responded to my request by letter and photographs.

One of the comparative structures examined by Elder Christensen was the stone arch bridge (see fig. 5), nearly hidden at Fisher's Point at the south edge of Nauvoo, which was built after the Mormon era to enable wagons to cross the drainage canal dug by the Mormons. Elder Christensen concludes that the limestones in the stone arch bridge were extracted from the local quarry. These stones differ from those used in the arch entrance of the alleged tomb in that they are "rough cut," meaning that they were not finished or polished such as those in the arch of the alleged tomb. "No attempt was made to smooth the surface like the stones placed in the arch of the alleged tomb," reports Christensen.<sup>45</sup>

The wine cellar located on Warsaw Street in Nauvoo (see fig. 6) was also analyzed by Elder Christensen. "Again the stone is salvaged from other stone work or was rubble from older buildings," he wrote. "It's very crude at best." It does not evidence the craftsmanship or artisan efforts at the alleged tomb.

Regarding the old wine cellars located on Fulmer and Winchester Streets in Nauvoo (figs. 7–8, p. 78), he wrote that the old stone ceilings inside the wine cellars were arched but that the entrances were rough cut. The front of each cellar appeared to be added later and was made of concrete. In his opinion, these were definitely wine cellars. Then he speaks of the alleged tomb: "It appears that there was a place above the keystone where an identification of some kind could have been etched."

Elder Christensen acknowledges in his letter, "I now have all the pictures I need to make my argument that the only stone work in any of the caves or cellars that appear[s] to be cut by the same caliber stone masons as the temple is the one we looked at. . . . This stone is cut and finished the same as the temple stones appear to be. It's cut and fit by stone masons as good as those who worked on the temple."<sup>46</sup>

After reading Elder Christensen's conclusion, I was heartened and began to research the possibility of having discovered the tomb of Joseph. I examined journal entries and historical documents and contacted residents of the brick home (205 Bluff Avenue) across the street from the site. Barb Bolton, who lives there with her husband, Rich, said, "We have been mowing the lawn in front of the cave for years. In exchange for mowing the lawn we can park our cars on the property [and] have a swing set and picnic table for our family." When asked about the cave and its origin, she replied that she was not familiar with its history. However, she did indicate that the cave needed repair, "The cave at the top is beginning to collapse. I worry that someone will go into the cave and get hurt."<sup>47</sup>

Holly Johnson at the Carthage County clerk's office said the property taxes were being paid by Henry M. Dethlessen, a sixty-seven-year-old California farmer.<sup>48</sup> When Mr. Dethlessen was asked about the origin of the cave, he said, "I have been back there once and saw the cave. I think it was built by the people that came after the Mormons." He explained that he was one of nine individuals who inherited the property after the passing of his uncle Fred Dethlessen. Fred Dethlessen had purchased portions of the site in July 1965, May 1968, and

November 1969 under the impression that Nauvoo was being rebuilt and one day his property would be worth a lot of money.<sup>49</sup>

I debated about publishing my findings until I received a phone call and a clarifying letter from Elder Robert Christensen on 10 June 1996: “This is the letter I said I’d write to clarify my final understanding of your or our belief in the location of the real tomb. I guess the light wasn’t right before, or it might be that our visitors have asked me to identify for them other buildings in Nauvoo that contained pieces of temple stone.”

He then explained, “The day I took our daughter Melissa’s in-laws, the Argyles, around, I clearly identified pieces of temple stone in the old jail” (see fig. 10). The old Nauvoo Jail is a structure composed of “stone salvaged from other buildings,” including the Nauvoo Temple. Christensen claims that this structure is a post-Mormon building. However, the stones that were once part of the Nauvoo Temple have an etching that is similar if not exact to the stones seen in the arch of the alleged tomb—“also the stone building on Young Street and other old buildings” (see fig. 11, p. 82).

I then went by to see our tomb in the existing light—saw the same design cut into the stone. I don’t think I even mentioned it before. The stones are dressed the same in the old cultural hall. The stone is dressed around the edge with lines or grooves for approximately 1 1/2 inches as a border. Then the center is pocked with sharp chisel teeth [with] a brush chisel. The old jail has pieces scattered around in it with the design on it. The tomb’s arch stones are dressed the same way. Most of it is almost gone. But in good light it can be seen like this [see fig. 12, p. 82]:

“This also, for sure means this stone was not temple rubble, recut for a wine cellar. . . . I think you’ll be sure when you see it up close.”<sup>50</sup>

## Conclusion

“A good frontier yarn should be obvious, but this one continues to be used by people who might know better.”<sup>51</sup> Elder Robert Christensen has been in the business of working with stone for nearly twenty-five years. I have been a professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University for nearly twenty years. We could just call our excitement “the follies of youth,” but both of us are too old for that. “Midlife crisis” isn’t apropos either to explain our enthusiasm for the discovery. Perhaps in my case, it is just a historian wanting to find something old, yet new.

The case of the tomb of Joseph has been presented. Known facts are clearly identified and a cave in Nauvoo awaits inspection (another possible site was destroyed in 1973). If the hypothesis proves true, does that suggest that the Prophet Joseph Smith and his family members—now numbering seventeen<sup>52</sup>—who are buried in the gardenlike cemetery near the Homestead, should be interred again? That would be presumptuous. But what it does suggest is the need for further discussion about the tomb of Joseph.

## Notes

1. Richard Lloyd Anderson, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981), 155 and 158.

2. *Ibid.*, xi.

3. Ibid, xii.
4. *History of the Church*, 6:625.
5. Ibid.
6. "Autobiography of Allen Joseph Stout," BYU Special Collections (hereafter BYU-S), 19.
7. "The Life of Mary Ann Rich: 1820—1912," BYU-S, 17.
8. "History of Sarah Studeviant Leavitt," BYU-S, 13.
9. "Autobiography of George Morris," BYU-S, 22.
10. "I shall ever remember my feelings," *Church News*, 24 June 1984, 11 (translated from the original Welsh by Dr. Ronald D. Dennis, BYU professor).
11. "Life of Mary Ann Rich," 17.
12. *History of the Church*, 6:626.
13. Ibid., 6:627.
14. Letter from Vilate Kimball to Heber C. Kimball, 30 June 1844, as cited in Ronald K. Esplin, "Life in Nauvoo, June 1844: Vilate Kimball's Martyrdom Letters," *BYU Studies* 19/2 (1979): 238.
15. "Journal of Sarah De Armon Pea Rich," BYU-S, 40.
16. *History of the Church*, 6:627.
17. "The Mosiah Hancock Journal," BYU-S, 29—30.
18. Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, "'All Things Move in Order in the City': The Nauvoo Diary of Zina Diantha Huntington Jacobs," *BYU Studies* 19/3 (1979): 293.
19. *Church News*, 24 June 1984.
20. Some historians contend that the bodies were concealed on the main floor of the Mansion House. See transcription of presentation by Robert J. Matthews given on 24 March 1995, at Religious Education Friday Faculty Forum at Brigham Young University (in author's possession). Some of the information shared by Matthews is credited to the research of LaMar C. Berrett.
21. William Phelps wrote an 1855 recollection of the sermon, which was reproduced in Richard Van Wagoner and Steven C. Walker, "The Joseph/Hyrum Smith Funeral Sermon," *BYU Studies* 23/1 (1983): 3—7.
22. The Nauvoo House was designed to be an L-shaped structure, with each wing being about 120 feet long and 40 feet wide. There were to have been seventy-five rooms in the building. Construction on the house began in 1841. The brickwork had been progressing so much by the summer of 1843 that \$12,000 had been spent to

purchase the lumber. However, by June 1844 the home was still not completed, and the last effort to do so was in 1845. When the city was abandoned in 1846, all work stopped. Lewis Bidamon was responsible for constructing the Riverside Mansion, the present Nauvoo House, using materials from the uncompleted structure. He began this project in 1869. It was purchased in 1909 by the RLDS Church.

23. *History of the Church*, 6:628.

24. “They call it a spring house, but that means there is a spring there and they say there’s not much evidence of water ever having been there. Some of them call it a root cellar and some of them call it a storage shed. We’ve got about five different names for it, but Bee House and Spring house are the ones it is called the most.” Matthews, 24 March 1995, 9.

25. See letter of Samuel O. Bennion, president of the Central States Mission, to President Heber J. Grant and his counselors, written on 21 January 1928 from Independence, Missouri (in author’s possession). A few of the deceased children of Joseph and Emma Smith were afterward removed and interred near the location.

26. Emma Smith’s remains were interred in a brick vault, south of the Old Homestead, alongside the concealed grave of her husband.

27. Matthews, 24 March 1995; Roger D. Launius, *Joseph Smith III, Pragmatic Prophet* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 39.

28. F. Mark McKiernan, “David H. Smith: A Son of the Prophet,” *BYU Studies* 18/2 (1978): 238, verses 1 and 4.

29. Letter from Bennion to Grant, 21 January 1928.

30. *Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 535.

31. *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 295; *History of the Church*, 5:361.

32. *Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, 536.

33. John Taylor, “How to Know the Things of God,” address given on 6 May 1870 in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, *Journal of Discourses*, 13:231; cf. 18:333.

34. *History of the Church*, 7:256.

35. *Times and Seasons* 6 (8 October 1844): 1014 ; *History of the Church*, 7:472.

36. *History of the Church*, 7:472–73.

37. “Autobiography of Joseph Grafton Hovey,” BYU-S, 22.

38. *History of the Church*, 7:418.

39. *Deseret Evening News*, 27 November 1875.

40. Franklin D. Richards, “A Tour of Historic Scenes,” *Contributor* 7/8 (May 1886): 300.

41. E. Cecil McGavin, *Nauvoo the Beautiful* (Salt Lake City: Stevens & Wallis, 1946).
42. Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., files located in vault of Family Land and Records Center, LDS Visitors' Center, Nauvoo, Ill.
43. Matthews, 24 March 1995, 2 and 15.
44. The deed for the properties is recorded in book 309, page 817, in the Carthage County clerk's record book. The parcel numbers for the properties are 01–36–000–760, 01–36–000–742, and 01–36–000–744.
45. Robert Christensen, telephone conversation with author, 2 November 1998.
46. Robert Christensen, letter to author, 16 September 1995.
47. Barb Bolton, telephone conversation with author, 10 September 1996.
48. Holly Johnson said that the property in question borders one of fifty parcels of property owned by Danny Kraus.
49. Henry Dethlessen, telephone conversation with author, 13 September 1996. Uncle Fred Dethlessen willed the property to nine heirs: Henry Dethlessen, his wife, and three of his children own 5/9 of the properties, and his cousin, who lives in the Bay Area, owns 4/9.
50. Robert Christensen, letter to author, 10 June 1996.
51. Anderson, *Investigating*, 160.
52. Joseph Smith Sr., Lucy Mack Smith, Hyrum Smith, Hyrum Smith Jr., Emma Hale Smith, Frederick G. W. Smith, Don Carlos Smith (stillborn son of Joseph and Emma Smith), Emmeline Griswold Smith, Evelyn Rebecca Smith, Joseph Arthur Smith, Samuel Harrison Smith, Mary Bailey Smith, Lucy B. Smith, Don Carlos Smith, Sophronia C. Smith, Caroline Grant Smith, and Robert Blashel Thompson. Also buried in the Smith Family Cemetery are Lewis Crum Bidamon, second husband of Emma Hale Smith, and the children of James and Sevilla Gifford, close friends of Emma Hale Smith and Joseph III: Wilbur W. Gifford, Celeste Gifford, Edwin James Gifford, and Maude A. Gifford.

# Words of Comfort: Funeral Sermons of the Prophet Joseph Smith

Donald Q. Cannon

Joseph Smith taught some of the most profound doctrines of the restoration in funeral sermons. While some eulogistic elements were present in these sermons, the major emphasis was on doctrinal exposition. Some of these sermons were delivered early in his career, but the majority given were in the latter part of his ministry. The compassion and tenderness of the Prophet Joseph Smith is also evident in these funeral addresses.

During his lifetime Joseph Smith probably attended dozens of funerals, but available historical evidence records that Joseph Smith preached only eleven funeral sermons. A written text is available for eight of those sermons. In addition, he also made retrospective comments about four individuals who had died. A complete chronological list of his sermons and comments is found in the appendix.<sup>1</sup>

Eight of Joseph Smith's eleven funeral sermons were preached in Nauvoo. In the early period of his ministry Joseph Smith preferred to have others give the sermons, whether general or funeral. Thus Sidney Rigdon and Oliver Cowdery delivered more sermons than Joseph Smith. The first public discourse of the church was given by Oliver Cowdery, but as Joseph Smith gained experience he began to deliver sermons more frequently. The number and frequency of his sermons increased in the Nauvoo era, and certainly his best-known funeral sermons were presented during the final year of his life.

Perhaps some of the content of his funeral sermons grew out of his life experience. Death was a frequent visitor at the Smith home, both during his childhood and his adult years. One thinks, for example, of the death of his brother Alvin while they were living in Palmyra. The untimely loss of Alvin, coupled with the pessimistic funeral sermon preached by the local clergyman, had a strong impact on Joseph and his family.<sup>2</sup> This bitter experience was followed by the loss of several of his own children.<sup>3</sup> During their married years Joseph and Emma experienced the deaths of six of their eleven children. The tragic loss of so many of his own children had a powerful influence upon the Prophet, which misfortune caused him to pay particular attention to the loss of children in death. These experiences with death and tragedy shaped Joseph Smith's personality in a very meaningful way. Through these life experiences he developed a sense of compassion, one of his dominant character traits.

Occasionally Joseph Smith made retrospective comments about people who had died; for instance, he received a revelation in 1836 regarding his brother Alvin. This revelation was later canonized and included in the Doctrine and Covenants. Relevant passages from section 137 follow:

The heavens were opened upon us, and I beheld the celestial kingdom of God, and the glory thereof, whether in the body or out I cannot tell.

I saw the transcendent beauty of the gate through which the heirs of that kingdom will enter, which was like unto circling flames of fire;

Also the blazing throne of God, whereon was seated the Father and the Son.

I saw the beautiful streets of that kingdom, which had the appearance of being paved with gold.

I saw Father Adam and Abraham; and my father and my mother; my brother Alvin, that has long since slept;

And marveled how it was that he had obtained an inheritance in that kingdom, seeing that he had departed this life before the Lord had set his hand to gather Israel the second time, and had not been baptized for the remission of his sins.

Thus came the voice of the Lord unto me, saying: All who have died without a knowledge of this gospel, who would have received it if they had been permitted to tarry, shall be heirs of the celestial kingdom of God. (D&C 137:1–7)

In August 1842 Joseph Smith described his brother Alvin and paid him this tribute, now recorded in the *History of the Church*.

Alvin, my oldest brother—I remember well the pangs of sorrow that swelled my youthful bosom and almost burst my tender heart when he died. He was the oldest and the noblest of my father’s family. He was one of the noblest of the sons of men. Shall his name not be recorded in this book [the Book of the Law of the Lord]?<sup>4</sup> Yes, Alvin, let it be had here and be handed down upon these sacred pages for ever and ever. In him there was no guile. He lived without spot from the time he was a child. From the time of his birth he never knew mirth. He was candid and sober and never would play; and minded his father and mother in toiling all day. He was one of the soberest of men, and when he died the angel of the Lord visited him in his last moments.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to retrospective comments, Joseph Smith also preached sermons at the time of death in a regular funeral service. Perhaps the earliest formal funeral sermon Joseph gave was in 1831 in Missouri. Soon after arriving in Missouri, Polly Knight, wife of Joseph Knight, died. Although she had been ill, she greatly desired to travel with the Saints to Missouri and be buried there. No text or record of the sermon is extant, but Joseph Smith preached her funeral sermon designating Polly Knight as “a worthy member.”<sup>6</sup>

The loss of fourteen members of the Zion’s Camp expedition in a cholera epidemic was especially painful for Joseph Smith. Later in the year he reported having a vision regarding the state of the victims of the cholera epidemic in Missouri. Concerning that vision the Prophet related: “I have seen those men who died of the cholera in our camp; and the Lord knows, if we get a mansion as bright as theirs, I ask no more.”<sup>7</sup>

During the next year, on 18 November 1835, Joseph Smith preached a funeral sermon in honor of Nathan Harris, the father of Preserved and Martin Harris. The Prophet taught on the subject of resurrection and reported that the audience was very attentive.<sup>8</sup>

In 1838, when David W. Patten died at the Battle of Crooked River, Joseph Smith did not preach a formal sermon but called at the Patten home and made an observation about the fallen hero. Pointing to the lifeless body, Joseph Smith said: “There lies a man that has done just as he said he would—he has laid down his life for his friends.”<sup>9</sup> During the same year the Prophet also preached a funeral sermon for James Marsh. George A. Robinson reported that the members of the audience were greatly edified on the occasion.<sup>10</sup>



As previously mentioned, most of the funeral sermons given by Joseph Smith were presented in Nauvoo. Not only do most of the sermons occur during this period, but it is also the time for which the best documentation exists in the form of texts or diary entries that contain some of the sermons that Joseph Smith delivered in Nauvoo.

The earliest known funeral sermon given by the Prophet in the Nauvoo era was given in honor of Seymour Brunson. On 10 August 1840 Brunson, a member of the Nauvoo High Council, died, and Joseph Smith spoke at his funeral five days later. On that occasion the Prophet spoke for the first time on the subject of baptism for the dead. Although no contemporary record of the sermon exists, Heber C. Kimball and Simon Baker did prepare reminiscent accounts. Baker's brief record of the sermon follows:

I was present at a discourse that the prophet Joseph delivered on baptism for the dead 15 August 1840. He read the greater part of the 15th chapter of Corinthians and remarked that the Gospel of Jesus Christ brought glad tidings of great joy, and then remarked that he saw a widow in that congregation that had a son who died without being baptized, and this widow in reading the sayings of Jesus "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven," and that not one jot nor tittle of the Savior's words should pass away, but all should be fulfilled. He then said that this widow should have glad tidings in that thing. He also said the apostle was talking to a people who understood baptism for the dead, for it was practiced among them. He went on to say that people could now act for their friends who had departed this life, and that the plan of salvation was calculated to save all who were willing to obey the requirements of the law of God. He went on and made a very beautiful discourse.<sup>11</sup>

Later that year Joseph Smith referred to the Brunson funeral sermon in this way:

I first mentioned the doctrine [of baptism for the dead] in public when preaching the funeral sermon of Brother Seymour Brunson; and have since then given general instructions in the Church on the subject. The Saints have the privilege of being baptized for those of their relatives who are dead, whom they believe would have embraced the Gospel, if they had been privileged with hearing it, and who have received the Gospel in the spirt [sic], through the instrumentality of those who have been commissioned to preach to them while in prison.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, the doctrine of baptism for the dead would speak comfort to the hearts and minds of many Saints who wondered about the fate of loved ones who had left mortality. This wonderful doctrine of the restoration explains that the gospel can be preached to those who departed this life without opportunity to hear the gospel. Further, it provides for vicarious ordinances, such as baptism, to be performed by caring descendants.

On 14 September 1840 Joseph Smith Sr. died. The funeral sermon was preached by Robert B. Thompson. The Prophet did not preach, but he prepared a eulogy, which was later published in the *History of the Church*.<sup>13</sup>

During July 1841 Joseph Smith joined Sidney Rigdon in preaching a "general funeral sermon" to the Saints in Nauvoo. No text or notes remain but Joseph commented: "I followed him, illustrating the subject of the resurrection by some familiar figures."<sup>14</sup> Their dual sermon was designed to comfort and instruct the Saints, especially those who had lost relatives through death.

In March of 1842 the Prophet delivered a powerful sermon on the subject of death and the resurrection. This address was a Sunday sermon, but it was partly a funeral discourse because Wilford Woodruff recorded that the body of a recently deceased child was in the congregation. Although Elder Woodruff did not identify the child, it

was probably the child of Windsor Lyon, likely his daughter Marian.<sup>15</sup> Joseph's concern and compassion is evident as he addressed the question of why infant children are taken from friends and family. This was a question he would take up on several other occasions—a subject that obviously concerned him. In this sermon he answered the question by explaining:

The Lord takes many away, even in infancy, that they may escape the envy of man, and the sorrows and evils of this present world; they were too pure, too lovely, to live on earth; therefore, if rightly considered, instead of mourning we have reason to rejoice as they are delivered from evil, and we shall soon have them again.<sup>16</sup>

On 7 April 1842 Ephraim Marks, son of President William Marks, died. Two days later Joseph preached a funeral sermon in honor of the young man. Among other sentiments, the Prophet said:

I never felt more solemn; it calls to mind the death of my oldest brother, Alvin, who died in New York, and my youngest brother, Don Carlos Smith, who died in Nauvoo. It has been hard for me to live on earth and see these young men upon whom we have leaned for support and comfort taken from us in the midst of their youth. Yes, it has been hard to be reconciled to these things. . . .

When we lose a near and dear friend, upon whom we have set our hearts, it should be a caution unto us not to set our affections too firmly upon others, knowing that they may in like manner be taken from us.

Our affections should be placed upon God and His work, more intensely than upon our fellow beings.<sup>17</sup>

About one year later, on 16 April 1843, Joseph Smith preached a funeral sermon in honor of Lorenzo Barnes, who had died in England while serving as a missionary. Joseph Smith said he would have felt better about the death of Elder Barnes if his body could have been brought back to Nauvoo. As it was, Lorenzo Barnes was buried in England. Joseph went on to teach that it is a great blessing to be buried among family and friends. He then expressed his earnest desire to be buried near his father, Joseph Smith Sr. He looked forward to being resurrected and taking his father by the hand on resurrection morning.<sup>18</sup>

On 13 August 1843 Joseph Smith stood before the Saints and preached a funeral sermon in memory of Judge Higbee. Elias Higbee had served as a lawyer and judge in Missouri and Illinois and was revered by the Saints. As the Prophet remarked: "We are called this morning to mourn the death of a just and good man—a great and mighty man."<sup>19</sup> Joseph went on to say that it would be tragic to lose a friend in death if we had no hope of ever seeing him again. Further, he said how serious it would be if we had no hope of the resurrection. However, in an expression of comfort, he stressed that we *do* have hope of resurrection and of seeing our dear friends again.<sup>20</sup>

Sometimes the Prophet used funeral sermons as a vehicle for teaching unique doctrines of the restoration. Such was clearly the case with the funeral sermon for Judge Higbee. He taught, for example, the doctrine of election. As Willard Richards reported Joseph Smith's remarks:

When a seal is put upon the father and mother, it secures their posterity, so that they cannot be lost, but will be saved by virtue of the covenant of their father and mother. . . .

The speaker continued to teach the doctrine of election and the sealing powers and principles, and spoke of the doctrine of election with the seed of Abraham, and the sealing of blessings upon his posterity, and

the sealing of the fathers and children, according to the declarations of the prophets. He then spoke of Judge Higbee in the world of spirits, and the blessings which he would obtain.<sup>21</sup>

At 2:00 on the afternoon of Monday, 9 October 1843, Joseph Smith spoke on the demise of James Adams. Like Judge Higbee, James Adams was a prominent and respected member of Nauvoo society. He was a probate court judge in Springfield, Illinois, who ran unsuccessfully for governor in 1834 and was also personally acquainted with Abraham Lincoln.

Joseph Smith's opening statement had a dramatic flair: "All men know that they must die. And it is important that we should understand the reasons and causes of our exposure to the vicissitudes of life and of death, and the designs and purposes of God in our coming into the world, our sufferings here, and our departure hence."<sup>22</sup>

After emphasizing how little we know about the premortal world and life after death, the Prophet set about the task of providing answers. Thus he said: "Reading the experience of others, or the revelation given to *them*, can never give *us* a comprehensive view of our condition and true relation to God. Knowledge of these things can only be obtained by experience through the ordinances of God set forth for that purpose. Could you gaze into heaven five minutes, you would know more than you would by reading all that ever was written on the subject."<sup>23</sup>

Elaborating on the heavenly nature of things, he explained:

The organization of the spiritual and heavenly worlds, and of spiritual and heavenly beings, was agreeable to the most perfect order and harmony: their limits and bounds were fixed irrevocably, and voluntarily subscribed to in their heavenly estate by themselves, and were by our first parents subscribed to upon the earth. Hence the importance of embracing and subscribing to principles of eternal truth by all men upon the earth that expect eternal life.<sup>24</sup>

Concerning the incompatibility of truth and error he proclaimed: "Concerning Brother James Adams, it should appear strange that so good and so great a man was hated. The deceased ought never to have had an enemy. But so it was. Wherever light shone, it stirred up darkness. Truth and error, good and evil cannot be reconciled."<sup>25</sup>

All of Joseph's Nauvoo funeral sermons were delivered outdoors, which was customary there. The Saints held their conference sessions outdoors. In fact, they did not build any meetinghouses in Nauvoo. Virtually all of their large public meetings were held outdoors in places called "groves." They held meetings in three different groves located on the edge of the bluff or in natural amphitheaters to the east, west, and south of the Nauvoo Temple.<sup>26</sup>

On the afternoon of Sunday, 7 April 1844, Joseph Smith delivered what has been called his greatest sermon,<sup>27</sup> the King Follett Discourse.<sup>28</sup> The Prophet Joseph Smith spoke in honor of King Follett, a member of the church who had died in an accident during the previous month. This sermon has been published more frequently than any other of Joseph Smith's speeches. As Joseph Smith spoke, three men made official notes, and one recorded the sermon on his own. The official recorders were Thomas Bullock, William Clayton, and Willard Richards. Wilford Woodruff made unofficial notes. Their original handwritten notes, held in the LDS Church Archives, are the source of the printed versions of the sermon.<sup>29</sup>

In his discourse, which lasted over two hours, the Prophet spoke concerning some 158 doctrinal subjects, including the character of God, the origin and destiny of man, the unpardonable sin, the resurrection, and Joseph

Smith's love for all men.<sup>30</sup> This sermon contained many unique Latter-day Saint doctrines. Several of the 158 topics he discussed are teachings that clearly distinguish Latter-day Saint doctrine from doctrines espoused by others. Some of these unique doctrines relate to God. In the King Follett Discourse, Joseph Smith stressed the importance of knowing God and having a correct understanding of him:

There are but very few beings in this world who understand rightly the character of God. If men do not comprehend the character of God, they do not comprehend their own character. They cannot comprehend anything that is past or that which is to come; they do not know—they do not understand their own relationship to God. The world knows and comprehends but little more than the brute beast. If a man knows nothing more than to eat, drink, sleep, arise, and not any more, and does not comprehend what any of the designs of Jehovah are, what better is he than the beast, for it comprehends the same things—it eats, drinks, sleeps, comprehends the present and knows nothing more about God or His existence. This is as much as we know, unless we are able to comprehend by the inspiration of Almighty God. And how are we to do it by any other way?

I want to go back, then, to the beginning that you may understand and so get you to lift your minds into a more lofty sphere and exalted standing than what the human mind generally understands. I want to ask this congregation—every man, woman, and child—to answer this question in their own heart: What kind of a being is God? Ask yourselves! I again repeat the question: What kind of a being is God? Does any man or woman know? Turn your thoughts in your hearts, and say, Have any of you seen Him? or communed with Him? Here is a question that will, peradventure, from this time henceforth occupy your attention while you live.<sup>31</sup>

Closely related to the admonition to learn about God is the challenge to become as God is. This task is expressed in the well-known saying: "As man now is, God once was; as God now is, man may be." It was Lorenzo Snow who coined this phrase, but he had learned the doctrine from Joseph Smith Sr. and the Prophet.<sup>32</sup>

Concerning the nature of God and mankind's potential, Joseph Smith taught:

What kind of a being was God in the beginning, before the world was? I will go back to the beginning to show you. I will tell you, so open your ears and eyes, all ye ends of the earth, and hear, for I am going to prove it to you with the Bible. I am going to tell you the designs of God for the human race, the relation the human family sustains with God, and why He interferes with the affairs of man. First, God Himself who sits enthroned in yonder heavens is a Man like unto one of yourselves—that is the great secret! If the veil were rent today and the great God that holds this world in its sphere and the planets in their orbit and who upholds all things by His power—if you were to see Him today, you would see Him in all the person, image, fashion, and very form of a man, like yourselves.

... Contemplate the saying that they will be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ. What is it? To inherit and enjoy the same glory, powers, and exaltation until you ascend a throne of eternal power and arrive at the station of a God, the same as those who have gone before. What did Jesus Christ do? "Why I do the same things that I saw my Father do when worlds came rolling into existence." Saw the Father do what? "I saw the Father work out His kingdom with fear and trembling and I am doing the same, too. When I get my kingdom, I will give it to the Father and it will add to and exalt His glory. He will take a higher exaltation and I will take His place and am also exalted, so that He obtains kingdom rolling upon kingdom."<sup>33</sup>

As the congregation listened they might have asked the question, how does one become a God? Joseph Smith put it very succinctly: “When you climb a ladder, you must begin at the bottom rung.”<sup>34</sup>

The King Follett Discourse contained much about knowledge. Joseph Smith put it this way: “knowledge saves a man.”<sup>35</sup> His succinct statement has been elaborated upon by subsequent church leaders. According to their statements, spiritual knowledge is of paramount importance. This key concept received full attention in Joseph Smith’s funeral sermons.

In the course of this long sermon Joseph Smith taught about the importance of tolerance. At one point he declared: “Meddle not with any man for his religion.”<sup>36</sup> Stressing the role of government in matters relating to tolerance, he affirmed: “All laws and government ought to tolerate and permit every man to enjoy his religion, whether right or wrong.”<sup>37</sup>

In the wide range of topics covered in his discourse, the Prophet also taught about hell. Focusing on a unique Latter-day Saint concept of hell he said:

A sinner has his own mind and his own mind damns him. He is damned by mortification and is his own condemner and tormenter. Hence the saying: They shall go into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. I have no fear of hell fire, that doesn’t exist, but the torment and disappointment of the mind of man is as exquisite as a lake burning with fire and brimstone—so is the torment of man.<sup>38</sup>

Still another distinctive teaching of Mormonism set forth in the King Follett Discourse is the concept of intelligence. An appropriate excerpt from the sermon reads: “The mind of man—the intelligent part—is as immortal as, and is coequal with, God Himself.”<sup>39</sup>

The intelligent part of man—or intelligence—is eternal, without beginning or end. Intelligence was not created. The relationship between intelligence and creation is crucial. According to Joseph Smith, creation out of nothing—creation *ex nihilo*—does not exist. Thus Latter-day Saints are able to clearly and logically explain creation as a process of organization of already existing matter.

Concerning the plan of salvation, Joseph Smith taught that it had its foundation in a heavenly council: “In the beginning, the head of the Gods called a council of the Gods; and they came together and concocted [prepared] a plan to create the world and people it.”<sup>40</sup>

The King Follett Discourse stands as a witness of the divine calling of Joseph Smith. Certainly it is the longest and most quoted funeral sermon of Joseph Smith. It does not stand alone, however. In the early years of his ministry and especially during the Nauvoo era, Joseph Smith provided words of comfort and consolation as he taught doctrinal truths to the Saints at the death of loved ones. The ideas in these sermons fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. They are a reflection of his life and calling. These funeral sermons, taken together, testify of the divine calling of Joseph Smith. They provide a sure witness of his role as prophet of the restoration.

#### **Appendix of Funeral Sermons and Comments by Joseph Smith Jr.**

<b>Sermon</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date of Delivery</b>
1. Polly Knight	Kaw Township, Missouri	7 August 1831
2. Nathan Harris	Kirtland, Ohio	18 November 1835
3. James Marsh	Far West, Missouri	9 May 1838

4. Seymour Brunson	Nauvoo, Illinois	15 August 1840
5. General Funeral Sermon	Nauvoo, Illinois	25 July 1841
6. Marian Windsor	Nauvoo, Illinois	20 March 1842
7. Ephraim Marks	Nauvoo, Illinois	7 April 1842
8. Lorenzo Barnes	Nauvoo, Illinois	16 April 1843
9. Elias Higbee	Nauvoo, Illinois	13 August 1843
10. James Adams	Nauvoo, Illinois	9 October 1843
11. King Follett	Nauvoo, Illinois	7 April 1844
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date of Death</b>
1. Alvin Smith	Palmyra, New York	November 1823 <sup>1</sup>
2. Zion's Camp Victims	Clay County, Missouri	June 1834 <sup>2</sup>
3. David W. Patten	Far West, Missouri	25 October 1838 <sup>3</sup>
4. Joseph Smith Sr.	Nauvoo, Illinois	14 September 1840 <sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Retrospective comments by the Prophet—21 January 1836 and 22 August 1842
  2. Retrospective comments by the Prophet—fall 1838
  3. Remarks given by the Prophet at the home of D. W. Patten
  4. Comments and eulogy written by the Prophet

## Notes

1. The figure of eleven funerals and four retrospective comments was derived from a search of the *History of the Church*; the major biographies of Joseph Smith; J. Christopher Conkling, *A Joseph Smith Chronology* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1979); and references from Larry E. Dahl and Donald Q. Cannon, eds., *The Teachings of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997).
2. See Donna Hill, *Joseph Smith: The First Mormon* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977), 60 n. 17.
3. LaMar C. Berrett, "Joseph, a Family Man," in *The Prophet Joseph: Essays on the Life and Mission of Joseph Smith*, ed. Larry C. Porter and Susan Easton Black (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988), 45.
4. See *History of the Church*, 5:124–25.
5. *Ibid.*, 126–27.
6. William G. Hartley, *"They Are My Friends": A History of the Joseph Knight Family, 1825–1850* (Provo, Utah: Grandin Book, 1986), 80.
7. Joseph Young, "History of the Organization of the Seventies," LDS Church Archives, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1; published in *History of the Church*, 2:181n. For a general study of Zion's Camp and the cholera experience, see Roger D. Launius, *Zion's Camp* (Independence, Mo.: Herald Publishing House, 1984).
8. See *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 89–90.
9. *History of the Church*, 3:175.

10. See *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 2:240.
11. *The Words of Joseph Smith*, ed. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980), 49.
12. *History of the Church*, 4:231.
13. See *ibid.*, 189–97.
14. *Ibid.*, 389.
15. See *ibid.*, 553; *Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 1833–1898 Typescript*, ed. Scott G. Kenney (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983), 2:159.
16. *History of the Church*, 4:553.
17. *Ibid.*, 587.
18. See *Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, 2:226–27.
19. *History of the Church*, 5:529.
20. *Ibid.*, 529–30.
21. *Ibid.*, 530–31.
22. *Ibid.*, 6:50.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*, 6:51.
25. *Ibid.*
26. See David E. and Della S. Miller, *Nauvoo: The City of Joseph* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1974), 70–71; James L. Kimball Jr., “Nauvoo Life, Worship,” *Church News*, section of the *Deseret News*, 1 May 1976, 16; and interview with T. Edgar Lyon, 5 December 1975.
27. Many students of Joseph Smith agree that the King Follett Discourse was his greatest sermon. See, for example, Preston Nibley, *Joseph Smith the Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1944), 503; Joseph Fielding McConkie, “A Historical Examination of the Views of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints on Four Distinctive Aspects of the Doctrine of Deity Taught by the Prophet Joseph Smith” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1968), 135; John J. Stewart, *Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Mercury, 1966), 207–8; George Q. Cannon, *Life of Joseph Smith, the Prophet* (1888; reprint, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1972), 479; Jay R. Lowe, “A Study of the General Conferences of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1901” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1972), 212. For a general study of the development of the King Follett Discourse, see Donald Q.

Cannon, "The King Follett Discourse: Joseph Smith's Greatest Sermon in Historical Perspective," *BYU Studies* 18/2 (1978): 179–92.

28. Some discrepancy exists in the early records on the spelling of the name *Follett*. Wilford Woodruff, Willard Richards, and William Clayton spelled it *Follet*, and Thomas Bullock spelled it *Follit*. Almost all the published accounts of the King Follett Discourse use the current spelling—Follett—which is the correct spelling, according to the Genealogical Department and members of the Follett family.

29. See Cannon, "Greatest Sermon," 182–83, especially nn. 18–21.

30. See Donald Q. Cannon and Larry E. Dahl, *The Prophet Joseph Smith's King Follett Discourse: A Six Column Comparison of Original Notes and Amalgamations* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1983). The number 158 comes from the author's count from the detailed index added to the original publication in 1998.

31. Cannon and Dahl, *King Follett Discourse*, 19–21. This quotation and several other following quotations are from the Larson version of the King Follett Discourse found in *BYU Studies* 18/2 (1978): 193–208.

32. *The Teachings of Lorenzo Snow*, comp. Clyde J. Williams (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1984), 1–2.

33. Cannon and Dahl, *King Follett Discourse*, 27, 33.

34. *Ibid.*, 35.

35. *Ibid.*, 61.

36. *Ibid.*, 25.

37. *Ibid.*

38. *Ibid.*, 63.

39. *Ibid.*, 49.

40. *Ibid.*, 43, parenthetical clarifications added by author.



# Richard Lloyd Anderson and Worldwide Church Growth

Richard O. Cowan

My first contact with the work of Richard Lloyd Anderson came when I had the privilege of serving a summer stake mission in Los Angeles as a high school youth. I was told about a remarkable new teaching outline that had been developed in the Northwestern States Mission and was encouraged to write for a copy. Presently I received in the mail a large envelope containing material in a black folder entitled “A Plan for Effective Missionary Work.” I was impressed with its persuasive use of scriptural passages to teach gospel concepts. Only in later years when I began studying recent Latter-day Saint history did I more fully appreciate the widespread impact of Anderson’s work.

## Earlier Antecedents

During the church’s earlier decades, door-to-door “tracting” had been the primary method by which missionaries contacted people. The object was to leave a religious tract at every home, hoping for a possible discussion later if individuals had any questions from their reading. Often weeks would go by without any apparent results from the missionaries’ efforts. Not surprisingly, several twentieth-century mission presidents compiled materials to help missionaries be more effective in their work.

Still, no organized missionary lesson plans were available. Many missionaries filled this vacuum by building their discussions around existing series of tracts. One popular series, “Rays of Living Light” by Charles W. Penrose, “presented the first principles of the gospel [but] with little mention of Joseph Smith and the restoration.” Another series, Elder Brigham H. Roberts’s “Why Mormonism?” gave more emphasis to “the message of the restoration.”<sup>1</sup>

Another publication in 1937 was destined to have a long-lasting impact on Latter-day Saint missionary work. LeGrand Richards, a future presiding bishop and member of the Council of the Twelve, concluded his presidency of the Southern States Mission by leaving a copy of *The Message of Mormonism* with each missionary. This outline was prepared to assist the missionaries in their study and presentations of the gospel in a systematic and logical manner. In twenty-four weekly topics, a missionary could cover the restoration and basic doctrines of the gospel. Under each topic President Richards outlined key scriptures, listed tracts or other available reading matter, and suggested questions that should be answered in the discussion. The “major emphasis” was on teaching the gospel; “little mention was made of the need for the investigator to accept baptism at the hands of the elders.”<sup>2</sup>

During the next several years many other missions adopted this plan. Repeated requests for copies eventually led Elder Richards to enlarge his material and to publish it in book form under the title *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*. This became one of the most popular Latter-day Saint doctrinal works of the twentieth century.

## The “Anderson Plan”

Following the close of World War II, the church’s full-time missionary force soared from 477 in 1945 to 2,244 a year later. This meant that there were many new missionaries in the field who lacked experience and who could profit from some assistance and direction. To help meet this need, various mission presidents compiled guidelines and suggestions that were distributed among their own missionaries and often in adjoining missions. Without question, the most widely circulated postwar proselyting outline was that prepared by Richard L. Anderson.

Elder Anderson built on foundations others had laid. As a youth he was impressed by accounts of his father's missionary experiences in Missouri at the time of World War I. The father and his missionary companion had challenged each other to memorize one hundred scriptures. After accomplishing this significant goal, Elder Lloyd Anderson had an opportunity to employ his newly acquired arsenal while preaching on a street corner. After the discourse a bystander remarked: "I never have heard a person quote so many scriptures—and less said." Still, hearing this comment would kindle in young Richard a love for the scriptures.

Richard L. Anderson enlisted in the Navy during World War II. While stationed at Jacksonville, Florida, he enjoyed going out with the local missionaries. It was at this time that he met and was profoundly impressed by Reid E. Bankhead, an ensign who was also at the Jacksonville naval base. Bankhead gave a series of fireside lectures on topics commonly discussed by the missionaries. Anderson was impressed with Bankhead's ability to select key conversion topics and to present the scriptures effectively. This experience reinforced young Anderson's determination to hone his own skills in using the scriptures to teach the gospel. While in the service, Anderson visited with many other missionaries to see what they were doing successfully. As he gathered this added perspective, the major features of his own future method took shape.<sup>3</sup>

In the fall of 1946, one year after the war ended, young Elder Anderson arrived in the Northwestern States Mission. He was now determined to build on the teaching concepts he had worked out while in the military service.

Under this program, rather than merely handing out tracts at the door, the missionaries' objective was to get inside the homes in order to present their message. "We would better understand our purpose in tracting if we termed it personal contacting," Elder Anderson explained. "The Lord tells us to *preach* the gospel. *Passing out literature is not effective tracting—the object is to get inside.*"<sup>4</sup>

Another key feature gleaned from others' experiences was emphasis on the Book of Mormon as a powerful teaching tool and key to conversion. Placing copies was a specific goal of the initial contact. "If the Book of Mormon is explained in a clear and distinct way," Anderson affirmed, "any honest person should want to read it."<sup>5</sup> Fourteen doctrinal discussions, beginning with two on the Book of Mormon, were arranged in a logical sequence to bring conversion.

The plan emphasized the need to secure commitments as teaching progressed. The first major feature in each lesson was "Agreement to be reached."<sup>6</sup> "*One topic should not be left until agreement is reached; it is pointless to ever hand out information without definite commitment on the part of the investigator.*"<sup>7</sup>

The main body of each lesson was entitled "Material to discuss."<sup>8</sup> Emphasis was on a logical analysis of relevant scriptures. Open and direct questions allowed the investigator "to decide what each scripture meant, and then . . . to express his frank opinion after sufficient proof was presented." Questions were designed to foster commitment and belief.<sup>9</sup> "*Arouse the prospect to active thinking and definite reaction on each point.*"<sup>10</sup> No dialogue was provided, but missionaries were to get the logical sequence of topics in mind and then present the material in their own words. They were urged to memorize scriptures. "*Don't let a day go by that you don't memorize at least one passage.*"<sup>11</sup>

A selection from the first discussion, on the Book of Mormon, illustrates the plan's structure and flavor:

*Gen. 49:1, 8–10.* Jacob prophesies what will befall each tribe. Judah receives the blessing of kingship—he will be the political leader. The point of reading this passage is to make clear the difference in the blessings given these two most important tribes, Judah and Joseph. (1 Ch. 5:2 will often help here.) *Gen. 49:22, 23 v. 26.* What does the word “progenitors” mean? Who are Joseph’s progenitors? They inherited the definite area known as Palestine. If Joseph’s blessing prevails above their blessing, will he inherit a land of greater scope and extent?<sup>12</sup>

Still, a key step was missing. During his first missionary assignment, at Bend, Oregon, Elder Anderson observed that though the people appeared to believe what was being taught, something more was needed “to get them out of their front rooms into church meetings.” Anderson wrote to his old friend, Reid Bankhead, who shared a baptismal challenge worked out by a missionary companion, Glen Pearson. Inserting this discussion brought dramatic results.<sup>13</sup>

Elder Anderson’s mission president, Joel Richards, had a background in the insurance business. He felt that his call to preside over the mission was divinely inspired, and he sensed an urgency to apply what he had learned in the business world. As he rode the train from Utah to mission headquarters in Portland, he pondered how missionary work could be structured to become more effective. Upon his arrival, he was excited to learn about what Elder Anderson and his companion were doing in Bend.

“Sister Richards and I feel that [this] Missionary Plan has come in direct answer to prayer,” the new president later wrote, “and that Elder Richard L. Anderson was inspired in its preparation. Since receiving our call to preside over the Northwestern States Mission, we were very much concerned as to how we could best help the missionaries in their study and preparation, and in presenting the Gospel in a logical and convincing manner so as to actually get results. We talked about it and prayed about it and just couldn’t get it off our minds. When we arrived in the mission field,” President Richards continued, “we saw Elder Anderson in action and achieving outstanding success, having baptized over thirty converts within a year. As we studied his method we were convinced that it was the answer to our prayer.”

President Richards assigned Elder Anderson to teach his methods to missionaries in Corvallis, one of the larger districts, to see if the results would be the same. After three months “the results were so startling and the missionaries so enthusiastic,” the “Anderson Plan,” as it was coming to be called, was introduced throughout the mission in mid-1948.<sup>14</sup>

As these improved methods were adopted throughout the mission, the results were apparent. While during the first half of 1948 the mission had baptized only 158, the number of converts during the second half of that year soared to 384. In comparison to only 48 baptisms during the first three months of 1948 there were 225 during the same period a year later.<sup>15</sup> Within the mission the number of converts per missionary climbed from 1.87 in 1946 to 5.72 in 1949. In this latter year the Northwestern States Mission baptized 1,001 converts, thus becoming the first mission in modern times to exceed one thousand baptisms during a single year.<sup>16</sup> President Richards also noted some other benefits: “In holding missionary conferences and reading the weekly reports and letters, it is most gratifying to see the change that has taken place in the morale of our missionaries. They are enthusiastic about their work because they are making progress and getting results. . . . ‘Nothing succeeds like success,’” he concluded, “and the missionaries, seeing the fruits of their labours, were eager to find more contacts and hold more cottage meetings in order that they might have more converts, and this all led to more hours tracting and spent in proselyting time.” President Richards gratefully acknowledged that “This rejuvenation and change in

morale was felt throughout the entire mission, and a common expression among our missionaries was: ‘Oh, if we had only had this plan when we first came into the mission field, how much more we could have accomplished!’”<sup>17</sup>

The impact of Elder Anderson’s innovations was not limited to the Northwestern States Mission. As other missions heard about the success achieved through these improved methods, they requested copies of the plan. Although Elder Anderson’s materials were first published in 1949, by early 1951, “eleven thousand copies of this guide for missionary work have now been published, and requests for it have come from all over the world.”<sup>18</sup>

Statistics reflect the churchwide impact of the Anderson Plan. During the postwar years 1946 to 1950 the number of convert baptisms had grown from 2,600 to 9,000, but the number of missionaries had also been growing. Hence the annual number of converts per missionary remained relatively static, between 1.84 and 1.95—approximately the same level at which this figure had languished during the previous quarter of a century. By 1951 the Anderson Plan was being adopted by a growing number of missions worldwide. In that year, even though the Korean War almost halted growth in the number of missionaries, total converts shot up to over 13,500 and the number of converts per missionary rose to 2.71.

## Subsequent Developments

In wake of the Anderson Plan’s widespread success, the church decided to publish a plan of its own to be used in all missions. Gordon B. Hinckley, executive secretary of the General Missionary Committee, interviewed the individuals who had helped develop the various postwar proselyting programs.<sup>19</sup> Richard L. Anderson was impressed with the openness of his interview and with the intelligent questions Hinckley asked.<sup>20</sup> The first of these plans published officially by the church appeared in 1952. *A Systematic Program for Teaching the Gospel* built on the foundations laid by the Anderson Plan but condensed the missionaries’ presentation into only seven discussions. The plan’s preface explained:

Experience has shown that it is not always necessary to take people through an extended series of lessons before they become converted to the Church. Agreement may be gained on . . . fundamental doctrines in a relatively short time through a logical presentation of gospel principles, fortified by scripture, together with reading, convincing testimony, and sincere prayer.<sup>21</sup>

There was less emphasis on logic and proofs and more on the force of the missionaries’ testimony.

The lessons were written in dialogue form, but the missionaries were encouraged to give them from their hearts and to use their own words as they gained experience. Another innovation was the recommendation that the missionaries sit with the family around a table and draw simple diagrams on a sheet of paper.

In 1961 church leaders convened the first worldwide seminar for mission presidents. Under the leadership of the General Authorities the mission presidents pooled their experience in refining proselyting methods. The result was a new missionary plan, *A Uniform System for Teaching Investigators*. Using President David O. McKay’s slogan of “Every Member a Missionary,” stress was placed on the Saints’ role in finding and fellowshipping potential converts. Church members were admonished to lead exemplary lives that would win the respect of others and open the way for gospel discussions. For some time the referral system, in which the Saints gave names of interested friends to the missionaries, had proved successful. Now the Saints were encouraged to invite nonmembers into their homes for “group meetings” to hear the missionaries’ message. This method proved even

more successful and had at least two important advantages: Missionaries could use their time much more efficiently, concentrating on teaching rather than finding contacts. Then, the same families who first introduced nonmembers to the missionaries could later help these friends make the transition from one way of life to another and often from one circle of friends to another. This plan's six lessons continued to build on principles developed in the Anderson Plan—emphasis on the scriptures, thoughtful questions, and obtaining commitments.

A new missionary outline that appeared in 1973 reflected the growing emphasis on the family. *The Uniform System for Teaching Families* suggested that missionaries might introduce the gospel by working with nonmember parents in presenting family home evenings. The remainder of the seven proselyting discussions presented the same basic principles that were emphasized in previous missionary plans. One significant innovation was citing scriptures from the Book of Mormon as well as from the Bible—representing a further development of the Anderson Plan's emphasis on the Book of Mormon's converting power.

In 1985 the church made further refinements in the teaching process. *The Uniform System for Teaching the Gospel* in its six discussions provided some dialogue, instructions to missionaries, and scriptural resources.

The church has experienced remarkable growth during the past half century. In 1947, the year after Richard L. Anderson entered the Northwestern States Mission, the church's membership passed the one million mark. In 1997 the church passed the ten-million milestone. Most of this growth has come from convert baptisms resulting from missionary work. Elder Anderson was the first to insist that thousands of missionaries deserve the credit for this remarkable progress. Paraphrasing the words of Paul (1 Corinthians 3:6), Richard humbly acknowledged: "Others and I may have planted, many others watered, but certainly God gave the increase."<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, at the beginning of this era of unprecedented worldwide expansion, the Anderson Plan laid important foundations on which subsequent missionary programs have built. These improved methods, in turn, have played a key role in enabling the latter-day kingdom of God to fulfill the destiny foreseen by the ancient prophet Daniel—to roll forth and fill the whole earth.

## Notes

1. Jay E. Jensen, "Proselyting Techniques of Mormon Missionaries" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974), 74.

2. Ibid., 76.

3. Richard L. Anderson interview by author, 26 February 1997.

4. Richard L. Anderson, *A Plan for Effective Missionary Work: Prepared and Used by Northwestern States Mission* (Portland, Ore.: Northwestern States Mission, 1951), 3, emphasis in original in all quotations.

5. Ibid.

6. See, for example, *ibid.*, 11.

7. *Ibid.*, 10.

8. See, for example, *ibid.*, 11.

9. Jensen, "Proselyting Techniques," 78–79.
10. Anderson, *Plan for Effective Missionary Work*, 8.
11. *Ibid.*, 9.
12. *Ibid.*, 13.
13. Anderson interview.
14. Joel Richards, introduction to *A Plan for Effective Missionary Work*, comp. Richard L. Anderson (Kaysville, Utah: Inland, 1954), 5.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Compiled from Annual Mission Reports, ms., LDS Church Archives.
17. Richards, "Introduction," 5.
18. Anderson, *Plan for Effective Missionary Work*, i.
19. See Sheri L. Dew, *Go Forward with Faith: The Biography of Gordon B. Hinckley* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), 144.
20. Anderson interview.
21. *A Systematic Program for Teaching the Gospel* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1953), 6.
22. Anderson interview.

# The Return of Oliver Cowdery

Scott H. Faulring

On Sunday, 12 November 1848, apostle Orson Hyde, president of the Quorum of the Twelve and the church's presiding official at Kanesville-Council Bluffs, stepped into the cool waters of Mosquito Creek<sup>1</sup> near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and took Mormonism's estranged Second Elder by the hand to rebaptize him. Sometime shortly after that, Elder Hyde laid hands on Oliver's head, confirming him back into church membership and reordaining him an elder in the Melchizedek Priesthood.<sup>2</sup> Cowdery's rebaptism culminated six years of desire on his part and protracted efforts encouraged by the Mormon leadership to bring about his sought-after, eagerly anticipated reconciliation. Cowdery, renowned as one of the Three Witnesses to the Book of Mormon, corecipient of restored priesthood power, and a founding member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, had spent ten and a half years outside the church after his April 1838 excommunication.

Oliver Cowdery wanted reaffiliation with the church he helped organize. His penitent yearnings to reassociate with the Saints were evident from his personal letters and actions as early as 1842. Oliver understood the necessity of rebaptism. By subjecting himself to rebaptism by Elder Hyde, Cowdery acknowledged the priesthood keys and authority held by the First Presidency under Brigham Young and the Twelve.

Oliver Cowdery's tenure as Second Elder and Associate President ended abruptly when he decided not to appear and defend himself against misconduct charges at the 12 April 1838, Far West, Missouri, high council hearing.<sup>3</sup> Instead, Oliver sent a terse letter in which he elaborated on his differences of opinion "on some Church regulations." In this defensive communiqué, Oliver implored Bishop Edward Partridge and the council to "take no view of the foregoing remarks, other than my belief on the *outward government* of this Church."<sup>4</sup> President Cowdery regretted that differences existed, but he explained that he was not willing to be dictated to in his temporal business affairs or have his civil liberties abused by those who, he believed, were aspiring for position. The Far West High Council, unsympathetic to Oliver Cowdery's views, sustained six of the nine charges against him, and he was promptly excommunicated.<sup>5</sup> That his disparities were mainly bureaucratic versus theocratic is supported by Thomas B. Marsh's chance meeting of Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer later that summer. Marsh, by then himself a defector from the Mormon fold, asked the two witnesses if they still held to the beliefs as proclaimed in their published Book of Mormon testimony. Marsh recalled that both David and Oliver answered emphatically, "Yes."<sup>6</sup>

The first encouraging news about Oliver Cowdery after his disaffection came to Nauvoo in a letter written to Joseph Smith from an unidentified church member in Kirtland. Laura Pitkin, a resident of Nauvoo, shared news gleaned from this Kirtland letter in the postscript of her letter to Heber C. Kimball. Pitkin observed: "Brother Joseph received a letter from Kirtland last week. Martin Harris has come [back] into the church. Oliver Cowd[e]ry is very friendly and they have properous times in that place."<sup>7</sup>

No official action was taken to replace Oliver Cowdery as Associate President until 24 January 1841. In Joseph Smith's first public revelation after being liberated from his Missouri imprisonment, reasons for a reorganization were explained, required in part because of the expulsion of Oliver Cowdery. Hyrum Smith, the Prophet's older brother, was called to fill the office of church patriarch, replacing Father Smith, who had died four months earlier. In addition, Hyrum was called to fill the vacancy left by Cowdery as Associate President and given the "same blessing, and glory, and honor, and priesthood, and gifts of the priesthood" once held by Cowdery (D&C 124:95).

Since Oliver had defected and isolated himself from the church, it is presumed that he was not notified of the change.

After leaving Missouri in the fall of 1838, Oliver Cowdery returned to Kirtland, settling close to his non-Mormon brother, Lyman. In early 1840, Oliver was admitted to the Ohio bar as an attorney. He practiced law in Kirtland with Lyman for a short time. Cowdery moved in the fall of 1840 to Tiffin, a town in northwestern Ohio, where he continued as a lawyer.<sup>8</sup> For the next seven years, Tiffin was Cowdery's home.

By December 1842, four and a half years after he had been excommunicated, Cowdery was visited at least three times by his devoted friend and brother-in-law Phineas H. Young. Phineas, who had been away from Nauvoo for five months, was accompanied by Franklin D. Richards and had been sent to Cincinnati to preside over the church in the southern district of Ohio.<sup>9</sup> While laboring in Ohio, Phineas called on Oliver. It is unclear whether Elder Young was specifically directed by church leaders to contact Oliver Cowdery or whether he did so on his own initiative. Nonetheless, these visits were the first steps taken to redeem Cowdery from estrangement. Phineas, married to Oliver's half-sister Lucy, started the momentum that would, six years later, result in Oliver's reinstatement. Reporting that Oliver was alive and well, Phineas wrote his brother Brigham and the Twelve informing them that Oliver's "heart is still with his old friends."<sup>10</sup>

Phineas expressed his conviction that the disenfranchised Second Elder would willingly gather with the Saints in Nauvoo if only Brother Joseph understood Oliver's side of the controversy that led to his (Cowdery's) dismissal from Far West. Always Oliver's staunchest supporter and ever the sympathetic observer, Phineas believed that his brother-in-law had been unjustly driven out by jealous, conspiring elders. He expressed his opinion that men such as Sidney Rigdon, Thomas Marsh, George Hinkle, George Robinson, and others, nurturing ulterior motives, testified against President Cowdery and gave Joseph Smith prejudicial information. Oliver, feeling outnumbered, believed that defending himself against these biased witnesses was futile.

Phineas's December 1842 correspondence with the Twelve clarified several issues raised during Oliver Cowdery's high council hearing four years earlier. Cowdery contradicted persistent reports of his supposed claim that if he left the church, it would collapse. Phineas reported that Oliver never harbored such a pretentious attitude, that such an arrogant disposition never entered the Second Elder's heart. In addition, Oliver had concerns that promissory notes he once held against Brigham Young and others, which were paid off or settled, had been turned over to Oliver Granger for delivery to the parties concerned. Somehow these obligations were sold or given to Granger's son Gilbert for collection. The fraudulent use of these notes caused Cowdery "great anxiety" because he felt personally responsible for their proper and lawful disposition. These and other issues had not been resolved, and Cowdery felt that they tarnished his reputation and wanted them settled.

Near the end of 1842, although involved with his legal practice in Tiffin, Oliver volunteered to leave home to help prepare a legal defense for Elder John Snyder. Leader of a company of British Mormon converts, Snyder was arrested for mutiny in New Orleans.<sup>11</sup> Cowdery was ready, with the authorization<sup>11</sup> of the Nauvoo High Council, to go with Phineas to New Orleans. Phineas assured Brigham and Joseph Smith's secretary, Willard Richards, that "I am satisfied [Oliver] has no sinister motives in the above proposition, as he is crowded with business continually." It is unlikely that the Twelve responded to Cowdery's offer since Elder Snyder was released from jail by the second week of January 1843.<sup>12</sup>



William W. Phelps, one of the Prophet's personal secretaries and himself a recently reclaimed elder, wrote to Cowdery in March 1843.<sup>13</sup> This was the earliest recorded written contact by a church representative with Oliver since his defection. For unexplained reasons, Oliver viewed Phelps's letter as a "strange . . . epistle." He told Phineas that Phelps did not request a reply but he planned to write him back anyhow.<sup>14</sup> A week later, Cowdery changed his mind, explaining that since Phelps did not specifically ask for an answer, "I have not written him in return."<sup>15</sup>

During the summer of 1843, Oliver received word from his brother Lyman that Phineas had returned to Kirtland. He looked forward to a visit from his esteemed brother-in-law. Cowdery thought about going to Kirtland, but referred to the difficulty in leaving a professional business to be "absent a few weeks when one has numerous competitors." Oliver bragged that his legal practice was increasing steadily and that nothing stood in his way except his previous involvement with Mormonism. He anguished over this intolerance:

Were it not for this, I believe I could rise to the height of my ambition. But, shame on the man, or men, who are so beneath themselves, as to make this a barrier. My God has sustained me, and is able still to sustain me—and through his own mysterious providence to lift me above all my foes. With his dealings I will be content.<sup>16</sup>

Cowdery was unaware that months earlier, on 19 April, during a routine Wednesday afternoon meeting, Joseph Smith instructed the Twelve to invite their former colleague back into church fellowship and service. According to Willard Richards, keeper of the Prophet's journal, Joseph directed: "Write to Oliver Cowdery and ask him if he has not eat[en] husks long enough, if he is not most ready to return [be clothed with robes of righteousness], and go up to Jerusalem. Orson Hyde hath need of him."<sup>17</sup> Richards noted that the Twelve immediately drafted a letter that was "signed by the members of the Quorum present." In their invitational epistle, addressed specifically to Oliver as one of the Three Witnesses of the Book of Mormon, the Twelve observed:

We thought perhaps our old, long esteemed friend might by this time have felt his lonely, solitary situation; might feel that he was a stranger in a strange land, and had wandered long enough from his Father's house and that he might have a disposition to return. If this is the case, all that we have got to say is, your *brethren* are ready to receive you; we are not your enemies, but your brethren. Your dwelling place you know ought to be in Zion—your labor might be needed in Jerusalem, and you ought to be the servant of the living God.<sup>18</sup>

The Twelve told Oliver that they would be "happy to have an answer from you to let us know your feeling" and asked him to respond to quorum president Brigham Young at Nauvoo.

This invitation to return, although composed, signed, and dated April 1843, for unexplained reasons, was not mailed until December. In August, Phineas Young, aware of the invitation, told Oliver about the Twelve's dispatch. Oliver replied: "You say 'the Twelve' say they have written me. I have received nothing from them." Cowdery reminded Phineas that the only communication he had received from church leaders was the "strange unmeaning letter from my old friend Phelps last spring."<sup>19</sup> Finally, on 20 December, Oliver received the Twelve's epistle, which he noted had a 10 December Nauvoo postmark.

Despite the letter's delay, Oliver took time Christmas day to respond. He admitted his confusion over the detained letter but assumed that "feelings of friendship and kindness therein expressed are the same *now*, as then."<sup>20</sup> Accepting the Twelve's epistle as a "friendly letter," Cowdery reciprocated their cordial sentiments by asserting

that he held “no unkindly feelings” toward them. He readily admitted the truth of their observation that he lived a “lonely, solitary situation—a stranger in a strange land” and confessed that it “is true, strictly true.” Oliver wrote:

It has been a long time, nearly six years—the winds and waves, floods and storms, have been arrayed to oppose me; and I need hardly say to you, that the Lord alone has upheld me, till I have fought up, labored up, and struggled up, to a fair reputation and a fair business in my present profession.<sup>21</sup>

Cowdery longed to put the strife associated with his June 1838 departure from Far West behind him. The situation, he explained, was “painful to reflect on.” In a genuine spirit of reconciliation, Oliver offered his personal interpretation of the circumstances leading to his dismissal. He observed candidly:

I believed at the time, and still believe, that ambitious and wicked men, envying the harmony existing between myself and the first elders of the church, and hoping to get into some other men’s birthright, by falsehoods the most foul and wicked, caused *all this difficulty from beginning to end*. They succeeded in getting myself out of the church; but since they themselves have gone to perdition, ought not old friends—long tried in the furnace of affliction, to be friends still?<sup>22</sup>

Oliver also told Brigham and the other members of the Twelve that he did not believe any of them had contributed to his removal and thus could speak freely with them about returning.<sup>23</sup> In his reply to the Twelve’s invitation, Oliver mentioned a “certain publication,” signed by some eighty-three church members then living in Missouri, charging him and others with conspiring with outlaws.<sup>24</sup> Cowdery emphatically denied such a vile indictment. He conceded that he had not seen the offending declaration but had heard of its existence and the accusations made in it.

Six months later, near noon on that tragic 27 June, the Prophet Joseph Smith, while incarcerated in Carthage Jail, was visited by Almon W. Babbitt. During his stay with the Prophet, Babbitt read a communication received recently from Oliver Cowdery.<sup>25</sup> Although the letter has been lost and its specific contents remain unknown, it can be presumed from Oliver’s recent optimistic overtures that his was a congenial letter.<sup>26</sup>

Cowdery’s reaction to news of Joseph’s murder was captured in a statement by William Lang, a Tiffin, Ohio, attorney who studied law under Oliver’s supervision. Lang reported:

[Joseph] Smith was killed while [Oliver] C[owdery] lived here. I well remember the effect upon his countenance when he read the news in my presence. He immediately took the paper over to his house to read to his wife. On his return to the office we had a long conversation on the subject, and I was surprised to hear him speak with so much kindness of a man that had so wronged him as Smith had. It elevated him greatly in my already high esteem, and proved to me more than ever the nobility of his nature.<sup>27</sup>

Phineas Young, traveling east on another mission, spent four days in November 1844 with Cowdery at his home in Tiffin. Soon afterwards, Phineas wrote to Brigham. He conveyed that “[Oliver] sends love to you and all old friends,” adding parenthetically that Oliver “sees the folly of Sidney [Rigdon]’s course.”<sup>28</sup> In a further attempt to reclaim Oliver Cowdery, Phineas told his brother, “There are many things I want to say . . . therefore I will write somewhat to you on a certain subject that I wish you to disclose to no one, but ponder the same in your heart.” With this in mind, Phineas asked Brigham to reflect

back on the days of sorrow witnessed by our beloved Prophet and his old friend O[liver] Cowdery. Watch their prayers and tears, consider their feelings and friendship for each other, see them in Colesville in their weakness, remember them in Jackson [County], Missouri, in Kirtland, Ohio, all was peace, all was love. Did they ever quarrel? No. Did they ever forsake each other? No. What was the difficulty?<sup>29</sup>

Phineas blamed Thomas B. Marsh and others at Far West in 1838 with conspiracy in driving Oliver Cowdery out of the church by charging him with apostasy, forgery, and theft. George W. Robinson, Rigdon's son-in-law, was singled out as having driven Oliver from his home in June 1838.<sup>30</sup> Phineas insisted that if the charges "were placed on the heads of those apostates" (that is, Marsh, Robinson, and others), then Oliver Cowdery would admit his shortcomings, make amends for his weaknesses, and rejoin the Saints. Phineas encouraged Brigham to publish a statement in the church's Nauvoo periodical, the *Times and Seasons*, explaining "to the Saints and to the world that these charges were false and instigated by false brethren."<sup>31</sup> Cowdery anticipated returning as a useful, productive member of the church. He believed that he would not be considered a credible witness of the early events of the restoration without a statement clearing him of the Missouri charges. Brigham, preoccupied with the mounting pressure from apostates and antagonistic non-Mormons that would eventually force the Saints to flee Nauvoo, did not respond to his brother's appeal.

Nearly a year later, in October 1845, during another visit from Phineas, Oliver wrote again to Brigham Young. Once more, he offered his legal and personal services to the church. This time the matter was the Saints' anticipated departure from Nauvoo and surrounding areas and their journey west into Mexican territory. While together in Tiffin, Oliver and Phineas discussed the probability of the church needing to send out an "exploring company" to find a less-hostile, uninhabited gathering location. Cowdery sensed the strong national desire to push America's borders farther west to the Pacific and recognized how it could be combined with the Latter-day Saints' need to find refuge in either the uninhabited Rocky Mountains or upper California. He proposed traveling to Washington, D.C., to visit President Polk and other national leaders about dispatching a Mormon colonizing party and, as he said, "if favorably received, ask aid." Oliver, fearing he would be perceived as ambitious or scheming for a leadership position, explained: "I only wish to say, that should you determine on a removal to the west, and wish me to see President Polk, and others as I have stated, you will signify such a wish, and any aid I can render you, will be cheerfully done, as I have said to Brother Phineas."<sup>32</sup>

Brigham Young directed his clerk, W. W. Phelps, to respond to Cowdery's generous but unsolicited offer. In early December, Phelps, in a succinct letter, expressed President Young's current attitude toward federal assistance in their westward trek: "We have concluded to let this rotten government alone, and shall not petition at Washington."<sup>33</sup> It appears that after many frustrating years during which the Saints unsuccessfully sought redress from the national government for their privations in Missouri, the governing Quorum of Twelve had all but lost confidence in the integrity of the federal government and did not want to enter into any entangling agreements with it. This antigovernment assistance stance mellowed by January 1846 when Brigham Young sent his representative, Jesse Little, to Washington seeking President Polk's support for the Saints' offer to construct blockhouses and bridges and enlist Mormon military recruits in exchange for government support in their exodus west.<sup>34</sup>

Also in Phelps's reply was a renewed invitation for Oliver to rejoin with the Saints and go west. Phelps, addressing himself as "your old associate," entreated his former coeditor of the *Evening and the Morning Star*, "As to our Exodus, if you believe that we are *Israel*, come on and go with us and we will do you good, for the Spirit says come, and your friends say come, and let him that is athirst say come, with all things ready."<sup>35</sup>

Oliver Cowdery accepted Phelps's epistle as friendly and thanked him for writing, but commented to Phineas that the letter from Phelps was "very short" and "very different from what I had anticipated." Confiding with Phineas, Oliver shared his prolonged concern that the old Missouri difficulties had not been resolved, and until they were, he felt unable to return to full fellowship. In a tone reflecting both frustration and conciliation, he wrote to Phineas:

I think some times, that my frequent letters to you on the subject of, what I have so often expressed anxiety upon, has led you to believe me officious and overanxious; and though I have often been disappointed, there is notwithstanding, an act of justice due to me, not only for my own, but for the sake and character of my friends and relatives; and particularly those who are yet in the Church. So far as others are concerned, they care nothing about it. Indeed, I sometimes think, they wish it never to be given, as that may effectually prevent my return. You know my feelings fully on this subject—you will present them to Bro. Brigham—tell him I am more and more anxious that matters be settled—the sooner the better, of course.<sup>36</sup>

In spite of Cowdery's distress, his name was not immediately cleared nor was his reputation cleansed of the offending charges.

During the spring of 1846, Oliver's frustration peaked over a letter he received from Orson Hyde. Cowdery wrote that he did not fully understand the purpose of Hyde's epistle, admitting that he either misunderstood or was "[in] spirit misconceived by me."<sup>37</sup> Although Orson Hyde's letter is not extant, we do know from a letter he sent to Brigham Young in early March 1846 that he believed the ongoing efforts to reclaim Cowdery would eventually pay off. Elder Hyde informed President Young that he had put down those who were advocating Strangism and Pagism; he then mentioned the return of the prodigal Luke Johnson and boldly predicted "Oliver will come next."<sup>38</sup>

Again the former Associate President, in a letter to his brother-in-law, emphasized his anxiety for his reputation. Cowdery mentioned: "I have only sought, and only asked, that my character might stand exonerated from those charges which imputed to me the crimes of theft, forgery, &c. Those which all my former associates knew to be false." In making this statement, Oliver was not expecting to be excused from admitting any real shortcomings or wrongs. He readily admitted he had many faults. In what has become Cowdery's most impassioned plea, one focused on his desire to be considered a credible witness of the early restoration to future generations, he wrote:

I have cherished a hope, and that one of my fondest, that I might leave such a character, as those who might believe in my testimony, after I should be called hence, might do so, not only for the sake of the truth, but might not blush for the private character of the man who bore that testimony. I have been sensitive on this subject, I admit; but I ought to be so—you would be, under the circumstances, had you stood in the presence of John, with our departed Brother Joseph, to receive the Lesser Priesthood—and in the presence of Peter, to receive the Greater, and looked down through time, and witnessed the effects these two must produce,—you would feel what you have never felt, were wicked men conspiring to lessen the effects of your testimony on man, after you should have gone to your long sought rest.<sup>39</sup>

Oliver expressed his confidence that "no unjust imputation will be suffered to remain upon my character" and "I am fully, doubly, satisfied, that all will be right—that my character will be fully vindicated."<sup>40</sup> Having eloquently expressed his concerns, Oliver did not mention the "character" issue again in any of his letters.

Phineas, in a letter written between 5 and 9 March, discussed with Oliver the subject of “2nd Eldership, Counsellorship” and noticed the upcoming church conference on 6 April. This caused Oliver to reminisce about the organization of the church of Christ on 6 April 1830. He wrote: “Brother Phineas, [if] I could be with you, and tell you about the 6th of April, 1830, when but six members only belonged [to] the Church, and how we looked forward to a future, I should gladly, but I cannot—only in spirit—but in spirit I shall be with you.”<sup>41</sup> From this and other comments one senses a yearning on Cowdery’s part to once again be personally involved in and associated with the church. In this March 1846 letter, Oliver expressed his intention to get out of debt so that he could move west with the Saints. He told his friend Phineas that “The situation of my family is such, that it is not possible for me to come with them, this Spring; but I want to be prepared at the earliest moment.” Cowdery concluded this touching letter with his blessing: “M[ay] the Lord God of our Father’s bless you, and yours—and the Church, as a body. Such is my prayer—such is my heart. I am yours in the new and everlasting covenant.” As with previous letters written during this period, Oliver asked that the contents of his letter remain confidential with the Twelve.

Sometime in July, Oliver Cowdery received a letter from Phebe Jackson, his other half-sister. In her communiqué, she confided to her brother the emotional distress she felt concerning the trials and tribulations anticipated in the trek west. She also expressed personal anxiety with the emerging practice of plural marriage among the Saints. Oliver, evidently uninformed by Phineas about the continuance of polygamy at Nauvoo, wrote an emotional reply to Phebe and her husband, Daniel. A brief excerpt reads,

Now, brother Daniel and Sister Phebe, what will you do? Has Sister Phebe written us the truth? . . . I can hardly think it possible, that you have written us the truth, that though there may be individuals who are guilty of the iniquities spoken of—yet no such practice can be preached or adhered to, as a public doctrine.<sup>42</sup>

Cowdery’s response to this news is intriguing. He spoke from personal experience when he pointed out the imprudence of plural marriage as a “public doctrine.” Recorded in historical records are credible witnesses to the fact that Oliver himself was involved in and censured for an unauthorized polygamous relationship during the church’s stay in Kirtland, Ohio, during the 1830s.<sup>43</sup> In this period, Joseph Smith married his first plural wife—Fanny Alger.<sup>44</sup> It is unclear why Cowdery, on his own authority, felt the need to take an additional wife. By 1835, the Mormon Church was being publicly “reproached” for the “crime” of polygamy. In Oliver’s carefully worded “Article on Marriage,” which first appeared in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, a public statement was made defending the church against immoral conduct. In this article, polygamy was renounced and monogamy declared to be the belief of the church. Later in Missouri, one charge preferred against Cowdery was that he accused Joseph Smith of adultery.<sup>45</sup> Two years after this emotionally charged social issue was brought to his attention in 1846, during his lengthy private conversations with Elders Orson Hyde and George A. Smith at Kanesville in October—November 1848, Oliver was evidently brought up-to-date on the Nauvoo-era application of the plural-marriage doctrine.

Also, in his response to Phebe and Daniel, Oliver said that his emigration with the church depended on circumstances. He did not elaborate on what those situations might be, but his struggles with plural marriage, exhausted finances, and ever-fragile health were relevant concerns. Yet in spite of these concerns, Cowdery was convinced that going west offered a most hopeful prospect. To Phebe and her husband, Oliver wrote optimistically, “So far as going west is concerned, I have thought it a wise move—indeed, I could see no other; and though the journey is long, and attended with toil, yet a bright future has been seen in the distance.”<sup>46</sup>

Later, in November 1846, Oliver answered a letter received “a long time since” from Phineas. Cowdery was uncertain his brother-in-law would get the letter given the “confusion and difficulty then existing at Nauvoo.” He had been anxiously waiting for answers to specific questions asked in his last letters. It is possible that Oliver was referring to inquiries he had made about the Saints’ living the doctrine of plural marriage. Preoccupied with his frail health and desiring to better himself professionally, Oliver announced to Phineas that he was selling his Tiffin law practice and moving in the spring.<sup>47</sup>

Sometime between late November and mid-December 1846, Oliver Cowdery traveled to Washington, D.C., where he visited his political contacts. Before departing for Washington, he wrote to Phineas and asked him to find out if the church leaders wanted information that might be of help to them in their westward migration. Noting that the then-raging war with Mexico would afford an opportune diversion for the church, Oliver offered his unsolicited advice for handling the politically sensitive situation of wintering on federal lands set aside specifically for the Indians. He explained, “[I] have made the foregoing suggestions out of the deep feelings of my soul, and because the welfare of that church, the foundations of which my own hands helped to lay, is constantly near my thoughts.”<sup>48</sup> Cowdery’s mid-November letter received notice during a council meeting on 22 December 1846. Brigham Young’s history reports, “A favorable letter from O. Cowdery to Phineas H. Young was read.”<sup>49</sup>

At this point, efforts by the church leaders to facilitate Oliver Cowdery’s anticipated reconciliation with the church went into limbo for nearly a year. Several reasons exist for the delay. First, the church leaders’ attention and the church’s resources were focused on supplying and organizing for the forced westward movement of thousands of Saints. Second, Oliver had not received the expected exoneration from the false charges made against him at Far West, Missouri, in 1838 along with the associated restoration of his reputation. Third, Cowdery did not have sufficient means to outfit a wagon and team for a pioneer trek. Fourth, the Saints’ immediate future was uncertain and Oliver, already suffering physically and financially, hoped to rejoin and live with the Saints under less life-threatening conditions.<sup>50</sup> During this interlude, Oliver kept busy as a lawyer. For several months, he was temporary editor of the *Seneca Advertiser* while his editor friend, John Breslin, attended to state political responsibilities at Columbus, Ohio.<sup>51</sup> The Mormon leaders, scattered across the Midwestern plains, turned their focus toward the impending exodus of the scattered Saints from the state of Iowa and Nebraska territory.

By mid-February 1847, Cowdery wrote again to Phineas. He was deeply concerned because he had not heard from his revered brother-in-law or other relatives in some time. Oliver confided, “For no day passes without our thoughts being turned towards our relatives and once loved friends, who are toiling and struggling in the far-off wilderness, during a cold pitiless winter.”<sup>52</sup> Reporting on his recent trip to Washington, Oliver informed Phineas that from his personal conversations with his political contacts and the information he gathered, no one in authority at the federal district planned to give the displaced Latter-day Saints any difficulty with their settling temporarily upon Indians’ territorial land. As expected, the executive and legislative leaders in Washington were preoccupied by the ongoing war with Mexico. Oliver pointed out that he perceived a feeling of sympathy in the nation’s capital toward the uprooted Saints.<sup>53</sup> Although Cowdery asked to be remembered to his former associates, including Brigham Young, Luke Johnson, and William W. Phelps, he did not discuss rejoining the Saints that spring.

Oliver left Tiffin, Ohio, in April 1847 and went to Wisconsin to explore immediate career options there and to be close to his brother Lyman, who had moved there the previous fall. Oliver saw the Wisconsin Territory, on the threshold of statehood, as a land of interim opportunity. He hoped that southern Wisconsin’s climate would be better suited to his fragile health and that a developing economy would possibly improve his struggling law

practice. He settled in southern Wisconsin, at Elkhorn, less than twenty miles from the Illinois state line. Oliver's later actions suggest that he was purposefully positioning himself closer to the Iowa exodus camps of the Saints. Within two months of his arrival, brothers Oliver and Lyman were again working together as attorneys.

During the last week of July, William E. McLellin arrived in southern Wisconsin to talk with Oliver Cowdery. McLellin, one of the original latter-day apostles called in 1835, became disillusioned and left the church in 1836. In the summer of 1847, he was traveling west from his home in Kirtland attempting to "prepare the way for the old ship to unhitch her cables and again sail forth" by gathering the Three Witnesses into his faction.<sup>54</sup> McLellin came to Wisconsin specifically to meet with and possibly persuade the unaffiliated former Second Elder to join his movement.<sup>55</sup> Cowdery received him as a "mutual friend and former co-laborer." During a "lengthy conversation,"<sup>56</sup> they discussed their personal views of priesthood authority and the future of the church restored through the efforts of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery in 1830. Oliver made no commitments to McLellin. He simply discussed his religious opinions with McLellin and then they parted after a two-day visit.

Prompted by McLellin's visit, Oliver penned a confidential dispatch to his brother-in-law David Whitmer. Cowdery candidly expressed to his fellow Book of Mormon witness his opinion that the church was "lying to" or inactive "either for want of pilots or hands to work her." He tersely dismissed Sidney Rigdon and James Strang as uninspired men who were not called by God to lead the church after Joseph Smith was "meanly and unlawfully murdered." As for the Twelve's claim to succession, Cowdery was more open-minded. He considered, "[They] have perhaps not as a matter of choice at first, but of necessity taken such as would adhere to them and fled to the western slope of our continent." In this private letter, Oliver expressed his conviction that he still held the priesthood keys and authority conferred on Joseph Smith and him beginning in 1829. He readily admitted that he did not know whether the Lord would again call David and him to "work in his great cause." As before, Oliver's concern for reputation and character resurfaced. He explained that,

If ever the church rises again in true holiness, it must arise in a measure *upon our testimony*, and *upon our characters as good men*. Such being the case, . . . some one should step forward—capable and worthy, who knew us well, and whose heart the Lord should or has touched, whose duty and office should be to vindicate our characters, and disabuse the minds of the honest of those prejudices which they do and would otherwise labor under. All this must be done without solicitation on our part. And it is expedient it should be done by [some]one who has known us from the beginning.<sup>57</sup>

To his trusted relative, Oliver declared his willingness, when circumstances were appropriate, to be involved again in the building up of the Lord's kingdom. In the letter's conclusion, Cowdery summarized his heartfelt feelings about his involvement in the latter-day work, "I will only say that when *the time comes*, I am ready! But I am not persuaded that it has yet fully come. Let the Lord vindicate our characters, and cause our testimony to shine, and then will men be saved in his kingdom."<sup>58</sup>

Five weeks after parting with Oliver in Wisconsin, McLellin, while visiting John and David Whitmer in Missouri, obtained a copy of Cowdery's personal letter to David Whitmer along with Whitmer's private response.<sup>59</sup> Eight months later, back in Kirtland, McLellin, without permission from either Cowdery or Whitmer, published the letters in the May 1848 issue of his *Ensign of Liberty*.

In October 1847, Hiram Page, Oliver's wife's brother-in-law and one of the Eight Witnesses to the Book of Mormon, contacted Oliver Cowdery. Page was also estranged from the church. He advised Oliver not to commit



to any Mormon reaffiliation until they (i.e., Page, the Whitmers, and Cowdery) could counsel together. Probably because Cowdery could afford neither the time nor the expense in traveling to Missouri for a meeting, he did not respond to Page's invitation. Whatever his reasons for not replying, within six months Oliver wrote to David Whitmer encouraging him to meet at Council Bluffs so they could settle their differences with the Latter-day Saint Church led by Brigham Young.<sup>60</sup>

By late November 1847, just before the reorganization of the First Presidency, Brigham Young, writing collectively for the Twelve, renewed contact with Oliver Cowdery through his brother Phineas. This epistle from the Twelve was actually written in late November but not dispatched until Christmas 1847, shortly after the reorganization of the presidency, and was hand-carried to Oliver by Phineas. In it Oliver was questioned about his declared interest in the "salvation of Israel in these last days," asked about the testimony that he previously bore with "unshaken confidence," and again invited to be rebaptized. The Twelve's invitation was typically straightforward, yet filled with compassion. They wrote:

[We] say to you in the Spirit of Jesus, . . . come for all things are now ready and the Spirit and the Bride say come, and return to our Father's house, from whence thou hast wandered, and partake of the fatted calf and sup and be filled, and again be adorned with the Jewels of Salvation, and be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace, by putting your hand in Elder [Phineas] Young's and walking straightway into the Waters of Baptism, and receiving the laying on of his hands and the office of an Elder, and go forth with him and proclaim repentance unto this generation and renew thy testimony to the Truth of the Book of Mormon with a loud voice and faithful heart.<sup>61</sup>

Oliver was offered the assurance that the Saints "will with open arms hail thee as their long lost . . . brother found in the new and everlasting covenant."<sup>62</sup>

On 27 February 1848, in a "private and confidential" letter from Elkhorn, Cowdery replied. With increased enthusiasm, he acknowledged:

By the hand of Brother Phinehas H. Young I received your epistle of Dec[ember] last, and after reading it carefully and conversing freely with Brother Phinehas, have thought that if circumstances would permit, I would visit you in the early part of the Spring, say as soon as the 6th of April, if possible.<sup>63</sup>

To avoid raising false hopes, Oliver warned that his visit in early April could be delayed due to "certain business" he might be obliged to fulfill. At that time, Lyman Cowdery had drafted a legislative bill that, with assistance, would be introduced in the Wisconsin Territorial council and house of representatives authorizing Oliver to prepare "a complete Index arranged in Alphabetical order of all the session Laws from the year[s] 1839 to 1848 inclusive." Oliver, through this proposed index bill, had the potential to earn up to \$650. This was Cowdery's opportunity to raise the money needed to purchase an adequate team and wagon for the trip west. With support, the bill passed the council on the third, but was negated by the House on 7 March 1848.<sup>64</sup>

In his February letter, Oliver told Brigham that he had just written to David Whitmer "advising him, . . . by all means to be at Winter Quarters on the 6th of April." Oliver felt that he and David needed to meet with "many valuable old friends, and time too, of conversing upon interesting subjects." He promised to explain his objective more completely later.



A month later, after the failure of Lyman's proposed index bill, Oliver informed Phineas that he anticipated leaving Elkhorn for Winter Quarters, but was caught, the previous Saturday, in a thundershower that brought on, as he described, "one of the severest attacks of chills and fever—a regular Sandusky attack." He expressed his disappointment in not being physically able to leave as planned but was optimistic that with a few days' rest, he would regain his health and be on his way. Oliver expected, with the cooperation of his "little nag" and good dry roads, to travel fifty miles a day and make the over four-hundred-mile journey in little more than a week.<sup>65</sup> Unfortunately, this was not to be. Oliver Cowdery's sickness continued for two weeks more, and thus he missed the opportunity to be at April conference.

On 7 April 1848, during the afternoon session of the second day of general conference, Elder Phineas Young was invited to report on his recent mission. The conference was held in the log tabernacle at Council Bluffs. Obviously disappointed by Oliver's failure to arrive as expected, Phineas described his journey east, which included a First Presidency-assigned stop in Wisconsin to visit Oliver Cowdery. Elder Young reported that,

This is the first opportunity of seeing so many since last Xmas—I journeyed to the East—and but recently ret[urne]d . . . I went to see the 2nd El[der] in the C[hurch] of J[esus] C[hrist of] L[at]ter D[ay] S[aints] O[liver] Cowd[e]ry and once more invite him to return to his Fat[he]r's house—found him in good health and prep[are]d to rece[ive] the word which I [h]ad from the 1st Pres[idenc]y and the 12—it might be impossible for him to get to this conf[erence], but he wo[ul]d be here bef[ore] the 1st Pres[idenc]y go over the mountains—he is willing to do his 1st works over ag[ai]n[.] he wrote toâ€David Whitmer &c[.] I [h]av[e] not learned that theyâ€[a]r[e] on the wa[y]—I bel[ieve] they will all be here as soon as cir[cumstanc]es will permit—he [Oliver Cowdery] conversed freely ab[ou]t the coming forth of this work and was conscious that I [h]ad fulfilled my mission.<sup>66</sup>

Wilford Woodruff, present at the afternoon conference session, noted in his journal his observations about what Phineas said regarding his stay with the Book of Mormon witness. Elder Woodruff emphasized that Phineas mentioned Oliver's feelings for the Saints.<sup>67</sup>

Nine days later, on 16 April, Cowdery addressed a long letter to his friend Phineas. He explained his delay, described his prolonged recovery, and observed that making the journey to Council Bluffs—stopping in Richmond, Missouri, to visit the Whitmers and returning to Elkhorn in time for court—would not be possible in so short a time. Oliver wrote optimistically about their future. He said that he had, for quite some time, determined to move to what he called the "new purchase."<sup>68</sup> During Phineas's visit the previous February, they talked about establishing a fruit tree nursery enterprise in the Salt Lake Valley. In mid-April, Cowdery shared with his brother-in-law his feelings about the proposal. He wrote: "The more I have reflected on it, the more anxious have I been to engage in the business." Oliver recommended they gather a large inventory of seeds, even offering to obtain them in Ohio and bring them with him in the fall.

Cowdery, the forty-two-year-old lawyer, in his personal letter to Phineas declared that he was now planning to make the western migration to the Great Basin in the fall with Bishop Reuben Miller. Sometime that previous winter, Bishop Miller, a reclaimed church leader from Strang's movement and Cowdery's Wisconsin neighbor, generously offered to outfit a team for the Second Elder and his family to use to go west. Oliver noted that Miller stood ready to grant him any assistance needed for the move.<sup>69</sup>

In this letter, Cowdery anxiously asked for information about the recent church conference. His most pressing question dealt with whether David Whitmer had responded to his request to be at the conference. He asked,

Was David there? Were any steps taken towards effecting the reconciliation and union of which we talked, and which is so much to be desired? Tell me plainly on all these. Had I been permitted to have been there, these matters would have engaged my earnest labors. . . . From henceforward, I shall double my efforts in effecting an harmonious, righteous reconciliation—I know what is right, and hope I may soon see that right take place.

Over and over again in his correspondence with church leaders, Oliver asked whether he should first visit the church's temporary headquarters at Kanesville in preparation for the move west. As Oliver sought counsel on these decisions and other topics related to his reuniting with the church, he willingly deferred to either Phineas or Brigham for advice.

During the spring of 1848, Oliver Cowdery had another distraction, unrelated to his declining health, to deal with. He was nominated as the Elkhorn district's Democratic candidate for state assembly of the newly admitted state of Wisconsin. Whether Cowdery sought this position or was simply nominated by supporters, or whether he believed he could win the election is not known. However, the Democrats in Walworth County had gotten to know Cowdery pretty well in the year he lived there. They had unshaken confidence in his political abilities. Several articles supporting his candidacy appeared in Wisconsin newspapers.<sup>70</sup> The Whig opposition, fearing Oliver's growing support, took advantage of Cowdery's most obvious political vulnerability by drawing attention to Oliver's earlier Mormon connection. Especially damning in the opposition's mind was the fact that he was one of the Three Witnesses to the Book of Mormon.<sup>71</sup> Oliver quietly withstood the criticism, campaigned confidently, and lost the election by only forty votes—less than one-tenth of the vote. Immediately after Cowdery's narrow loss, his friend and Democratic ally Horace A. Tenney, editor of the state's major political newspaper, observed:

We regret to learn from the Walworth County Democrat that Oliver Cowdery Esq. was defeated for the Assembly in the Elkhorn district, by a small majority. He is a man of sterling integrity, sound and vigorous intellect, and every way worthy, honest and capable. He was defeated in consequence of his *religion!*<sup>72</sup>

We can only speculate what Cowdery's future might have been had he been elected to the state assembly. The responsibility and influence of public office may have distracted Oliver from the anticipated move west. Once again, this time in a narrow political defeat, Oliver may have sensed that any future professional success or personal happiness was invariably connected to his association with the Mormon Church.

Near the end of May, Reuben Miller wrote from the upper crossing of the Missouri River, twelve miles northwest of Kanesville, believing that Oliver, whom he had not seen since last winter, was visiting friends and family in Richmond, Missouri, and expected to arrive within days. Miller also assumed that Phineas Young had gone to Missouri to accompany Cowdery to Pottawattamie County.<sup>73</sup> Miller's expectation of Cowdery's departure from Wisconsin and anticipated arrival in western Iowa was premature. Sometime that summer, Miller himself traveled back to Wisconsin. Oliver, on the other hand, remained in Elkhorn throughout the summer of 1848, where he renewed his law practice and became associate editor of the *Walworth Democrat*.

In mid-September 1848, Reuben Miller, journeying south toward the gathered Saints at the Bluffs, visited several of his bygone acquaintances in LaSalle County, Illinois. While there he met Phineas Young, who was traveling north to Elkhorn to retrieve Oliver Cowdery. They spent 18 September together, during which Miller gave Young more

than eighty dollars. Fulfilling his promise made the previous winter, Reuben Miller freely gave to help his friend Oliver move with the Saints and migrate west. Miller noted in his journal that thirty-one dollars was appropriated for Oliver Cowdery.<sup>74</sup>

Phineas Young arrived in Elkhorn by late September or early October. On Monday, 2 October, he witnessed the sale by Oliver and his wife, Elizabeth, of eight lots and an additional acre of land to Jonathan Delap for three hundred dollars.<sup>75</sup> In early October, Strang's nearby *Gospel Herald* commented on Cowdery's recent political and religious activities and, in the process, noticed Phineas Young's presence and his mission. The editorial recognized, "On the whole, Oliver seems to be in good demand and first rate standing. Even Phineas Young is here, telling that brother Cowdery is going with him to Council Bluffs."<sup>76</sup> Within days of the real estate sale, Oliver, Elizabeth, and Maria, their only surviving child, accompanied by Phineas, departed Walworth County for the last time.

They made a hurried trip from southern Wisconsin to the Saints' camp in Pottawattamie County, Iowa. Phineas and the Cowderys arrived Saturday afternoon, 21 October, during a special local conference. They entered the open-air meeting, convened in a grove close to Mosquito Creek in the vicinity of Council Bluffs, while Elder Orson Hyde, the presiding official at Kaneshville, was speaking. In addition to Hyde, apostles George A. Smith and Ezra Taft Benson were in attendance. Elder Hyde immediately recognized the presence of the former Associate President. Reportedly, Hyde stopped speaking, came down off the stand and embraced Cowdery. Taking him by the arm, Orson brought Oliver up on the platform. After a brief introduction by Elder Hyde, Oliver was invited to speak to the conference. Cowdery stood for a few moments looking out into the numerous faces in the audience. Oliver recognized some, but most were strangers to him. Finally, after more than a decade's lonely separation from the people he loved, the Second Elder was reunited with the Saints of God.

With overwhelming emotion swelling in his heart, yet in a clear and striking voice, Oliver Cowdery addressed this gathering of nearly two thousand people—the largest Mormon audience he ever spoke to. He bore a spontaneous yet lucid testimony of his personal involvement in the early years of the Mormon Church. Cowdery detailed the coming forth of the Book of Mormon and the restoration of the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods. He reaffirmed his staunch belief in the Prophet Joseph Smith's divine appointment and mission. Oliver recalled that years earlier he had laid hands on Elder Hyde's head and ordained him to the priesthood and extended to him his call as an apostle. Cowdery unequivocally acknowledged the Twelve's authority to lead the church. He also commented on the nautical imagery used earlier by Elder Hyde in his conference discourse. Oliver said: "Bro. Hyde has just said that it was all important that we keep in the true channel in order to avoid the sandbars. This is true. The channel is here. The priesthood is here."<sup>77</sup> Another report adds that Cowdery expressed his conviction "that the Priesthood was with this people, and the 'Twelve' were the only men that could lead the Church after the death of Joseph."<sup>78</sup> Given his years both in and out of the church, Oliver knew firsthand about spiritual "sandbars" and priesthood authority.

The audience's reaction to Cowdery's spontaneous discourse was unanimously positive. George A. Smith noted in a letter to Orson Pratt, "His testimony produced quite a sensation among the gentlemen present, who did not belong to the church, and it was gratefully received by all the Saints."<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, no immediate action was taken nor motion made during the conference to readmit Oliver Cowdery.

Nine days later, on Monday, 30 October, Oliver spent the evening talking with Elders Orson Hyde and George A. Smith. He wanted to know their feelings toward him. It is supposed that Oliver was willing to respond to any questions or concerns they had about him. Cowdery expressed his willingness to receive counsel from them. They

advised him to remain in Kanesville that winter, help Elder Hyde set up the *Frontier Guardian* press, and then migrate west the next spring. During the meeting, Cowdery confided with his two old friends that he had not come to Kanesville for a leadership position. His only desire in returning was to have his membership reinstated and to be one among and live with the Saints. Oliver said, "If Mormonism goes up, I want my name to go up with it, and if it goes down, my name goes down with it."<sup>80</sup> Oliver Cowdery recognized the necessity of being rebaptized and affirmed that he "did not expect to return without it."<sup>81</sup> He knew that baptism was the door back into the church.

Since Oliver had been gone during a decade of spirited doctrinal development, Elders Hyde and Smith evidently took the time during this evening discussion to bring Cowdery up-to-date. We know little about that aspect of their conversation, but it might have included discussion of such temple-related principles as baptism for the dead and the Nauvoo-era endowment. Given Oliver's previously expressed concern with the Saints' active participation in plural marriage, that topic was discussed and resolved in Cowdery's mind.<sup>82</sup> Before concluding, Elders Hyde and Smith requested that Oliver attend a combined meeting of high priests and the high council the first Sunday in November to review his situation formally and accept him back into the church.

The Pottawattamie High Council met Saturday, 4<sup>th</sup> November, at Hiram Clark's home in a preliminary session. Oliver was not invited to this meeting. Orson Hyde raised the issue of Cowdery's readmittance. Several council members commented on the proposal. Elder Hyde mentioned a rumor that Phineas Young had "secretly" rebaptized the Second Elder while visiting in Wisconsin. This discussion was inappropriate since President Brigham Young, in the Twelve's December 1847 epistle, invited Cowdery to be rebaptized by Phineas. Regardless, no evidence exists that Phineas "secretly" or otherwise performed the baptism ordinance before Cowdery's formal return in October—November 1848. George A. Smith offered his personal views on Oliver's readmission and gave an account of his and Elder Hyde's private interview with Oliver Cowdery the previous Monday. Elder Smith also reviewed Oliver's deep involvement in the first decade of the church and his subsequent apostasy. The high council adjourned, agreeing to meet with the high priests quorum the next day in an unusual joint session.

On Sunday, 5 November 1848, Oliver Cowdery joined with the high priests and Pottawattamie High Council<sup>83</sup> in the Kanesville Log Tabernacle.<sup>84</sup> After some unrelated initial discussion, Orson Hyde addressed the group, noting that Cowdery was present and "wished to come back into the church" and "be identified with us." Hyde requested that Oliver speak to the assembled council. Cowdery responded that he "did not come to speak, but to be a looker on, and to hear. . . . He wishe[d] to come into the Church in an humble manner, an humble follower of Jesus Christ, not seeking any presidency."<sup>85</sup> Although reluctant at first to speak, Cowdery did take the opportunity to express his personal feelings about his prolonged absence from the church, gave his reasons for leaving, and concluded by acknowledging that those who were the cause of his estrangement had died or left the church. He said:

I feel that I can honorably return. I have sustained an honorable character before the world during my absence from you, this tho[ugh] a small matter with you, it is of vast importance. I have ever had the honor of the Kingdom in view, and men are to be judged by the testimony given. I feel to sanction what has been said here today. I am out of the church.

I know the door into the church, and I wish to become a member thro[ugh] the door. I wish to be a humble private member. I did not come here to seek honor.<sup>86</sup>

After Cowdery spoke, George W. Harris motioned that Oliver Cowdery be allowed to be rebaptized. Evan M. Greene seconded the proposal. At this point, an intense discussion erupted. William Snow, president of the high

priests, questioned Oliver about his (Cowdery's) July 1847 letter to David Whitmer, published the previous May in McLellin's renegade *Ensign of Liberty*. Harris objected, saying that since Cowdery was asking to come back as a "humble member, no action should be now taken upon that letter." George A. Smith agreed, adding, "I am not afraid of [Oliver] overturning the Church." Phineas Young, along with several others, spoke in support of Cowdery's readmission without further discussion of the offending letter.<sup>87</sup>

President Snow's concerns centered on Cowdery's bold statements to Whitmer regarding priesthood authority, keys, and succession leadership, such as, "True it is that our right gives us the head" and "We have the authority and do hold the keys." Cowdery explained that the letter was a "private" letter, not for public exhibition and published by McLellin without either his or David's knowledge or consent.<sup>88</sup> Cowdery elaborated that he had, since writing the letter, changed his views on the subject. To this, President Snow asked what had changed his opinion. Oliver responded, "When I wrote that letter I did not know of the Revelation [D&C 124:95] which says, that the keys and power conferred upon me, were taken from me and placed upon the head of Hyrum Smith. And it was that revelation which changed my views on this subject."<sup>89</sup> Evidently during their private discussions with Oliver in late October 1848, Orson Hyde and George A. Smith made him aware of the January 1841 revelation.<sup>90</sup> In closing, Cowdery elaborated:

I have not come to seek place, nor to interfere with the business and calling of those men who have borne the burden since the death of Joseph. I throw myself at your feet, and wish to be one of your number, and be a mere member of the Church, and my mere asking to be baptized is an end to all pretensions to authority.<sup>91</sup>

Oliver then assured the council: "My coming back and humbly asking to become a member through the door covers the whole ground. *I acknowledge this authority.*"<sup>92</sup> Elder Orson Hyde expressed his satisfaction with Cowdery's explanation and called for a vote to the effect that "all past transactions be forgotten and that O. Cowdery be received into this Church by Baptism."<sup>93</sup> A full vote was given and the proposal carried unanimously. Finally, six years after first showing a desire to return, Cowdery was only days away from being rebaptized.

Although trustworthy sources verify 12 November 1848 as Oliver Cowdery's rebaptism date, at least one official church record implies that he was rebaptized on 5 November. The high council minutes, written within days or weeks of the event, read:

After some more remarks from different ones of the Brethren, the question was called up and Bro. O. Cowdery was received back again into the church, on his being baptized, by a full vote, and many expressed their gratified feelings on the occasion. About 2 o'clock p.m., he was Baptized by the hand of Bro. Orson Hyde.<sup>94</sup>

Other contemporary sources support Sunday, 12 November 1848, as the actual readmittance date. For unknown reasons, Cowdery was rebaptized a week after his meeting with the combined high council and high priests in the Kanesville Log Tabernacle. Orson Hyde wrote to his fellow apostle Wilford Woodruff on 11 November 1848, explaining that "Bro. Oliver Cowdery has . . . made Satisfaction to the church and has been voted to be rec[eive]d by baptism. I expect to baptize him tomorrow."<sup>95</sup> Cowdery's temporal benefactor, Reuben Miller, writing to a friend, confirmed the later date. Four days after the rebaptism, Miller acknowledged, "Brother Oliver Cowdery is here and has been baptized by Elder Hyde on last Sunday."<sup>96</sup>

His personal restoration to full membership marked a beginning for Oliver. He remained in the Kaneshville area for the next two and a half months, during which time Cowdery and his family stayed principally with Phineas Young. Oliver immediately went to work helping Orson Hyde set up the printing press that would eventually publish the *Frontier Guardian*.<sup>97</sup>

By early January 1849, Oliver had decided to take his small family and visit his in-laws, the Whitmers, in Missouri before setting out with the western migration in the spring. Heading southeast to Richmond, they encountered a ruthless snowstorm in northwestern Missouri. Desperately seeking a haven from the blizzard, the Cowderys called at the cabin of Samuel W. Richards, a Latter-day Saint. The Cowdery and Richards families spent two weeks riding out the storm. As Samuel Richards later described his time with Cowdery, “This was not lost time to either of us.” Being limited by the inclement weather, they had little to do, so they talked about the church. Elder Richards asked Oliver about his initial experiences with the Prophet Joseph Smith. Cowdery obliged, describing in vivid detail the working method of the Book of Mormon translation. Richards was definitely impressed; he summarized his feelings about meeting the Second Elder:

This interview with Brother and Sister Cowdery was one of entire freedom and familiarity, although we had never met before; and his experience in connection with the prophet Joseph, when the ministrations of Angels were frequent in restoring Priesthood, and the Keys of Knowledge . . . made it all a most divinely and sacred interview to me.<sup>98</sup>

Before leaving in mid-January, Oliver agreed to return to Council Bluffs in the spring prepared for the early migration to the Great Basin.<sup>99</sup> By late April 1849, while comfortably situated with the Whitmers in Richmond, Cowdery’s plans were becoming more tentative. He wrote Phineas Young and explained that he felt it a “bad policy” to compete with the California gold rush teams who were thronging the trail. Cowdery confided, “The idea of being crowded in and mixed up with companies—thousands of gold hunters, would impel *me* to wait another year, as a preference, if I could not safely go this fall.”<sup>100</sup> In June, Cowdery contacted Phineas again, updating him on his intentions: “I have obliged to abandon the idea of going to the Mountains this season.” Oliver’s concerns were not a wavering of his renewed Mormon affiliation; he wholeheartedly wanted to be with the church. His anxieties were fueled by persisting financial concerns and worry for his and his family’s survival out on the western trail and in the Great Basin.<sup>101</sup> Later, in the early fall of 1849, in his last known letter to his beloved friend Phineas Young, Cowdery reflected:

I am poor, very poor, and I did hope to have health and means sufficient last spring to go west and get some gold, that I might so situate my family, that I could be engaged in the cause of God; but I did not succeed. I was then in hope *you* could go . . . if I could not. Now, as neither of us went, let us not be discouraged, but press on, trusting in the Lord.<sup>102</sup>

In July 1849, the First Presidency wrote directly to Oliver Cowdery, acknowledging his return<sup>103</sup> and exhorting him to magnify his office by “learning [his] duty towards God and man, and practicing according to that knowledge,” also requesting his cooperation with Almon W. Babbitt, Orson Hyde, and John Bernhisel to petition for Deseret to be admitted as a state.<sup>104</sup> They called on Cowdery to accompany Babbitt, their congressional delegate, to Washington and help publicize their statehood aspirations and draft a memorial seeking the admission of Deseret as a free state. It is not known for sure if Cowdery received the First Presidency’s request.<sup>105</sup> If he did, Oliver would not have had the physical strength to travel since he was seriously weakened by recurring health problems.

Around the first of August, Cowdery suffered an attack of bilious fever and the chills. The fever, which Cowdery described as the “most severe of any in my life,” stirred his persistent lung problem.<sup>106</sup> From this time, in late summer 1849, until his death a little more than six months later, his health deteriorated steadily.<sup>107</sup> He would not live to go west, get some gold, start a fruit tree business, or serve the church as he so nobly wanted.

In spite of a diseased body, Cowdery’s mind and spirit were vigorous and alert to the end. A few months before his death, Oliver received a visit from Jacob Gates, an old Mormon acquaintance from before his excommunication in 1838. Gates, heading east on a mission to England, heard that his former priesthood leader was in poor health and stopped in Richmond to renew their friendship.<sup>108</sup> After conversing about troubled times in early church history, Gates asked Cowdery about his testimony printed in the Book of Mormon. He wanted to know if the testimony was based on a dream, the imagination of his mind, an illusion, or a myth. Jacob wanted the truth. As the account goes, Oliver Cowdery got up from his resting place, retrieved a first edition Book of Mormon, and read solemnly the testimony. Turning to face Gates, he said,

Jacob, I want you to remember what I say to you. I am a dying man, and what would it profit me to tell you a lie? I know . . . that this Book of Mormon was translated by the gift and power of God. My eyes saw, my ears heard, and my understanding was touched, and I know that whereof I testified is true. It was no dream, no vain imagination of the mind—it was real.<sup>109</sup>

On 3 March 1850, the day Oliver Cowdery died at the Peter Whitmer Sr. home, he was surrounded by his wife; their only daughter, Maria; his brother-in-law, David Whitmer; Hiram Page, his nurse; others of the Whitmer family; his half-sister, Lucy; and her husband, Phineas Young. Oliver asked to be raised so he could speak. As he had done hundreds of times before, he bore a resolute testimony of the Book of Mormon. Phineas reported that Oliver, on his deathbed, confided in him, “The[re] was no Salvation but in the valley and through the priesthood there.”<sup>110</sup> Thus ended the mortal life of the Second Elder of Mormonism.

To modern generations, Oliver’s legacy lives on because of his strong character and integrity as a latter-day witness of that ancient American scripture he assisted in bringing forth. Fellow Book of Mormon witness David Whitmer related that after Cowdery said his good-byes and bore his closing testimony, he “died the happiest man I ever saw. . . . [Oliver] said, ‘Now I lay me down for the last time, I am going to my Savior,’ and died immediately with a smile on his face.”<sup>111</sup>

## Notes

This article would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my mentor, Richard Lloyd Anderson. I appreciate his dedicated friendship and generous assistance but assume full responsibility for the interpretations offered herein. In order to keep the length of this essay within reason, I have focused primarily on Oliver Cowdery’s feelings and views during his final decade. My thanks to Larry Porter, Richard Cowan, Shane Heath, Stephanie Terry, and Gary Webb for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this paper.

1. I have taken the position that Cowdery was rebaptized in Mosquito Creek (instead of Indian Creek or the Missouri River) based on the following data: (1) Cowdery’s brother-in-law Phineas Young lived in Cartersville, a settlement on the east side of Mosquito Creek; (2) Oliver Cowdery stayed with Phineas Young during all or most of his two-and-a-half month sojourn in western Iowa; (3) Cowdery’s rebaptism took place a week after the combined Pottawattamie High Council—high priests meeting on 5 November 1848 that was held in the Kanessville



Log Tabernacle; and (4) eleven-year-old Seymour B. Young, Phineas Young's nephew, was also baptized near Cartersville in late 1848. He related, "Just near by the bank of the creek where the baptism occurred lived my uncle, Phineas H. Young. I returned to his home after baptism, and there I met with a man somewhat famous in the history of the Church, namely Oliver Cowdery." *Conference Reports*, April 1921, 114–15.

2. Although no contemporary documentation exists for Cowdery's reordination, the action would be logical since Cowdery had been excommunicated. Several early sources mention Oliver's reordination. See Brigham Young's remarks in the Sunday morning session of the October 1870 semi-annual general conference where he remarked, "Oliver Cowdery . . . returned, was baptised and *ordained again* went to visit his friends in Missouri, and died" (*Ogden Junction*, 12 October 1870, emphasis added). See also statement by W. W. Blair in "'Mormonism' Reviewed," *Saints' Herald* 23/3 (1 February 1876): 74–75. Blair, a member of the RLDS first presidency, wrote, "We have been informed by credible witnesses that in [1848], he [Oliver Cowdery] attended a conference at Carterville, a hamlet near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and was there re-baptized, and *re-ordained to the office of an elder*" (emphasis added).

3. President Cowdery had been at odds with Joseph Smith and other church leaders for months preceding his high council trial. Cowdery's difficulties, although not enumerated at the time, centered principally on personal problems between Joseph and himself and on "administrative" or "procedural" differences. These difficulties received notice as far back as September 1837 when Joseph Smith wrote a letter to the church leaders in Missouri, which he dispatched by the hand of Thomas B. Marsh. Part of the Prophet's epistle reads, "Oliver Cowdery has been in transgression, but as he is now chosen as one of the Presidents or Councilors I trust that he will yet humble himself and magnify his calling, but if he should not, the Church will soon be under the necessity of raising their hands against him. Therefore pray for him." See Joseph Smith to John Corrill and the church in Zion, 4 September 1837, retained copy in "Scriptory Book of Joseph Smith Jr." (kept by George W. Robinson), 22, Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter LDS Church Archives); published in *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, ed. Scott H. Faulring (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 165 (hereafter Faulring, *American Prophet's Record*) or *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (hereafter Jessee, *Papers of Joseph Smith*), 2 vols. to date (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989–92), 2:219–20. Spelling and punctuation have been modernized in all primary source quotations used.

4. Oliver Cowdery to Bishop Edward Partridge, 12 April 1838, included in the Far West Record, 119–22, Archives of the First Presidency, LDS Church (hereafter AFP), emphasis added. The official source of Cowdery's trial minutes is Far West Record, 118–26; published in Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., *Far West Record: Minutes of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1844* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983), 162–71. A contemporary abstract is found in "Scriptory Book of Joseph Smith Jr.," 29–31, LDS Church Archives; published in Faulring, *An American Prophet's Record*, 172–74, and Jessee, *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:228–30.

5. The six charges sustained against Oliver Cowdery (quoted here with minor modernization) were (1) For stirring up the enemy to persecute the brethren by urging on vexatious lawsuits and thus distressing the innocent; (2) For seeking to destroy the character of President Joseph Smith Jr. by falsely insinuating that he was guilty of adultery; (3) For treating the church with contempt by not attending meetings; (4) For leaving the calling, in which God had appointed him, by Revelation, for the sake of filthy lucre, and turning to the practice of the Law; (5) For disgracing the church by being connected in the 'Bogus' business as common report says; and (6) For dishonestly retaining notes after they had been paid. It should be pointed out that the Far West Record reports that the fifth charge listed here was only sustained on circumstantial grounds. Seymour Brunson preferred the nine charges against Oliver on 7 April 1838. For the entire list of nine charges, see Far West Record, 118–19.



6. "History of Tho[ma]s Baldwin Marsh," *Deseret News*, 24 March 1858, 18.

7. Laura Pitkin to Heber C. Kimball, 18 July 1840, postscript, original in uncataloged letters collection, Daughters of Utah Pioneers Society Archives, Salt Lake City. The entire letter was published in Kate B. Carter, comp., *Heart Throbs of the West* (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1944), 5:380–82. At the time this letter was written, Elder Kimball was serving with his fellow apostles on a mission in Great Britain. Laura Pitkin later became a plural wife to Heber C. Kimball.

8. According to William Lang, Oliver first visited Tiffin in the spring of 1840 where, on 12 May, he spoke to a large gathering of local Democratic supporters. Cowdery was, during that time, scouting out a location to practice law. Lang mentions that Oliver moved to Tiffin in the (late) fall of 1840. See William Lang, *History of Seneca County* (Springfield, Ohio: Transcript Printing, 1880), 364–65, 387.

9. Phineas served in this position until June 1843, when he was recalled to Nauvoo. Shortly after returning to Illinois, he was sent back east on another mission. See untitled Phineas H. Young manuscript autobiography in the Mormon Biographical Sketches Collection (Ms 2050, box 20, folder 3, item 9), LDS Church Archives. A typescript entitled "Life of Phineas Howe Young. Written by Phineas Howe Young," is in the Phineas H. Young Collection (Ms 14458, folder 6), LDS Church Archives. The typescript version is cited herein because it is more intelligible than the manuscript.

10. Phineas Young, with postscript by Oliver, to Willard Richards and Brigham Young, 14 December 1842, Tiffin, Ohio, Brigham Young Collection (BYC), LDS Church Archives.

11. Snyder (also spelled Snider) was sent by revelation to England to raise money for the building of the Nauvoo House and Nauvoo Temple (see D&C 124:22, 62, 70, and uncanonized 22 December 1841 revelation, published in *History of the Church*, 4:483). He departed Nauvoo for England on 26 March 1842 (Jessee, *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:343–45, 356, 362, 373). On the return voyage from Liverpool, Elder Snyder had charge of a company of 157 emigrating Saints on board the ship *Henry*. The voyage lasted six weeks, and during the last four weeks, the ship was frequently stalled by lack of winds. Elder Snyder and the ship's commanding officer, Captain Benjamin Pierce, had several disagreements during the voyage. The *Henry* arrived in New Orleans by mid-November 1842, where Snyder was arrested. See Conway B. Sonne, *Ships, Saints, and Mariners: A Maritime Encyclopedia of Mormon Migration 1830–1890* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987), 95–96, and Andrew Jenson, *Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia: A Compilation of Biographical Sketches of Prominent Men and Women in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Andrew Jenson History Company and Deseret News, 1901–36), 3:221.

12. An entry in Joseph Smith's journal for 23 January 1843 noted the arrival of Snyder in Nauvoo: "Bro. John Snider come home from England, where he had been sent by the Twelve according to Revelation to procure help for the Temple." See "President Joseph Smith's Journal [1842–]1843 as kept by Willard Richards," Joseph Smith Collection, LDS Church Archives; published in Faulring, *American Prophet's Record*, 295, and edited slightly in *History of the Church*, 5:260.

13. Phelps, along with Cowdery, David and John Whitmer, Luke E. Johnson, and others, became disaffected during the internal Mormon difficulties at Far West in 1838. In June 1840, W.â€W. Phelps humbly asked for and subsequently received forgiveness from Joseph Smith for betraying the Mormon leader by testifying against him at Judge Austin A. King's hearing at Richmond, Missouri, in November 1838. See Phelps's testimony in *Document Containing the Correspondence, Orders, &c. in Relation to the Disturbances with the Mormons* (Fayette, Mo.: Boon's

Lick Democrat, 1841), 120–25. See copy of Phelps’s appeal in Joseph Smith Letter Book, 2:155–56, Joseph Smith Collection, LDS Church Archives; published in *History of the Church*, 4:141–42. Joseph Smith’s compassionate reply, dated 22 July 1840, is in Joseph Smith Letter Book, 2:157–58; and is published in *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 472–73.

14. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 19 August 1843, AFP. Phelps’s letter to Cowdery has not been located. Near the time he wrote to Oliver, Phelps sent a letter to another disenfranchised elder, Warren Parrish. After encouraging Parrish to come and fellowship with the Saints in Nauvoo, Phelps noted the number of non-Mormon lawyers in the city and hinted that Parrish could come to Nauvoo as a “Mormon” attorney. Perhaps Phelps, in his letter to Cowdery, made the same proposal to Oliver but obscured the meaning or was misunderstood. Phelps mentioned to Parrish that “I want this letter to be an epistle general: as well to Zerrubbabel Snow, Esq. as you and Oliver Cowdery, Esq., if you will give him a hint of it by writing.” See transcription of Phelps to Parrish in Walter D. Bowen, “The Versatile W. W. Phelps—Mormon Writer, Educator, and Pioneer” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1958), 111.

15. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 26 August 1843, AFP.

16. Cowdery to Young, 19 August 1843, AFP.

17. Joseph Smith’s 1843 journal, 19 April 1843; published in Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 372. An expanded form of this statement, based on Willard Richards’s Quorum of Twelve minutes, was published in *History of the Church*, 5:368, and includes the phrase “be clothed with robes of righteousness” inserted between “If he is not almost ready to return” and “and go up to Jerusalem.”

18. Brigham Young and Twelve to Oliver Cowdery, 19 April 1843, Nauvoo, Illinois; retained copy, Luna Young Thatcher Collection (Ms 6140, folder 4), LDS Church Archives, emphasis in original.

19. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 26 August 1843, AFP.

20. Oliver Cowdery to “Dear Brethren” (i.e., Brigham Young and the Twelve), 25 December 1843, BYC, LDS Church Archives, emphasis in original.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., emphasis in original.

23. “Them” referred to the addressees of his response, namely Elders Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Parley P. Pratt, William Smith, Orson Pratt, Willard Richards, Wilford Woodruff, John Taylor, and George A. Smith. During his troubles in Far West, 1837–38, Oliver Cowdery was not oppressed or persecuted by any of these men.

24. Actually a public or warning-out letter (ca. 18 June 1838) addressed to the leading dissenters (i.e., Oliver Cowdery, John and David Whitmer, W. W. Phelps, and Lyman E. Johnson). This document warned Cowdery and others to depart Far West with their families within seventy-two hours or “a more fatal calamity shall befall you.” A copy of the letter was published as evidence in *Document Containing the Correspondence, Orders, &c.*, 103–6. Sidney Rigdon is suspected as the letter’s author. For balanced context to this incident, see Alexander L. Baugh, “Dissenters, Danites, and the Resurgence of Militant Mormonism,” chapter 4 of “A Call to Arms: The 1838 Mormon Defense of Northern Missouri” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1996), 68–101.

25. Willard Richards, "Journal and Memorandum," 27 June 1844, LDS Church Archives; source of comment published in *History of the Church*, 6:613.
26. Church historian Joseph Fielding Smith surmised that the Cowdery letter read at Carthage Jail was written in response to the Twelve's earlier invitation to return. This opinion is entirely speculative since, as President Smith admits, "The contents of that letter I have always regretted I did not know; in the perilous times it was lost and no record was made of it." Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954), 1:227.
27. William Lang to Thomas Gregg, 5 November 1881, published in Charles A. Shook, *The True Origin of the Book of Mormon* (Cincinnati: Standard, 1914), 56.
28. Phineas Young to Brigham Young, 26 November 1844, postscript, BYC, LDS Church Archives.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. Rigdon's infamous "Salt Sermon," delivered 17 June 1838, contained veiled threats against Cowdery and the other dissenters, and the subsequent ca. 18 June 1838 letter, addressed to Cowdery, David and John Whitmer, W. W. Phelps, and Lyman E. Johnson, was an explicit warning to them as protagonists to leave Far West or face dire consequences. This letter was signed by George W. Robinson and eighty-two other Mormons. George Robinson is credited with delivering the public warning-out in late 19 June 1838. Robinson's entry in the 1838 Scriptorium Book (page 47) reveals his true feelings toward the dissenters:
- I would mention or notice something about O. Cowdery, David Whitmer, Lyman E. Johnson, and John Whitmer who being guilty of base iniquities and that too, manifest in the ages of all men, and being often entreated would continue in their course seeking the lives of the First Presidency and to overthrow the Kingdom of God which they once testified of. Pres[iden]t Rigdon preached one Sabbath upon the salt that had lost its savour that it is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men, and the wicked flee when no man pursueth. These men took warning and soon they were seen bounding over the prairie like the scapegoat to carry off their own sins. We have not seen them since. Their influence is gone and they are in a miserable condition. (Faulring, *American Prophet's Record*, 187, and Jessee, *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:249)
31. Phineas H. Young to Brigham Young, 26 November 1844.
32. Oliver Cowdery to Brigham Young, 7 October 1845, BYC, LDS Church Archives.
33. W. W. Phelps to Oliver Cowdery, 1 December 1845, quoted in Cowdery to Phineas Young, 18 December 1845, AFP.
34. On this dramatic change of position toward government help, see Richard E. Bennett, *Mormons at the Missouri, 1846–1852: "And Should We Die . . ."* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 21–22.
35. W. W. Phelps to Oliver Cowdery, 1 December 1845, quoted in Cowdery to Phineas Young, 18 December 1845, AFP, emphasis in original. Phelps and Cowdery coedited the *Evening and Morning Star* at Independence, Missouri, from 1832–1833.
36. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 18 December 1845.

37. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 23 March 1846, Oliver Cowdery Collection, LDS Church Archives.

38. Orson Hyde to Brigham Young, 10 March 1846, BYC, LDS Church Archives.

39. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 23 March 1846, emphasis in original.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.; bracketed words represent material missing from holes in the manuscript.

42. Oliver Cowdery to Daniel and Phebe Jackson, 24 July 1846, original letter unlocated; photographs of original letter, RLDS Archives and Richard Lloyd Anderson research files.

43. In spite of some minor differences in details, the essence of these reports is that Oliver Cowdery learned about plural marriage while serving as the Prophet Joseph Smith's assistant and that he (Cowdery) practiced it without the Prophet's consent during the 1830s. A sample of statements by early church leaders regarding Oliver Cowdery and plural marriage include: Brigham Young, 26 August 1857, LDS Church Archives, quoted in *Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 1833–1898*, ed. Scott G. Kenney (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983–85), 5:84; Brigham Young in *Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 1857*, 439 (based on Woodruff's journal entry with added detail), LDS Church Archives; Heber C. Kimball (comment made 24 May 1868) in "Record of the Provo Stake of Zion," LDS Church Archives; Brigham Young in Joseph F. Smith diary, 9 October 1869, LDS Church Archives; Brigham Young in Charles Walker Diary, 26 July 1872, LDS Church Archives; Joseph F. Smith, 7 July 1878, in *Journal of Discourses*, 20:29; George Q. Cannon in *Juvenile Instructor* 16 (15<sup>th</sup> September 1881): 206; and Joseph F. Smith (comment made 4 March 1883) in "Provo Utah Central Stake, Historical Records and Minutes, 1877–1888," LDS Church Archives. This episode of Cowdery's life has been examined recently by several scholars. Not all agree whether Oliver practiced an early form of plural marriage. For instance, Richard S. Van Wagoner, in *Mormon Polygamy: A History*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 11, reported that Oliver Cowdery "never became reconciled to Mormon polygamy." I disagree with Van Wagoner's interpretation. I believe that evidence suggests Cowdery believed in and practiced this Kirtland-form of plural marriage (1833–34), got in trouble for it (1834), and for many years (1835–48) was opposed to the practice. This opposition mellowed when he returned to the church in 1848. Nine days after arriving at Kaneshville in October 1848, Oliver had a "lengthy and agreeable interview" with the presiding officials at Council Bluffs—Elders Orson Hyde and George A. Smith. During their evening discussion, Cowdery affirmed that he had come to "listen to [their] counsel and would do as [they] told him." He recognized the need to be rebaptized and bore sincere testimony that Joseph Smith had "fulfilled his mission faithfully before God until death." Oliver assured Elders Hyde and Smith that he sought no position or office in the church; he only wanted to be "one among us, and live with the Saints." At this point in 1848, it is reasonable to assume that Oliver Cowdery was, if he had not already been, made aware that plural marriage was commonly practiced within Mormon society. Unfortunately we do not know Oliver's reaction, but until his death in 1850, Cowdery was making serious plans to move to Utah. If his deteriorating health had not prevented him, he would have come to Utah and served the church in whatever capacity they wanted him to serve. It is logical that if Cowdery was as morally offended by the Saints' plural marriage relationship as Van Wagoner and others have suggested, he would not have wanted to immigrate to Utah and live as "one" among them. During his "interview" with Elders Hyde and Smith, Oliver said that he "was determined to rise with the Church, and if it went down he was willing to go down with it." See George A. Smith to Orson Pratt, 31 October postscript to 20 October 1848 letter, in *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 14; and Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra Taft Benson, "A Report to Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards and the Authorities of the Church of

Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints,” 5 April 1849, 4–5, Robert Campbell, clerk, Kaneshville, Iowa, BYC (Ms 1234), LDS Church Archives.

44. See Todd Compton, “Fanny Alger Smith Custer: Mormonism’s First Plural Wife?” *Journal of Mormon History* 22/1 (1996): 174–207, republished in Todd Compton, *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1999), chap. 2; and Danel W. Bachman, “A Study of the Mormon Practice of Plural Marriage before the Death of Joseph Smith” (M.A. thesis, Purdue University, 1975), 81–83.

45. During late 1837 to early 1838, Joseph and Oliver were involved in a prolonged emotional discussion about the alleged “adulterous affair” between Joseph and Miss Fanny Alger. Contemporary references to the Smith-Alger relationship are in Oliver Cowdery to Joseph Smith, 21 January 1838 (retained copy in Oliver Cowdery to Warren Cowdery, 21 January 1838), Oliver Cowdery to Warren Cowdery, 21 January 1838, Oliver Cowdery Letter Book, 80–83, Huntington Library, San Marino, California; Thomas B. Marsh to Joseph Smith, 15 February 1838, in *Elders Journal of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints* 1/3 (July 1838): 45; and Far West Record, Ms 118, 123–24; also in Cannon and Cook, *Far West Record*, 167–68.

46. Cowdery to Daniel and Phebe Jackson, 24 July 1846.

47. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 12 November 1846, BYC, LDS Church Archives. Cowdery’s law partnership with Joel Wilson was dissolved on 18 December 1846. See notice in *Seneca Advertiser*, 18 December 1846.

48. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 12 November 1846.

49. “Manuscript History of Brigham Young,” 16:526; published in *Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 1846–1847*, ed. Elden J. Watson (Salt Lake City: Elden J. Watson, 1971), 482.

50. By 1846, Oliver and Elizabeth Cowdery had had six children born to them—only one, Maria Louise, survived adolescence. Being frequently ill and impoverished, Cowdery was keenly aware of his limited ability to provide for his wife and child. Oliver made frequent mention in his correspondences of his concern for his “small family” and their temporal survival. He sensed from the reports he received about the Saints’ destitute condition that if he joined with them he would be subjecting his family to unknown dangers.

51. Cowdery’s involvement was noticed in the *Seneca Advertiser* for 11 December 1846: “The editorial management of the Advertiser will be entrusted to the hands of a capable friend, during the absence of the editor.” Two months later, when Breslin returned, he announced:

The Editor has returned to his post.

In looking over the columns of the Advertiser, published during our absence, we felt impelled to congratulate our readers upon the interest and ability parted them by our friend, Mr. Cowdery, to whom we entrusted the management of our paper. Mr. C[owdery] has conducted it in a manner wholly satisfactory to ourselves, and we doubt not to our readers, and our thanks are due him for his attention and kindness. (*Seneca Advertiser*, 19 February 1847)

52. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 14 February 1847, AFP.

53. See *ibid.*

54. Oliver Cowdery to David Whitmer, 28 July 1847; published in William E. McLellin's *Ensign of Liberty* 1/6 (May 1848): 92, emphasis in original.

55. For the broader context of McLellin's efforts to "get back on the old foundation," see Larry C. Porter, "The Odyssey of William Earl McLellin: Man of Diversity, 1806–83," in *The Journals of William E. McLellin, 1831–1836*, ed. Jan Shippy and John W. Welch (Urbana: BYU Studies and University of Illinois Press, 1994), 341–46.

56. Cowdery to Whitmer, 28 July 1847.

57. *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

58. *Ibid.*, emphasis in original.

59. McLellin left Wisconsin by late July 1847 and traveled to Nauvoo where he met with Emma Smith, widow of the Prophet. From there, he journeyed to Richmond, Missouri, in an attempt to enlist David Whitmer in his cause. On 6 September, McLellin accompanied Hiram Page and David and Jacob Whitmer to Far West, where they counseled together at John Whitmer's. Two days later, on 8 September while at Far West, David Whitmer replied to Oliver's letter, which he had received at Richmond in late August. McLellin published a detailed report of his western trip in "Our Tour West in 1847," *Ensign of Liberty* 1/7 (August 1849): 99–105. See also Porter, "Man of Diversity," 343.

60. See Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 16 April 1848, AFP.

61. Brigham Young to Oliver Cowdery, 22 November 1847, retained copy, BYC, LDS Church Archives. The only extant source, a retained copy, is dated 22 November, but evidence supports the late December dispatch date. In his reply, Oliver referred to the letter as bearing a December date. The First Presidency's clerk, Thomas Bullock, noted on the copy that the invitation was personally delivered by Phineas Young. On 7 April 1848, while reporting on his eastern mission before the conference gathered at Council Bluffs, Phineas said, "This is the first opportunity of seeing so many since last Christmas." See Conference Minutes, 7 April 1848, LDS Church Archives. In his autobiography, Phineas indicated that "in Dec[ember] [I] took a mission to Wisconsin." See "Life of Phineas Howe Young. Written by Phineas Howe Young," Ms 14458, LDS Church Archives.

62. Brigham Young to Cowdery, 22 November 1847.

63. Oliver Cowdery to Brigham Young, 27 February 1848, BYC, LDS Church Archives. On the outside of the letter, Cowdery indicated that the letter was being delivered by Phineas. Phineas returned to Council Bluffs on 26 March 1848. See Young, "History of Phineas Howe Young."

64. "A bill to provide for the publication of a general Index," 3 March 1848, Madison, Wisconsin, Council Bill 45, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin. According to the territorial legislative record, Council Bill 45 passed the Wisconsin Territorial Council on 3 March 1848, but the House of Representatives on 7 March 1848 decided to "strike out all after the enacting clause." See *Journal of the Council, Second Annual Session, of the Fifth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Wisconsin, held at Madison, February 7th, a.d. 1848* (Madison: Tenney, 1848), 116, 138, 139, 146, and *Journal of the House of Representatives, Second Annual Session, of the Fifth Legislative Assembly, of the Territory of Wisconsin, held at Madison, on the Seventh day of February [1848]* (Madison: Tenney, 1848), 235–36.

Days earlier, on 1 March, Oliver wrote Phineas advising him that he had just received a letter from Lyman expressing great confidence in passage of the index bill. He told Phineas that he would not write to David Whitmer again until he knew the outcome of the bill and whether he would be able to see Whitmer in person. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, 1 March 1848, AFP.

65. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas H. Young, 27 March 1848, Phineas Young Collection, Ms 14458, folder 2, LDS Church Archives.

66. Conference minutes, 7 April 1848, manuscript notes by Thomas Bullock, LDS Church Archives. These minutes were taken down in Bullock's personal form of shorthand which allowed him to record near-verbatim notes of the speakers' comments.

67. See Wilford Woodruff journal, 7 April 1848; published in *Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, 3:339.

68. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 16 April 1848, AFP. Cowdery's use of the term "new purchase" referred to the land purchased from Mexico as part of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (signed 2 February 1848; ratified 10 March 1848) ending the Mexican War. With this annexation, the United States acquired what is now Arizona, California, western Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.

69. See Cowdery to Phineas Young, 16 April 1848. An informative essay detailing Reuben Miller's contact with Cowdery is in Richard L. Anderson, "Reuben Miller, Recorder of Oliver Cowdery's Reaffirmations," *BYU Studies* 8/3 (1968): 277–93.

70. An example of the endorsements Cowdery received from his local supporters follows. This editorial appeared in the *Wisconsin Argus* shortly before the elections:

Who is Oliver Cowdry?—*Western Star*. For the information of the editor of the Star, we will tell him. Oliver Cowdery is an honest man and sterling democrat, who has battled "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" hard cider whiggery ever since he was old enough to have a voice in political matters. He is a democrat who possessed the entire confidence of the people of that staunch old democratic strong hold—Seneca county, Ohio . . . We have known Mr. C[owdery] long and favorably by reputation in, that state, as a leading democrat, an eminent lawyer, and a worthy citizen, who is entitled to the fullest confidence of his party. (*Wisconsin Argus*, 11 April 1848)

Cowdery's Tiffin, Ohio, associate, John Breslin offered his belated support:

We are gratified to learn . . . that our esteemed friend and former fellow citizen, O[liver] Cowdery, Esq., has been nominated as the democratic candidate for the House of Representatives in that State. This intelligence has been hailed with the highest satisfaction by his numerous friends here, . . .

Mr. C[owdery] was a resident among us for a period of seven years, during which time he earned himself an enviable distinction at the Bar of this place and of this Judicial circuit, as a sound and able lawyer, and as a citizen none could have been more esteemed. His honesty, integrity, and industry were worthy the imitation of all. . . . Politically, Mr. C[owdery] was a prominent, active and radical democrat, never tiring in furthering the good cause. (*Seneca Advertiser*, 5 May 1848)



71. Examples of secular criticism of Cowdery's connection with the Book of Mormon and what they considered his "youthful indiscretions" with Mormonism are found in the Milwaukee *Daily Sentinel and Gazette*, 13 and 29 April 1848.
72. *Wisconsin Argus*, 16 May 1848, emphasis in original.
73. See Reuben Miller to James M. Adams, 30 May 1848, RLDS Archives. Miller returned to Walworth County by early June 1848 where he sold his farm for one thousand dollars. See Anderson, "Reuben Miller," 291.
74. See Reuben Miller journal, 18 September 1848, LDS Church Archives; transcribed in Anderson, "Reuben Miller," 291.
75. See Deeds, 9:295–96, Oliver Cowdery and Elizabeth Cowdery to Jonathan Delap, 2 October 1848, Walworth County Court House, Elkhorn, Wisconsin. The deed was executed in the "presence of Phineas H. Young and Levi Lee." Lee, a justice of the peace, also notarized the deed.
76. *Gospel Herald*, 5 October 1848.
77. Reuben Miller journal, 21 October 1848, LDS Church Archives. Miller, present at the conference session, took what was later described as a "verbatim report" of Cowdery's address. These notes, no longer extant, were copied into the journal soon afterwards and provided the source for Cowdery's testimony.
78. Hyde, Smith, and Benson, "Report to Presidents," 5 April 1849; see also George A. Smith's remarks in *Journal of Discourses*, 13:347–48.
79. George A. Smith to Orson Pratt, 31 October postscript to 20 October 1848 letter, in *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 14.
80. "Report to Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards and the Authorities of the Church," 5 April 1849, Kanesville, Iowa, BYC, LDS Church Archives.
81. George A. Smith to Orson Pratt, 31 October postscript to 20 October 1848 letter.
82. See previous discussion about Oliver Cowdery and plural marriage, above in n. 43.
83. Fortunately, three sets of minutes—two official, one unofficial—cover this assembly. Official minutes in Pottawattamie High Council Minutes, 5 November 1848, LDS Church Archives and Pottawattamie High Priests Quorum Minutes, 5 November 1848, LDS Church Archives. The unofficial account appears in two forms in the Reuben Miller journal, the rough draft pencil notes (pp. 40–42) taken during the meeting and Miller's slightly expanded copy (pp. 16–18).
84. A physical description of the Kanesville Log Tabernacle is in Bennett, *Mormons at the Missouri*, 212–13. This book has been invaluable in understanding the various church settlements at Council Bluffs and surrounding environs.
85. Pottawattamie High Priests Quorum Minutes, 5 November 1848.



86. Pottawattamie High Council Minutes, 1848–1851, 5 November 1848; Pottawattamie High Priests Quorum Minutes, 1846–1852, 5 November 1848.

87. Pottawattamie High Priests Quorum Minutes, 1846–1852, 5 November 1848.

88. Evidence of Cowdery's displeasure is found in a letter from Hiram Page to Oliver Cowdery, which reads in part:

It appears there is some things that your mind is anxious about. One is whether Brother David [Whitmer] gave Bro. Wm. [McLellin] liberty to publish private letters; I hear say that there were no such liberties given but he was not to publish anything to the world that did not belong to the world. His publications are so conducted that we have sent to have him discontinue his papers to Richmond. (23 July 1848, Hiram Page Letters, RLDS Archives)

89. "Report to Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards and the Authorities of the Church," 5 April 1849.

90. Excerpts of this revelation, including the material relating to Oliver Cowdery, were first published in *Times and Seasons* 2/15 (1 June 1841): 424–29. The complete revelation was included in the 1844 Doctrine and Covenants as section 103. In spite of being published in Nauvoo, Oliver was unaware of the revelation until he came to Kanesville in the fall of 1848.

91. "Report to Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards and the Authorities of the Church," 5 April 1849.

92. See Miller journal, 5 November 1848, 17, emphasis added.

93. Pottawattamie High Priests Quorum Minutes, 5 November 1848.

94. Pottawattamie High Council Minutes, 5 November 1848.

95. Orson Hyde to Wilford Woodruff, 11 November 1848, Wilford Woodruff Papers, LDS Church Archives. The date of Hyde's letter has been misinterpreted by several researchers as "10 November 1848" because the second "1" has an end flourish which gives the number the appearance of a "0." Elder Woodruff received the letter on 19 December and wrote in his diary:

Among the letters which I obtained yesterday was one from O. Hyde who informed me that Oliver Cowdery had come back to the Church, had made satisfaction, And was voted to come in by the door of Baptism. He was the first man baptized into the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in this last dispensation, under the Hands of Joseph Smith the Prophet but after being out of the church eleven years, he had now returned again. And may the Lord bless him and keep him steadfast unto the end. (*Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, 3:392–93 [20 December 1848])

On 26 December, Wilford passed the news about Cowdery's return on to Elder Orson Pratt who was in Great Britain. See Woodruff to Pratt, in *Millennial Star* 11/3 (1 February 1849): 43.

96. Reuben Miller to Henry Sabey [aka Henry Eriksen], 16 November 1848, LDS Church Archives.

97. See Hyde to Woodruff, 11 November 1848, LDS Church Archives. The first issue of the *Frontier Guardian* was published 7 February 1849. The *Guardian* was a Whig-sympathetic newspaper, which may explain why Cowdery, a staunch democrat, did not stay to help edit the paper.

98. Samuel W. Richards, handwritten statement, 21 May 1907, Ms 3703, LDS Church Archives.

99. Ibid.

100. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 27 April 1849, AFP, emphasis in original.

101. Cowdery to Phineas Young, 24 June 1849, AFP.

102. Oliver Cowdery to Phineas Young, date missing (written between 14 and 22 September 1849 based on evidence in the letter and its postmark), AFP.

103. Apparently, in the winter of 1848–49, the westward mail to Deseret slowed down considerably or came to a stop. The presiding officials at Kanesville (i.e., Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra Taft Benson) waited until early April 1849 to inform the First Presidency of Cowdery's return. This report was probably hand carried west with one of the first emigration companies. See "A Report to Presidents," 4–5, BYC, LDS Church Archives.

104. Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards to Oliver Cowdery, 20 July 1849, retained copy, BYC, LDS Church Archives. See also Brigham Young to Orson Hyde, 19 July 1849; Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards to Orson Hyde, 21 July 1849; and Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards to N. H. Felt, 24 July 1849, all retained copies in BYC, LDS Church Archives.

105. In mid-September 1849, Oliver wrote to Phineas acknowledging a previous letter from Phineas informing him that the "brethren in the Valley wish me to go to Washington" with Almon W. Babbit. Cowdery to Phineas Young, ca. 14–22 September 1849, AFP.

106. From the description of his long-term symptoms, Oliver was probably suffering from chronic pulmonary tuberculosis. Symptoms include fatigue, night sweats and fever, and persistent cough. Hemorrhages of blood occur as the lung tissue is destroyed by the disease. Kathryn L. McCance and Sue E. Huether, *Pathophysiology: The Biologic Basis for Disease in Adults and Children*, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1994), 1174–75. During the last years of his life, Cowdery displayed all these symptoms.

107. See Hiram Page to Warren A. Cowdery, 20 March 1850, published in *Saints' Herald* 33/6 (6 February 1886): 83. Also, Cowdery to Phineas Young, ca. 14–22 September 1849, AFP.

108. Jacob Gates (1811–1892) was appointed to a three-year mission during the fall conference of 1849. He departed Salt Lake City on 19 October 1849 and arrived in Liverpool by 6 April 1850. See Jacob Gates, "Items of History of the Life and Labors of Jacob Gates," Jacob Gates Collection, LDS Church Archives. Paraphrased in Andrew Jenson, *LDS Biographical Encyclopedia*, 1:198. Although not specifically mentioned in his biography, it is conjectured that Gates, who was traveling to St. Louis with Erastus Snow, Franklin D. Richards, and other missionaries, stopped in Richmond, Missouri, during January 1850 and visited Oliver Cowdery. See Franklin D. Richards to Orson Pratt, 8 January 1850, published in *Millennial Star* 12 (1 March 1850): 75–76, and Erastus Snow to his wives, 17 February 1850, LDS Church Archives.

109. Jacob Forsberry Gates (son of Jacob Gates), signed and notarized affidavit, 30 January 1912, LDS Church Archives; published in *Improvement Era* (March 1912): 418–19. These are actually two typewritten affidavits by Gates, separated by a month's interval. The first draft, dated 30 December 1911, Gates signed but left unnotarized. The second statement, dated 30 January 1912, was signed and notarized.

110. Phineas Young to Brigham Young, 25 April 1850, BYC, LDS Church Archives.

111. Reported in Joseph F. Smith and Orson Pratt interview with David Whitmer, 7–8 September 1878, draft report, dated 17 September 1878, Joseph F. Smith to "President John Taylor and Council of 12," Joseph F. Smith Papers (Ms 1325, box 12, folder 10), LDS Church Archives.

# Eyewitness, Hearsay, and Physical Evidence of the Joseph Smith Papyri

John Gee

Richard Lloyd Anderson is truly a scholar and a gentleman. I have had the opportunity to witness his kindness on many occasions and have never known him to do anything mean, petty, or unchristian. Nor has this remarkable man been noted for boasting of his achievements; thus few members of the church remember, as does my father, when the missionary discussions were known as the Anderson Plan. I appreciate his graciousness to me not only while I was his student but afterward. While I was his student, he introduced me to many facets of New Testament study that I have since had opportunity to work on at greater length.<sup>1</sup> Here, however, I would like to pick up a thread from his Latter-day Saint historical work and apply it to a field that sorely needs it.

In his seminal work, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, Anderson discusses the need for a “safeguard” in historical work to protect against character assassination:

Be sure that all statements come from the witness himself. Courts formalize this policy by various rules against hearsay, for one of the main questions about evidence is its directness, whether it is firsthand. . . . In short, accurate evidence from a Book of Mormon witness must come from the witness not from garbled reports through intermediaries. Almost all of the first generation of anti-Mormon writers ignored this basic rule, and now even educated authors may do no better. . . .

Although we are discussing specific objections to Book of Mormon witnesses, the methods of response should be helpful in similar claims not discussed for lack of space.<sup>2</sup>

Like the Book of Mormon witnesses, the Joseph Smith Papyri need careful treatment since discussions of the situation have generally been plagued by reliance on hearsay evidence or unwarranted assumptions. This has been true even of the *omnium-gatherum* approach in which all available evidence is assembled, eyewitness testimony and hearsay being given equal weight.<sup>3</sup> I will review the eyewitness testimony to provide two types of reconstructions: the extent of the Joseph Smith Papyri and, to the degree possible, Joseph Smith’s understanding of the papyri. Obviously much more can still be done, but this might lay the groundwork for further research.<sup>4</sup>

Historical witnesses of the papyri often mingle eyewitness testimony with hearsay. Care thus needs to be taken to separate the eyewitness portions from the hearsay portions of any given witness’s testimony. For example, consider the following statement about the Joseph Smith Papyri: “Then she [Lucy Smith] turned to a long table, set her candle-stick down, and opened a long roll of manuscript, saying it was ‘the writing of Abraham and Isaac, written in Hebrew and Sanscrit,’ and she read several minutes from it as if it were English. . . . Then in the same way she interpreted to us hieroglyphics from another roll.”<sup>5</sup> Charlotte Haven, in the same statement, is an eyewitness to some things but a hearsay witness to others. She is an eyewitness that in Nauvoo, there was “a long roll of manuscript” and “another roll”; but when she reports that the manuscript was “written in Hebrew and Sanscrit” she is not in a position to confirm that from firsthand knowledge. Instead she gets her information from Mother Smith who “said she read it through the inspiration of her son Joseph.”<sup>6</sup> Thus Haven’s report of the language of the papyri is garbled thirdhand hearsay. Failure to observe what is eyewitness and what is hearsay has caused much

confusion over these reports.<sup>7</sup> As Anderson has noted, “Hearsay situations raise the question of whether secondhand evidence started with observation.”<sup>8</sup> In this case part did and part did not.

## The Joseph Smith Papyri

As is well-known, the Joseph Smith Papyri (JSP) were found at Thebes by Antonio Lebolo with a cache of mummies.<sup>9</sup> Lebolo commissioned Albano Oblasser to take the mummies to America and sell them. After buying the mummies in New York, Michael Chandler toured the eastern United States with them, selling them piecemeal as he went to pay debts. At Kirtland, Ohio, he sold the remaining four of the mummies to Joseph Smith and others in July 1835 for the price of \$2,400. The mummies and papyri traveled to Missouri and Nauvoo. After Joseph’s death, Emma Smith’s second husband, Lewis Bidamon, sold the mummies to Abel Combs, who took them on another traveling show. While keeping some of the papyri, he sold the mummies to the Saint Louis Museum, after which they were sold to the Wood Museum in Chicago, where they were destroyed in the great fire of 1871. The papyri kept by Combs eventually went to Combs’s housekeeper, whose daughter’s widower sold them in 1947 to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who in turn gave them to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on 27 November 1967.

What the Metropolitan Museum of Art obtained and in turn gave to the church were ten fragments of papyri that had once comprised three separate manuscripts, originally belonging to a man named Hor (JSP I, X–XI) and women named Tsemminis<sup>10</sup> (JSP II, IV–IX) and Neferirtnoub (JSP IIIa–b). Our concern here is not so much to trace the various places in which the papyri were located and in whose house they were at any given time, but rather to use eyewitness testimony to reconstruct the extent and physical condition of the papyri at the time Joseph Smith owned them and to determine, if possible, what happened to the various rolls. We will examine the eyewitnesses in chronological order.

## The Eyewitnesses 1835–1837

The first known mention of the Joseph Smith Papyri is by A. Gardner<sup>11</sup> in a letter in the 27 March 1835 *Painesville Telegraph*.<sup>12</sup> On one of the female mummies exhibited by Michael Chandler, termed “No. 1,” “was found with this person a roll or book, having a little resemblance to birch bark; language unknown. Some linguists however say they can decipher 1336, in what they term an epitaph; ink black and red; many female figures.”<sup>13</sup> Another female mummy, termed “No. 2,” was “found with a roll as No. 1, filled with hieroglyphics, rudely executed.”<sup>14</sup> A male mummy, termed “No. 3,” “had a roll of writing as No. 1 & 2.”<sup>15</sup> These can plausibly be linked with the following remaining fragments of the Joseph Smith Papyri: No. 1, with the red and black ink and the many female figures, is the roll of Tsemminis. The cipher 1336 would probably be an attempt to make out the hieratic of *dd mdw Ān* “words said by” in the rubric (called here an “epitaph”). No. 2, from a female and with the rudely executed hieroglyphs, is likely the roll of Neferirtnoub, and No. 3, from a male, would be the roll of Hor.

Within a month of the purchase of the papyri, William W. Phelps who at that time, among other assignments, served as scribe to Joseph Smith wrote to his wife in Missouri: “The last of June four Egyptian mummies were brought here; there were two papyrus rolls, besides some other ancient Egyptian writings with them.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, at that time there were two rolls and more than one piece of other scattered papyri.

In December 1835, Oliver Cowdery, who like Phelps was Joseph's scribe and so had worked closely with the papyri, described them as "two rolls of papyrus" filled with "characters . . . such as you find upon the coffins of mummies, hieroglyphics, &c. with many characters or letters exactly like the present, (though probably not quite so square,) form of the Hebrew without points" forming a "record . . . beautifully written on papyrus with black, and a small part, red ink or paint, in perfect preservation."<sup>17</sup> To this he added "that two or three other small pieces of papyrus, with astronomical calculations, epitaphs, &c. were found with others of the Mummies."<sup>18</sup> Cowdery thus indicated that there were several other miscellaneous pieces of papyri besides the two large rolls. The prolix Cowdery<sup>19</sup> also described the vignettes on the papyri:

The representation of the god-head three, yet in one, is curiously drawn. . . . The serpent, represented as walking, or formed in a manner to be able to walk, standing in front of, and near a female figure, is to me, one of the greatest representations I have ever seen upon paper, or a writing substance. . . . Enoch's Pillar, as mentioned by Josephus, is upon the same roll. . . . The inner end of the same roll . . . presents a representation of the judgment: At one view you behold the Savior seated upon his throne, crowned, and holding the sceptres of righteousness and power, before whom also, are assembled the twelve tribes of Israel, the nations, languages and tongues of the earth, the kingdoms of the world over which satan is represented as reigning, Michael the archangel, holding the key of the bottomless pit, and at the same time the devil as being chained and shut up in the bottomless pit. But upon this last scene, I am able only to give you a shadow, to the real picture.<sup>20</sup>

Jay Todd, years ago, seems to have accurately connected these descriptions with the present papyri fragments.<sup>21</sup> The "god-head" representation seems to be from JSP IV; the walking serpent and pillar seem to be from JSP V, thus all from the Tsemminis roll. The description of the judgment scene (which Cowdery got right)<sup>22</sup> would match JSP IIIa-b, except Cowdery describes it as being on "the inner end of the same roll," which leads one to conclude that this was a vignette from Book of the Dead 125 on the Tsemminis roll, and this would seem to be confirmed by a fragment of the text of Book of the Dead 125 included in JSP IX.

By 1836, after much moving and handling,<sup>23</sup> the papyri had suffered damage to the outer edges of the rolls (cf. figs. 1 and 2).<sup>24</sup> A transcription of portions of the Tsemmenis roll probably done in 1835 shows squiggle marks used to indicate the edge of the papyrus, showing that portions had already come loose.<sup>25</sup> That the papyri were beginning to break into little pieces is demonstrated by the tiny fragments patched in the wrong places in the mounted papyri.<sup>26</sup> The backing paper is dated to the Kirtland period. Only the damaged outer portions of the rolls were mounted on paper; the remainder of the papyri, still being in relatively good condition, were left as rolls. This explains all the eyewitness reports and the remaining physical evidence. Joseph Smith's own concern was shown when he committed the Egyptian antiquities into the hands of Joseph Coe (who had assisted in their purchase) in February 1836: "I complied with his request, and only observed that they must be managed with prudence and care especially the manuscripts."<sup>27</sup> It is at this time, if not earlier, that I suggest the papyri were mounted. The present Joseph Smith Papyri all come from these mounted fragments from the end of the rolls; none of the rolls has been preserved.

In 1837, William S. West described the papyri he saw as "a quantity of records, written on papyrus, in Egyptian hieroglyphics. . . . These records were torn by being taken from the roll of embalming salve which contained them, and some parts entirely lost."<sup>28</sup> This is confirmed by Luman Shirliff's examination of the papyri in December 1837. Shirliff

looked at the parchment or Papyrus as called in the Egyptian language. This Parchment appeared to be made of fine linen cloth starched or sized with some kind of gum then ironed very smooth and written on in characters, figures, hieroglyphics, and conveying the Egyptian language. These sheets were about as large as the face of this book [12 x 15" and 30 x 37.5 cm] when open. They were rolled up, put in a gum case and laid on the breast of one of the leading men of the Egyptians, when the Mummy or body was found this record was on his breast.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, by the end of 1837, parts of the papyri were already separated into sheets.

### **The Eyewitnesses 1838–1856**

When the Brethren were driven out of Kirtland in 1838, the manuscripts were brought afterward, in the summer, by Vinson Knight to Far West.<sup>30</sup> A visitor from Montrose visited the Prophet in April 1840 and described “several frames, covered with glass, under which were numerous fragments of Egyptian papyrus, on which, as usual, a great variety of hieroglyphical characters had been imprinted.”<sup>31</sup>

On 5 May 1841, William I. Appleby visited Joseph Smith and wrote an extensive account in his journal. Much of this account copies sections from the Book of Abraham before it was published; we are, however, interested here in the descriptions of the papyri included here within context. Appleby says that he

Saw the Rolls of Papyrus and the writings thereon, taken from off the bosom of the Male Mummy, having some of the writings of ancient Abraham and of Joseph that was sold into Egypt. The writings are chiefly in the Egyptian language, with the exception of a little Hebrew. I believe they give a description of some of the scenes in Ancient Egypt, of their worship, their Idol gods, etc. The writings are beautiful and plain, composed of red, and black inks. There is a perceptible difference, between the writings. Joseph, appears to have been the best scribe. There are also representations of men, beasts, Birds, Idols and oxen attached to a kind of plough, and a female guiding it. Also the serpent when he beguiled Eve. He appears with two legs, erect in the form and appearance of man. But his head in the form, and representing the Serpent, with his forked tongue extended. There are likewise representations of an Altar erected, with a man bound and laid thereon, and a Priest with a knife in his hand, standing at the foot, with a dove over the person bound on the Altar with several Idol gods standing around it. A Celestial globe with the planet *Kolob* or first creation of the supreme Being a planet of light, which planet makes a revolution once in a thousand years, Also the Lord revealing the Grand key words of the Holy Priesthood, to Adam in the garden of Eden, as also to Seth, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, and to all whom the Priesthood was revealed. Abraham also in the Court of Pharaoh sitting upon the King’s throne reasoning upon Astronomy, with a crown upon his head, representing the Priesthood as emblematical of the grand Presidency in Heaven, with the scepter of Justice and Judgment in his hand. And King Pharaoh, standing behind him, together with a Prince a principal waiter, and a black slave of the King. A genealogy of the Mummies, and Epitaphs and their deaths, etc., etc., are also distinctly represented on the Papyrus which is called the “*Book of Abraham*.”<sup>32</sup>

Here are the elements of the published Book of Abraham in a journal before its publication. But here also are descriptions of scenes from the papyri that were not published. Important to note are the following: The description of JSP II (“oxen attached to a kind of plough, and female guiding it”), the knife depicted in the hand of figure 3 of Facsimile 1 (which is in the yet-to-be published facsimile but not on the current surviving fragment of

JSP I), the distinct difference between the handwritings of the scribes of the papyri, and the recognition of the genealogies of the mummies on the papyri.

The imaginative Reverend Henry Caswall visited Nauvoo on 18 April 1842, just after the Book of Abraham and the facsimiles were published in the *Times and Seasons*, and viewed the papyri. He reports that they were preserved in “a number of glazed slides, like picture frames, containing sheets of papyrus, with Egyptian inscriptions and hieroglyphics.”<sup>33</sup> He further describes the vignettes in a dialogue where eyewitness is heavily mixed with hearsay. One vignette contained “the figure of a man lying on a table” accompanied by a “man standing by him with a drawn knife.”<sup>34</sup> The description is plainly JSP I (reproduced as Facsimile 1 in the Book of Abraham). Caswall indicates that a separate papyrus contained “a hieroglyphic representation” with “four little figures” and a “big dog looking at the four figures.” The dog was accompanied by a “person keeping back the big dog.” At another point on the papyrus was a “figure” with “his two wives”; there were “stripes across the dress of one of [his] wives . . . only reaching up to his wife’s waist.”<sup>35</sup> This description seems to match that of JSP IIIa–b.

Reverend Caswall’s testimony remains problematical, partially because Caswall fabricated parts of his visit to Nauvoo.<sup>36</sup> One might be inclined to think that he just derived his information about the papyri from their widespread publicity except for his description of JSP IIIa–b; this indicates that he actually had a firsthand experience with the papyri. Yet another obstacle remains, since Caswall, a non-Mormon openly hostile to Joseph Smith, describes JSP I as having “that man standing by him with a drawn knife.”<sup>37</sup> The existence of the knife has been doubted by many because it does not conform to what other Egyptian papyri would lead us to expect,<sup>38</sup> yet it has here been described by a non-Mormon eyewitness whose description of the storage and preservation of the papyri matches that of independent contemporary accounts. It also matches the description William Appleby made before Reuben Hedlock made the woodcuts of the facsimiles. This gives us two independent eyewitnesses to the presence of a knife on Facsimile 1, regardless of what we might think.

Robert Horne is an example of an eyewitness who adds nothing new to the picture but is an independent eyewitness nonetheless. He described the papyri between 1842 and 1843 as “some kind of parchment or papyrus, and it contained writing in red and black.”<sup>39</sup>

When Charlotte Haven saw the papyri in February 1843, she described seeing “a long roll of manuscript” and seeing “hieroglyphics from another roll.”<sup>40</sup> This second roll had several vignettes: “one was Mother Eve being tempted by the serpent, who the serpent, I mean was standing on the tip of his tail, which with his two legs formed a tripod, and had his head in Eve’s ear.” Declaring the female figure to be Mother Eve is clearly an interpretation; setting that aside, the description of the vignette does not match any in the preserved Joseph Smith Papyri, nor should we expect it to. Since the outer edges of the rolls were the damaged ones and thus the ones mounted on paper and preserved in glass frames, the intact center of the rolls remained and were kept as rolls. This vignette was specifically said to be on one of the remaining rolls, not on the papyri mounted in the glass frames, which were the only ones to be preserved down to the present and thus is not part of the Joseph Smith Papyri in our possession.<sup>41</sup>

When Josiah Quincy saw the papyri in 1844, he described them as “some parchments inscribed with hieroglyphics . . . preserved under glass and handled with great respect.”<sup>42</sup> Quincy also described one of the vignettes this way: “The parchment last referred to showed a rude drawing of a man and woman, and a serpent walking upon a pair of legs.”<sup>43</sup> Quincy’s description was also told to Henry Halkett, who reported Quincy as saying one of the papyri “had



a representation of a man, a woman, a tree, and a non-descript animal.”<sup>44</sup> JSP V shows a woman facing a serpent walking on legs but shows neither man nor tree; thus it would seem that Quincy described a different papyrus fragment. This would indicate that not all of the mounted fragments ended up in the batch that went to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

While the papyri were in the Saint Louis Museum, Gustavus Seyffarth, who was a rival to Jean-François Champollion,<sup>45</sup> viewed at least one of the papyri rolls in 1856 and pronounced, “the papyrus roll is not a record, but an invocation to the Deity Osiris, in which occurs the name of the person, (Horus,) and a picture of the attendant spirits, introducing the dead to the Judge, Osiris.”<sup>46</sup> The “picture” described seems to be Facsimile 3. This indicates that the part of the roll that JSP I, XI, and X came from was still preserved as a roll in 1856 and that Facsimile 3 of the Book of Abraham was on that roll. The contents of the Saint Louis Museum were sold to the Wood Museum and moved to Chicago, where the same description was repeated in the 1863 catalog.<sup>47</sup> This group of antiquities seems to have been destroyed in the Chicago fire of 1871.

### **The Extent of the Joseph Smith Papyri**

From the eyewitness historical descriptions of the papyri and the remaining physical evidence we can construct the following Egyptological description of the papyri (see fig. 3).<sup>48</sup> Book of the Dead of Tsemminis, daughter of Eskhons, was a long roll (estimated original dimensions were 320 x 32 cm),<sup>49</sup> whose damaged outside leaves were preserved under glass; remaining fragments are from JSP VII, VIII, V, VI, IV, and II (arranged in that order from right to left). The Book of the Dead chapters covered are BD 3–6, 53–54, 57, 63, 65, 67, 70, 72, 74–77, 83, 86–89, 91, 100–101, 103–6, 110, 125.<sup>50</sup> As a late-period copy of the Book of the Dead, it can definitely be said to be Theban, belonging to Mosher’s Style 1a and phase III.<sup>51</sup> Fragments from the first quarter of the roll are missing.<sup>52</sup> The fragments were separated from the roll and mounted on glass, probably in 1836. The roll seems to have contained a copy of Book of the Dead 125 as well as a vignette of a tree, a man, and a woman, with a snake standing on its legs with his head in the woman’s ear; this is consistent with both the extant chapters and the eyewitness descriptions. The roll and possibly some of the fragments seem to have been destroyed in the Chicago fire. This roll probably dated to the last half of the third century B.C.

Book of the Dead of Neferirtnoub was, from early accounts, apparently a roll of considerable size, of which two fragments remain as JSP IIIa–b, containing the vignette of Book of the Dead 125. Since only the two fragments remain, the rest may have perished in the Chicago fire.

Scroll of Hor (a son of Osoroeris and Taykhebit)<sup>53</sup> was a roll of some size (estimated original dimensions are 320 x 11 cm). The outer leaves, separated and mounted in Kirtland in 1836, remain as JSP I, XI, and X (in that order, from right to left). This roll contains the so-called “Book of Breathings Made by Isis” and at least one other text. The relationship of this roll to P. Louvre 3284 needs to be clarified, since most of the translations and commentaries on JSP XI–X are in fact translations and commentaries of P. Louvre 3284.<sup>54</sup> One difference between the two papyri is that the terminal comments from P. Louvre 3284 (= column 6) become the preliminary comments in JSP XI (= column 1), and would normally be termed “rubrics” except that red ink was not used in either case.<sup>55</sup> Beyond that, the relationship seems to be that JSP XI–X is an abridged copy of the same text as P. Louvre 3284 to the extent that a one-to-one correspondence exists between the columns of the text,<sup>56</sup> which leads us to expect that there would have been two other columns on the roll of Hor’s papyrus in addition to the vignette preserved as Facsimile 3 in the Book of Abraham. These columns would contain the abridged version of the negative confession, but no

real invocations to Osiris as described by Seyffarth.<sup>57</sup> This argues for more than one text on the roll;<sup>58</sup> thus we would expect more to have remained on the roll than the two columns of text from the Book of Breathings and the vignette (Facsimile 3). Though the outer pieces ended up as JSP I, XI, and X, the remainder of the roll almost certainly was in the Wood Museum in Chicago and was thus destroyed in the fire of 1871.

The Hypocephalus of Sheshonq (original dimensions are 19 x 20 cm) is preserved only as Facsimile 2 in the Book of Abraham.

Parts of the Unknown Document of Amenhotep, son of Tanoub, are preserved only in a poor copy in Kirtland Egyptian Papers, Egyptian manuscript no. 6.<sup>59</sup> The copy is in three columns of text, but how these relate to the original papyrus is unknown. One of the columns contains Book of the Dead 45. The other columns have not been identified as any Book of the Dead or other known text. The different name is what makes it appear to be a separate document.

### **The Papyri Contents: *Pars pro toto*?**

The Joseph Smith Papyri are generally termed typical funerary documents. Some people assume that if the documents are funerary they cannot contain anything else. Some Book of the Dead papyri, however, do contain other texts.<sup>60</sup> For example, a fragmentary Eighteenth-Dynasty Book of the Dead in Cairo (JE 95575) contains account texts on the front side (recto).<sup>61</sup> Papyrus Vandier also has a Book of the Dead on the verso (back side), but the recto contains the story of Meryre, who was sacrificed on an altar (an intriguing similarity to the Book of Abraham).<sup>62</sup> The Book of the Dead of Psenmines (Louvre 3129) and Pawerem (BM 10252) both contain temple rituals.<sup>63</sup> Both Papyrus Harkness<sup>64</sup> and BM 10507 (demotic funerary papyri) contain several different texts.<sup>65</sup> Just because the preserved sections of the Joseph Smith Papyri are funerary in nature does not mean that they could not have had other texts, either on the verso or on missing sections of the rolls. Arguing from silence is usually considered a fallacy.<sup>66</sup> Seyffarth's report indicates that the scroll belonging to Hor contained more than simply a Book of Breathings; unfortunately, it is unclear exactly what else it did contain, thus providing yet another example of an objective historical fact that is presently irrecoverable by scholarly means and methods.

### **Hearsay and Joseph Smith's Understanding of the Papyri**

Critics have often engaged in mind reading to say what they believed Joseph Smith thought about the papyri and have often brought forward evidence to support their contention. Unfortunately, the evidence brought forward to support this contention has usually been secondhand or hearsay rather than statements made or published by the Prophet. The latter have priority over the former. Two examples should make this plain.

By the end of July the *Cleveland Whig* printed the report that "the prophet Joe has ascertained, by examining the papyrus through his spectacles, that they are the bodies of Joseph, (the son of Abraham,) and king Abimelech and his daughter."<sup>67</sup> This account was circulated by five other newspapers as far away as New York and Washington, D.C.<sup>68</sup> "For the purpose of correcting these, and other erroneous statements," concerning both the mummies and also the records, church leaders took pains to point out in an official publication:

It has been said, that the purchasers of these antiquities pretend they have the body of Abraham, Abimelech, the king of the Philistines, Joseph, who was sold into Egypt, &c. &c. for the purpose of attracting the attention of the multitude, and gulling the unwary which is utterly false. . . .

Who these ancient inhabitants of Egypt are, we do not pretend to say, neither does it matter to us. We have no idea or expectation, that either of them are Abraham, Abimelech, or Joseph. Abraham was buried on his own possession, “in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron, the son of Zohar the Hittite, which is before Mamre,” which he purchased of the sons of Heth; Abimelech lived in the same country, and for aught we know, died there, and the children of Israel carried Joseph’s bones from Egypt when they went out under Moses. Consequently, [they] could not have been found in Egypt in the 19th century.<sup>69</sup>

Neither in their own day, nor particularly since, have the church leaders been given credit for the good sense and critical thinking displayed here. Yet this did nothing to stop the false reports from circulating to this day.

A visitor to Joseph Smith in 1840 reports his suggested identification of one of the mummies:

“It may have been the Princess Thermuthis,” I replied, “The same that rescued Moses from the waters of the Nile.”

“It is not improbable,” answered the Prophet, “but time has not yet allowed fully to examine and decide the point.”<sup>70</sup>

Though Joseph Smith allowed others to speculate on the identity of the mummies, and in some cases may have passed the speculation on, he had not decided the point. Secondhand sources maintaining he claimed the mummies to be a specific, and especially a famous, individual are suspect and cannot be taken as firsthand accounts of what Joseph Smith thought.

For our second example, Josiah Quincy has often been cited both in and out of the church,<sup>71</sup> though the former is ironic since Quincy is clearly mocking the Prophet in his narrative. Yet Quincy was not the only one present at his interview with the Prophet in April 1844 nor the only one to leave a record of the interview. Consider Quincy’s account of Joseph’s statements about the papyri:

Some parchments inscribed with hieroglyphics were then offered us. They were preserved under glass and handled with great respect. “That is the handwriting of Abraham, the Father of the Faithful,” said the prophet. “This is the autograph of Moses, and these lines were written by his brother Aaron. Here we have the earliest account of the Creation, from which Moses composed the First Book of Genesis.”<sup>72</sup>

Quincy’s traveling companion, Charles Francis Adams, described this a bit differently:

He also conducted them on a tour of his house, where he showed them four Egyptian mummies and explained (for a fee of twenty-five cents) the contents of a manuscript “written by the hand of Abraham” which had been found in one of them.<sup>73</sup>

Adams’s description of the manuscript as “written by the hand of Abraham” is different from Quincy’s description as “the handwriting of Abraham” and is significant because it more closely matches the Prophet’s published statement that the manuscript was one “purporting to be the writings of Abraham, while he was in Egypt, called the Book of Abraham, written by his own hand, upon papyrus.”<sup>74</sup> Quincy seems to have taken liberties with the wording of the Prophet and garbled it in the process. Published statements of the Prophet take precedence over secondhand garbled remembrances, no matter how well intentioned.

Joseph's journal entries discuss his understanding of what he did with the papyri.<sup>75</sup> Most of these entries refer to exhibiting the papyri to interested onlookers.<sup>76</sup> Four entries refer to translating,<sup>77</sup> one to transcribing,<sup>78</sup> and one to the Kirtland Egyptian Papers.<sup>79</sup>

## The Kirtland Egyptian Papers

The Kirtland Egyptian Papers are a collection of documents, dating mostly to the Kirtland period, in the handwriting of various individuals. They have been grouped into two classes of documents, Book of Abraham manuscripts (hereinafter KEPA) and Egyptian manuscripts (hereinafter KEPE). For a description of the manuscripts, refer to table 1.

The provenance of KEPA 1 differs from that of the other Kirtland Egyptian Papers. It was acquired from Charles E. Bidamon by Wilford Wood while at least some of the others were brought to Salt Lake by Willard Richards,<sup>81</sup> and some might have been brought by W. W. Phelps. This has possible interpretive implications for the Kirtland Egyptian Papers, for if W. W. Phelps brought them, they are W. W. Phelps's notes, not Joseph Smith's. The scattered provenances of the documents also indicate that we may not possess all the relevant Kirtland Egyptian Papers.

Each of the Kirtland Egyptian Papers needs to be analyzed on its own merits. They are not uniform in regard to handwriting, date, or purpose. None of the manuscripts is dated, though some of them are datable within limits. The purpose seems to be more varied. For example, KEPA 4 appears to be the printer's manuscript for the first installment of the Book of Abraham, as it covers exactly the same material, matches the printed edition (even in paragraphing), and is in the handwriting of one of Joseph's scribes at the time. KEPA 5 may have been originally intended to serve the same purpose for Facsimile 2, but plans altered.<sup>82</sup> None of the other Kirtland Egyptian Papers appears to be directly connected with the publication of the Book of Abraham. The meaning of each of the papers needs to be carefully ascertained since none of the individuals who were involved in their production seems to have discussed the documents, with the exception of one reference in Joseph Smith's journal.<sup>83</sup>

## Journal Entry of 1 October 1835

The single entry in Joseph Smith's journal referring to the Kirtland Egyptian Papers deserves special attention:

October 1, 1835. This after noon labored on the Egyptian alphabet, in company with brsr. O. Cowdery and W. W. Phelps: The system of astronomy was unfolded.<sup>84</sup>

What editors have done with this entry in Oliver Cowdery's handwriting shows the need for clarification. Warren A. Cowdery, in preparing the Manuscript History of the Church, dropped some things and added others while smoothing out the English (italics indicate editorial changes):

*He stayed at home and* labored on the Egyptian Alphabet in company with *his brethren* O. Cowdery & W. W. Phelps. The system of Astronomy was unfolded.<sup>85</sup>

B. H. Roberts, in preparing the *History of the Church* for publication, changed the entry to first person, smoothed out the English, and used later entries to explain the laconic comment about astronomy (again, italics indicate editorial changes).

This afternoon I labored on the Egyptian alphabet, in company with *Brothers Oliver Cowdery* and *W. W. Phelps*, and during the research, the principles of astronomy as understood by *Father Abraham* and the ancients unfolded to our understanding, the particulars of which will appear hereafter.<sup>86</sup>

Scott Faulring, in editing the Prophet's journals, thought it necessary to add bracketed material:

October 1[st] 1835 This after noon labored on the Egyptian alphabet in company with Br[other]s O[liver] Cowdery and W[illiam] W. Phelps. The system of astronomy was unfolded [to us].<sup>87</sup>

Two phrases in the journal deserve clarification for an understanding of what occurred on this date.

*System of Astronomy.* The phrase *system of astronomy* has provoked the most emendation. Later that year, Joseph Smith explained to William McLellen, Brigham Young, and Jared Carter "concerning the dealings of God with the ancients and the formation of the planetary System."<sup>88</sup> Warren Parrish expanded this entry from the Prophet's journal in the *Manuscript History of the Church* to read that the Prophet explained "many things concerning the dealings of God, with the ancients especially the system of astronomy as taught by Abraham, which is contained upon these manuscripts [the Egyptian papyri]."<sup>89</sup> Parrish made these changes nearly contemporary with the journal entry. Within a week of this journal entry, Oliver Cowdery described the papyri as including more than just papyri rolls, noting "that two or three other small pieces of papyrus, with astronomical calculations, epitaphs, &c. were found with others of the Mummies."<sup>90</sup> The Brethren here were referring to a specific papyrus and its interpretation. Joseph Smith specified which papyrus document in a Nauvoo journal entry:

Exhibiting the Book of Abraham, in the original, To Bro Reuben Hadlock [Hedlock]. so that he might take the size of the several plates or cuts. & prepare the blocks for the *Times & Seasons*. & also gave instruction concerning the arrangement of the writing on the Large cut. illustrating the principles of Astronomy.<sup>91</sup>

One of the unnoticed things about the original publication of the facsimiles is that Reuben Hedlock produced the facsimiles in the *Times and Seasons* to size. Facsimile 2 was a separate broadside and significantly larger than the other two; this is impossible to tell from most modern publications, which are sized to fit the available space. (Joseph Smith's and Reuben Hedlock's careful epigraphic concerns are underappreciated, particularly when compared with other epigraphic and Egyptological publications of the pre-Lepsius era.)<sup>92</sup> This tells us that Facsimile 2 of the Book of Abraham was the astronomical manuscript, which appeared in the very next issue of the *Times and Seasons*. The journal entry for 1 October 1835 records the revelation of the interpretation of Facsimile 2.

The Book of Abraham as published in the *Times and Seasons* was not a complete translation, but the publication of the facsimiles illustrates an order to the story. In Facsimile 1, Abraham is saved from being sacrificed; Facsimile 2 contains the knowledge of astronomy revealed to Abraham; and Facsimile 3 depicts Abraham teaching this astronomical knowledge in Pharaoh's court. The Book of Abraham also gives an outline of its prospective contents:

A knowledge of the beginning of the creation, and also of the planets, of the stars, as they were made known unto the fathers, have I kept even unto this day, and I shall endeavor to write some of these things upon this record, for the benefit of my posterity that shall come after me. (Abraham 1:31)

In its currently published form, the Book of Abraham stops in the middle of a revelation on the creation, given to Abraham preparatory to his entry into Egypt.

A word on the “explanations” of the facsimiles of the Book of Abraham is in order here. Though each facsimile has what is termed an “explanation,” it does not explain much of what is going on in the facsimiles; rather, the “explanation” identifies various elements, which are then explained in the text of the Book of Abraham. As presently constituted, the text of the Book of Abraham stops before the explanation of Facsimile 2 occurs. When Joseph Smith writes on 1 October 1835 that “the system of astronomy was unfolded,” he provides a date for the progress achieved to that point in the translation of the Book of Abraham, a point further along in the Book of Abraham than was ever published. Furthermore, the first hint of astronomical things occurs in Abraham 3:2, which is further along in the translation than any manuscript of the Book of Abraham dating from the Kirtland period (KEPA 1–3). No Kirtland period manuscript discusses the hypocephalus. Nor does any passage in the Book of Abraham really discuss “the formation of the planetary System.”<sup>93</sup> That the translation had progressed further than the present Book of Abraham is corroborated by the firsthand report of Anson Call that, in 1838, it took “altogether about two hours” to read the Book of Abraham aloud;<sup>94</sup> it takes about half an hour now. This indicates that by 1838, Joseph Smith had translated approximately four times as much as we currently have in the Book of Abraham, and, as we have no record of translation after 25 November 1835, it would seem that most if not all of it had been translated in 1835.

*Egyptian Alphabet.* The other phrase that deserves examination in the 1 October entry is that Joseph Smith says that he “labored on the Egyptian alphabet.” It has long been assumed that this was the so-called “Egyptian Alphabet and Grammar” (KEPE 1).<sup>95</sup> This cannot be maintained on several grounds: (1) The title given to KEPE 1 is “Grammar and Alphabet of the Egyptian Language,”<sup>96</sup> whereas other documents, notably KEPE 3–5, bear the title “Egyptian Alphabet”; (2) the handwriting of KEPE 1 is that of W. W. Phelps and Warren Parrish. Parrish was not hired as a scribe to Joseph Smith until four weeks later.<sup>97</sup> On the other hand KEPE 3–5 are in the handwritings of the three men whom Joseph Smith identifies as being present on that occasion: Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and W. W. Phelps. Thus the documents referred to, if we possess them at all, must be KEPE 3–5.

Kirtland Egyptian Papers, Egyptian manuscripts 3, 4, and 5, are almost identical in content. The columns on the left are filled with characters from various columns of JSP I, identified by degree (column or line) and part (fragment).<sup>98</sup> The copied glyphs indicate that the papyrus has deteriorated since 1835. The English renderings in the last column are not connected with the Book of Abraham or astronomy,<sup>99</sup> although they should be were the critics correct. The fact that the only one of these manuscripts to have Joseph Smith’s handwriting on it matches JSP I but not the Book of Abraham would indicate that Joseph Smith did not think that the Book of Breathings was the Book of Abraham.<sup>100</sup> The three manuscripts are not copies of each other; free variants and synonyms abound indicating that the manuscripts are independent notes made on the same occasion.<sup>101</sup> Thus the labor was on JSP I, but the revelation given on the occasion was about a different papyrus, the Joseph Smith hypocephalus (Facsimile 2).

Consequently the one record in which there is a discussion about the Kirtland Egyptian Papers by someone whose handwriting appears on them (Joseph Smith’s journal entry of 1 October 1835) confirms that the Kirtland Egyptian Papers were not directly connected with the translation of the Book of Abraham at all. The revelation was not dependent on, derived from, or a product of the Kirtland Egyptian Papers. The translation of the Book of

Abraham had already progressed far beyond the place where the Kirtland Egyptian Papers were. As is common with most deciphered ancient languages, the decipherment and translation comes first, and a grammar is written after the text is understood.<sup>102</sup> Therefore, the Kirtland Egyptian Papers, if anything, may have been the result of an effort by the Brethren to align the Book of Abraham already received by revelation with papyri documents in their possession, although even this is doubtful. The extent of Joseph Smith's participation in the remaining Kirtland Egyptian Papers is made tenuous by (1) the absence of his handwriting on the remaining documents, (2) the demonstrable independence of the scribes even when working in coordinated fashion, (3) the promises to scribes like Warren Parrish (in whose handwriting much of the KEP are) that "he shall see much of my ancient records, and shall know of hidden things, and shall be endowed with a knowledge of hidden languages,"<sup>103</sup> and (4) the well-known fact that "the scribes and clerks often composed and recorded information on their own."<sup>104</sup>

The Book of Abraham was located elsewhere on the rolls since Joseph Smith refers to teachings from the Book of Abraham and stated that he learned this "by translating the papyrus now in my house,"<sup>105</sup> but the process was not that of a modern Egyptologist. The word chosen to describe the process, "unfolded," indicates, as elsewhere in the writings of Joseph Smith, that the process was one of revelation and not of research.<sup>106</sup> That the Book of Abraham was received by direct revelation is confirmed by the disgruntled Warren Parrish after his apostasy:

I have set by his side and penned down the translation of the Egyptian Heiroglyphicks [sic] as he claimed to receive it by direct inspiration of Heaven.<sup>107</sup>

The evidence provided by those involved in the translation process indicates that the Book of Abraham came by revelation and not through modern Egyptological methods or the Kirtland Egyptian Papers. The Kirtland Egyptian Papers are at best a by-product of the translation.

## **The Need for Caution**

When a subject is truly brought into focus, different lines of approach converge on the same result. If we rely on hearsay evidence, however, the lines will focus on the gossip about a subject rather than on the subject itself. The preceding examples show the need for more care in gathering and sifting through materials, particularly when trying to determine what Joseph Smith thought he was doing. While some difficulties arise from a failure both to assemble the relevant material and to place the material in its proper historical context (because Joseph preceded and was outside the Egyptological tradition, he used terms that have gone unrecognized and misunderstood; Joseph was then blamed for not being within the tradition or for modern misunderstandings), at least as much havoc has been wreaked by not separating firsthand statements from garbled hearsay. Separating eyewitness from hearsay evidence is the only sound way to make sense of the mess surrounding the Joseph Smith Papyri. As a rule, ancient historians are unaccustomed to having so much information to deal with; normally we have so little information that we must accept any sort of information that can be brought to bear. Too often our attempts to fit the data into our own preconceived notions have overlooked the lesson that Richard Anderson has stressed: Firsthand primary sources take precedence over all others. The Joseph Smith Papyri can only make sense if attention is paid to whether the sources are firsthand for the information we seek. All too often, they have not been.

## **Notes**

1. For instance, I first read Morton Smith's work *Jesus the Magician* for Anderson's class. For a brief evaluation of this wretched work, see John Gee, "Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob," *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 7/1 (1995): 67–70.
  2. Richard Lloyd Anderson, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981), 152–53.
  3. Examples include James R. Clark, *The Story of the Pearl of Great Price* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1955); Jay M. Todd, *The Saga of the Book of Abraham* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1969); John A. Larson, "Joseph Smith and Egyptology: An Early Episode in the History of American Speculation about Ancient Egypt, 1835–1844," in *For His Ka: Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer*, ed. David P. Silverman (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1994); H. Donl Peterson, *The Story of the Book of Abraham: Mummies, Manuscripts, and Mormonism* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995). By listing these works in the category of *omnium-gatherum* approaches I do not wish to say that the authors (compilers?) exercised no critical faculties although they all certainly could have exercised more. Clark had very little primary material to work with. Todd and Peterson (and Richard Lloyd Anderson) have unearthed most of the primary material. Anyone looking for a simple narrative of the papyri will have a difficult time because Peterson and Todd clog their narratives with stories about how they got the information, while Larson seems to have misunderstood and thus mishandled his sources.
  4. I would like to thank Matthew Roper; for many years we have been gathering eyewitness accounts of the papyri and mummies. The thesis on the papyri, however, is my own, and no one else should be blamed for any mistake herein.
- I have published comments on various aspects of this problem in a series of review essays: John Gee, "A Tragedy of Errors," *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 4 (1992): 93–117; Gee, "Abracadabra, Isaac and Jacob," 19–84; John Gee, "'Bird Island' Revisited, or the Book of Mormon through Pyramidal Kabbalistic Glasses," *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 7/1 (1995): 219–28; and John Gee, "Telling the Story of the Joseph Smith Papyri," *FARMS Review of Books* 8/2 (1996): 46–59. It is time that many of these strands were pulled together.
5. Charlotte Haven, to her mother, 19 February 1843, in "A Girl's Letters from Nauvoo," *Overland Monthly* (December 1890), cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 245.
  6. Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 245.
  7. See *ibid.*, 246–49.
  8. Anderson, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 155.
  9. The story of the Joseph Smith Papyri is told in the sources in note 3 above, with the fullest details in Peterson, *The Story of the Book of Abraham*; compare Jay M. Todd, "Papyri, Joseph Smith," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 3:1058–60; and Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 275–309.
  10. Various Greek spellings are attested for the Egyptian name transliterated T<sub>3</sub>-š.r.t-Mn, including Semminis and Senminis.
  11. Contra the suggestion by Robert K. Ritner in Larson, "Joseph Smith and Egyptology," 161; the name need not be "a pseudonym, in the American tradition of Benjamin Franklin's 'Poor Richard,'" since the family is attested in the



Cuyahoga County census in both 1830 and 1840 (Cuyahoga County Ohio 1830 census, p. 102; and Cuyahoga County Ohio 1840 census, p. 12).

12. According to Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 133, this newspaper account was first located by Richard Lloyd Anderson.

13. Cited in *ibid.*, 134.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. William W. Phelps to Sally Phelps, 19–20 July 1835, in Leah Y. Phelps, “Letters of Faith from Kirtland,” *Improvement Era* (August 1942): 529, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 172, and in Peterson, *Story of the Book of Abraham*, 4.

17. Oliver Cowdery, letter to William Frye, 22 December 1835, printed in the *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate* 2/3 (December 1835): 234. Citations of this may also be found in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 188–89.

18. Cowdery to Frye, 22 December 1835, in *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate*, 234.

19. Oliver’s style follows more closely the writing styles of his day than Joseph’s does. Compare the accounts of Oliver in *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989–92), 1:26–96, with any of Joseph’s accounts of the same events in the same volume. “Here the reader will observe that the narrative assumes a different form. . . . The writer deemed it proper to give a plain, simple, yet faithful narration.” Joseph Smith History 1834–36, September 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 1:97. This encapsulates the difference between Joseph Smith’s and Oliver Cowdery’s styles.

20. Cowdery to Frye, 22 December 1835, in *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate*, 236. See Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 191–92.

21. See Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 194.

22. Cowdery’s identification precedes by seven years that of K. Richard Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1842), 13–15, and by nineteen years the discussion of Max Uhlemann, *Das Todtengericht bei den alten Ägyptern* (Berlin: Geelhaar, 1854).

23. For the travels of the papyri to that point, see Peterson, *Story of the Book of Abraham*, 43–102, esp. the map on p. 91.

24. For similar deterioration, see the photos of Papyrus Harkness in Thomas J. Logan, “Papyrus Harkness,” in *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1976), 150; Theodore M. Davis, *The Funeral Papyrus of Louiyya*, intro. Edouard Naville (London: Constable, 1908), plate I as opposed to plate XXXIV; Louis Speleers, *Le Papyrus de Nefer Renpet* (Brussels: Vromant, 1917), plates; CG 40003 (JE 95834) and CG 25095, in Irmtraut Munro, *Die Totenbuch-Handschriften der 18. Dynastie im Ägyptischen Museum Cairo*, Textband (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 1: plates 55–56, 58–61. The outside of the roll is generally to the right but depends on the

direction of the writing; for the usage see the statue of Horemheb (MMA 23.10.1) in Peter F. Dorman, Prudence O. Harper, and Holly Pittman, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Egypt and the Ancient Near East* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987), 67; see also Jaroslav Černý, *Paper and Books in Ancient Egypt* (1952; reprint, Chicago: Ares, 1985), 10, 13–14.

25. Kirtland Egyptian Papers, Egyptian manuscript 8, p. 1, in the Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter LDS Church Archives). The name T3-šrt-MĀn m3'-hrw ms.n Ns-nsw m3'-hrw is clear in the copy and is also clearly broken by the squiggle marks, starting midword.

26. See the discussions in Klaus Baer, "The Breathing Permit of HĀ'r: A Translation of the Apparent Source of the Book of Abraham," *Dialogue* 3/3 (1968): 109–34.

27. Joseph Smith's Ohio Journal, 17 February 1836, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:176.

28. William S. West, *A Few Interesting Facts Respecting the Rise, Progress, and Pretensions of the Mormons* (Warren, Ohio, 1837), cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 196–97.

29. Journal of Luman A. Shirliff, 1:87–88, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 200.

30. See Anson Call, Manuscript Journal, summer of 1838, p. 9, cited in Robert J. Matthews, "A Plainer Translation": *Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible, A History and Commentary* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1975), 98; contra Larson, "Joseph Smith and Egyptology," 169. Vinson Knight had been in Kirtland on 12 January 1838; Scott H. Faulring, ed., *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature, 1989), 191. By "the fall of 1838" he was expelled from Missouri; Vinson Knight, affidavit of 29 October 1839, in *Mormon Redress Petitions: Documents of the 1833–1838 Missouri Conflict*, ed. Clark V. Johnson (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992), 261.

31. The *Quincy Whig*, 17 October 1840, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 211.

32. William I. Appleby Journal, 5 May 1841, ms. 1401 1, pp. 71–72, LDS Church Archives.

33. Henry Caswall, *The City of the Mormons; or, Three Days at Nauvoo, in 1842* (London: Rivington, 1842), 22; also cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 237.

34. Caswall, *City of the Mormons*, 22–23.

35. *Ibid.*, 23.

36. The standard discussion is Hugh W. Nibley, "The Greek Psalter Mystery or Mr. Caswall Meets the Press," in *Tinkling Cymbals and Sounding Brass: The Art of Telling Tales about Joseph Smith and Brigham Young* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1991), 304–406.

37. Caswall, *City of the Mormons*, 23.

38. Most recently by Stephen E. Thompson, "Egyptology and the Book of Abraham," *Dialogue* 28/1 (1995): 148–49 and n. 25. If Caswall did not see the knife, as Thompson argues, why did he not comment on what would have been an obvious discrepancy. Granted that the resultant vignette would not make sense based on what Thompson

knows about Egyptian funerary papyri, it is not valid to argue that something does not exist because it does not correspond to what we expect. Nor is it, as Thompson erroneously claims, “unlikely that an Egyptian would ever wish himself depicted being approached by a god with a knife” (ibid., 149). For examples, see Émile Chassinat, *Le Temple d’Edfou*, MIFAO 27 (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1928–60), 10:2: plates CXLV, CXLVIII, CLIII; Lepsius, *Das Tottenbuch der Ägypter*, plates LXI–LXIV; Suzanne Ratié, *Le papyrus de Neferoubenef (Louvre III 93)* (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1968), plate XIII; Jacques J. Clère, *Le Papyrus de Nesmin: Un livre des morts hiéroglyphique de l’époque ptolémaïque* (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1987), plates XV–XVI; Eva von Dassow, ed., *The Egyptian Book of the Dead: The Book of Going Forth by Day* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1994), plate 11; Munro, *Die Totenbuch-Handschriften*, 1: plate 60–61. A jackal-headed figure need not be Anubis; it could also be Isdes, who does wield a knife; see Chassinat, *Le Temple d’Edfou*, MIFAO 22, 5:143; another jackal-headed figure with a knife appears regularly in the eleventh mound of Book of the Dead 149; see Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead* (London: British Museum, 1985), 141.

39. Robert Horne, “Reminiscences of the Church in Nauvoo,” *Millennial Star* 55/36 (4 September 1893): 585; also cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 249.

40. Charlotte Haven, to her mother, 19 February 1843, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 245. Charlotte Haven’s account of the papyri rolls in Nauvoo is corroborated by a remembrance of Joseph F. Smith, which comes thirdhand through Preston Nibley to Hugh Nibley: “President Smith (as Elder Nibley recollected with his remarkable memory) recalled with tears the familiar sight of ‘Uncle Joseph’ kneeling on the floor of the front room with Egyptian manuscripts spread out all around him, weighted down by rocks and books, as with intense concentration he would study a line of characters, jotting down his impressions in a little notebook as he went.” Hugh W. Nibley, “A New Look at the Pearl of Great Price,” *Improvement Era* (March 1968): 17–18, repeated in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 219. From personal inspection of the Mansion House at Nauvoo, I would estimate that no more than 15–20 feet of the papyri could be unrolled at a time.

41. Contra Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 246–49.

42. Josiah Quincy, *Figures of the Past from the Leaves of Old Journals* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1883), 386. Another edition (Boston: Little, Brown, 1926), 325, is cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 256; and Larson, “Joseph Smith and Egyptology,” 172.

43. Quincy, *Figures* (1883), 386; (1926), 326.

44. Quoted in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 257.

45. A clear idea of his own, shall we say, idiosyncratic views of Egyptian hieroglyphs may be seen in Gustavus Seyffarth, “A Remarkable Papyrus-Scroll, Written in the Hieratic Character about 1050 B.C.,” *The Transactions of the Academy of Science of St. Louis* 1 (1856–60): 527–69, plate XIX, nos. 1–16. Some of Seyffarth’s views of the Egyptologists of his day, especially Champollion, expressed in this work deserve to be quoted: “They [unnamed individuals in New York] were acquainted only with the system of Champollion, according to which nobody, as yet, has succeeded in translating one line of a hieroglyphic, or Hieratic text, down to this day, as is known” (ibid., 529). The work of Heinrich Brugsch (on the Book of Breathings) he dismisses as “nonsense” (ibid., 536). Peter Le Page Renouf’s attack on his work “is written so ingeniously, skilfully, and winningly, that scarcely one reader, except the author and myself, would suspect its deceptiveness” (ibid., 539). His comments on de Rougé and Lepsius may be left to those interested. Suffice it to say, Seyffarth was hardly a mainstream Egyptologist of either his or our day; nevertheless, from time to time he comes up with a correct translation for all the wrong reasons (e.g., *ntr* ‘3 “the

great god” as “the powerful godhead” in *ibid.*, plate XIX no. 4, section III, lines 8–9, though assigning the meanings to the wrong words).

46. Catalogue of the Saint Louis Museum 1859, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 296–98.

47. See Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 299–302.

48. My reconstruction previously appeared in Gee, “A Tragedy of Errors,” 108–9, and here is greatly expanded and corrected.

49. Assuming that the damaged area was a fourth of the original length of the roll. Measurements were taken from the photographs in “New Light on Joseph Smith’s Egyptian Papyri,” *Improvement Era* (February 1968): 40–41 (also 40A–H), from the rulers shown in the photographs. This produced a calculation of 373 x 34.5 cm. The Turin papyrus of Efonkh measured 57’3” (1786 cm) in length; while MMA 35.9.19 measures 174.5 x 14.5” (453 x 37.5 cm). The chapters covered by the fragments take approximately one-fifth of the Efonkh papyrus, which would produce a length of 466 cm, a length closer to MMA 35.9.19. I have deliberately rounded down to the average size of papyri in the Ptolemaic period taken from P. W. Pestman, *The New Papyrological Primer*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 4–5.

50. The chapters were identified and put in proper order by John A. Wilson, “A Summary Report,” part of “The Joseph Smith Egyptian Papyri: Translations and Interpretations,” *Dialogue* 3/2 (1968): 67–85. Wilson and his editor, Joseph Jeppson, however, sowed sheer confusion by renumbering the papyri. For those who would work with Wilson’s article in the future, here is a concordance of the numberings the papyri have had through the years:

JSP #s	MMA #s	Wilson-Jeppson #s
I	47.102.9	A (photo 1)
II	47.102.10	B (photo 8)
IIIa	47.102.2	C (photo 5)
IIIb	47.102.3	C (photo 6)
IV	47.102.1	B (photo 3)
V	47.102.4	B (photo 2)
VI	47.102.7	B (photo 4)
VII	47.102.5	B (photo 7)
VIII	47.102.6	B (photo 9)
IX = Church Historian’s Fragment	—	B
X	47.102.8	D (photo 10)
XI	47.102.11	D (photo 11)
Facsimile 2	—	E
Facsimile 3	—	F
KEPE 6	—	G
?	—	H

Wilson’s documents A and F are the same document. Wilson’s document H (whose language is Arabic) appears to be a mirage created by Jerald and Sandra Tanner.

51. See Malcolm Mosher Jr., “Theban and Memphite Book of the Dead Traditions in the Late Period,” *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 29 (1992): 145–48, 170–72.

52. Based on the twenty-one of seventy-nine plates covering the anticipated material in the Turin scroll of Efonkh, in Lepsius, *Das Totenbuch der Ägypter*.

53. The name of the mother was misread as a father’s name Rmny-qöi at JSP XI 2/7 by Richard A. Parker, trans., “The Book of Breathings (Fragment 1, the ‘Sensen’ Text, with Restorations from Louvre Papyrus 3284),” part of

“The Joseph Smith Egyptian Papyri,” 99, and followed by Hugh W. Nibley, *Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri: An Egyptian Endowment* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1975), 26 and passim, which was the source of Gee, “Tragedy of Errors,” 105, 108 (a mistake I here correct).

54. This includes both Baer, “The Breathing Permit of HĀ’r,” and Nibley, *Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri*.

55. The terminology and discussion here follows the lead of Thomas G. Allen, *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth by Day: Ideas of the Ancient Egyptians concerning the Hereafter as Expressed in Their Own Terms* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 2.

56. The information for this comparison can be found in Nibley, *Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri*, 18–65, but was not noticed by Nibley.

57. Seyffarth might have mistaken the epithet of Osiris applied to Hor as the name of the god, although this is doubtful for two reasons: (1) Seyffarth consistently renders the term *WšĀr* before a personal name as “the most holy one” (“A Remarkable Papyrus Scroll,” plate XIX no. 11, line 64, and no. 15, line 134). (2) Seyffarth did identify another Book of Breathings as a book of hymns, translating *á, ¥3ty- ‘ m š ‘ y n snsnw Ār.n Is.t n sn = s WšĀr* “beginning of the book of breathings which Isis made for her brother Osiris” as “The Book of Hymns for singing the glories of him who made the Isis (the earth), (the glories) of that invisible being who made Osiris (the sun)” (ibid., 530 and plate XIX nos. 8–9, lines 1–14). Specifically it is the phrase *á, ¥3ty- ‘ m š ‘ y* “beginning of the book” that Seyffarth renders as “Book of Hymns” (ibid., plate XIX no. 8, lines 1–4). This indicates that Seyffarth, in identifying a text as an “invocation,” might have read the beginning lines of another text, one after the Book of Breathings.

58. The frequent and wild variations among Books of Breathings has long been commented on. This trait is especially common among Second Books of Breathings; see FranĀois-RenĀ Herbin, “Une nouvelle page du livre des respirations,” *BIFAO* 84 (1984): 249–50 n. 3.

59. Photograph of the document in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 316.

60. A general discussion of the reuse of rolls may be found in Āšernyv, *Paper and Books in Ancient Egypt*, 21–23. Here we are concerned specifically with multiple texts in connection with the Book of the Dead.

61. See Munro, *Totenbuch-Handschriften*, 1:191–204, plates 67–71; 2: plates 139–41.

62. See Georges Posener, *Le Papyrus Vandier* (Cairo: Institute FranĀsais d’ArchĀologie Orientale, 1985).

63. See Siegfried Schott, *Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts: BŪcher und SprŪche gegen den Gott Seth* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929).

64. See Logan, “Papyrus Harkness,” 150–61; Mark Smith, “Papyrus Harkness,” *Enchoria* 18 (1991): 95–105.

65. See Mark Smith, *The Mortuary Texts of Papyrus BM 10507*, Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, vol. 3 (London: British Museum, 1987), 19. This funerary papyrus was found with and written by the same scribe as the Instructions of Onchsheshonqy, which also contains a tale about burning Harsiese on an altar; for the latter, see S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of ‘Onch-she-shonqy (British Museum Papyrus 10508)*, Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, vol. 2, pt. 1 (London: British Museum, 1955); Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian*

*Literature: A Book of Readings* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973–80), 3:159–84; Heinz J. Thissen, *Die Lehre des Ansheschonqi* (P. BM 10508) (Bonn: Habelt, 1984).

66. See David H. Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 47–48.

67. *Cleveland Whig*, 31 July 1835, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 175.

68. It appeared in the *Pittsburgh Chronicle* on 13 August 1835, in the *New York Sunday Morning News* on 16 August 1835, in the *Washington, D.C., Daily National Intelligencer* on 21 August 1835, in the *New York Evening Star* in August 1835, and in the *Painesville Telegraph* on 4 September 1835. Details and quotations in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 175–79. It is worth noting that like today, the newspapers of that day copied each other, but unlike today the news organizations were much more open about their political biases, as the very titles of the newspapers often proclaim.

69. *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* 2/3 (December 1835): 233–34; also cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 187–88. This account is usually ascribed to Joseph Smith, but Todd thinks it may have been penned by the editor, John Whitmer (*ibid.*, 187).

70. "A Glance at the Mormons," *Quincy Whig*, 17 October 1840, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 210.

71. Perhaps the most notable and influential quotation may be found in LeGrand Richards, *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), 406–7.

72. Quincy, *Figures* (1926), 325–26.

73. Martin B. Duberman, *Charles Francis Adams, 1807–1886* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), 92.

74. *Times and Seasons* 3 (1 March 1842): 704, cited in Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 233.

75. An abbreviated discussion appears in Gee, "'Bird Island' Revisited," 226–27.

76. See Joseph Smith, *Ohio Journal*, 1835–36, entries for 3, 19, 24, and 29 October 1835; 17, 23, and 30 November 1835; 7, 10, 12, 14–16, 20, and 23 December 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:46, 53, 56–58, 85, 88, 92, 97, 101–2, 104–6, 119–20.

77. See Joseph Smith, *Ohio Journal*, 1835–36, 7 October 1835, 19–20, 25 November 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:50, 87, 90.

78. See Joseph Smith, *Ohio Journal*, 1835–36, 26 November 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:90.

79. See Joseph Smith, *Ohio Journal*, 1835–36, 1 October 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:45.

80. Taken from Hugh W. Nibley, "The Meaning of the Kirtland Egyptian Papers," *BYU Studies* 11/4 (1971): 351. Handwriting identifications were by Dean Jessee; I have modified the dates in places.

81. See Todd, *Saga of the Book of Abraham*, 281–84, 286, 326–31.

82. See Joseph Smith, Illinois Journal, 1841–42, 4 March 1842, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:366.
83. There is a reference to “the Alphabet” in Joseph Smith, Ohio Journal, 1835–36, 17 November 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:85, but this is (1) a later insertion (2) inserted as the object of the verb “exhibited” and thus provides no evidence for Joseph’s thought.
84. *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, comp. and ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 60; *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:45.
85. *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 1:102, emphasis added.
86. *History of the Church*, 2:286.
87. Faulring, *An American Prophet’s Record*, 35.
88. Joseph Smith, Ohio Journal, 1835–36, 16 December 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:106.
89. Manuscript History of the Church, Book A-1, 16 December 1835, LDS Church Archives, 148, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 1:163.
90. Cowdery to Frye, 22 December 1835, in *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate*, 234.
91. Joseph Smith, Illinois Journal, 1841–42, 4 March 1842, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:366.
92. See Ricardo Caminos, “The Recording of Inscriptions and Scenes in Tombs and Temples,” in *Ancient Egyptian Epigraphy and Palaeography* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1976), 3–4. The expedition of Lepsius (published from 1849–59) is the only epigraphic achievement he found worthy of mention before 1875.
93. Joseph Smith, Ohio Journal, 1835–36, 16 December 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:106. The only possible passage to discuss this is Abraham 4:14–18, which alludes to this but makes no explicit mention of any specific planets, much less a “planetary system,” or the “formation” of such a thing.
94. Anson Call, Manuscript Journal, summer of 1838, p. 9, cited in Matthews, *Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Bible*, 98.
95. See, for example, Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Mormonism Shadow or Reality?* 5th ed. (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1987), 311–13.
96. I have normalized the spelling and capitalization of the title; see table 1 for original spelling.
97. See Joseph Smith, Ohio Journal, 1835–36, 29 October 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:56. Warren Parrish’s handwriting begins with the entry of 8 October 1835, yet indications are present that Joseph was three weeks behind in his record keeping. This was not an isolated situation. When Parrish was sick on 25 January 1836, Joseph “appointed Elder Sylvester Smith acting Scribe for the time being or till Eld[er]. Parrish shall recover his health”; Sylvester Smith’s handwriting actually begins in the entry of 22<sup>nd</sup> January 1836, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:160 n. 2, 162. Likewise, on 8 February 1836, “Elder Parrish my scribe, received my journal again” but his handwriting actually begins the previous day, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:171 n. 1, 172. One can also observe the



brevity of most of the entries between 8 and 29 October 1835, which suggests that the effort was being made to bring the journal up to date quickly.

98. This use of terminology is discussed in John A. Tvedtnes, "The Critics of the Book of Abraham" in *Book of Abraham Symposium* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Institute of Religion, 1971), 73–74, as well as in Tvedtnes's footnote in Gee, "Tragedy of Errors," 114 n. 59. The confusion of the terminology can be seen in Wesley P. Walters, "Joseph Smith among the Egyptians," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16/1 (1973): 31–32.

99. This can perhaps best be illustrated by a transcription of the English column of KEPE 4 (p. 1, lines 2–24): "the first being who exercises Supreme power / the first man or one who has kingly power or / a prince universal reign having geater dominion or power / rolyal family royal blood or pharaoah or supreme power or King / crown of a princys or queen or stands for queen / Virgin unmaried or the priciple of virtue / the name of a royal family in female line / An unmaried woman and a virgin prices of / unmarried man a price / woman married or unmarried a daughter / Crown of a prince or King / the Earth / beneath or underwater / the eye or to see or sight sometimes me myself / the land of Egypt first seen under / what other person is that or who / a government power or Kingdom / the begining first before pointing to / in the begining of the Earth or Creation / Signifys to be in any as light in th[e . . .] / the first Creation of any thing first [ . . . ] tion / from the first to any Stated period after / from any or some fixed period of time to the begining." This is the Book of Abraham? How could anyone get the Book of Abraham from this?

100. Contra Tanner and Tanner, *Mormonism Shadow or Reality?* 311–14; Walters, "Joseph Smith among the Egyptians," 34–37.

101. For example, KEPE 3 (p. 1, line 15, column 4) reads: "beneath, below, under, water." The corresponding line in KEPE 4 (p. 1, line 14, column 3) reads: "beneath or underwater." The corresponding line in KEPE 5 (p. 1, line 13, column 5) reads simply "or water." Similar variants lead to the conclusion that these are independent notes rather than slavish copies of each other.

102. "A *decipherer*, who skips over scruples and difficulties ingeniously, and a *philologist*, who ponders his results carefully as he forges them into rules, are fundamentally different and *must not be mistaken for each other*." Johannes Friedrich, *Extinct Languages* (1957; reprint, New York: Dorset, 1989), 24–25. It was Richard Lepsius, Heinrich Brugsch, and Adolf Erman who forged the way philologically for grammar books such as those of Adolf Erman and Alan Gardiner. Friedrich (who was a Hittitologist and was himself responsible for the decipherment of Hittite hieroglyphs) documents this progression many times in his book (e.g., *ibid.*, 53–57, 61–68). The time lag between decipherment and grammar is often considerable.

103. Joseph Smith, Ohio Journal, 1835–36, 14 November 1835, in *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2:79.

104. Howard C. Searle, "Authorship of the History of Joseph Smith: A Review Essay," *BYU Studies* 21/1 (1981): 105.

105. *The Words of Joseph Smith*, comp. and ed. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980), 380; see John Gee, "The Role of the Book of Abraham in the Restoration" (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997), 8.

106. Noted already in Gee, "Tragedy of Errors," 111 n. 50. Compare the usage in Doctrine and Covenants 6:7; 10:64; 11:7; 32:4; and 90:14. Compare the use of the word *unfolding* by Oliver Cowdery in his history, in *Papers of*



*Joseph Smith*, 1:69.

107. Warren Parrish, letter to the editor of the *Painesville Republican*, dated 5 February 1838, in *Painesville Republican* 2/14–15 (15 February 1838), 3.

# Every Kindred, Tongue, and People

Gary P. Gillum

My friendship with Richard Lloyd Anderson began long before a new library assignment placed me in an office a mere thirty feet from his. As an adult convert to the church and a colleague who also taught New Testament, I discovered very early in my frequent conversations with Richard that he had been responsible for the famous Anderson Plan for Effective Missionary Work.<sup>1</sup> This background was the catalyst for a new missionary hymn.

A 1996–97 issue of *BYU Studies* included a beautiful poem by Dr. Arthur Henry King:

## Hymn: Every Kindred, Tongue, and People

Though Rome's lance pierced the Crucified, Her peace allowed His word. Now free men live where  
Joseph died By mob and law unheard. We love the right in any land; The wrong, by gospel truth withstand;  
But first we follow, voice and hand, Our Savior, Master, Lord.

From Deseret, first Zion's hearth, When east and north toiled west, He sent their sons about the earth To  
gather in the best. But, as the western church grew strong, He bade men stay where they belong To add  
new Zion to the throng And strengthen all the rest.

"Christ reigns!" lake-valley, ocean-peak, And continent proclaim. In every language brethren speak, Our  
hearts and tongues aflame, From northern straits to boisterous Horn, To sunset from the gates of morn,  
With those long dead and those new born, We praise His holy name.<sup>2</sup>

As I read the poem, an original hymn tune thrust itself into my mind so forcefully and insistently that nothing else was as important as noting down the melody so that it would not be lost forever. With the oral history center being nearby, I fairly ran to borrow a tape recorder and cassette tape so that I could sing the new tune into the recorder. That evening I listened to my vocal rendition often enough that I could note it on music manuscript paper. Harmonization naturally came next, and I am indebted to Ruth Ann Hay, a library colleague, whose knowledge of music theory enabled me to have the full music for a hymn. In the midst of working out the harmony, I called Dr. King for permission to use his poem along with my music. After singing the third verse to him over the phone, he enthusiastically endorsed it, calling it a "simple and straightforward" melody.

After that telephone call, I learned that the first musical phrase recalls that beloved English folk tune, "British Grenadiers," while the third line evokes a few measures from the Rhosymedre hymn tune, "Our Father, by Whose Name."<sup>3</sup> Both allusions are English, and the overall spirit of the hymn tune is Anglican, harking back not only to Dr. King's pre-LDS heritage but to mine as well. The words, however, are a distinct and worthy commemoration to Dr. Richard Lloyd Anderson as an erstwhile missionary and a teacher of missionaries as he sought—and seeks—to help the church spread the gospel to "Every Kindred, Tongue, and People." Moreover, the inspiration for the text and music of the hymn is a testimony to all who seek the gifts of the Spirit and are willing to listen to the voice of revelation.

## Notes

1. See Richard L. Anderson, *A Plan for Effective Missionary Work* (Portland, Ore.: Northwestern States Mission, 1949).
2. See Arthur Henry King, "Hymn: Every Kindred, Tongue, and People," *BYU Studies* 36/1 (1996–97): 182. King passed away on 15 January 2000.
3. *Hymns*, 1985, no. 296.

# David Whitmer and the Shaping of Latter-day Saint History

Kenneth W. Godfrey

Although I had already read everything Richard Lloyd Anderson had published, I met him for the first time in January 1963 when I first arrived at Brigham Young University in quest of a Ph.D. degree in LDS church history. Unlike some professors, Richard treated me as an equal, shared his knowledge and items from his archives with me, and seemed pleased when I gave him materials that I had discovered pertaining to Mormon history. He encouraged me to publish several articles and inspired me with his dedication to finding the truth wherever it led him, while at the same time maintaining his deep faith in the church, its leaders, and the integrity of Joseph Smith and those men and women most closely associated with him.

For more than thirty years I have continued to visit with Richard whenever I have been in Provo and have counted him among my most cherished friends. He has never failed to have something new and exciting to share with me and my admiration for him has continued to grow. The essay that follows is intended as a tribute to a great scholar, one of Mormonism's most important historians, and a man I deeply respect and love.

## David Whitmer and Early Mormon History

David Whitmer, like Joseph Smith, Lucy Mack Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and Martin Harris, has greatly influenced our perceptions of Mormon beginnings. Interviewed on more than fifty occasions, Whitmer related over and over again what he knew about the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, the organization of the church, and his experience as a restoration witness.<sup>1</sup> Moreover in 1887, after he had lost the thumb on his right hand and was therefore unable to write, Whitmer dictated to John J. Snyder a ninety-one-page document entitled *An Address to All Believers in Christ*. Eighty-two years old at the time, and only a year from his death, Whitmer recalled his first experiences with Joseph Smith and the translation and publication of the Book of Mormon and also detailed his reasons for leaving the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.<sup>2</sup>

A careful study of the Whitmer interviews reveals that he gave believing Latter-day Saints more details regarding his Mormon experiences than he did nonbelievers. When facing reporters who, he felt confident, did not believe angels who delivered gold plates to unlearned boys, he tended to relate only those things that he had witnessed, such as the translation process and his experience with the angel and the plates. With believers, in contrast, he at times commented about things to which he was not a personal witness, such as the priesthood restoration, the ordination of the first high priests, and the establishment of the Quorum of the First Presidency.<sup>3</sup>

It may be that Whitmer, who by the 1880s had perhaps known Joseph longer than any living person, tended to enlarge his memory when in the presence of believers because he knew they were vitally interested in every event, no matter how small, that involved their beloved Prophet Joseph Smith. He also knew that Mormons would talk about their experiences with him and make available the details he provided as part of the historical record. Thus with each interview he reestablished his importance as one of the preeminent figures in the early Latter-day Saint movement.

While scholars, historians, anti-Mormon writers, and faithful Latter-day Saints have carefully scrutinized the writings of Joseph Smith, pointing out inaccuracies, inconsistencies, chronological problems, and errors of fact, David Whitmer's accounts of Mormonism's seminal years, for the most part, have escaped such a scrutiny;<sup>4</sup> instead, most of what he said has been accepted as fact. A careful study of Whitmer's writings reveals that his

statements are not always synchronized. The fact that he was out of the church for almost half a century tends to give an anti-Mormon flavor to some of his views on doctrine and history. Scholars therefore attempting to flesh out the true story of those initial years of Mormonism would be well-advised to weigh carefully what Whitmer remembered against accounts authored by his contemporaries such as Joseph Knight, Oliver Cowdery, Joseph Smith, and Lucy Mack Smith. It is important, too, to note that Whitmer himself was not always consistent in the way he remembered Latter-day Saint beginnings. This paper addresses the latter concern by pointing out significant contradictions in Whitmer's own statements about important events in the church's early years. While I do occasionally evaluate Whitmer's claims in light of what others remembered and reported, my main purpose is to delineate inconsistencies in Whitmer's own record. My intent is not to wholly discredit Whitmer as a reliable source of information, but to show that historians must subject his statements to the same scrutiny to which they subject the accounts of others.

The accompanying table (see table 1, pp. 245–50) provides information on interviews with David Whitmer, all of which took place in Richmond, Missouri. David Whitmer said that he first heard of Joseph Smith early in 1828 after the Prophet had obtained the plates of gold from the Hill Cumorah. Whitmer told M. J. Hubble in 1886 that his (Whitmer's) brother was "Sheriff of our county in Western New York. He [Whitmer's brother] got Crippled," and, having business in the Palmyra area, sent David "to attend to it."<sup>5</sup> While transacting his brother's business, David learned that about "150 pages" of the plates had been translated, then lost, and that Joseph had been punished for his transgression by having the plates taken from him. However, Joseph received assurances that "at the end of his punishment, . . . [he] might translate" again.<sup>6</sup>

Five years earlier Whitmer told a *Kansas City Journal* reporter that he traveled to Palmyra on business in 1828 and "stopped with one Oliver Cowdery."<sup>7</sup> "A great many people," Whitmer said, "were talking about the finding of certain golden plates by one Joseph Smith, jr."<sup>8</sup> Talking about the things they heard, Cowdery and Whitmer "paid but little attention to it, supposing it to be only . . . idle gossip."<sup>9</sup> Cowdery, seemingly more interested than Whitmer and acquainted with the Smiths, resolved to investigate the matter further. Whitmer, however, was intrigued enough to engage in conversation with "several young men" and learned that they were positive Smith had obtained golden plates. Before "he attained them," these boys told Whitmer, "he had promised to share with them but had not done so, and they were very much incensed with him."<sup>10</sup> The young men told Whitmer they had seen the place in the hill from which the plates were extracted. Their statements were so positive that he "began to believe there must be some foundation for the stories then in circulation all over that part of the country."<sup>11</sup> Interviewed by James H. Hart in 1884, Whitmer said that the young men, who were about Joseph's age, believed he had the plates and "were very angry" because he "had not given them any [of the plates] as he had promised."<sup>12</sup>

In subsequent conversations with Cowdery, Whitmer learned the "history of the finding of the plates."<sup>13</sup> He told a *St. Louis Republican* reporter that when Joseph Smith saw the plates, his first thought was how much they were worth, and the angel then hurled him down the Hill Cumorah. Whitmer further reported that it was "six months" before Joseph "obtained possession of the stone box that held the plates" (actually four years passed before Joseph secured the plates of gold).<sup>14</sup>

Whitmer probably did not learn all these details on his visit to Palmyra in 1828. Joseph and Emma lived in Harmony, Pennsylvania, at the time Whitmer traveled to Palmyra, but what he remembered provides important details regarding talk in the Manchester area at the time he transacted business there.<sup>15</sup> Oliver Cowdery wrote

accounts of early events in Mormon history, published in the Latter-day Saints' *Messenger and Advocate* in 1835, and Whitmer's own accounts of these early events may well have been influenced by Cowdery's writings.<sup>16</sup>

His business completed, Whitmer returned home. Several months passed and Cowdery—on his way to Harmony, Pennsylvania, to see Joseph Smith—stopped at the Whitmer home in Fayette, New York. He told Whitmer he intended to learn the “truth or untruth” regarding Smith and “would let [Whitmer] know.”<sup>17</sup>

Only days after becoming Joseph's amanuensis or scribe, Cowdery sent a missive to Whitmer telling him “that he was convinced that Smith had the records.” Cowdery was, moreover, assisting in their translation.<sup>18</sup> In a second letter to Whitmer, Cowdery included “a few lines of what they had translated” and informed him that the record “gave a complete history” of a people “that inhabited this continent.”<sup>19</sup> Whitmer shared this letter with his parents, brothers, and sisters.

Not many days passed before a third letter came from Cowdery. He asked Whitmer to come to Harmony with a team and wagon and bring Joseph and Oliver to his (Whitmer's) father's house so they could there complete the translation of the Book of Mormon.<sup>20</sup> Thus, for the first time, Whitmer was placed in a position to become a witness to important events in early Latter-day Saint history.

Notwithstanding this account, Whitmer told Edward Stevenson a slightly different story. He said that on 1 June 1829 he received a letter from Joseph Smith, not Cowdery, asking that he come to Harmony and convey the two men to Fayette. Pressured with work, having twenty acres of land left to plow, Whitmer concluded he would first finish his farmwork and then make the journey as requested.<sup>21</sup> One morning, although he did not remember how long after receiving the letter, he arose to go to work and “found between 5 and 7 acres of my ground had been plowed during the night.”<sup>22</sup> The plowing, he said, was done precisely as he would have done it, and the plow “was left standing in the furrow.”<sup>23</sup> His ground plowed, Whitmer departed.<sup>24</sup>

Arriving in Harmony, David was met by both Joseph and Oliver, who came out to welcome him. Whitmer relates Cowdery's report that “Joseph had told him [Cowdery] when I started from home, where I had stopped the first night, how I read the sign at the tavern, where I stopped the next night and that I would be there that day before dinner, and this was why they had come out to meet me.”<sup>25</sup> Whitmer was astonished by what Cowdery told him, it was all true. In recounting his visit with Whitmer, Joseph F. Smith remembered Whitmer reporting that before his (Whitmer's) arrival, Joseph Smith also detailed for Cowdery the wagon Whitmer would arrive in, “with two long poles in it at each end across the end gates of the wagon box, and then two boards laid across that for seats those hickory poles.”<sup>26</sup>

Nathan Tanner Jr., who talked with Whitmer in April 1886, recorded the story in a slightly different version. He wrote that it was Joseph who told Whitmer that he had seen him “coming in vision” and “told him where he stayed en route. How he had seen him reading a sign,” and told “him so many things which he could not know only by inspiration.”<sup>27</sup>

Edward Stevenson called on David Whitmer in January 1887 and wrote that Whitmer told him that “the Prophet look[ed] into the seer stone [and] told names of each stopping place.” Whitmer, having forgotten the names, was reminded by “O. Cowdery who [had] mad[e] notes for every one.”<sup>28</sup> They found it was just as the Prophet related James H. Hart, who spoke with David in 1884, said that Whitmer could not remember the names of the hotels at

which he stayed and that on the way back to Fayette, “[Whitmer] pointed out the several houses where [he] had stopped, when he [Cowdery] took out his book and found them to correspond even to the names on the sign boards, all of which he had written before [they] met.”<sup>29</sup> Though the details vary, Whitmer’s account of his going Harmony and Joseph’s having seen his travels in vision or through the seer stone had an impressive core consistency. It had the effect of increasing Whitmer’s faith that Joseph Smith was indeed God’s prophet.

Whitmer related to apostles Smith and Pratt one other unusual event connected with the journey that Joseph, Oliver, and he made from Harmony to Fayette. He said that one day as they were traveling, they “were suddenly approached by a very pleasant, nice looking old man in a clear open place, who saluted us with, ‘Good morning, it very warm,’ at the same instant wiping his face or forehead with his hand.” At Joseph’s signal, Whitmer invited him to ride, which invitation was declined. “No,” he said, “I am going to Cumorah,” and suddenly the old man disappeared.<sup>30</sup>

Whitmer said that the old man “was about 5 feet 9 or 10 inches and heavy set.” He was “dressed in a suit of brown woolen clothes; his hair and beard were white,” and the knapsack on his back appeared book shaped.<sup>31</sup> Talking to Edward Stevenson in 1886, Whitmer claimed that he and Cowdery asked Joseph to “enquire of the Lord who the stranger was.” After only a short time Joseph, appearing pale, declared he “was one of the Nephites and he had the plates of the Book of Mormon.”<sup>32</sup> In an 1887 interview, Whitmer told Stevenson that this mysterious stranger was one of the Three Nephites. When Stevenson published the account of his interview with Whitmer in the *Juvenile Instructor*, he wrote that Whitmer had said that Joseph told him the messenger was Moroni. Whitmer later saw him near his father’s farm and said that Moroni showed the plates to his mother, Mary.<sup>33</sup> They felt his influence previous to his mother’s visitation.<sup>34</sup> Reporting his visit with Whitmer in the *Millennial Star*, Stevenson said that when Mother Whitmer went to the barn to milk cows the stranger showed her the plates, turning them over leaf by leaf, except for the sealed portion.<sup>35</sup> Apparently, Whitmer only told this story to Latter-day Saint General Authorities who visited with him. While David only related the story after his mother’s death, his nephew John C. Whitmer told assistant church historian Andrew Jenson essentially the same tale and added that she [Mary] called the holy angel, “Brother Nephi.”<sup>36</sup> Thus, while Whitmer was consistent in asserting that both he and his mother had seen this being, his own statements leave us wondering who this “stranger” really was.

Concerning the journey from Harmony to Fayette, Whitmer related at least one other incident. He told Zenas Gurley in a January 1885 interview that Joseph and Oliver talked freely about baptizing each other but said nothing about an angel ordaining them.<sup>37</sup> It was not until 1834–36 that Whitmer learned an angel had ordained Joseph and Oliver to the Aaronic Priesthood.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps the two men believed that it was not the proper time nor place to convey such knowledge to Whitmer. More about this incident will be discussed later.

## How the Book of Mormon Was Translated

Whitmer freely told the many visitors who came to his Richmond, Missouri, home what he knew about the golden plates, the Urim and Thummim, and the translation of the Book of Mormon.<sup>39</sup> He informed a *Chicago Tribune* reporter that the plates were eight by seven, the sheets as thick as ordinary tin and were bound together with three gold rings. A large portion of the volume was sealed, he said. On the loose plates were engraved hieroglyphics. With the plates came “a pair of spectacles, set in silver bows.”<sup>40</sup> Discussing early Mormon history with Nathan Tanner Jr., Whitmer said that the Prophet “had the Urim and Thummim, and a chocolate colored

stone, which he used alternately, as suited his convenience.”<sup>41</sup> And when M. J. Hubble interviewed him in November 1886, he told him that Joseph translated the Book of Mormon with a pair of “large bound Spectacles.”<sup>42</sup>

David asserted that each day before Joseph commenced to translate, everyone in the Whitmer household knelt in prayer and invoked “the Divine blessing on the proceeding.” Following the prayer, Joseph would sit “on one side of a table and the amanuenses, in turn as they became tired, on the other.”<sup>43</sup> Those people present and “not actively engaged in the work seated themselves around the room and the work began.”<sup>44</sup>

The story Whitmer told regarding the translation of the Book of Mormon varied at times. Whitmer told a *Chicago Times* reporter that the Prophet “affix[ed] the magical spectacles to his eyes” and the graven characters would appear one character at a time, which he then translated.<sup>45</sup> Sometimes one English word would appear while at other times an entire sentence.<sup>46</sup>

However, in discussing the translation with a J. L. Traughber Jr., Whitmer reported he never heard Joseph say that the translation was made with the Urim and Thummim, but in 1876 he told Thomas Wood “that he saw Joseph translate, by the aid of the Urim and Thummim, time again.”<sup>47</sup> When interviewed in the late 1880s Whitmer again told a story that altogether excluded the Urim and Thummim from the translation process. He said that before translating, Joseph would offer prayer, then take “a dark colored opaque stone, called a ‘seer-stone,’ and plac[e] it in the crown of his hat.” He would then “put his face into the hat, and read the translation as it appeared before him.”<sup>48</sup>

A *Kansas City Journal* reporter said that Whitmer told him Joseph “had two small stones of a chocolate color, near egg shaped and perfectly smooth but not transparent.” He would hold these “to his eyes and cover his face with a hat.” (Just how this could be accomplished he does not say.) What seemed to be a parchment would soon appear with the characters written thereon, and “immediately below would appear the translation in English.”<sup>49</sup> Smith then read this to his scribe “who wrote it down exactly as it fell from [Smith’s] lips.”<sup>50</sup>

Whitmer also told George Q. Cannon that Joseph placed a stone in a hat to exclude light, and the characters appeared and under that “the translation in English.” The English remained until the scribe had copied it correctly.<sup>51</sup>

When James H. Hart visited Whitmer in March 1884, he learned that

Joseph would place the seer stone in a deep hat, and placing his face close to it, would see, not the stone but, what appeared like an oblong piece of parchment, on which the hieroglyphics would appear, and also the translation in the English language, all appearing in bright luminous letters. Joseph would then read it to Oliver, who would write it down as spoken. Sometimes Joseph could not pronounce the words correctly, having had but little education; and if by any means a mistake was made in the copy, the luminous writing would remain until it was corrected.<sup>52</sup>

Whitmer also said that if the seer stone was not placed in the hat “no characters or writing could be seen therein.”<sup>53</sup>



Martin Harris told Edward Stevenson essentially the same story as Whitmer regarding the translation. Joseph Knight, Isaac Hale, and Michael Morse (Emma's sister's husband) related similar stories.

However, difficulties remain in these accounts that completely exclude the Urim and Thummim from the translation process. As Stephen Ricks has pointed out, neither David Whitmer, Martin Harris, nor anyone else, for that matter, save perhaps Oliver Cowdery, had "knowledge of the method of translation of the Book of Mormon from personal experience."<sup>54</sup> Joseph Smith, the only person who really knew how the translation was done, wrote the following in the 1839 draft of his history. He said that after he arrived at the Whitmers' Fayette home in June 1829, he still had the Urim and Thummim through which he obtained revelation.<sup>55</sup> The Prophet's mother related that following prayer and supplications to God after the loss of the 116 manuscript pages, Joseph received again the Urim and Thummim and had the satisfaction of translating again.<sup>56</sup> Oliver Cowdery, who knew more about the translation than anyone save Joseph Smith himself, testified under oath "that said Smith [Joseph] found with the plates, from which he translated his book, two transparent stones, resembling glass, set in silver bows. That by looking through these, he was able to read in English, the reformed Egyptian characters, which were engraved on the plates."<sup>57</sup> Moreover, Cowdery, in the *Messenger and Advocate*, describes sitting "day after day" as Joseph "translated" through the interpreters.<sup>58</sup> Cowdery, who became Joseph's scribe after the 116 pages were lost, "does not speak of translation only by a single seer stone."<sup>59</sup> I agree with Ricks, who, in his study of the translation of the Book of Mormon, concluded: "It seems most likely, then, that both instruments [the Urim and Thummim and the seer stone] were used during the entire translation process."<sup>60</sup>

Whitmer's account of the translation appearing in English at the bottom of a hat, seems, moreover, to minimize the spiritual and mental effort on the part of the translator. Oliver Cowdery, as is well known, learned that more than asking and reading were required of the would-be translator. Study, thought, and then prayer were necessary before the meaning of the markings on the plates became clear (see D&C 6, 8, and 9). Royal Skousen, a scholar who has spent years studying the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon, i.e., the one written as Joseph Smith dictated, has shown that textual errors do exist in that document.<sup>61</sup> Thus Whitmer's assertion that the English only disappeared after the scribe had written it down correctly was not entirely true.<sup>62</sup> I am not arguing here for lack of "tight control" (Skousen's phrase) over the text, but rather that Oliver and Joseph's human nature did not allow them to produce an error-free text as Whitmer's account of the translation process would have us believe.

With respect to the translation of the Book of Mormon, David Whitmer gave those who interviewed him other details. He said that while Joseph and Oliver resided at the Whitmer home, "a blanket which served as a portiere was stretched across the family living room to shelter the translators and the plates from the eye of any who might call at the house while the work was in progress."<sup>63</sup> The purpose of the blanket, said Whitmer, was not to conceal the plates or the translator from the amanuensis. However, in another account, Whitmer told Nathan Tanner Jr. that a blanket separated Joseph from his scribe, a variation from the account in the *Chicago Tribune*.<sup>64</sup>

Whitmer also told Tanner that he believed the plates were not present while Joseph dictated to his scribes. If this information is correct, then why were the plates preserved in the first place? Why did Joseph Smith have all those years of preparation and waiting before obtaining the plates if he did not need them present while he translated? Furthermore, why did Whitmer see them on the table in the woods near his father's farm, and why were they shown to the Eight Witnesses and to his mother, Mary Whitmer? And finally, why did he tell other interviewers that the plates were present during the translation?

Historians and teachers of Mormon history should be cautious in accepting Whitmer's version of the translation process. Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery make no reference to placing a seer stone in a hat as the prime method of translating the Book of Mormon. Why did David and the other witnesses see the Urim and Thummim and the bow in which they were placed if the Book of Mormon as we now have it was translated exclusively by means of a chocolate-colored seer stone, as Whitmer sometimes asserted? Why, if the Prophet read the English translation it appeared in the crown of a hat, does the original manuscript "show signs of rapid writing with many words spelled as they sounded, and with no punctuation other than periods at the end of chapters, and only indiscriminate capitalization?"<sup>65</sup> On the other hand, if there was not tight textual control, how does one account for Hebraisms, chiasmus, and other sophisticated writing forms that pepper the Book of Mormon narrative? We should remember that Whitmer, after all, was not an eyewitness to the translation process, i.e., he did not look in the seer stone or the Urim and Thummim and see what Joseph saw.

## David Whitmer the Witness

David Whitmer is most acclaimed and remembered for his role as one of the Three Witnesses who saw the plates, an angel, and other sacred objects about eleven o'clock one morning "towards the end of June 1829."<sup>66</sup> His testimony of this event was the prime reason reporters and Mormons traveled to Richmond to talk with him. That he outlived Martin Harris and Oliver Cowdery, the two other witnesses, allows Richard L. Anderson to call him the witness who "was interviewed far more extensively than the others."<sup>67</sup> Significantly, given his tendency to contradict himself when reporting on other topics, Whitmer's accounts of his experience as a witness are quite consistent.

Conversing with Edward Stevenson, Whitmer said that he was plowing in a field when he heard a voice and saw a personage. The "voice said Blessed is the name of the Lord & they who keep his commandments."<sup>68</sup> While reflecting on this experience, still plowing, he observed Joseph Smith approaching. Joseph told Whitmer he had been chosen to be one of the witnesses of the Book of Mormon. Whitmer tied his team to the fence and the two men at "the edge of the woods . . . sat upon [a] log."<sup>69</sup> A *Richmond Democrat* reporter remembered that Whitmer told him that while plowing "Smith and Cowdery" came and "requested that he accompany them into the woods, [located] on a hill across the road for the purpose of witnessing a manifestation."<sup>70</sup> While in the woods, the three men engaged in prayer, but only for a short time, when "a great light . . . far brighter and more dazzling than [than] the brilliancy of the noon-day sun," appeared. The light, he said, "seemingly envelop[ed] the wood[s] for a considerable distance."<sup>71</sup> Seized by "a spirit of elevation," he felt "joy indescribable" and a "strange influence" entranced him, and he felt "chained to the spot."<sup>72</sup> Then a personage clothed in white appeared, as did a table upon which lay gold plates, brass plates, the Urim and Thummim, and the sword of Laban. The three men were "directed to examine" these objects carefully, following which "they were told that the Lord would demand that they bear witness thereof to all the world."<sup>73</sup>

Ten years before this account, Whitmer told Orson Pratt and Joseph F. Smith in September 1878 that he also saw the sword of Laban and the Liahona, which he called the directors.<sup>74</sup> "I heard the voice of the Lord," he said, "declaring that they [the plates] were translated by the gift and power of God."<sup>75</sup> Martin Harris was not with them; he concluded.

Edward Stevenson called on Whitmer on more than one occasion. In December 1877, Whitmer told Stevenson that the angel placed "upon a table before them the plates of gold, also the brass plates," and the other objects

mentioned above.<sup>76</sup> Again in 1881, he told a *Kansas City Journal* reporter essentially the same story.<sup>77</sup>

In what is now known as the William H. Kelley/G. A. Blakeslee interview conducted in 1882, Whitmer said that he, Cowdery, and Smith, sat on a log and talked for a while. Then they knelt in prayer, Joseph being the mouth. When the Prophet concluded his prayer, they again sat on the log talking. As a light descended encircling the three men an angel came and said, “[David], Blessed is he that keepeth His commandments.”<sup>78</sup> Then a “table was set before us,” he continued, “and on it the records were placed.”<sup>79</sup> Whitmer mentions plates, the Liahona, and the sword of Laban, but says nothing—if Kelley and Blakeslee recorded the interview accurately—about the Urim and Thummim. He told the two men that he heard the voice of God declare the translation to be correct.<sup>80</sup>

When interviewed by J. W. Chatburn, Whitmer said, “These hands handled the plates, these eyes saw the angel, and these ears heard his voice.”<sup>81</sup> James H. Moyle’s interview with Whitmer appeared in the *Church News*, August 1941.<sup>82</sup> He remembered Whitmer told him “that he did see and handle the plates; that he did see and hear the angel and heard the declaration that the plates had been translated correctly; that there was absolutely nothing prevent his having a full, clear view of it all.”<sup>83</sup> Soon after talking to Whitmer, the recent graduate of the University of Michigan law school recorded in his diary what the witness said. Moyle wrote that “he was somewhat spiritual in his explanation and not as materialistic as I wished.”<sup>84</sup> Whitmer believed that what he saw and heard “was through the power of God.”<sup>85</sup> Hence the experience had a definite spiritual quality. He told Nathan Tanner Jr. that his natural eyes “had to be prepared” to see the plates and that he was “overshadowed by the power of God.”<sup>86</sup> Thus his experience was indeed spiritual in nature.

Whitmer, in 1878, told P. Wilhelm Poulson that part (about half, he later testified) of the book (i.e., plates) was sealed and that the sealed portion appeared “as solid to my view as wood.”<sup>87</sup> The plates, he said, were eight inches wide and six or seven inches long and were bound together by three rings.<sup>88</sup> In the same interview, he said that the plates were returned to a cave where they are to remain until “the time arrives” for the sealed portion to be translated.<sup>89</sup> He also related that he had seen the stone box “in which the plates were stored” and that it was located on the “side of the hill, and a little down from the top.”<sup>90</sup>

Again, in 1885, he told a correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune* that Joseph Smith took Whitmer and Cowdery to the Hill Cumorah where they personally viewed “the receptacle in which Moroni . . . had concealed the history of his father.”<sup>91</sup> As early as 1875 Whitmer told a *Chicago Times* reporter that he had seen the stone box three times and that it had been washed “down to the foot of the hill.”<sup>92</sup> As to what happened to this sacred object after that does not say.

Over the years Whitmer’s testimony as to what he saw when in the company of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery remained for the most part consistent. In each interview in which he broached the subject of what he experienced near the end of June 1829, he testified that he saw the plates and an angel and heard the voice of the Lord declaring the translation to be correct. On most occasions he also said that the plates were on a table together with the sword of Laban, the brass plates, the Urim and Thummim, the Liahona, and the breastplate. I examined all the known interviews with Whitmer and tabulated what he said he saw in arriving at this conclusion.

Historians should be aware that in all the Whitmer interviews the risk is high that some of what we read reflects the words and biases of the individual reporter. In no case do we have the unabridged words of Whitmer himself

The document that Oliver Cowdery, Martin Harris, and Whitmer signed, which appears in each copy of the Book of Mormon, succinctly reports “that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates, and the engravings thereon.”<sup>93</sup> While Whitmer sometimes testified that he handled the plates and at other times that he did not, David Whitmer’s testimony remained impressively consistent over the years.

### **David Whitmer and Other Early Mormon History**

In 1887, David Whitmer published his pamphlet *An Address to All Believers in Christ*. In this small publication he defended the Book of Mormon, condemned plural marriage, and then gave his version of events that transpired early Mormon history. Whitmer believed that the introduction of the office of high priest was wrong and originated with Sidney Rigdon. He objected to changes in the revelations and the hierarchical nature of church government. He told some of those who talked with him that he never heard of the coming of John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John until 1835. Critics of the church and its priesthood have sometimes used Whitmer to flesh out arguments against angels conferring authority on Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery.<sup>94</sup>

A close look at the historical record discloses that Whitmer’s memory may have betrayed him with respect to the restoration of the priesthood by John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John. As early as 1823, the Prophet learned that “the Lord will give the holy priesthood to some.”<sup>95</sup> Joseph Smith first wrote of this event in 1832, and Oliver Cowdery offered the first detailed, recorded account in 1834.<sup>96</sup> Even William E. McLellin, under a journal entry of 25 October 1831, writes of “the high priesthood” and the “lesser priesthood,”<sup>97</sup> suggesting that he knew of two priesthoods in the church.<sup>98</sup>

David Whitmer himself was not free from inconsistency when recounting his views on the priesthood. For example, David H. Cannon reported that in 1861 when he visited Whitmer, the two men with others stood beside the grave of Oliver Cowdery. Whitmer declared that he had heard Oliver say, “I know the Gospel to be true and upon this head has Peter, James, and John laid their hands and conferred the Holy Melchizedek Priesthood.”<sup>99</sup> Whitmer also displayed for the group how this was done. While the historicity of the restoration of priesthood authority is complex and the documentation not nearly as clear as we would prefer, certainly David Whitmer’s testimony that casts doubt on the appearance of John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John should not be accepted as true, especially in light of what he told Cannon.

Whitmer probably made other historical errors as well. He was mistaken in affirming that the manuscript given him by Oliver Cowdery was the “original” Book of Mormon manuscript. All historians agree that what he possessed was the second or printer’s copy. His assertion that Missouri’s Danites originated with Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon is problematic and one with which many good historians would quarrel.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, we have seen that his assertions that Joseph Smith did not have the Urim and Thummim after the loss of the 116 pages of manuscript, that he did not have the plates as he translated, or that he translated only by means of a stone placed in the bottom of a hat can be seriously questioned.

Whitmer at times spoke of the ignorance of Joseph Smith. Emma, he said, told him that the Prophet could not pronounce Sariah correctly and did not know that Jerusalem was a walled city.<sup>101</sup> Grant Underwood, in contrast, has shown that the Prophet was rather remarkable in his biblical knowledge,<sup>102</sup> not all of which was obtained as he worked on his translation of the Bible.

Still, Whitmer does provide valuable information for historians with respect to the organization of the church. He said that “it was about Diner time at Peter Whitmers [Sr.] house, there was present about 40 or 50 Persons Most Members of the Church at Fayette N York.”<sup>103</sup> Only six persons signed the official document (which has not yet been found) incorporating the church, yet there were many others who participated in the events of that day.

David Whitmer in many ways was a remarkable man. Historians of Mormon beginnings are grateful that he spoke so often and in such detail about the seminal events in early Latter-day Saint history. However, care and corroborating documentation must be applied before we can accept his recollections as reality.

At least two problems are glaringly present in the things he said he remembered. First, most conversations with him took place fifty years or more after the events happened. It is difficult, if not impossible, to have a high accuracy of recall after such time lapses. Second, what he said, or did not say, comes to us through the pen of reporters, most of whom did not believe in Mormonism, or through believers, who, like the reporters, may have had an agenda of their own as they talked with him. Thus only when he publicly replied to inaccurate reporting, and he sometimes did, can we be confident that the information reflects what he really said. Richard L. Anderson points out that in transcribing one of the Edward Stevenson interviews, Lyndon Cook misreads the manuscript and has Whitmer stating that the guardian of the plates “was under one of the beds,” not at the “shed,” as is clear from the original manuscript.<sup>104</sup> And we have already learned that a Whitmer interview by Edward Stevenson published in the *Instructor* names the “mysterious stranger” as Moroni, while Stevenson’s diary claims that the stranger was one of the Three Nephites. Finally, Whitmer sometimes spoke of things on which he had no personal knowledge. For example, he did not look into the Urim and Thummim nor a seer stone and see for himself what appeared thereon. Therefore, his testimony as to precisely “how” the Book of Mormon was translated is hearsay. Only Joseph Smith could testify about the actual translation process, and he did not tell us much more than that was done “by the gift and power of God.”<sup>105</sup>

Scholars would be well-advised to study what David Whitmer said with the same care and attention to detail that has characterized the examination of the historical documents authored by Joseph Smith. To rely solely and unquestioningly on David Whitmer for our knowledge and interpretation of early Latter-day Saint history does neither the cause of Mormon history nor David Whitmer himself the justice they deserve.

Matthias F. Cowley, after talking with David Whitmer, was impressed that he (Whitmer) stood in the same position to the Book of Mormon as the sectarians did to the Bible. Whitmer told him that the “Book of Mormon contained all that is necessary to guide us till the Savior comes.”<sup>106</sup> Whitmer did not understand the essential core of the restoration. Joseph Smith was a prophet through whom God spoke and would continue to speak, and David did not seem to grasp the importance of continuing revelation if the little stone from the book of Daniel was to increase in size as it rolled forth. Thus he was left behind clinging to his Book of Mormon, insisting that Joseph Smith’s introduction of a priesthood hierarchy and changing of revelations caused God to reject him. David Whitmer, though a good, honest man, was mistaken in his assessment of the post-1835 Joseph Smith. Mormonism would not have endured had its leaders relied solely on the Book of Mormon.

## Notes

1. See Lyndon W. Cook, ed., *David Whitmer Interviews: A Restoration Witness* (Orem, Utah: Grandin Book, 1991). Cook compiled approximately 80 percent of the known Whitmer interviews and for the most part reproduces them accurately. Richard L. Anderson does point out a few errors in Cook’s editing of the interviews in his review

in the *Journal of Mormon History* 20/1 (1994): 186–93. Following Anderson’s lead, I have tried to use only the reliable portions of the interviews Cook published.

2. See David Whitmer, *An Address to All Believers in Christ* (Richmond, Mo.: David Whitmer, 1887).

3. See Anderson, review of *Whitmer Interviews*, 191.

4. See James B. Allen, “Eight Contemporary Accounts of Joseph Smith’s First Vision: What Do We Learn From Them?” *Improvement Era* (April 1970): 4–13; James B. Allen, “Emergence of a Fundamental: The Expanding Role of Joseph Smith’s First Vision in Mormon Religious Thought,” *Journal of Mormon History* 7 (1980): 43–61; Neal E. Lambert and Richard H. Cracroft, “Literary Form and Historical Understanding: Joseph Smith’s First Vision,” *Journal of Mormon History* 7 (1980): 31–42; Dean C. Jessee, “The Early Accounts of Joseph Smith’s First Vision,” *BYU Studies* 9/3 (1969): 275–94; H. Michael Marquardt and Wesley P. Walters, *Inventing Mormonism: Tradition and the Historical Record* (Salt Lake City: Smith Research Associates, 1994); Richard L. Anderson, “The Reliability of the Early History of Lucy and Joseph Smith,” *Dialogue* 4/2 (1969): 13–28; Richard L. Anderson, “Joseph Smith’s New York Reputation Reappraised,” *BYU Studies* 10/3 (1970): 283–314; Richard L. Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Roger I. Anderson, “Joseph Smith’s Early Reputation Revisited,” *Journal of Pastoral Practice* 4/3 (1980): 71–108, and 4/4 (1980): 72–105; *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989).

5. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 210.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*, 60.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*, 60–61.

12. *Ibid.*, 113.

13. *Ibid.*, 61.

14. *Ibid.*, 150.

15. Cf. Richard L. Anderson, “Circumstantial Confirmation of the First Vision through Reminiscences,” *BYU Studies* 9/3 (1969): 373–404.

16. See *Latter-day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate* 1 (July 1835): 155–59; 2 (October 1835): 195–202.

17. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 61.

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. See *ibid.*
21. Ibid., 26.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., 27.
24. See *ibid.*
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 49.
27. Ibid., 191.
28. Ibid., 213.
29. Ibid., 123.
30. Ibid., 27.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., 182.
33. See *ibid.*, 214, 218.
34. See *ibid.*, 218.
35. See *ibid.*
36. Richard Lloyd Anderson, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981), 31
37. See Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 154–55.
38. See *ibid.*, 155.
39. For important background on the translation process, see Stephen D. Ricks, “Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Book of Mormon” (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1986), 1. See also Richard L. Anderson, “By the Gift and Power of God,” *Ensign* (September 1977): 78–85; John Welch and Tim Rathbone, “The Translation of the Book of Mormon: Basic Historical Information” (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1986); and Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism*, 79–113.

40. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 172–73.
41. *Ibid.*, 191.
42. *Ibid.*, 211.
43. *Ibid.*, 174.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. See *ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*, 10 (published in 1879).
48. *Ibid.*, 53.
49. *Ibid.*, 62.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, 108.
52. *Ibid.*, 115.
53. *Ibid.*
54. Ricks, “Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Book of Mormon,” 4.
55. See *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 234.
56. See Lucy Mack Smith, *Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet, and His Progenitors for Many Generations* (Liverpool: Published for Orson Pratt by S. W. Richards, 1853), 91–92, quoted in Richard Van Wagoner and Steven Walker, “Joseph Smith: The Gift of Seeing,” *Dialogue* 15/2 (1982): 62.
57. A. W. Benton, “Mormonites,” *Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate* n.s. 2/15 (9 April 1831), quoted in Ricks, “Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Book of Mormon,” 2–3.
58. *Messenger and Advocate* 1 (October 1834): 14; see *Evening and Morning Star*, January 1833.
59. Anderson, review of *Whitmer Interviews*, 190.
60. Ricks, “Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Book of Mormon,” 3.
61. See Royal Skousen, “Towards a Critical Edition of the Book of Mormon,” *BYU Studies* 30/1 (1990): 44.



62. See Royal Skousen, "Critical Methodology and the Text of the Book of Mormon," *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 6/1 (1994): 124–25; and Royal Skousen, "The Original Language of the Book of Mormon: Upstate New York Dialect, King James English, or Hebrew?" *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 3/1 (1994): 29.

63. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 173.

64. *Ibid.*, 191.

65. Charles D. Tate Jr., "John H. Gilbert's Work on the Book of Mormon," in *Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History*, New York (Provo, Utah: BYU Department of Church History and Doctrine, 1992), 113.

66. *Ibid.*, xiii.

67. Anderson, *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 79.

68. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 181.

69. *Ibid.*

70. *Ibid.*, 229.

71. *Ibid.*

72. *Ibid.*

73. *Ibid.*

74. *Ibid.*, 25–26.

75. *Ibid.*, 26.

76. *Ibid.*, 15.

77. *Ibid.*, 63.

78. *Ibid.*, 86.

79. *Ibid.*

80. See *ibid.*

81. *Ibid.*, 92.

82. See Anderson, review of *Whitmer Interviews*, 188.

83. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 163.

84. *Ibid.*, 166–67. For a discussion of the errors Cook makes in publishing the Moyle interview, see Anderson, review of *Whitmer Interviews*, 188–89.
85. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 167.
86. *Ibid.*, 188.
87. *Ibid.*, 20.
88. See *ibid.*, 21.
89. *Ibid.*, 22. For other accounts of the return of the plates to a cave, see *Journal of Discourses*, 19:38; *Wilford Woodruff Journal*, 11 December 1869, LDS Church Archives; John Whitaker diary, 6:104, LDS Church Archives; Edward Stevenson, *Reminiscences of Joseph the Prophet, and the Coming Forth of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Stevenson, 1893), 14–15; *Charles L. Walker Diary*, ed. A. Karl and Katharine Larson (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1980), 2:525-26.
90. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 23.
91. *Ibid.*, 173.
92. *Ibid.*, 7.
93. “The Testimony of Three Witnesses,” printed in the Book of Mormon.
94. See D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), 7–10.
95. Brian Q. Cannon and BYU Studies Staff, “Priesthood Restoration Documents,” *BYU Studies* 35/4 (1995–96): 163.
96. See Oliver Cowdery to W. W. Phelps, *Messenger and Advocate* 1 (October 1834): 14–16, cited in Cannon and staff, “Priesthood Restoration Documents,” 182.
97. Jan Shippy and John W. Welch, eds., *The Journals of William E. McLellin* (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 1994), 45, 283.
98. An excellent discussion of priesthood restoration is Larry C. Porter, “The Restoration of the Priesthood,” *Religious Studies Center Newsletter* 9 (3 May 1995), and Larry C. Porter, “The Restoration of the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods,” *Ensign* (December 1996): 30–47.
99. Quoted in Cannon and staff, “Priesthood Restoration Documents,” 198, corrections in punctuation and spelling.
100. See Alex Baugh, “A Call To Arms: The 1838 Mormon Defense of Northern Missouri” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1996), 68–102.
101. See Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 126.

102. See Grant Underwood, "Joseph Smith's Use of the Old Testament," in *The Old Testament and the Latter-day Saints: Sperry Symposium* (Salt Lake City: Randall Book, 1986), 381–413.

103. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 11; see also 14, 16–17.

104. Anderson, review of *Whitmer Interviews*, 189.

105. *History of the Church*, 1:315.

106. Cook, *Whitmer Interviews*, 91.

**Table 1. Whitmer Interviews**

<b>Interviewer</b>	<b>Interview Date</b>	<b>Name of Publication</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>
Thomas B. Marsh	1838	<i>Deseret News</i>	24 March 1858
Davis H. Bays	13 September 1869	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 November 1869
Henry Moon	9 January 1872	<i>Deseret Evening News</i>	10 April 1872
Eri B. Mullin	1874	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 March 1880
James Caffall	August 1874	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	15 September 1874
<i>Chicago Times</i> reporter	August 1875	<i>Chicago Times</i>	7 August 1875
Thomas Wood Smith	January 1876	<i>Fall River Herald (Mass.)</i>	28 March 1879
Edward Stevenson	22–23 Dec. 1877	Diary of Edward Stevenson, LDS Church Archives	
Edward Stevenson	22–23 Dec. 1877	Journal History, LDS Church Archives	
Edward Stevenson	22–23 Dec. 1877	Journal History, LDS Church Archives	
Edward Stevenson	22–23 Dec. 1877	<i>Salt Lake Herald</i>	2 February 1878
P. Wilhelm Poulson		<i>Deseret Evening News</i>	16 August 1878
Orson Pratt, Joseph F. Smith	7–8 Sept. 1878	Joseph F. Smith Diary, LDS Church Archives	
Orson Pratt, Joseph F. Smith	7–8 Sept. 1878	<i>Deseret News</i>	16 November 1878
Orson Pratt, Joseph F. Smith	7–8 Sept. 1878	Orson Pratt correspondence, LDS Church Archives	
Orson Pratt, Joseph F. Smith	7–8 Sept. 1878	Joseph F. Smith Collection, LDS Church Archives	
J. L. Traughber Jr.	October 1879	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	15 November 1879
Thomas Wood Smith	January 1876	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 January 1880
Jesse R. Badham	20 March 1881	Diary of Jesse R. Badham, RLDS Church Library—Archives	
Jesse R. Badham	20 March 1881	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 April 1881
<i>Kansas City Journal</i> reporter	1 June 1881	<i>Kansas City Journal</i>	5 June 1881
David Whitmer's corrections to <i>Kansas City Journal</i>		<i>Kansas City Journal</i>	19 June 1881
<i>Chicago Times</i> correspondent	14 October 1881	<i>Chicago Times</i>	17 October 1881
Edwin Gordon Woolley	1882	Diary of Edwin Gordon Woolley, BYU Library—Archives	
Edwin Gordon Woolley	1882	E. G. Woolley Biography, BYU Library—Archives	
William H. Kelley, G. A. Blakeslee	15 January 1882	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 March 1882
Joseph Smith III et al.	4 April 1882	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	1 May 1882
John Morgan, Matthias F. Cowley	13 April 1882	John Morgan Diary, LDS Church Archives	
John Morgan, Matthias F. Cowley	13 April 1882	John Morgan to John Taylor	
John Morgan, Matthias F. Cowley	13 April 1882	Diary of Matthias F. Cowley, LDS Church Archives	
J. W. Chatburn	No Date	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	15 June 1882
Moroni Pratt, S. R. Marks, et al.	30 June 1883	<i>Bear Lake Democrat</i>	14 July 1883

Moroni Pratt, S. R. Marks, et al. James H. Hart	30 June 1883 21 August 1883	<i>Deseret News</i> James H. Hart Notebook (see <i>Mormon in Motion: The Life and Journals of James H. Hart, 1825—1906</i> [Windsor Books, 1976], 216)	21 July 1883
James H. Hart	21 August 1883	<i>Deseret Evening News</i>	4 September 1883
James H. Hart	21 August 1883	<i>Bear Lake Democrat</i>	15 September 1883
James H. Hart George Q. Cannon	21 August 1883 27 February 1884	<i>Contributor</i> George Q. Cannon Journal, LDS Church Archives	October 1883
James H. Hart	10 March 1884	<i>Deseret News</i>	25 March 1884
James H. Hart	10 March 1884	<i>Deseret News</i>	10 April 1884
James H. Hart	10 March 1884	<i>Bear Lake Democrat</i>	28 March 1884
E. C. Briggs, Rudolph Etzenhouser	25 April 1884	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	21 June 1884
J. Frank McDowell	8 May 1884	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	9 August 1884
Herman C. Smith, William H. Kelley	19 June 1884	<i>Saints' Herald</i>	12 July 1884
Joseph Smith III et al. <i>St. Louis Republican</i>	mid-July 1884 mid-July 1884	<i>Saints' Herald</i> <i>St. Louis Republican</i>	28 January 193 16 July 1884
Zenas H. Gurley James H. Moyle	14 January 1885 28 June 1885	Gurley Collection, LDS Church Archives James H. Moyle Journal, LDS Church Archives	
James H. Moyle	28 June 1885	24 November 1928 reminiscence	
James H. Moyle	28 June 1885	<i>Conference Reports</i>	April 1930
James H. Moyle	28 June 1885	<i>Deseret News [Church Section]</i>	2 August 1944
James H. Moyle	28 June 1885	<i>Instructor</i>	1945
<i>Chicago Tribune</i> correspondent	15 December 1885	<i>Chicago Tribune</i>	17 December 1885
Edward Stevenson	9 February 1886	Diary of Edward Stevenson, LDS Church Archives	
Edward Stevenson	9 February 1886	<i>Millennial Star</i>	8 March 1886
Edward Stevenson	9 February 1886	<i>Utah Journal</i>	10 March 1886
Nathan Tanner Jr.	13 April 1886	Nathan Tanner Jr. Journal, LDS Church Archives	
Nathan Tanner Jr. <i>Omaha Herald</i> correspondent	13 April 1886 10 October 1886	Tanner reminiscence, LDS Church Archives <i>Omaha Herald</i>	17 October 188
D. C. Dunbar	10 October 1886?	Dunbar correspondence, LDS Church Archives	
M. J. Hubble	13 November 1886	Missouri State Historical Society, Columbia, Missouri	
Edward Stevenson	2 January 1887	Diary of Edward Stevenson, LDS Church Archives	
Edward Stevenson	2 January 1887	<i>Juvenile Instructor</i>	15 February 18
Edward Stevenson	2 January 1887	<i>Millennial Star</i>	14 February 18
Edward Stevenson	2 January 1887	<i>Juvenile Instructor</i>	1 January 1889
Angus M. Cannon	7 January 1888	Angus M. Cannon Diary, LDS Church Archives	
Angus M. Cannon	7 January 1888	<i>Deseret Evening News</i>	13 February 18
David H. Cannon	7 January 1888?	Diary of Charles L. Walker (A. Karl Larson and Katherine Miles Larson, eds., <i>Diary of Charles Lowell Walker, 773—74</i> , 11 June 1894 entry)	
<i>Chicago Tribune</i> correspondent	23 January 1888	<i>Chicago Tribune</i>	24 January 188
Unidentified Chicago man	[No Date]	<i>Chicago Times</i>	26 January 188
<i>Richmond Conservator</i> report	26 January 1888	<i>Richmond Conservator</i>	26 January 188
<i>Richmond Democrat</i> report	January 1888	<i>Richmond Democrat</i>	26 January 188

# Pleasing the Eye and Gladdening the Heart: Joseph Smith and Life's Little Pleasures

Andrew H. Hedges

When the Spirit of revelation from God inspires a man, his mind is opened to behold the beauty, order, and glory of the creation of this earth—Brigham Young<sup>1</sup>

Recently, several scholars have attempted to portray Joseph Smith and the religious ideas he taught as nothing more than products of American frontier culture, arguing that little, if anything, about the restored gospel and its founder was truly unique and original when compared to the early nineteenth-century cultural milieu of which it was a part.<sup>2</sup>

This paper presents evidence to the contrary and contends that in at least one respect Joseph and the religion he founded were unique on the American religious scene in the early nineteenth century. This uniqueness arose from Joseph's views of, and teachings about, the physical world in which he lived, his physical body, and the value he ascribed to his associations with other people. While Joseph clearly loved all that this physical world has to offer, evidence from popular pamphlets, sermons, and books of the time suggests that most Christians in early nineteenth-century America held to the belief that the physical world and the pleasure to be derived therefrom were inherently burdensome, miserable, restricting, and evil. Most Christians of the period were taught, and taught others, that one's focus should be on strictly spiritual concerns and that most forms of recreation, play, popular music, and other "worldly" concerns were to be engaged in at the peril of their eternal souls. These values were instilled in children at an early age. "Instead of loving God and keeping his commandments," one pamphlet written for Sunday school children read, "you have been disobedient and rebellious. . . . Instead of giving your hearts to God, you have given them to your sports and plays, to dress and fashion, and the vanities of the world."<sup>3</sup> Time spent playing or on other "frivolous diversions"<sup>4</sup> like reading too many books, other pamphlets warned, detracted from the real business of life, and people were counseled to "divide the day into proper portions," with "so much time [set aside] for retirement and divine worship, so much for business, and so much for study, exercise, &c."<sup>5</sup> Such a regimen was to be observed even at the expense of one's friends,<sup>6</sup> for "company, beyond a certain measure, is of bad consequence, be they ever so good and wise. Keeping much retired and by ourselves, is most profitable for us all."<sup>7</sup> While the ministers and Sunday school teachers taught that temporal success followed in the wake of such a disciplined lifestyle, it is clear that they considered far more was at stake than their listeners' livelihoods. "A sound of your approaching damnation roars aloud in every threatening of [God's] word. Even while I speak," thundered one instructor, "hell stands open to receive you, and devils stand ready to drag you into everlasting fire. . . . Why be careless? Why be merry?"<sup>8</sup>

The dangers of enjoying life's pleasures were taught so powerfully that Brigham Young, who grew up in this environment, recalled:

When I was young, I was kept within very strict bounds, and was not allowed to walk more than half-an-hour on Sunday for exercise. The proper and necessary gambols of youth [have] been denied me, . . . I had not a chance to dance when I was young, and never heard the enchanting tones of the violin, until I was eleven years of age; and then I thought I was on the high way to hell, if I suffered myself to linger and listen to it.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, aspiring Christians were taught that the physical world and its influences were so worthless and corrupting and presented so many hazards to one's personal salvation that one should have no qualms about leaving this unhappy world for a better and should perhaps actually long for the great day of "dissolution" to arrive. The idea was a popular one and actually spawned its own genre of literature, which generally took the form of short pamphlets, and occasionally books, recounting the last days and dying statements of exemplary Christians.<sup>10</sup>

Biographies and memoirs of persons who lived and taught these ideals throughout their lives were also immensely popular at the time. Consider, for example, the book *Memoirs of the Rev. David Brainerd; Missionary to the Indians on the Borders of New-York, New-Jersey, and Pennsylvania*, published in 1822. David Brainerd was a household name in early nineteenth-century America; not only had various portions of his work, most of which detailed his labors as a missionary among the Mohican and Delaware Indians between 1743 and 1747, been published and republished in both America and England over the years, but they had also received glowing endorsements from such eminent divines as Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, and John Styles. By the Prophet Joseph's time, they were considered as valuable for aspiring Christians as they were popular; in fact, the editor of the 1822 edition wrote confidently that the missionary's diary alone was "probably the best manual of christian experience, ever yet published" and that Brainerd himself "would probably be selected by all denominations of christians as the *holiest missionary*, if not the *holiest man*, of modern times."<sup>11</sup>

Brainerd's piety lay in the disdain he held for the world and any happiness it might provide. "The whole *world* appears to me like a huge *vacuum*," he wrote his brother John, "a vast empty space, whence nothing desirable, or at least satisfactory, can possibly be derived; and I long *daily* to *die* more and more to it."<sup>12</sup> The heavily wooded region in which he lived and worked was, in his eyes, "the most melancholy *desart*," the "most lonesome wilderness," nothing more than a source of "great hardships" and "tedious travel."<sup>13</sup> Convinced that the physical world had nothing to offer, Brainerd could not even visit a house "where one was dead and laid out" without "look[ing] on the corpse," he wrote, "and long[ing] that my time might come to depart," or suffer some small inconvenience without being "comforted, to think, that death would ere long set me free from these distresses."<sup>14</sup> "O death, death, my kind friend," he called out at one point, "hasten, and deliver me from dull mortality, and make me spiritual and vigorous to eternity!"<sup>15</sup>

It is important to note that this pronounced "otherworldliness" was not original or unique to early nineteenth-century America. The idea that things of a material or physical nature were far inferior to those of a spiritual nature had been part and parcel of Christianity ever since Greek converts, unable to relinquish their ancient philosophers' teachings in this regard, had introduced it into the church— which had no such doctrine of its own— in the first and second centuries.<sup>16</sup> The popularity of these ideas in the early nineteenth century merely indicates that these centuries-old "doctrines" were alive and well during the time of the Prophet Joseph and that the effects of the Great Apostasy were still being felt.<sup>17</sup>

For all the health this philosophy was enjoying in early America, however, it is important to note that in Joseph Smith we find precisely the opposite. For Joseph, the things of this earth were very much deserving of his attention, and he had no qualms about enjoying the pleasures to be derived from the physical world. This was not because Joseph was a hedonist, but rather because he understood, as few of his Christian contemporaries did, that the time-honored Christian teaching about the inferiority of the physical world was one of the "vain philosophies of men" that had crept into the early church, and one that had no basis in the doctrines of the gospel.<sup>18</sup>

As a youth, Joseph was cognizant of the earth's pleasures and the beauty of its order, and apparently appreciated, at least to a degree, its significance in the grand order of things. In his 1832 account of the First Vision, Joseph recounts how, as a boy, he

looked upon the sun the glorious luminary of the earth and also the moon rolling in their majesty [sic] through the heavens and also the stars shining in their courses and the earth also upon which I stood and the beast of the field and the fowls of heaven and the fish of the waters and also man walking forth upon the face of the earth . . . and when I considered upon these things my heart exclaimed well hath the wise man said fool saith in his heart there is no God.<sup>19</sup>

Already aware, then, of the implications inherent in the very order of the earth as a young man, Joseph learned even more about its beauty and purposes during the summer of 1831, shortly after he and several other elders had dedicated the land of Zion and its temple lot. Known today as section 59 in the Doctrine and Covenants, this revelation from the Lord contains one of the great truths about the physical world that the Prophet restored during his ministry:

Verily I [the Lord] say, that inasmuch as ye [keep the Sabbath holy], the fulness of the earth is yours, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and that which climbeth upon the trees and walketh upon the earth; Yea, and the herb, and the good things which come of the earth, whether for food or for raiment, or for houses, or for barns, or for orchards, or for gardens, or for vineyards; Yea, all things which come of the earth, in the season thereof, are made for the benefit and the use of man, both to please the eye and gladden the heart; Yea, for food and for raiment, for taste and for smell, to strengthen the body and to enliven the soul. And it pleaseth God that he hath given all these things unto man; for unto this end were they made to be used. (D&C 59:16–20)

It is clear from his own writings, as well as from those of his contemporaries who took the time to record their observations of the Prophet, that Joseph took this doctrine to heart and made it a point to enjoy life's little pleasures, even when they were not convenient. On the night of 26 May 1834, for example, Joseph and Zion's Camp were bedded down on the Illinois prairie just west of the Embarras River. About 11:00 p.m., the camp's guards awakened Joseph with the news that they could see the mob's campfires to the southeast. Although it was immediately clear to Joseph that they had merely seen the light of the moon rising over the flat prairie, he was so struck with how beautiful the view was that he aroused the entire camp, "wishing the brethren to enjoy the scene as well as myself," he wrote, and feeling it "well worth the trouble of any man rising from his couch to witness."<sup>20</sup>

The scenery did not need to be as spectacular as a prairie moonrise to win the Prophet's admiration. From his own record, for example, we read of the "truly delightful" view that could be obtained from the top of an ancient mound in Illinois, or the "beautiful location" of Adam-ondi-Ahman.<sup>21</sup> The Prophet found the area around Nauvoo particularly noteworthy in this regard. In a letter to John C. Bennett, written shortly after the Saints began settling there, Joseph noted how the growing town was "beautifully situated on the banks of the Mississippi . . . [at] probably the best and most beautiful site for a city on the river."<sup>22</sup> In a proclamation to the Saints issued a few months later, Joseph went on to explain the new city's name—a Hebrew word for a beautiful and restful place—by noting its "most delightful location" on the east bank of the great river and at the western edge of "an extensive prairie of surpassing beauty."<sup>23</sup>

Closely related to this appreciation for natural beauty was the Prophet's love for the outdoors and outdoor activities. It is no coincidence that several people remember having first laid eyes on the Prophet, not in the confines of his office or in a meeting, but *outside*, and frequently at work. Brigham Young, for example, first saw Joseph as he was "chopping and hauling wood" near his home in Kirtland.<sup>24</sup> Wilford Woodruff first saw him "out in the field," where "he had on a very old hat, and was engaged shooting at a mark."<sup>25</sup> The Prophet's own record indicates that when he was not chopping wood or target practicing, he enjoyed walking in the woods, working in his garden, riding his horse, and taking pleasure rides on the steamship *Maid of Iowa*, of which he was a half owner.<sup>26</sup>

Along with his appreciation for the outdoors and beautiful scenery, Joseph thoroughly enjoyed his healthy body and took advantage of its potential. As Leonard Arrington makes clear, this is not to suggest that Joseph crossed the line "between living the fuller life to which we are called by the gospel and indulging in licentious behavior" but rather simply to note that the Prophet, who realized the eternal significance of the body and of the information to be learned through it, took every opportunity that presented itself to exercise its gifts.<sup>27</sup> Best known in this regard is his love for wrestling and other sports, such as pulling sticks, jumping at a mark, and playing ball.<sup>28</sup>

Not so well-known, perhaps, but entirely in keeping with his zest for life, was his love for good food. While evidence for this side of Joseph's character is rare in the historical record, his noting the "excellent wild turkey [he had] for supper" on his way from Independence to Kirtland in 1831, or the "sumptuous feast" he attended at Newel K. Whitney's home early in 1836, certainly suggests that he appreciated a well-prepared meal.<sup>29</sup> So too does a recollection of the Prophet by John L. Smith, who lived with Joseph for several months as a youth. After having been called to a dinner of corn bread, John reported, Joseph "looked over the table [and] said, 'Lord, we thank Thee for this Johnny cake, and ask Thee to send us something better.'" His request was not long in being granted; before they had finished the corn bread, according to John, "a man came to the door and asked if the Prophet Joseph was at home. Joseph replied he was, whereupon the visitor said, 'I have brought you some flour and a ham.'"<sup>30</sup>

Of all that Joseph found to enjoy in this world, evidence suggests that he derived his greatest pleasure from the association he had with other people—something his religious contemporaries, remember, were being cautioned against. A close reading of the historical record shows that he was rarely to be found alone, and that this was largely a result of his own desire to be with others. Whenever possible, these were first and foremost members of his own family. As LaMar C. Berrett has shown, Joseph was a devoted son, brother, husband, and father, a man who "took time to be with his wife"—as well as other members of his family—"whether he had it or not."<sup>31</sup> He also enjoyed spending time with children, finding in "the prattling child," according to one contemporary observer, the "innocence and purity" he loved so much.<sup>32</sup> And finally, Joseph clearly welcomed opportunities to associate with other adults, to the point where his son Joseph III recalled that his "father's home in Nauvoo was generally overrun with visitors."<sup>33</sup>

Joseph frequently combined his love for exercise and the outdoors with his love for associating with his family and friends. When Brigham Young first saw the Prophet, for example, "two or three of his brothers" were with him in the woodlot, while Wilford Woodruff noted that he was attended by his brother Hyrum when he met him in the field target practicing.<sup>34</sup> For this very reason, Zion's Camp, in spite of its hardships, provided Joseph with great pleasure at times, as evidenced by a letter he wrote to Emma after having reached the Mississippi River in June 1834:



The whole of our journey, in the midst of so large a company of social honest and sincere men, . . . and gazing upon a country the fertility, the splendor and the goodness so indescribable, all serves to pass away time unnoticed, and in short were it not [th]at every now and then our thoughts linger with inexpressible anxiety for our wives and our children . . . our whole journey would be as a dream, and this would be the happiest period of all our lives.<sup>35</sup>

Similarly, Joseph went on walks, horseback rides, and at least one sleigh ride with Emma, and did everything from “playing in the yard” to hunting ducks and sliding on the ice with his sons.<sup>36</sup> His whole family accompanied him on his pleasure trips aboard the *Maid of Iowa*.<sup>37</sup> Much of the time he spent with neighbor children was also outdoors, where he could be found playing ball with a group of boys at one moment and picking flowers for a fatherless little girl the next.<sup>38</sup>

Overtly manifesting his love for the beauties and pleasures of the earth, Joseph offended several of his religious-minded contemporaries who had been raised to believe that a truly religious individual should wear, like David Brainerd did, his otherworldliness on his sleeve.<sup>39</sup> Many of these people, although taken aback at some point in their association with Joseph by his down-to-earth qualities, were able to overcome their prejudices and learn from the Prophet’s manner. Rachel R. Grant, for example, who admitted that the “great deal of sectarianism” she had imbibed made her think initially that the more serious Hyrum seemed more like a prophet than the “cheerful and happy” Joseph, faithfully went on to raise the seventh president of the church.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, Sidney Rigdon learned a valuable lesson when he censured the Prophet in 1838 for encouraging a company of Mormon militiamen, wet and cold from an October rainstorm, to warm and cheer themselves by wrestling. “Brother Sidney,” Joseph said, “you had better go out of here and let the boys alone; they are amusing themselves according to my orders.” To Sidney’s chagrin—especially since it resulted in his coat being torn—the Prophet then commenced wrestling with him, after which the first counselor reportedly “never countermanded the orders of the Prophet” again.<sup>41</sup>

Joseph, fully realizing that his unique approach to life could be misconstrued, did what he could both to allay others’ fears and educate them in this regard. “The Saints need not think because I am familiar with them and am playful and cheerful, that I am ignorant of what is going on,” he told members of the Quorum of the Twelve thirteen months before his death. “Iniquity of any kind cannot be sustained in the Church, and it will not fare well where I am; for I am determined while I do lead the Church, to lead it right.”<sup>42</sup> Similarly, William M. Allred recalled that Joseph once reported that he knew “it tried some of the pious folks to see him play ball with the boys.” Joseph explained his actions by relating the story of a prophet “who was sitting under the shade of a tree amusing himself in some way, when a hunter came along with his bow and arrow and reproved him. The prophet,” said Joseph, “asked him if he kept his bow strung up all the time. The hunter answered that he did not. The prophet asked why, and he said it would lose its elasticity if he did. The prophet said it was just so with his mind, he did not want it strung up all the time.”<sup>43</sup>

In spite of his efforts, however, a number of people were not able to relinquish their hold on their prejudices. This included several ministers who visited Joseph at various times and who were reportedly “shocked”—“awfully shocked,” in one case—when Joseph challenged them to a wrestling match or jumping contest.<sup>44</sup> At times, Joseph’s manner elicited even more extreme reactions. George A. Smith, for example, knew of an entire family who left the church because they saw Joseph “[come] down out of the translating room, where he had been translating by the gift and power of God, and commenc[e] playing with his little children.”<sup>45</sup>

## Conclusion

The contrast between Joseph Smith and the nineteenth-century ideal of a religious man could not have been greater. At a time when many people felt that piety was a function of one's ability to ignore the pleasures this world has to offer, Joseph was making no secret of the fact that he loved his life on this physical earth and wanted to experience it to the fullest possible extent. This was because he understood, like very few of his Christian contemporaries, that this earth had been created for the express purpose of making mankind happy and that there was nothing inherently wicked about enjoying its pleasures. This truth, like so many others, had been lost during the Great Apostasy, and people had been suffering the effects of its absence for some eighteen hundred years by the time Joseph arrived on the scene. The restoration of this truth to the earth in the early nineteenth century and the Prophet's willingness to live and teach it as a truly Christian principle in the face of great opposition count as great events in the history of the restoration of the gospel.

## Notes

1. *Journal of Discourses*, 9:256.

2. For examples, see John L. Brooke, *The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology, 1644–1844* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Brent Lee Metcalfe, ed., *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon: Explorations in Critical Methodology* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993); and Dan Vogel, ed., *The Word of God: Essays on Mormon Scripture* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1990).

3. *An Address Delivered to the Children of a Sunday School in Boston on the Last Sabbath of December, 1818* (Boston: Boston Society for the Moral and Religious Instruction of the Poor, 1819), 3–4. I am indebted to David Holland for alerting me to this and the following pamphlets and tracts.

4. Charles Atmore, *Serious Advice, from a Father to His Children, Respecting Their Conduct in the World; Civil, Moral, and Religious* (Philadelphia: Cunningham, 1819), 34.

5. *Ibid.*, 10.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *An Affectionate Address to Young Christians* (New York: Seymour, 1819), 7.

8. *Advice to Youth* (Baltimore: Religious Tract Society of Baltimore, 1819), 2.

9. *Journal of Discourses*, 2:94.

10. For examples, see Experience Mayhew, *Indian Converts: or, Some Account of the Lives and Dying Speeches of a Considerable Number of the Christianized Indians of Martha's Vineyard, in New-England* (London: 1727); *The Pleasures of Piety in Youth Exemplified, in the Life and Death of Several Children* (Boston: Lincoln and Edmands, 1819); *Accounts of the Happy Deaths of Two Young Christians* (Boston: Willis, 1819); *Early Instruction Recommended in a Narrative of the Life of Catherine Haldane, with an Address to Parents on the Importance of Religion* (New Haven: Sidney's Press, 1819), 9, 13–23; George Hendley, *A Memorial for Sunday School Girls, Being the Second Part of an Authentic Account of the Conversion, Experience, and Happy Death, of Twenty-five Children* (Boston: Armstrong, 1819).

11. Sereno E. Dwight, *Memoirs of the Rev. David Brainerd; Missionary to the Indians on the Borders of New-York, New-Jersey, and Pennsylvania* (New Haven: Converse, 1822), 9, spelling retained, emphasis in original in all quotations from Dwight.

12. *Ibid.*, 122.

13. *Ibid.*, 99, 101, 121, 176.

14. *Ibid.*, 180, 145.

15. *Ibid.*, 167.

16. See Stephen E. Robinson, "Warring against the Saints of God," *Ensign* (January 1988): 39.

17. Other authors have noted the harsh otherworldliness that prevailed in early nineteenth-century Christianity and the effects it had on many church members. Leonard J. Arrington, for example, has observed that "the goal set up by the ministers of the time was that each church member should become a spiritual athlete, that is, work unceasingly at being a religious person," and that many who were raised under the "artificially severe, ascetic, fun-abhorring" conditions "that contemporary religion seemed to insist upon . . . felt guilty if they enjoyed the ordinary things of life;" see Leonard J. Arrington, "Joseph Smith and the Lighter View," *New Era* (August 1976): 8, 10. For a further discussion of this topic, see Rex A. Skidmore, "Joseph Smith: A Leader and Lover of Recreation," *Improvement Era* (December 1940): 716.

18. I should emphasize here that this paper compares Joseph's views of the physical world with those of his devoutly Christian contemporaries only. Its scope, then, is quite narrow, and does not attempt to compare Joseph's ideas with those of the Deists, Rationalists, Romantics, and the emerging Naturalists and Transcendentalists who shared his world. I will simply note here that while many of these philosophies and ideologies promoted the glories and pleasures of the world, they did so at the expense of basic Christian beliefs; Thomas Jefferson, for example, a Rationalist, denied the divinity of Christ, while the Transcendentalists' "Supreme Being" was a disembodied "Oversoul" with which one sought to "commune" through nature. Joseph, tutored by the Lord, was unique among these groups in that he was able to explain his beliefs about the physical world, and enjoy it himself, without having to abandon fundamental truths about Christ's divinity and the nature of God.

19. *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989), 1:6.

20. *History of the Church*, 2:72.

21. *Ibid.*, 2:79; 3:39.

22. *Ibid.*, 4:177.

23. *Ibid.*, 4:268. I am indebted to Larry Porter for leading me to these references about Nauvoo. Similar statements are peppered liberally throughout the Prophet's record. A sampling of descriptive phrases used by the Prophet to convey his appreciation for the earth's beauties would include "spring . . . with all its charms," "the beautiful, clear water of the lake," and "beautiful country"; see *History of the Church*, 2:405, 503, and 3:34 respectively. While Joseph may not have penned several similar statements contained in his *History*, evidence suggests that he probably read and endorsed them. These would include a description of Jackson County, where

the author recorded that “as far as the eye can glance the beautiful rolling prairies lay spread around like a sea of meadows. . . . The shrubbery was beautiful. . . . The prairies were decorated with a growth of flowers that seemed as gorgeous grand as the brilliance of stars in the heavens, and exceed description”; see *Papers of Joseph Smith*, 1:359.

24. *History of the Church*, 1:297.

25. *Journal of Discourses*, 7:101.

26. See Skidmore, “Joseph Smith,” 717, 762.

27. See Arrington, “Joseph Smith,” 13.

28. See Alexander L. Baugh, “Joseph Smith’s Athletic Nature,” in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1993), 137–50.

29. *History of the Church*, 1:202; 2:362.

30. John Lyman Smith, “Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith,” *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 172.

31. LaMar C. Berrett, “Joseph, a Family Man,” in *The Prophet Joseph: Essays on the Life and Mission of Joseph Smith*, ed. Larry C. Porter and Susan Easton Black (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988), 36–48; quotation on p. 43.

32. Louisa Y. Littlefield, “Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith,” *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 24.

33. Joseph Smith III, *Joseph Smith III and the Restoration*, ed. Mary Audentia Smith Anderson (Independence: Herald House, 1952), 73.

34. *History of the Church*, 1:297; *Journal of Discourses*, 7:101.

35. *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, comp. and ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1984), 324–25. I am indebted to Richard L. Anderson for directing me to this account.

36. Berrett, “Family Man,” 43–44; John Lyman Smith, “Recollections,” 172; Joseph Taylor Sr., “Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith,” *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 202; *History of the Church*, 5:265.

37. See Skidmore, “Joseph Smith,” 762.

38. For stories of Joseph playing with neighborhood children, see accounts by Edwin Holden, John Lyman Smith, Calvin W. Moore, John W. Hess, Bathsheba W. Smith, Lucy M. Smith, and William M. Allred in “Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith,” *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 153, 172, 255, 302, 344, 471, and 472, respectively. For an account of his picking flowers for a fatherless girl, see Mercy R. Thompson, “Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith,” *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 399.

39. Both Alexander L. Baugh and Truman G. Madsen have noted this phenomenon; see Baugh, “Athletic Nature,” 145–47, and Truman G. Madsen, *Joseph Smith the Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989), 25–26. I am indebted to these two authors for pointing me to the sources I use in developing this argument further.

40. Rachel R. Grant, "Joseph Smith, the Prophet," *Young Woman's Journal* 16 (December 1905): 551.
41. John D. Lee, *Mormonism Unveiled; or The Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop, John D. Lee* (St. Louis: Bryan, Brand, 1877), 76–78; quotations on pp. 77, 78.
42. *History of the Church*, 5:411.
43. William M. Allred, "Recollections of the Prophet Joseph Smith," *Juvenile Instructor* 27 (1892): 472.
44. Edwin F. Parry, comp., *Stories about Joseph Smith the Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1934), 17–18; *Journal of Discourses*, 3:67.
45. *Journal of Discourses*, 2:214.

# Scenes from Early Latter-day Saint History

Kent P. Jackson

If the story of the restored Church of Jesus Christ tells us anything, it is that little things add up—and taken together, they become great things. Consider the beginnings of the Prophet Joseph Smith: On 23 December 1805, in the most remote corner of the world imaginable, a baby boy is born to a frontier family in a tiny rented home in the woods. In a small society concerned only with day-to-day activities and the necessities of life, far from any center of culture, education, or government, Joseph Smith could justifiably reflect in later years that he had been “an obscure boy, . . . a boy of no consequence in the world” (Joseph Smith—History 1:22).

But what of those consequences not yet realized? From our vantage point nearly two centuries after his birth, we can judge that he certainly was one of those noble and great ones, chosen before he was born, to do a work of awesome importance for the human family (see Abraham 3:22–23).

So it is also with the Lord’s church, his priesthood, and the doctrines of heaven. Revealed to simple mortals in their weakness and in their humble circumstances, these heavenly gifts shine more brightly with each passing year. We honor every step of the restoration, every man and woman who contributed to it, and every place in which the Lord’s great work was done, even in obscure and humble beginnings. Faithful companions and friends, log homes, hallowed burial grounds, wooded countrysides, rented rooms—each contributed in its way, and each deserves to be held in honored memory.

*Figure 1.* Hyrum Smith, born 9 February 1800, at Tunbridge, Vermont, was the older brother of Joseph Smith. Almost six years older than his prophet brother, he never failed to sustain him in his calling and was a loyal and trusted friend and adviser to the end of their lives on 27 June 1844. Hyrum received through the Prophet a divine revelation in May 1829 in which the Lord instructed him to “seek to bring forth and establish the cause of Zion” (D&C 11:6). On 19 January 1841 the Lord praised Hyrum, saying, “Blessed is my servant Hyrum Smith; for I, the Lord, love him because of the integrity of his heart, and because he loveth that which is right before me” (D&C 124:15). Richard Anderson is no stranger to locations like this one. In the days before university research money was readily available, his summers were often spent traveling at his own expense to investigate early Latter-day Saint history on-site—at historic locations such as this, as well as in scattered local archives throughout New England, New York, and the Midwest.

*Figure 2.* The original house was built in Palmyra Township, New York, during the winter of 1818–19, two years after the arrival of the Smith family in the Manchester-Palmyra area. They lived here until they moved into their larger frame home in about 1825. The latter home has been standing since then, but this log home was destroyed in the nineteenth century. During the time the family lived in the log home, the first vision took place at the nearby Sacred Grove in the spring of 1820; it was in this home that the angel Moroni appeared to Joseph Smith on 21–22 September 1823. This replica, built at the original site after extensive archaeological work, was dedicated on 27 March 1998 by President Gordon B. Hinckley.

*Figure 3.* Alvin Smith, born 11 February 1799, was the oldest child of Joseph Smith Sr. and Lucy Mack Smith. At the time of his death on 19 November 1823, he was engaged in building a spacious new house for his parents’ family to replace the small log home in which they had been living. Alvin’s death came only weeks after Moroni’s first appearance to Joseph Smith. On his deathbed, he encouraged his younger brother to be faithful to the charge he had received to bring forth the sacred record. The Prophet later recalled his brother with these words: “In him

there was no guile. He lived without spot from the time he was a child. . . . He was one of the soberest of men, and when he died the angel of the Lord visited him in his last moments” (*History of the Church*, 5:126–27). Alvin was buried in the General John Swift Memorial Cemetery in Palmyra.

*Figure 4.* In the fall of 1825, Joseph Smith worked as a laborer for a man named Josiah Stool somewhere in this area, assisting him in his unsuccessful attempt to locate a reputed silver mine. Stool lived near South Bainbridge, New York, over thirty miles to the north, but he had heard that Spaniards had mined silver in the Harmony area. He therefore hired young Joseph Smith, Joseph’s father, and others to dig for him. The Prophet later reported, “I continued to work for nearly a month, without success in our undertaking, and finally I prevailed with the old gentleman to cease digging after it” (Joseph Smith—History 1:56). While employed at Harmony and boarding at the nearby home of Isaac and Elizabeth Hale, Joseph Smith first made the acquaintance of their daughter Emma. The couple married over a year later in January 1827.

*Figure 5.* This is the approximate site of the restoration of the Aaronic Priesthood and the baptism of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery. The priesthood restoration came about as a result of questions concerning baptism that were raised during the translation of the Book of Mormon. The Prophet reported that he and his scribe “went into the woods to pray and inquire of the Lord.” John the Baptist appeared and said, “Upon you my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah, I confer the Priesthood of Aaron” (Joseph Smith—History 1:69). The Prophet gave the date of 15 May 1829 for the event. The Melchizedek Priesthood was restored some miles upstream from here, somewhere between Harmony and Colesville, New York. The specific date of that restoration was not recorded, but strong evidence points to a time about two weeks after the Aaronic Priesthood restoration.

*Figure 6.* In the late summer of 1829, Egbert B. Grandin agreed to print 5,000 copies of the Book of Mormon for \$3,000, secured with a mortgage on Martin Harris’s farm. The typesetting was done by Grandin’s employee, John Gilbert, on the third floor; the printing and binding took place on the second. The ground floor served as the bookstore. The Book of Mormon was first available here for public sale on 26 March 1830. It was also here that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery purchased the Bible that they used for their work on the Prophet’s new translation of the Bible (the Joseph Smith Translation). Known today as the Book of Mormon Historic Publication Site, the original building is now completely refurbished to look as it did in the days of Joseph Smith. It was dedicated by President Gordon B. Hinckley on 26 March 1998.

*Figure 7.* It was here that the Book of Mormon translation was completed in June 1829 after it became necessary for Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery to move from Harmony, Pennsylvania, to find the peace and safety needed to accomplish the work. In a nearby wood, the Three Witnesses saw the angel Moroni and the Book of Mormon plates. Twenty of the early revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants were received at or near this home, and according to Joseph Smith, this was the place where the restored church was officially organized on 6 April 1830. Two sons of the Whitmer family—David and Peter Jr.—were among the six original members (see Richard Lloyd Anderson, *Ensign* [June 1980]: 44–45; [October 1980]: 71). This replica was built following careful archaeological and historical research and was dedicated by President Spencer W. Kimball on 6 April 1980, the sesquicentennial date of the organization of the church.

*Figure 8.* Joseph Smith moved from New York in January 1831 and arrived in Kirtland around 1 February. An apartment above the store of convert Newel K. Whitney became the Smith family’s home and served for a time as the headquarters of the rapidly growing church. Newel K. Whitney and his wife, Elizabeth, had been converted to the gospel the previous fall by the missionaries to the Lamanites—Oliver Cowdery, Parley P. Pratt, Peter Whitmer Jr., and Ziba Peterson. The School of the Elders—priesthood and mission training for the elders of the church—was

sometimes held in this second-story room. It was in the school, perhaps in this room, that church leaders in the winter of 1833–34 presented the theology lectures that were published as the *Lectures on Faith*.

*Figure 9.* The commandment to build the Kirtland Temple was received in late 1832 (see D&C 88:119–20), and in due time the Lord revealed the basics of its design (see D&C 95:11–17). Construction began in 1833, and the building still stands today. The temple was built with two large meeting rooms, one on the main floor and one directly above it. In each of these rooms, the east and west sides contain a series of pulpits—for the Aaronic Priesthood on the east end of the room and for the Melchizedek Priesthood on the west end. On the third floor, several smaller rooms were built. The temple was constructed of sandstone quarried about two miles south of the town. The quarry can still be seen today in a park on the same road as the temple. The temple was dedicated on 27 March 1836, accompanied by spiritual manifestations; the Prophet’s dedicatory prayer is recorded as section 109 of the Doctrine and Covenants. A few days after the temple’s dedication, Moses, Elias, Elijah, and Jesus Christ appeared in it (see D&C 110).

*Figure 10.* When Elders Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles arrived with their companions in Preston, England, in 1837, they were aware that their mission to the British Isles would be a momentous development in the history of the young church. They had been called by the Prophet Joseph Smith and knew they were on the Lord’s errand. “Truth Will Prevail,” an election slogan that greeted them as they first entered Preston’s town square, became their motto. Within days of their arrival, they were preaching the restored gospel in packed meeting places to future converts, as well as to others curious to hear missionaries from America who claimed to have a true message from God. Satan was not unaware of their presence nor of the consequences of bringing the gospel to the nations. In the early morning of 30 July 1837, in the rented room shown in the picture above, the missionaries experienced a profound satanic manifestation by which they learned firsthand of the devil’s malice toward the work of God. Undeterred, however, early the next morning the missionaries baptized their first British proselytes in the River Ribble. The great harvest of European converts had begun. Sometime later, when Joseph Smith in America heard about the event at the Saint Wilfred Street apartment, he rejoiced, saying, “I then knew that the work of God had taken root in that land” (Orson F. Whitney, *Life of Heber C. Kimball* [Salt Lake City: Kimball Family, 1888], 145; see 143–45).

*Figure 11.* When in March 1840 Elder Wilford Woodruff arrived in Herefordshire to preach the restored gospel, he came upon a large group of Christian “dissenters” who willingly heard him. These members of “United Brethren” congregations opened their doors and their hearts to his message, and he converted and baptized many. Among those converted were several leaders of the group, and those individuals made available to Elder Woodruff their meeting places and their congregations. The Gadfield Elm Chapel was a United Brethren meetinghouse that was used by the Latter-day Saints as its congregation became converted to the restoration. Church members met there from 1840 until most had immigrated to America several years later. The chapel now stands in a ruined condition but still serves as a monument to the faith and devotion of those who accepted the message of salvation.

*Figure 12.* On 30 October 1838 a vigilante militia of over two hundred men invaded the small Latter-day Saint settlement of Haun’s Mill in eastern Caldwell County, Missouri, sixteen miles east of the main community of Far West. The Haun’s Mill Saints, largely unarmed because their weapons had been taken in previous days by other vigilantes and members of the Missouri militia, took cover wherever they could in the settlement as the attackers fired at them in an effort to kill them and drive the survivors from the area. When the invaders left, seventeen Latter-day Saint men and boys lay dead or dying, most of whose bodies were later thrown into a dry well and buried there. Haun’s Mill, home to fewer than a dozen families, had been established on the Shoal Creek. There were two mills at the site used for sawing lumber and grinding meal. The stones shown here remain from the



settlement. The larger stone is now located in a public square in the town of Breckenridge, Missouri, and the fragment is in the Latter-day Saint visitors center in Independence, Missouri.

*Figure 13.* Construction of the temple in Nauvoo began in the fall of 1840, and the ceremonial laying of the cornerstones took place on 6 April 1841. Although the building took more than five years to complete, parts of it were put to use prior to the official dedication on 1 May 1846. Between the time when construction began and the time of the dedication, many significant events happened in the church—early baptisms for the dead in the Mississippi River, the administration of the first endowments, the recording of the revelation on eternal marriage, the organization of the Relief Society, the training of the Twelve to assume the leadership of the church, the Prophet’s teachings on the nature of God, the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and the beginning of the exodus to the West, to name a few. Around the exterior of the Nauvoo Temple were thirty pilasters, each with a moon carved in relief at the base, a sun for the capital, and a star above. The sunstone shown here is in the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History in Washington, D.C. On 4 April 1999 President Gordon B. Hinckley announced that the church would rebuild the Nauvoo Temple “as a memorial to those who built the first such structure there on the banks of the Mississippi” (“Thanks to the Lord for His Blessings,” *Ensign* [May 1999]: 89).

# Antiquities, Curiosities, and Latter-day Saint Museums

Glen M. Leonard

The collecting of antiquities for institutional uses in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints began when Michael Chandler's four Egyptian mummies were presented to Joseph Smith in 1835. Chandler had been touring the mummies as a traveling exhibition. The Prophet removed the papyrus scrolls for study, and then his wife, Emma, showed the mummies to inquisitive visitors at their home. For a time, Joseph Coe exhibited both the mummies and the scrolls in a rented room in John Johnson's Inn at Kirtland. The Prophet later transferred custody of the Egyptian materials to his mother, Lucy Mack Smith. She exhibited them at ten cents per view for a time in Quincy, Illinois, in 1839. Five years later, in Nauvoo, visitors were paying twenty-five cents to gaze at these ancient curiosities, displayed in the widowed Lucy Mack Smith's upstairs room in the Mansion House. The Prophet's younger brother William obtained the mummies from his mother in 1847 and toured them for a time. Within a decade they were part of a museum collection in St. Louis, and by 1863 they had found their last known resting place in the Chicago Museum.<sup>1</sup> This small collection of Egyptian antiquities managed by the Smith family marked the beginning of a museum tradition among Latter-day Saints.

During the Nauvoo years that nascent interest grew and expanded. It soon included both the curiosities of nature and the products of human manufacture, or, as one writer put it, "the great things of God, and the inventions of men."<sup>2</sup> The escalating attention in Nauvoo included more than an attempt to create a collection and find a place to display it. More important, proponents established a way of thinking about museums. Their words and ideas set the pattern of discourse for half a century. Nauvoo discussions defined the educational purposes of museums, established a way to build a collection, and identified the church as an appropriate sponsor. When late twentieth-century advocates sought links with the past to demonstrate a continuity of church support for museums, they referred to the ideas and continued the patterns of the 1840s. From Nauvoo to Winter Quarters to Salt Lake City, notions about the whys and hows of museums contained a mix of secular and sacred worldviews to serve the purposes of education and faith.

## The Nauvoo Revelation

In May 1843 Nauvoo's *Times and Seasons* published a notice defining museums as part of the religious responsibility of Latter-day Saints. Editor John Taylor followed the brief announcement with an editorial commentary. In it he defined the scope of collecting for the proposed Nauvoo museum and enlisted the help of missionaries in gathering items of every kind from all parts of the earth. The initial announcement, delivered to the editor by one of Joseph Smith's clerks, was published as follows:

According to a Revelation, received not long since, it appears to be the duty of the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, to bring to Nauvoo, their precious things, such as antiquities, and we may say, curiosities, whether animal, vegetable or metal[lic]: yea, petrifications as well as inscriptions and hieroglyphics, for the purpose of establishing a *Museum* of the great things of God, and the inventions of men, at Nauvoo. We have just received the first donation at the office of President Joseph Smith. Who will come and do likewise?<sup>3</sup>

The published announcement raises several questions: Who authored and authorized the notice? What do we know about the recent revelation mentioned as the authorization for a museum? And what was the first donation received at the President's Office?

On the announcement's authorship, the *Times and Seasons* is silent. A third-person reference in the note to "the office of President Joseph Smith" seems to eliminate the Prophet as author. John Taylor's commentary allows us to conclude only that a clerk in Joseph Smith's office in the Red Brick Store walked the note a short block down Water Street to the frame building that housed the printing shop and handed it to Taylor or one of his assistants while typesetters mocked up the forms for the bimonthly publication. The carrier may have written the message on behalf of the Prophet. That courier-author may have been Willard Richards, the Prophet's principal clerk and historian and an apostle since 1840. Other possibilities include another clerk in the office or William W. Phelps, recently confirmed mayor's clerk and author of a poem about the Nauvoo Temple (quoted below).<sup>4</sup> Whoever the scribe, it seems plausible to suggest that Joseph Smith sanctioned the announcement. This would be particularly expected since the note does not refer to a specific museum revelation but rather expands the meaning of an existing revelation on a related subject.<sup>5</sup>

Because no specific revelation referring directly to a museum is known to exist, we are left to assume that when the author says that a revelation was "received not long since," this could possibly reach back twenty-eight months to Joseph Smith's January 1841 revelation on the Nauvoo Temple (D&C 124).<sup>6</sup> How did a revelation calling upon the Saints to build a temple (and a hotel) in the City Beautiful lend its divine sanction to a third project, that of a museum? That it did so seems likely because certain language in the temple revelation is echoed in the 1843 *Times and Seasons* invitation to contribute to a museum in Nauvoo. Ideas from both sources are cited by John Taylor and subsequent museum advocates.

Three ideas in the 1841 temple revelation appear consistently in other revealed instructions for building temples. Because these ideas have an indirect influence on discussions about museums, the parallels are worth noting. Both ancient and modern scriptural texts directing the construction of temples consistently mention (1) precious building materials, (2) the means of gathering these materials, and (3) specially skilled workmen called to assist in the project.

The building materials specified by the Nauvoo Temple revelation include gold, silver, and precious stones; wood from box, fir, and pine trees; and iron, copper, brass, zinc, and other "precious things of the earth" (D&C 124:27). The revelation sets forth a plan to send "swift messengers"<sup>7</sup> to instruct the Saints to gather to Nauvoo with these materials for the Lord's House and "with all your antiquities," presumably as offerings or for use in beautifying the Lord's dwelling place. The revelation also invites persons with "knowledge of antiquities"—that is, skills in fashioning precious woods and metals using ancient methods—to help build the Nauvoo Temple (see D&C 124:26–27). It was clear from these instructions that the new temple at Nauvoo was to reflect in its building style, construction, and decoration the temples of earlier times.

As was typical of Joseph Smith's revelations restoring the practices of earlier dispensations, references to old and rare materials echoed the words and meaning of ancient scripture. King David planned a house for the Lord using gold, silver, brass, iron, wood, onyx, precious stones, and marble. His intent in using these valuable materials for the Lord's palace was to acknowledge God as the source of all riches and honor, "for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine" (1 Chronicles 29:2, 8, 11). David's heir, Solomon, realized the plan. Solomon reissued the call for these expensive materials and specified Lebanon as a source for cedar, fir, and algum trees. He appointed an agent to collect donations from the people and called for skilled craftsmen to work the precious metals and woods (see 2 Chronicles 2:7–9). Not surprisingly, the Book of Mormon contains a similar reference. Nephi taught his people to work in wood, iron, copper, brass, steel, gold, silver, and precious ores. The Nephites built a temple "after the manner of the temple of Solomon save it were not built of so many precious things" (2 Nephi 5:15–16). This

scriptural language, ancient and modern, contains a consistency of content applied to temple construction. William W. Phelps summarized the message in a poem, “The Temple of God at Nauvoo,” which begins:

Ye servants that so many prophets foretold, Should labor for Zion and not for the gold, Go into the field ere the sun dries the dew, And reap for the kingdom of God at Nauvoo.

Go carry glad tidings, that all may attend, While God is unfolding “the time of the end;” And say to all nations, whatever you do, Come, build up the Temple of God at Nauvoo.

Go say to the Islands that wait for his law, Prepare for that glory the prophets once saw, And bring on your gold and your precious things, too, As tithes for the Temple of God at Nauvoo.

Go say to the great men, who boast of a name; To kings and their nobles, all born unto fame, Come, bring on your treasures, antiquities, too, And honor the Temple of God at Nauvoo.<sup>8</sup>

After the martyrdom, the Twelve issued their own more practical version of the call to collect building materials for the Nauvoo Temple. In an epistle in January 1845, they invited “all the young, middle aged, and able bodied men who have it in their hearts to stretch forth this work with power, to come to Nauvoo, . . . to bring with them teams, cattle, sheep, gold, silver, brass, iron, oil, paints and tools.”<sup>9</sup>

Of interest is the scriptural language used in the call for a Nauvoo museum, including references to “precious things” and “antiquities,” and the use of “swift messengers” to encourage the gathering of the Saints with their treasures. The use of these words in the museum announcement or in Taylor’s appended commentary implies a relationship between the museum notice and the Nauvoo Temple revelation, which can best be defined as an expansion of the revelation’s original meaning. Someone, with or without the Prophet’s direct influence, extrapolated a meaning from the revelation that added a museum to the divine call for a temple and a hotel.<sup>10</sup>

One way the note broadens the meaning of the revelation is by adding its own classifications to references to “antiquities” and “precious things.” The note writer adds: “and we may say, curiosities, whether animal, vegetable or metal[li]c: yea, petrifactions as well as inscriptions and hieroglyphics.” The temple revelation does not mention curiosities—let alone petrified specimens—or ancient writings. The note’s author admits to the expansion. It is not the Lord who says “curiosities.” It is the note’s author (the editorial *we*) who adds “curiosities.” The author does so with the presumptive “we may say.”

A second pointer toward the temple revelation is the way the note makes the revelatory call for a museum tentative. “According to a Revelation, received not long since,” the note begins, “it appears to be the duty of the members” to contribute toward a museum. The tentative words “it appears to be the duty” could be read as an admission that the museum project is an expansion on the original intent of the cited revelation, which called the Saints to gather to Nauvoo and to bring with them their antiquities and precious metals, woods, and stones for use in the temple.<sup>11</sup>

The *Times and Seasons* notice carries the title “To the Saints among All Nations,” giving it the weight of a proclamation. The title serves in addition as the heading for Taylor’s editorial comments, which follow immediately without a typographical break. His expansive emendations fill two and one-half pages of the newspaper. First, Taylor offered his own detailed list of things to collect for the proposed Nauvoo Museum. His suggestions reflect

museum collecting practices of the times with a hint of Mormon revelatory approaches to knowledge. He asked for

every thing new and old, ancient and modern, antique, fanciful and substantial—indeed any thing and every thing that has a tendency to throw light upon ancient nations, their manners, customs, implements of husbandry and of war, their costume, ancient records, manuscripts, paintings, hieroglyphics, models of any new invention in the arts and sciences, any thing that has a tendency to throw light upon Geology, Mineralogy, Anatomy, Philosophy, Mechanics or any thing that is calculated to enlighten the mind, enlarge the understanding, gratify the curiosity, and give general information.<sup>12</sup>

Taylor’s list reads like a catalog of a typical nineteenth-century museum with its cabinet (square room) filled with curiosities. Also in concert with his times, Taylor intended the proposed collection to serve an educational purpose.<sup>13</sup> Learning was consistent with Joseph Smith’s 1832 revelation counseling Latter-day Saints to seek knowledge “of things . . . in the earth, and under the earth; things which have been . . . and a knowledge also of countries and of kingdoms” (D&C 88:78–79).<sup>14</sup> Other revelations similarly counseled the Saints both to seek for spiritual light and to become acquainted with secular knowledge “for the salvation of Zion” (D&C 93:53; and see Topical Guide: Education). Whereas the museum’s collection was to enlighten and inform the patrons about ancient cultures and modern sciences for their own temporal and spiritual salvation, the antiquities gathered to adorn the temple were to glorify God and acknowledge his creation and ownership of all things (see 1 Chronicles 29:12–16).

Taylor’s commentary revealed a special interest in museums, enhanced by his recent travels as a missionary in Great Britain. Drawing from protracted notes made during a visit to the Mechanics Institute in Liverpool in July 1840, he viewed the extensive collections of that institution as an example of Nauvoo’s potential as a great city and as a repository of collections and knowledge.<sup>15</sup> The specimens he saw in Liverpool had caused him to reflect on the rise and fall of nations. “We expect that ere long Nauvoo will be the great emporium of the west,” Taylor concluded, “and take the lead in the arts, sciences, and literature, as well as in religion; . . . it only requires a little exertion on our part, to make a museum or repository of this kind, to exceed any thing on the western continent, and in the world.” A knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of ancient empires, he reasoned, would allow the old men of modern Israel to become wise and permit the young men to learn knowledge from them.<sup>16</sup>

In an echo of the temple revelation, Taylor suggested further that the church’s own network of swift messengers could facilitate the collection of artifacts. He admitted that he was issuing the call without conferring with President Smith. The church, he noted, was already sending “men of intelligence to every nation under Heaven, and to every clime” as missionaries. Taylor advised the elders to send the collected items directly to the Prophet.<sup>17</sup>

Perhaps Taylor knew that it was a missionary who had prompted the note from the President’s Office. “We have just received the first donation at the office of President Joseph Smith,” the note said, adding, “Who will come and do likewise?” The first donation consisted of curiosities—in the animal category—suitable for a relic hall (but not a temple). Addison Pratt was the donor. Ordained a seventy by Brigham Young the preceding day and set apart as “a swift messenger to the nations of the earth” to serve a mission to the Society Islands (Tahiti), Pratt offered relics accumulated during his time as a whaler in the 1820s.<sup>18</sup> According to a notation made by Willard Richards in the Prophet’s diary on Wednesday, 24 May 1843,<sup>19</sup> “Elder Addison Pratt . . . presented the tooth of a whale,

coral, Bones of an Albatros[s'] wing and skin of a foot, Jaw Bone of a porpoise, [and] tooth of a south sea seal as a beginning for a Museum in Nauvoo.”<sup>20</sup>

It seems highly unlikely that Addison Pratt had delivered the souvenirs in response to the 1841 revelation’s appeal for “precious stones” and “antiquities” to adorn the temple. Pratt’s bones and teeth from the South Seas did not qualify for either of those categories. Ready for a lengthy missionary journey, he probably merely wanted to unload his whaling souvenirs. He took them to the President’s Office seeking a custodian. Whatever Pratt’s intent, someone in the office accepted the donation and responded with the public announcement expanding the revelation’s definition of collectibles and their uses to include curiosities for a museum. Not suited for use in building or decorating a temple, these oceanic relics may have prompted an extrapolation to justify a new “temple of learning,” that is, a “house of the muses,” or *museum*. The expansion made sense anciently and in Nauvoo. The temple, the museum, and the library—all places of learning—shared common roots and a common place in the ancient world, where sacred texts in the temple library and the collection of sacred treasures were an integral part of the worship and learning that took place in the temple. The influence of the temple as the center of learning expanded outward to influence all aspects of learning in society.<sup>21</sup> As noted above, Nauvoo’s missionaries were enjoined to gain knowledge of peoples and cultures. The Nauvoo Temple would become a place of learning for the Saints. And the Lord had designated the temple as a sacred repository for the records of the dead (see D&C 127:9; 128:1–7).

The message in the published call for a Nauvoo museum, including the idea that the proposal enjoyed divine sanction, was not lost on museum advocates in Nauvoo, or later. Apparently, no one challenged the idea set forth in the note that an unspecified revelation appeared to obligate the Saints, and particularly the missionaries, to become adjunct curators for a church-encouraged museum. Unrecorded information—perhaps earlier conversations between Joseph Smith and his associates—may have reinforced the notion that the Lord had sanctioned the call through his prophet. The idea was consistent with President Smith’s revelations on learning (see D&C 88:77–80, 118; 90:15; and 93:53), his reputation as a translator of ancient records, and his mother’s stewardship over the Egyptian mummies and records.

The next known reference to antiquities in Nauvoo appeared the following spring in a law proposed by Joseph Smith. It was drafted by his chief clerk, Willard Richards, the probable scribe for the museum note. The Prophet submitted his legislation to Congress in April 1844. The proposed ordinance would have authorized Lt. Gen. Joseph Smith to enlist one hundred thousand soldiers to defend immigrants headed for Texas and Oregon. Nauvoo’s leaders knew of scientific surveys of the American West by military explorers such as John C. Frémont. Their understanding of federally sponsored expeditions no doubt influenced the bill’s draftsman to propose an educational role for the army volunteers. Besides their principal military task of protecting immigrants, the soldiers would “search out the antiquities of the land, and thereby promote the arts and sciences, and general information.” The bill, which failed to interest Congress, did not mention a repository for the proposed collections, but other government scientific explorers returned their findings to Washington.<sup>22</sup>

In similar language, in December 1844, Amasa M. Lyman alluded to the church’s collecting interests in a discourse at the dedication of the Seventies’ Hall. Following John Taylor’s example, he admonished the seventies to use their callings as messengers to every land to “gather many antiquities, with various books, charts, etc.” These were intended for deposit with the Seventies’ Library and Institute Association “for the advancement of art and science, which, with just principles, will go heart and hand unto perfection.”<sup>23</sup> The collections were to include library

materials, sculpture, paintings, and antiquities. The city council had that month chartered the association to replace another defunct Nauvoo library and to assume the role of a museum.<sup>24</sup>

The action was appropriate. The seventies had constructed their hall as a place of learning preparatory to missionary service. In many respects they, too, had adopted a temple revelation—one given at Kirtland in 1832 (see D&C 88:118–38)—and had created a School of the Prophets in the Nauvoo Seventies’ Hall to continue the school held in Kirtland and Missouri. It was appropriate that the Nauvoo missionary quorums be the collectors of books and artifacts from around the world, for these materials were intended to prepare quorum members for service among the nations of the earth. It was the missionaries of the church—at Nauvoo, the seventies quorums—who had first been enjoined by revelation in 1832 to “seek learning, even by study and also by faith” (D&C 88:118).

### **From Winter Quarters to the Deseret Museum**

Nothing further is known of Addison Pratt’s contributions to a Nauvoo museum, but the idea of a church-sanctioned house of learning remained alive during the migration west. After the exile from Nauvoo, Brigham Young led a pioneer group to the valley of the Great Salt Lake, then returned to the Missouri River. There, with the help of Willard Richards, now serving as his clerk and soon to become his counselor, President Young issued a “General Epistle . . . to the Church . . . abroad, dispersed throughout the Earth” on behalf of the Twelve.<sup>25</sup> The omnibus epistle of 23 December 1847 set forth a comprehensive summary of recent events, instructions for migrating, a report of preparations underway in the Salt Lake Valley, and specific counsel. The directive brought together the several ideas about temple building, artifact collecting, and learning that had informed such discussions in Nauvoo. It offered counsel on the future directions for these three related enterprises—education, a museum, and a temple.<sup>26</sup>

The epistle first emphasized the importance of education for the youth of the church: “It is the duty of all parents to train up their children in the way they should go,” the letter noted with an allusion to scripture (see Proverbs 22:6; see also Isaiah 54:13; D&C 68:25–28; and 93:40). The document encouraged the Saints to use every opportunity available to them to gather up books on education for their children, together with “every historical, mathematical, philosophical, geographical, geological, astronomical, scientific, practical, and all other variety of useful and interesting writings, maps, &c.”<sup>27</sup> from which the church recorder could compile textbooks for students. Though reminiscent of Amasa Lyman’s discourse, the focus of this document was education and the writing of textbooks for children, not the training of adult missionaries. This task drew upon a precedent reaching back to the church’s days in Kirtland. A revelation in 1831 had assigned to William W. Phelps and Oliver Cowdery the task of “selecting and writing books for schools in this church, that little children also may receive instruction” (D&C 55:4). It anticipated the creation of the Deseret alphabet readers for children in the 1860s.

The epistle continued with another educational proposal: “We also want all kinds of mathematical and philosophical instruments, together with all rare specimens of natural curiosities and works of art that can be gathered and brought to the valley, where, and from which, the rising generation can receive instruction; and if the Saints will be diligent in these matters, we will soon have the best, the most useful and attractive museum on the earth.”<sup>28</sup> The Great Salt Lake Valley museum proposed here would include not only “the great things of God, and the inventions of men,” but a third category, works of art. This had been added mostly through Philo Dibble’s influence, but continued the precedent set by John Taylor and Amasa Lyman in Nauvoo. The epistle became the direct inspiration for the first museum in Utah Territory.

Without further comment on a museum, the letter next encouraged the elders to keep journals and to gather historical information for the church historian. This was consistent with the revelations of 1830 and 1831 calling upon historians and recorders to keep a history (see D&C 20:81– 83; 21:1; and 47:1–4). It reemphasized the role of missionaries as collections agents.<sup>29</sup>

After offering advice on several other matters, the epistle from Winter Quarters turned to temple building. It invited the Saints to migrate to the new western Zion,

bringing their gold, their silver, their copper, their zinc, their tin, and brass, and iron, and choice steel, and ivory, and precious stones; their curiosities of science, of art, of nature, and every thing in their possession or within their reach, to build in strength and stability, to beautify, to adorn, to embellish, to delight, and to cast a fragrance over the House of the Lord; . . . whether it be in precious jewels, or minerals, or choice ores, or in wisdom and knowledge, or understanding, manifested in carved work; or curious workmanship of the box, the fir and pine tree, or any thing that ever was, or is, or is to be, for the exaltation, glory, honour, and salvation of the living and the dead, for time and all eternity.<sup>30</sup>

All these commodities, physical and intellectual, reflected directly on the messages of the Nauvoo Temple revelation and its ancient predecessors. Of special interest was the inclusion here of the “curiosities of science, of art, [and] of nature” for use in the temple. While it may appear that museum collecting categories were now influencing the items judged appropriate “to beautify, to adorn, [and] to embellish” the temple, the precedent for such existed in ancient times, and portraits were hung in the Kirtland and Nauvoo Temples.<sup>31</sup> The epistle of 1848 clearly distinguished between the collecting interests of a museum for the education of children in the valleys of the mountains and the materials needed to build and decorate a temple in the tops of those same mountains for the exaltation of the human race.

Brigham Young, like John Taylor, understood the merits of a good museum. In his missionary travels, President Young had seen museums in London, Boston, and other cities.<sup>32</sup> Even so, his endorsement of a museum in the letter from Winter Quarters reflected the influence of a second Nauvoo museum promoter—Philo Dibble. Dibble (again, like John Taylor) was a man excited about the prospects of a Latter-day Saint museum. In July 1848 Dibble revealed his hand at Kanesville, Iowa, in a letter to Orson Pratt and Orson Spencer, missionaries in England.<sup>33</sup> Dibble recognized these two men as amenable to his proposition to create a museum that would feature a series of large oil paintings on church history. He credited Orson Spencer with being the first to sustain his “feeble efforts in support of the noble cause of illustrating by paintings the history of the Church.”<sup>34</sup> Dibble had already engaged the help of draftsman Robert Campbell and artist William W. Major, both British immigrants. In Nauvoo, they had worked on two canvasses for the series. A martyrdom painting had been finished first and was displayed during April conference in 1845 in Nauvoo’s Masonic Hall. A second work, depicting Gen. Smith’s last address to the Nauvoo Legion, was nearing completion that September.<sup>35</sup> Orson Pratt had praised Dibble’s art project and pronounced the images of Joseph and Hyrum Smith accurate. In April 1848, Dibble displayed the paintings in the log tabernacle in Pottawattamie County, Iowa, and was invited to continue efforts to create historical paintings that they might be displayed in “a gallery in Zion.”<sup>36</sup>

“As the importance of the work grew upon me, and it needed a more extensive patronage,” Dibble wrote to his friends, “the first presidency, and the leading authorities of the church were the willing supporters and the hearty co-operators in placing these high objects before the Saints.”<sup>37</sup> In other words, the newly sustained First



Presidency had endorsed Dibble's project by inserting a plea for support of a museum in their epistle to the Saints. The Twelve had earlier rejected Dibble's attempt in Nauvoo to gain possession of two or three of the wooden oxen from the dismantled temple font for his museum. The First Presidency and the Twelve endorsed his artwork project after discussing it in a council meeting. Dibble's purpose in writing to Pratt and Spencer now was to enlist the specific help of his friends in publicizing his project among the Saints in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and "wherever your influence may be extended."<sup>38</sup> Wilford Woodruff had been impressed with the first two murals and was soliciting support in the Eastern States.<sup>39</sup>

Later in his letter Dibble alluded to John Taylor's 1843 statement in the *Times and Seasons* and once more to Brigham Young's Winter Quarters epistle, and he added his own list of necessities for the museum. Of the responsibilities of the Saints, Dibble wrote, "God has from time to time, by revelation and by epistle, made it their duty to help by their means and substance in the building up a museum. My object in addressing you is to obtain the necessary materials of glass, nails, oils, paints, &c., to take to the valley for its erection." He then appealed to the Saints in Great Britain to help him so that "a museum may be established in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, as a repository in which shall be collected from all parts of the earth, specimens of the works of nature and art, to connect with these sceneries." He wanted the support by fall, and he invited English artists to migrate to Utah to help in preparing the murals. Dibble argued that "by revelation" (a reference to Elder Taylor's article) "and by epistle" (the Winter Quarters statement) the Saints had been obligated to support his project.<sup>40</sup>

Although Philo Dibble did not realize his dream, he lived to see others establish a museum in territorial Utah. Even that effort took twenty years. Between 1848 and 1868, a few displays were offered at the annual fair sponsored by the Deseret Agricultural and Manufacturing Association in the Social Hall on State Street. In 1858, for example, the exhibition featured "the sword worn by Jos. Smith 'in Zion's camp,' and a cane used by him. There were also numerous curiosities brought home by the missionaries from the different sections of the earth."<sup>41</sup> During these same years, the tradition of a seventies' school-library-museum continued. Truman Angell drew up plans for a seventies' hall in 1851. Four years later the seventies drafted "a constitution for a Library; and . . . a Museum, in which may be deposited all collections of antiquities, relics, ancient coins, philosophical and astronomical instruments, as well as books, maps, charts, drawings, &c., &c."<sup>42</sup> That decade saw construction of the first wing of a territorial capitol in Fillmore and a Social Hall in Salt Lake, but not the Seventies' Hall of Science.

In 1867 Brigham Young's twenty-two-year-old son, John W., sought funding from the territorial legislature to establish a museum. He wanted to impress visitors and educate residents with a collection of natural and man-made resources. Young proposed to exhibit "the animals that inhabit the mountains of Utah, with specimens of natural curiosities and native products; to be increased by the addition of specimens of interest from every quarter of the world as fast as they could be obtained."<sup>43</sup> When the legislature rejected his appeal that year and the next, Young created his own private museum. His father furnished its first home, an adobe house just west of the Lion House. President Young's missionary collection, gathered from around the world by the Lord's swift messengers, helped get the Salt Lake City Museum and Menagerie launched. (Live caged animals and birds in the yard made it a menagerie.) Assisting in organizing the collection was Guglielmo G. R. Sangiovanni, with whom John Young had traveled Europe visiting museums and zoos. The mainstay in collections development was Joseph L. Barfoot, whose interest in natural history, especially botany, gave the museum a distinctive scientific identity.<sup>44</sup>

The Salt Lake City museum opened to the public in 1869. Soon known as the Deseret Museum, it became a church agency in 1878 and in the final decade of the century served the LDS College (later LDS University). During this time, the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association encouraged local groups "to collect specimens and

maintain cabinets of curiosities in connection with their libraries.”<sup>45</sup> The Deseret Museum’s curator offered to help local sponsors catalog their collections, and he invited exchanges between the headquarters collection and the local miniature museums. In 1918 the extensive natural history collections were given to the church university and became known as the LDS University Museum (later divided between the University of Utah and Brigham Young University). The Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, who had become caretakers of two intermingled collections of historical artifacts, moved their portion to the basement of the newly built state capitol. The remaining pioneer relics and the archaeological specimens of the prehistoric West moved to a new wing of the Bureau of Information on Temple Square and opened in March 1919 as the LDS Church Museum. That museum closed in 1976 after a long period of meaningful service to church members and visitors.<sup>46</sup>

At various times during its history the Deseret Museum defined its purposes differently. At first, as a general museum, it touted Utah’s natural and industrial offerings to tourists arriving on the transcontinental railroad and also served local school children. It built a significant natural history collection—including mineral and fossil specimens and mounted birds and animals—and accepted historical items incidentally. Gradually the museum developed an increased role in educating the youth of Zion. At the height of its half-century life, the Deseret Museum’s director was James E. Talmage, a geology professor at the University of Utah and, after 1911, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve. He served the museum from 1891 until the dispersal in 1918. In 1911 the museum moved to quarters in the Vermont Building, on South Temple Street at Richards Street, its fifth and final home. When the museum opened its handsome galleries, offices, laboratory, and library, Dr. Talmage defined its purpose:

By derivation, the word “Museum” means a home or temple of the Muses, hence a place for study and contemplation. The educational value of museums is now very generally recognized; and institutions of the kind are maintained, some of them on an elaborate scale, by great universities, as also by cities, states, and nations. At the present time museums vie with libraries as factors of public education.

... [T]he Deseret Museum ... represents the sum of the past and is of assuring promise in our future development [as a people]. “In its present condition the Deseret Museum is at once a consummation and a beginning.”<sup>47</sup>

The professionalization of the Deseret Museum under Talmage’s direction, and its more direct ties with teaching, marked the end of the pioneer museum era and a first step toward an expanding tradition of educational museums for Utah and the church.

## **Church Museums since 1918**

For half a century after the creation of the LDS Church Museum on Temple Square, collections increased in the spirit of the original call for a museum in Nauvoo. With the guidance of directors who operated under a public relations and missionary charge, the museum added artifacts illustrating church history and cultural objects from around the world to demonstrate the spread of the gospel. The children of the founding generation donated relics carried across the plains, while the missionaries brought home mementos of service in faraway places.

The LDS Church Museum was a natural outgrowth to the Bureau of Information to which it was attached. Local quorums of Seventy in Salt Lake City had started the Bureau of Information to help the church tell its own story instead of leaving the task to cab drivers who took tourists around town to see the sights. The local seventies built a small kiosk on Temple Square in 1902 and then expanded into a new bureau two years later. They added a second floor in 1911. The bureau’s first director collected and displayed mementos from around the world. The

existence of this collection may have prompted the expansion of the bureau to include the artifact collection from the Deseret Museum. For the next half century, under the supervision of the Temple Square Mission, hundreds of guides distributed literature and conducted tours for an increasing flood of visitors. The purpose of the Bureau of Information and LDS Church Museum was to make friends for the church and preserve the relics of the pioneers and prehistoric Southwest peoples.<sup>48</sup>

During the late 1930s and again in the mid-1960s, church leaders considered proposals from Temple Square directors to expand the museum's size. Because of the success of the church's exhibit at the New York World's Fair in 1964, attention was given first to the creation of the Visitors' Center North. It opened in August 1966, employing teaching techniques found effective at the New York pavilion. Over the next decade, the church sponsored exhibits at three other expositions and began building visitors' centers at some other temples and historic sites.<sup>49</sup>

In 1969 President David O. McKay and his counselors sent a circular letter to stake presidents in the continental United States encouraging them to help collect items for a newly organized Historical Arts Committee headed by Elder Mark E. Petersen. The letter offered its own version of a list of items of interest to the committee. During the twentieth century, the church had added historic sites and buildings to its list of collectibles for member study and edification. The committee would become involved in restoring and furnishing historic buildings as well as collecting for the church museum.<sup>50</sup>

Somewhat different from the lists that were offered by John Taylor in Nauvoo and Brigham Young at Winter Quarters, the items mentioned in the 1969 First Presidency letter met new as well as older collecting interests. Reviving the emphasis of Philo Dibble's days, the circular gave art an important role. This reflected the museum's newly assigned stewardship in building the church's small but important art collection. The call included the pictorial with the more traditional artifactual and written evidence of church history: "historical artifacts of significance including books, letters, journals, papers, documents, paintings, sculptures, crafts, drawings, architecture and architectural fragments, photographs, metalwork, carriages, wagons, all household furnishings, handwork, pre-Columbian artifacts, and pioneer memorabilia." The scope of interest for donations was defined as anything relating to "the culture of the Mormon people from the beginning of the Church to the present time." Many of the nonartifactual items were destined for deposit in the library and archives of the Church Historical Department, known until 1972 as the Historian's Office. The remainder would find a home in restored historic buildings or the church's museum on Temple Square. To help expand historical collection efforts, the letter encouraged stakes in the United States and Canada to appoint historical arts correspondents. These were the curatorial swift messengers of the late twentieth century called to collect the items mentioned in the First Presidency letter.<sup>51</sup>

The Philo Dibble behind this letter was Florence S. Jacobsen, a member of Elder Petersen's Historical Arts Committee. In 1973 she would be named church curator and assigned to care for the museum collection on Temple Square and a dispersed fine arts collection. A few years later, as director of the Arts and Sites Division of the Church Historical Department, she would join a revived Historic Arts and Sites Committee headed by Elder G. Homer Durham of the Seventy, who was also the executive director of the Historical Department. The "Arts" in these titles referred to museum responsibilities, the "Sites" to historic buildings and sites.

During the 1970s, the caretakers of church collections revived planning for an improved museum facility to house the church's growing art and artifact collection. The Bureau of Information and its annex, the LDS Church

Museum, closed in 1976 to make way for the Visitors' Center South. The museum collection went into temporary storage. This marked the physical and administrative separation of the museum function from the Temple Square missionary effort. On 12 August 1980, President Spencer W. Kimball announced that the church would construct the Museum of Church History and Art opposite the Salt Lake Tabernacle on West Temple, with supervision centered in the Church Historical Department.<sup>52</sup>

In January 1984, shortly before the new museum opened, the First Presidency issued another request for museum contributions. The letter emphasized an interest in art by inviting donors to offer high-quality original art representing "the various national and cultural traditions which characterize the mission of the Church." Preferred topics, the presidency said, were themes "related to scripture, Church history, religious values, or Latter-day Saint lifestyle," a subject listing that continues to influence art collecting at the church museum. The notice included an expanded list of acceptable artistic media—"painting, sculpture, watercolor, etching, engraving, stained glass, woodcarving, weaving, basketry, and pottery"—and added other items that the museum's acquisitions committee would consider: "furniture, clothing, national costumes, historical artifacts and memorabilia of all kinds of significance to the Latter-day Saint Church, also folk art, and the decorative arts, including quilting, lace work and needlepoint. A particular need is for works of art representing outstanding Latter-day Saint artists, living and dead."<sup>53</sup>

The collecting interests and objectives of the Museum of Church History and Art were mentioned in comments by the five speakers at dedication services for the museum's new building on 4 April 1984.<sup>54</sup> No longer would the museum at church headquarters assemble antiquities for examination by students and church members; the role of showcasing anthropological specimens had been relegated to the Museum of Peoples and Cultures at Brigham Young University in Provo and was not mentioned at the dedication. In addition, most of the curiosities that once attracted visitors at the Bureau of Information had been laid away on storage shelves. The church museum now specialized in interpretive, educational exhibits featuring church history and art. President Gordon B. Hinckley of the First Presidency mentioned these two types of collections in his dedicatory prayer.<sup>55</sup>

An inaugural exhibit at the museum featured C. C. A. Christensen's 1880s "Mormon Panorama," on loan from Brigham Young University. The Panorama offered a reminder to visitors of the tradition launched by Philo Dibble and his artists in Nauvoo of telling church history through art. Elder G. Homer Durham of the Seventy, the executive director of the Historical Department, drew attention to the dramatic scenes with an 1879 quotation from the Danish immigrant artist: "History will preserve much, but art alone can make the narration of the suffering of the Saints comprehensible for the following generations."<sup>56</sup>

The closest the dedication speakers came to citing a scriptural sanction for the new museum was President Hinckley's extrapolation from the Lord's 1830 commandment to keep a record of important events in church history (see D&C 21:1). To this compilation of a written record, President Hinckley noted, church museums now added "the preservation of examples of the artistic work of [Latter-day Saints] in architecture, furniture, painting, sculpture, music, and other expressions" of God-given talents. President Ezra Taft Benson, then presiding in the Quorum of the Twelve, cited the admonition in the thirteenth Article of Faith to seek things lovely and praiseworthy. Other speakers also used that verse to suggest a theme for the museum's collecting interests. Perhaps these references could be considered Nauvoo-style extrapolations to support a museum. Nevertheless, for museum advocates in the late twentieth century, the authorization of a museum by present leaders of the church seemed in itself a sufficient revelatory sanction.<sup>57</sup>

The new museum's educational role seemed foremost in the thoughts of the speakers that April day. Florence Jacobsen quoted Brigham Young's dream of building "the best, the most useful and attractive museum on the earth" as an educational tool for Zion's children. Elder Boyd K. Packer of the Quorum of the Twelve demonstrated his skills as master teacher by using historical objects displayed at the museum to teach a lesson in faith to present generations. President Benson, like Elder Talmage before him—and like most of the dedication speakers—linked past, present, and future. "Our past, after all," he said, "is our prologue to the future."<sup>58</sup>

Little was said of temples during the museum's dedication ceremonies; the dedicatory prayer lacked any specific long listing of building materials or building parts as had been common in such supplications in earlier years. In his remarks and in the prayer, President Hinckley did link the museum with the granite temple on the square to the east, whose finish the museum's gray cast-stone facade resembled. The museum, he said, was an appropriate neighbor to the temple and other examples there of pioneer architecture and workmanship.<sup>59</sup>

During its opening months, the Museum of Church History and Art celebrated the tradition of Latter-day Saint interests in museums reaching back to Kirtland and Nauvoo. It did so with an exhibit called "Church Museums—Past and Present." The display featured a few old cases from the Deseret and LDS Church museums filled with curiosities for old-time's sake. Shown were "the great things of God, and the inventions of men": the tooth of a whale (but not from Addison Pratt's collection), one of the Deseret Museum's prized Utah quartz crystals, a stuffed New Zealand king penguin from the Bureau of Information, and relics of early Utah manufacture (the territory's first nails, glass, and sugar). Not shown were the mummies so popular on Temple Square. These were not Chandler's Egyptian mummies once shown by Lucy Mack Smith, but rather the Anasazi Indian remains that, with the watch worn by John Taylor at Carthage Jail, had distinguished the LDS Museum's reputation for half a century. The Four Corners Indian Collection had become part of Brigham Young University's anthropological study collection in the Museum of Peoples and Cultures. Only a pair of ragged, braided Pueblo moccasins in the exhibit "Church Museums—Past and Present" reminded viewers of the Deseret Museum's interest in the antiquities of prehistoric Utah peoples.<sup>60</sup>

After a longer-than-intended showing for the exhibit, these memories of past museums returned to storage. The Museum of Church History and Art turned its attention to a new purpose, that of helping present generations gain a better understanding of Latter-day Saint history from 1820 to the present by examining selected artifacts, art, and documents in an interpretive setting. Its hallmark exhibit, "A Covenant Restored," celebrates the origins and early development of the church. Changing exhibits tell other historical stories and share collections gathered from around the world with the assistance of members, missionaries, and church leaders. Not unlike its predecessors dating back to Nauvoo, the church museum functions under the supervision of executive directors assigned from the quorums of the Seventy.

Meanwhile, museums at Brigham Young University continue the Deseret Museum's late-nineteenth-century emphasis on natural history and cultural study collections for students. The Monte L. Bean Life Science Museum, located east of the Marriott Center, was the first of the campus museums to get a modern building to house its collections and exhibits. The facility attracts students of all ages seeking to understand the natural world. The museum preserves the last of the Deseret Museum's mounted specimens—a California gull—and continues Joseph Barfoot's tradition of collecting and documenting botanical and zoological collections.<sup>61</sup> The university's Earth Sciences Museum focuses on dinosaurs and has been housed since 1987 in a temporary facility west of Cougar Stadium. The museum greatly expands an interest introduced in 1912 when the Deseret Museum acquired a replica of the nineteen-foot-long skeleton of a *Megatherium cuvieri*, a South American ground sloth.<sup>62</sup>

The Museum of Peoples and Cultures, located at 100 East and 700 North in Provo, offers interpretive displays of native peoples, primarily in the Americas. Its collections include most of the ethnological specimens that had once been part of the LDS Museum displays on Temple Square, including items from the Anasazi burial sites of the Four Corners Region. It serves as the repository for more than one hundred thousand items secured through more recent university archaeological excavations and ethnological collecting expeditions.<sup>63</sup>

In 1986, the university announced plans to seek private funding to build a new fine arts museum and new facilities for two existing campus museums, the Earth Sciences Museum and the Museum of Peoples and Cultures.<sup>64</sup> The Museum of Art was the first of the three to be built. It was created to house and display the university's collection of paintings, sculptures, costumes, and crafts from cultures worldwide. James A. Mason, dean of the College of Fine Arts and Communications, oversaw development of the new museum; its handsome new facility, adjacent to the Harris Fine Arts Center, opened in October 1993. In his dedicatory remarks, President Gordon B. Hinckley, then first counselor in the First Presidency, mentioned a doctrinal basis for collecting things lovely and of good report. He added that art enriches life and will "cause us more frequently to ponder on the wonder of Him who is our God and our Creator, the Author of all the truly beautiful."<sup>65</sup> Among the museum's early offerings was an exhibition of C. C. A. Christensen's "Mormon Panorama" of church history. While the museum generally centers its exhibits more broadly on world art treasures and their historical and aesthetic values, this offering of historical Mormon art from the museum's collection was a brief echo of Philo Dibble's early interest in using art to inspire viewers with an understanding of Latter-day Saint history.

As the twenty-first century approaches, the museum tradition begun privately in Kirtland and expanded through the sanction of the "museum revelation" in Nauvoo continues in several church-sponsored settings. Like their forerunners in times past, today's Latter-day Saint museums offer specializations suited to the education of a new generation interested in the great things of God and the inventions and adventures of peoples worldwide.

## Notes

1. See *History of the Church*, 2:235, 348–51, 396; Linda K. Newell and Valeen T. Avery, *Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 54; James R. Clark, *The Story of the Pearl of Great Price* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1955), 146–63.

2. *Times and Seasons* 4 (15 May 1843): 201.

3. *Ibid.* This issue was published at least nine days after the 15 May dateline (see n. 19, below). It was not an unusual situation, given problems with paper supplies, health of workers, and late-breaking news. To complicate matters this particular month, John Taylor and Wilford Woodruff had just taken on the editorship of the *Nauvoo Neighbor* and had published their first issue on 3 May; see *History of the Church*, 5:380.

4. Willard Richards began service in the Prophet's office as the church recorder and historian in December 1842 and is the most likely person to have been present at the time. Other clerks assisting Joseph Smith during 1843 were James Sloan, 1840–43; William Clayton, 1842–44; and Thomas Bullock, 1843?–44. Howard C. Searle, "Authorship of the History of Joseph Smith: A Review Essay," *BYU Studies* 21/1 (1981): 104, 108, 111. The city council approved Phelps as mayor's clerk on 11 February 1843; see *History of the Church*, 5:270.

5. The reference to the office echoes the third-person wording of an entry in the Prophet's diary for the previous day, when Richards wrote, "The Twelve met at Prest J Smith's office" to ordain six men as missionaries. Scott H.

Faulring, ed., *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 380. S. George Ellsworth, ed., *The Journals of Addison Pratt . . .* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990), 115–16, takes the account at face value and makes Joseph Smith both the direct recipient of the relics and the responsible party behind the note.

6. See V. Garth Norman, “Analysis of the Joseph Smith Document on the Nauvoo Museum Project,” introductory comments to a panel discussion on historic archaeology and museums in the Nauvoo era, 41st Annual Archaeology of the Scriptures Symposium, Brigham Young University, 24 October 1992, excerpts in possession of author. Norman checked with Dean C. Jessee, Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History at BYU, and the Church Historical Department about the possible existence of a museum revelation. No such revelation is known, nor is a museum mentioned in the revelations not contained in the Doctrine and Covenants; see Fred C. Collier, comp., *Unpublished Revelations of the Prophets and Presidents of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Collier's, 1979), 1:90–103.

7. Doctrine and Covenants 124:26 uses “swift messengers” and “chosen messengers” in the same way Isaiah did in his prophecy of “ambassadors” who would be sent as “swift messengers” to gather a scattered people to Mount Zion (Isaiah 18).

8. *Times and Seasons* 3 (15 June 1842): 830.

9. *History of the Church*, 7:357.

10. Norman, “The Nauvoo Museum Project,” suggests that Joseph Smith may have seen the museum’s educational role as a tool for accomplishing “the revelation’s directive to gain knowledge of antiquities and other subjects.”

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Times and Seasons* 4 (15 May 1843): 201.

13. See Edward P. Alexander, *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1979), 8–9, 11–13.

14. I am indebted to Norman, “The Nauvoo Museum Project,” for this observation.

15. See *Times and Seasons* 4 (15 May 1843): 201–3.

16. See *ibid.*, 203.

17. *Ibid.*, 201.

18. See *History of the Church*, 5:404, 406.

19. That the May 24 contribution came nine days after the date on the *Times and Seasons* issue announcing the first donation is evidence of the late publication of this issue (see n. 3 above).

20. Faulring, *American Prophet's Record*, 380; and see *History of the Church*, 5:406. The entry was inserted into the Prophet’s history in 1854 by Church Historian George A. Smith. Searle, “Authorship,” 112.

21. See Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 6–7. The word *museum*, from the Greek *mouseion*, originally meant “temple of the muses”—home of the nine goddesses of the arts and sciences—and in ancient Egypt, the word referred to the library and research center in Alexandria. Marjorie P. Katz, “Museum,” in *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1977 ed., 13:777. Thus, Hugh Nibley has observed, “The temple was . . . the center of learning, beginning with the heavenly instructions received there. It was the *Museon*, or home of the Muses, representing every branch of study. . . .

Central to the temple school was the library, containing sacred records, including the ‘Books of Life,’ the names of all the living and the dead, as well as liturgical and scientific works.” Hugh W. Nibley, “Meanings and Functions of Temples,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 4:1462; and see Hugh W. Nibley, “What Is a Temple,” in *Mormonism and Early Christianity* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1987), 379–81.

22. *History of the Church*, 6:276. Copies of Frémont’s report were available in Nauvoo; see *History of the Church*, 6:375.

23. *History of the Church*, 7:339.

24. See George W. Givens, *In Old Nauvoo: Everyday Life in the City of Joseph* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990), 260.

25. *Millennial Star* 10 (15 March 1848): 81.

26. See *ibid.*, 85–86.

27. *Ibid.*, 85.

28. *Ibid.*

29. See *ibid.*, 85–86.

30. *Ibid.*, 86.

31. Besides the use of such things in the temples of Solomon and Herod, Greek and Roman temples displayed votive offerings or booty of gold, silver, and bronze objects, statues, paintings, and sculpture. These treasures served as a public reserve used to meet emergency expenses. Alexander, *Museums in Motion*, 7. The walls of the celestial room in the Nauvoo Temple were hung with maps, mirrors, paintings, and portraits—including some of the church leaders and their wives. William Clayton, *An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton*, ed. George D. Smith (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1995), 206, entry for 11 December 1845. Portraits also adorned the Kirtland and Salt Lake Temples.

32. See *History of the Church*, 4:239; 7:162.

33. See *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 11–12.

34. *Ibid.*, 11.

35. See *History of the Church*, 7:390, entry for 4 April 1845; Hosea Stout, *On the Mormon Frontier: The Diary of Hosea Stout, 1844–1861*, ed. Juanita Brooks (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press and Utah State Historical



Society, 1964), 34, 56, 60–62; Glen, M. Leonard, "Picturing the Nauvoo Legion," *BYU Studies* 35/2 (1995): 110–13.

36. *Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 1833–1898*, typescript edition, ed. Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983–85), 3:340.

37. *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 11.

38. *Ibid.*, 12, 11.

39. See *Woodruff's Journal*, 3:334, 338–41, entries for 25 March and 7 April 1848. Dibble had approached the Twelve on the day of the cornerstone laying, 24 May 1845, to obtain the oxen that had been removed about four months earlier. That afternoon the Twelve voted to retain the oxen for the time being; compare *History of the Church*, 7:358, 418.

40. *Millennial Star* 11 (1 January 1849): 12.

41. *New York Times*, 11 November 1858, 2.

42. Robert L. Campbell (not the Nauvoo artist) to Franklin, D. Richards, 7 January 1856, in *Millennial Star* 18 (24, May 1856): 332.

43. "Deseret Museum and Menagerie," in *Guide to Salt Lake City, Ogden, and the Utah Central Railroad* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Office, 1870), 16.

44. See Joseph L. Barfoot, "A Brief History of the Deseret Museum," manuscript, 1880, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, microfilm copy, Marriott Library, University of Utah; and Lila Carpenter Eubanks, "The Deseret Museum," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 50/4 (1982): 361–76.

45. Junius F. Wells, "Editorial," *The Contributor* 12 (March 1891): 194–95.

46. For additional information, see *ibid.*, and James E. Talmage, "The Passing of the Deseret Museum," *Deseret Museum Bulletin*, 15 February 1919, 3–4; Eubanks, "The Deseret Museum," 361–76; and Florence Smith Jacobsen, "Museums, LDS," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 2:972–73.

47. *Deseret Museum Bulletin*, new series, no. 1, 16 August 1911, 1; also in *Improvement Era* (August 1911): 951.

48. See Donald L. Enders, "Bureau of Information/Museum, Temple Square, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1918–1976," research report, November 1982, Museum of Church History and Art.

49. See *Deseret News 1995–96 Church Almanac* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1994), 385–86.

50. See First Presidency (David O. McKay, Hugh B. Brown, N. Eldon Tanner) to All Stake Presidents in the Continental United States, 9 September 1969, copy at Museum of Church History and Art.

51. See *ibid.* The historical arts correspondents were phased out gradually after about seven years.

52. See *Deseret News*, 16 August 1980, “Church News” section, 3, 6.

53. Statement of 31 January 1984, in *Deseret News*, 5 February 1984, “Church News” section, 5.

54. Copies of the talks cited below and a videotape of the entire program are on file in the LDS Church Historical Department Library.

55. See Gordon B. Hinckley, “Dedication of Museum of Church History and Art, Wednesday, April 4, 1984.”

56. G. Homer Durham, “The Museum of Church History and Art Dedicatory Service, Wednesday, April 4, 1984.” The quotation appeared first in a letter from Christensen to editor A. W. Winberg, who published it in his Danish-language newspaper *Bikuben* (Salt Lake City), 20 March 1879. The panorama is part of the collection of the Museum of Art at Brigham Young University.

57. See Hinckley, “Dedication”; Ezra Taft Benson, “Dedication of Museum of Church History and Art, April 4, 1984.”

58. Florence S. Jacobsen, “Dedication—Museum of Church History and Art”; Boyd K. Packer, “Museum Dedication, April 4, 1984”; Benson, “Dedication.”

59. See Hinckley, “Dedication.”

60. See “Church Museums—Past and Present,” exhibit texts, Museum of Church History and Art.

61. In 1984, the Bean Museum loaned (and later donated) the king penguin, which bears the Deseret Museum label, for the “Museums—Past and Present” exhibit at the Museum of Church History and Art. The other stuffed specimens had deteriorated and been discarded after being stored for many years under the seating of the football stadium. The Deseret Museum’s extensive collection of mineral specimens, collected as samples from Utah mining districts under John W. Young’s supervision and expanded by James E. Talmage, are preserved at the Utah Museum of Natural History at the University of Utah.

62. See *Deseret News*, 19 December 1987, “Church News” section, 5; Sterling Talmage, “A Monstrous Beast,” *Improvement Era* (May 1912): 615–18.

63. The Museum of Peoples and Cultures received the bulk of the Deseret Museum ethnological specimens when the Bureau of Information closed in 1976 and additional transfers from the Museum of Church History and Art during the early 1990s.

64. See *Deseret News*, 4 May 1986, “Church News” section, 14.

65. *Deseret News*, 23 October 1993, “Church News” section, 3–4.

# The Role of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible in the Restoration of Doctrine

Robert J. Matthews

## Overview

The Holy Bible originally contained the revealed word of God in plainness, but extensive omissions and changes early in the post–New Testament era significantly depleted the content of all manuscript copies to such an extent that no known Bibles now on earth present the fulness of the gospel in doctrinal clarity. The problem today lies not with the inability to translate languages, but in the absence of an adequate manuscript. This heavy loss of gospel truth has been coterminous with worldwide apostasy from the true church, so that for centuries the world saw neither an adequate Bible nor an adequate church. As an early step in the restoration of the true church to the earth, the Prophet Joseph Smith was commanded to make a revelatory translation of the Bible, the process of which restored lost material to the Bible and contributed to the doctrinal base of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

## Historical Background of the Joseph Smith Translation

The Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible (JST) was produced by the Prophet Joseph Smith and his close associates from the years 1830 to 1844. The handwritten manuscript consists of 464 pages, 8 1/2" x 14". This is accompanied by an 1828 printing of the King James Version containing various pencil and ink markings, which are actually directions pertaining to the manuscript. The manuscript itself consists of first and second drafts, edited and punctuated with a view toward publication. Every book of the Old and New Testaments received attention, although the written manuscript itself has no mention of Ecclesiastes. Joseph Smith called this work the "New Translation."

Extracts from the translation (now identified as the book of Moses and Joseph Smith–Matthew in the Pearl of Great Price) were published and circulated in the time of the Prophet Joseph Smith. The presiding brethren of the church had serious plans underway in Nauvoo for a complete publication, but Joseph Smith's martyrdom in 1844 prevented it. The manuscript and the marked Bible eventually came to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (RLDS) through the Smith family and was published as the Holy Scriptures in 1867. Several editions containing modest variations have since been published by the RLDS.<sup>1</sup>

## The JST Overlooked by Latter-day Saint Scholarship

It is my observation that the JST has neither received the attention it deserves nor been recognized for what it is and for the extensive influence it has had on Latter-day Saint scripture and doctrine. It has been largely neglected and even ignored by LDS scholars and historians. I suppose this condition exists for the following reasons: (1) Because the JST is a Bible, church historians have not sensed its connection with *latter-day* revelation, scripture, or events in history. (2) On the other hand, because the JST is not a translation of the Bible in the usual sense of ancient manuscripts and languages, traditional, professionally trained textual experts in the church have not regarded it as a translation at all or even as a serious biblical document. As a consequence, the JST has in effect been relegated to the incorrect status of an orphan, a stepchild, or an ugly duckling in the house of Latter-day Saint scholarship.

In 1994 I examined every book listed under the heading of Doctrine and Covenants in the card files of the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University and discovered that, even though many publications discuss the origin, history, and content of the book of Doctrine and Covenants, few contain any mention of the JST, and only one author clearly discussed the role of the JST as a contributing factor to the doctrine of the church. This was surprising since the translation of the Bible is referred to several times in the text of the Doctrine and Covenants and also in the official seven-volume *History of the Church*.

## **My Approach to the Subject**

This treatise deals somewhat with biblical textual criticism, but because of space it can be only a survey. Those familiar with the technical nature of biblical criticism will recognize that some of the conclusions herein may seem to be oversimplifications. I think, however, that the statements presented in the remaining parts of this treatise are based on reliable evidence. For space consideration, I cannot present extensive supporting arguments, but I do cite various published works. However, differing opinions exist even among world-renowned textual specialists, particularly as to which ancient biblical manuscripts present the most accurate text. My goal is to discuss the subject in a reasonable manner in the context of latter-day scripture and also of statements by the Prophet Joseph Smith. I feel that these sources offer a reliable dimension of interpretive control that non-LDS scholars do not enjoy. I do not pretend to be a biblical scholar, although I am very interested in textual criticism, have read much of the literature, and enjoy the search. I do not, however, always agree with the way they interpret their discoveries.

## **Unholy Hands on the Bible**

In 1842 the Prophet Joseph Smith expressed a basic tenet of the church when he wrote: “We believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly” (Article of Faith 8). In both earlier and later statements the Prophet clearly demonstrated that he did not mean only the translation of languages, but rather the transmission of the Bible, such as the work of copying, editing, and excising, in addition to translating. This wider view is evident by his following utterances:

From sundry revelations which had been received, it was apparent that many important points touching the salvation of men, had been taken from the Bible, or lost before it was compiled.<sup>2</sup>

And also:

I believe the Bible as it read when it came from the pen of the original writers. Ignorant translators, careless transcribers, or designing and corrupt priests have committed many errors.<sup>3</sup>

Textual experts have also noted from their examination of existing manuscripts that thousands of variations exist and have been perpetuated in the transmission of the Bible. Several reasons exist for these differences, some accidental and others intentional. Accidental variations occur because of human frailty, the difficulty of copying a large document by hand, and also errors of sight and hearing. The planned, deliberate, intentional changes are far more damaging because they are selective and are usually of doctrinal significance. Planned departures in the text are often accomplished by simply omitting what one feels is objectionable—perhaps consisting of words, sentences, paragraphs, or whole books.

Omissions and other kinds of differences would not be permanently damaging if the original manuscripts were available for comparison. In the absence of the originals, or near facsimiles, it appears that the wounded text

produced by the many successive copiers of varying degrees of integrity has become an accepted base of the Old and New Testaments from which all Bibles today have descended. Many detailed and technical books are currently available that describe the known Bible manuscripts and laboriously and meticulously discuss the various readings. Textual criticism is a fascinating and time-consuming study, even though the experts do not agree on all points. The following are several concepts that I consider appropriate to this treatise and that I have observed in the writings of acclaimed biblical scholars. No one writer seems to say it all, but from the aggregate, much useful information is obtained and some interesting observations can be deduced. I know these are selective on my part, but they are actual quotations from experienced, serious men.

Sir Frederick Kenyon (1863–1954) spoke of the New Testament:

The originals of the several books have long ago disappeared. They must have perished in the very infancy of the Church; for no allusion is ever made to them by any Christian writer.<sup>4</sup>

John W. Burgon (1813–88) wrote:

It must not be imagined that all the causes of the depravation [sic] of the text of Holy Scripture were instinctive. Or that mistakes arose solely because scribes were overcome by personal infirmity, or were unconsciously the victims of surrounding circumstances. There was often more design and method in their error. They, or those who directed them, wished sometimes to “correct” and “improve” the copy or copies before them. And indeed occasionally they desired to make the Holy Scriptures witness to their own peculiar belief. Or they had their ideas of taste, and they did not scruple to alter passages to suit what they fancied was their enlightened judgment.<sup>5</sup>

Burgon believed that “the omission of words, clauses and sentences” was the most frequently occurring type of “corrupt variations from the genuine Text” of the Bible.<sup>6</sup> He also noticed that even where omissions had occurred in the text, the remainder of the passage generally appeared to be complete rather than dangling or awkward, thus making omissions harder to detect. He further declared:

Inadvertency may be made to bear the blame of some omissions, but it cannot bear the blame of shrewd and significant omissions of clauses which invariably leave the sense complete. A systematic and perpetual mutilation of the inspired Text must be the result of design, not of accident.<sup>7</sup>

While it was once believed by students that existing New Testament manuscripts could be traced in genealogical fashion in an unbroken line to the originals, it is now evident that a space of nearly 300 years elapsed between the originals and the earliest New Testament manuscripts available today, except for some small fragments in which the gap is “only” 150 or 200 years. The alarming truth is that none of the surviving manuscripts contains categorical information as to where, when, by whom, or from what precise source they were copied. Such information, if discovered at all, must come from detective-like investigation, which so far has not given significant answers. Some textual scholars realize that the second century A.D. presents an impenetrable barrier to tracing the history and source of New Testament documents. We read the following by Dr. Frederick C. Grant (1891–1974):

Instead of tracing back the text to its original in the autographs by a steady process of convergence following back to a common source the divergent lines of descent, we shall have to stop when we get to the second century; and in place of some rule of preference for one type of text over another, or for their

common agreements over their divergences, we shall have to trust a great deal more than heretofore to what is called internal criticism. . . . But now, with Kenyon's conclusions before us, it is more obvious than ever where our chief problems lie. "In the first two centuries this original text disappeared under a mass of variants, created by errors, by conscious alterations, and by attempts to remedy the uncertainties thus created. Then, as further attempts to recover the lost truth were made, the families of text that we now know took shape. They were, however, nuclei rather than completed forms of text, and did not at once absorb all the atoms that the period of disorder had brought into existence."<sup>8</sup>

What Drs. Kenyon and Grant are saying is that a gap of at least two or three centuries between any present text and the originals is present. Surely anyone with a sense of history must be concerned about what changes could have occurred during that time, without apostolic leadership to correct errors and with no original manuscripts for honest folk to use for comparison.

Another dimension yet to be considered is the fact that the Bible contains the word of God and is therefore a target of Satan's influence. Burgon, cited earlier, said it this way:

The Scriptures became a mark for the shafts of Satan from the beginning, for the very reason that they were known to be the Word of God. So they were as eagerly solicited by heretical teachers on the one hand, as they were hotly defended by the orthodox on the other. Therefore, from friends and from foes the Scriptures are known to have experienced injury, and that in the earliest age of all. Nothing of the kind can be predicated of any other ancient writings. This consideration alone should suggest a severe exercise of judicial impartiality in the handling of ancient evidence of whatever sort. Observe that I have not said—and I certainly do not mean—that the Scriptures themselves have been permanently corrupted either by friend or foe. Error was fitful and uncertain, and was contradicted by other error. And it eventually sank before a manifold witness to the truth. Nevertheless, certain manuscripts belonging to a few small groups . . . bear traces incontestably of ancient mischief.<sup>9</sup>

Elder Bruce R. McConkie, a latter-day scripture advocate, also attributed corruption of the scriptures to the influence of Satan:

As we consider them [the Book of Mormon, the Bible, and the revelations to Joseph Smith] we should be aware of the insidious and devil-directed attack upon them.

Let me speak plainly. Satan hates and spurns the scriptures. The less scripture there is, and the more it is twisted and perverted, the greater is the rejoicing in the courts of hell.

There has never been a book—not even the Book of Mormon—that has been so maligned and cursed and abused as the Bible.<sup>10</sup>

That the Bible was intentionally altered by designing persons so as to neutralize its witness of Jesus Christ is also declared in the words of the angel to Nephi. After explaining to Nephi that "many plain and precious things" would be taken "out of the book" that contained the words of the Jewish prophets and apostles, the angel also said:

Wherefore, these things go forth from the Jews in purity unto the Gentiles, according to the truth which is in God. And *after* they go forth by the hand of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, from the Jews unto the Gentiles, thou seest the formation of that great and abominable church, which is most abominable above

all other churches; for behold, they have taken away from the gospel of the Lamb many parts which are plain and most precious; and also many covenants of the Lord have they taken away. And *all this have they done that they might pervert the right ways of the Lord*, that they might blind the eyes and harden the hearts of the children of men. Wherefore, thou seest that after the book hath gone forth through the hands of the great and abominable church, that there are many plain and precious things *taken away from the book*, which is the book of the Lamb of God. (1 Nephi 13:25–28)

I have observed from my own study that most textual scholars emphasize the variants that were caused by the difficulties of writing, whereas the Book of Mormon (see 1 Nephi 13) and the book of Moses (see 1:41) place the emphasis on the losses by designing and deceitful persons. The textual critics, of course, are governed in their thinking by their research, and they have no way of measuring the extent of the loss by omission, whereas prophets are more likely to judge the text by the help of the Spirit of God. For example, the Prophet Joseph Smith evaluated the Bible by comparison with the revelations he had received: “There are many things in the Bible which do not, as they now stand, accord with the revelations of the Holy Ghost to me.”<sup>11</sup>

Based on an extensive comparison of the Bible and latter-day revelation, it is my conviction that omissions to the Bible text are (1) more extensive, (2) earlier, and (3) more intentional than the textual critics have realized.

### **Example from the Book of Mormon**

The loss of 116 pages of Book of Mormon manuscript in 1828, within one year of the time Joseph Smith got the plates, alerts every Latter-day Saint to the fact that large sections of material can be lost from the text in a very short time. This particular example also serves to emphasize that in order to be effective, omissions must occur early before multiple copies are extant. This condition requires that the perpetrators be near the top, or at least have access to the originals or near originals. Such a condition suggests that the corruption of the New Testament occurred early, before wide distribution, and must therefore have been an “inside job.” This fact was pointed out by the angel to Nephi, as recorded in 1 Nephi 13:29: “And after these plain and precious things were taken away it [the record of the Jews] goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles.”

The Old Testament appears to have been depleted much earlier, even perhaps as early as 300 B.C., before the Septuagint or the Dead Sea Scrolls appear; thus they suffer from the same major loss as other manuscripts. Jesus expressed to the Jews his displeasure that they had already, before his day, taken away the “fulness of the scriptures” (Luke 11:52 JST). It is true that the Jewish scribes developed intricate rules and safeguards for preserving the accuracy of the Old Testament text; however, these seem to have been put in place too late, after much loss had occurred. Furthermore, rules and safeguards are for honest people—scriptural thieves are not hampered by rabbinic rules.

### **The Difficulty of Recovering the Original Text**

It was noted earlier that today no known original manuscripts of the Bible exist. However, nearly five thousand New Testament manuscripts in varying degrees of completeness, containing thousands of textual differences, have been preserved. Three of these, known as Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus are given the greatest credence by most nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars. These manuscripts are in good condition, are rather complete, and are eloquently written in Greek; they were probably prepared in Egypt in the fourth century A.D. They are thus separated from the originals by more than 250 years. It is not known who produced them or even from what documentary sources they were copied. Because these three were seemingly composed centuries

earlier than most other available New Testament manuscripts, they are highly regarded by modern scholars and have been the basis of most revisions of the Bible in the past one hundred years, for instance, the English Revised Version of 1881, the American Standard Revision of 1901, the Revised Standard Version of 1946–52, and the New English Bible of 1961. Although highly regarded by many scholars, these particular texts, when compared with latter-day revelation, are shown to be doctrinally weaker than the New Testament manuscripts from which the King James Version was obtained.

The difficulty, if not impossibility, of completely determining the original text and meaning of the Bible by the methods of literary criticism alone (without the aid of new revelation) is staggering. The Bible is too extensive, too ancient, and too complex, and the sources are too uneven for that. Perhaps such a task could be illustrated as follows. Suppose one wished to know so much about a particular ancestor (whom we will call the “archetype”) of 250 years ago—his size, facial features, hair pattern, countenance, intellect, personality, etc.—that if seen he would be recognized. To accomplish this the researchers had only a record of some of his descendants for four or five generations, lacking some major links in the genealogical chain. Even though current descendants could be interviewed and examined, and the writings, descriptions, and diaries of intervening ancestors long since dead could be studied, it would be next to impossible to reassemble the archetype. Too many variables complicate the process.

The task is made more difficult if the researchers neither really know what particular features are right if found nor whether specific traits present in the archetype are not found in any of the known descendants. Because some features present in the missing descendants are not evident in any of the existing descendants, it is not possible to reconstruct the archetype accurately. Perhaps all that can be determined with certainty would be that the ancestor did exist at a given time and place, that he wore clothes, and that he has many descendants with a certain eye and hair color, certain types of physique, and so forth. If, however, an accurate color portrait were discovered (or revealed), accompanied by a detailed physical and personality description, then a possible determination of the archetype could be made, and perhaps a living descendant could then be recognized as having many of the same likenesses.

### **The Bible as a Witness for Christ**

The scriptures have a basic mission to testify of Christ (see John 5:39). This may be the appropriate time to note the words of the angel to Nephi, as recorded in 1 Nephi 13:39–40. After explaining to Nephi that many plain and precious things would be taken “out of the book” containing the record of the Jews and the testimony of the Apostles of the Lamb (surely the Old and New Testaments), the angel speaks of a restoration, through the agency of “other books,” which “shall establish the truth of the first, which are of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, and shall make known the plain and precious things which have been taken away from them” (1 Nephi 13:39–40). Two things are apparent here: (1) material has been lost from the Bible, and (2) the missing parts shall be made known again through other books. It seems evident that these “other books” would include the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the JST.

A similar reference is found in Moses 1:40–41, in which the Lord informs Moses that after he (Moses) has written a book about this earth (surely this is Genesis) that others will “take many things out of the book which” Moses has written. However, the Lord will raise up another “like unto” Moses, and once more the lost material “shall be had among those who believe” and who accept this second Moses. If this later one is Joseph Smith, then, according to prophecy, he would restore certain words once written by Moses that have been taken away. Those who would not “believe” the words of Joseph Smith would not recognize the restoration. A related example of willful



extraction of scripture, later restored, is found in Jeremiah 36:20–32, but space limits the discussion of that item in this treatise.

Selective omissions from the Bible have weakened its power as a witness for the Lord Jesus Christ. To be the once strong witness it was, the Bible would need to have the missing parts returned to its pages.

### **The Lack of an Adequate Manuscript**

It was noted earlier that the problem with recovering the original text and meaning of the Bible is not one of knowing the ancient biblical languages, but rather the absence of an adequate manuscript to be translated. This is the crux of the whole matter. An illustration: A balding man who once had plenty of hair waits his turn in a barbershop. As the barber finishes with an earlier patron who has ample, healthy hair, the balding man approaches the chair, and says to the barber: “Make me look like him.” This may be good for a laugh, but the truth is that it cannot be done because the substance is not there. The barber would probably say, “It’s too late.” And indeed it is. A true translation of an inadequate manuscript cannot produce the material that is no longer in the manuscript. Only an outside intervention can restore material that was originally in the manuscript but is not there now. Thus the need for a revelatory translation of the Bible by the Prophet Joseph Smith is evident. I will now discuss some of the significant contributions of the JST to the doctrine of the church and the role of the JST in strengthening the Bible as a witness for Christ.

### **The Unfolding of the JST**

The Bible, in spite of its deficiencies, is still a marvelous record of God’s dealings with mankind and tells of Jesus’ ministry among the Jews. However, the Prophet Joseph Smith, even as a boy, discovered that the Bible was sufficiently vague in some very important doctrinal matters, actually creating confusion rather than offering clear answers. His experience was that “the teachers of religion of the different sects understood the same passages of scripture so differently as to destroy all confidence in settling the question by an appeal to the Bible” (JS—H 1:12). These circumstances led him to pray for information, which resulted in the first vision, from which he gained knowledge through new revelation. Joseph Smith also noticed that the angel Moroni quoted various passages “with a little variation” from how they read in the Bible (JS—H 1:36). Such experiences would give him, even at an early age, an awareness that the nineteenth-century Bible without additional revelation is an insufficient guide.

### **The Value of Original Sources**

In studying the original manuscripts of the JST to check the accuracy of the published editions, a second theme emerged that appears apropos to the subject of Bible manuscript history. Much has been said in this paper about the value that original sources would be in the study of the Holy Bible. Quite unexpectedly to me, I discovered that the same is true with the JST. Without an examination of the original manuscripts prepared by the Prophet Joseph Smith and his scribes, I could not have obtained the perspective that the real purpose of the JST is to be a primary source of doctrine and to strengthen the Bible as a witness for the Lord Jesus Christ.

When reading printed editions of the JST, I had often noticed the similarity of doctrine and even identical phrases found in the Doctrine and Covenants. From the published sources alone, it would generally be impossible to discover which of the two came first. I have often heard it said that Joseph Smith “Mormonized the Bible,” that is, that he “corrected” the Bible on the basis of what he already knew about the gospel to make it conform to Latter-day Saint doctrine. One prominent church historian, William E. Berrett, promoted this concept in a textbook that was used in the church school system for many years. In discussing the JST he said that “the work was limited to

those parts of the Bible upon which divine revelation had been received.”<sup>12</sup> Dr. Berrett was one of the few who mentioned the JST in his writings, but unfortunately he did not have the benefit of the original manuscripts.

When in 1967 the opportunity arose for me to examine the original JST manuscripts in the RLDS archives, it was with the encouragement and support of William E. Berrett that I was able to go to Independence, Missouri, and make the study. At that time the sole purpose in my mind was to compare the published editions of the JST with the original sources to determine if the published editions were accurate. This was a fruitful exercise requiring weeks of diligent, eyestraining effort. And I was happy to report that in the main, the printed JST by the RLDS Church correctly reflects the text of the manuscripts, except for a few adjustments yet to be made. To examine the originals over many months was inspiring. The task seemed significant since the RLDS had not previously made the manuscripts available for research, and no Latter-day Saint had carefully examined them in over a century.

## **A Chronological Approach**

Having completed the comparison, the story could well have ended at that point, had it not been that the manuscripts contained dates of their composition and showed frequent changes in handwriting, denoting changes of scribes and revealing other bits of information in addition to the text itself. Because of these dates, it became possible to determine when particular portions of the JST were composed in relation to various revelations printed in the Doctrine and Covenants. This could not have been ascertained without the dates on the original manuscripts. I learned that in many instances doctrinal utterances appeared in the JST earlier than in the Doctrine and Covenants. This remarkable fact opened the way for a chronological study of the JST and allowed me to see that the JST was often the source, not simply the beneficiary, of Latter-day Saint doctrine.

Once this perspective is in place, an entirely new vista lies before the willing researcher, as he sees a steady, progressive unfolding of doctrine in the early days of the church. The Book of Mormon brought unparalleled light on many gospel subjects, but revealed limited detail on the premortal existence, degrees of glory, celestial marriage, the law of consecration of property, organization of priesthood quorums, the office of bishop, and such things. Many of these were first made known to the Prophet as he translated the Bible.

That the JST was to be a learning experience for the Prophet Joseph Smith is seen in the Lord’s directive that he begin a translation of the New Testament:

And now, behold, I say unto you, it shall not be given unto you to know any further concerning this chapter, until the New Testament be translated, and in it all these things shall be made known; Wherefore I give unto you that ye may now translate it, that ye may be prepared for the things to come. (D&C 45:60–61)

We will more plainly see the doctrinal contribution of the JST if we sort it out chronologically. We are not accustomed to doing that because we tend to think in terms of separate books rather than in terms of history. We read the Book of Mormon one year, the Doctrine and Covenants another year, and the Old and New Testaments in yet two more years. Without an awareness of the context, we tend to forget, or perhaps even fail to learn, that the gospel was revealed to Joseph Smith line upon line, precept upon precept, a little at a time.

## **The Church in 1830**

Consider what the church was like in June 1830. What were the offices, the doctrines, and the practices of the church in that day? It would be easier to identify features the church lacked. In June 1830 the church had no wards, no stakes, no First Presidency, no Council of the Twelve, no patriarchs, no seventies, no bishops, no “word of wisdom,” no revelation on degrees of glory, no tithing, no welfare program, no law of consecration or united order, no priesthood quorums of any kind, no temples, no endowments, no sealings, no marriages for eternity, no real understanding of the New Jerusalem, no baptisms for the dead, no Doctrine and Covenants, no Pearl of Great Price, and no JST. How did each of these features, which today we recognize as vital to our spiritual life and basic to the church, come into being?

The publication of the Book of Mormon was completed during the week of 18–25 March 1830. A few days later, on 6 April, the church was organized. A few weeks later, in June 1830, we have the earliest revelation associated with the JST. We are familiar with it as the “Visions of Moses” in the Pearl of Great Price, Moses 1. We do not know the exact day in June on which the material was written, but it was recorded in Harmony, Pennsylvania. Comparing the chronology of the JST with the Doctrine and Covenants reveals the striking pattern that many of the concepts contained in the Doctrine and Covenants were first presented to the mind of the Prophet during his translation of the Bible and were actually first recorded for that purpose. Many of these subjects were later expanded by subsequent revelation and appear as parts of various sections of the Doctrine and Covenants.

### **The Prophet’s Credentials as a Translator**

The greatest credential of the Prophet Joseph Smith to translate the Bible was the command and authorization from the Lord to do so. His situation seems similar to that of Nephi, who was commanded to build a ship. Nephi felt confident that “If God had commanded me to do all things I could do them” (1 Nephi 17:50). By 1830, when the Prophet Joseph began the translation of the Bible, he was already an experienced translator because of his work on the translation of the Book of Mormon. He said that he and Oliver Cowdery had specific help from the Holy Ghost so that the scriptures were “laid open to our understandings, and the true meaning and intention of their more mysterious passages revealed unto us in a manner which we never could attain to previously, nor ever before had thought of” (JS—H 1:74). Such aid would surpass even the help of a biblical language and a lexicon.

### **Enoch and the Consecration of Property**

An extensive revelation about Enoch and his people was received by Joseph Smith in December 1830 while he and Sidney Rigdon were translating from the fifth chapter of the King James Version of Genesis. Chronologically this came after Doctrine and Covenants section 35 and before section 37. This revelation, called in early Latter-day Saint literature the “Prophecy of Enoch,” deals with the ministry of Enoch, his faith in Jesus Christ, his preaching of the gospel, his city called Zion, the righteousness of his people, the fact that no poor existed among them, the taking of the people into heaven, and a declaration that they would return to the earth in the last days and be joined with the New Jerusalem, which would be built upon the earth (see Moses 6–7). This information about Enoch contains many items of history and doctrine of particular interest to Latter-day Saints because it deals with the work of the Lord on the earth in our day—the establishment of latter-day Zion.

Consider the situation of the church in December 1830. What did anyone in the church know about Enoch, the New Jerusalem, the city of Zion, or any of these things at that time? We certainly cannot learn much from the King James Version about Enoch, his city of Zion, or the laws that governed the people of Zion. None of the Bibles available today say Enoch had a city, his people were called “Zion,” or his people were translated. The entire offering in the Bible about Enoch can be read in less than two minutes and consists of only nine verses totaling

thirty-eight lines of type, found in Genesis 5:18–24, Hebrews 11:5, and Jude 1:14–15. Together that would amount to about three-fourths of one column of print in a Bible. The Book of Mormon does not help on this subject, for it does not mention or even allude to Enoch.

The church in 1830 was entirely dependent on revelation in order to learn anything substantial about Enoch, his ministry, the people of his city (Zion), or their laws. The introduction began in November and December 1830 while the Prophet was translating from Genesis. In the next few months (after the initial installment about Enoch), the revelations in Doctrine and Covenants 42–43, 45–51, and 57–59 (February–August 1831) were received. What a marvelous prelude the prophecy of Enoch in Genesis 7 JST (Moses 7) was in laying the foundation for these later revelations. In length alone it is impressive. The information about Enoch and Zion, as revealed to Joseph Smith in November and December 1830 while he was translating the Bible, is eighteen times longer than all the Enoch material contained in the King James Version and contains over 5,200 more words of very detailed and informative text about Enoch and the gospel. Thus if we want a correct historical perspective of how the Lord educated the Prophet Joseph about Zion, we must first read the revelations received during the translation of the Bible. This is perfectly proper, because that is the order in which they were received. It is only in publishing them in separate books that we have created an artificial separation between Genesis 6–7 JST and Doctrine and Covenants 38–59. In order to get a proper orientation about the sections in the Doctrine and Covenants dealing with consecration and the establishment of Zion, one would appropriately first study Genesis 6–7 JST (Moses 6–7) about Enoch and his people who were called Zion, their laws, their absence of poverty, their glory, and so on, before reading Doctrine and Covenants 38–59. Genesis 7 JST is an overview of the glory and greatness of Enoch's Zion given to the church as a prelude before the Lord revealed in detail the laws and requirements that would enable the Latter-day Saints to build a similar Zion.

We could gain a clearer, richer, and more comprehensive understanding of the way the doctrine of this dispensation was unfolded by taking the revelations received during the translation of the Bible and placing them in their proper chronological order between the sections of the Doctrine and Covenants. For example, Moses 1 would come just before section 25; Genesis 1–5 JST (Moses 2–5) would be just before section 29; Genesis 6 JST (Moses 6) would be just before section 35; and Genesis 7 JST (Moses 7) would be just before section 37. This procedure occurred to me only after I had access to the original JST manuscripts and discovered the dates on them. Seeing the originals changed my perspective.

## **The Age of Accountability**

In Doctrine and Covenants 68:25–28 the age of accountability is explained as beginning at the age of eight years, at which time baptism should be administered. This doctrine is mentioned only once in the Doctrine and Covenants and is dated November 1831. However, baptism and the eight-year-old age of accountability is recorded in the JST in connection with Genesis 17:1–11. The dates on the JST manuscript show that this Genesis chapter was recorded sometime between February and April 1831 and did, therefore, appear from six to nine months earlier than the teaching in the Doctrine and Covenants.

A careful reading of Doctrine and Covenants 68:25–8 demonstrates that the declaration of eight-year-old accountability at that instance does not sound like a “first-time” announcement, but more like a reaffirmation or a reminder. And indeed, that was the case, for, as we have seen, the concept was already written in the translation of the Bible many months before it was reiterated in the Doctrine and Covenants. Without the dates on the original JST manuscript, we would never have been able to reconstruct this historical connection.

## **The Vision of the Degrees of Glory**

While translating John 5 and pondering verse 29 concerning the resurrection of the just and of the unjust, Joseph Smith received the vision of the degrees of glory. In the revelation itself we read this explanation:

For while we were doing the work of translation, which the Lord had appointed unto us, we came to the twenty-ninth verse of the fifth chapter of John, which was given unto us as follows—Speaking of the resurrection of the dead, concerning those who shall hear the voice of the Son of Man: And shall come forth; they who have done good, in the resurrection of the just; and they who have done evil, in the resurrection of the unjust. Now this caused us to marvel, for it was given unto us of the Spirit. And while we meditated upon these things, the Lord touched the eyes of our understandings and they were opened, and the glory of the Lord shone round about. (D&C 76:15–19)

## **The JST Is a Primary Source**

Based on the line of thinking presented above, it is evident that many important doctrines and practices of this church were made known to the Prophet Joseph Smith during the course of his translation of the Bible. The reason the Kirtland era was such a great revelatory period may be that it was the time in which the Prophet was engaged most actively in the translation of the Bible. Time prohibits a discussion of each example, but this concept includes revelations on at least the following subjects: the New Jerusalem, plural marriage, Zion, powers of the priesthood, quorums and councils in the church, quorum organization and duties, the fall of Adam, the atonement of Jesus Christ, the spirit world, resurrection, exaltation, age of accountability, agency, and the nature of the devil, man, and God.

## **Restoring the Biblical Witness**

At least one more vital point should be considered: What do we do with the JST—is it simply Joseph Smith’s commentary on the Bible or is it in part a restoration of lost material? In view of the role of the JST as a primary source of doctrine, produced not out of thin air, but by command of the Lord as the Prophet studied the pages of the Bible itself, it seems very reasonable to argue that the JST is at least a restoration of meaning and doctrinal content. Every translation is to some extent a commentary and an interpretation. The JST deserves to be given recognition primarily as a restoration of lost biblical content and meaning.

When Sidney Rigdon was called as the scribe for Joseph Smith in the translation, the Lord told him, “thou shalt write for him; and the scriptures shall be given, even as they are in mine own bosom” (D&C 35:20). The implication is that current Bibles were not in a condition like “the Lord’s own bosom.” Such a promise sounds strongly like a statement of restoration. It is either declaring a restoration or saying that the ancient Bible never had the truth in the first place. This would be contrary, however, to the statement of the angel to Nephi that in the beginning the Bible was plain and precious, easy to understand, and contained the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ (see 1 Nephi 13:24–25). Is it not an insult to say that the ancient apostles and prophets did not know how to write details of the doctrine of the Lord any clearer than they occur in our current Bibles? Since many basic doctrines are not now clearly presented in our Bibles, we are led to conclude that the Bible has been ravaged by unholy hands and does not do justice to the original authors.

Some may think it too bold to say the JST is in part a revealed restoration. However, we note that Doctrine and Covenants 45:15–59 claims to be a restoration of a dialogue that once took place between Jesus and the Twelve on the Mount of Olives. The Latter-day Saint student may need to ask himself this question: If the Lord could and

would reveal that Olivet conversation to Joseph Smith, could or would he do so again and again in the translation of the Bible?

The Bible is Judah's witness for God and for Jesus Christ. I do not think it sufficient for the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price alone to restore the missing doctrinal truth. Justice requires that the Bible itself be restored as an expert witness. Having the truth only in the other books of scripture cannot suffice. The Bible must also be made right. The JST is a start in the restoration of the Bible as a witness for Christ. Although realizing his translation of the Bible was not perfected, Joseph considered it complete enough to use.

## Conclusion

What then is the conclusion to the whole matter? I believe that the Prophet's translation of the Bible is a primary source for much of the doctrinal content of the church. In like manner, I feel that the Judeo-Christian world has failed to realize the extent to which the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, is weakened in doctrinal perspective and therefore undermined as a witness for Christ. It will remain so depleted until an original manuscript is found or a revelation received. If the reader would indulge me, I submit that the JST is closer to the content and doctrine of the original Bible than anything the world has seen in the past nineteen hundred years. The Prophet Joseph Smith has restored much of the original doctrinal content of the Bible—it is called the Joseph Smith Translation.

## Notes

Robert J. Matthews is a former dean of Religious Education and a longtime friend, associate, and admirer of Richard Lloyd Anderson, whom this volume honors.

1. For more detail and photographs, see my "A Plainer Translation": *Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible: A History and Commentary* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1975).

2. *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 9–11, 16 February 1832.

3. *Ibid.*, 327, 15 October 1843.

4. Sir Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 155.

5. John W. Burgon, "The Causes of Corruption Chiefly Intentional," in *The Traditional Text of the New Testament*, republished in *Unholy Hands on the Bible*, vol. 1 (Lafayette, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), B-44.

6. *Ibid.*, B-61.

7. *Ibid.*, B-9.

8. Frederick C. Grant, "The Greek Text of the New Testament," in *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, chair of the revision committee, Luther A. Weigle (n.p.: International Council of Religious Education, 1946), 40, quoting Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (Oxford: Kemp Hall, 1937), 241–42.

9. Burgon, "Causes of Corruption," B-4.

10. Bruce R. McConkie, "The Doctrinal Restoration," in *The Joseph Smith Translation: The Restoration of Plain and Precious Things*, ed. Monte S. Nyman and Robert L. Millet (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1985), 12.

11. *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 310.

12. William E. Berrett, *The Restored Church* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1961), 100.

# The Authorship Debate concerning *Lectures on Faith*: Exhumation and Reburial

Noel B. Reynolds

In 1835, Joseph Smith's revelations, given for the direction of the restored church, were published a second time under the title *Doctrine and Covenants*. This publication contained significant additions to the original 1833 *Book of Commandments*. Prominently placed at the beginning of this sacred collection were seven "lectures" derived from presentations at the School of the Elders in Kirtland the preceding winter. These seven lectures were apparently conceived as the first installment in a projected "course of lectures designed to unfold . . . the doctrine of Jesus Christ."<sup>1</sup> All seven lectures take up the doctrine of faith as "the first principle in revealed religion and the foundation of all righteousness."<sup>2</sup> There is no evidence of subsequent efforts to follow through with similar treatments of other basic gospel principles. The seven lectures were included in subsequent editions of the revelations until the 1921 edition, when they were discontinued with the explanation that they were not really part of canonical LDS scripture because "they were never presented to nor accepted by the church as being otherwise than theological lectures or lessons."<sup>3</sup> These lectures were only rarely used by scripture scholars and were almost never mentioned or quoted in general conference talks. Known in their subsequently separated state as the *Lectures on Faith*, these lectures were published and attracted a small and devoted following.<sup>4</sup> While there have been rumors that the lectures might be resurrected for inclusion in an enhanced edition of LDS scripture, nothing has ever materialized. More recently, in 1990, BYU professors Larry E. Dahl and Charles D. Tate Jr. produced a new edition of the lectures, which they published with supplementary chapters on each lecture drawn from a special conference designed to promote them and to enhance our awareness and understanding of them.<sup>5</sup>

It is worth noting that the title of the 1835 publication, *Doctrine and Covenants*, was actually devised to accommodate these lectures. The 1833 publication of Joseph Smith's revelations was variously referred to as the *Book of Commandments*, the *Book of Covenants*, or the *Articles and Covenants of the Church*, following the name of its lead section as it was circulated principally in handwritten copies. In 1835, when the lectures (part 1), under the title "On the Doctrine of the Church of the Latter Day Saints," were combined with Joseph's revelations (part 2), under the title "Covenants and Commandments," the resulting volume was labeled *Doctrine and Covenants* to signal the two major divisions of the contents.<sup>6</sup>

The range of reactions to the lectures within the LDS community is not easy to explain. From the beginning, there appears to have been a rather general disinterest on the part of most church members and leaders.<sup>7</sup> Also, there have been doubts about the lectures evident in the judgment of those who found them to be excessively "Protestant" in tone or content and to contain teachings not easily reconciled with standard Latter-day Saint doctrinal understandings. Indeed, this perspective played some role in the decision of the church to abandon the lectures in the 1921 re-editing of the *Doctrine and Covenants*.<sup>8</sup> Supporters of the lectures, on the other hand, found them to be among the most sublime of all religious writings and fortified with doctrines that were essential to a clear grasp of the true LDS position. The church never chose to enter this debate in any official or public way.

These differing views over the value of the lectures in the intellectual tradition of the Latter-day Saints were sometimes developed and expressed in terms of a debate about authorship. Those who disliked the lectures usually attributed them principally to Sidney Rigdon. Their promoters assumed Joseph Smith to be the author. No one has yet produced solid historical evidence from the 1834–35 time period to establish or refute either view.



The 1990 volume on the *Lectures on Faith* presents a good example of this. The historical background presented there underplays the evidence for Rigdon's leading role. Most contributors assumed Joseph Smith's authorship as an unquestioned fact. Recognizing the impossibility of settling this question with certainty on the basis of information available to scholars at this time, I wish to offer a more vigorous exploration of the thesis that Sidney Rigdon may have been the sole or principal author of the lectures. While this analysis makes the Rigdon thesis look more promising than the alternatives, the full truth of the matter is likely sealed in the memories of the actual participants in the key events of 1834 and 1835, during which time period these distinctive compositions were produced. Recognition of Sidney Rigdon's probable leading role in the writing of the lectures would not, however, settle the question of their worth or importance for Latter-day Saints. It would only serve as a warning that the discussion of those issues should not proceed on the assumption that Joseph Smith was their author, an assumption that has helped to elevate the lectures to something near scriptural status in the eyes of some interpreters.

## The Authorship Issue

The issue that continues to provoke the most interest relative to the *Lectures on Faith* is their authorship. Who wrote them? The available evidence tends to undermine the view that Joseph Smith was primarily responsible for them. It is unfortunate that some feel so strongly about maintaining Joseph Smith's authorship or responsibility for these lectures. This makes it difficult for other faithful Latter-day Saints to assess the evidence critically, and it also plays into the hands of critics of the church and Joseph Smith. Critics find much in the lectures and in the church's eventual exclusion of them from the scriptural canon with which to embarrass faithful Mormons.<sup>9</sup> Insisting that Joseph was responsible for the lectures only makes the critics' task easier. For example, Lecture 5 provides Dan Vogel with his principal evidence for an evolving Mormon concept of God that in 1835 reflected "Sidney Rigdon's Primitivistic background and not the orthodox LDS view of three distinct personages in the godhead."<sup>10</sup>

Opinions on the authorship and status of the lectures in Latter-day Saint literature have varied widely among both scholars and church authorities. Elders Bruce R. McConkie and Joseph Fielding Smith both saw Joseph Smith as a principal author of the lectures and believed he had approved them in full, having revised and prepared them for publication.<sup>11</sup> However, that view does not appear to have been generally shared by the church leadership that discontinued official publication of the seven lectures in 1921, allowed the copyright to lapse, and explicitly reiterated that these lectures were not scripture but merely "helps."<sup>12</sup> The "Explanatory Introductions" of subsequent editions have included such explanations as this one from page v of the 1966 edition:

Certain lessons, entitled "Lectures on Faith," which were bound in with the *Doctrine and Covenants* in some of its former issues, are not included in this edition. These lessons were prepared for use in the School of the Elders, conducted in Kirtland, Ohio, during the winter of 1834–1835; but they were never presented to nor accepted by the Church as being otherwise than theological lectures or lessons.

At least some of the presiding brethren possibly held the view published later by Elder John A. Widtsoe, who believed they were "written by Sidney Rigdon and others."<sup>13</sup> Three independent authorship studies conducted in recent decades and using different reputable techniques all conclude that Sidney Rigdon was the primary author of the lectures. Based on these studies, not a single lecture can conclusively be attributed to Joseph Smith.

## Authorship Studies

The first authorship study on the lectures was done at the request of the Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1976. Elinore H. Partridge performed a traditional qualitative stylistic analysis on Joseph Smith's holographic writings and compared these to the lectures. She identified a set of clear differences between the writing styles of Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon and used these as guides in her analysis of the lectures. While she could find possible influences of Joseph Smith in the images, examples, scriptural references, and phrasing of the lectures, she was "quite certain that Joseph Smith neither wrote nor dictated the major portion of the lectures."<sup>14</sup> Similarly, some passages reminded her of Oliver Cowdery's argumentative style, while other passages and features of the lectures did not seem to fit any of the potential authors she considered. Unfortunately, she did not extend her analysis to include contemporary Protestant lectures of this same type that might have provided stylistic elements possibly borrowed by the Kirtland lecturers. While she found Sidney Rigdon's style to be dominant throughout most of the seven lectures and thought he most likely prepared them for publication, she warned that the style was not consistently his throughout.<sup>15</sup>

At about the same time, Alan J. Phipps was writing a master's thesis on the authorship of the lectures at Brigham Young University.<sup>16</sup> Phipps used the quantitative technique of counting "function words" in the writings of several candidates for authorship of the lectures and then compared their frequency ratios with frequencies in the seven lectures as a whole. He concluded that of the possible authors considered, the function word frequency of the lectures most nearly matched the writings of Sidney Rigdon. In spite of the brevity of the individual lectures, the same technique was invoked to assess their authorship, one at a time. Again, Rigdon emerged as the likely author, except for Lecture 5, the results for which more closely matched the writings of Joseph Smith. Lectures 2, 3, 4, and 6 were not as clearly distinguishable as 1, 5, and 7.<sup>17</sup>

One needs to be very cautious about giving too much weight to such a study for two reasons. First, there have not been enough statistical studies performed on function word frequencies to establish either the reliability of this method or base statistical measures that would tell us how much of a difference is significant. Phipps had to rely on his own intuition and common sense for these guidelines. Second, the lectures are individually quite short and offer only small textual samples, varying in length from a mere 744 words in Lecture 5 to 2,929 in Lecture 7. Small samples are the bane of statisticians and cannot ordinarily be used to draw strong conclusions. Phipps also attempted some other tests, but problems of sample size make these even less convincing, especially as they were applied to individual paragraphs in an attempt to sort out editorial additions.

Similar cautions apply to the 1980 study of Wayne Larsen, Alvin Rencher, and Tim Layton. However, these professional statisticians were well aware of such issues and took appropriate precautions in selecting analytical techniques that could work for such small texts. They extended their massive statistical study of noncontextual word frequencies in the text of the Book of Mormon—which first established scientifically the independent authorship of the different sections of that book—to include the *Lectures on Faith*.<sup>18</sup> One reason for doing this was that their statistical techniques were different from and more powerful than those used by Phipps, and they also had a stronger set of comparison texts to work from. Still, their findings generally confirmed those of Phipps. They were virtually positive that Rigdon had authored all lectures except 2 and 5. Lecture 2, it should be noted, consists principally of materials quoted from the Bible and the Joseph Smith Translation (JST), a fact not easily accommodated in these kinds of studies. Larsen, Rencher, and Layton would attribute Lecture 5 to W. W. Phelps or even Parley P. Pratt, but those statistical correlations are much weaker. Lecture 2 statistics were also weak and favored Joseph Smith, with Sidney Rigdon a close second choice.

The formal authorship studies that have been conducted on the *Lectures on Faith* all favor Sidney Rigdon as author or principal author in a group effort. When considered individually, Lecture 5 was consistently problematic and was linked tentatively to W. W. Phelps, Parley P. Pratt, or Joseph Smith. This uncertainty is to be expected because the text of Lecture 5 is so much smaller than any of the other six and provides little data for analysis. While these studies each have their own limitations and none should be relied on alone for strong conclusions, the fact that three different studies, using completely different assumptions and approaches, reached the same general conclusion provides support for the Rigdon thesis. Furthermore, the historical and circumstantial evidence leans the same way.

## The Historical Evidence

None of the participants in the 1834 School of the Elders left us any clarifying contemporary statements about the lectures or their authors. The only direct statements we have from the participants include a relatively contemporary journal entry by Heber C. Kimball and an interview with Zebedee Coltrin published almost fifty years later in Salt Lake City. Kimball referred to the Theological School held during the winter of 1834–35, in which the *Lectures on Faith* were given. While it is usually assumed that the lectures were delivered before the opening of the grammar school on 22 December 1834, “under the superintendence of Sidney Rigdon and William E. McLellin teachers,”<sup>19</sup> the record is not definitive on this matter. Rigdon himself noted in 1845 that the course of lectures was “delivered before a theological class in Kirtland, O. in the winter of 1834 & 5.”<sup>20</sup> Nor does it seem likely that the rhetorically homogenous lectures published in the Doctrine and Covenants are transcriptions of all the teachings on faith given at the school. Kimball describes how “a certain number were appointed to speak at each meeting.” On the day appointed for his turn, Kimball followed others who were also assigned to speak on faith and who “quoted every passage mentioned in the scriptures on the subject.” He records how he retold a family incident illustrating the faith of a child and reduced the Prophet to tears.<sup>21</sup> Zebedee Coltrin also remembers that the School of the Elders in which the *Lectures on Faith* were studied was held in a school “where Sidney [Rigdon] presided.”<sup>22</sup>

The *History of the Church* appears to have a few helpful entries. But those who have relied on these accounts to establish the Prophet’s responsibility for the lectures have failed to notice that they are not all drawn from original records such as the Prophet’s journals but are interpolated by later secretaries. The only one of these that would appear to link Joseph Smith to the content of the lectures is a January 1835 entry, which reads as follows:

During the month of January, I was engaged in the school of the Elders, and in preparing the lectures on theology for publication in the book of Doctrine and Covenants, which the committee appointed last September were now compiling.<sup>23</sup>

Such a statement falls far short of acceptable historical evidence that Joseph was responsible for their content or method. If Rigdon is the main author, how are we to know if Joseph’s review was light or heavy? Those who have had the experience of revising materials written by a close associate know what a complex task that can be.

Furthermore, the statement itself may not reflect Joseph Smith’s own memory at all. Joseph’s original diaries and journals, which for some periods provided most of the source material from which the *History of the Church* was later compiled, have a fifteen-month gap that includes the period in which the lectures were delivered and prepared for publication. Consequently, we can never know from Joseph’s own records whether or not he was heavily involved. The statement quoted above was introduced by Willard Richards eight years later, as can be

demonstrated by consulting Richards's journal entry for 28 August 1843 containing his note indicating which pages of the manuscript history he worked on that day.<sup>24</sup> It cannot be determined whether Richards's insertion was suggested by Joseph Smith or by someone else. Joseph may have been in town on that day,<sup>25</sup> but Richards seems to have been working largely alone during this period. In the face of these contingencies, the most reasonable assumption is that Richards did have some factual basis, now not available to us, for this January entry. But the language is unfortunately too vague to help us assess the level of Joseph Smith's contribution to the publication of the lectures.

Similarly, claims that the Saints in 1835 accepted the theological lectures as the "doctrine of the Church" and that they were "wholly approved"<sup>26</sup> by the Prophet overstate the documented facts. In contrast, the minutes of the church conference that approved publication of the new Doctrine and Covenants identify Joseph's revelations as church doctrine and the lectures as "judiciously arranged and compiled, and . . . profitable for doctrine."<sup>27</sup> But even this weaker claim is a later expansion of the original record of the conference.<sup>28</sup> The *Kirtland Council Minute Book* reports President John Smith's response principally in terms of his personal experiences of being present when some of the revelations were given and his joy in finally receiving "the long wished for document to govern the church in righteousness and bring the elders to see eye to eye."<sup>29</sup> The derivative account published only weeks later in the *Messenger and Advocate* and also the Doctrine and Covenants may indeed have correctly reported additional comments by John Smith that referred explicitly to the lectures, but these comments are not found in the original record. John Smith was speaking as the president of the Kirtland High Council, the body that in August 1834 had appointed the four-man committee to prepare a new edition of Joseph's revelations for publication. Of the four members of the First Presidency (who composed this committee), Oliver Cowdery and Sidney Rigdon were the only ones present for the August 1835 assembly. Joseph Smith and Frederick G. Williams were duly noted as absent.

The longer account of the *Kirtland Council Minute Book* reports the essence of the comments made by each quorum or group as they registered their vote on the book (combining the lectures with the revelations to Joseph Smith). Apparently, Oliver Cowdery presented a set of page proofs as "the Book," which was passed from one president to the next as they stood in turn to announce their quorum votes. While most of the comments referred to the revelations and to personal experiences of those present when the revelations were received, two men did refer to the lectures, including them in their testimonies of the truthfulness of the new book. Bishop Newel K. Whitney referred to both parts of the proposed volume and specified that he had examined the lectures contained in the book, "that he believed them beyond a doubt," and that "the revelations contained in it . . . were true."<sup>30</sup> Similarly, President Leonard Rich, appointed to speak for the Seventy, took the book in his turn, "and said that he had examined the Lectures and many of the Revelations contained in it, and was perfectly satisfied with the same, and further, that he knew that they were true by the testimony of the Holy Spirit of God given unto him."<sup>31</sup> The written "Testimony of the Twelve Apostles," which was also read at this meeting and written into the minutes, only endorsed the revelations, mentioning "the Book of the Lord's Commandments" given "to His Church through Joseph Smith Jun." They testify that "these commandments," without mentioning the Lectures, were "given by the inspiration of God."<sup>32</sup> The comments of most others focused their testimonies on the revelations or the Book of Mormon, without any clear suggestion that they had actually read the new book, or even a major portion of it. Neither the original minutes nor the revised versions published later give any suggestion of divided opinion on the new book. The voting on it and on the two additional articles on government and marriage was unanimous.

There might be stronger warrant for attributing the lectures to Joseph Smith if we could reasonably project present-day church decision-making processes back to 1834–1835 without anachronism. It is not likely that counselors in a contemporary First Presidency would ever try to impose statements of doctrine on a president if he did not fully endorse them. The church has, however, matured a great deal since 1835. The internal dynamics of first presidencies today exhibit a unity of purpose and approach and a deference for the president that Joseph Smith may have dreamed of, but appears never to have enjoyed. This was a period of time in which Joseph’s preeminent role as president was not clearly established (see D&C 28:1–7; 30:7; and 43:1–7). And within a few years all the key actors in this particular episode turned against Joseph openly and left the church.

For the same 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants in which the theological lectures were first published, we have clear evidence of other significant materials being included despite explicit, repeated requests from Joseph Smith to leave them out. According to Brigham Young, Oliver Cowdery had included the statement on marriage in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants against Joseph’s wishes.<sup>33</sup> Yet Joseph’s printed name leads the list of signatories to the prefatory letter prepared six months earlier for that volume. How can we conclude any particular level of enthusiasm for the lectures on Joseph’s part merely from their inclusion and his name on the prefatory letter? To do so would be to project our own enthusiasm onto him in the absence of any clear evidence. In all these matters, Joseph may have felt bound by the majority of the four-man committee—and later by the vote of the 1835 conference—to accept the new publication, even though it was presided over by Rigdon and Cowdery in Joseph’s absence. Further, the letter of preface clearly recognizes that it was the Kirtland High Council that commissioned this work, not the presidency itself. In terms of the decision-making process regarding the composition and publication of the *Lectures on Faith*, the only clearly documented role played by Joseph Smith was his membership on the four-man committee that prepared the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants for publication. Given the historical record, it is perfectly possible that Joseph’s role was limited to the preparation of his own revelations, which constituted the bulk of that volume. The most obvious procedure for that committee would have been to make each member responsible for the preparation of his own contributions to the larger volume. If that were their procedure, it would also make sense for each of them to be signatories to the preface, even though we have such clear evidence that Joseph wished some of the materials to be excluded. Could it be that Joseph felt it necessary—given the dynamics of his presidency—to let them include their personal contributions in order to get his revelations in print?

Why were the *Lectures on Faith* included in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants? They were added to the revelations of Joseph Smith along with two additional items known to have been written by Oliver Cowdery (and possibly W. W. Phelps): the statements on government and marriage.<sup>34</sup> The preface to the 1835 edition, dated 17 February 1835, alludes rather clearly to each of these three nonrevelatory items and indicates that they were written in response to criticisms of the church. This is generally recognized to be the motive for the statement on marriage, which goes overboard to make Mormon marriage look identical to nineteenth-century Christian American practices. It is also commonly seen as the motive for the statement on government, which is mostly a summary of standard tenets of American democratic liberalism and ignores interesting political concepts in the Book of Mormon and other revelations to Joseph Smith.

The reasons given for the Kirtland High Council having appointed the committee to prepare these materials for publication are “adduced” by the committee to have been as follows: “They knew that the church was evil spoken of in many places—its faith and belief misrepresented, and the way of truth thus subverted. By some it was represented as disbelieving the Bible, by others as being an enemy to all good order and uprightness, and by others as being injurious to the peace of all governments civil and political” (“Preface,” Doctrine and Covenants,

1835). The three common accusations listed in the last sentence are rebutted in the order given by (1) the lectures, (2) the statement on marriage, and (3) the statement on government.

Similarly, viewing the lectures as a response to criticism might help to explain their atypical style. Some of the early brethren were apparently embarrassed by Joseph's lack of education and the simple language of his inspired writings.<sup>35</sup> The idea of taking a leading role in the School of the Elders or the publication process might come easily to Oliver Cowdery, Frederick G. Williams, W. W. Phelps, or Sidney Rigdon, all of whom boasted some education and had at some point earned their living as school teachers or publishers. Furthermore, the expansions of the 1835 edition may be seen as a means of reducing the preeminence of Joseph's revelations by combining them with contributions from others—the two doctrinal statements from Cowdery and Phelps and the theological lectures from Rigdon—and placing the lectures first in the compilation.

It is intriguing to note that when Rigdon left Nauvoo in 1844 and organized his own Church of Christ in Pittsburgh, he started up a paper (another *Messenger and Advocate*) and republished the seven Kirtland lectures in a monthly series between October 1845 and March 1846.<sup>36</sup> This action clearly indicates that Rigdon placed high value on the lectures, quite plausibly because of his own primary role as author or chief author. Also, while the lectures include 136 Bible quotations and 11 JST quotations, the revelations to Joseph are cited only twice (Lecture 7), and the Book of Mormon is referred to in only a single paragraph of Lecture 1. The predominant stance of the lectures is to derive its premises from the Bible alone, while ignoring the vast treasury of knowledge made available through Joseph Smith's revelations. The only significant exception is the emphasis on the JST in Lecture 2.

That the language and thought pattern of the lectures was integral to Rigdon's own is evident in his 1845 introduction to his Pittsburgh publication of them:

Faith being the first principle of action in all intelligent beings, and those lectures setting forth that principle in a clear and interesting manner, we thought perhaps we could not interest our readers more than by giving place to one of them at this time.<sup>37</sup>

Here Rigdon focuses immediately on the philosophical claim that faith is the first principle of action for all intelligent beings, a claim that is not endorsed elsewhere by Joseph Smith or the scriptures, but which does appear in popular Protestant theologies of the period. He credits the lectures as "clear and interesting" presentations of that central principle, as the most interesting thing he can offer his readers "at this time."

One is left to wonder if Joseph Smith really desired to give pride of place to a new introductory letter and the lectures and relegate the "Lord's Preface" and all his revelations to part 2 of the volume. It is also worth noting that the presiding quorums of the church eventually deleted the 1835 preface, the statement on marriage, and the *Lectures on Faith*, with only the statement on government being retained in the contemporary Doctrine and Covenants. The 1835 preface was the first to go. When Orson Pratt undertook the 1876 edition, he added another twenty-six revelations; because the new section 132 conflicted with the statement on marriage, the latter was dropped at that point. Three years later Pratt found himself in England preparing another edition, and he requested permission from President John Taylor to drop the *Lectures on Faith*. President Taylor deferred the request, explaining that "the *Lectures on Faith* were published with the sanction and approval of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and we do not feel that it is desirable to make any alteration in that regard, at any rate, not at present."<sup>38</sup> President Taylor's letter to Pratt does not give us any new insights into the lectures or their origins. It specifically did not claim that Joseph Smith helped write the lectures. Nor does it provide any further evidence for

Joseph's approval of the lectures other than the inclusion of Joseph's name on the prefatory letter of 1835. In 1921 the lectures were finally dropped from the Doctrine and Covenants, and the presiding authorities of the church chose to return to the 1833 model of the original Book of Commandments—featuring officially recognized revelations, introduced by the “Lord’s Preface” as the first section.

### **The Rhetoric of the *Lectures on Faith* in the Context of 1830s Protestantism**

The first thing Latter-day Saints notice when reading the lectures is that they are quite unlike other statements on doctrine by the prophets of the restoration. This is largely because of their philosophical tone. The confidence and certainty that the lectures exhibit—while relying on techniques of philosophical rhetoric, proof texting, and seemingly logical argumentation—make many Latter-day Saints uncomfortable. We are not accustomed to seeing Bible passages used in this way to “prove” unfamiliar theological claims. One of the main points of the lectures is that God is an appropriate object of faith for “rational beings.” The persistent claim is that faith must be rational and based on demonstrable knowledge. Furthermore, the arguments supporting these claims repeatedly appeal to reason. My casual count turned up almost eighty such appeals or allusions in the seven lectures.<sup>39</sup> Students of philosophy and Christian theology are accustomed to this kind of rhetorical approach, but Latter-day Saints are not in their role as students of the gospel. If we are not used to that approach, we can mistake its confident rhetoric and philosophical posturing for unusual profundity or sophistication. And, indeed, those were some of the intended effects of this rhetorical style in Protestant teaching.

One writer dismisses the common complaint that the lectures are Protestant in character by showing that the basic concept of God portrayed in the lectures is not exactly the same as the traditional Protestant concept.<sup>40</sup> But this misconstrues the objection. It is not that the lectures have no Mormon content or features; on the contrary, they are full of restoration insights that would be obvious to non-LDS readers. Rather, it is that in presenting some uniquely Mormon scriptures and concepts, the lectures repeatedly incorporate Protestant elements of rhetoric and doctrine that seem foreign in the context of other restoration literature, particularly the revelations and teachings of Joseph Smith. Furthermore, one difference does not outweigh numerous similarities.

Critics of Joseph Smith and the development of Latter-day Saint theology point to Lecture 5 as evidence that in the mid-1830s Joseph was following the binitarian doctrine of the godhead that was being promoted among the Christian Primitivists of those decades. Lecture 5 clearly teaches that “there are two personages” who “constitute the . . . supreme power over all things”<sup>41</sup> and that the Son possesses “the same mind with the Father, which mind is the Holy Spirit.”<sup>42</sup> Juxtaposed to more ambiguous statements in the Book of Mormon, the critics are able to use Lecture 5 to paint a picture of significant change in the thinking of Joseph Smith about the godhead. But even the critics have recognized that Sidney Rigdon, a Reformed Baptist, is the more likely source of the binitarian formulation of the lectures.

Several characteristics of the fifth lecture seem to reflect the “dynamic” monarchianism of the Christian Connection. The lecture never affirms the deity of Jesus but rather reflects a view expressed by Millard and other Primitivists that Jesus “possess[es] all the fulness of the Father . . . being begotten of him,” that he shares the divine nature through the “Holy Spirit,” and that through the same Spirit the saints can become one with the Father “as the Father and Son are one.” . . . The lecture is consistent in its use of the term “Holy Spirit,” a favorite with Campbell’s movement, rather than the Mormon use of “Holy Ghost.”<sup>43</sup>



But in a later period of theological turmoil in Nauvoo, Joseph Smith publicly affirmed: "I have always declared God to be a distinct personage, Jesus Christ a separate and distinct personage from God the Father, and that the Holy Ghost was a distinct personage and a Spirit: and these three constitute three distinct personages and three Gods."<sup>44</sup> Rather than trying to reconcile his revelations and this 1844 statement with the lectures, why should we not read it as Joseph's denial that he was the author of Lecture 5?

The Protestantism of the lectures is not merely doctrinal. It is particularly evident in the rhetorical and stylistic dimensions of the lectures. Why has no one examined them in light of Protestant writings and lectures of the period? The preface to the 1835 edition clearly acknowledges that many similar articles of religious faith were then extant. A casual review of the writings of Charles Finney, the famous frontier revivalist preacher of this period, shows some remarkable similarities in both rhetorical technique and substantive content. When Finney later published his lectures, he called them a course of "Theological Lectures." He organized them in the same numbered paragraph format as the Kirtland lectures and ended each lecture with similar long lists of catechetical questions and answers. On the central issue of delineating the attributes of God that have to be understood before one can have faith, the Kirtland lectures and those of Finney develop remarkably similar lists.<sup>45</sup> Finney's list of God's moral attributes or dispositions includes benevolence, omniscience (knowledge), justice, mercy, and truth. The *Lectures on Faith* list knowledge, faith (power), justice, judgment, mercy, and truth. Neither of these looks much like a list that could be found anywhere in the revelations or teachings of Joseph Smith. Furthermore, the lectures set up an order of gospel principles featuring sacrifice, knowledge, faith, enduring temptation, and eternal life. This differs fundamentally from both the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's other revelations, which consistently emphasize repentance, baptism in water, and the gift of the Holy Ghost as central and essential elements of the gospel process by which men may find eternal life.<sup>46</sup> Much more needs to be known before the extent of the influence of frontier theologians such as Finney on the Kirtland lectures could be determined, but it is hardly imaginative to see elements of the lectures as imitative of common Protestant theological discourse in light of these simple and obvious facts.

The philosophical tone of the lectures has already been noted. Might it be possible that this was a response to the criticism of those like Charles Finney, whose third lecture on theological method began with the assertion that "Mormonism is ridiculous credulity, founded in utter ignorance or a disregard of the first principles of evidence in relation to the kind and degree of testimony demanded to establish anything that claims to be a revelation from God"?<sup>47</sup> How else can the fact that the Kirtland lectures emulate the format, the philosophical tone, and the "principles of evidence" of Finney's lectures be explained? Why else do the Kirtland *Lectures on Faith* appeal so frequently to what Finney calls the "affirmations of reason," contrary to the distinctive Mormon style with its emphasis on revelation and testimony? Assuming that the published version of Finney's lectures reflects the style and content of what he had been saying in his earlier years on the western lecture circuit, even though he explains that they "have undergone repeated revisions, enlargement, and modification,"<sup>48</sup> these connections may indicate some indirect influence on the Kirtland lectures, if only through his earlier influence on people who subsequently converted to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Finney's own life features a further development that may provide an appropriate cautionary tale for Mormons who, like Sidney Rigdon, may be overanxious to adopt the rationalistic theologies of their Protestant brothers. Though himself a great critic of Joseph Smith, Finney records a conversion experience that shows him initially following in Joseph Smith's footsteps in certain remarkable ways, but later reinterpreting his own personal encounters with the Lord because they were not reasonable in light of the theology of his times.



As Finney later wrote in his memoirs, his own conversion to Christ had come on an autumn day in 1821 when he had finally resolved to retire to the woods to pray. After he struggled vainly to pray, a scripture flashed to his mind that enabled him to break through the barrier and pray without restraint and to receive extensive promises from the Spirit in his heart. Returning to his law office, he finished up his affairs for the day. Bidding good-bye to his last associate that evening, he returned to the office to pray and found the previously unlit room to be “perfectly light.”

As I went in and shut the door after me, it seemed as if I met the Lord Jesus Christ face to face. It did not occur to me then, nor did it for some time afterward, that it was wholly a mental state. On the contrary it seemed to me that I saw him as I would see any other man. He said nothing, but looked at me in such a manner as to break me right down at his feet. I have always since regarded this as a most remarkable state of mind; for it seemed to me a reality, that he stood before me, and I fell down at his feet and poured out my soul to him. I wept aloud like a child, and made such confessions as I could with my choked utterance. It seemed to me that I bathed his feet with my tears; and yet I had no distinct impression that I touched him, that I recollect.<sup>49</sup>

Apparently in his later rationalizing as he developed his theology, Finney concluded that the direct revelation of his youthful memories was really only a mental state. What, we might ask, would have been the consequence for Mormonism and its founding visions had Joseph Smith shifted so decisively in the direction of a rational theology as did Charles G. Finney?

## Conclusions

Again, these observations are not based on an exhaustive study of any of the materials mentioned. Much scholarly work on the lectures remains to be accomplished. There needs to be extensive work done on the writings and teachings of Rigdon, Cowdery, Phelps, Williams, and others. The most recent biography of Rigdon gives him primary credit for the *Lectures on Faith*, but without any analysis of the evidence for authorship.<sup>50</sup> Also, it is to be hoped that someone will take a closer look at Finney, Campbell, and other prominent frontier preachers to assess the extent to which their widespread influence in frontier America might have touched the Latter-day Saints and the degree to which their teachings and approaches differed from the revelations made available through Joseph Smith.

This review of historical evidence, authorship studies, textual content, and style raises serious questions for the recurring assumption in some Latter-day Saint circles that Joseph Smith authored the *Lectures on Faith*. In none of these dimensions are the lectures clearly linked to Joseph Smith. Rather, in every detail, the evidence points away from Joseph to Sidney Rigdon. We may never have adequate evidence to settle this authorship question with certainty. But if Rigdon was the principal author, and if the style and content of Finney’s Protestantism was crucial, it would be much easier to understand the rationalistic or theological stance of the lectures, their similarities in style and content with the lectures of such frontier phenomena as Charles Finney, their inconsistencies with standard Latter-day Saint teaching, their noticeably Protestant flavor, and Rigdon’s eagerness to publish them in his own newspaper after leaving the church. To the extent this preliminary study has raised legitimate questions about this enigmatic document, there may be good reason for students of Mormon history to look more closely at the Protestant environment of the lectures, at Sidney Rigdon’s thought and rhetorical style during the Kirtland period, and at his influence on Mormon theological rhetoric in those early days of the church.

## Notes

While this essay has gained in accuracy and perspective through a decade of research and writing, I am embarrassed that I cannot now remember and thank all those who have contributed to it with criticisms, suggestions, or research assistance. Thomas J. Lowery and Louis T. Cowley were particularly helpful as research assistants. Scott H. Faulring provided invaluable assistance with source materials and documentation. Louis C. Midgley, John A. Tvedtnes, Ronald K. Esplin, Kent P. Jackson, and Matthew Roper all read some version of the paper and offered helpful suggestions. I hope Larry E. Dahl, Robert L. Millet, and Robert J. Matthews will find in this final version an honest attempt to deal with their concerns expressed about earlier drafts.

1. Larry E. Dahl and Charles D. Tate Jr., eds., *The Lectures on Faith in Historical Perspective* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1990), 31. This paper is derived in part from my earlier review essay on the Dahl and Tate volume in *BYU Studies* 32/1–2 (1991): 285–94.
2. Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*, 31.
3. “Explanatory Introduction” in the 1921 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, v.
4. The best brief account of the connection of the lectures to the Doctrine and Covenants is found in Robert J. Woodford, “Doctrine and Covenants Editions,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 1:425–27. The best publication history of the lectures is found in Larry E. Dahl, “Authorship and History of the Lectures on Faith,” in Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*, 13–16.
5. See Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*.
6. See Woodford, “Doctrine and Covenants Editions,” 425.
7. The 2 March 1997 CES fireside broadcast is a notable exception wherein Elder Jeffrey R. Holland based part of his presentation on a statement from the lectures. In subsequent conversation he made it perfectly clear that even though he had mentioned Joseph Smith in that connection, he did not want his statements about the lectures to be interpreted as support for any particular theory of their authorship.
8. See Dahl, “Authorship and History,” 16–18.
9. See, for example, Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality*, 5th ed. (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1987), 166–67.
10. Dan Vogel, “The Earliest Mormon Concept of God,” in *Line upon Line: Essays on Mormon Doctrine*, ed. Gary J. Bergera (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 27; see also 28–29. Similar points are made in other essays in the Bergera volume. See, for example, Thomas G. Alexander, “The Reconstruction of Mormon Doctrine,” 54–56, and Vern G. Swanson, “The Development of the Concept of a Holy Ghost in Mormon Theology,” 89–94, in which Swanson credits the continuing inclusion of the lectures in the Doctrine and Covenants for “the longevity of the idea that the Holy Ghost was not a personage” (p. 94) in Latter-day Saint doctrinal teaching and writing.
11. See, for example, Bruce R. McConkie, “The Lord God of Joseph Smith,” in *Speeches of the Year, 1971–72* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1972), 4; and Joseph Fielding Smith, *Seek Ye Earnestly* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970), 194, respectively.
12. Leland H. Gentry, “What of the Lectures on Faith?” *BYU Studies* 19/1 (1978): 11.

13. John A. Widtsoe, *The Message of the Doctrine and Covenants* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1969), 2.
14. Elinore H. Partridge, *Characteristics of Joseph Smith's Style and Notes on the Authorship of the Lectures on Faith* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1976), 25.
15. *Ibid.*, 28.
16. See Alan J. Phipps, "The Lectures on Faith: An Authorship Study" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1977), 1–4.
17. *Ibid.*, 77.
18. Wayne A. Larsen, Alvin C. Rencher, and Tim Layton, "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon? An Analysis of Wordprints," *BYU Studies* 20/3 (1980): 249, appendix E, "The Lectures on Faith," revised and reprinted most recently in *Book of Mormon Authorship*, ed. Noel B. Reynolds (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1996), 183–84.
19. Dahl, "Authorship and History," 12.
20. *Ibid.*, 15.
21. *Ibid.* See *Journal History* for 22 December 1834. It should be noted in passing that the classroom procedures described here match closely those in use by the frontier sensation, Rev. Charles G. Finney, as described in the opening paragraph of the preface to his published lecture outlines. See *Finney's Lectures on Theology* (1840; reprint, Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1968), 3.
22. *1883 Salt Lake School of the Prophets Minute Book*, MSS p. 69. Dahl, "Authorship and History," 2–13, reinterprets these references to Rigdon's presiding role on the assumption that Joseph must have presided if he were present. While this assumption would clearly be justified in a twentieth-century context, leadership norms in the Kirtland period were not so clearly established. "By 1835 there were nine 'presidents of the Church,'" and they tended to rotate the duties of conducting and presiding; evidence shows that most of the preaching, doctrinal writing, and teaching were performed by others. Until the institution of the First Presidency was clarified in 1838, Joseph was regarded more as "first among equals." Ronald K. Esplin, personal correspondence, 1 September 1998.
23. *History of the Church*, 2:180.
24. Compare Willard Richards's journal (Archives Division, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; hereinafter LDS Church Archives), 28 August 1843, with the Manuscript History of the Church, Book B-1, LDS Church Archives, 563.
25. See Scott H. Faulring, ed., *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1989), 411.
26. Robert L. Millet, "The Supreme Power over All Things: The Doctrine of the Godhead in the Lectures on Faith," in Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*, 238–39.
27. *History of the Church*, 2:244.

28. Compare *History of the Church*, 2:243–44, with *Kirtland Council Minute Book*, in LDS Church Archives, 98–106.

29. *Kirtland Council Minute Book*, 103.

30. *Ibid.*, 104.

31. *Ibid.*

32. The “Testimony of the Twelve Apostles” was included in the 1835 edition on p. 256 and has been included in the “Explanatory Introduction” of recent editions.

33. Concerning the “Article on Marriage,” Joseph F. Smith recorded a statement by Brigham Young: “Prest. Young spoke 12 minutes in relation to Sec. 109 B[ook] of Doctrine and Covenants [“Article on Marriage”]. Saying Oliver Cowdery wrote it, and incisted on its being incerted in the Book of D. & C. contrary to the thrice expressed wish and refusal of the Prophet Jos. Smith” (Joseph F. Smith diary, 9 October 1869, LDS Church Archives), cited in Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Provo, Utah: Seventy’s Mission Book Store, 1981), 348–49 n. 11.

34. Bruce A. Van Orden has examined the common assumption that Oliver Cowdery wrote the 1835 statements on government and marriage and advances persuasive evidence that Cowdery and Phelps worked together on these, and that Phelps’s background for writing the government statement in particular was significantly stronger than Cowdery’s. See his “W. W. Phelps: His Ohio Contributions, 1835–36,” in *Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History (Ohio)*, ed. Milton V. Backman Jr. (Provo, Utah: Department of Church History and Doctrine, Brigham Young University, 1990), 45–62, esp. 49–50.

35. Both Rigdon and Cowdery were among the ten elders at the 1 November 1831 conference in Hiram, Ohio, where concerns were expressed over “the seemingly uneducated language found in the revelations then ready for printing.” Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 107. Doctrine and Covenants 67 was given in direct response to those concerns (see verses 5–9).

36. Sidney Rigdon, ed., “Lectures on Faith,” series in *Messenger and Advocate* (Pittsburgh, Pa.) 1 (15 October 1845): 360, 364–66; 1 (November 1845): 385–89; 1 (December 1845): 405–7; 1 (January 1846): 422–24; 1 (February 1846): 443–45; 2 (March 1846): 449–52.

37. Rigdon, “Lectures on Faith,” 360–61, quoted in Dahl, “Authorship and History,” 15.

38. John Taylor to Orson Pratt, 25 April 1879, retained copy in John Taylor letter book, 16 August 1878 to 27 May 1879, pp. 710–13, at the LDS Church Archives, cited in Robert J. Woodford, “Historical Development of the Doctrine and Covenants” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1974), 1:87–88.

39. For example, Lecture 2 explains how God became “an object of faith for rational beings,” and Lecture 3 lists the three conditions “necessary for any rational and intelligent being to exercise faith in God.” Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*, 39, 51, and 65.

40. See Millet, “The Supreme Power,” 223.

41. Dahl and Tate, *Historical Perspective*, 83.

42. *Ibid.*, 84.

43. Vogel, "Earliest Mormon Concept of God," 27.

44. *History of the Church*, 6:474.

45. Finney, *Finney's Lectures on Theology*, 68, 76.

46. The Book of Mormon pattern is analyzed in detail in Noel B. Reynolds, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ as Taught by the Nephite Prophets," *BYU Studies* 31/3 (1991): 31–50, and Noel B. Reynolds, "The True Points of My Doctrine," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 5/2 (1996): 26–56. Cf. Moses 6:52.

47. Finney, *Finney's Lectures on Theology*, 19.

48. *Ibid.*, 4.

49. Charles G. Finney, *Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney* (1876; reprint, New York: AMS, 1973), 18–20.

50. See Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Sidney Rigdon: A Portrait of Religious Excess* (Salt Lake City: Signature Press, 1994). See also the review of this biography by David J. Whittaker in *Journal of Mormon History* 23/1 (1997): 189–95, where similar complaints are raised.

# John Gilbert's 1892 Account of the 1830 Printing of the Book of Mormon

Royal Skousen

Occasionally historians and other observers of the past attempt to discredit someone's account of a past event by referring to the age of the person when the account was given. Age frequently becomes an argument against the account if the historian or observer does not agree with the implications of that account.

Yet the real issue is how an account matches up with other accounts or, even more significantly, how it matches up with the physical evidence that remains. Independent, physical evidence can often be used to test the reliability of accounts. A good example of this procedure in analyzing accounts can be found in the analysis by Don Enders of numerous statements made in E. D. Howe's 1834 *Mormonism Unveiled*, in particular, claims by some of the residents around Palmyra that Joseph Smith's family were poor and lazy. Enders compared these claims against the original land and tax records and other local government papers from the 1820s and 1830s and discovered that the assessment of Joseph Smith Sr.'s property, based on the 1830 tax records, shows that the valuation of the Smith farm per acre exceeded that of nine out of ten farms owned by families who criticized the Smiths in *Mormonism Unveiled*. This finding calls into question the overall validity of these accounts in Howe's book denigrating the Smiths' work ethic.<sup>1</sup>

In this article, I would like to consider a statement made by John Gilbert, the compositor (or typesetter) for the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon. Gilbert made this statement on 9 September 1892, when he was 90 years old. In his statement, a typescript located in the King's Daughters Library in Palmyra, Gilbert describes events that occurred 63 years earlier. Now of course we could dismiss his account (if we didn't like what he was saying about the early publishing history of the Book of Mormon) by simply referring to his age, or the lateness in making this statement, or even his anti-Mormon bias. But the better procedure is to test this statement against what we have been able to discover about the printing of the first edition of the Book of Mormon.

This process includes evidence from the two Book of Mormon manuscripts: the original manuscript and the printer's manuscript. The original manuscript is the dictated manuscript the scribes wrote down as Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon. During 1829–30, a copy of the original manuscript was made. This copy is called the printer's manuscript because, for the most part, this was the manuscript that was taken to the printer's shop in Palmyra, New York, where the type was set for the first edition of the Book of Mormon, published in 1830. About 28% of the original manuscript is extant. Most of the extant portions of the original manuscript are owned by the LDS Church. The printer's manuscript is owned by the RLDS Church and is extant except for three lines. Fragments of the original manuscript show that the original (dictated) manuscript rather than the copied printer's manuscript was used to set the 1830 edition from Helaman 13 through Mormon 9.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the two manuscripts, this analysis of John Gilbert's statement has involved the examination of about one hundred copies of the 1830 edition, an original proof sheet of the 1830 title page, and a complete set of unbound sheets of the 1830 edition (sometimes called the "uncut sheets") that Gilbert had saved.

I reproduce Gilbert's entire statement (as a typographical facsimile) in the appendix to this article (see pp. 400–405), but here I list a number of claims Gilbert made in that statement about the printing of the 1830 edition and compare those claims with the extant physical evidence dating from 1829 and 1830.

## **1. 500 pages of manuscript**

A few pages of the manuscript were submitted as a specimen of the whole, and it was said there would be about 500 pages.<sup>3</sup>

There were 466 pages in the printer's manuscript and probably a few more in the original manuscript, perhaps as many as 480 pages. In either case, the estimate that Gilbert remembered is close to the actual number of pages.

## **2. 5,000 copies of the 1830 edition for \$3,000**

In the forepart of June 1829, Mr. E. B. Grandin, the printer of the "Wayne Sentinel," came to me and said he wanted I should assist him in estimating the cost of printing 5,000 copies of a book that Martin Harris wanted to get printed, which was called the "Mormon Bible." . . .

The contract was to print and bind with leather 5,000 copies for \$3,000.

The number 5,000 agrees with other accounts of the press run for the 1830 edition. For instance, these same figures are found in Joseph Smith's 1839 History, in both the draft and the final versions.<sup>4</sup> The final version reads:

Mean time our translation drawing to a close, we went to Palmyra, Wayne Country, N.Y: Secured the Copyright; and agreed with Mr Egbert Grandin to print five thousand Copies, for the sum of three thousand dollars.

## **3. 1,000 ems per printed page**

The size of the page was agreed upon, and an estimate of the number of ems in a page, which would be 1,000.

An em is a measure of type width equal to the point size of the font being used. There are about 1,075 ems per page in the 1830 edition, with 25 ems per line and 43 lines per page (excluding the header on each page). Gilbert's recollection of the estimated number of ems is close to the actual count for an 1830 page.<sup>5</sup>

## **4. Manuscript page somewhat longer than an 1830 printed page**

A page of manuscript would make more than a page of printed matter, which proved to be correct.

As already noted, there are 466 pages of manuscript in the printer's manuscript and perhaps as many as 480 pages were in the original manuscript. The 1830 edition itself has 590 pages, which means that one manuscript page provided about one and a fourth pages in the 1830 edition.

## **5. A new font of small pica**

Mr. Grandin got a new font of small pica, on which the body of the work was printed.

The "small pica" of the 1830 edition is a 10-point type. The type used in the 1830 edition is called Scotch Roman, a very common type designed about 1810 by Richard Austin in Edinburgh, Scotland. This type face was widely used

throughout the nineteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

The type used in the 1830 edition had only a few pieces of broken type. The type imprint in 1830 copies is sharp and clean and shows little wear.

## **6. 24 pages on foolscap paper**

When the printer was ready to commence work, [Martin] Harris was notified, and Hyrum Smith brought the first installment of manuscript, of 24 pages, closely written on common foolscap paper.

The entire printer's manuscript is a collection of gatherings of sheets. To form a gathering, Oliver Cowdery (the principal scribe for the printer's manuscript, as well as the original manuscript) would typically take 6 sheets of foolscap paper (a size of paper), line them, and fold them down the center to form a gathering of 24 pages or 12 leaves. Later, after writing the text, he would secure the gathering by producing at least 4 holes (or "stabs") along the fold (or "gutters") and weaving in yarn and then tying it to hold the gathering together. The very first gathering for the printer's manuscript starts at the beginning of 1 Nephi and goes up to 1 Nephi 14:21. Like most of the other gatherings in the printer's manuscript, this first one contains 24 pages (6 foolscap sheets folded widthwise to form 12 leaves or 24 pages).

Foolscap paper originally referred to a watermark showing a fool's cap, but by the 1800s this term was universally used to refer to a paper size. The sheets for the printer's manuscript show some variance, but range from 31.4 to 33.1 cm in width and from 38.3 to 41.5 cm in length. Published accounts (given in the *Oxford English Dictionary* under "foolscap") indicate that foolscap paper varied from 12 to 13.5 inches in width and from 15 to 17 inches in length (that is, from 30 to 34 cm in width and 38 to 43 cm in length). All the sheets in the printer's manuscript are within these bounds, as are the extant sheets of the original manuscript.

## **7. Proof sheet of title page alone**

The title page was first set up, and after proof was read and corrected, several copies were printed for [Martin] Harris and his friends.

One of the individuals in the print shop that day was Stephen Selwyn Harding, who later served as territorial governor of Utah (1862–63). Harding received one of these copies of the proof sheet of the title page and in 1847 donated his copy to the LDS Church. This copy has been on display at the Church Museum in Salt Lake City. In comparing this proof sheet with the title page as actually published, we see that a number of misspellings were corrected; in addition, the spacing (or "leading") between the various lines, especially in the title and subtitle, was increased.

## **8. Grammatical "errors" not corrected**

On the second day—[Martin] Harris and [Hyrum] Smith being in the office—I called their attention to a grammatical error, and asked whether I should correct it? Harris consulted with Smith a short time, and turned to me and said: "The Old Testament is ungrammatical, set it as it is written."

For the most part, Gilbert did not edit out the grammatical "errors." The vast majority of them were copied over straight from the manuscripts into the 1830 edition. In some cases some accidental correction seems to have occurred. And in a handful of cases we have specific evidence that either John Gilbert or Oliver Cowdery



consciously corrected what was perceived to be pronominal redundancies. For instance, in Ether 9:8, the printer's manuscript originally read as follows:

& now the brother of him that suffered death & his name was Nimrah & he was angry with his father because of that which his father had done unto his brother

While punctuating the manuscript to set the type for this part of the text, Gilbert placed the intrusive "& his name was Nimrah" in parentheses and then crossed out the words "& he" that followed. This kind of conscious editing is infrequent in the text. The vast majority of "ungrammatical" expressions were left unchanged.

## 9. Scribes for the printer's manuscript

Martin Harris, Hyrum Smith, and Oliver Cowdery were very frequent visitors to the office during the printing of the Mormon Bible. The manuscript was supposed to be in the handwriting of Cowdery. . . .

Cowdery held and looked over the manuscript when most of the proofs were read. Martin Harris once or twice, and Hyrum Smith once, Grandin supposing these men could read their own writing as well, if not better, than anyone else; and if there are any discrepancies between the Palmyra edition and the manuscript these men should be held responsible.

The printer's manuscript is mostly in Oliver Cowdery's hand (84.6%). A not-yet-identified scribe (referred to as scribe 2) accounts for 14.9% of the printer's manuscript. This scribe basically transcribed two large portions (from Mosiah 25 to Alma 13, and from 3 Nephi 19 to the end of Mormon), but in the first portion, Hyrum Smith briefly took over for scribe 2 on five different occasions (from Mosiah 28 to Alma 5). Hyrum's minor contribution amounts to only 0.5% of the text.

But the printer never saw the second portion done by scribe 2. Instead, the original manuscript was taken in for this portion of the typesetting. All extant fragments of the original manuscript from this part of the text (from Helaman 13 to the end of Mormon) are in Oliver Cowdery's hand, so if we presume that all this portion of the original manuscript was in Oliver's hand, the 1830 printer saw Oliver Cowdery's hand for slightly over 91% of the text. By this calculation, scribe 2 then accounts for 8.5% of the text and Hyrum the remaining 0.5%. So Gilbert's comment that the manuscript was supposed to be in Oliver's hand is probably accurate for about 91% of the text.

Gilbert's comment that Oliver Cowdery did most of the proofing, but that Martin Harris did it twice and Hyrum Smith once is intriguing, especially since these rankings are consistent with the frequency with which the printer set type from the handwriting of Oliver Cowdery, scribe 2, and Hyrum Smith. The additional statement from Grandin about proofing "their own writing" suggests that Martin Harris might have been scribe 2, although of course Gilbert's initial statement about the handwriting implies that Oliver Cowdery was the only scribe. Except for his signature, there are apparently no identified extant examples of Martin Harris's handwriting.<sup>7</sup>

We also have definite evidence that Oliver Cowdery was learning from his proofing of the 1830 edition. For instance, by the time he got into 3 Nephi, Oliver had learned that *exceeding(ly)* is spelled with two e's after the c, not as *exceding(ly)*, which is how he consistently spelled the word in the original manuscript as well as in the printer's manuscript before 3 Nephi 12:12. From then on in the printer's manuscript, Oliver always spelled *exceeding(ly)* correctly.

In addition, Oliver Cowdery also learned to hyphenate at the end of lines. Earlier he had always hyphenated at the beginning of the line (in the original manuscript and the first part of the printer's manuscript). For example, in the original manuscript, if only *accord* of *according* fit at the end of a line, Oliver would have written *accord* at the end of the line and *-ing* at the beginning of the next line. But when he finally learned that hyphenation occurs at the end of the line, Oliver would have written *accord-* at the end of the line, but still he would have kept the hyphen at the beginning of the next line (that is, *-ing*), thus ending up with two hyphens.

Oliver Cowdery started this practice of double hyphenation at the beginning of 2 Nephi (page 49 in the printer's manuscript), but here he put hyphens at the end of a line only once or twice a page, so that in this part of the printer's manuscript most hyphenated words had only a single hyphen, at the beginning of a line. But by the time Oliver got through 200 pages of the printer's manuscript, he started to hyphenate more frequently at the ends of lines, so that ultimately in the last half of the manuscript we often find double hyphenation more than ten times a page.

## 10. Paragraphing and punctuation in the manuscript

Every chapter, if I remember correctly, was one solid paragraph, without a punctuation mark, from beginning to end.

... I punctuated it to make it read as I supposed the author intended, and but very little punctuation was altered in proof-reading.

Originally, very little punctuation appeared on the printer's manuscript and virtually none on the original manuscript, including that portion (from Helaman 13 to the end of Mormon) used to set the type for the 1830 edition. For the first part of the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery copied the original manuscript without adding punctuation. He finally realized that he himself could add the punctuation, so beginning with page 106 of the printer's manuscript, Oliver started to add a little punctuation, but only sporadically and never systematically. Moreover, Gilbert basically ignored Oliver's punctuation.

Beginning with page 129 of the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery added paragraph marks as he prepared this manuscript, but by page 145 he stopped this practice, probably because he had realized that the compositor was ignoring his suggested paragraph breaks. In any event, all the original chapters in the Book of Mormon manuscripts were written as a single paragraph. Gilbert is responsible for the actual paragraphing in the 1830 edition, although he does not mention it in this statement. While inserting punctuation, he would also use the letter *P* (not the reversed paragraph symbol ¶) whenever he wanted to show the beginning of a new paragraph.

Scribe 2, unlike Oliver Cowdery, fairly consistently punctuated the portions of the printer's manuscript that he was responsible for, although scribe 2 had only a single punctuation mark that sometimes looks like a period and sometimes like a small comma. This same mark is used interchangeably for both full and half stops. Once more, for the first portion of scribe 2's handwriting (from Mosiah 25 to Alma 13), Gilbert ignored this rather confusing punctuation mark from scribe 2.

As Gilbert indicated, he basically typeset the 1830 edition with the same punctuation marks that he had placed in the printer's manuscript. I would estimate that over 90% of Gilbert's punctuation marks in the printer's and original manuscripts were carried over without change into the 1830 edition.

## 11. Capitalization in the manuscript

Names of persons and places were generally capitalized, but sentences had no end. The character & was used almost invariably where the word *and* occurred, except at the end of a chapter.

In those portions of the original manuscript in the hand of Oliver Cowdery, the first word in a chapter was systematically capitalized (as were names). If the first word was *and*, it was written as *And*. Gilbert's "end of a chapter" refers, of course, to the beginning of a new chapter, since one implies the other. But other sentence-initial words in the original manuscript were generally not capitalized by Oliver. And he wrote virtually all other examples of *and* as an ampersand (&). Oliver nearly always followed this same practice in the printer's manuscript. In a couple instances in the manuscripts, Oliver did write *and* as *and*, but in each case he had accidentally started to write some other word and he then overwrote the incorrect word by writing out the full *and* rather than using the shorter ampersand.

On the other hand, it should be noted that in the book of Helaman, Oliver Cowdery started to occasionally show the beginning of a new sentence in the middle of a chapter by capitalizing the sentence-initial word, as in Helaman 5:5–6:

for they remembered the words which their father Helaman spake unto them & these are the words which he spake Behold my Sons I desire that . . .

Although Oliver never consistently applied this practice in the rest of the printer's manuscript, still he occasionally did capitalize a few sentence-initial words in the middle of a chapter. And eventually, there are examples of mid-chapter sentences beginning with *And* instead of &, as in 3 Nephi 13:34–14:1:

sufficient is the day unto the evil thereof And now it came to pass that . . .

Although this sentence begins chapter 14 in our current chapter system (dating from Orson Pratt's editing for the 1879 edition), originally this sentence occurred about one-third the way through chapter VI of 3 Nephi. But since this part of the printer's manuscript was never seen by John Gilbert, he never saw this example of a mid-chapter *And*. Only in a few cases in Ether and Moroni of the printer's manuscript could Gilbert have seen in the middle of a chapter an occasional *And* instead of Oliver Cowdery's much more frequent &. In nearly all instances, Gilbert would have seen & in the printer's manuscript.

The two other scribes in the printer's manuscript (scribe 2 and Hyrum Smith) used both & and *and* interchangeably, but this variation would have occurred for only 8.9% of the text (from Mosiah 25 to Alma 13). In any event, Gilbert's recollection of the massive use of & is accurate for the vast majority of the Book of Mormon text.

## 12. John Gilbert works on the manuscript at home

After working a few days, I said to [Hyrum] Smith on his handing me the manuscript in the morning: "Mr. Smith, if you would leave this manuscript with me, I would take it home with me at night and read and punctuate it, and I could get along faster in the day time, for now I have frequently to stop and read half a page to find how to punctuate it." His reply was, "We are commanded not to leave it." A few mornings after this, when Smith handed me the manuscript, he said to me: "If you will give your word that this manuscript shall be returned to us when you get through with it, I will leave it with you." I assured Smith that it should be returned all right when I got through with it. For two or three nights I took it home with me and read it, and punctuated it with a lead pencil. This will account for the punctuation marks in pencil.

John Gilbert had to wait more than “a few mornings” after “a few days” before getting permission to take the printer’s manuscript home to punctuate it. In the first part of the manuscript, before page 73, there are only a few minor places where Gilbert added punctuation to the manuscript. These few punctuation marks are all in pencil. When Gilbert refers to reading down half a page of manuscript to determine the punctuation, he was apparently trying to determine the reading of the text and then adding the punctuation to the typeset text only, not on the manuscript itself (except in those few cases).

The first place where Gilbert began to systematically punctuate the printer’s manuscript is on page 73 (beginning with 2 Nephi 17:4). Since this place is about one-sixth the way through the manuscript, Gilbert’s impression about when he started to take the manuscript home is a little too early. I would estimate that he probably took the manuscript home sometime in the last half of September 1829, after at least one month of printing.

We do have evidence that Gilbert took the manuscript home for two days. For these two sessions, Gilbert marked the punctuation in heavy black ink, not in pencil. The first session covers pages 73–75 of the printer’s manuscript. The second session covers pages 77–79 and the first third of page 80.

After these two sessions, all of Gilbert’s subsequent punctuation marks on the printer’s manuscript (and on the original manuscript for Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon) are in pencil rather than ink. Gilbert’s penciling seems to be restricted to work actually done in the printing shop, not at home, especially since his punctuation marks are interspersed with take marks (also in pencil) that were made during the actual setting of the type. (These take marks show where in the manuscript the compositor finished setting the type for a portion of the text.)

Since the clear majority of Gilbert’s punctuation is in pencil, it is understandable that he might not have remembered that he used ink for the two nights he took the manuscript home to prepare it for typesetting.

### **13. Details about the signatures**

The [Mormon] Bible was printed 16 pages at a time, so that one sheet of paper made two copies of 16 pages each, requiring 2,500 sheets of paper for each form of 16 pages. There were 37 forms of 16 pages each, 570 pages in all.

The 1830 edition has 16 pages to a signature and has 37 signatures. Of course, Gilbert could determine this by referring to a copy of the edition (or perhaps to his set of 37 unbound folded sheets). There are, however, 592 pages in the 1830 edition ( $37 \times 16 = 592$ ), of which the last two are blank, thus giving 590 printed pages, not 570. Perhaps the 570 is a typo for 590.

The 2,500 sheets for each signature would thus account for 5,000 copies since they were printing all 16 pages of each signature on both sides of the sheet. This process, called half-sheet imposition (or in more modern terminology, “work and turn”), requires that each sheet be properly oriented and lined up (a process referred to as registering) before printing the opposite side. Finally, the 2,500 larger sheets were torn or cut in two—so that prior to binding, 5,000 copies of each signature were available.

Examination of the unbound sheets shows quite clearly the torn side at the top of each of the 37 signatures. Here each of the original larger sheets was folded and cut along the crease with a bone cutter (personal communication from Don Enders), which left a rough, tornlike edge. The bottom edge has always been cut mechanically, whereas the sides always show a deckle edge—that is, the original uneven edge that results from the paper-making process itself. In addition, the two pinholes resulting from pinning down the middle of the full sheet to the tympan (the

frame to which the sheet is secured during the presswork) can be found about half the time near the torn upper edge of the unbound sheets. Thus the unbound sheets clearly show that Gilbert's statement about printing 2,500 sheets to produce 5,000 copies was entirely accurate.<sup>8</sup>

## Conclusion

From these many examples, we can see that in every instance, John Gilbert's recollections regarding the printing of the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon are either precisely correct or, where wrong, the error is easily explained. In a number of cases where he thought something held in every instance, the actual facts show that his recollection is still correct for the clear majority of cases. All in all, these examples show that Gilbert's memory is very accurate, even at 90 years of age and 63 years after the fact.<sup>9</sup>

## Notes

1. Donald L. Enders, "The Joseph Smith, Sr., Family: Farmers of the Genesee," in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1993), 213–25; see page 220 for the nine-out-of-ten statistic.

2. For further information about the use of the original manuscript as the printer's copy, see Royal Skousen, "Piecing Together the Original Manuscript," *BYU Today* (May 1992): 18–24; or Royal Skousen, "The Book of Mormon Critical Text Project," in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, 65–75.

3. To enhance readability, a few changes (mostly in punctuation and grammar) have been made in the quotations from the typographical facsimile that appears at the end of this article.

4. See *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, ed. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989), 1:241 and 300.

5. I wish to thank Jonathan Saltzman for help in determining these figures.

6. I wish to thank Jonathan Saltzman for identifying the type face for the 1830 edition. For further information about Scotch Roman, see W. Pincus Jaspert, W. Turner Berry, and A. F. Johnson, *The Encyclopaedia of Type Faces*, 4th ed. (Poole, Dorset, England: Blandford, 1970), 203.

7. For an early discussion of this problem, see Dean C. Jessee, "New Documents and Mormon Beginnings," *BYU Studies* 24/4 (1984): 397–428.

8. I wish to thank Louis E. Crandall of the Crandall Historical Printing Museum (Provo, Utah) for his valuable assistance in identifying these aspects of the unbound sheets. For further information on printing in the 1800s and earlier, see Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (1928; reprint, New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll, 1994), 22–23 (for registering), 19 and 45–46 (for the tympan), 66–70 (for half-sheet imposition), and 103 (for deckle edge).

9. I wish to thank Richard L. Anderson and Larry C. Porter for providing copies of Gilbert's 1892 statement. Scott Faulring provided access to some related documents; Matthew Empey, my research assistant, helped collect some of the information for this article. Don Enders also provided a helpful critique of this paper as well as some additional information.

# Historical Perspectives on the Kirtland Revelation Book

John A. Tvedtnes

In the LDS Church Archives is a manuscript record from the Kirtland era that is labeled Kirtland Revelations on the spine and Book of Revelations on the cover. However, it has come to be known as the Kirtland Revelation Book (KRB). It contains some 50 entries, 48 of them revelations.<sup>1</sup> Of these, 44 are in the Doctrine and Covenants.<sup>2</sup> For the most part, clear separators, consisting of lines or lines and strokes going across the entire page between two entries, separate the text. Exceptions occur when one entry ends at the bottom of a page and the next begins at the top of the following page. Corrections and notations to some of the revelations were subsequently added in Joseph Smith's handwriting. A later, smaller hand has written the relevant Doctrine and Covenants section numbers in the upper left-hand corner of most of the revelations (here noted with section numbers from the 1981 edition).

The notation *To go into the covenants* was added at the beginning of two of the revelations, Doctrine and Covenants 84 (p. 20) and 86 (p. 31). This evidently refers to the intention to include these revelations in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants, where they became sections 4 and 6, respectively.<sup>3</sup> It is surprising that the same notation was not added at the beginning of other revelations in the KRB. Scott Faulring has suggested that the KRB was used as a "printer's manuscript" for the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants.<sup>4</sup> Such a possibility is made plausible by the fact that all but three of the revelations recorded in the KRB were published in 1835.<sup>5</sup> Another evidence for this is that the KRB has a later notation added to the revelation on pages 60–61 (D&C 96) that became the heading for the revelation in the 1835 edition. The note is in the handwriting of Oliver Cowdery, who helped prepare that edition.<sup>6</sup>

The KRB has great importance for studying the physical preservation and textual development of the written revelations of Joseph Smith. Here, however, we shall concern ourselves with the implications of the book as a source for the revelations contained therein. Two questions readily present themselves: (1) During what time period were revelations actually recorded in the book, and (2) were any of the revelations originally recorded in the book, as opposed to being copied from earlier documents?

I believe that we can give at least partial answers to these questions to enlighten us on a number of issues. For example, some revelations have been assigned more than one date in different documents. In some cases, the KRB can help us determine the actual date a given revelation was received. This, along with information on which scribe recorded the revelation in the KRB,<sup>7</sup> can shed light on when the entry was made.

A manuscript table of contents (some call it an index) at the beginning of the book lists the page on which each revelation begins and, for some entries, the date it was received. This index lists the revelations down to page 31. This is followed by an indented entry for page 33, which actually describes the revelation (D&C 87) that begins on page 32. The entries for the two revelations that became Doctrine and Covenants 88 were later added to the list but inserted in the wrong position. Thus the entry for Doctrine and Covenants 88:1–126, which begins on page 33, was squeezed into the table of contents between the listings for pages 19 and 20, while the entry for Doctrine and Covenants 88:127–37, which begins on page 47, is squeezed into the listings for pages 18 and 19. The reason for this inconsistency is unclear.

The contents page had evidently been deliberately left blank to accommodate entries as revelations were added to the KRB. There is no consistency in the page number entries in the contents. The first, for example, reads “Page first.” The three entries for pages 10–11 are all preceded by “P,” while the rest have only the page number.

## KRB Entries

The table on pages 410–18 lists the date, pages, current Doctrine and Covenants section number, scribal hand, and notes associated with each of the KRB entries, including those found in the table of contents. The dates given on the contents page sometimes contradict the dates given at the beginning of the revelations themselves. I have noted in parentheses where they differ. Where either date differs from the one given in the current edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, the latter date is indicated in square brackets. Written text that was crossed out in the KRB is noted; the use of < > indicates an editorial correction made shortly after it was originally written, and [ ] indicates an expansion of an abbreviation. Initials for the scribes are as follows: FGW = Frederick G. Williams, JS = Joseph Smith, OH = Orson Hyde, OC = Oliver Cowdery, NI = not identified.

Table 1. Entries in the Kirtland Revelation Book

Date	Page(s)	D&C	Hand	Notes <sup>8</sup>
16 Feb 1832	1–10	76	FGW, JS	<p>Contents: “The Vision of Joseph and Sidney”</p> <p>At beginning: “The Vision”</p> <p>At end: “Sidney Rigdon/Joseph Smith Jr.,” in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams</p> <p>Many above-line additions and corrections in a different hand</p>
27 Feb 1832	10	–	FGW	<p>Contents: “A Revelation to Lincoln Hasskins”</p> <p>“X”ed out, probably to exclude from publication because Hasskins left the church.</p>
8 Mar 1832	10–11	–	FGW	<p>Contents: “Ordination of Jesse Gause &amp; his call to be councillor”</p> <p>Ordination of Sidney Rigdon and Jesse Gause as counselors, beginning “chose this day &amp; ordained.”<sup>9</sup></p>
1 Dec 1832	11–12	71	FGW	<p>Contents: “A commandment to Joseph and Sidney to go into the world and call upon the people to repent” (supralinear <del>and warn the people</del>)-</p>
[31] (contents: 1832)				
12 Mar 1832	12	79	FGW	<p>Contents: “A Revelation to Jared Carter”</p> <p>At beginning: “A revelation given to Jared Carter”</p>
7 Mar 1831	12–13	47	FGW, JS	<p>Contents: “A Revelation to John Whitmer calling him to be a hystorian to the church”</p>
(contents: 7 Mar 18312 )				
4 Dec 1831	13	72:1–8	JS	<p>Contents: “A Revelation given to choose a Bishop. N. K. Whitney was chosen &amp; was sanctioned by the Lord and also another in addition to the law making known the duty of the Bishop.” Beginning with “and also,” this entry describes the revelation that follows (see D&amp;C 72:9), with which it was combined to form D&amp;C 72.</p>
4 Dec 1831	13–15	72:9–26	JS, FGW	<p>For the contents description, see the previous revelation.</p>

1 Mar 1832	15–17	78	FGW	<p>Contents: “A Revelation given for Sidney Joseph &amp; Newel to go an[d] sit in council with the elders in Zion”</p> <p>Several corrections</p>
15 Mar 1832	17–18	81	FGW	<p>Contents: “Revelation to Jesse Gauze”</p> <p>In text, “Jesse” crossed out, supralinear “Frederick G. Williams added (verse 1)”</p>
7 Mar 1832 20 Mar 1832	18–19 19	80 –	FGW FGW	<p>Contents: “Revelation to Stephen Burnett”</p> <p>Contents: “A commandment to Joseph Sidney &amp; Newel to purchase pa-per and omit translating for the present time” “X”ed out</p>
29 Aug 1832	19–20	99	FGW	<p>Contents: “Revelation to John Murdock”</p> <p>At end: “by Joseph the seer—and written by—F. G. Williams Scribe”</p>
22–23 Sep 1832	20–31	84	FGW, JS	<p>“Revelation given to six Elders Sept 22 &amp; 23d of 1832 explaining the two priesthoods and commissioning the Apostles to preach the gospel”</p> <p>Note added at beginning: “To go into the covenants”</p> <p>At end: “F. G. Williams Scribe.”</p> <p>A few corrections</p> <p>A break in the KRB between what now constitute verses 102 and 103 seems to denote two parts to the revelation.<sup>10</sup></p>
6 Dec 1832	31–32	86	FGW	<p>Note added at beginning: “To go into the covenants”</p> <p>At beginning and in contents: “A Revelation explaining the parable of the wheat &amp; tears [sic]” (on p. 31, where supralinear “the” was added before “tears”)</p> <p>At end: “Kirtland December 6th AD 1832 given by Joseph the seer and written by Sidney the scribe and Councillor &amp; Transcribed by Frederick assistant scribe and councillor”</p>
25 Dec 1832	32–33	87	FGW	<p>Contents: “Prophecy given Dec 25 – 1832 concerning concerning the wars”</p> <p>At beginning: “A Propecy given Decm 25th 1832”</p> <p>At end: “Given by Joseph the Seer written by F G Williams”</p>
27 Dec 1832	33–46	88:1–126	FGW, JS	<p>Squeezed into contents between entries for pages 19 and 20: “A Rev given to the first Elders &amp;c”</p> <p>At beginning: “A Revelation given the first Elders of this Church of Christ in the last days Dec 27th 1832,” with supralinear “to” later</p>



inserted after "given"

At end: "Given by Joseph the seer and written by F. G. Williams  
assistan scribe and councillor to s[ai]d Joseph"

A number of corrections

3 Jan 1833 47–48 88:127– FGW Squeezed into contents between entries for pages 18 and 19: "A  
37 Revelation giving instructions how to regulate the Elders school"

At beginning: "Revelation given to organize for a pattern" At end:  
"Given by Joseph the seer and written by Frederick assistant scribe  
and Councillor"

27 Feb 1833 48–49 – FGW  
27 Feb 1833 49–51 89 FGW  
8 Mar 1833 51–55 90 FGW

At beginning: "Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated"  
At beginning: "A Revelation for the benefit of the saints &c"  
At end: "Geven by Joseph the seer and written by Frederick  
Councillor & Scribe"

An asterisk is inserted on p. 54 at the end of what became verse 28  
and, after end "scribe" notation, what now constitute verse 29 and  
the first half of verse 30 (to the word "Zion") has been added,  
probably in hand of FGW.

9 Mar 1833 55 91 FGW  
15 Mar 1833 55 92 FGW  
6 May 1833 56–59 93 OH  
1 Jun 1833 59–60 95 OH  
4 Jun 1833 60–61 96 OH

At beginning: "A Revelation given concerning Apocrypha"  
A few corrections  
A few corrections  
A few corrections  
A scrap of paper was added between pages 60 and 61, with the  
notation, "Revelation given Enoch showing the order of the city or  
stake of Zion, Shinehah, given for a sample to the saints in  
Kirtland June 1833," in the hand of OC.<sup>11</sup>

A few corrections

2 Aug 1833 61–64 97 FGW

At beginning: "The word of the Lord unto Joseph Sidney and  
Frederick"

A few corrections

2 Aug 1833 64–66 94 FGW

6 Aug 1833 66–71 98 JS, FGW

Note squeezed in at end in different hand: "These two houses are  
not to be built till I give you a commandment concerning them."  
After an aborted attempt to add omitted text on page 69 (the  
latter part of verse 29 and all of verse 30), an asterisk was  
inserted after the words "fourth generation" in what now  
constitutes verse 29. The missing text to be inserted at this point  
was written on a scrap of paper that was added to the KRB  
between pages 68 and 69, in an unidentified hand.

A few corrections

12 Oct 1833 71–72 100 OC

At beginning: "A Revelation to Joseph and Sidney given them  
while on their journey to Canada, according to direction of the  
Spirit"

Some corrections

[16 Dec 1833]	73–83	101	FGW	A few corrections
Oct 1830	83–84	32	FGW	At beginning: "Revelation to Parley Pratt to go to the wilderness"
Nov 1831	84–86	107:59–92, 99–100	FGW	At beginning: "Revelation given November 1831 Cuyahoga Co Ohio regulating the Presidency of the Church"

Between what now constitute verses 84 and 85, no real break is shown, but a new paragraph begins.

30 Oct 1831	87	65	FGW	At beginning, "May" was written over an original "August"
20 May 1831	87–89	51	FGW	At beginning: "Revelation given in independence July th 20 1831 shewing that to be the place of the city of Zion and the gathering"
20 July 1831	89–91	57	FGW	At beginning: "Revelation given May 1831 in Kirtland concerning the farm owned by Frederick and also concerning Joseph & Ezra"
May 1831	91–92	–	FGW	At beginning: "Revelation given May 1831 in Kirtland concerning the farm owned by Frederick and also concerning Joseph & Ezra"
30 Apr 1832	93	83	FGW	One correction
4 Feb 1831	93–94	41	FGW	At beginning: "A Commandment given February 4th, 1831 to choose A Bishop &c"
[Jan 1832]	94–95	74:2–7	FGW	At beginning: "An explanation of the 14th verse of the 7 chap. of the first corinthians"
[25] Oct 1831	95–97	66	FGW	At beginning: "Rev To Wm E. McLelin"

At end: "A Revelation given to William E McLelin a true descendant from Joseph that was sold into Egypt down through the loins of Ephraim his son"

22 June 1834	97–100	105	OC	A few corrections
23 Apr 1834	100–107	104	OH	At beginning: "Revelation given April 23d – 1834 appointing to each member of the united firm their Stewardship"

At end: "Recorded by O. Hyde 18 Augt. 1834 upon this Book"

A few corrections

24 Feb 1834	108–11	103	OH	At end: "Recorded on this book by O. Hyde 18 Augt 1834"
-------------	--------	-----	----	---

A few corrections

28 Apr 1834	111	–	OH	At end: "Recorded on this book by O. Hyde 27 Augt. 1834"
17 Feb 1834	111–15	102	OH	At beginning: "To go into the covenants"

At end: "Orson Hyde / Oliver Cowdery } Clerks"

A few corrections

25 Nov 1834	116	106	OC	A few corrections
[Jan 1832]	117	74:2–7	NI	At beginning: "An explanation of the 14 verse of the 7th chapt of first Corinthians"
23 Feb 1831	117–18	42:74–77	NI	Half page left blank at end; very unusual for the KRB
[June 1829]	119–20	17	NI	At beginning: "A Revelation to Oliver David & Martin Given Fayett, Seneca Co. New York given previous to them having a view of the plates &c." The last names of the three men have been added supralinearly.

A few corrections

In order to determine when the Kirtland Revelation Book was begun and which (if any) of its entries were made at the time of the revelation (rather than copied from earlier documents), we must examine the scribal clues in the book.

1. The first entry (p. 1) is dated 16 February 1832, so the book cannot have been started before that time. Since the handwriting is that of Frederick G. Williams, the book must have come into use after he became a scribe to Joseph Smith on 20 July 1832.<sup>12</sup>

2. The revelation on pages 17–18 was originally addressed to Jesse Gause, whose name has been crossed out in the KRB, and substituted by that of Frederick G. Williams. It is likely that this was written into the KRB before Gause was dropped as a counselor to Joseph Smith. The note on pages 10–11 concerns the ordination of Sidney Rigdon and Jesse Gause as counselors, though written in the hand of Frederick G. Williams. Gause was excommunicated in December 1832 and replaced by Frederick G. Williams.

3. A number of the revelations were written by “F. G. Williams,” which may imply that they were recorded in the KRB as Joseph Smith dictated them. These possibly contemporaneous entries are dated as follows:

<b>29 August 1832</b>	<b>(pp. 19–20)</b>
<b>25 December 1832</b>	<b>(pp. 32–33)</b>
<b>27 December 1832</b>	<b>(pp. 33–46)</b>
<b>3 January 1833</b>	<b>(pp. 47–48)</b>
<b>8 March 1833</b>	<b>(pp. 51–55)</b>
<b>2 August 1833</b>	<b>(pp. 61–64)</b>

Significantly, all these entries postdate Williams’s official call as scribe on 20 July 1832.<sup>13</sup>

4. The revelation of 29 August 1832 (pp. 19–20) is signed “F. G. Williams Scribe.” It is the first such notation in the KRB and belongs to the first revelation in the book received after Williams’s call as scribe on 20 July 1832. Consequently, it is quite likely a contemporary account.

5. At least one revelation (D&C 86), dated 6 December 1832 (pp. 31–32), appears to have been taken from dictation by Sidney Rigdon (“scribe and Councillor”) and then “transcribed by Frederick assistant scribe and councillor” in the KRB. It has usually been thought that, since Frederick G. Williams’s predecessor, Jesse Gause, was excommunicated in December 1832, Williams must have become Joseph Smith’s counselor in either December 1832 or January 1833. This need not be so, however; Gause may have been released even before his excommunication, when his apostasy began to be evident.

6. For the revelations of 6 December 1832 (pp. 31–32), 27 December 1832 (pp. 33–46), and 3 January 1833 (pp. 47–48), Williams signed as “assistant scribe and councillor.”<sup>14</sup> He may have already been a counselor to Joseph Smith by the time of these revelations, making them contemporaneous entries.

7. The revelation of 8 March 1833 (pp. 51–55) was written by “Frederick Councillor & Scribe.” This is, in fact, the revelation that confirmed his calling as a counselor (verse 6).

8. The revelations of May and June 1833 (pp. 56–61) are in the hand of Orson Hyde, while the revelation of 12 October 1833 (pp. 71–72) is in the hand of Oliver Cowdery. Significantly, on 6 June 1833, “a conference of High Priests assembled, and chose Orson Hyde a clerk to the Presidency of the High Priesthood,”<sup>15</sup> so it is likely that the May–June revelations were copied into the KRB after that time. Frederick G. Williams had written all the other materials through the first part of page 97. Williams was listed in a First Presidency decision of 4 May<sup>16</sup> and

is thought to be the scribe in whose handwriting the revelation of 6 May (D&C 93) was written on a separate sheet of paper from which it may have been copied onto KRB, pages 56–59, by Orson Hyde.<sup>17</sup>

9. The revelation on pages 71–72, dated 12 October 1833, is in the hand of Oliver Cowdery, though pages 61–71 and 73–97 were written by Frederick G. Williams. Oliver arrived at Kirtland from Missouri on 9 August.<sup>18</sup> On 11 September he met with Joseph, Frederick, Sidney, and Bishop Whitney in Kirtland.<sup>19</sup> Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon had traveled to Canada on 5 October.<sup>20</sup> Oliver had gone to New York on church business four days earlier.<sup>21</sup> Joseph and Sidney returned to Kirtland on 4 November,<sup>22</sup> so Oliver could not have recorded this revelation earlier than that date (see the note at the beginning of the entry). Frederick G. Williams appears to have been in town at the time, however, for on 10 October he wrote a letter to Zion from Kirtland.<sup>23</sup> Though Orson Hyde had been appointed clerk to the Presidency on 6 June (and had written three of the revelations, in KRB, pp. 56–61), he had gone to Missouri, arriving there about 28 September.<sup>24</sup> He did not return until 25 November 1833.<sup>25</sup>

10. The revelation on pages 97–100 is in the hand of Oliver Cowdery. It is preceded by a number of revelations (pp. 73–97) entered by Frederick G. Williams and is followed by four revelations (pp. 100–115) entered by Orson Hyde. The revelation written into the KRB by Oliver Cowdery had been revealed during the Zion’s Camp march on 22 June 1834 and was later entered into the record. Oliver Cowdery and Frederick G. Williams had been chosen clerks at the conference held 3 May,<sup>26</sup> and Oliver was clerk at the council held in Kirtland on 11 August.<sup>27</sup> He had remained in Kirtland with Sidney Rigdon when Joseph and Frederick went with Zion’s Camp to Missouri in early May.<sup>28</sup> Since Joseph arrived in Kirtland about 1 August,<sup>29</sup> the revelation could not have been recorded into the KRB before that time. It may have been written during the week of 21 August, when Frederick G. Williams was in Cleveland.<sup>30</sup> Williams was not present for the council of 23 August, which was attended by Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and Orson Hyde.<sup>31</sup>

11. The revelations on pages 100–111 are in the hand of Orson Hyde and are followed by the minutes of the first high council meeting (pp. 111–15), also in the hand of Orson Hyde, though he and Oliver Cowdery are listed as “Clerks.” The revelation on page 116 is in the hand of Oliver Cowdery. From the wording at the end of each of the entries by Orson Hyde, it is clear that he was copying the revelations from another source. He dates his work to 18 and 27 August. Orson and Oliver were chosen clerks at the high council meeting of 30 August.<sup>32</sup> They had also been clerks at the organization of the first high council on 17 February 1834,<sup>33</sup> as noted at the end of the entry for Doctrine and Covenants 102 on page 115.

## **A Chronological Analysis**

For purposes of historical analysis, we can divide the Kirtland Revelation Book as follows:

*Pages 1–19a.* Most of these revelations date to the period February–March 1832 (pp. 1–11a, 12b–13a, 15b–19a), while the rest are from the previous December (pp. 11b–12a, 13b–15a). As the KRB was begun, these apparently were added to the book from other (perhaps original) copies, possibly kept on single sheets. They were written after Frederick G. Williams had been appointed scribe to the Prophet Joseph Smith, though Joseph Smith’s hand is seen in some of the revelations. Joseph Smith, when introducing Doctrine and Covenants 79 (KRB, p. 12), indicated that Sidney Rigdon was his scribe. The revelations on pages 13–15 (D&C 72), received only three days

later (4 December 1831), were probably originally recorded by Sidney as well. I suspect that the revelation on pages 1–10 (D&C 76), bearing, at the end, the names Sidney and Joseph<sup>34</sup> (who received the vision, as noted in verse 11), was also originally recorded elsewhere by Rigdon.<sup>35</sup>

*Pages 19b–83b.* The revelations given between 29 August 1832 and 16 December 1833 are in chronological order and were hence probably recorded at the time they were received or shortly thereafter, except for the ones on pages 51–55 (D&C 90), 66–71 (D&C 98), and 71–72 (D&C 100), as explained below. With a few exceptions, all the revelations are in the hand of Frederick G. Williams. Orson Hyde wrote the entries of May and June 1833 (pp. 56–61a), while Oliver Cowdery was scribe for the revelation of 12 October 1833 (pp. 71b–72). The entry made by Oliver Cowdery is “a revelation to Joseph and Sidney given them while on their journey to Canada.” These two, along with Freeman Nickerson, left on their Canadian mission on 5 October 1833<sup>36</sup> and returned 1 November 1833.<sup>37</sup> It is uncertain whether the revelation was actually recorded on 12 October<sup>38</sup> or whether it was dictated after Joseph returned to Kirtland, but its inclusion in the KRB in the hand of Oliver Cowdery must postdate 1 November.

In addition to the chronological order of the revelations in this group, additional evidence implies that the KRB entries may be contemporary records. Sidney Rigdon and Joseph Smith lived in Hiram, Ohio, until they were attacked by a mob in the last days of March 1832, whereupon Sidney moved to Kirtland, then to nearby Chardon. On 1 April Joseph left for Missouri, with a detour to Wheeling, Virginia, to purchase paper for the church press in Zion.<sup>39</sup> On his return, he settled in Kirtland “some time in June.”<sup>40</sup> On 20 July Frederick G. Williams was called to be the Prophet’s scribe. Significantly, most of the revelations recorded on the first nineteen pages of the KRB were received in Hiram. Beginning with the revelation on page 20, through page 71, received during the period of September 1832 through August 1833, Kirtland is listed as the place of recording. Since Williams lived on a farm just outside Kirtland, he could readily have recorded these original revelations in the KRB or copied them into the KRB soon after their original dictation.<sup>41</sup>

A slight problem arises with the revelation on pages 19–20, which, according to the KRB, was received in Hiram on 29 August 1832. We have no record of Joseph returning to Hiram at this time, though he may have gone there to move his family to Kirtland. And since John Murdock, to whom the revelation is addressed, did not live in Hiram (his latest known residence being Orange, where the twins adopted by Joseph and Emma Smith were born), one wonders whether the revelation was actually given at Hiram. If so, then its inclusion in the KRB is probably not a contemporaneous record, since Frederick G. Williams lived near Kirtland.

For the revelation known as Doctrine and Covenants 84, recorded on pages 20–31, a clear break of a full line between what now constitute verses 102 (ending in “Amen”) and 103 (p. 29) is present. The words *And again* at the beginning of verse 103 are used throughout Joseph Smith’s revelations to mark places where the Lord gave him supplementary information to a previous revelation, usually the same day, after a break. That the whole was considered a single revelation is indicated by the fact that, for this revelation, no date or other heading appears before Doctrine and Covenants 84:103 and no division marker occurs until page 31. Since a note at the end of the revelation declares that it was “given by Joseph the seer and written by Sidney the scribe and Councillor and transcribed by Frederick assistant scribe and councillor,” it seems clear that what we have in the KRB is a copy, not an original. The second part of the revelation (verses 102–20) may have been on a separate sheet of paper, but Williams was told that it was supplementary to the earlier revelation. A similar phenomenon occurs for the revelation from Doctrine and Covenants 107, on pages 84–86. Between our current verses 84 and 85, no real break appears, but a new paragraph begins with the words *And again*.

Evidence indicates that the revelation (D&C 90) on pages 51–55 was copied into the KRB and did not originate with it. At the end of what became verse 28, an asterisk was inserted on page 54, and the text of what now constitute verse 29 and the first half of verse 30 (to the word *Zion*) was added in very small handwriting at the end of the revelation (p. 55). Since verse 28 ends with the word *Zion*, it seems clear that this is a case of *homoioteleuton*, in which, during copying, Williams’s eyes inadvertently jumped from the word *Zion* in what is now verse 28 to the same word in what is now verse 29, resulting in the inadvertent omission of the intervening words.

The same phenomenon is found in the revelation (D&C 98) on pages 66–71. After the words *fourth generation* in what became verse 29 (in the middle of page 69), the scribe’s eye skipped to these same words at the end of our verse 30 and wrote *Nevertheless*, the first word in verse 31. When the error was noted, an attempt to correct it on the page was made by first erasing *nevertheless*, then by beginning to add the missing words supralinearly. It soon became apparent that the space was inadequate to squeeze these in, so the added words were crossed out. In their place, a scrap of paper was attached to the KRB between pages 68 and 69 that supplied all the missing words beginning with *I have delivered* in verse 29 through *nevertheless* in verse 31. An asterisk in the original text refers us to the additional wording. Again, the scribal error and subsequent correction are evidence that the revelation was not written into the KRB from dictation.

Despite the three revelations that were clearly not original to the KRB, the chronological order of the revelations on pages 19b–83a suggests that they represent the time period (August 1832 through December 1833) during which the KRB was in active use as the book in which revelations were recorded as dictated by the Prophet Joseph Smith.

*Pages 83b–97a.* After the end of 1833, a number of earlier revelations (mostly from 1830 and 1831) were added to the KRB in the hand of Frederick G. Williams. Two revelations within these pages (pp. 93a and 94a–95b) date from the early part of 1832, before the KRB was begun.

*Pages 97b–116.* The 1834 revelations are not in sequence, and all but the first and last (both in the hand of Oliver Cowdery) were recorded “[up]on this book” by Orson Hyde, during the month of August 1834, as he clearly confirms. They had probably been originally recorded on loose sheets and then transcribed into the KRB by Hyde. This is evidenced by the fact that, though these revelations date from February through June 1834, the KRB specifically states that three of them were recorded in the book during the month of August. This was the year of Zion’s Camp, which could explain why the revelations were not placed in the book at the time they were received or soon thereafter. This implies the KRB was not taken to Missouri by the Prophet and hence had to be updated when he returned to Kirtland. By this time, it would appear that Frederick G. Williams was no longer scribe to Joseph Smith.

*Pages 117b–120.* The last entries in the KRB are recordings of two revelations from 1831 and 1829, both received before the book was begun.

## Conclusions

Robert J. Woodford wrote that “the non-consecutive order of the revelations in the book is an indication that this is not the original source for at least some of the revelations in it.”<sup>42</sup> In fact, nineteen of the revelations, covering some 74 (62%) of the 120 pages in the KRB *are* in consecutive (chronological) order and recorded in the same scribal hand, that of Frederick G. Williams, who was, during that time period, Joseph Smith’s scribe.<sup>43</sup> The fact that

these are in a large block in the middle portion of the book suggests that the nonsequential revelations were secondary to the production of the KRB.

When the work was begun, earlier revelations were recorded, in random order, on the first eighteen and one-half pages. After the chronological sequence on pages 19b–83a, Frederick G. Williams copied ten earlier revelations into the KRB, also in random order, on pages 83b– 97a. Then follows an entry by Oliver Cowdery (pp. 97b– 100a), four by Orson Hyde (pp. 100b–115), and another by Oliver Cowdery (p. 116). No further entries were made until the Nauvoo era, when James Mulholland became Joseph Smith’s scribe.

Three of Orson Hyde’s entries into the KRB (pp. 100b– 111a) indicate that they were made on two dates, 18 and 27 August 1834. This means that Frederick G. Williams’s last contemporaneous entry was 16 December 1833 (pp. 73– 83a), followed by his recording of earlier revelations in the KRB. This may be significant. The next revelation in sequence is Doctrine and Covenants 102 (KRB, p. 111a–115), the minutes of the organization of the high council at Kirtland, 17 February 1834. As noted at the end of the KRB entry (p. 115) and at the end of Doctrine and Covenants 102, Oliver Cowdery and Orson Hyde served as clerks at that time. It is therefore not surprising to see them as the scribes who recorded all the 1834 revelations into the KRB (pp. 97b– 116). Evidently, Williams now devoted his full attention to his call as Joseph Smith’s second counselor, and the work he had begun in the Kirtland Revelation Book was at an end.

The evidence for contemporaneity of entries postdating Frederick G. Williams’s call to serve as scribe to Joseph Smith seems strong. Contemporaneity, however, need not imply that the revelations were written down in the KRB as Joseph Smith originally dictated them. The KRB entries may have been made immediately or soon after the revelations were dictated and recorded elsewhere. Indeed, as we have seen, clear evidence indicates that at least three of the 1832–33 revelations in the hand of Frederick G. Williams were copied into the KRB from an earlier source.<sup>44</sup> But it is likely that all or most of the other revelations from that time period are also secondary to the KRB, for none of them exhibits the kind of scribal corrections one would expect in manuscripts prepared from dictation.<sup>45</sup>

If, in fact, the KRB contains secondary entries, many of them contemporaneous or nearly contemporaneous with the original dictation, what was its purpose? I suggest that the principal reason was preservation of the writings. Single pieces of paper could be readily misplaced or stolen.<sup>46</sup> Having a second copy in the KRB would be a natural step in safeguarding the revelations. It would also facilitate the preparation of a subsequent published collection of Joseph Smith’s revelations, the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants.

## Notes

I am indebted to Scott Faulring for his critique of this article and for his valuable suggestions.

1. The first of the two entries that are not revelations, on pages 10– 11, appears to be a diary entry noting the ordination of Joseph Smith’s counselors. The second, on pages 48–49, is said to be a song “sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated.”

2. The revelation known as Doctrine and Covenants 74 is found twice in the KRB, on pages 94–95 and 117. Some of the separate entries in the KRB were combined to form a single section in the Doctrine and Covenants. It has been shown that in some cases we are dealing with what was intended to be a single revelation dictated in two or three sittings.

3. The words *To go into the covenants* reflect the fact that the “doctrine” part of the original Doctrine and Covenants comprised the *Lectures on Faith* prepared for the Kirtland school of the prophets and the “covenants” portion referred to the revelations. An earlier collection of Joseph Smith’s revelations had been published in 1833 under the name Book of Commandments, a title still reflected in the preface to the Doctrine and Covenants (see D&C 1:6).

4. Scott Faulring, conversation with author.

5. The three revelations appearing in the KRB but not published in 1835 are Doctrine and Covenants 87 (KRB, pp. 32–33), 105 (KRB, pp. 97–100), and 103 (KRB, pp. 108–11). Only three of the KRB revelations appeared in the 1833 Book of Commandments (BC), many of the unpublished ones having been received after the cutoff date for that publication; those three revelations are Doctrine and Covenants 47 (BC 50; KRB, pp. 12–13); 41 (BC 43; KRB, pp. 93–94); and 42:74–77 (BC 47:21–24; KRB, pp. 117–18). All three had been received in February and March 1831, a year before the KRB was begun, and were later copied into the book.

6. Some of the later corrections to the KRB entries may have been made with the intention of including them in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants. Because this present study is only minimally concerned with textual emendation, I have not pursued this matter.

7. The handwriting studies were summarized by Earl E. Olson, “The Chronology of the Ohio Revelations,” *BYU Studies* 11/4 (1971): 332–33, and in the typed index to the “Kirtland Revelations” in the LDS Church Historical Department.

8. In most cases, I have omitted dates given at the beginning and end of the entries, since these are noted in the first column.

9. Faulring thinks of this as a “diary entry” and notes that, at the time in question, Joseph Smith had not as yet begun his 1832 diary.

10. The revelation may actually have been received in three segments. The KRB indicates that it was “given the 22 & 23d of Sept 1832” to “Joseph and six Elders” (p. 20), the preface being preserved as verse 1 of Doctrine and Covenants 84. But in what now constitutes verse 42, after “this day,” the KRB reads “viz 23d day of September AD 1832 Eleven High Priests save one” (p. 24). Somewhere between these two verses, Joseph moved from a meeting with six elders to a meeting with eleven high priests. It is not clear at what point the new material was recorded, for no break occurs in the text. But knowing the pattern usually followed in Joseph Smith’s revelations, it may have come at verse 29, which begins, “And again.”

11. It is unclear when Oliver Cowdery added this notation, whether while serving as scribe for the KRB entries or when he assisted in the preparation of the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants. In any event, the wording on the scrap of paper became the heading for this revelation in that edition, where it became section 96.

12. Faulring has suggested in a conversation with the author that Williams may have acted as scribe even earlier. He notes that an unpublished handwritten statement by Williams indicating that he had begun writing for Joseph Smith on 20 July 1832 implies that this is the date from which he was to be paid by the Prophet, being in his “employ,” leaving open the question of whether he provided scribal services gratis before that date. But the text makes it clear that he “commenced writing for Joseph” on that date. Moreover, the first KRB entry for which Williams signed as “scribe” (pp. 19–20) is also the first in the KRB to postdate the 20 July appointment to that



position, and is dated 29 August 1832. For the present, I lean toward the date I have given here and will leave it to Faulring to argue his case elsewhere.

13. Faulring's view has implications for the contemporaneity of entries recorded in the KRB. He notes that many of the early revelations, including the first, are in chronological order:

D&C 76 (pp. 1–10)	16 February 1832
uncanonized (p. 10)	27 February 1832
diary entry (pp. 10–11)	8 March 1832
D&C 79 (p. 12)	12 March 1832
D&C 81 (pp. 17–18)	15 March 1832
uncanonized (p. 19)	20 March 1832

Using this scenario, the 1831 revelations found scattered between these pages were being added to the KRB, copied from earlier documents. Faulring's suggestion is certainly plausible, but I am concerned by the fact that two of the 1832 revelations are out of sequence. These are Doctrine and Covenants 78 (dated 1 March 1832, pp. 15–17) and 80 (dated 7 March 1832, pp. 18–19), which not only follow later revelations recorded on pp. 12 and 17–18, but are separated by a revelation (D&C 81) dated 15 March 1832 (pp. 17–18). While it is not impossible that the revelations that became Doctrine and Covenants 78 and 80 were recorded belatedly, their disruption of the sequence suggests other possibilities.

14. It may be significant that Williams's first notations of his position, accompanying the revelations of 29 August and 22–23 September 1832, indicate that he was the "scribe" (pp. 20, 31), while in the revelations of 6 December 1832 and 3 January 1833, he calls himself "assistant scribe and councillor" (pp. 32, 48). The change may reflect the designation of Sidney Rigdon (who is called "scribe and Councillor" in the revelation of 6 December 1832, p. 32) as first counselor and Williams as second. However, in the revelation of 8 March 1833, Williams calls himself "Counsellor & Scribe," the last time he uses either title in the KRB. Indeed, it is the last time he expressly credits himself with having recorded a revelation in the KRB.

15. *History of the Church*, 1:353.

16. See *ibid.*, 343.

17. The manuscript copy is in the Newel K. Whitney collection at Brigham Young University. See Robert J. Woodford, "The Historical Development of the Doctrine and Covenants" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1974), 1208.

18. According to *History of the Church*, 1:407, Oliver returned on 21 August. But Faulring, in a conversation with the author, has noted that Oliver Cowdery wrote a letter from Kirtland to the brethren in Zion on 10 August, in which he records that he had arrived the previous day.

19. See *History of the Church*, 1:409.

20. See *ibid.*, 416.

21. See *ibid.*, 418.

22. See *ibid.*, 422.

23. See *ibid.*, 417.

24. See *ibid.*, 410.

25. See *ibid.*, 446.

26. See *ibid.*, 2:62–63.

27. See *ibid.*, 142–44.

28. See *ibid.*, 64.

29. See *ibid.*, 139.

30. See *ibid.*, 146.

31. See *ibid.*, 147.

32. See *ibid.*, 160.

33. See *ibid.*, 34–35.

34. These are not signatures, for they are in the hand of Frederick G. Williams. The original from which he copied the revelation into the KRB may have borne the actual signatures of Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon.

35. See *History of the Church*, 1:245.

36. See *ibid.*, 416.

37. See *ibid.*, 422.

38. See *ibid.*, 419–21. If the revelation was recorded during the Canada trip, the original would have been written by Joseph, Sidney, or Freeman Nickerson.

39. See *ibid.*, 1:265–66.

40. *Ibid.*, 272.

41. Faulring has suggested in a conversation with the author that Williams may have gone to Hiram to record revelations into the KRB before July 1832. It is, of course, possible that Williams spent all or part of February and March 1832 in Hiram, writing for Joseph Smith. This would probably not have interfered with planting crops on his own farm in Kirtland, which farming activities presumably would have begun after the month of March. He could even have gone to Hiram in August to record the KRB entry on pages 19–20, a revelation said to have been given at Hiram. But the evidence for Williams's presence in Hiram is lacking.

42. Woodford, "Historical Development of the Doctrine and Covenants," 98.

43. If Faulring's assessment is correct, an even larger portion of the KRB reflects a chronological sequence for most of the entries beginning in February 1832, interspersed with the addition of earlier revelations in the earlier and latter portions of the manuscript.

44. These are Doctrine and Covenants 84 (KRB, pp. 20–31), 90 (KRB, pp. 51–55), and 98 (KRB, pp. 66–71).

45. For a discussion of the criteria for determining manuscripts prepared from dictation, see Royal Skousen, “John Gilbert’s 1892 Account of the 1830 Printing of the Book of Mormon,” pages 383–405 in this volume.

46. Faulring has shown me evidence that some early records kept by Joseph Smith were, in fact, stolen, but I shall leave it to him to present this elsewhere. See Scott Faulring, “Symonds Ryder,” *Mormon History Association Newsletter* 103 (fall 1996): 3–5.

# Oliver Cowdery's 1835 Response to Alexander Campbell's 1831 "Delusions"

John W. Welch

All his life, Richard Lloyd Anderson has set an important example for many Latter-day Saint scholars and students. His emphasis on documentary research—locating and analyzing the best primary sources—has become the hallmark of his scholarship, with respect to both the New Testament and early Mormon history. As an undergraduate and graduate student in his ancient history and Greek New Testament classes, I learned firsthand to appreciate his skills in working with texts, in forensically evaluating claims of various scholars, and in providing substantial arguments in support of the commonsense, mainstream views of the central events in the history of the church from the time of Christ to the era of Joseph Smith. The present study deals with a little-known editorial written by Oliver Cowdery in the 1830s.<sup>1</sup> By contributing to this volume in Richard Anderson's honor, I hope to pay tribute to him, to his attention to historical documents, and to his devoted defenses of the characters and concepts that are crucial to the restoration of the gospel in these the latter days.

## The First Substantive Attack on the Book of Mormon

As early as February 1831, a barrage of incendiary criticisms against the Book of Mormon was published by a Baptist minister, greeting the first of the Saints as they moved into the Kirtland, Ohio, area. The author of that onslaught was Alexander Campbell (1788–1866), a potent preacher, lecturer, and philosopher who took part in contemporary debates; ran two newspapers (*Christian Baptist* and *Millennial Harbinger*); organized and led the largest indigenous Protestant group in the New World (the Campbellites); became the founder, first president, and professor of Bethany College; and crusaded for a new basis of Christian unity.<sup>2</sup> “During his life he sought to bring essential religious beliefs and the philosophically novel ideas of his contemporaries into some kind of intellectual harmony.”<sup>3</sup>

The *Millennial Harbinger*, launched on 4 January 1830, was the second and larger of the two papers published and contributed to by Campbell. On its masthead was the text of Revelation 14:6–7. Living and working in northern Ohio, Campbell indicated that the comprehensive object of the magazine was to be “devoted to the destruction of sectarianism, infidelity, and antichristian doctrine and practice. It shall have for its object the development and introduction of that political and religious order of society called The Millennium, which will be the consummation of that ultimate amelioration of society proposed in the Christian Scriptures.”<sup>4</sup> Campbell then listed nine objectives of the magazine that were based on an interest in proclaiming fundamental gospel truth and discrediting those organizations that wandered from that path.<sup>5</sup>

On 10 February 1831, the *Millennial Harbinger* carried a lengthy article by Campbell entitled “Delusions.” The piece reviewed the Book of Mormon and proceeded to develop a number of arguments against its authenticity. This article was published less than a year after the Book of Mormon first appeared in March 1830, and it ran only a few weeks after the conversion of Sidney Rigdon, a Campbellite minister also living near the soon-to-become-Mormon Kirtland, Ohio. Though Campbell probably had only a few weeks to read the Book of Mormon and to write his response, he covered most of the areas of criticism still in use by anti-Mormons against the Book of Mormon today.

Campbell began his article by taking insulting jabs at the Book of Mormon as he rehearsed the history of the Nephites: He called the book a romance: “This romance—but this is for it a name too innocent” (p. 86). This label still pops up from time to time in anti-Mormon literature. Campbell exaggerated the claims made by the Book of Mormon. According to Campbell, “Lehi was a greater prophet than any of the Jewish prophets, and uttered *all the events* of the Christian era, and developed the records of Matthew, Luke and John 600 years before John the Baptist was born” (p. 87, emphasis added). He glibly affixed oversimplified classifications: “The Nephites were good Christians, believers in the doctrines of the Calvinists and Methodists” (p. 87). And so on: Nephi preached “every thing which is now preached in the state of New York” (p. 87); Mormon was no Quaker—he commanded 42,000 men (see p. 89); God is the same—“consequently, must always create suns, moons, and stars, every day!!” (p. 90)—not such a bad idea. After his cursory overview of the Book of Mormon, Campbell presented a number of evidences that he thought worked against Joseph Smith’s story: “Admitting the Bible now received to have come from God,” Campbell asserted, “it is impossible that the book of Mormon came from the same Author” as the Bible (p. 91)—which conclusion at least ignores the fact that the Bible was actually written by many authors.

Despite the sarcasm and occasional misunderstanding, Campbell gave a fairly accurate synopsis and detailed overview of the historical contents of the Book of Mormon. Though the book was quite new, Campbell obviously had read much of it in a very short time.

The body of his attack presents a parade of evidences that he thought invalidated Joseph Smith’s story. Campbell argued that because the following “internal evidences” were contrary to his understanding of the Bible, the claim of the Book of Mormon to have come from the same God as the Bible had to be false:

1. According to scripture, God gave Levi all rights to the priesthood and Aaron all rights to the high priesthood, forever. Even Jesus, said Campbell, “were he on earth, could not be a priest; for he was of a tribe concerning which Moses spake nothing of priesthood” (p. 91). The result of Korah’s rebellion against the priesthood in Numbers 16, Campbell asserted, was that no one except Levites can ever hold the priesthood. Campbell was disturbed that Lehi offered sacrifices and that Nephi was a priest and consecrated others as priests, built a temple, and made “a new priesthood which God approbates” (p. 91). Campbell was concerned that the tribe of Joseph, which supposedly followed the law of Moses, could have a new priesthood. He held that such a development would make God a liar—effectively repudiating his promises to the tribe of Levi (see p. 92).

2. Campbell saw a problem in the existence of a second Promised Land. If reprobate Jews had departed from the Holy Land on their own initiative and had gone off to another land and built another temple, that would be tolerable, because it would not implicate God in the process. But to think that God would command Lehi to depart from the land which God himself had sworn to their fathers was their promised land was a “monstrous” error (p. 92), in Campbell’s mind.

3. He also believed Lehi violated the law by separating a family from the nation of Israel (see Deuteronomy 29:21), and he concluded incredulously that the Book of Mormon depicts Lehi as doing better out in the desert than the best Israelite ever did living “under the best of all governments!!!” (p. 92).

4. Campbell criticized the Book of Mormon for seeming to claim there were more Jews in the New World than in Judah, that the scepter had departed from Judah, and that King Benjamin in the Book of Mormon was wiser than Solomon in the Bible (see p. 92).

5. The Book of Mormon, contrary to every precept of the law of Moses, told of temple worship in the new land. Campbell accused the Nephites of never being sad about being cut off from the main group and never having

looked back to Jerusalem and to God's temple. Even Jews in captivity looked to Jerusalem, but the Nephites, in their "wig wam temple" enjoyed God's presence in a foreign land—even though God's only house of prayer stood in Jerusalem (see p. 92). Campbell claimed that the Book of Mormon portrayed the Nephites as subverting the law of Moses, even though Malachi and Moses commanded the Jews to keep the law until the Messiah should come (see pp. 92–93).

6. The Book of Mormon, according to Campbell, besides distorting God's laws and commandments, also proved to be ignorant of the New Testament (see p. 93). In Ephesians 3:5, Paul reserved for the apostles the first right of announcing certain secrets that were disclosed by Nephi regarding the blessing of gentiles. Paul said that those things were "not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets" (Ephesians 3:5). Campbell also concluded that the Book of Mormon was betrayed by its portrayal of the geography of Judea (see p. 93). It claimed that John baptized in the village of Bethabara (see 1 Nephi 10:9; John 1:28 is not so clear) and—Campbell misstates—that Jesus was born in Jerusalem (see Alma 7:10).

7. Campbell was surprised that the Book of Mormon contained sections that discussed—according to his topic headings—infant baptism, ordination, the Trinity, regeneration, repentance, justification, the fall of man, the atonement, transubstantiation, fasting, penance, church government, religious experience, the call to the ministry, general resurrection, eternal punishment, who may baptize, the right of man, and apostasy. He claimed that phrases such as "your own eternal welfare," "salvation is free," "everlasting salvation of your souls," "an infinite atonement," "flesh must go to mother earth," and "death must deliver up its dead" (p. 94) reflected the New York background of Joseph Smith and confirmed the book's falseness. He concluded that it must have been easy for Joseph Smith to "prophecy [*sic*] of the past or of the present time" (p. 93).

8. Pre-Christian Jewish-Christianity was claimed by the Book of Mormon. Campbell observed that the Nephite-Jews were called Christians (see Alma 46:14–15), that the resurrection of Jesus was known to them, that they believed the Great Creator would die for all men, and that they knew his name would be called Jesus Christ (see 2 Nephi 10:3).

9. "I could swear that this book was written by one man," said Campbell (p. 93). He criticized its uniform style, calling Joseph Smith, who names himself the author on the title page, a very ignorant man (see p. 93). He said the phrase *of which hath been spoken* appears in other writings by Joseph Smith, words of Oliver Cowdery, as well as in the Book of Mormon (see p. 94), and he pointed out several other often-used phrases.

10. Campbell also took delight in singling out mistakes of grammar in the first edition of the Book of Mormon: "we are a descendant," "virgin which," "ye are like unto they," "I saith," "arrive to the promised land," "made mention upon the first plate," "the righteous . . . shall be confounded," "I had spake," "for a more history part," "do not anger again," and "Lord remembereth all they" (p. 94).

11. He alleged the presence of anachronisms in the Book of Mormon. He was the first to cite such examples as "the God of Nature suffers" (a pagan concept), and Shakespeare's idea of death being a silent grave (see p. 94).

12. Campbell also criticized those who were associated with the Book of Mormon, starting with Joseph Smith, claiming that this "New York imposter" (p. 85) was "as ignorant and impudent a knave as ever wrote a book" (p. 91); he also included many other disparaging opinions about Smith's intellect and practices.

I have reviewed many of Campbell's arguments, not because they are particularly insightful or compelling, but because he charted the course that has been followed almost routinely by anti-Mormon writers ever since. It is

interesting that from the 1830s, virtually all the criticisms raised against the Book of Mormon by numerous detractors can be classified into five general assertions. In the 1980s, I organized a project to identify anything that anyone had ever claimed was wrong with the Book of Mormon. With the help of many people (initially Ara Norwood, Joe Zwick, and subsequently Matthew Roper, Donald Parry, William Hamblin, Daniel Peterson, and others), we found that the claimed errors could be classified into five categories: (1) supposed contradictions between the Book of Mormon and such other things as the Bible, Israelite culture, or even the subsequent teachings of Joseph Smith; (2) alleged absurdities and anachronisms—including internal inconsistencies, erroneous quotations from the Bible, mistakes in geography, or other incomprehensible details; (3) asserted environmental influences from nineteenth-century sources, culture, or ideas; (4) claims that significant people involved with the coming forth of the Book of Mormon were untrustworthy, unreliable, or generally evil; and (5) discrepancies and changes in the subsequently published editions of the Book of Mormon from one printing to the next. Even a cursory glance shows that Campbell's arguments cover the first four categories in considerable detail and the only reason he did not claim any problems in the fifth category was because only one edition of the Book of Mormon had been published at the time. Campbell covered many of the main types of arguments ever raised in opposition to the Book of Mormon.

Many of Campbell's arguments continue to lead the recurring parade of Book of Mormon criticisms. These five areas are still the main areas of attack pursued by anti-Mormons today, many of whom merely rehash the same points or questions Campbell raised. Moreover, many of his specific attacks are still found among the most familiar and often repeated accusations. For example, Campbell's criticism that the Nephites and Lamanites took upon themselves the name of Christ before the time of Christ is often brought up by critics.<sup>6</sup> Many authors still bring up the questions of whether the Nephites and Lamanites really kept the law of Moses,<sup>7</sup> offered sacrifices,<sup>8</sup> or had anything like a compass.<sup>9</sup> To those familiar with the routine fare of Book of Mormon criticism, reading Campbell's parade of horrors is like seeing yet another rerun of an old TV show.

### **The Published LDS Response to Campbell**

When Latter-day Saints settle in an area, they often begin distributing official church publications or start unofficial church-oriented papers to share local news and to keep posted on the international church.<sup>10</sup> The early Saints took advantage of the news media popular in their day: "The period from 1800 to 1865 saw the printing of religious literature in America reach a high point—the result of the Second Great Awakening and the activities of various interdenominational Bible and tract societies. It was in this environment of vigorous printing activity that the [LDS] Church emerged and grew."<sup>11</sup>

The *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* succeeded the *Evening and the Morning Star* in October 1834 as a publication of the church.<sup>12</sup> It was published in Kirtland, Ohio, from October 1834 to September 1837, in the form of thirty-six sixteen-page, two-column issues. Its name described its purpose: to be the messenger and advocate of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, thus to help the Saints better understand its doctrine and principles.<sup>13</sup> "Main doctrinal contributions came from Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, Oliver Cowdery, W. W. Phelps, and John Whitmer. . . . Oliver Cowdery edited the *Messenger and Advocate* from October 1834 to May 1835. He was succeeded by John Whitmer from June 1835 to March 1836, but returned as editor from April 1836 to January 1837."<sup>14</sup>

The members of the church at this time had had many encounters with Campbellites.<sup>15</sup> A response to Alexander Campbell's article was therefore important to clarify the church's stand. Accordingly, an article entitled "Delusions" was printed in March 1835 during Oliver Cowdery's first term as editor. It ran with the byline "ed.," presumably indicating that Oliver Cowdery was the author. This little-known article is a classic early-Mormon testimony of the truthfulness and importance of the Book of Mormon and is one of the most impressive responses to an anti-Mormon publication ever printed in an official church magazine.

As interesting as what Cowdery said in this editorial is what he did not say. Of all the many trivial and scurrilous barbs thrown at the Book of Mormon by Campbell, Cowdery responded only to three points. By focusing his rebuttal on these three points—the priesthood, the promised land, and temple worship—Oliver managed to answer his critic by affirming and preaching important principles of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. Cowdery avoided the temptation of responding point by point to insignificant criticisms hardly worth mentioning; instead, he turned the tables by basing his response on key concepts of the restoration. By grounding his rebuttal in these ultimate declarations, Cowdery rested his case, as a good lawyer would, on firm ground and did not allow Campbell to set the ground rules or to prescribe the boundaries of their debate. Instead, Cowdery took the upper hand by answering with solid arguments that not only responded defensively, but also established affirmatively his three most meaningful points.

Because of its obscurity, Cowdery's 1835 document will be quoted here in full, interspersed with a few brief remarks. Cowdery, like Campbell, began his editorial with mild sarcasm, discounting the effect of Campbell's publication and viewing it as a mere distraction:

Said Mr. A. Campbell, in 1831, soon after the church of the Saints began to be established in this place; but unfortunately for his purpose, if a purpose he had, his cry was unheard, the cause still progressed, and *continues* to progress. As this gentlemen [*sic*] makes high professions as a Reformer, and is some tenacious that his sentiments are to pervade the earth before the final end of darkness, we think, or at least hope, our readers will pardon our digress from ordinary matters, to give this modern apostle a passing notice.  
(p. 90)

## The Priesthood

Cowdery then got serious with the first of his three points. He quoted Campbell's claim that God had given the priesthood only to the tribe of Levi:

In his [not] far-famed pamphlet, of Feb. 10, 1831, this grave Reformer, while examining the book of Mormon, says:

"Internal Evidences: It admits the Old and New Testaments to contain the revelations, institutions, and commandments of God to Patriarchs, Jews and Gentiles, down to the year 1830—and always, as such, speaks of them and quotes them. This admission at once blasts its pretensions to credibility. For no man with his eyes open can admit both books to have come from God. Admitting the Bible now received to have come from God, it is impossible that the Book of Mormon came from the same Author. For the following reasons:—

1. Smith, its real author, as ignorant and impudent a knave as ever wrote a book, betrays the cloven foot in basing his whole book upon a false fact, or a pretended fact, which makes God a liar. It is this:—With the



Jews God made a covenant at Mount Sinai, and instituted a priesthood, and a high priesthood. The priesthood he gave to the tribe of Levi, and the high priesthood to Aaron and his sons for an everlasting priesthood.— He separated Levi, and covenanted to give him this office irrevocably while ever the temple stood, or till the Messiah came.” (pp. 90–91)

It is significant that Cowdery began his defense of the Book of Mormon by defending the restoration’s knowledge of the doctrines of the priesthood. After all, Oliver Cowdery was present with Joseph Smith when the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods were restored. This topic would have been close to Oliver Cowdery’s heart; on this matter he could speak from firsthand knowledge. Indirectly, his answer to Campbell becomes one of the earliest testimonies for the restoration of the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods.

Cowdery answered Campbell by making four points: that God takes a longer view of things, that God can bestow or restore the priesthood anew on any people he wishes, that the temple itself did not stand when Aaron was given the priesthood (and so Campbell’s picky argument on this point collapses), and that modern revelation has clarified how Moses received his priesthood, which allows for others holding the Melchizedek Priesthood to officiate as did Lehi and his posterity:

Mr. Campbell attempts by a single stroke, to overthrow the validity of the book of Mormon, by bringing forward the institution of the priesthood, conferred upon Aaron and his sons, but we are willing to go the whole length in this matter of priesthood, and say that it was conferred upon Aaron and his seed throughout their generations. Ex. 40:15. And thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they minister unto me in the priest’s office: for their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations. We quote this passage because Mr. C. says, that it was only “while ever the temple stood, or till the Messiah came.” Israel’s God takes a longer stretch than this Rev. gentleman. He says “throughout their generations.” If the literal descendants of Aaron are no more, then this priesthood is lost from Israel, unless God bestows it upon another family; but if not, not.

But Mr. C. says “while ever the temple stood, or till the Messiah came.”— By-the-by the temple was not reared when this covenant was made, it, nor the Messiah at the time: it is only one of this Reformer’s new fashioned spiritualizing systems—we have not yet learned it.

This is not all: He says that the scripture teaches, that a person of another family who should come near, when this holy ordinance [sacrifice] was being performed should be put to death. We know that, “the stranger, who cometh nigh, shall be put to death,” and that the heathens were called strangers, but not the children of Israel.

Again: Lehi and his sons, who were descendants of Joseph, offered sacrifice, and this is enough to “blast the pretensions of the book of Mormon, to credibility.”

Now, as it is, and very correctly too, Lehi and his sons were blessed with the high priesthood—the Melchizedek priesthood. They never made any pretense that they were descendants of Aaron or ever received that priesthood which was conferred upon him by the hand of Moses, at the direction of the Lord.

How did it happen that Moses had authority to consecrate Aaron a priest? Where did he get his authority to arrange the tabernacle, ark, &c.? Who laid hands upon him? Had he authority to “come near” when the Lord was entreated by sacrifice? He was Aaron’s brother, to be sure, but Aaron was the high priest.

Should Mr. C. finally learn, that Moses received the holy priesthood, after the order of Melchisedek, under the hand of Jethro, his father-in-law [see D&C 84:6], that clothed with this authority he set Israel in order, and by commandment ordained Aaron to a priesthood less than that, and that Lehi was a priest after this same order, perhaps he will not raise so flimsy a criterion as he does when he says the validity of the book of Mormon is destroyed because Lehi offered sacrifice; and perhaps, also, he may not be quite so lavish with his familiar titles as he was when he called brother Smith “as impudent a knave as ever wrote a book!!” (p. 91)

## The Land of Zion

Second, Oliver Cowdery turned to Campbell’s claim that only one land of promise could ever exist, namely, the land of Canaan. But the early Saints knew that not only had a land of promise been given to Lehi and his people, but that Zion was being gathered for the New Jerusalem in the Western Hemisphere. The concept of a promised land was a critical doctrine of the restoration in the 1830s, and Cowdery defended it by making early and novel uses of Genesis 49:26 (in which Jacob declared that Joseph’s blessings prevailed above those of his progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills; Jacob conferred those blessings on the head of his son Joseph, from whom Lehi descended) and Deuteronomy 33:13 (in which Moses promised land to Joseph) in support of the Book of Mormon and of the gathering of Zion from all the corners of the earth:

This is a mere specimen: “This ignorant and impudent liar, [bro. Smith] in the next place, makes the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, violate his covenants with Israel and Judah concerning the land of Canaan, by promising a new land to a pious Jew.”

We know that God promised to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, but we have yet to learn where he said that he would not give them any more. Mr. C. will find, in the 49th of Genesis, where Jacob declared that his blessings had prevailed above those of his progenitors unto the *utmost bounds of the everlasting hills*, and that he confers them upon the head of his son Joseph, of whom Lehi was a descendant.

If the reader will also look into the 33d chap. of Deut. he will find that Moses promises Joseph a land; for he says, “blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and the deep that crouches beneath, and for the precious fruits bro’t forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills.

Why all this parade about the blessing of Joseph, if he were only to inherit an equal proportion of the land of Canaan? Surely the Messiah was never promised through his lineage, or descendants: then why say so much about Joseph? But we quote another verse from the same chap which makes the subject sufficiently plain only to a man who has been crying Millennium! Millennium!! some four or five years, without ever giving his hearers one solitary scroll to point them to the word of God for a preparatory guide to be prepared for that august period!

“His [Joseph’s] glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh.”

Now, if some friend of ours, or even the editor of the Millennial Harbinger, will be so kind as to solve one mystery on the subject of Joseph's blessing, he will do us a favor. Place Joseph in the land of Canaan and never suffer his descendants to go out, and then set him to push the *people together to [from] the ends of the earth*, and if you do not see a new thing under the sun, it will be because the Millennial Harbinger has gathered Israel from the four winds, and left them all standing where they now are!

If the Lord promised, (which he did,) the land of Canaan to Abraham, and Jacob's blessing had prevailed above that, to the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills, where could he find it? Not in the land of Canaan, merely, though Mr. C. has the daring effrontery to say that if God should take any of the seed of Jacob to any other part of the earth, he would violate his covenant which he had previously made!—How does he know it? (pp. 91–92)

## The Temple

Third, Oliver Cowdery defended the idea that God's people in all dispensations are temple-building people. The construction of the Kirtland Temple was well under way when his answer to Campbell went to press, and dreams were still alive for a temple in Independence, Missouri. Cowdery rightly rejected Campbell's interpretation of the Bible to the effect that it permitted the building of a temple only in Jerusalem, and he boldly declared the right of men, namely Joseph Smith and himself, who were "endowed with the holy priesthood, after the order of Melchizedek," to construct a house of glory acceptable to God:

With his boasted knowledge he will not be disturbed if we give our readers another specimen:

"The pious Jews in the captivity turned their faces to Jerusalem and the holy place, and remembered God's promises concerning the place where he recorded his name. They hung their harps upon the willow trees, and could not sing the songs of Zion in a foreign land; but the Nephites have not a single wish for Jerusalem, for they can, in their wigwam temple, in the America, enjoy more of God's presence than the most righteous Jew could enjoy in that house of which David had rather be a door-keeper than to dwell in the tabernacles of men. And all this too, when God's only house of prayer, according to his covenant with Israel, stood in Jerusalem."

Here are further secrets unfolded.—We remember to have read, in the 137th Ps. either a history of what had taken place, or a prophecy concerning something to come, and which, in the days of David was yet to transpire;—but the lamentation was uttered by those who were in distress and mocked by the heathen. The reader will also remember that Solomon, the son of David, built the Temple, and how, we ask, could David be a door-keeper in the same, when it was not reared until his earthly tabernacle was crumbling to dust? But it does very well for Mr. C.—he can get him up there with songs of thanksgiving, waiting before God, and keeping the doors of his sacred Temple, and not a stone of it yet laid!!

We remember also to have read a sublime sentence uttered by the mouth of a prophet, in the name of the Lord, something like this: "Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: Where is the house that ye build unto me? And where is the place of my rest? For all those things that my hand has made." Solomon, who built the Temple, of which Mr. C. says David desired to be a door-keeper, after he was gathered to his fathers, says: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, the heaven, and heavens of heavens cannot contain thee."

Now, if God's presence and glory fill the heavens, is he not sufficient to fill more than one small house like that built at Jerusalem? and has not a man, endowed with the holy priesthood, after the order of Melchisedek, authority to build a house to the honor of HIS name, and especially, when the worship of that at Jerusalem was corrupted, or it thrown down? We have yet to be informed *when* the Lord said that he would *not* fill another house with his glory, if he did that at Jerusalem, or when he ever said that the descendants of Joseph should be cursed, if they should build another like that, when enjoying the promised blessing, made to them by the mouth of God, through Moses, that they should possess the ends of the earth.

Our readers will understand that these extracts are taken from Mr. C.'s writings of 1831, and if occasion requires, we shall give them a specimen of his writings since, in a future number, and then close with this gentleman forever.—[Editor.] (pp. 92–93)

## Conclusion

Oliver Cowdery's reply was logically persuasive and forensically compelling. Displaying his aptitude for lawyering, he showed keen ability to mount a strong response. He argued effectively on technical grounds: for example, he incisively showed that the priesthood was conferred by Moses upon Aaron and his seed throughout *their* generations (see Exodus 40:15), and that if the literal descendants of Aaron are no more, then God is not limited, but can bestow it on another. He skillfully exposed logical inconsistencies in his opponent's position: for instance, in response to the claim that only Levi was to have the priesthood "while ever the temple stood, or till the Messiah came," Cowdery pointed out that the temple was not reared nor the Messiah come in the days of Moses at the time the covenant was made. Cowdery accurately interpreted authoritative texts: for example, he rightly observed that when the scriptures require that if any foreigners were to come near when sacrifices were being performed, they should be put to death ("the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death," Numbers 18:7), this refers to heathens, not the children of Israel. In several ways, Cowdery exposed defects in Campbell's position and showed ways in which Campbell had not carried his burden of persuasion. Moreover, he showed how modern revelation had clarified how Moses received his priesthood as did Lehi and his posterity.

Moreover, a good debater knows that the best defense is a strong offense. Cowdery offered affirmative arguments: for example, he asked how Jacob's blessing to Joseph was to be fulfilled that he should reach to the ends of the earth and prevail to the "utmost bounds of the everlasting hills" (Genesis 49:26), and how Moses' promise to the tribe of Joseph would come to pass that he "shall push the people together to the ends of the earth" (Deuteronomy 33:13), if Joseph was to be found only in the land of Canaan.

But even more than that, Cowdery was effective in singling out a few key points and focusing his attention on those issues while simply ignoring the dozens of other sometimes flippant and even silly arguments that Campbell had tossed into his stew. Many papers have been published by others over the years that have more than amply answered virtually all of Campbell's detailed concerns; but instead of responding line by line or word by word, Cowdery took the tack of building his response on three points—only those that were most important and that were points of strength for the restoration: the restoration of the priesthood, the gathering of Zion from the ends of the earth, and the reinstatement of temple ordinances. By turning his attention to the strengths of his own position, Cowdery was able to reclaim the higher ground in the debate and, in the process, to proclaim affirmatively the main messages of the restoration.

Oliver Cowdery's strategy offers modern defenders of the Book of Mormon an interesting model to keep in mind. Although Campbell may not have conceded the victory to Cowdery and may have felt that Cowdery failed to address his numerous sparring jabs, I think that Cowdery won the exchange going away, by showing, in effect, that Campbell had neither discredited nor even hit upon the real issues of the restoration.

## Notes

I thank Claire Foley for her work on this article.

1. Oliver Cowdery, "Delusions," *Messenger and Advocate* 1/6 (March 1835): 90–93.
2. See S. Morris Eames, *The Philosophy of Alexander Campbell* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Standard, 1966), 16.
3. *Ibid.*, 17.
4. *Millennial Harbinger* 1/1 (4 January 1830), quoted in Robert F. West, *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 165.
5. See West, *Alexander Campbell*, 165–66.
6. See H. Stevenson, *Lecture on Mormonism* (1839), 11; Tyler Parsons, *Mormon Fanaticism Exposed* (Boston, 1841), 75; Edmund Clay, *The Book of Mormon Proved to Be a Blasphemous and Impudent Forgery* (London: Wertheim and Macintosh, 1850), 14; John Bowes, *Mormonism Exposed* (1850), 31; J. M. Burgess, *The Book of Mormon Contradictory* (Liverpool: Blevin, 1850), 25; Josiah B. Lowe, *Mormonism Exposed* (Liverpool: Howell, 1852), 14; John Haynes, *The Book of Mormon Examined* (London: Seely, 1853), 15; William Sheldon, *Mormonism Examined* (Broadhead, Wis.: by the author, 1876), 20; A. G. Hobbs, *Did the Book of Mormon Come from God?* (Fort Worth, Tex.: Hobbs, 1954), 17; Jack Free, *Mormonism and Inspiration* (Concord, Calif.: Pacific, 1962); Marvin W. Cowan, *Mormon Claims Answered* (Salt Lake City: Cowan, 1975), 35; W. N. Jackson, *Is the Book of Mormon from God?* (Tupelo, Miss.: Barber, 1977), 5–6; James M. Tolle, *Is the Book of Mormon from God?* (San Fernando, Calif.: Tolle, 1977); William J. Mitchell, *A Christian Looks at Mormonism* (Mesa, Ariz.: by the author, 1977), 11; Walter R. Martin, *The Maze of Mormonism* (Santa Ana, Calif.: Vision House, 1978), 327; Latayne C. Scott, *The Mormon Mirage* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1979), 87; Weldon Langfield, *The Truth about Mormonism: A Former Adherent Analyzes the LDS Faith* (Bakersfield, Calif.: Langfield, 1991), 46; John Ankerberg and John Weldon, *Everything You Ever Wanted to Know about Mormonism* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1992), 322.
7. See James H. Hunt, *Mormonism* (St. Louis: Ustick and Davies, 1844), 27, 36; Sheldon, *Mormonism Examined* (1876), 13–14; Charles J. Sundberg, *The Mysterious Book of Mormon* (Sandy, Utah: by the author, 1917), 11; Bales, *The Book of Mormon?* (Fort Worth, Tex.: Manney, 1958), 148–56; Michael H. Marquardt, *The Use of the Bible in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1979), 116–17; Wesley P. Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon" (master's thesis, Covenant Theological Seminary, 1981), 15–17; Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Covering Up the Black Hole in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1990), 56–59.
8. See Eber D. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled* (Painesville, Ohio: by the author, 1834), 47, 61–62; Origen Bachelier, *Mormonism Exposed Internally and Externally* (New York, 1838), 30–32; Parsons, *Mormon Fanaticism Exposed* (1841), 70–71; Jonathan B. Turner, *Mormonism in All Ages* (New York: Platt & Peters, 1842), 192; Hunt, *Mormonism* (1844), 85–86; William Palmer, *Mormonism Briefly Examined* (London: Hall, 1849), 4–5; Clay, *The Book*

of *Mormon Proved* (1850), 11–12; Lowe, *Mormonism Exposed* (1852), 13–14; Haynes, *The Book of Mormon Examined* (1853), 13; John Hyde, *Mormonism: Its Leaders and Designs* (New York: Fetridge, 1857), 229–30; Martin T. Lamb, *The Golden Bible* (New York: Ward & Drummond, 1887), 98–99; Golman B. Hancock, *Mormonism Exposed* (Marianville, Mo.: Doggett, 1902), 38; Free, *Mormonism and Inspiration* (1962), 126–27; Martin, *The Maze of Mormonism* (1978), 327; Cary Trivanovich, *Speaking the Truth in Love* (Orange, Calif.: Promise, 1988), 10.

9. See Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled* (1834), 32; Anonymous, “The Book of Mormon and the Mormonites,” *Athenaeum, Museum of Foreign Literature, Science, and Art* 42 (July 1841): 372; Parsons, *Mormon Fanaticism Exposed* (1841), 11, 66; Turner, *Mormonism in All Ages* (1842), 192; Hunt, *Mormonism* (1844), 30–31; Daniel P. Kidder, *Mormonism and the Mormons* (New York: Lane and Tippet, 1844), 259; Charles S. Smith, *The Mormonites: The Origin, History and Their Pretensions* (Bristol, 1849), 3; R. Clarke, *Mormonism Unmasked* (London: G. J. & R. Books, 1849), 26; Palmer, *Mormonism Briefly Examined* (1949), 6; Edmund Clay, *The Book of Mormon: Its History and an Analysis of Its Contents* (1850), 9–10; Bowes, *Mormonism Exposed* (1850), 31–32; Andrew B. Hepburn, *An Exposition of the Blasphemous Doctrines and Delusions* (London: Marshall, 1852), 12; Haynes, *The Book of Mormon Examined* (1853), 14–15; Dawson Burns, *Mormonism Explained and Exposed* (London: Houlston & Stoneman, 1853), 19n; W. Sparrow Simpson, *Mormonism: Its History, Doctrines and Practices* (London: Pigott, 1853), 3; Andrew B. Hepburn, *Mormonism Exploded* (Sheffield: Thomas, 1855), 38–39; Samuel Hawthornthwaite, *Adventures among the Mormons* (Manchester, England: by the author, 1857), 69; Hyde, *Mormonism: Its Leaders and Designs* (1857), 222–23; Thomas B. H. Stenhouse, *The Rocky Mountain Saints* (New York: Appleton, 1873), 530–31; Sheldon, *Mormonism Examined* (1876), 138–40; Joseph Johnson, *The Great Mormon Fraud* (Manchester: Butterworth & Nodal, 1885), 81; Enos T. Hall, *The Mormon Bible* (Columbus, Ohio: Heer, 1899), 8; Henry C. Sheldon, *A Fourfold Test of Mormonism* (New York: Abingdon, 1914), 49–50; Sundberg, *The Mysterious Book of Mormon* (1917), 10; Stuart Martin, *The Mystery of Mormonism* (London: Odhams, 1920), 44; Frank Ballard, *Why Not Mormonism?* (London: Epworth, 1922), 12; James H. Snowden, *The Truth about Mormonism* (New York: Dunn, 1926), 104; George B. Arbaugh, *Revelation in Mormonism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 55; William E. Biederwolf, *Mormonism under the Searchlight* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1947), 16; Hobbs, *Did the Book of Mormon Come from God?* (1954), 9; George B. Arbaugh, *Gods, Sex and Saints* (Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana, 1957), 22; Tolle, *Is the Book of Mormon from God?* (1957), 13; Leslie Rumble, “The Book of Mormon,” *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 60/4 (January 1960): 344; Anthony A. Hoekema, *Mormonism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1963), 28; Ben M. Bogard, *An Exposure of Mormonism* (Little Rock, Ark.: Missionary Baptist Seminary, 1965), 33; Gordon R. Lewis, *The Bible, the Christian, and Latter-day Saints* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1966), 17; Mitchell, *A Christian Looks at Mormonism* (1977), 11; Martin, *The Maze of Mormonism* (1978), 48; Rick Branch, “A Few Problems,” *The Director* (Marlow, Oklahoma) 3/5 (January–February 1983): 3; Thomas Key, “A Biologist Looks at the Book of Mormon,” *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 37/2 (1985): 98–99; James R. White, *Letters to a Mormon Elder* (Southbridge, Md.: Crowne, 1990), 175; Langfield, *The Truth about Mormonism* (1991), 45–46.

10. See Jack A. Nelson, “LDS Newspapers,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 3:1011. In 1831 a revelation was given to Joseph Smith, recorded in section 57 of the Doctrine and Covenants, which includes a command to W. W. Phelps to be a printer, and to Oliver Cowdery to edit material for publication. See also Doctrine and Covenants 112:6.

11. Larry W. Draper, “Publications,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 3:1173.

12. See Ronald D. Dennis, “The Evening and Morning Star,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 2:477.

13. See David B. Galbraith, “Messenger and Advocate,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 2:892.

14. Ibid.

15. See, for example, *The Journals of William E. McLellin: 1831–1836*, ed. Jan Shipps and John W. Welch (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 1994), 65–66, 124, 152, 160, 167–68, 224, 225; *Times and Seasons* 1 (1840): 135–36; John Murdock Journal, typescript, BYU-A, 8–11; and Milton V. Backman Jr., “The Quest for a Restoration: The Birth of Mormonism in Ohio,” *BYU Studies* 12/4 (1972): 346–64.

# Mormon Missiology: An Introduction and Guide to the Sources

David J. Whittaker

## **Introduction**

Missionary work has been a central concern of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (commonly called Mormons) since their beginnings in 1830. The visions of Joseph Smith proclaimed the opening of a new dispensation in which the gospel of Jesus Christ would go forth to all nations. In their study of the Bible, particularly the New Testament, Latter-day Saint leaders identified with early Christian missionaries who were commissioned by the Master to “go ye therefore, and teach all nations” (Matthew 28:19). Latter-day Saint scriptures emphasized and reinforced this missionary outlook. Many passages in the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants described the world as a “field . . . white already to harvest” (D&C 4:4; 6:3; 11:3; 12:3; 31:4; etc.), and the faithful were assured that no joy would be greater than that which came as a result of successful missionary work. They understood that once they heard the “good news,” they had a desire and an obligation to inform their neighbors (see D&C 88:81). These same scriptures told the stories and described the qualities of good missionaries (see, for example, Alma 17–26, 29; D&C 4).

Early in the history of the church, missionaries were commanded to assemble “the elect” from throughout the world (D&C 29:7–8; compare D&C 110:11). Their work centered on the concept of the “gathering,” a two-phase process. First, missionaries were to preach the restored gospel of Jesus Christ to the honest in heart and then to administer the saving priesthood ordinances (beginning with baptism by immersion and the laying on of hands to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost) to those who accepted their message. Second, converts were to gather physically with other faithful members to assist in building Zion, a covenant community of righteous Saints.<sup>1</sup> Immigration to America followed conversion throughout the nineteenth century, and this gathering to a central place gave the Mormon movement great economic, political, and religious power wherever the Latter-day Saints settled. In fact, the process was viewed as a critical part of preparing the earth for the second coming of Jesus Christ. Rejecting old ways and purposefully acting on new knowledge was a significant rite of passage for the new convert. Millennial expectations thus fueled a missionary zeal and outreach that remains unabated to our own day.<sup>2</sup>

Besides the obvious spiritual benefits of this kind of work, there were also more practical effects. Historically, missionary work served to revitalize church membership at critical periods of stress and strain. New converts also brought much-needed skills and talents during the hectic western pioneering period of the church’s history. The history and development of the various missions of the church were often the testing ground for church leaders as well as for official programs and publications. The mission experience was an important instrument of socialization and testimony building for those who accepted the call to serve. Problems of government and administration that arose in the various mission fields very early required church leaders to deal more comprehensively with matters of organization, licensing, discipline, publication, immigration, and financial management. Thus the study of missions and missionary work is an essential area for students of Latter-day Saint history, or for students of the broader topic of missiology, or the scholarly study of mission history in its broadest sense.<sup>3</sup>

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints remains a strong missionary organization; as of January 2000 more than 59,000 full-time missionaries were assigned to one of 333 missions in 160 countries and territories



worldwide. Each missionary generally serves from one to two years, but missionary service is a task accepted throughout the lifetime of active members. While the majority of missionaries today are nineteen to twenty-three years old, it is common to have self-supporting retired couples also called to serve in a variety of missionary capacities. In addition, about 137,000 members of the church are currently serving church-service missions that range from family history projects to literacy education and public communications. Whether the work of teaching grows out of a formal mission call, or from a more informal setting in one's own neighborhood, missionary work remains a central concern for the Mormon faithful.

The Latter-day Saint missionary system has been voluntary from the beginning. To study it is to study the history of the church itself, moving as it did from a few committed families in April 1830 to an international membership today. A full discussion of the missionary system would require a look at a variety of topics ranging from preparing to serve; receiving the formal missionary call (including preparing for and receiving the sacred temple ordinances); the conversion process in which the nonmember is converted (including such sociological topics as recruitment, acculturation, and socialization); the mission experience itself (including such topics as testimony, morale, the disciplined life of the missionary, missionary companionships, the mission rules, the quest for orthodoxy in thought, behavior, and literature); the mission experience as a rite of passage into the larger Mormon world; and religious disaffection or apostasy. Until recently these topics have been subsumed into the historical studies of the various missions. But such topics require a closer focus on the missionary as well as on the convert and form the substance of the scholarly field of missiology.

### **Mormon Missions: A Short Overview**

Church membership grew from 6 original members in April 1830 to 268,331 in 1900, by which time Latter-day Saint missionaries had preached in nearly all the countries of the world. The majority of the missionaries who served in the nineteenth century were older by today's standards and were almost always males who commonly left wives and families behind while serving wherever they were called. The first "foreign" mission attempted was into Ontario, Canada. From 1832 on, individuals or groups of missionaries hazarded trips there, and notwithstanding the few converts that were made in these early years, those who were baptized became instrumental in the opening of the British Mission, the next foreign mission attempted by the church. From its small beginnings in 1837, the British Mission became the most successful foreign mission of the church in the nineteenth century. From 1840 to about 1900 it is estimated that over 50,000 converts immigrated to the United States from Britain.

Very early in their history, the Latter-day Saints also sent missionaries into other countries. Even before the death of Joseph Smith, elders were sent to Australia, India, South America, Germany, and Jamaica. Although they failed to go, Orson Hyde and George J. Adams were even called to Russia. Orson Hyde did visit Palestine in 1842, and other missionaries visited the Society Islands in the Pacific Ocean in 1843. Thus a substantial effort had been expended in missionary work by 1844.

From England, early missionaries made the first proselyting thrusts into Ireland, Wales, Scotland, and continental Europe and then gradually extended themselves in more organized ventures. In 1849, no doubt encouraged by the Revolutions of 1848, calls were issued for the Italian, French, and Scandinavian missions. A mission to Hawaii came in 1850, another to South America in 1851, and in 1852 missionaries were dispatched to Gibraltar, India, Burma, Siam, China, South Africa, the West Indies, British Guiana, and again to Australia. Although few of these more extended missions were successful during the nineteenth century, the very attempt suggests the serious international outlook and millennialism of the early church. As Paul had benefited from the law and transportation

routes of the Roman Empire, early Latter-day Saint missionary work followed the paths and locations of the British Empire throughout the world.<sup>4</sup>

During a period of anti-Mormon persecution and prosecution in the 1880s, foreign missionary work continued. It began in Mexico in 1875 but ended about 1889. Mexico was opened again in 1901 and, with Latin America, has become the most fruitful mission field in the church. In 1883 several missionaries worked in Austria and Hungary, but for many years few significant results were obtained there. In 1885 missionary work was begun in Turkey. In 1888 a mission was organized in Samoa; in 1891 the work was extended to Tonga, which was organized as a separate mission in 1916. In 1901 Japan was opened as the twentieth foreign mission, while the older missions continued to grow.

The stress on the gathering of new converts to an American headquarters meant sacrificing a stable base in the converts' home country in favor of the colonizing activities in the Great Basin. By 1907 President Joseph F. Smith, following suggestions of George Q. Cannon in 1894, began counseling European members to remain in their own lands. However, despite this counsel, a significant number of converts continued to gather to America. The church itself maintained statistics on these numbers until 1962: 103,000 from 1840 to 1910 (ca. 2,000 per year); 10,185 from 1911 to 1946 (ca. 291 per year); 6,000 from 1947 to 1953 (ca. 1,000 per year), and almost 8,000 from 1954 to 1962.<sup>5</sup> While the general trend has been for converts to remain in their native countries, it is obvious that the American pull has been strong on new members.

World wars and the Great Depression hindered but did not stop Latter-day Saint missionary work in the twentieth century. In some cases, it was LDS American servicemen who began or strengthened missionary work in the country to which they were assigned (for example, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, and Thailand). In some cases, the destruction brought by war opened countries as well as people's hearts to the message the missionaries brought. By 1950 there were 46 missions.

By the end of the Second World War, as other Christian missionary groups were beginning to apply more systematic and bureaucratic techniques to their proselyting efforts,<sup>6</sup> young Latter-day Saint missionaries moved to more systematically organize the missionary program of the church. Particularly influential was the program suggested by Richard Lloyd Anderson. What became known as the Anderson Plan originated in 1948 as a more systematic lesson outline for teaching the gospel in the Northwestern States Mission.<sup>7</sup> Its success assured that it would be copied and used throughout the missions of the church. The church itself would issue in 1953 *The Systematic Program for Teaching the Gospel*, the first set of missionary lessons issued by the church to be used in all missions. Their success built on the pioneering work of individuals like Richard Lloyd Anderson.<sup>8</sup> The tremendous missionary success of the LDS Church since 1950 owes much to this more thoughtful and systematic lesson approach for its missionaries, particularly its emphasis on the Book of Mormon as a proselyting tool.<sup>9</sup> The 1961 discussions, *A Uniform System for Teaching Investigators*, and the 1973 discussions, *The Uniform System for Teaching Families*, are clearly based on these earlier programs.<sup>10</sup> The efforts to make "every member a missionary," with active involvement in every step from referral to fellowshipping, was formalized in the 1960s by President David O. McKay.<sup>11</sup> But this success has also raised new challenges for the church, particularly in relation to cultural conflict, translation, and Americanization. The sheer numerical growth of the church has been a significant challenge that can be only partially solved with better training and a broader use of electronic technology.

Thus the latter part of the twentieth century has witnessed a significant growth of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints throughout the world. With congregations in 140 nations and in 21 territories and possessions,

churchwide membership by 2000 reached 11,000,000. The number of missions reached 331. This growth, which includes an internal increase of about 20 percent, is the result of systematic and aggressive missionary programs. In projecting its numerical growth in 1984, Rodney Stark, a non-Mormon sociologist of religion, suggested evidence of the emergence of a new world religion.<sup>12</sup> While no complete history has yet been produced that tells the full story of Mormon missionary work, the following studies offer a useful beginning.

## General Studies

Seldom has the study of Latter-day Saint missionary work been put into a broader historical or cultural context. Mormons themselves could learn from the experiences of other Christian missions as could students of Mormon missionary work. An excellent study to begin with is Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1984). For the more ambitious, the works of Kenneth Scott Latourette are essential: *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 7 vols. (London: Harper & Brothers, 1937–45); and *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*, 5 vols. (New York: Harper, 1958–62). Useful reference works are Burton L. Goddard, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Missions* (Camden, N.J.: Nelson and Sons, 1967); David B. Barrett, ed., *World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comparative Survey of Churches and Religions in the Modern World, A.D. 1900–2000* (Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1982); Samuel Wilson and J. Siewert, eds., *Mission Handbook: North American Protestant Ministries Overseas*, 13th ed. (Monrovia, Calif.: Missions Advanced Research and Communication Center, 1986); Wilbert R. Shenk, “North American Evangelical Missions since 1945: A Bibliographic Survey,” in *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880–1980*, ed. Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990), 317–34; and Paul D. Peterson, ed., *Missions and Evangelism: A Bibliography Selected from the ATLA Religion Database*, rev. ed. (Chicago: American Theological Library Association, 1985). Periodicals include the *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, *Missiology*, and *World Mission* (a Catholic publication). A “Selected Annotated Bibliography of Missiology” has appeared in *Missiology* since 1986.<sup>13</sup>

Other studies with particular relevance to Latter-day Saint history are Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963); Clifton J. Phillips, *Protestant America and the Pagan World: The First Half-Century of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1810–1860* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1954; published in 1969 by the East Asian Research Center, Harvard University); William R. Hutchison, *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); R. Pierce Beaver, “Missionary Motivation through Three Centuries,” in *Reinterpretation in American Church History*, ed. Jerald C. Brauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 113–51; R. Pierce Beaver, ed., *American Missions in Bicentennial Perspective* (South Pasadena, Calif.: Carey Library, 1977); Edward R. Dayton, “Current Trends in North American Protestant Ministries Overseas,” *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 1 (April 1977): 2–7; Charles W. Forman, “A History of Foreign Mission Theory in America,” in *American Missions in Bicentennial Perspective*, ed. R. Pierce Beaver (South Pasadena, Calif.: Carey Library, 1977), 69–140; Henry W. Bowden, *American Indians and Christian Missions: Studies in Cultural Conflict* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Andrew F. Walls, “The American Dimension in the History of the Missionary Movement,” in *Earthen Vessels, American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880–1980* (1990), 1–25; William A. Smalley, *Translation as Mission: Bible Translation in the Modern Missionary Movement* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1991); Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America, 1776–1990* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992); Brian Stanley, *The History of the Baptist Missionary Society, 1792–1992* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1992); Andrew F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History, Studies in the Transmission of Faith* (Mary Knoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1996); Timothy Yates, *Christian Mission in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); James M. Phillips and Robert T. Coote, eds., *Toward the Twenty-First Century in Christian Mission: Essays in Honor of Gerald H. Anderson* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993). A study of early Protestant missions to the Mormons is

T. Edgar Lyon, "Evangelical Protestant Missionary Activities in Mormon Dominated Areas, 1865–1900" (Ph.D. diss., University of Utah, 1962).

Useful volumes, with extensive bibliographies, suggesting the current trends in Christian missiological studies are *Missiology, An Ecumenical Introduction: Texts and Contexts of Global Christianity*, ed. F. J. Verstraelen, A. Camps, L. A. Hoedemaker, and M. R. Spindler (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995); and Louis J. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures: New Perspectives in Missiological Anthropology* (New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Books, 1988).<sup>14</sup>

### **Latter-day Saint Missions**

Two studies which provide both a large perspective and specific statistical information on Latter-day Saint missionary work are Brad Morris, "The Internationalization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (manuscript, 11 September 1972, copy in Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City); and Gordon Irving, "Numerical Strength and Geographical Distribution of the LDS Missionary Force, 1830–1974," *Task Papers in LDS History*, No. 1 (Salt Lake City: Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1975). More recent statistics are presented in the annual *Deseret News Church Almanac*. R. Lanier Britsch, "Mormon Missions: An Introduction to the Latter-day Saints Missionary System," *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 3 (January 1979): 22–27, is a general introduction, while Tancred I. King, "Missiology and Mormon Missions," *Dialogue, A Journal of Mormon Thought* [hereafter cited as *Dialogue*] 16/4 (1983): 42–50, was the first serious attempt to place the study of Mormon missions into the larger area of missiology. See also Leonard J. Arrington, "Missionaries in Church History," *New Era* (June 1973): 62–65; L. Grant Shields, "Language Challenges Facing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Preaching the Gospel to 'Every Nation'" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1976); Leonard J. Arrington, "Historical Development of International Mormonism," *Religious Studies and Theology* 7 (January 1987): 9–22; and Samuel M. Otterstrom, "The International Diffusion of the Mormon Church" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1994). Valuable articles on all aspects of missionary work appear in the four-volume *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* (New York: Macmillan, 1992). Until the establishment of the Manchester England Stake in 1960, church organizations outside of North America were administered as missions.

No one-volume study on the Mormon missionary experience exists.<sup>15</sup> Since the Latter-day Saints have been keeping records from their earliest years, numerous missionary records exist upon which such a history could be based. An overview of important sources, particularly journals and autobiographies of members (many of which contain accounts of missionary activities) is Davis Bitton, *Guide to Mormon Diaries and Autobiographies* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1977). The LDS Church Historical Department in Salt Lake City has the most extensive collection of these records in addition to significant institutional records and compilations that trace the history of the various missions of the church. Most of these manuscript histories were compiled by Andrew Jenson and focus on the nineteenth century, but they are very useful manuscript scrapbooks for LDS missiology. This same repository has a collection containing thousands of letters written between about 1880 and 1915 by prospective missionaries, their relatives, and local church leaders, in response to inquiries from church headquarters about candidates for missionary service. The Historical Department of the church has also been conducting oral histories about LDS missions throughout the world with General Authorities, mission presidents, and selected missionaries. From 1906 to 1929 the *Improvement Era* ran a series of monthly reports entitled "Messages from the Mission," which reported various contemporary activities; see *Improvement Era* (January 1906–October 1929). The *Church News* ran a series of biographical pieces prepared by members of the Historical Department, "A Church for All Lands," from 1977 to 1980 (p. 16 of each issue beginning 30 April 1977). The archives at Brigham Young University also hold a significant body of Mormon missionary records, an annotated

guide to which is available in *Mormon Missions and Missionaries: A Bibliographical Guide to Published and Manuscript Sources*, comp. David J. Whittaker with the assistance of Chris McClellan (Provo, Utah: Special Collections and Manuscripts, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU, 1993). The Folklore Archive at BYU contains a number of LDS missionary stories.

Official policies and statements dealing with missionary work can be found in a variety of publications. The official conference reports (general and area), including minutes of meetings and addresses of church leaders, have been published from the earliest years. Thus early Mormon periodicals, such as the *Times and Seasons* (Nauvoo, 1840–46), the *Journal of Discourses* (Liverpool, 1854–86), and the *Conference Report* (Salt Lake City, 1898 to the present) are excellent sources.

Manuals, issued in various editions by the church, that address various aspects of missionary work include the *Missionary's Handbook* (Independence, Mo.: Zion's Printing, 1946), rev. ed. (1957); *Uniform System for Teaching Investigators* (1961); *Priesthood Correlation in the Missionary Program* (1964); *Suggestions for Operating Stake Missions* (1965); *Suggestions for Stake Missionaries* (1965); *Priesthood Missionary Handbook for Stake Missions* (1970); *Priesthood Missionary Program Fellowship Manual* (1970); Gordon B. Hinckley, *Sharing the Gospel in Military Service* (1970); *The Uniform System for Teaching Families* (1973, 1975); *Mission President's Handbook* (1973, 1990); *Missionary Guide: Training for Missionaries* (1988); *Handbook for Missionary Couples* (1983); *The Returned Missionary: Guidelines for Mission Presidents, Stake Presidents, District Presidents, Bishops, Branch Presidents, and Elders Quorum Presidents* (1981); and *I Need a Friend: A Friendship Guide for Members of the Church* (1978). Compilations from the talks of two recent presidents of the LDS Church focusing on missionary work are *Proclaiming the Gospel: Spencer W. Kimball Speaks on Missionary Work* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1987), and Ezra Taft Benson, *Missionaries to Match Our Message* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1990). See also John A. Widtsoe, *The Successful Missionary: Letters to Elders in the Field* (Liverpool: European Mission, 1932); and Bruce R. McConkie, *Proselyting Principles* (Salt Lake City, n.d.).

Two useful introductions focusing on the nineteenth century are William E. Hughes, "A Profile of the Missions of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1849–1900" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1986); and Rex T. Price Jr., "The Mormon Missionary of the Nineteenth Century" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1991). Shorter studies of more recent times include Gordon Shepherd and Gary Shepherd, "Sustaining a Lay Religion in Modern Society: The Mormon Missionary Experience," in *Contemporary Mormonism: Social Science Perspectives*, ed. Marie Cornwall, Tim B. Heaton, and Lawrence A. Young (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 161–81; Shepherd and Shepherd, "Membership Growth, Church Activity, and Missionary Recruitment," *Dialogue* 29/1 (1996): 33–57; Keith Parry, "The Mormon Missionary Companionship," in *Contemporary Mormonism, Social Science Perspectives* (1995), 182–206; and Madison H. Thomas and Marian P. Thomas, "The LDS Missionary Experience: Observations on Stress," *AMCAP Journal* 15/2 (1990): 49–79. See also Willis Robinson, "The Value System and the Decision to Do Missionary Work" (master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1960). Studies of the teaching techniques of Mormon missionaries are Barbara McFarlane [Higdon], "The Role of Preaching in the Early Mormon Church, 1830–1846" (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1961); Jay E. Jensen, "Proselyting Techniques of Mormon Missionaries" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974); and Jensen, "The Effect of the Initial Mission Field Training on Missionary Proselyting Skills" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1988). See also David E. Payne, "Socioeconomic Status and Leadership Selection in the Mormon Missionary System," *Review of Religious Research* 13 (Winter 1972): 118–25.

The lay nature of the church, with its encouragement of active participation of its members from the youngest years, has helped to develop personal talents and abilities in such areas as public speaking and teaching, which are very useful attributes in missionary work. While not professionally trained in theology or history, young Latter-day

Saints have ample opportunities to learn doctrine and history in a variety of church-sponsored settings beyond just Sabbath church attendance. These include seminary and institute classes. The general stress on missionary work throughout the life cycle of the members is suggested in Gary J. Coleman, "Member Missionary Involvement in the LDS Church" (Ed.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1978). The increase of couple missionaries is suggested in a series of short vignettes in "Serving as Couple Missionaries," *Ensign* (September 1997): 14–17; and in S. George Ellsworth, "Called to Tubuai: Missionary Couples in French Polynesia, 1850," *Ensign* (October 1989): 35–39. A study of married men as missionaries is Robert J. McCue, "Married Men as Full-Time Missionaries," *Third Eye: The Canadian Journal of Mormon History* 1 (1996): 47–59.

Calvin S. Kunz, "A History of Female Missionary Activity in the Church . . ." (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1976); Ann Gardner Stone, "Louisa Barnes Pratt: Missionary Wife, Missionary Mother, Missionary," in *Sister Saints*, ed. Vicky Burgess-Olsen (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1978), 43–59; and Diane L. Mangum, "The First Sister Missionaries," *Ensign* (July 1980): 62–65, provide beginning studies on a topic that needs further work, while Carol C. Madsen examines a further dimension in "Mormon Missionary Wives in Nineteenth Century Polynesia," *Journal of Mormon History* 13 (1986–87): 61–85. See also Marie S. Ellsworth, "The First Mormon Missionary Women in the Pacific, 1850–1852," in *Proceedings, Eleventh Annual Conference, Mormon Pacific Historical Society, June 10–16, 1990* (n.p.: Mormon Pacific Historical Society, 1990), 123–41. The first official women missionaries were called in 1898;<sup>16</sup> today (2000) about 20 percent of the full-time missionary force are women (ca. 10,000).<sup>17</sup> See also Jessie L. Embry, "The Rhetorical Self-Definition of Sister Missionaries, 1930–1970: Oral Histories," in *Annual of the Association for Mormon Letters*, ed. Lavina Fielding Anderson (Salt Lake City: Association for Mormon Letters, 1997), 147–51. The Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, BYU, has conducted oral histories with sixty women who have served as LDS missionaries, which interviews have been transcribed and are available in Special Collections, Lee Library, BYU. See also *Mormondom's First Woman Missionary, Louisa Barnes Pratt: Life Story and Travels Told in Her Own Words*, 2nd ed. (n.p.: Nettie Hunter Rencher, ca. 1950).

The folklore and humor of Mormon missionaries has been the subject of several essays by BYU folklorist William A. Wilson: "Dealing with Organizational Stress: Lessons from the Folklore of Mormon Missionaries," in *Inside Organizations: Understanding the Human Dimension*, ed. Michael O. Jones, Michael D. Moore, and Richard C. Snyder (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1988), 271–79; *On Being Human: The Folklore of Mormon Missionaries*, Utah State University Faculty Honor Lecture (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1981); and "Powers of Heaven and Hell: Mormon Missionary Narratives as Instruments of Socialization and Social Control," in *Contemporary Mormonism, Social Science Perspectives* (1995), 207–17. A recent study of the German mission folklore is Stephen Van Orden, "Spit-Shined Shoes, Clear Decisions, and the West German Mission Horror Stories: A Study of the Emergence and Function of the Missionary Folklore of the Dresden Mission during 1990" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1996). For a look at the humor of the missionary experience see Darold Westover, *Two by Two: A Cartoonist's Look at Missionary Life* (Bountiful, Utah: Horizon, 1992); Bruce Call, *From Bad to Verse: A Collection of Missionary Light Verse* (American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 1992); and John Thompson, *Called to the Work: A Comical Look at Life after the Mission Call* (Tigard, Ore.: Family Gathering, 1990).

James N. Baumgarten's "The Role and Function of the Seventies in LDS Church History" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1960) is an important overview of the priesthood quorum that was given major responsibility for missionary work in the nineteenth century. By 1900, 92 percent of Mormon missionaries were seventies; by 1941 only 27 percent were; and by 1986 stake seventies quorums were discontinued, although major shifts and expansions to the First and Second Quorums occurred in April 1989. The Third, Fourth, and Fifth Quorums were organized in April 1997. Additional studies of these important missionary quorums include William G. Hartley, "The Seventies in the 1880s: Revelations and Reorganizing," *Dialogue* 16/1 (1983): 62–88; S. Dilworth Young, "The

Seventies: A Historical Perspective," *Ensign* (July 1976): 14–21; and Richard D. Ouellette, "Seventies Quorums: 1835–1986," *Sunstone* 11 (January 1987): 35–37. See also John L. Lund, "An Extensive Annotated Bibliography [to 1970] of Literature Relative to the Office and Calling of the Seventy" (manuscript, copy in Special Collections, Lee Library, BYU). The life of one of the most important and powerful leaders of the seventies is the subject of Truman G. Madsen, *Defender of the Faith: The B. H. Roberts Story* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980).

The Missionary Training Centers (MTCs) operated by the church (16 currently) function as a kind of boot camp for the young missionaries; in addition to scriptural and doctrinal training and intensive language courses where required, the centers also provide some cultural education and have issued various manuals for this training. For example, see *Culture for Missionaries: Mexico and Central America* (prepared and issued by the Missionary Training Center of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977). The basic history of the formal training of missionaries is presented in Richard O. Cowan, *Every Man Shall Hear the Gospel in His Own Language: A History of the Missionary Training Center and Its Predecessors* (Provo, Utah: Missionary Training Center, 1984). Additional perspectives are provided in LeRoi Snow, "The Missionary Home," *Improvement Era* (May 1928): 552–54; Elayne Wells, "Centers Prepare Missionaries to Be Effective Instruments," *Church News*, 13 January 1990, 6; Gerry Avant, "Missionary Training Center Expands," *Church News*, 19 March 1994, 11; "New Missionary Training Center Dedicated in Brazil," *Ensign* (September 1997): 78, with a photograph of the largest church building outside North America; James B. Allen and John Harris, "'What Are You Doing Looking Up Here?' Graffiti Mormon Style," *Sunstone* 6 (March/April 1981): 27–40 (discusses graffiti on the ceiling tiles of an earlier missionary language training center at BYU); Jeffrey K. Hafen, "Latin American Cross-Cultural Education for Missionaries: Latter-day Saints Missionary Training Center, A Case Study, Provo, Utah, 1987" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1987); Gary J. Bergera, "What You Leave Behind: Six Years at the MTC," *Dialogue* 21/1 (1988): 46–55; and Scott D. Miller, "Thought Reform and Totalism: The Psychology of the LDS Church Missionary Training Program," *Sunstone* 10/8 (1986): 24–29, with a response by C. Jess Groesbeck (pp. 30–31). A visual mapping of the current mission training facilities appears in the *Ensign* (January 1997): 76. See also George T. Taylor, "Effects of Coaching on the Development of Proselyting Skills Used by the Missionary Training Center, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Provo, Utah" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1987); and Rawn A. Wallgren, "A Comparison of Mission Programs Used in Three Language Training Missions of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1975).

The 1986 Public Broadcasting System documentary (Sage Productions in association with KCTS/Seattle) by Bobbie Birleffi, "The Mormons: Missionaries to the World," tried to treat the whole mission experience; an interesting interview with Birleffi is in *Sunstone* 11 (May 1987): 45–48. See also "A Light unto the World," where Peggy Fletcher and Bruce L. Christensen discuss in separate articles the problems of public relations and image building in a missionary church: *Sunstone* 7 (July/August 1982): 16–31. See also Fred C. Esplin, "The Church as Broadcaster," *Dialogue* 10/1 (1977): 25–45; Heather R. Miller, "Conversion, The Mass Media and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (Ph.D. diss., United States International University, 1981); and John H. Evans, "The Church Bureau of Information: A Great Missionary Force," *Instructor* 74 (October 1939): 413–17. *God's Army*, a motion picture (1 hr. 47 min.) about Mormon missionaries in Los Angeles, was produced by Richard Dutcher and released on a limited basis in March 2000. An overview of historic sites, visitors centers, and museums that play important roles in public relations and missionary work is Steven L. Olsen, "Museums and Historic Sites of Mormonism," in *Mormon Americana: A Guide to Sources and Collections in the United States*, ed. David J. Whittaker (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies Monograph Series, 1995), 522–37.

Training of mission presidents is another aspect of Mormon missiology. Occasionally talks by General Authorities given to the presidents and their wives are published, but most are not. The 1961 seminar was made available:



*Mission President's Seminar, 26 June–5 July 1961* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1961). See also Joseph Walker, "A Profile of Those Called to Lead Missions," *Church News*, 19 June 1982, 8–10; and George W. Pace, "The Effectiveness of Mission Presidents of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as Measured by Six Selected Criteria" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1976), a portion of which was later published as "The Effectiveness of Mission Presidents of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints as Measured by Six Criteria," *Review of Religious Research* 19 (Winter 1978): 209–19. For a comparison of the leadership styles of six different mission presidents in Finland, see Kaija H. Penley, "Leadership of Mormon Missionary Efforts in Finland and Its Influence on Conversion Rates in the Finnish Mission, 1947–1969" (master's thesis, Utah State University, 1994). For an area that needs more study, see David E. Payne, "Social Determinants of Leadership in the Mormon Missionary System" (master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1970); Payne, "Socioeconomic Status and Leadership Selection in the Mormon Missionary System," *Review of Religious Research* 13 (Winter 1972): 118–25.

The increasing concern with the health of missionaries is revealed in Susan Jensen, "Health Problems of Selected LDS Missionaries throughout the World" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1981); C. Stephen Hatch, Virgil J. Parker, E. Arnold Issacson, and Lindsay R. Curtis, "Minding Body and Soul: The Life of Physician Mission Presidents," *Journal of Collegium Aesculapium* 3 (1985): 21–33; Marie L. Sellars, "Mental Health of Proselyting Missionaries" (Ph.D. diss., University of Utah, 1971); and Charles D. Cranney, ed., "Pathogen, Parasites, and Proselyting: The Medical Advisory Committee Enhances the Health of the Missionaries," *Journal of Collegium Aesculapium* 8 (1990): 26–31. An introduction to the health missionaries is James O. Mason, "A Conversation about the Church's New Health Missionaries," *New Era* (March 1972): 8–11.

The international thrust of the church is the subject of Spencer J. Palmer, *The Expanding Church* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1978), which includes Bruce R. McConkie's talk, "To the Koreans and All the People of Asia," 137–52; F. LaMond Tullis, ed., *Mormonism: A Faith for All Cultures* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1978); Lavina Fielding [Anderson], "The Expanding Church," *Ensign* (December 1976): 7–13; James R. Moss, R. Lanier Britsch, and Richard O. Cowan, *The International Church* (Provo, Utah: BYU Publications, 1982); Richard O. Cowan, *The Church in the Twentieth Century* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1985); Cowan, "From Footholds to Strongholds: Spreading the Gospel Worldwide," *Ensign* (June 1993): 56–61; Garth N. Jones, "Spiritual Searchings: The Church on Its International Mission," *Dialogue* 20/2 (1987): 58–75; Dean L. Larsen, "The Challenges of Administering a Worldwide Church," *Ensign* (July 1974): 18–22; Gardner, "Taking the Church Anywhere," *Ensign* (June 1981): 38–44 (deals with internationalization), Marvin K. Gardner, "Taking the Gospel to Their Own People [in Central America]," *Ensign* (October 1988): 12–16; Edward L. Kimball, "The Administration of Spencer W. Kimball," *Sunstone* 11 (March 1987): 8–14; Edwin B. Firmage, *Paul and the Expansion of the Church Today* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1979); and Spencer W. Kimball, "When the World Will Be Converted," *Ensign* (October 1974): 2–14. Kahlile Mehr, "A LDS International Trio, 1974–97," *Journal of Mormon History* 25/2 (1999): 101–20, examines three institutional initiatives that functioned outside normal priesthood channels and helped move the church and its message further into the world: (1) an international ambassador in 1974; (2) expansion of the international missions in 1987; and (3) the founding of an International Affairs Office in Washington, D.C., in 1984. See also Sterling M. McMurrin, "Problems of Universalizing Mormonism," *Sunstone* 4 (December 1979): 9–20, including a response by Truman G. Madsen; "For Ye Are All One in Christ Jesus": *The Global Church in a World of Ethnic Diversity, Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference of the International Society, 21 August 1995* (Provo, Utah: David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies, 1996); J. Michael Cleverly, "Mormonism on the Big Mac Standard," *Dialogue* 29/2 (1996): 69–75; and Eugene England, "Becoming a World Religion: Blacks, the Poor,—All of Us," *Sunstone* 21 (June–July 1998): 49–60. A valuable collection of essays assessing the future of the church into the



next century throughout the world, with each essay giving a focus to a specific country or region, was edited by Armand Mauss and appears in *Dialogue* 29/1 (1996).

A significant number of early missionaries published accounts of their labors. The most important works for the nineteenth century are Heber C. Kimball, *Journal of Heber C. Kimball . . . Giving an Account of His Mission to Great Britain* (Nauvoo, Ill.: Robinson and Smith, 1840); Orson Hyde, *A Voice from Jerusalem . . .* (Liverpool, 1842); Erastus Snow, *One Year in Scandinavia . . .* (Liverpool, 1851); Lorenzo Snow, *The Italian Mission . . .* (London, 1851); Orson Spencer, *The Prussian Mission . . .* (Liverpool, 1853); George Q. Cannon, *My First Mission [to Hawaii]* (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1879); and Wilford Woodruff, *Leaves from My Journal* (Salt Lake City, 1881). James Linforth, ed., *Route from Liverpool to the Great Salt Lake Valley . . .* (Liverpool, 1855), and George A. Smith, *Rise Progress and Travels of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 2nd ed. (1872) contain useful summaries of early missionary work, as do the “General Epistles” issued by the First Presidency in the nineteenth century; see especially volume 2 of James R. Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965–74). Other published accounts include E. F. Parry, *Sketches of Missionary Life* (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon, 1899); Preston Nibley, ed., *Missionary Experiences* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1942); and Dean Hughes and Tom Hughes, *We’ll Bring the World His Truth: Missionary Adventures from around the World* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995).

A good study of the formative missionary work is Barbara McFarlane [Higdon], “The Role of Preaching in the Early Mormon Church, 1830–1846” (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1961). Valuable accounts of the earliest years are Dean C. Jessee and William G. Hartley, “Joseph Smith’s Missionary Journal,” *New Era* (February 1974): 34–36; *The Journals of William E. McLellin*, ed. Jan Shippo and John W. Welch (Provo, Utah, and Urbana, Ill.: BYU Studies Monograph and University of Illinois Press, 1994), which includes a short annotated guide to “Other Early Mormon Missionary Journals and Accounts,” 408–12; Larry C. Porter, “‘The Field Is White Already to Harvest’: Earliest Missionary Labors and the Book of Mormon,” in *The Prophet Joseph: Essays on the Life and Mission of Joseph Smith*, ed. Larry C. Porter and Susan Easton Black (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988), 73–89, and Parley P. Pratt, *Autobiography*, ed. Parley P. Pratt Jr. (New York: Russell, 1874). A study of more recent times is James L. Bateman, “The Speaking in the Mormon Missionary System” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1950). Studies of the early missionary literature include David J. Whittaker, “Early Mormon Pamphleteering” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1982); Peter Crawley, “Parley P. Pratt: Father of Mormon Pamphleteering,” *Dialogue* 15/3 (1982): 13–26; David J. Whittaker, “Orson Pratt: Prolific Pamphleteer,” *Dialogue* 15/3 (1982): 27–41; and Peter Crawley and David J. Whittaker, *Mormon Imprints in Great Britain and the Empire, 1836–1857* (Provo, Utah: Friends of the Brigham Young University Library, 1987). The most significant works used in Mormon missionary work include the Book of Mormon (1830); Parley P. Pratt, *A Voice of Warning* (1837); Parley P. Pratt, *Address to the Citizens of Washington, D.C.* (1840); Orson Spencer, *Letters . . .* (Liverpool, 1848); Orson Pratt, *A[n] Interesting Account of Several Remarkable Visions* (Edinburgh, 1840), and two series of tracts Orson Pratt issued in 1848–51 and in 1856–57; Lorenzo Snow, *The Only Way to Be Saved* (1840) and *Voice of Joseph* (1852); Charles W. Penrose, “Mormon” *Doctrine Plain and Simple* (Salt Lake City, 1882) and *Rays of Living Light* (Liverpool, 1898); and John Morgan, *Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (1885) and *The Plan of Salvation* (1881). Two books by James E. Talmage are consistently used by Mormon missionaries in their personal study: *The Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1899), and *Jesus the Christ* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1915). An overview of the literature and tracting system is given in Jensen, “Proselyting Techniques of Mormon Missionaries,” 9–24. Several works by Ben E. Rich, especially *Mr. Durant of Salt Lake City*, “*That Mormon*” (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, 1893), and *A Friendly Discussion upon Religious Subjects* (Brooklyn, ca. 1898) along with Matthias F. Cowley, *Cowley’s Talks on Doctrine* (Chattanooga, Tenn.: Ben E. Rich, 1902) were popular tracts down to the 1940s and 1950s. Another popular work is Le Grand Richards, *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*

(Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1950). A useful chronological guide to the writings of the General Authorities of the church, many of which deal with missionary themes, is Gary Gillum, "Out of the Books Which Shall Be Written," *Dialogue* 12/2 (1979): 99–123.

A scholarly introduction to the "Appeals of Mormonism" is in Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints* (New York: Knopf, 1979), 20–46. An important one-volume history of the LDS Church, which gives ample attention to its missionary work, is James B. Allen and Glen M. Leonard, *The Story of the Latter-day Saints*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992).

Missionary work is a voluntary enterprise, the majority costs of which are borne by each missionary and his or her family. In addition, some funds are available from friends, the local congregation, or the general church missionary funds. In an attempt to standardize mission costs, the church has set official monthly costs for each missionary from the United States or Canada who goes out. See "Church Equalizes Costs for Single U.S. and Canadian Missionaries," *Ensign* (February 1991): 78, for the initial policies, which have now been expanded. A useful study of the problems of financing early missions is Richard L. Jensen, "Without Purse or Scrip? Financing Latter-day Saint Missionary Work in Europe in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Mormon History* 12 (1985): 3–14, but it ought to be supplemented by David J. Whittaker, "Early Mormon Pamphleteering," *Journal of Mormon History* 4 (1977): 35–49, a study that examines, in part, the sales and distribution of church literature by missionaries for income. See also Jessie L. Embry, "Without Purse or Scrip," *Dialogue* 29/3 (1996): 77–93, which focuses on the years after World War II.

The geographical widening and consequent realignments of mission boundaries as well as the personnel and leadership changes and assignments can be traced through such church publications as the *Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star* (1840–1970); *Skandinaviens Stjerne* (Copenhagen, 1851–1956); *Zion's Watchman* (Sydney, 1853–56); *Der Stern* (1869–1986); the *Improvement Era* (1898–1970); the *Ensign* (1970–present); and the *Deseret News*, particularly the weekly supplement, the *Church News* section. The *Deseret News Church Almanac* (generally published annually from 1974 to the present) is a very useful compilation of facts and statistics about the church with ample space being devoted regularly to missions and missionary topics. Occasionally, specific articles have appeared in the *Church News*, such as "From Whence Come Missionaries" (27 September 1947): 6–7, and it regularly features short articles on missionary successes throughout the world. There has been a significant body of published material issued by various missions; these range from formally printed magazines to mimeographed and computer-generated newsletters. Both the LDS Church Library in Salt Lake City and the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University in Provo have substantial collections of these mission publications, although neither library has made a systematic attempt to identify or collect all of them. More significant examples include the *LDS Millennial Star* (begun in 1840), which remains a basic source for all foreign missions before 1900 and for the British Mission until 1970, at which time the periodical was discontinued; *Liahona: The Elders' Journal* was the official mission publication of the Central and Southern States Missions during the first half of the twentieth century. A useful introduction to the latter publication and its role in the missions is Arnold K. Garr, "A History of 'Liahona: The Elders' Journal': A Magazine Published for the Mormon Missions of America, 1903–1945" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1986). See also David Buice, "Chattanooga's *Southern Star*: Mormon Window on the South, 1898–1900," *BYU Studies* 28/2 (1988): 5–15. Other church publications, especially in the nineteenth century, are valuable sources for mission history.<sup>18</sup>

A sampling of lesser-known mission publications, ranging from mission magazines to newsletters, include the following: *Accelerator* (Australian Mission); *The Reaper* (Alabama Florida Mission); *Atalaya* (Mexico City Mission); *Aurora* (North British Mission); *Avante!* (Brazil Central Mission); *Blick ins Feld* (North German Mission); *Cumorah's*

*Southern Messenger* (South African Mission); *Thoroughbred Pacer* (Kentucky-Tennessee Mission); *Echo Asia* (Southeast Asia Mission); *Ka Elele oiaio* (Hawaiian Mission); *L'Etoile* (French Mission); *Este* (Argentina East Mission); *The Revontulet* (Finnish Mission); *Gaamalii* (Southwest Indian Mission); *Hvezdicka* (Czechoslovakia Mission); *Ko e tuhulu* (Tongan Mission); *Te-Kare* (New Zealand Mission); *The Piper* (Scottish Mission); and the *Trumpet* (Italian Mission). These titles represent only a small number of the publications issued by LDS missions in the twentieth century. The student ought not ignore these mission organs, but should be forewarned that the titles can vary within each mission (for example, the newsletter for the Australia East Mission was titled at various times *The Aurora Australis*, *Austral Star*, *Australia East Mission News*, *Australia Mission Branch News*, and *Australia Sydney Mission News*); or that the same title was used by various missions (for example, the title *Challenge* was used for the newsletters of the Swedish, New Zealand North, Central German, and Central Atlantic States Missions).

The many varieties of Mormon missions and missionary work are surveyed in A. Glen Humpherys, "Missionaries to the Saints," *BYU Studies* 17/1 (1976): 74–100; Gary L. Phelps, "Home Teaching—Attempts by the Latter-day Saints to Establish an Effective Program during the Nineteenth Century" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1975); and William G. Hartley, "Every Member Was a Missionary," *Ensign* (September 1978): 21–24.<sup>19</sup>

One of the great values of Mormon missionary records is the insight that they can give the social historian into the lives of ordinary people among whom the missionaries worked. Beyond the daily cares and cycles of the lives of common people are insights into the economic and political worlds they inhabited. Poverty, inflation, population mobility, family and community structure, and religious attitudes are just a sample of the indices missionary journals and letters can provide. The experiences of Mormon missionaries in the American South in the 1880s, for example, reveal the tensions and even bloodshed of a section of the country trying to regain local control after Reconstruction. The few episodes of the murder of Mormon missionaries must also be treated.<sup>20</sup> Mormon missionary records from Germany in the 1920s help historians reconstruct the high inflation and related tensions during the rise of the Third Reich. Mormon missionaries and their records in New Zealand have helped to keep the Maori language alive.

## **United States and Canada**

The best study of early missionary work still remains S. George Ellsworth, "A History of Mormon Missions in the United States and Canada, 1830–1860" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1951). It is especially valuable in its detailed research and its accounts of the growth of the missionary system from an informal program reaching out first to families in a village setting and then into more urban centers, to a centralized system controlled by the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.<sup>21</sup> Ellsworth traces the geographical widening of the missionary program as well as the appearance of the more formal dimensions of missionary work, such as specific mission rules and licensing. Other studies of these missions include Richard S. Williams, "The Missionary Movements of the Latter-day Saint Church in New England, 1830–1860" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1969); Laurence M. Yorgason, "Some Demographic Aspects of Social, Geographical and Religious Backgrounds of One Hundred Early Mormon Converts, 1830–1837" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974); V. Alan Curtis, "Missionary Activities and Church Organization in Pennsylvania, 1830–1840" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1976); Steven C. Harper, "Missionaries in the American Religious Marketplace: Mormon Proselyting in the 1830s," *Journal of Mormon History* 24/2 (1998): 1–29; Harper, "Infallible Proofs, Both Human and Divine: The Persuasiveness of Mormonism for Early Converts," *Religion in American Culture* 10/1 (2000): 99–118; Warren A. Jennings, "The First Mormon Mission to the Indians," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 37 (Autumn 1971): 288–99; Richard Lloyd Anderson, "The Impact of the First Preaching in Ohio," *BYU Studies* 11/4 (1971): 474–96; Mark R. Grandstaff, "The Impact of the Mormon Migration on the Community of Kirtland, Ohio, 1830–1839" (master's

thesis, Brigham Young University, 1984); M. Terresa Baer, "Charting the Missionary Work of William E. McLellin: A Content Analysis," in *The Journals of William E. McLellin* (1994), 379–405; Davis Bitton, "Kirtland as a Center of Missionary Activity, 1830–1838," *BYU Studies* 11/4 (1971): 497–516; Eugene England, "Brigham Young as Missionary," *New Era* (November 1977): 30–37; Donald Q. Cannon, "Wilford Woodruff's Mission to Maine," *Improvement Era* (September 1970): 82–86; LaMar C. Berrett, "History of the Southern States Mission, 1831–1861" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1960); Leonard J. Arrington, "Mormon Beginnings in the American South," *Task Papers in LDS History*, No. 9 (Salt Lake City: Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1976); Heather M. Seferovich, "History of the LDS Southern States Mission, 1875–1898" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1996); Arthur M. Richardson, *The Life and Ministry of John Morgan* (Salt Lake City: Nicholas G. Morgan Sr., 1965); *Faith-Promoting Experiences in the Ministry of President John Morgan* (Salt Lake City: Morgan, 1964); David Buice, "All Alone and None to Cheer Me': The Southern States Mission Diaries of J. Golden Kimball," *Dialogue* 24/1 (1991): 35–54; Buice, "Excerpts from the Diary of Teancum Williams Heward, Early Mormon Missionary to Georgia," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 64/3 (1980): 317–25; Benjamin L. Rich, "That Missionary: Ben E. Rich," *Improvement Era* (June 1952): 403, 486–87; Ted S. Anderson, "The Southern States Mission and the Administration of Ben E. Rich, 1898–1908, Including a Statistical Study of Church Growth in the Southeastern United States during the Twentieth Century" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1976); Steven C. Harper, "Ministerial Tramps: Southern States Missionaries, 1920–1930," *Mormon Heritage Magazine* 2 (September/October 1995): 29–37; Brigham D. Madsen, *Against the Grain: Memoirs of a Western Historian* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998), 73–113 [Tennessee and North Carolina, 1934–36]; William B. Smart, "Mormonism's First Foothold in the Pacific Northwest," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 29 (January 1961): 21–30; Asahel H. Woodruff, "Historical Sketch of the Northern States Mission," *Millennial Star* 66 (4 February 1904): 65–68; Davis Bitton, "B. H. Roberts at the World Parliament of Religion [1893]," *Sunstone* 7 (January/February 1982): 46–51; Charles Hart, "The Canadian Mission," *Improvement Era* (May 1928): 571–73; Melvin S. Tagg, "A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Canada, 1830–1963" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1963); Wilbur G. Hackney, "History of the Western Canadian Mission" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1950); Richard E. Bennett, "A Study of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Upper Canada, 1830–1850" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1975); Jerald R. Izatt and Dean R. Louder, "Peripheral Mormondom: The Frenetic Frontier," *Dialogue* 13/2 (1980): 76–89; Louder, "Canadian Mormon Identity and French Fact," in *The Mormon Presence in Canada*, ed. Brigham Y. Card et al. (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1990), 302–27; "The Mission Experience of Spencer W. Kimball," *BYU Studies* 25/4 (1985): 109–40; Eugene E. Campbell, "A History of the Church . . . in California, 1846–1946" (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1952); Parley P. Pratt, *Autobiography* (1874; reprint 1985); David J. Whittaker, "Brigham Young and the Missionary Enterprise," in *Lion of the Lord: Essays on the Life and Service of Brigham Young*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Larry C. Porter (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), 85–104; and Donald Q. Cannon, "Licensing in the Early Church," *BYU Studies* 22/1 (1982): 96–105. The growth of the church on the east coast of the United States has yet to be fully studied; a look at the Philadelphia area in the 1840s is found in David J. Whittaker, "East of Nauvoo: Benjamin Winchester and the Early Mormon Church," *Journal of Mormon History* 21/2 (1995): 31–83. A number of histories produced by local church units include mission history material.

Demographic studies of Mormons provide useful insights into the consequences of missionary successes. See Donald Meinig, "The Mormon Cultural Region: Strategies and Patterns in the Geography of the American West, 1847–1964," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 55 (June 1965): 191–220; Paul T. Johnson, "An Analysis of the Spread of the Church . . . from Salt Lake City, Utah, Utilizing a Diffusion Model" (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1966); Dean L. May, "A Demographic Portrait of the Mormons, 1830–1980," in *After 150 Years, The Latter-day Saints in Sesquicentennial Perspective*, ed. Thomas G. Alexander and Jessie L. Embry (Provo, Utah: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, BYU, 1983), 37–69; Lowell "Ben" Bennion, "The Geographic Dynamics

of Mormonism, 1965–1995,” *Sunstone* 18 (December 1995): 21–32; Lowell Bennion and Lawrence A. Young, “The Uncertain Dynamics of LDS Expansion, 1950–2020,” *Dialogue* 29/1 (1996): 8–32; and Jack W. Carlson, “Income and Membership Projections for the Church through the Year 2000,” *Dialogue* 4/1 (1969): 131–36. A reflection on Mormon growth is James B. Allen, “On Becoming a Universal Church: Some Historical Perspectives,” *Dialogue* 25/1 (1992): 13–36.

An introduction with extensive bibliography on Mormon missionary work with Native Americans is David J. Whittaker, “Mormons and Native Americans: A Historical and Bibliographical Introduction,” *Dialogue* 18/4 (1985): 33–64. For an analysis of the centrality of missionary work among Native Americans in Joseph Smith’s thought, see Ronald W. Walker, “Seeking the ‘Remnant’: The Native American during the Joseph Smith Period,” *Journal of Mormon History* 19/1 (1993): 1–33.

## The British Isles

The great success of Mormon missionaries in Victorian Britain has assured that these missions have received the lion’s share of scholarly and popular attention. A short overview of the beginnings of the British Mission is Stanley B. Kimball, “First Mission to Britain,” *Improvement Era* (October 1961): 720–21, 744, 746; Walter M. Wolfe, “History of the British Mission,” *Millennial Star* 66 (14 July 1904–4 August 1904): 4-part series; and Agnes M. Smith, “The First Mormon Mission to Britain,” *History Today* 37 (July 1987): 24–31. The first book-length study, based extensively on material in the *LDS Millennial Star*, is Richard L. Evans, *A Century of “Mormonism” in Great Britain* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1937; reprinted, 1987). V. Ben Bloxham, James R. Moss, and Larry C. Porter, eds., *Truth Will Prevail: The Rise of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the British Isles, 1837–1987* (Sollihul, England: Corporation of the President, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1987), is an uneven attempt to update the Evans volume; unfortunately the endnotes were excluded from the Bloxham volume. The Winter and Spring 1987 issues of *BYU Studies* are devoted to the history of the church in the British Isles. The best overall study remains Philip A. M. Taylor, *Expectations Westward: The Mormons and the Emigration of Their British Converts in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966). A book-length study of the early missions is James B. Allen, Ronald K. Esplin, and David J. Whittaker, *Men with a Mission: The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in the British Isles, 1837–1841* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992). Five of the key individuals in the early missions to England are examined in James B. Allen and Thomas G. Alexander, eds., *Manchester Mormons, The Journal of William Clayton, 1840–1842* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1974); James B. Allen, *Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987); Leonard J. Arrington, *Brigham Young, American Moses* (New York: Knopf, 1985); Thomas G. Alexander, *Things in Heaven and Earth: The Life and Times of Wilford Woodruff, A Mormon Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1991); and Stanley B. Kimball, *Heber C. Kimball: Mormon Patriarch and Pioneer* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981). An extended bibliography, which includes many references to missionary work, is David J. Whittaker, “Mormonism in Victorian Britain: A Bibliographic Essay,” in *Mormons in Early Victorian Britain*, ed. Richard L. Jensen and Malcolm R. Thorp (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1989), 258–71. The *Ensign* carried a number of essays in its 1987 issues on the early missions in Britain, including Ronald K. Esplin, “A Great Work Done in That Land [the 1837 mission],” (July 1987): 20–27; Esplin, “Brigham Young in England” (June 1987): 28–33; and Paul T. Smith, “Among Family and Friends: John Taylor’s Mission to the British Isles” (March 1987): 36–41.

Studies of the later years of the nineteenth century include Richard W. Sadler, “Franklin D. Richards and the British Mission [1847–48],” *Journal of Mormon History* 14 (1988): 80–95; Samuel W. Richards, “Missionary Experience,” *Contributor* 11 (February 1890): 155–59 (president of British mission relates his experiences answering questions before a parliamentary committee); Richards, “Missionary Experience Recalled by the Death of Queen Victoria,”

*Improvement Era* (March 1901): 363–67; and Kenneth W. Godfrey, “Charles W. Penrose: The English Mission Years,” *BYU Studies* 27/1 (1987): 113–25. More contemporary studies are Ronald W. Walker, “Heber J. Grant’s European Mission, 1903–1906,” *Journal of Mormon History* 14 (1988): 17–33; and Richard L. Bushman, “The Crisis in Europe and Hugh B. Brown’s First Mission Presidency,” *Dialogue* 21/2 (1988): 51–59. A short piece with good photographs of church office buildings in Liverpool and London is R. Eugene Allen, “The Mission President in Europe: Some Reflections on an Eventful Administration Overseas from 1904 to 1906,” *Improvement Era* (November 1936): 694–95. A problem episode in Mormon missionary work in Europe (especially Britain) is studied in D. Michael Quinn, “I-Thou vs. I-It Conversions: The Mormon ‘Baseball Baptism’ Era,” *Sunstone* 16 (December 1993): 30–44; and Richard Mavin, “The Woodbury Years: An Insider’s Look at Baseball Baptisms in Britain,” *Sunstone* 19 (March 1996): 56–60. An autobiographical history by an LDS leader in contemporary England is Derek A. Cuthbert, *The Second Century, Latter-day Saints in Great Britain, Volume I, 1937–1987* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the author, 1987), some of which is summarized in Cuthbert, “Breakthrough in Britain,” *Ensign* (July 1987): 28–32. George K. Merritt and Richard Jensen have presented a statistical profile of the Mormons in the British Isles in the *Ensign* (July 1987): 19. See also Joy A. O’Banion, “The Convert as Social Type: A Critical Assessment of the Snow-Machalek Conversion Typology as Applied to British Mormon Converts” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1988); and Don L. Searle, “The Church in the United Kingdom and Ireland,” *Ensign* (June 1998): 40–51.

On Ireland and Scotland, see Brent A. Barlow, “History of the Church . . . in Ireland since 1840” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1968); Breck England, “Gospel Seeds in Scottish Soil,” *Ensign* (February 1987): 26–31; Frederick S. Buchanan, “The Emigration of Scottish Mormons to Utah, 1849–1900” (master’s thesis, University of Utah, 1961); Buchanan, “The Ebb and Flow of Mormonism in Scotland, 1840–1900,” *BYU Studies* 27/2 (1987): 27–52; and Buchanan, ed., *A Good Time Coming: Mormon Letters [1853–1872] to Scotland* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1988). The Scottish mission diaries (1897–99) of David O. McKay have been edited by Stan Larson and Patricia Larson in *“What E’er Thou Art, Act Well Thy Part”: The Missionary Diaries of David O. McKay* (Salt Lake City: Blue Ribbon Books, 1999).

The Welsh Mormon experience has received increased attention in recent years. See Douglas J. Davies, “The Mormons at Merthyr-Tydfil” (B.Litt. thesis, Oxford University, 1972); Davies, *Mormon Spirituality: Latter-day Saints in Wales and Zion* (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1987); Ronald D. Dennis, “Dan Jones, Welshman: Taking the Gospel Home,” *Ensign* (April 1987): 50–56; Dennis, “The Welsh and the Gospel,” in *Truth Will Prevail* (1987), 236–67; Dennis, *The Call of Zion: The Story of the First Welsh Mormon Emigration* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1987); and Dennis, *Welsh Mormon Writings from 1844 to 1862: A Historical Bibliography* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1988).

Other studies that provide information relating to the history and administration of the British mission and include much emphasis on social history are Sam Hamerman, “The Mormon Missionaries in England, 1837–1852” (master’s thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1938); John Cotterill, “Midland Saints: Mormon Mission in the West Midlands, 1837–77” (Ph.D. diss., University of Keele, 1985); Jan G. Harris, “The Mormons in Early Victorian Manchester” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1987), some of which she presents in “Mormons in Victorian Manchester,” *BYU Studies* 27/1 (1987): 47–56; Susan L. Fales, “The Nonconformists of Leeds in the Early Victorian Era: A Study in Social Composition” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1984); James B. Allen and Malcolm R. Thorp, “The Mission of the Twelve to England, 1840–1841: Mormon Apostles and the Working Classes,” *BYU Studies* 15/4 (1975): 499–526; Malcolm R. Thorp, “The Religious Background of Mormon Converts in Britain, 1837–52,” *Journal of Mormon History* 4 (1977): 51–65; Thorp, “The Field Is White Already to Harvest,”

appendix A, in *Men with a Mission* (1992), 323–44; and David J. Whittaker, “Harvest in Herefordshire [Wilford Woodruff’s British mission, 1840–41],” *Ensign* (January 1987): 46–51.

The emigration of European converts, most of whom were channeled through Liverpool with the assistance of the Perpetual Emigrating Fund (1849–1887), has been covered by Mark W. Cannon and Graham Dodd, “Mormon Immigrants: Dregs or Doers?” *Improvement Era* (March 1968): 5–7; W. H. G. Armytage, “Liverpool, Gateway to Zion,” *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 48 (April 1957): 39–43; M. Hamlin Cannon, “Migration of English Mormons to America,” *American Historical Review* 52 (April 1947): 436–55; Cannon, “The ‘Gathering’ of British Mormons to Western America: A Study of Religious Migration” (Ph.D. diss., American University, 1950); Bryan R. Wilson, “Migrating Sects: Review Article,” *British Journal of Sociology* 18 (Summer 1967): 303–17; Norman Hill, “The Trumpet of Zion: Mormon Conversion and Emigration in Britain,” *Tangents* 3 (Spring 1975): 56–69; Gustive O. Larson, “Story of the Perpetual Emigration Fund,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 18 (September 1931): 184–94; Larson, *Prelude to the Kingdom* (Francistown, N.H.: Marshal Jones, 1947); William Mulder, “Mormonism’s ‘Gathering’: An American Doctrine with a Difference,” *Church History* 23 (September 1954): 248–64; Glen M. Leonard, “Westward the Saints: The Nineteenth Century Mormon Migration,” *Ensign* (January 1980): 6–13; Richard L. Jensen and Gordon Irving, “The Voyage of the Amazon: A Close View of One Immigrant Company,” *Ensign* (March 1980): 16–19; William G. Hartley, “‘Down and Back’ Wagon Trains,” *Ensign* (September 1985): 26–31; Hartley, “The Great Florence Fitout of 1861,” *BYU Studies* 24/3 (1984): 341–71; Hartley, “Coming to Zion: Saga of the Gathering,” *Ensign* (July 1975): 14–18; and Lily Pritchard, “Across the Waves: Mormon Emigration of British Saints, 1840–1870” (Ph.D. diss., University of Bradford, 1989). On the large literature dealing with the Mormon Trail, see Stanley B. Kimball’s essay, “Mormon Emigration Trails,” in *Mormon Americana: A Guide to Sources and Collections in the United States*, ed. David J. Whittaker (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies Monograph Series, 1995), 406–36; and Kimball, “Sail and Rail Pioneers before 1869,” *BYU Studies* 35/2 (1995): 7–42.

The rich ethnic heritage of Utah, in large part a product of missionary work and the consequent immigration of converts, is surveyed in essays gathered in Helen Z. Papanickolas, ed., *The Peoples of Utah* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1976). See also John A. Olson, “Proselytism, Immigration, and Settlement of Foreign Converts to the Mormon Culture in Zion,” *Journal of the West* 6 (April 1967): 189–204. Surveys of ethnic branches and wards in the United States include Jessie L. Embry, “Ethnic Groups and the LDS Church,” *Dialogue* 25/4 (1992): 81–97; and Embry, *“In His Own Language”: Mormon Spanish-Speaking Congregations in the United States* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998), which provides information on the 350 LDS Spanish-speaking congregations in the United States, as well as on the 500 full-time Spanish-speaking missionaries in the United States.

## **Europe, Russia, and the Middle East**

A recent historical survey of the church in Europe, from an American perspective, using almost exclusively American sources, is Bruce Van Orden, *Building Zion, The Latter-day Saints in Europe* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996). Its strengths and weaknesses are suggested in an essay review by Wilfried Decoo, “Issues in Writing European History and in Building the Church in Europe . . .,” *Journal of Mormon History* 23/1 (1997): 140–76; and in the discussion in the *Journal of Mormon History* 24/1 (1998): v–lvii. Other works provide the background and details of the many other missions in Europe; the most successful after Britain was Scandinavia. On northern Europe, see Andrew Jenson, *History of the Scandinavian Mission* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1927); Janne M. Sjødahl, “The Beginning of the Scandinavian Mission,” *Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine* 3 (July 1912): 103–11; Nelson White, “A Flame Was Kindled in the Northlands,” *Improvement Era* (June 1950): 476–77, 525–27 (Scandinavia); William Mulder, *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957); Mulder, “Mormons from Scandinavia, 1850–1900: A Shepherded Migration,” *Pacific*

*Historical Review* 23 (1954): 227–59; Mulder, “Image of Zion: Mormonism as an American Influence in Scandinavia,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 43 (June 1956): 18–38; Albert L. Zobell Jr., *Under the Midnight Sun: Centennial History of Scandinavian Missions* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1950); John A. Widtsoe, *In the Gospel Net: The Story of Anna K. G. Widtsoe* (Independence, Mo.: Zion’s Printing, 1941); Andrew Karl Larson, *Erastus Snow: The Life of a Missionary and Pioneer for the Early Mormon Church* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1971); Alfred Christiansen, “Scandinavians and the New Zion in the West,” *American Scandinavian Review* 60 (1972): 263–71; Ronald K. Watkins, “Notes on the Early Mormon Mission in Denmark,” *The Bridge: Journal of the Danish American Heritage Society* 3 (August 1980): 1–5; Jens P. Wilde, “Bleeding Feet, Humble Hearts: Danish Mormon Migration, 1850–1860,” *The Bridge: Journal of the Danish American Heritage Society* 3 (August 1980): 6–19; H. N. Hansen, “An Account of a Mormon Family’s Conversion to the Religion of the Latter-day Saints and of Their Trip from Denmark to Utah,” Parts I and II, *Annals of Iowa* 41 (Summer and Fall 1971): 709–28, 765–79; Helge Seljaas, “The Mormon Migration from Norway” (master’s thesis, University of Utah, 1972); Richard G. Ellsworth, “The Dilemma of a Pernicious Zion,” *BYU Studies* 8/4 (1968): 407–22; Gerald Haslam, “Early Norwegian Converts to the LDS Church,” *Genealogical Journal* 9 (June 1980): 78–89; Richard L. Jensen, “A New Home, A New Life: Contributions of the European Saints in Building the Kingdom,” *Ensign* (August 1973): 56–62; Douglas F. Tobler, “Update on Western Europe,” *Ensign* (August 1976): 30–34; Tobler, “Alone with God,” *Ensign* (April 1993): 50–52; Gerald Haslam, “The Norwegian Experience with Mormonism, 1842–1920” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1981, published in New York by Peter Lang in 1984); Curtis B. Hunsaker, “History of the Norwegian Mission from 1851 to 1960” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1965); Gideon N. Hulterstrom, “Mormonism in Sweden,” *Millennial Star* 92 (30 October 1930): 761–65; Sheryl R. Benson, “Emigration of Swedish Mormons to Utah, 1905–1955” (master’s thesis, University of Utah, 1965); A. Dean Wengreen, “A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Sweden, 1850–1905” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1968); Carl-Erik Johansson, “History of the Swedish Mission . . . 1905–1973” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1973); Frank I. Kooyman, “The Netherlands Mission,” *Millennial Star* 92 (6 November 1930): 769–75; T. Edgar Lyon, “Landmarks in the Netherlands Mission, 1861–1936,” *Improvement Era* (September 1936): 546–47, 573; Keith C. Warner, “History of the Netherlands Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1861–1966” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1967); Marius A. Christensen, “History of the Danish Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1966); Douglas F. Tobler, Barton W. Marcois, and J. L. W. van Langendijk, “Geschiedenis van de Mormoonse Kerk Nederland en Vlaanderen [Mormons in the Netherlands, 1841–74],” *Horizon* 1/2 (March 1982): 46–55; 1/4 (July 1982): 48–55; 1/5 (September 1982): 51–56; 2/2 (March 1983): 47–53; 2/3 (May 1983): 50–57; 2/5 (September 1983): 53–60; Gilbert W. Scharffs, “History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Germany between 1840 and 1968” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1969); published as *Mormonism in Germany: A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in Germany between 1840 and 1970* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970); Michael Mitchell, “The Mormons in Wilhelmine, Germany, 1870–1914: Making a Place for an Unwanted American Religion in a Changing German Society” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1994); Joseph M. Dixon, “Mormons in the Third Reich: 1933–1945,” *Dialogue* 7/1 (1972): 70–78; Alan F. Keele and Douglas F. Tobler, “The Fuhrer’s New Clothes: Helmuth Hübener and the Mormons in the Third Reich,” *Sunstone* 5/6 (November/December 1980): 20–29; *When Truth Was Treason: German Youth against Hitler*, comp., trans., and ed. Blair R. Holmes and Alan F. Keele (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995); Douglas F. Tobler, “Before the Wall Fell: Mormons in the German Democratic Republic, 1945–89,” *Dialogue* 25/4 (1992): 11–30; Dale Z. Kirby, “History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Switzerland” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1971); J. Roger Fechser, “Historical Review of the French Mission,” *Millennial Star* 92 (2 October 1930): 695, 698–700; Gary Ray Chard, “A History of the French Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1850–1960” (master’s thesis, Utah State University, 1965); Douglas F. Tobler, “Heinrich Hug and Jacob Tobler: From Switzerland to Santa Clara, 1854–80,” *Dialogue* 26/4 (1993): 107–27; John C. Jarvis, “Mormonism in



France: A Study of Cultural Exchange and Institutional Adaptation" (Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1991); Ronald D. Dennis, "William Howells: First Missionary to France," in *Supporting Saints, Life Stories of Nineteenth-Century Mormons*, ed. Donald Q. Cannon and David J. Whittaker (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1985), 43–81; Kahlile Mehr, "The Trial of the French Mission," *Dialogue* 21/3 (1988): 27–45; Wilfried Decoo, "Mormonism in a European Catholic Region: A Contribution to the Social Psychology of LDS Converts," *BYU Studies* 24/1 (1984): 61–78 (the original questionnaires used for this study, completed by Dutch converts, 1980–84, are in Special Collections, Lee Library, BYU); and C. Brooklyn Derr, "Messages from Two Cultures: Mormon Leaders in France, 1985," *Dialogue* 21/2 (1988): 98–111.

On southern and eastern Europe and the Near East, see Michael W. Homer, "The Italian Mission, 1850–1867," *Sunstone* 7 (May/June 1982): 16–21; Homer, "The Budding of Mormon History in Italy," *Dialogue* 25/1 (1992): 174–76; Diane Stokoe, "The Mormon Waldensians [Italy]" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1985); James R. Christianson, "Early Missionary Work in Italy and Switzerland," *Ensign* (August 1982): 35–46; *Autobiography of Jabez Woodard* (Provo, Utah: Stevenson, 1976); Mark L. Grover, "Migration, Social Change, and Mormonism in Portugal," *Journal of Mormon History* 21/1 (1995): 65–79; Grover, "Pioneers in a Land of Explorers [Portugal]," *Ensign* (April 1997): 42–47; Ralph L. Cottrell Jr., "A History of the Discontinued Mediterranean Missions of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1963); LeGrande W. Smith, "Trial and Triumph in Thessaloniki: The Challenges of Opening Greece for the Preaching of the Gospel," *Latter-day Digest* 3 (July 1994): 20–34; Joseph W. Booth, "The Armenian Mission," *Improvement Era* (October 1928): 1048–52 (the extensive Booth diaries are at BYU); Daniel J. Pingree, "And Your Name Will be Remembered . . . : The History of John Alexander Clark's Turkish Mission," *Thetean* 24 (1995): 30–50; Rao H. Lindsay, "History of the Missionary Activities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Near East, 1884–1929" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1958); Russell M. Nelson, "Drama on the European Stage," *Ensign* (December 1991): 6–17 (opening of eastern Europe for missionary work in 1980s); Howard L. Biddulph, *The Morning Breaks: Stories of Conversion and Faith in the Former Soviet Union* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996); Gary L. Browning, "Out of Obscurity: The Emergence of the Church . . . in 'That Vast Empire' of Russia," *BYU Studies* 33/4 (1993): 674–88; Browning, *Russia and the Restored Gospel* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1997); Browning, "Pioneering in Russia," *Ensign* (June 1997): 24–30; Thomas F. Rogers, *A Call to Russia, Glimpses of Missionary Life from the Journal of a Mission President in the Russia St. Petersburg Mission* (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies Monographs, 1999); Tania Rands, "Mormonism in a Post-Soviet Society: Notes from Ukraine," *Dialogue* 30/1 (1997): 71–96; Kahlile Mehr, "The 1903 Dedication of Russia for Missionary Work," *Journal of Mormon History* 13 (1986–87): 111–23; Mehr, "The Gospel in Hungary: Then and Now," *Ensign* (June 1990): 8–13; Mehr, "The Eastern Edge: LDS Missionary Work in Hungarian Lands," *Dialogue* 24/2 (1991): 27–46; Albert L. Zobell Jr., "Twenty Years in the Czechoslovakian Mission," *Improvement Era* (January 1950): 32–33, 76–77; Kahlile Mehr, "Enduring Believers: Czechoslovakia and the LDS Church, 1884–1990," *Journal of Mormon History* 18/2 (1992): 111–54; Mehr, "Keeping Promises: The LDS Church Enters Bulgaria, 1990–1994," *BYU Studies* 36/4 (1996–97): 69–105; Stanley B. Kimball, "The Mormons in the Hapsburg Lands, 1841–1914," *Austrian History Yearbook* 9–10 (1973–74): 143–65; Garold Davis and Norma Davis, "Behind the Wall: The Church in Eastern Germany (Part 1: Saints in Isolation, 1945–1989)," *Ensign* (April 1991): 22–27; Davis and Davis, "The Wall Comes Down: The Church in Eastern Germany (Part 2: 1989–1990)," *Ensign* (July 1991): 32–36; David B. Galbraith, "Orson Hyde's 1841 Mission to the Holy Land," *Ensign* (October 1991): 16–19; Arnold H. Green, "A Survey of LDS Proselyting Efforts to the Jewish People," *BYU Studies* 8/4 (1968): 427–43 (from his master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1967); Green, "Jews in Mormon Thought," *BYU Studies* 34/4 (1994–95): 137–64; Steven Epperson, *Mormons and Jews: Early Mormon Theologies of Israel* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992); Steven W. Baldrige, *Grafting In: A History of the Latter-day Saints in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Branch, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1989); Ivan J. Barrett, "The Story of the Mormons in the Holy Land" (typescript, Lee

Library, BYU, 1977); Rao H. Lindsay, "The Dream of a Mormon Colony in the Near East," *Dialogue* 1/4 (1966): 50–67; Richard O. Cowan, ed., "Mischa Markow: Mormon Missionary to the Balkans," *BYU Studies* 11/1 (1970): 92–99; William H. Kehr, "Missionary to the Balkans: Mischa Markow," *Ensign* (June 1980): 29–32; Spencer J. Palmer, ed., *Mormons and Muslims* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1983); Marianne Perciaccanti, "The Mormon-Muslim Comparison" (master's thesis, University of Virginia, 1988); Anson D. Shupe and John Heinerman, "State-within-a-State Diplomacy: Mormon Missionary Efforts in Communist and Islamic Countries," in *The Politics of Religion and Social Change*, ed. Anson D. Shupe and Jeffrey K. Hadden (New York: Paragon House, 1988), 67–83; Terry N. Montague, "... Mine Angels Round About": *Mormon Missionary Evacuation from Western Germany, 1939* (Murray, Utah: Roylance, 1989); David F. Boone, "The Worldwide Evacuation of Latter-day Saint Missionaries at the Beginning of World War II" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1981) and Joseph F. Boone, "The Roles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Relation to the United States Military, 1900–1975" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1975). The special 1946 mission of Ezra Taft Benson to postwar Europe is told in *A Labor of Love: The 1946 European Mission of Ezra Taft Benson* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989). Because so much of Mormon mission history has focused on church leaders, it is instructive to compare an account of a church leader with the accounts of local members: Thomas S. Monson, *Faith Rewarded: A Personal Account of Prophetic Promises to the East German Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996); and *Behind the Iron Curtain, Recollections of Latter-day Saints in East Germany, 1945–1989*, comp., trans., and ed. Garold Davis and Norma Davis (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies Monograph Series, 1996).

## Mexico and South America

In recent years the most successful area for Mormon proselyting has been Mexico and South America. Mormon missionaries have been quite successful in countries where Catholics have preceded them. Today (1998) Spanish is the language spoken by the majority of convert members. Thus Mormon missiology must look closer here. The best place to begin is with F. LaMond Tullis, *Mormons in Mexico: The Dynamics of Faith and Culture* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1987), which includes a good summary of the Third Convention movement (pp. 137–68), a nativist reaction to American leadership. Additional studies of the history of Mormonism in these areas include the following: Rey L. Pratt, "History of the Mexican Mission," *Improvement Era* (April 1912): 486–98; Reva H. Stanley and Charles C. Camp, "A Mormon Mission to California in 1851, from the Diary of Parley P. Pratt," *California Historical Society Quarterly* 14 (March and June 1935): 59–73; 175–82; F. LaMond Tullis, "California and Chile in 1851 as Experienced by Mormon Apostle Parley P. Pratt," *Southern California Quarterly* 67 (Fall 1985): 291–307; Tullis, "Early Mormon Exploration and Missionary Activities in Mexico," *BYU Studies* 22/3 (1982): 289–310; Tullis, "Reopening the Mexican Mission in 1901," *BYU Studies* 22/4 (1982): 441–53; A. Delbert Palmer and Mark L. Grover, "Hoping to Establish a Presence: Parley P. Pratt's 1851 Mission to Chile," *BYU Studies* 38/4 (1999): 115–37; Kenneth W. Godfrey, "Moses Thatcher and Mormon Beginnings in Mexico," *BYU Studies* 38/4 (1999): 139–55; Mark L. Grover, "Execution in Mexico: The Death of Rafael Monroy and Vicente Morales [17 July 1915]," *BYU Studies* 35/3 (1995–96): 6–28; and Dale F. Beecher, "Rey L. Pratt and the Mexican Mission [Mexico City, 1906–24]," *BYU Studies* 15/3 (1975): 293–307; and Byron J. McNeil, "The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Mexico" (master's thesis, San Jose State University, 1990); Henri P. P. Gooren, "De expanderende Mormoonse Kerk in Latijns Amerika: schetsen uit een week in San Jose Costa Rica" (master's thesis, University of Utrecht, 1991); and Gooren, "Rich among the Poor: Church, Firm, and Household among Small-Scale Entrepreneurs in Guatemala City" (Ph.D. diss., University of Utrecht, 1998). See also "Conversation: The Church in Central America," *Ensign* (August 1998): 79–80.

The South American Mormon experience is discussed in John D. Peterson, "History of the Mormon Missionary Movement in South America to 1940" (master's thesis, University of Utah, 1961); G. Wallace Fox, "A Historical

Resumé: Missions of South America, Argentina–Brazil, 1925–1935,” *Improvement Era* (December 1935): 746–49; Joel A. Flake, “The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in South America: 1945–1960” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1975); Frederick S. Williams and Frederick G. Williams, *From Acorn to Oaktree: A Personal History of the Establishment and First Quarter Century of the South American Missions* (Fullerton, Calif.: Et Cetera Graphics, 1987); Marcus H. Martins, “The Oak Tree Revisited: Brazilian LDS Leaders’ Insights on the Growth of the LDS Church in Brazil” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1996); G. Benson Whittle, “From the Mission Field–Brazil,” *Dialogue* 1/4 (1966): 135–40; Mark L. Grover, “Mormonism in Brazil: Religion and Dependency in Latin America” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1985); Grover, “Religious Accommodation in the Land of Racial Democracy: Mormon Priesthood and Black Brazilians,” *Dialogue* 17/3 (1984): 23–34; Grover, *The Mormon Church in Latin America: A Periodical Index, 1830–1976* (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1977); Grover, “Relief Society and Church Welfare: The Brazilian Experience,” *Dialogue* 27/4 (1994): 29–38; Patrick Madden, “East of the River of Birds [Uruguay],” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1999); David C. Knowlton, “Thoughts on Mormonism in Latin America,” *Dialogue* 25/2 (1992): 41–53; Knowlton, “The Creation of Sacred Mormon Myth: Missionary, Native, and General Authority Accounts of a Bolivian Conversion,” *Sunstone* 13 (January 1989): 14–23; Knowlton, “Gringo Jeringo’: Anglo Mormon Missionary Culture in Bolivia,” in *Contemporary Mormonism, Social Science Perspectives* (1995), 218–36; Knowlton, “Mormonism in Chile,” in *Mormon Identities in Transition*, ed. Douglas J. Davies (London: Cassell, 1996), 68–79; Michael R. Morris, “Chile’s Fruitful Vineyard,” *Ensign* (December 1995): 32–41; Gordon Irving, “Mormonism and Latin America: A Preliminary Historical Survey,” *Task Papers in LDS History*, No. 10 (Salt Lake City: Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1976); Wesley W. Craig Jr., “The Church in Latin America: Progress and Challenge,” *Dialogue* 5/3 (1970): 66–74; F. LaMond Tullis, “Three Myths about Mormons in Latin America,” *Dialogue* 7/1 (1972): 79–87; Tullis, “The Church Moves outside the United States: Some Observations from Latin America,” *Dialogue* 13/1 (1980): 63–73; Terence L. Hansen, “The Church in Central America,” *Ensign* (September 1972): 40–42; Michael Smurthwaite, “Sociopolitical Factors Affecting the Growth of the Mormon Church in Argentina since 1925” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1968); A. Delbert Palmer, “Establishing the LDS Church in Chile” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1979); Marvin K. Gardner, “Pioneers in Paraguay,” *Ensign* (March 1994): 39–45; Allen Litster, “Pioneering in the Andes,” *Ensign* (January 1997): 16–22; Michael R. Morris, “Chile’s Fruitful Vineyard,” *Ensign* (December 1995): 32–41; and Judy C. Olsen, “Argentina’s Bright and Glorious Day,” *Ensign* (February 1998): 36–43. An interesting collection of personal essays on his mission experiences in Uruguay is Patrick Madden, “East of the River of Birds” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1999). A brief look at the independent work of Cordell Anderson in Guatemala is in Elizabeth Shaw, “Alone in a Valley: Cordell Anderson’s Private Peace Corps,” *Sunstone* 1 (Spring 1976): 45–52, and Melvin A. Lyman, *Out of Obscurity into Light* (Salt Lake City: Albany Book, 1985), 165–93.

## **The Pacific, Asia, and India**

The best place to begin studying Mormonism in the Pacific Basin is with 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). A companion volume by the same author on the history of the church in Asia is Britsch, *From the East: The History of the Latter-Day Saints in Asia, 1851–1996* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1998). A pioneering work that tried to cover too much ground was Robert C. Patch, “An Historical Overview of the Missionary Activities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Continental Asia” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1949). All of the following studies of their respective areas contain information that illuminate the proselyting picture: David J. Whittaker, “Parley P. Pratt and the Pacific Mission: Mormon Publishing in ‘That Very Questionable Part of the Civilized World,’” in *Mormons, Scripture, and the Ancient World: Studies in Honor of John L. Sorenson* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1998), 51–84; Richard C. Harvey, “The Development of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Hawaii” (master’s

thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974); Norman Douglas, "Latter-day Saint Missions and Missionaries in Polynesia, 1844–1960" (Ph.D. diss., Australian National University, 1974); Russell T. Clement, comp., *Mormons in the Pacific: A Bibliography* (Laie: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1981); Jay Todd, "Hawaii," *Improvement Era* (May 1966): 383–86; Francis J. Russell, "Diamond Jubilee of Missionary Effort in Hawaii," *Improvement Era* (May 1926): 613–19 (re: George Q. Cannon); R. Lanier Britsch, *Moromona: The Mormons in Hawaii* (Laie: Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1989); Andrew Jenson, "The Society Islands Mission," *Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine* 5–8 (January 1914–April 1917): 12-part series; Marba C. Josephson, "A Glance at Hawaiian Mission History," *Improvement Era* (August 1950): 619–20, 666–69; Comfort Margaret Bock, "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Hawaiian Islands" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1941); Castle H. Murphy, *Castles of Zion–Hawaii: Autobiography and Episodes from the Life of Castle A. Murphy, Missionary to Hawaii* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1963); Guy Bishop, "Henry William Bigler: Mormon Missionary to the Sandwich Islands during the 1850s," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 20 (1986): 122–36; Donald R. Shaffer, "A Forgotten Missionary: Hiram Clark, Mormon Itinerant, British Emigration Organizer, and First President of the L.D.S. Hawaiian Mission, 1795–1853" (master's thesis, California State University, Fullerton, 1990); Shaffer, "Hiram Clark and the First LDS Hawaiian Mission: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Mormon History* 17 (1991): 94–109; Scott G. Kenney, "Mormons and the Smallpox Epidemic of 1853," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 31 (1997): 1–26; Joseph H. Spurrier, *The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Hawaiian Islands* (Salt Lake City: Hawkes, 1978); Spurrier, *Sandwich Island Saints: Early Mormon Converts in the Hawaiian Islands* (Oahu: Spurrier, 1989); W. Karl Brewer, *Armed with the Spirit: Missionary Experiences in Samoa* (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1975); Max E. Stanton, "Samoa Saints: Samoans in the Mormon Village of Laie, Hawaii" (Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon, 1973), some of which appears in "Mormons, Matais, and Modernization: Stress and Change among Samoans of Laie, Hawaii," in *New Neighbors . . . Islands in Adaptation*, ed. Cluny McPherson, Bradd Shore, and Robert Franco (Santa Cruz: Center for South Pacific Studies, University of California, 1978), 272–85; R. Lanier Britsch, "The Lanai Colony: A Hawaiian Extension of the Mormon Colonial Idea," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 12 (1978): 68–83; Donna Higgins, "Samoa," *Improvement Era* (May 1966): 395–98, 448; Matthew Cowley, "Maori Chief Predicts Coming of L.D.S. Missionaries," *Improvement Era* (September 1950): 696–98, 754–56; Peter Lineham, "The Mormon Message in the Context of Maori Culture," *Journal of Mormon History* 17 (1991): 62–93; Duane P. Harris, "Missionaries in the Last Kingdom [Tonga]" (honors thesis, Harvard University, 1989); John H. Groberg, *In the Eye of the Storm* [Tonga] (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1993); Groberg, *The Fire of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1996); Fa'aki Kihelotu 'Alatini Richter, "Missionary Work in Tonga," in *Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, Mormon History in the Pacific, May 8–9, 1981* (n.p.: Mormon Pacific Historical Society, 1981), 49–64; Ian G. Barber, "Between Biculturalism and Assimilation: The Changing Place of Maori Culture in the Twentieth Century New Zealand Mormon Church," *New Zealand Journal of History* 29 (October 1995): 142–69; Marjorie Newton, "From Tolerance to 'House Cleaning': LDS Leadership Response to Maori Marriage Customs, 1890–1990," *Journal of Mormon History* 22/2 (1996): 72–91; Newton, "Mormonism in New Zealand: A Historical Appraisal," (Ph.D. thesis, University of Sidney, 1998); Doyle L. Green, "Tahiti: Looking Back on a Century of Work in French Oceania," *Improvement Era* (October 1939): 592–93, 632–33; Green, "French Polynesia," *Improvement Era* (May 1966): 377–80; Green, "Mission to Polynesia: The Story of Addison Pratt and the Society Islands Mission," *Improvement Era* (March 1949–March 1950): 10-part series; R. Carl Harris, *Samoa Apia Mission History, 1888–1983* (n.p.: Samoa Printing, 1983); Jennie M. Hart, John W. Hart, and R. Carl Harris, *The Expanded Samoan Mission History, 1888–1900*, vol. 1 (n.p.: Corporation of the President, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1988); Eugene England, "Mission to Paradise," *BYU Studies* 38/1 (1999): 170–85; Marvin E. Pack, "The Sandwich Islands Country and Mission," *Contributor* 17 (November 1895–October 1896): 11-part series (skips March), last five deal with missionary work; S. George Ellsworth, *Zion in Paradise: Early Mormons in the South Seas* (Logan, Utah: The Faculty Association, Utah State University, 1959); Ellsworth, "New Wine in Old Bottles: The LDS Conversion Experience in French Polynesia," in *Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, Mormon History in the Pacific, May 8–9, 1981* (n.p.: Mormon Pacific Historical Society, 1981), 1–

10; Ellsworth, ed., *The Journals of Addison Pratt* . . . (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990); Ellsworth, ed., *The History of Louisa Barnes Pratt, Being the Autobiography of a Mormon Missionary Widow and Pioneer* (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1998), esp. 95–191 (Tahiti, 1850–52); Ellsworth, *Seasons of Faith and Courage: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in French Polynesia: A Sesquicentennial History, 1843–1993* (Sandy, Utah: Perrin, 1994); David W. Cummings, *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific: The Building Program of the Church* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961); Alice C. Pack, *Building Missionaries in Hawaii, 1960–1963* (Laie: Church College of Hawaii, ca. 1963); Alma Greenwood, “My New Zealand Mission,” *Juvenile Instructor* 20–21 (March 1885–March 1886): 22-part series; Brian W. Hunt, “History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in New Zealand” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1971; published by the Church College of New Zealand, 1977); Harold T. Christensen, “The New Zealand Mission during the Great Depression: Reflections of a Former Acting President,” *Dialogue* 24/3 (1991): 69–76; Ruby Welch, “Ethnicity among Auckland Mormons” (master’s thesis, University of Auckland, 1989); Ian R. Barker, “The Connexion: The Mormon Church and the Maori People” (master’s thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1967); Tamar G. Gordon, “Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1988); Louis Midgley, “A Singular Reading: The Maori and the Book of Mormon,” in *Mormons, Scripture, and the Ancient World* (1998), 245–76; R. Lanier Britsch, “Mormon Intruders in Tonga: The Passport Act of 1922,” in *Mormons, Scripture, and the Ancient World* (1998), 121–48; Max E. Stanton, “A Gathering of Saints: The Role of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Pacific Islander Migration,” in *A World Perspective on Pacific Islander Migration*, ed. G. McCall and J. Connell (Centre for South Pacific Studies, The University of New South Wales, 1993), 23–37; William A. Moody, *Years in the Sheaf: The Autobiography of William Alfred Moody [in Samoa]* (Salt Lake City: Granite Publishing, 1959); R. Lanier Britsch, “The Founding of the Samoan Mission,” *BYU Studies* 18/1 (1977): 12–26; Britsch, “The Expansion of Mormonism in the South Pacific,” *Dialogue* 13/1 (1980): 53–62; Britsch, “Refounding of the LDS Mission in French Polynesia, 1892,” *Pacific Studies* 3 (Fall 1979): 68–80; Britsch, “The Church in the South Pacific,” *Ensign* (February 1976): 20–27; Britsch, “On the Pacific Frontier: The Church in the Gilbert Islands,” *Ensign* (October 1981): 28–31; “Conversation: The Church in the Pacific,” *Ensign* (February 1998): 79–80; Garth N. Jones, “Expanding the LDS Church Abroad: Old Realities Compounded,” *Dialogue* 13/1 (1980): 8–22; Jones, “Spreading the Gospel in Indonesia: Organizational Obstacles and Opportunities,” *Dialogue* 15/4 (1982): 79–90; Jones, “The Ahmadis of Islam: A Mormon Encounter and Perspective,” *Dialogue* 19/2 (1986): 39–54; Amasa Potter, “Missionary Sketches,” *Millennial Star* 33 (22 August 1871–3 October 1871): 4-part series on Australia; John D. Hawkes, “A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Australia to 1900” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1965); John Devitry-Smith, “William James Barratt: The First Mormon ‘Down Under,’” *BYU Studies* 28/3 (1988): 53–66; Marjorie A. Newton, “Southern Cross Saints: The Mormon Church in Australia” (master’s thesis, University of Sidney, 1987), published as *Southern Cross Saints, The Mormons in Australia* (Laie: Mormons in the Pacific Series, The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1991); Newton, “Pioneering the Gospel in Australia,” *Ensign* (October 1986): 32–41; Newton, “The Gathering of the Australian Saints in the 1850s,” *BYU Studies* 27/2 (1987): 67–78; Newton, “‘Seduced Away’: Early Mormon Documents in Australia,” *BYU Studies* 35/3 (1995–96): 149–65; Newton, “‘Almost Like Us’: The American Socialization of Australian Converts,” *Dialogue* 24/3 (1991): 9–20; Ross Geddes, “Before Stakehood: The Mission Years in Brisbane, Australia,” *Journal of Mormon History* 22/2 (1996): 92–119; Alison Craig, “The Saints in Indonesia,” *Ensign* (January 1977): 86–90; R. Lanier Britsch, “The Early Missions to Burma and Siam,” *Improvement Era* (March 1970): 35–44; Britsch, “Early Latter-day Saint Missions to South and East Asia” (Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968); Britsch, “From Bhutan to Wangts’ang: Taking the Gospel to Asia,” *Ensign* (June 1980): 6–10; R. Lanier Britsch and Richard C. Holloman Jr., “The Church’s Years in Vietnam,” *Ensign* (August 1980): 24–30; William R. Heaton Jr., “Vietnam and the Restored Church,” *Ensign* (June 1973): 35–37; David L. Hughes, “The Saints in Saigon: An End, A Beginning,” *This People* 6 (April 1985): 46–51; Spencer Palmer, *The Church Encounters Asia* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970); Craig G. Christensen, “The Beginnings in Thailand,” *Improvement Era* (March 1970): 32–34; Joan P. Ford and LaRene Gaunt, “The Gospel Dawning in Thailand,” *Ensign* (September

1995): 48–55; J. Talmage Jones, *In Singapore and Other Asian Cities* (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1984); Beng L. Pang, *A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Singapore: Journey to Stakehood, 1964–1997* (Singapore: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Singapore Stake, 1997); Manoth Suksabjarern, “Roman Catholic, Protestant and Latter-day Saint Missions in Thailand: An Historical Survey” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1977); and Don Hicken, “The Church in Asia,” *Dialogue* 3/1 (1968): 134–42.

For China, see R. D. Barney and Gary G. Y. Chu, “Differences between Mormons’ Perceptions and Chinese Natives’ Expectations in Intercultural Transactions,” *Journal of Social Psychology* 98 (February 1976): 135–36 (compare Chu’s master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974); R. Lanier Britsch, “Church Beginnings in China,” *BYU Studies* 10/2 (1970): 161–72; Paul V. Hyer, “Revolution and Mormonism in Asia: What the Church Might Offer a Changing Society,” *Dialogue* 7/1 (1972): 88–93; Robert J. Morris, “Middle Buddha,” *Dialogue* 4/1 (1969): 41–50; Robert J. Morris, “The Church and the Orient,” review of *The Church Encounters Asia*, by Spencer J. Palmer, *Dialogue* 5/3 (1970): 104–6; William R. Heaton, “Mormonism and Maoism: The Church and People’s China,” *Dialogue* 13/1 (1980): 40–50; Bruce J. M. Dean, “Chinese Christianity since 1849: Implications for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1981); and Feng Xi, “A History of Mormon-Chinese Relations: 1849–1993” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1994). See also Spencer J. Palmer, *Brigham Young University and the People’s Republic of China: The First Five Years* (Provo, Utah: David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies, BYU, 1984). A study of Chinese converts in 1996–97 is Caroline Pluss, “Chinese Participation in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) in Hong Kong,” *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 14/1 (1999): 63–76. For a brief look at Mongolia, see Charlotte D. Lofgreen, “Mongolia: The Morning Breaks,” *Cameo: Latter-day Women in Profile* 2 (February 1994): 9–26.

For Korea, see Dong S. Choi, “A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Korea, 1950–1985” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1990); and Spencer J. Palmer and Shirley H. Palmer, *The Korean Saints: Personal Stories of Trial and Triumph, 1850–1980* (Provo, Utah: Religious Education, BYU, 1995).

For Japan, see Alma O. Taylor, “About Japan and the Japan Mission,” *Improvement Era* (November 1906): 1–9; Taylor, “Memories of Far-off Japan: President Grant’s First Foreign Mission, 1901–1903,” *Improvement Era* (November 1936): 690–91; A. Ray Olpin, “The Art of Tracting in Japan,” *Improvement Era* (November 1917): 40–44; Murray L. Nichols, “History of the Japan Mission of the Church . . . 1901–1924” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1957); Ronald W. Walker, “Strangers in a Strange Land: Heber J. Grant and the Opening of the Japanese Mission,” *Journal of Mormon History* 13 (1986–87): 21–43; Heber J. Grant, *A Japanese Journal*, comp. Gordon A. Madsen (n.p.: by the compiler, n.d. [available at BYU]); R. Lanier Britsch, “The Closing of the Early Japan Mission,” *BYU Studies* 15/2 (1975): 171–90; John A. Widtsoe, “The Japanese Mission in Action,” *Improvement Era* (February 1939): 88–89, 125, 127 (re: direction of Japanese mission from Hawaii after closure of the mission in 1924); Christopher Conkling, “Members without a Church: Japanese Mormons in Japan from 1924–1948,” *BYU Studies* 15/2 (1975): 191–214; Terry G. Nelson, “A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Japan from 1948–1980” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1986); Seiji Katanuma, “The Church in Japan,” *BYU Studies* 14/1 (1973): 16–28; R. Lanier Britsch, “The Blossoming of the Church in Japan,” *Ensign* (October 1992): 32–38; Jiro Numauo, “How International Is the Church in Japan?” *Dialogue* 13/1 (1980): 85–91; Frederick R. Brady, *The Japanese Reaction to Mormonism and the Translation of Mormon Scripture in Japanese* (Tokyo: Sophia University, International College, 1979); and Tomoko Aizawa, “The LDS Church as a New Religious Movement in Japan” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1995). For Guam, see David M. Walden, “An Exploration of Recent Religious Conversion on Guam” (master’s thesis, University of Guam, 1978).

For the Philippines, Lawell E. Call, "Latter-day Saint Servicemen in the Philippine Islands: A Historical Study of Their Religious Activities and Influences Resulting in the Official Organization of the Church . . . in the Philippines" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1955); and Joseph P. Gray, "Ecclesiastical Conversion as a Social Process: A Case Study from the Philippines" (Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, 1976).

For India, see R. Lanier Britsch, "The Latter-day Saint Mission to India: 1851–1856," *BYU Studies* 12/3 (1972): 267–78; Britsch, "A History of the Missionary Activities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in India, 1849–1856" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1964); Britsch, *Nothing More Heroic, The Compelling Story of the First Latter-day Saint Missionaries in India* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1999); David J. Whittaker, "Richard Ballantyne and the Defense of Mormonism in India in the 1850s," in *Supporting Saints* (1985), 175–212; Ross Findlay and Lonnie Findlay, comps., *Missionary Journals of Hugh Findlay, India-Scotland* (Ephraim, Utah: by the compilers, 1973); Elizabeth S. VanDenBerghe, "Edwin Dharmaraju: Taking the Gospel Home to India," *Ensign* (April 1990): 60–62; Alma Heaton and Marie Heaton, *Behind the Taj Mahal, Spiritual Adventures in [Southwestern] India* (Provo, Utah: n.p., 1992); Michael R. Morris, "India: A Season of Sowing," *Ensign* (July 1995): 40–48; Roger R. Keller, "India: A Synopsis of Cultural Challenges," in *Mormon Identities in Transition* (1996), 87–92; and J. David D. Peck, "Mormonism and Eastern Mysticism," *Dialogue* 21/2 (1988): 113–26.

Looking at a modern "gathering," the experience of the Oakland California Stake, is Robert G. Larsen and Sharyn H. Larsen, "Refugee Converts: One Stake's Experience," *Dialogue* 20/3 (1987): 37–55. Jessie L. Embry's oral histories with LDS Asian Mormons are synthesized in her *Asian American Mormons: Bridging Cultures* (Provo, Utah: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, BYU, 1999). An early plea for Mormons to better understand Asian culture by a BYU professor and later a mission president in the Far East, was Russell N. Horiuchi, "Church Must Study Oriental Cultures to Meet Missionary Work Challenge," *Daily Universe*, BYU student newspaper, 15 November 1962, 2.

## Africa

Significant LDS missionary work in Africa has only come since 1978, when the church approved the ordaining of worthy black males to offices in the priesthood. The first overview of the Mormon experience in Africa was Farrell R. Monson, "History of the South African Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1853–1970" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1971). Other studies include Samuel Martin, "The Growth of the South African Mission," *Improvement Era* (October 1928): 1044–47; Eric Rosenthal, "Mormons in Africa," in his *Stars and Stripes in Africa* (London: Routledge and Sons, 1938), 100–103; Spencer J. Palmer, *Mormons in West Africa: New Terrain for the Sesquicentennial Church, Annual Religion Faculty Lecture, 27 September 1979* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religion Department, 1979); David J. Whittaker, "Early Mormon Imprints in South Africa," *BYU Studies* 20/4 (1980): 404–16; William Lye, "From Burundi to Zaire: Taking the Gospel to Africa," *Ensign* (March 1980): 10–15; Newell G. Bringhurst, "Mormonism in Black Africa: Changing Attitudes and Practices, 1830–1981," *Sunstone* 6 (May/June 1981): 15–21; Evan P. Wright, "A History of the South African Mission, Period I, 1852–1903" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1977); Wright, *A History of the South African Mission, 1852–1970*, 3 vols. (n.p., 1977–1986); Marjorie E. Woods, "Saints in South Africa," *Ensign* (September 1986): 45–48; Janet Brigham, "Nigeria and Ghana: A Miracle Precedes the Messengers," *Ensign* (February 1980): 73–76; Anthony U. Obinna, "Voice from Nigeria," *Ensign* (December 1980): 29–30; E. E. Fourie, "From Queenstown to Cimezile," *Ensign* (September 1987): 30–31; Alexander B. Morrison, "The Dawning of a New Day in Africa," *Ensign* (November 1987): 25–26; Morrison, *The Dawning of a Brighter Day: The Church in Black Africa* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990); "The Church in Africa," *Ensign* (September 1997): 79–80, a short conversation with the Area Presidency of the African Area; James B. Allen, "Would-Be Saints: West Africa before the 1978 Priesthood Revelation," *Journal of Mormon History* 17 (1991): 207–47; Andrew Clark, "The Fading Curse of Cain: Mormonism

in South Africa," *Dialogue* 27/4 (1994): 41–56; E. Dale LeBaron, "Gospel Pioneers in Africa," *Ensign* (August 1990): 40–43; LeBaron, *All Are Alike unto God: Fascinating Conversion Stories of African Saints* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1990); LeBaron, "Mormonism in Black Africa," in *Mormon Identities in Transition* (1996), 80–86; Marjorie W. Folsom, *Golden Harvest in Ghana* (Bountiful, Utah: Horizon Publishers, 1989); and Rendell N. Mabey and Gordon T. Allred, *Brother to Brother, The Story of the Latter-day Saint Members Who Took the Gospel to Black Africa* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1984); Mabey and Allred, *An African Legacy*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Artistic Printing, 1998). A history of LDS attitudes and practices relating to black Africans and Afro-Americans is told, with extensive bibliography, in Lester E. Bush Jr. and Armand L. Mauss, eds., *Neither White nor Black: Mormon Scholars Confront the Race Issue in a Universal Church* (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1984). See also Chester L. Hawkins, "Selective Bibliography on African-Americans and Mormons, 1830–1990," *Dialogue* 25/4 (1992): 113–31; Peggy Fletcher Stack, "LDS in Africa: Growing Membership Sees American Church with Unique Vision," "Missionaries in Africa Grow as They Seek New Converts," and "African Culture Presents Challenges for Mormon Converts," *Sunstone* 21 (June– July 1998): 71–74 (from *Salt Lake Tribune*, 4 April 1998).

## Special Topics

Because missionary work touches so many areas in Mormon history and culture, the variety of topics that the student of missiology must address is quite large. The "gathering" of converts to America in the nineteenth century is one such area, many studies of which have already been cited. Ronald G. Watt, "LDS Church Records on Immigration," *Genealogical Journal* 6 (March 1977): 24–32, suggests the rich archival sources; also valuable are Conway B. Sonne, *Saints on the Seas, A Maritime History of Mormon Migration, 1830–1890* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1983); Sonne, *Ships, Saints, and Mariners, A Maritime Encyclopedia of Mormon Migration, 1830–1890* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987); and Richard L. Jensen, "Steaming Through: Arrangements for Mormon Emigration from Europe, 1869–1887," *Journal of Mormon History* 9 (1982): 3–23. The problems of language, already suggested in several studies above, is further considered in Marcellus Snow, "Translating Mormon Thought," *Dialogue* 2/2 (1967): 49–62; and Joseph G. Stringham, "The Church and Translation," *BYU Studies* 21/1 (1981): 69–90. What is becoming more clear is that language is only part of a whole cultural system of which missionaries must be aware. Another aspect of the conversion process is briefly discussed in Arturo De Hoyos and Genevieve De Hoyos, "The Dilemma of Pluralism in the Mormon Conversion Process," *Society for the Sociological Study of Mormon Life*, Newsletter 2 (July 1987): 3. The missionary experience for young Latter-day Saints is a rite of passage, a period that Brigham Young referred to as "a sort of probation—a kind of middle period between boyhood and manhood—a time which as you improve or neglect, will make or mar your future career."<sup>22</sup> Much ritual and humor has developed around the mission in recent years, including the local community's anticipation of the formal "call," preparation for departure, and the missionary "farewell" where an extensive part of the sacrament worship meeting is devoted to the missionary and his or her family, even though the official policy of the church is to keep the focus of these meetings on the sacrament service and the worship of the Savior. At the end of the mission another such meeting is set apart for the "homecoming," where a formal report of the mission experience is given to the local congregation. Thus a significant amount of formal church service is centered on missionaries and missionary work. Finally, there are annual mission reunions usually planned around one of the church's general conferences in April or October. In 1988 there were about 900 such reunions. Surprisingly, few studies have appeared dealing with this important part of the Mormon experience.

There seems to be no end to the publishing of "how to" books for missionaries,<sup>23</sup> but few of the farewell or homecoming talks are ever published or made available, although the habit has developed wherein some families tape-record their missionary's part in the meeting. A sensitive exception is Douglas H. Parker, "Remarks at Chase's Missionary Farewell," *Dialogue* 17/3 (1984): 117–21. Some returned missionaries have written about their



experiences. They range from Jack S. Bailey, *Inside a Mormon Mission* (Salt Lake City: Hawkes, 1976), to Lynn K. Packer, *A Missionary Experience* (New York: Carlton, 1969).

What some suggest is one of the finest plays written in Mormon culture tries to address one aspect of the mission experience itself, the struggle to find a testimony in the face of honest questioning and the pressure to conform to the group: Robert Elliott, "Fires of the Mind," *Sunstone* 1 (Winter 1975): 23–93. The larger impact of the mission experience is considered in John M. Madsen, "Church Activity of LDS Returned Missionaries" (Ed.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1977). An early survey was Ruder Clawson, "The Returned Missionary: A Statistical Survey," *Improvement Era* (October 1936): 590–94.<sup>24</sup> See also L. A. Groberg, "A Preliminary Study of Certain Activities, the Religious Attitudes and Financial Status of 74 Returned Missionaries Residing in Wayne Stake, 1936" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1936); I. S. Searle, "A Comparative Study of Latter-day Saint Missionaries and Non-Missionaries in Scholastic Aptitude, Academic Achievement and Vocational Interests" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1958); S. L. Callister, "The Relationship of Self-Concept Discrepancies to Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Extracurricular Activities, and Mission Experience" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1962); R. W. Roskelley, "The LDS Missionary System in a Local Area: A Study of Some Social and Economic Aspects of 142 Converts and 130 LDS Missionaries now residing in certain towns in Cache Valley [Utah]" (master's thesis, Utah State University, 1933). Another aspect of Mormon missionary culture is examined in Lavina Fielding Anderson, "Truth and Consequences: The Identity Crisis in L.D.S. Missionary Fiction," *Sunstone* 3 (September/October 1978): 30–34. For a thoughtful reflection by a non-Mormon see Robert L. Lively, "A Non-Mormon Religion Professor's Impressions of Mormon Missionaries," *BYU Studies* 33/1 (1993): 151–59. See also Wayne C. Booth, "Confessions of an Aging, Hypocritical Ex-Missionary," *Sunstone* 21 (March–April 1998): 25–36; and Booth, "The Rhetoric of Fundamentalist Conversion Narratives," in *Fundamentalisms Comprehended*, ed. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, Fundamentalism Project of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. 5 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 367–95.

Another area where recent research adds to our understanding concerns itself with the topics of retention and disaffiliation of converts. It is not enough to count baptisms when a number of converts drop out of activity; some missions report at least a 70 percent inactivity rate. Church leaders have focused on this matter in recent years. Sociological studies of particular importance are Rodney Stark and William S. Bainbridge, "Networks of Faith: Interpersonal Bonds and Recruitment to Cults and Sects," *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (May 1980): 1376–95; Rodney Stark, "How New Religions Succeed: A Theoretical Model," in *The Future of New Religious Movements*, ed. David G. Bromley and Phillip E. Hammond (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1987), 11–29; Armand L. Mauss, "Dimensions of Religious Defection," *Review of Religious Research* 10/3 (1969): 128–35; Stan L. Albrecht and Howard M. Bahr, "Patterns of Religious Disaffiliation: A Study of Lifelong Mormons, Mormon Converts, and Former Mormons," *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* 22 (December 1983): 366–79; Marie Cornwall et al., "The Social Bases of Religion: Factors Influencing Religious Belief and Commitment," *Review of Religious Research* 29 (September 1987): 44–56; Stan L. Albrecht, Marie Cornwall, and Perry H. Cunningham, "Religious Leave-taking: Disengagement and Disaffection among Mormons," in *Falling from the Faith: Causes and Consequences of Religious Apostasy*, ed. David G. Bromley (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1988), 62–80; Stan L. Albrecht, "The Consequential Dimension of Mormon Religiosity," *BYU Studies* 29/2 (1989): 57–108; James T. Duke and Barry L. Johnson, "Changes in the Religious Devotion of Latter-day Saints throughout the Life Cycle," *BYU Studies* 36/1 (1996–97): 139–58; and Howard M. Bahr and Stan L. Albrecht, "Strangers Once More: Patterns of Disaffection from Mormonism," *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* 28 (June 1989): 180–200. An important study of the conversion process and its determinants is Linda Charney, "Religious Conversion: A Longitudinal Study" (Ph.D. diss., University of Utah, 1986). Two essays by Wilfried Decoo provide a very useful perspective on the nature of conversion and retention of European converts: "Mormonism in a European Catholic Region: A

Contribution to the Social Psychology of LDS Converts,” *BYU Studies* 24/1 (1984): 61–77; and “Feeding the Fleeing Flock: Reflections on the Struggle to Retain Church Members in Europe,” *Dialogue* 29/1 (1996): 97–118. See also Decoo’s reflections in “Issues in Writing European History and in Building the Church in Europe . . .,” *Journal of Mormon History* 23/1 (1997): esp. 163–76. A larger context for America is suggested in Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992); and Darren E. Sherkat and John Wilson, “Preferences, Constraints, and Choices in Religious Markets: An Examination of Religious Switching and Apostasy,” *Social Forces* 73 (March 1995): 993–1026. See also Laura M. Marwick, “From Mormon to Evangelical: A Look at Disaffiliation and Conversion” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1994);<sup>25</sup> and James T. Duke, “Latter-day Saint Exceptionalism and Membership Growth,” in *Mormon Identities in Transition* (1996), 46–51.

Compilations of conversion stories are abundant in LDS literature since the 1830s. For more recent works see Kevin Stoker, *Missionary Moments: Inspiring Conversion Stories* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989); Hartman Rector Jr. and Connie Rector, eds., *No More Strangers*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1971–1990); Eugene England, ed., *Converted to Christ through the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989); and Bruce Van Orden, D. Brent Smith, and Everett Smith Jr., eds., *Pioneers in Every Land* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997). A useful guide for new members is Clark L. Hidd and Kathryn H. Kidd, *A Convert’s Guide to Mormon Life: A Guidebook for New Members* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1998).

## Summary Thoughts

The history of missionary work is the history of Mormonism itself. It began with the first vision of Joseph Smith in 1820 and has continued to proclaim that the heavens are again open. It remains the heart of the Mormon enterprise as the doctrines and rites of the church tie members back to their ancestors and ahead to their posterity. Mormon theology offers a cosmic view for understanding the origins and destiny of all peoples. It sees this mortal experience as a part of an eternal journey that began long before birth into this world. Sent from the presence of heavenly parents, this chosen “exile” has divine purposes. We are being tried and tested as to what choices we make and how true we will be to the covenants we have made or will make. We are on this pilgrimage together; we all belong to the same family, and our relationships are to reflect this. All people will have a chance to hear the gospel message and all will be judged according to a fair and just God who makes every effort to warn and save us. The central place of Jesus Christ in this plan has been taught by Mormon missionaries since 1830. As a nonspeculative religion, Mormonism continues to emphasize the same core truths it espoused in its earliest years.

The community of the faithful, constantly growing and extending itself, has meant that the average member of the church today is a first-generation convert. The zeal of new converts is apparent throughout the church, as is the natural conservatism and doctrinal orthodoxy such newness encourages. It is sometimes a challenge for such a fast-growing church to meet the needs of the older members who regularly sit through lessons taken from manuals that primarily target new converts. This is one of the reasons that the potential for a kind of “underground church” is always present; the growth of member study groups seems to suggest this reality, and the membership of these groups would seem to come from second- and third-generation members.

When Joseph Smith organized the School of the Prophets in Kirtland in 1833, its primary purpose was to better prepare those who would be sent out as missionaries.<sup>26</sup> Much of the historical development of the Church Educational System (especially in the twentieth century) has been related to the concern church leaders have felt for better-prepared missionaries. The expansion of CES missionaries, consisting of retired couples, also focuses on the education and training of new converts.

The study of Mormon missionary history is a valuable way to discover some of the details of how the church has reached its current status. While statistics must be part of such a study, to focus on counting converts can lead to seeing the gospel as a product to be sold and whose success can be easily quantifiable. But such a narrow focus will leave much unanswered. For example, how do new converts learn about the history of the church they have joined? How does this history become relevant for those in non-American societies? What are their “stories” and how do they differ when understood in their own language and culture? How much of the “Utah” church will not be essential in an international setting?<sup>27</sup>

We have suggested that the study of Mormon missiology cuts across many topics: the printing and use of scriptures, the challenges of ethnicity, administrative history, doctrines and policies of the church, apologetics, the broad subject of Mormon biography, and the internationalization of the church, to mention only the most obvious. With a successful missionary system that has witnessed the doubling of the church membership every decade, the future promises even more topics for Mormon historical study. To study Mormonism is to study Mormon missiology.

## Notes

1. A useful introduction is Rex E. Cooper, *Promises Made to the Fathers: Mormon Covenant Organization* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990).

2. While it is beyond our concern here, a critical relationship exists between the Mormon missionary enterprise and Mormon expectations of the second coming of the Savior. Mormon millennialism generally avoided setting dates for this event, but anticipations for it fueled missionary zeal. Recent studies include Richard Lloyd Anderson, “Joseph Smith and the Millenarian Time Table,” *BYU Studies* 3/3-4 (1961): 55-66; Louis G. Reinwand, “An Interpretive Study of Mormon Millennialism during the Nineteenth Century with Emphasis on Millennial Developments in Utah” (master’s thesis, Brigham Young University, 1971); Keith E. Norman, “How Long O Lord?: The Delay of the Parousia in Mormonism,” *Sunstone* 8 (January 1983): 48-58; Stephen J. Stein, “Signs of the Times: The Theological Foundations of Early Mormon Apocalyptic,” *Sunstone* 8 (January 1983): 59-65; and Grant Underwood, *The Millenarian World of Early Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993).

3. Because the scholarly study of missiology is anchored in and is a critical reflection about the traditional Christian church’s mission history, it is not easy to apply these categories and perspectives to the study of Mormon missions. In general, based on the Latin roots of the word, *missiology* literally means a study of the sending forth or expansion of the church. An excellent summary and contemporary perspective is Dallin H. Oaks and Lance B. Wickman, “The Missionary Work of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” in *Sharing the Book: Religious Perspectives on the Rights and Wrongs of Mission*, ed. John Witte Jr. and Richard C. Martin (Mary Knoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1999), 247-75.

A brief overview of the definition and history of the discipline of mission history in Protestant and Catholic traditions is Louis J. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures: New Perspectives in Missiological Anthropology* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1988), 12-23. A useful introduction to the non-Mormon “What Do We Mean by ‘Missiology,’” is in *Missiology, An Ecumenical Introduction, Texts and Contexts of Global Christianity*, ed. A. Camps et al. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 1-7. See also Mark A. Noll, “The Potential of Missiology for the Crisis of History,” in *History of the Christian Historian*, ed. Ronald A. Wells (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 106-23.

4. A useful atlas that includes visuals on missionary work and membership is *Historical Atlas of Mormonism*, ed. S. Kent Brown, Donald Q. Cannon, and Richard H. Jackson (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994).

5. Based on information in Richard L. Jensen and William G. Hartley, "Immigration and Emigration," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 2:676.

6. See Andrew Walls, "World Christianity, the Missionary Movement and the Ugly American," in *World Order and Religion*, ed. Wade C. Roof (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1991), 147–72. Such bureaucratizing included (1) uniformity of message and delivery, "(2) goal setting and outcome measurement by objective criteria, (3) standardized and programmatic training of missionaries, (4) systematic supervision of missionary performance, and (5) cost-benefit accountability," as outlined by Gordon Shepherd and Gary Shepherd, "Membership Growth, Church Activity, and Missionary Recruitment," *Dialogue* 29/1 (1996): 36. Given this routinization, the Shepherds suggest the relevance of the military analogy for Mormon missions.

7. See *A Plan for Effective Missionary Work, Northwestern States Mission* (1949 and later printings by various missions). See also Richard Lloyd Anderson, comp., *A Plan for Effective Missionary Work* (Kaysville, Utah: Inland Printing, 1954). Anderson discusses the Plan in "Transcript of Interview with Richard Lloyd Anderson, March 12, 1993," Appendix F, 34–51, in Robert E. Lund, "A Review of the Missionary Lessons for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," *L.I.S.* 694 (Provo, Utah: Independent Research, School of Library and Information Science, BYU, 1993), copy in possession of Victor W. Purdy. See also Lewis C. Christian, "A Study of the Development of the Missionary Plan of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1950" (paper for Religion 544, Brigham Young University, 1975), copy in Special Collections, Lee Library, BYU. At the same time, Willard A. Ashton, in the Great Lakes Mission also moved to create a systematic missionary plan. These missionary lessons focused on the Book of Mormon, and Reid Bankhead, another church member who had served in the Navy with Richard Lloyd Anderson, would also move to emphasize the Book of Mormon as the key to Mormon missionary work. See Glenn L. Pearson and Reid E. Bankhead, *A Doctrinal Approach to the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962); and Reid E. Bankhead and Glenn L. Pearson, *The Work and the Witness: The Unique Witness of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1970). See also Ezra Taft Benson, "The Book of Mormon—Keystone of Our Religion," *Ensign* (November 1986): 4–7; and Benson, *A Witness and a Warning: A Modern-day Prophet Testifies of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988). This increased use of the Book of Mormon is studied in Melvin R. Maxfield, "The Book of Mormon and the Conversion Process to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: A Study of Recent Converts" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1977). See also Noel B. Reynolds, "The Coming Forth of the Book of Mormon in the Twentieth Century," *BYU Studies* 38/2 (1999): 6–47; and Richard O. Cowan's discussion, "Richard Lloyd Anderson and Worldwide Church Growth," in this volume, pages 105–15.

Of course, there were earlier works that had served missionary needs. A sample includes Lorenzo D. Barnes, *References to Prove the Gospel in Its Fullness* (Philadelphia, 1841); Charles Thompson, *Evidences in Proof of the Book of Mormon* (New York, 1841) and Benjamin Winchester, *Synopsis of the Holy Scriptures and Concordance* (Philadelphia, 1842). These items were recommended as "prompters" for the early missionaries in *Times and Seasons* 3 (15 September 1842): 923–24. Other examples are *Ready References, A Compilation of Scripture Texts, . . . Designed Especially for the Use of Missionaries and Scripture Students* (Liverpool, 1884; Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 2nd ed., 1887); Eldin Ricks, *Combination Reference: A Simple and Orderly Arrangement of Selected References to the Standard Works of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1943, and later printings); and Keith Marston, *Missionary Pal* (n.p.: Inland Printing, 1956).

Also, John Jaques, *Catechism for Children* (Liverpool: Richards, 1854), was a very popular instrument for teaching young members about the church and its doctrines. It was also used as a missionary tool for teaching. See Davis Bitton, "Mormon Catechisms," *Task Papers in LDS History*, No. 15 (Salt Lake City: Historical Department of the LDS Church, 1976). See also B. H. Roberts, *On Tracting* (New York: Eastern States Mission, n.d.); *The Elder's Manual* (Chattanooga, Tenn.: Southern States Mission, ca. 1915); *Aids in Proselyting: Questions Most Frequently Asked a Mormon Missionary* [Basil, Switzerland, 1936]; Hyrum L. Andrus and E. Paul Palmer, *Helps for Missionaries* (Rexburg: Rexburg Journal for the Division of Religion, Ricks College, 1949); M. Russell Ballard and Quinn G. McKay, *Street Meeting Suggestions* (London, n.d.); *Not with Wisdom of Words: An Appeal for a Discriminative Method of Tracting* (Stockholm: Swedish Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1951); and *Cottage Meeting Outline, Central Atlantic States Mission* (Roanoke, Va., 1952).

An example of the early suggestions that commercial salesmanship could be valuable for Mormon missionaries was *Some Suggestions for Latter-day Saints from the Field of Successful Commercial Salesmanship*, comp. Earl W. Harmer (Salt Lake City: by the compiler [c.1929], six editions by the end of the 1930s). Such approaches help explain the continued presence of such books as Og Mandino, *The Greatest Salesman in the World*; Norman Vincent Peale, *The Power of Positive Thinking*; Russell Conwell, *Acres of Diamonds*; Dale Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People*; Charles M. Sheldon, *In His Steps*; and other such examples of popular psychology and salesmanship in the literature of the mission field.

8. Richard Lloyd Anderson's professional work has continued to focus on several aspects of missionary work. His scholarship in LDS Church history has been devoted to (1) studying the lives of the witnesses of the Book of Mormon, (2) studying and defending the life and work of Joseph Smith, and (3) researching the life of the greatest early Christian missionary, Paul. Thus he is, in the classic sense, a Christian apologist—one who seeks to explain and defend the Christian message and its history. Richard's early training as a lawyer was an ideal background for an "advocate" of a cause.

9. From 1830 to 1996, over 83,000,000 copies of the Book of Mormon were printed, with about 56,000,000 from 1982. See the chart in the *Ensign* (March 1998): 75.

10. Paul VanDenBerghe, "Keeping Converts," *Ensign* (October 1998): 54–57, discusses the newest program.

11. A good overview is in Jay E. Jensen, "Proselyting Techniques of Mormon Missionaries" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974), 56–73. See also Arlene Crawley, "The Beginnings of the Family to Family Program," in *Converted to Christ through the Book of Mormon*, ed. Eugene England (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989), 10–19.

12. See Rodney Stark, "The Rise of a New World Faith," *Review of Religious Research* 26 (September 1984): 18–27. Stark's most recent study of early Christianity uses the Mormon church as a modern parallel; see Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996). See also Stark, "Modernization and Mormon Growth: The Secularization Thesis Revisited," in *Contemporary Mormonism: Social Science Perspectives*, ed. Marie Cornwall, Tim B. Heaton, and Lawrence A. Young (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 13–23; Stark, "So Far, So Good: A Brief Assessment of Mormon Membership Projections," *Review of Religious Research* 38 (December 1996): 175–78; Stark, "The Basis of Mormon Success: A Theoretical Application," in *Latter-day Saint Social Life, Social Research on the LDS Church and Its Members*, ed. James T. Duke (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1998), 29–70. In the same volume, James T. Duke provides a supportive analysis of certain aspects of Stark's thesis: "Cultural Continuity and Tension: A Test of Stark's Theory of Church Growth,"

71–103. Stark's most recent reflections are in his Mormon History Association Obert C. Tanner Lecture: "Extracting Social Scientific Models from Mormon History," *Journal of Mormon History* 25/1 (1999): 174–94.

13. We ignore here an important area of contemporary missiology: the use of electronic media. The LDS Church owns a number of radio, shortwave, and television stations, and has actively used satellite technology in its communication efforts. The appearance of a satellite receiving dish at most Mormon stake centers suggests the tremendous communications infrastructure now in place throughout the world. For a useful guide to the growing literature on the general uses by Christian churches of the electronic media, see the essays by Leonard I. Sweet and Elmer J. O'Brien in *Communications and Change in American Religious History*, ed. Leonard I. Sweet (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993). A positive assessment for its use in Mormonism is James B. Allen, "Testimony and Technology: A Phase of the Modernization of Mormonism since 1950," in *After 150 Years, The Latter-days in Sesquicentennial Perspective*, ed. Thomas G. Alexander and Jessie Embry (Provo, Utah: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, BYU, 1983), 171–207.

14. Latter-day Saints will, no doubt, feel uncomfortable with the growing relativism of much of the current Christian mission theology, which can argue that both Buddhism and Christianity are appropriate avenues to "salvation." Such broad ecumenicalism ultimately denies an exclusive truth claim of any religion. Such a position could never be part of the Mormon message.

15. A book on the topic, *Mormon Passage: A Missionary Chronicle*, by Gary Shepherd and Gordon Shepherd was published by the University of Illinois Press in 1998. In addition to a historical overview, it includes a focus on their own missions in different areas in Mexico. For a short comparative study of LDS and RLDS missionary systems in 1959, see Ivan Vallier, "Church, Society, and Labor Resources: An Interdenominational Comparison (Mormons and Reorganites)," *American Journal of Sociology* 68 (July 1962): 21–33.

16. An important biographical study of the Provo, Utah, bishop who issued the first calls to single women missionaries (Jennie Brimhall and Inez Knight) is Clinton D. Christensen, "Joseph Brigham Keeler: The Master's Builder" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1997). As this study shows, Keeler also pioneered more systematic religious training for the young men in the church in the form of the first Aaronic Priesthood lesson manuals, one goal of which was to produce better trained missionaries.

17. In the priesthood session of October 1997 General Conference, President Gordon B. Hinckley seemed to call for a decrease in the number of sister missionaries, saying that women and their bishops should not feel they had a responsibility to go but that there was still a great need for their service if they felt it was an appropriate thing to do. Some local leaders have said that speech was not a change of policy toward sister missionaries but a response to some bishops who made women feel guilty if they did not want to go on a mission. President Hinckley did remind the young men of their priesthood responsibility in the area of missionary work.

18. The most complete guide is Chad J. Flake, *A Mormon Bibliography, 1830–1930: Books, Pamphlets, Periodicals, and Broadsides Relating to the First Century of Mormonism* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1978). A ten-year supplement appeared in 1989: Chad J. Flake and Larry W. Draper, *A Mormon Bibliography, 1830–1930: Ten Year Supplement* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1989). A title index to both volumes was issued by the same press in 1992. See also L. R. Jacobs, *Mormon Non-English Scriptures, Hymnals, and Periodicals, 1830–1986: A Descriptive Bibliography* (Ithaca, N.Y.: by the author, 1986); and Joseph Sudweeks, *Discontinued L.D.S. Periodicals* (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1955).



19. See also T. Edgar Lyon Jr., "In Praise of Babylon: Church Leadership at the 1851 Great Exhibition in London," *Journal of Mormon History* 14 (1988): 49–61; Gerald J. Peterson, "History of Mormon Exhibits in World Expositions" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974); Melvin K. Johnson, "A History of the Temple Square Mission of the Church . . . to 1970" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1971); Martha S. Bradley and Lowell M. Durham Jr., "John Hafen and the Art Missionaries," *Journal of Mormon History* 12 (1985): 91–105; Charles W. Whitman, "The History of the Hill Cumorah Pageant, 1937–1964 . . ." (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1967); "The Ends of the Earth: A Conversation about the New International Mission," *Ensign* (April 1974): 7–10; Jessie L. Embry, "Missionaries for the Dead: The Story of the Genealogical Missionaries of the Nineteenth Century," *BYU Studies* 17/3 (1977): 355–60. We ignore here the economic and colonization missions of the nineteenth century, which were just as significant and required the same commitment as the proselyting missions. A good introduction is Leonard J. Arrington, *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830–1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958). A survey of the material on colonization is Wayne L. Wahlquist, "A Review of Mormon Settlement Literature," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 45 (Winter 1977): 4–21. Also generally ignored in this essay is the important Latter-day Saint concern with missionary work for those who have died. Such work involving genealogical research and vicarious ordinance work in temples also demands a significant time commitment by members. A useful introduction, with an extensive bibliography by Daniel B. McKinlay, is James B. Allen, Jessie L. Embry, and Kahlile B. Mehr, *Hearts Turned to the Fathers: A History of the Genealogical Society of Utah, 1894–1994* (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies Monograph Series, 1995).

An interesting study of the interfaith marriages of Mormons and their resulting high conversion rate is Brent A. Barlow, "Mormon Endogamy and Exogamy in Northern Florida" (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1972), part of which is summarized in "Notes on Mormon Interfaith Marriages," *Family Coordinator* 26 (April 1977): 143–50.

20. The topic of Mormon missionary martyrdom has not been comprehensively treated, but specific studies have begun to appear. The murder of Elders John Gibbs and William Berry in Tennessee in August 1884 is well documented in Mormon missionary literature. The Gibbs collection at BYU contains the diaries and papers of John Gibbs, and it includes the threatening note the missionaries received warning them to get out of the area "or else." BYU Archives also has the papers of Willis E. Robison, the first missionary to arrive at the scene after the attack. For other accounts see Horatio [B. H. Roberts], "The Tennessee Massacre," *Contributor* 6 (October 1884): 16–23; Roberts, "A Mormon Elder in the Southern States," *Contributor* 7 (June 1885): 326–31; (July 1885): 389–92; Willis E. Robison, "An Unpublished Letter on the Tennessee Massacre," *Improvement Era* (November 1898): 1–14; John Nicholson, *The Tennessee Massacre and Its Causes . . .* (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1884); and William W. Hatch, *There Is No Law: A History of Mormon Civil Relations in the Southern States, 1865–1905* (New York: Vantage, 1968). On the murder of Joseph Standing, another Mormon missionary, in Georgia in 1879, see John Nicholson, *The Martyrdom of Joseph Standing* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1886); Ken Driggs, "'There Is No Law in Georgia for Mormons': The Joseph Standing Murder Case of 1879," *Georgia Historical Review* 73 (Winter 1989): 745–72; and David S. Hoopes and Roy Hoopes, *The Making of a Mormon Apostle: The Story of Ruderger Clawson* (Lanham, Md.: Madison Books, 1990).

For more recent tragedies, see David C. Knowlton, "Missionaries and Terror: The Assassination of Two Elders in Bolivia," *Sunstone* 13 (August 1989): 10–15; and Ken Driggs, "The 1974 Texas Missionary Murders: Who Was Bob Kleasen and What Motivated Him?" *Sunstone* 20 (December 1997): 27–34. More recently, missionaries have been slain or seriously injured in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Ufa, Russia. These assaults were not directed at the missionaries' religious views but were random attacks or robberies.

21. More detail on the earliest history of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles is in Ronald K. Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830– 1841" (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1981).

22. Brigham Young to Joseph A. Young, 3 February 1855, in *Letters of Brigham Young to His Sons*, ed. and comp. Dean C. Jessee (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book for the Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1974), 13. Richard L. Bushman, speaking at his son's missionary farewell in 1985, likened the missionary experience to the vision quest of Native Americans. See Susan Buhler Tabler, *Mormon Lives: A Year in the Elkton Ward* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 236–37.

23. A sampling includes Roy W. Doxey, *Missionary Guide* (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1949); Alvin R. Dyer, *The Challenge* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962); Robert W. Daynes, *Missionary Helps* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1967); John D. Whetten, *Making the Most of Your Mission* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981); Joseph L. Bishop, *The Making of a Missionary* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982); Barbara Jacobs, *Missions for Marrieds* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983); Joe J. Christensen, *Making Your Home a Missionary Training Center* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985); Bruce L. Olsen, *The Successful Returned Missionary* (Orem, Utah: Belmont, 1988); Marc Garrison, *Teaching Children the Love of Missionary Work* (Orem, Utah: Aspen Books, 1990); Elaine Cannon, *Called to Serve Him: Preparing Missionaries to Bring People to Christ* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1991); Ed J. Pinegar, *Preparing for Your Mission* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992); Randy L. Bott, *Serve with Honor: Helps for Missionaries* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995); John Bytheway, *What I Wish I'd Known before My Mission* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996); and Carlos E. Asay, *The Seven M's of Missionary Service* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1996).

24. What became the largest fraternity for LDS returned missionaries, Delta Phi Kappa, began in 1869 at the University of Deseret (now the University of Utah) as a debating society. It lasted until about 1904 and was revived in 1920 by John A. Widtsoe, president of the University of Utah, as a fraternity for returned missionaries. First named the Friars Club, it merged with the dormant Delta Phi society in 1931. It is estimated that its membership numbered about 10,000 between 1920 and 1978, at which time it was absorbed into the more service-oriented Sigma Gamma Chi fraternity. A useful history is William G. Hartley, *Delta Phi Kappa Fraternity, Debating Society, Friars Club of the 1920s, National Fraternity for LDS Returned Missionaries* (Salt Lake City: Delta Phi Kappa Holding Corporation, 1990). A similar organization for returned LDS women missionaries was the Yesharah Society, the papers (minute books, 1929–60; account books, 1935–51) of which are housed in the BYU Archives.

25. An interesting call for new ways to treat conversion is Roger Finke, "The Illusion of Shifting Demand: Supply-Side Interpretations of Religious History," in *Retelling U.S. Religious History*, ed. Thomas A. Tweed (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 108–24, 256–60. See also Armand Mauss, *The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); and Mauss, "Identity and Boundary Maintenance: International Prospects for Mormonism at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century," in *Mormon Identities in Transition*, ed. Douglas J. Davies (London: Cassell, 1996), 1–19. See also Eric A. Eliason, "Toward the Folkloristic Study of Latter-day Saint Conversion Narratives," *BYU Studies* 38/1 (1999): 137–50.

26. See Doctrine and Covenants 88; John Z. Patrick, "The School of the Prophets: Its Development and Influence in Utah Territory" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1970); and Milton V. Backman Jr., *The Heavens Resound, A History of the Latter-day Saints in Ohio, 1830–1838* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983), 264–75. For the twentieth century, see John L. Fowles, "A Study concerning the Mission of the Week-Day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890–1990: A Response to Secular



Education” (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, Columbia, 1990). For an example of internally produced material for instructors in the Church Education System, see *Missionary Approach to the Gospel, Teacher Outline for Institute Instructors* (Provo, Utah: Church Education System, 1969).

27. In this light the church career of William G. Bangerter needs fuller study. His pivotal leadership and work in Brazil, from his early mission there when the missionaries only focused on the white European populations, to his mission president years (1958–63) when he led a “New Era” in Brazilian Mormon missionary work—including better prepared missionaries, the notion of multi-Zions, less emphasis on the lineage issues when teaching investigators, and the increased use of local leaders in decision making—all foreshadowed major shifts in Mormon missionary work. Given Spencer W. Kimball’s supervisory role in South America after 1959, it is interesting to note that most of the key changes during Kimball’s years as church president had their origins in earlier programs in Brazil. The 1978 revelation giving men of all races access to the priesthood came just five months before the dedication of the Sao Paulo Brazil Temple.

The issues of race and lineage are an important part of Mormon missiology. Much of this history focused on the literal conceptions of “Israel” and suggested, particularly in the first one hundred years, a missionary quest to gather modern descendants of these ancient lineages. Much work has yet to be done on this important topic. For one analysis of part of the story, see Armand Mauss, “In Search of Ephraim: Traditional Mormon Conceptions of Lineage and Race,” *Journal of Mormon History* 26/1 (1999): 131–73; for another, see Thomas W. Murphy, “From Racist Stereotype to Ethnic Identity: Instrumental Uses of Mormon Racial Doctrine,” *Ethnohistory* 46 (Summer 1999): 451–80.

# A Topical Bibliography of the Works of Richard Lloyd Anderson

David J. Whittaker

The full bibliographic and reprint information, as well as explanatory notes, appear in this topical bibliography.

Entries in the chronological bibliography may have been shortened.

## **Abbreviations**

BYU Brigham Young University

BYUS Brigham Young University Studies

CES Church Educational System

Dialogue Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought

FARMS Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies

IE Improvement Era

Ins Instructor

## **Outline**

I. Graduate Studies [thesis, dissertation]

II. LDS Church History

A. Joseph Smith

1. Ancestors/Parents

2. Personal

3. Smith Family

B. Early Mormon History

1. New York and Pennsylvania Period

a. First Vision

b. Coming Forth of the Book of Mormon

c. Priesthood Restoration

d. Organization of the Church

2. Ohio Period

3. Missouri Period

4. Illinois Period

5. Early Mormon Historiography

III. The Book of Mormon

A. Doctrinal/Historical Studies

B. Book of Mormon Witnesses

1. Oliver Cowdery

2. Martin Harris

3. David Whitmer

4. The Eight Witnesses

5. Other Studies

IV. New Testament Studies

A. The Gospels and the Life of Christ

B. Paul and the Apostles

C. Early Christianity

D. Biblical Textual Studies

V. Textbooks

VI. Book Reviews

A. Review Essays

B. Book Reviews

VII. Personal and Missionary Items

A. The Anderson Plan

B. Letters to the Editor

C. Testimonies

D. Interviews

E. Video Lecture/Presentation

F. Forewords

## **I. Graduate Studies**

“*Euangelion—A Study in New Testament Context: The New Testament Definition of the Gospel.*” Master’s thesis, BYU, 1957.

“The Rise and Fall of Middle-Class Loyalty to the Roman Empire: A Social Study of Velleius Paterculus and Ammianus Marcellinus.” Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

## **II. LDS Church History**

### **A. Joseph Smith**

#### **1. Ancestors/Parents**

*Joseph Smith’s New England Heritage: Influences of Grandfathers Solomon Mack and Asael Smith.* Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (GospelLink).

“Heritage of a Prophet.” *Ensign* (February 1971): 15–19.

“Joseph Smith, Sr.: Family and Church Patriarch.” In *Joseph Smith Sr., Family Reunion, Oral Presentations, 18–19 August 1972*, 47–51. Provo, Utah: Buddy Youngren, 1972.

“Personalities That Created Joseph Smith.” In *1971–72 California Know Your Religion Series*, 53–68. N.p.: BYU California Center, 1973.

“Methods Used in Discovering Joseph Smith’s Family History.” In *World Conference on Records: Preserving Our Heritage, August 12–15, 1980*. Vol. 4, North American Family and Local History, Part 2, Series No. 343. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1980.

“Lucy Mack Smith.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 3:1355–58. New York: Macmillan, 1992. Reprinted in *Church History: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 534–40. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

#### **2. Personal**

“Joseph Smith and the Millenarian Time Table.” *BYUS* 3/3–4 (1961): 55–66.

“The Trustworthiness of Young Joseph Smith.” *IE* (October 1970): 82–89.

“The Knowable Prophet.” *The Daily Universe, Monday Magazine* [BYU Campus Student Newspaper], 3 May 1971, 3, 11.

“Joseph Smith’s Insights into the Olivet Prophecy: Joseph Smith 1 and Matthew 24.” In *Pearl of Great Price Symposium*, 22 November 1975, 48–61. Provo, Utah: Department of Ancient Scripture, College of Religious Instruction, BYU Press, 1976.

“The Personality of the Prophet.” *New Era* (December 1987): 14–19.

“Joseph Smith’s Final Self-Appraisal.” In *The Prophet Joseph: Essays on the Life and Mission of Joseph Smith*, edited by Larry C. Porter and Susan Easton Black, 320–32. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

### **3. Smith Family**

“Joseph Smith’s Home Environment.” *Ensign* (July 1971): 57–59.

“Of Goodly Parents’: Joseph Smith, Sr., and Lucy Mack Smith” [two separate articles, printed in parallel columns]. *New Era* (December 1973): 34–39.

“What Were Joseph Smith’s Sisters Like and What Happened to Them after the Martyrdom?” *Ensign* (March 1979): 42–44.

“The Alvin Smith Story: Fact and Fiction.” *Ensign* (August 1987): 58–72.

“Joseph Smith’s Brothers: Nauvoo and After.” *Ensign* (September 1979): 30–33.

“The Religious Dimension of Emma’s Letters to Joseph.” In *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, edited by Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr., 117–25. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1993.

“Joseph Smith’s Ancestors.” In *Historical Atlas of Mormonism*, edited by S. Kent Brown, Donald Q. Cannon, and Richard H. Jackson, 4–5. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

## **B. Early Mormon History**

### **1. New York and Pennsylvania Period**

“Joseph Smith’s New York Reputation Reappraised.” *BYUS* 10/3 (1970): 283–314. Reprinted by FARMS in 1997.

“The Latter-day Saints in New York and Pennsylvania (1816–1831).” *First Annual Church Educational System Religious Educators Symposium: Transcripts and Abstracts*, 19–20 August 1977, 33–35. N.p., [1978].

“The Whitmers: A Family That Nourished the Church.” *Ensign* (August 1979): 34–40.

“The Mature Joseph Smith and Treasure Searching.” *BYUS* 24/4 (1984): 489–560. [Although dated 1984, this was written in 1986 and published in May 1986.] Reprinted by FARMS in 1997.

#### **a. First Vision**

“Circumstantial Confirmation of the First Vision through Reminiscences.” *BYUS* 9/3 (1969): 373–404. Reprinted by FARMS in 1997.

“Joseph Smith’s Testimony of the First Vision.” *Ensign* (April 1996): 10–21.

## **b. Coming Forth of the Book of Mormon**

“Confirming Records of Moroni’s Coming.” *IE* (September 1970): 4–8.

“The Credibility of the Book of Mormon Translators.” In *Book of Mormon Authorship: New Light on Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds, 213–37. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1982. Reprinted by FARMS in 1996.

## **c. Priesthood Restoration**

“The Second Witness of Priesthood Restoration” [Oliver Cowdery]. *IE* (September 1968): 15–24.

“The Second Witness on Priesthood Succession” [Oliver Cowdery]. *IE* (November 1968): 14–20.

## **d. Organization of the Church**

“The House Where the Church Was Organized.” *IE* (April 1970): 16–25.

“What changes have been made in the name of the Church? Its full designation does not appear in the revelations until 1838. (D&C 115:4).” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (January 1979): 13–14. Also in *A Sure Foundation: Answers to Difficult Gospel Questions*, 194–96. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

“Who were the six who organized the Church on 6 April 1830?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (June 1980): 44–45. A correction was noted regarding the chart on p. 45 in the October 1980 issue, p. 71.

“The Organization Revelations (D&C 20, 21, and 22).” In *Studies in Scripture Vol. 1: The Doctrine and Covenants*, edited by Robert L. Millet and Kent P. Jackson, 109–23. Sandy, Utah: Randall Book, 1984.

## **2. Ohio Period**

“The Impact of the First Preaching in Ohio.” *BYUS* 11/4 (1971): 474–96.

## **3. Missouri Period**

“Jackson County in Early Mormon Descriptions.” *Missouri Historical Review* 65/3 (April 1971): 270–93. Reprinted in *A New Light Breaks Forth: Essays in Mormon History*, edited by Lyndon W. Cook and Donald Q. Cannon, 155–77. Salt Lake City: Hawkes, 1980.

“Ray County in Mormon History.” In *Ray County* [Missouri], 1973, 223–29. Marcelline, Mo.: Walsworth, 1974. Also in *Ray County Mirror* 6/1 (April 1984): 3–6.

“The Political and Social Realities of Zion’s Camp.” *BYUS* 14/4 (1974): 406–20. With Peter Crawley.

“New Data for Revising the Missouri ‘Documentary History.’” *BYUS* 14/4 (1974): 488–501.

“Atchison’s Letters and the Causes of Mormon Expulsion from Missouri.” *BYUS* 26/3 (1986): 3–47.

“Clarifications of Boggs’s ‘Order’ and Joseph Smith’s Constitutionalism.” In *Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History: Missouri*, edited by Arnold K. Garr and Clark V. Johnson, 27–83. Provo, Utah: BYU Department of Church History and Doctrine, 1994.

#### **4. Illinois Period**

“Joseph Smith’s Prophecies of Martyrdom.” In *The Eighth Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium: A Sesquicentennial Look at Church History*, 1–14. Provo, Utah: BYU College of Religious Instruction, 1980.

#### **5. Early Mormon Historiography**

“The Reliability of the Early History of Lucy and Joseph Smith.” *Dialogue* 4/2 (1969): 12–28. Reprinted by FARMS in 1997.

“His Mother’s Manuscript: An Intimate View of Joseph Smith.” Forum Address, BYU, 27 January 1976. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

“Production and Publication of Lucy Smith’s History.” Provo, Utah: n.p., 1977. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

“History of the Prophet Joseph by Lucy Mack Smith.” In *First Annual Church Educational System Religious Educators Symposium, Transcripts and Abstracts, 19–20 August 1977*, 32–33. N.p. [1978].

“The Emotional Dimensions of Lucy Smith and Her History.” In *Dedication Colloquium, Harold B. Lee Library, March 15–March 17, 1977*, 129–37. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1978.

### **III. The Book of Mormon**

#### **A. Doctrinal/Historical Studies**

“Gold Plates and Printer’s Ink.” *Ensign* (September 1976): 71–76.

“By the Gift and Power of God.” *Ensign* (September 1977): 78–85.

“Imitation Gospels and Christ’s Book of Mormon Ministry.” In *Apocryphal Writings and the Latter-day Saints*, edited by C. Wilfred Griggs, 53–107. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1986. Reprinted by FARMS in 1986.

“Religious Validity: The Sacrament Covenant in Third Nephi.” In *By Study and Also by Faith: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, edited by John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks, 2:1–53. Salt Lake: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990. This essay was originally presented as the First Annual Book of Mormon Lecture, sponsored by FARMS, 2 March 1988. It was also distributed in 1989 by FARMS.

“The Restoration of the Sacrament: Part I: Loss and Christian Reformations.” *Ensign* (January 1992): 40–46.

“The Restoration of the Sacrament: Part II: A New and Ancient Covenant.” *Ensign* (February 1992): 11–17.

“Sidney B. Sperry: Steadfast Scholar.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 4/1 (1995): xxi–xxiii.

## **B. Book of Mormon Witnesses**

### **1. Oliver Cowdery**

“Reuben Miller: Recorder of Oliver Cowdery’s Reaffirmations.” *BYUS* 8/3 (1968): 277–93.

“Oliver Cowdery, Esq.: His Non-Mormon Career.” In *Proceedings of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 45, pt. 1, pp. 66–80. Salt Lake City: Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, 1968. Reprinted, with some corrections, as “Oliver Cowdery, Esq.: His Non-Church Decade.” In *To the Glory of God: Mormon Essays on Great Issues*, edited by Truman G. Madsen and Charles D. Tate Jr., 199–216. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1972.

“Oliver Cowdery’s Non-Mormon Reputation.” *IE* (August 1968): 18–26. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 37–50.

“The Scribe as a Witness.” *IE* (January 1969): 53–59. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 51–65.

“Did Oliver Cowdery, one of the three special Book of Mormon witnesses, express doubt about his testimony?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (April 1987): 23–25. Also in *A Sure Foundation: Answers to Difficult Gospel Questions*, 39–45. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

“Oliver Cowdery.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 1:335–40. New York: Macmillan, 1992. Reprinted in *Church History: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 73–80. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

“Oliver Cowdery’s Voice in Modern Scripture: Priesthood Restoration, Book of Mormon, and the Articles of Faith.” Expanded and annotated transcript, Ancient Scriptures and Restoration Conference. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997.

*Witness of the Second Elder: The Documentary History of Oliver Cowdery*, 4 vols. Forthcoming. With Scott H. Faulring.

### **2. Martin Harris**

“Martin Harris: The Honorable New York Farmer.” *IE* (February 1969): 18–21. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 95–106.

“The Certainty of the Skeptical Witness.” *IE* (March 1969): 62–67. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 107–22.

### **3. David Whitmer**

“David Whitmer: The Independent Missouri Businessman.” *IE* (April 1969): 74–81. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 67–78.

“The Most Interviewed Witness.” *IE* (May 1969): 76–83. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 79–94.



“David Whitmer: Unique Missouri Mormon.” In *Missouri Folk Heroes of the 19th Century*, edited by F. Mark McKiernan and Roger D. Launius, 43–59. Independence, Mo.: Independence Press, Herald Publishing House, 1989.

#### **4. The Eight Witnesses**

“Five Who Handled the Plates” [Hiram Page and Christian, Jacob, John, and Peter Jr. Whitmer]. *IE* (July 1969): 38–47. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 123–36.

“The Smiths Who Handled the Plates” [Joseph Smith Sr., Hyrum Smith, and Samuel Smith]. *IE* (August 1969): 28–34. Also in *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*, 137–50.

#### **5. Other Studies**

*Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981. Issued in paperback with minor corrections. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (Gospellink).

“Book of Mormon Witnesses.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 1:214–16. New York: Macmillan, 1992. Reprinted in *Scriptures of the Church: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 208–12. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

“Personal Writings of the Book of Mormon Witnesses.” In *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds, 39–60. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997.

### **IV. New Testament Studies**

#### **A. The Gospels and the Life of Christ**

“At the First Christmas Were There Shepherds and Wise Men?” *Ins* (December 1959): 394–95.

“New Testament Times” and “The Parables of the Kingdom.” In *Lectures on Jesus the Christ*, 28–40, 77–91. Provo, Utah: BYU Extensions Publications, 1963.

“What Old Testament books are most quoted by the Savior?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (October 1973): 28.

“How to Read a Parable.” *Ensign* (September 1974): 58–63.

“Why are the Gospels so incomplete on the details of Jesus’ life?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (September 1974): 75.

“Why did Christ convert so few people in His three-year ministry? Did the Holy Ghost not yet testify of His work?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (March 1975): 30–31.

“Did Jesus celebrate the Jewish passover at the last supper?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (June 1975): 20–21.

“The Ancient Practice of Crucifixion.” *Ensign* (July 1975): 32–33.

“The Path of Jesus: The Full Dimension.” *New Era* (February 1977): 20–24.

“The Testimony of Luke.” In *Studies in Scripture Vol. 5: The Gospels*, edited by Kent P. Jackson and Robert L. Millet, 88–108. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986.

“Parables of Mercy.” *Ensign* (February 1987): 20–24.

## **B. Paul and the Apostles**

“Paul and the Athenian Intellectuals.” *Commissioner’s Lecture Series*. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1974. A shortened version appeared in *Ensign* (February 1976): 50–55.

“Simon Peter.” *Ensign* (February 1975): 46–49.

“Types of Christian Revelation.” In *Literature of Belief: Sacred Scripture and Religious Experience*, edited by Neal E. Lambert, 61–78. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1981.

*Understanding Paul*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983. Issued in paperback with minor corrections. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (GospelLink).

“Misleading Translations of Paul.” In *The Eleventh Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium, 29 January 1983*, 17–26. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Education, Church Educational System, 1983.

“Parallel Prophets: Paul and Joseph Smith.” *Brigham Young University 1982–83 Fireside and Devotional Speeches*, 177–83. Provo, Utah: University Publication, 1983. Devotional address given 9 August 1983. Also in *Ensign* (April 1985): 12–17.

“What do we know of the life of John the Apostle after the Day of Pentecost? Why was he exiled to the Isle of Patmos?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (January 1984): 50–51.

“The First Presidency of the Early Church: Their Lives and Epistles.” *Ensign* (August 1988): 16–21.

“Peter’s Letters: Progression for the Living and the Dead.” *Ensign* (October 1991): 6–10.

“Paul’s Witness to the Early History of Jesus’ Ministry.” In *The Apostle Paul: His Life and His Testimony*, edited by Paul Y. Hoskisson, 1–33. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1994.

## **C. Early Christianity**

“Ramsay, The Seven Churches, and Early Christian Apostasy.” *Newsletter and Proceedings of the Society for Early Historic Archaeology* [BYU] 108 (17 September 1968): 1–4.

“The Church and the Roman Empire.” *Ensign* (September 1975): 12–23.

“Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp: Three Bishops between the Apostles and Apostasy.” *Ensign* (August 1976): 50–55.

## **D. Biblical Textual Studies**

“Manuscript Discoveries of the New Testament in Perspective.” In *Fourteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures* [13 April 1963], edited by Forrest R. Hauck, 52–60. Provo, Utah: Department of Extension Publications, Adult Education and Extension Services, BYU, 1963.

“The Pedigree of the King James Bible.” *Ins* (February 1968): 95–97.

“Missing Scriptures of New Testament Times.” *Ins* (October 1968): 419–21.

“The New English Bible: The New Testament.” *Dialogue* 5/4 (1970): 102–6. Part of “The New English Bible: Three Views.”

“Questions Frequent in Quest for Description of the Savior.” *Church News* section, *Deseret News*, 22 December 1973, 6.

“The Fraudulent Archko Volume.” *BYUS* 15/1 (1974): 43–64. See also “A speaker in Church last Sunday quoted from a book called *The Archko Volume* about the life of Christ. I had not heard any of the kinds of things he said before. Is the book authentic?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (October 1974): 45–46; and “The Archko Volume: Bible Counterfeit.” *Church News* section, *Deseret News*, 14 December 1974, 10, 13.

## V. Textbooks

*Life and Teachings of Jesus Christ*. Provo, Utah: Adult Education and Extension Services, BYU, 1963.

*Missionary Approach to the Gospel*. Provo, Utah: Department of Home Study, Division of Continuing Education, BYU, 1966.

*The Gospel in Principle and Practice*. 2 vols. Provo, Utah: Department of Home Study, Division of Continuing Education, BYU, 1966.

*Guide to the Life of Christ*. Provo, Utah: Alexander’s Print Stop, 1981–96. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

*Guide to Acts and the Apostles’ Letters*. Provo, Utah: Alexander’s Print Stop, 1981–96. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

*Guide to the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Provo, Utah: Alexander’s Print Stop, 1992–96.

*The Book of Mormon Witnesses: A Resource Guide*. 1998. With Scott H. Faulring.

## VI. Book Reviews

### A. Review Essays

“Editing the Prophet: Dean C. Jessee’s *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*.” *Journal of Mormon History* 11 (1984): 113–18.

Review of *Joseph Smith’s New York Reputation Reexamined*, by Rodger I. Anderson. *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 3 (1991): 52–80. Reprinted by FARMS in 1997.

Review of *David Whitmer Interviews: A Restoration Witness*, by Lyndon W. Cook. *Journal of Mormon History* 20/1 (1994): 186–93.

Review of “A Rhetorical Approach to the Book of Mormon: Rediscovering Nephite Sacramental Language,” by Mark D. Thomas. [In *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon, Explorations in Critical Methodology*, 53–80.] *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 6/1 (1994): 379–417.

“The Prophet Joseph Smith and His Plural Wives.” Review of *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith*, by Todd Compton. *FARMS Review of Books* 10/2 (1998): 67–104. With Scott H. Faulring.

## **B. Book Reviews**

[Richard served as the book review editor for *BYUS* from 1964 to 1968, and in that capacity prepared a number of Book Notes, which are not recorded here.]

Review of *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion*, by Sterling M. McMurrin. *Dialogue* 1/1 (1966): 113–18. This was part of a roundtable discussion of McMurrin’s book to which McMurrin responded in the second 1966 issue (pp. 135–40), to which Richard Anderson again responded in the third 1966 issue (pp. 5–6).

Review of *Exploding the Myth about Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet*, by F. L. Stewart [pseud. Lori Donegan]. *BYUS* 8/2 (1968): 231–36. Since Stewart’s book is a critique of Fawn M. Brodie’s *No Man Knows My History*, this review discusses both books in some depth.

Review of *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*, by Matthias Gelzer, translated by Peter Needham. *Manuscripta* 13 (March 1969): 42–43.

Review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947–1969*, by Edmund Wilson. *BYUS* 10/1 (1969): 120–24.

Review of *The Maze of Mormonism*, by Walter R. Martin. *BYUS* 6/1 (1964): 57–62.

Review of *Ring of Truth: A Translator’s Testimony*, by J. B. Phillips. *BYUS* 9/2 (1969): 229–31.

## **VII. Personal and Missionary Items**

### **A. “The Anderson Plan”**

[Various editions and printings of this work, including editions in foreign languages, have appeared since 1949. No attempt has been made to identify them all.]

*A Plan, as Used in the Northwestern States Mission, for Effective Missionary Training*. Introduction by Joel Richards, President of Northwestern States Mission. Portland, Ore.: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Northwestern States Mission, 1950. Introduction dated 12 June 1950.

*A Plan for Effective Missionary Work*, compiled by Richard Lloyd Anderson. Kaysville, Utah: Printed and Distributed by Inland Printing, 1954.

### **B. Letters to the Editor**

“The Most Egregious Error.” *Christianity Today* 5/9 (30 January 1961): 16. A response to Walter Martin.

Letter to the Editor. *Dialogue* 2/2 (1967): 15. A response to Kent Robson’s earlier observations (first 1967 issue) regarding LDS biblical interpretation.

“Mormon Theology Lesson.” *Christianity Today* 12 (1 March 1968): 21. A response to a piece on the Mormons in the 19 January 1968 issue.

“LDS Standards Upheld.” *The Daily Herald* [Provo, Utah], 28 July 1995. A response to a previous letter of Sterling McMurrin in the 24 July 1995 issue.

### **C. Testimony**

“A Tested Testimony.” In *A Thoughtful Faith: Essays on Belief by Mormon Scholars*, edited by Philip L. Barlow, 277–91. Centerville, Utah: Canon, 1986.

“Christian Ethics in Joseph Smith Biography.” In *Expressions of Faith: Testimonies of Latter-day Saint Scholars*, edited by Susan Easton Black, 155–71. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1996.

### **D. Interviews**

“An Interview with Dr. Richard Anderson.” Interview by Robert Miller, 18 October 1975. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

“Transcript of Interview with Richard L. Anderson, March 12, 1993.” Appendix F, pp. 34–51. In Robert E. Lund, “A Review of the Missionary Lessons for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.” *LIS 694* (Independent Research), Supervising Professor, Victor W. Purdy. Provo, Utah: School of Library and Information Science, BYU, April 1993.

### **E. Video Lecture/Presentation**

“Book of Mormon Witnesses” [transcript, audiotape, and videotape]. FARMS Book of Mormon Lecture Series. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1994.

### **F. Forewords**

Foreword to Hugh W. Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, xi–xiii. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1967.

Foreword to Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, ix. Provo, Utah: Seventy’s Mission Bookstore, 1981.

# A Chronological Bibliography of the Works of Richard Lloyd Anderson

David J. Whittaker

**1950**

*A Plan, as Used in the Northwestern States Mission, for Effective Missionary Training.* Introduction by Joel Richards, President of Northwestern States Mission. Portland, Ore.: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Northwestern States Mission, 1950 (various editions).

**1954**

*A Plan for Effective Missionary Work*, compiled by Richard Lloyd Anderson. Kaysville, Utah: Printed and Distributed by Inland Printing, 1954.

**1957**

“*Euangelion*” A Study in New Testament Context: The New Testament Definition of the Gospel.” Master’s thesis, BYU, 1957.

**1959**

“At the First Christmas Were There Shepherds and Wise Men?” *Ins* (December 1959): 394–95.

**1961**

“Joseph Smith and the Millenarian Time Table.” *BYUS* 3/3–4 (1961): 55–66.

Letter to the Editor. “The Most Egregious Error.” *Christianity Today* 5/9 (30 January 1961): 16.

**1962**

“The Rise and Fall of Middle-Class Loyalty to the Roman Empire: A Social Study of Velleius Paterculus and Ammianus Marcellinus.” Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

**1963**

*Life and Teachings of Jesus Christ.* Provo, Utah: Adult Education and Extension Services, BYU, 1963.

“Manuscript Discoveries of the New Testament in Perspective.” In *Fourteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures* [13 April 1963], edited by Forrest R. Hauck, 52–60. Provo, Utah: Department of Extension Publications, Adult Education and Extension Services, BYU, 1963.

“New Testament Times.” In *Lectures on Jesus the Christ*, 28–40. Provo, Utah: BYU Extensions Publications, 1963.

"The Parables of the Kingdom." In *Lectures on Jesus the Christ*, 77–91. Provo, Utah: BYU Extensions Publications, 1963.

## 1964

Review of *The Maze of Mormonism*, by Walter R. Martin. *BYUS* 6/1 (1964): 57–62.

## 1966

*The Gospel in Principle and Practice*. 2 vols. Provo, Utah: Department of Home Study, Division of Continuing Education, BYU, 1966.

*Missionary Approach to the Gospel*. Provo, Utah: Department of Home Study, Division of Continuing Education, BYU, 1966.

Review of *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion*, by Sterling M. McMurrin. *Dialogue* 1/1 (1966): 113–18; 1/3 (1966): 5–6.

## 1967

Foreword to Hugh W. Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, xi–xiii. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1967.

Letter to the Editor. *Dialogue* 2/2 (1967): 15.

## 1968

"Missing Scriptures of New Testament Times." *Ins* (October 1968): 419–21.

Letter to the Editor. "Mormon Theology Lesson." *Christianity Today* 12 (1 March 1968): 21.

"Oliver Cowdery, Esq.: His Non-Mormon Career." In *Proceedings of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 45, pt. 1, pp. 66–80. Salt Lake City: Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, 1968.

"Oliver Cowdery's Non-Mormon Reputation." *IE* (August 1968): 18–26.

"The Pedigree of the King James Bible." *Ins* (February 1968): 95–97.

"Ramsay, The Seven Churches, and Early Christian Apostasy." *Newsletter and Proceedings of the Society for Early Historic Archaeology* 108 (17 September 1968): 1–4.

"Reuben Miller: Recorder of Oliver Cowdery's Reaffirmations." *BYUS* 8/3 (1968): 277–93.

Review of *Exploding the Myth about Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet*, by F. L. Stewart [pseud. Lori Donegan]. *BYUS* 8/2 (1968): 231–36.

"The Second Witness of Priesthood Restoration." *IE* (September 1968): 15–24.

"The Second Witness on Priesthood Succession." *IE* (November 1968): 14–20.

## 1969

"The Certainty of the Skeptical Witness." *IE* (March 1969): 62â€"67.

"Circumstantial Confirmation of the First Vision through Reminiscences." *BYUS* 9/3 (1969): 373â€"404.

"David Whitmer: The Independent Missouri Businessman." *IE* (April 1969): 74â€"81.

"Five Who Handled the Plates." *IE* (July 1969): 38â€"47.

"Martin Harris: The Honorable New York Farmer." *IE* (February 1969): 18â€"21.

"The Most Interviewed Witness." *IE* (May 1969): 76â€"83.

"The Reliability of the Early History of Lucy and Joseph Smith." *Dialogue* 4/2 (1969): 12â€"28.

Review of *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*, by Matthias Gelzer. *Manuscripta* 13 (March 1969): 42â€"43.

Review of *Ring of Truth: A Translator's Testimony*, by J. B. Phillips. *BYUS* 9/2 (1969): 229â€"31.

Review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947â€"1969*, by Edmund Wilson. *BYUS* 10/1 (1969): 120â€"24.

"The Scribe as a Witness." *IE* (January 1969): 53â€"59.

"The Smiths Who Handled the Plates." *IE* (August 1969): 28â€"34.

## 1970

"Confirming Records of Moroni's Coming." *IE* (September 1970): 4â€"8.

"The House Where the Church Was Organized." *IE* (April 1970): 16â€"25.

"Joseph Smith's New York Reputation Reappraised." *BYUS* 10/3 (1970): 283â€"314.

"The New English Bible: The New Testament." *Dialogue* 5/4 (1970): 102â€"6.

"The Trustworthiness of Young Joseph Smith." *IE* (October 1970): 82â€"89.

## 1971

"Heritage of a Prophet." *Ensign* (February 1971): 15â€"19.

"The Impact of the First Preaching in Ohio." *BYUS* 11/4 (1971): 474â€"96.

"Jackson County in Early Mormon Descriptions." *Missouri Historical Review* 65/3 (April 1971): 270â€"93.

"Joseph Smith's Home Environment." *Ensign* (July 1971): 57â€"59.



*Joseph Smith's New England Heritage: Influences of Grandfathers Solomon Mack and Asael Smith.* Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971.

- “Prologue”
- “Lives of Solomon and Lydia Gates Mack”
- “Writings of Solomon Mack”
- “Lovisa Mack’s Healing”
- “Lives of Asael and Mary Duty Smith”
- “Writings of Asael Smith”
- “John Smith’s Family History”
- “Epilogue”

“The Knowable Prophet.” *The Daily Universe, Monday Magazine*, 3 May 1971, 3, 11.

## 1972

“Joseph Smith, Sr.: Family and Church Patriarch.” In *Joseph Smith Sr., Family Reunion, Oral Presentations, 18â€”19 August 1972*, 47â€”51. Provo, Utah: Buddy Youngren, 1972.

“Oliver Cowdery, Esq.: His Non-Church Decade.” In *To the Glory of God: Mormon Essays on Great Issues*, edited by Truman G. Madsen and Charles D. Tate Jr., 199â€”216. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1972.

## 1973

“Of Goodly Parents’: Joseph Smith, Sr., and Lucy Mack Smith.” *New Era* (December 1973): 34â€”39.

“Personalities That Created Joseph Smith.” In *1971â€”72 California Know Your Religion Series*, 53â€”68. N.p.: BYU California Center, 1973.

“Questions Frequent in Quest for Description of the Savior.” *Church News* section, *Deseret News*, 22 December 1973, 6.

“What Old Testament books are most quoted by the Savior?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (October 1973): 28.

## 1974

“The Archko Volume: Bible Counterfeit.” *Church News* section, *Deseret News*, 14 December 1974, 10, 13.

“The Fraudulent Archko Volume.” *BYUS* 15/1 (1974): 43â€”64.

“How to Read a Parable.” *Ensign* (September 1974): 58â€”63.

“New Data for Revising the Missouri ‘Documentary History.’” *BYUS* 14/4 (1974): 488â€”501.

“Paul and the Athenian Intellectuals.” *Commissioner’s Lecture Series*. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1974.

“The Political and Social Realities of Zion’s Camp.” *BYUS* 14/4 (1974): 406â€”20. With Peter Crawley.

“Ray County in Mormon History.” In *Ray County* [Missouri], 1973, 223–29. Marcelline, Mo.: Walsworth, 1974.

“A speaker in Church last Sunday quoted from a book called *The Archko Volume* about the life of Christ. I had not heard any of the kinds of things he said before. Is the book authentic?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (October 1974): 45–46.

“Why are the Gospels so incomplete on the details of Jesus’ life?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (September 1974): 75.

## 1975

“The Ancient Practice of Crucifixion.” *Ensign* (July 1975): 32–33.

“The Church and the Roman Empire.” *Ensign* (September 1975): 12–23.

“Did Jesus celebrate the Jewish passover at the last supper?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (June 1975): 20–21.

“An Interview with Dr. Richard Anderson.” Interview by Robert Miller, 18 October 1975. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

“Simon Peter.” *Ensign* (February 1975): 46–49.

“Why did Christ convert so few people in His three-year ministry? Did the Holy Ghost not yet testify of His work?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (March 1975): 30–31.

## 1976

“Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp: Three Bishops between the Apostles and Apostasy.” *Ensign* (August 1976): 50–55.

“Gold Plates and Printer’s Ink.” *Ensign* (September 1976): 71–76.

“His Mother’s Manuscript: An Intimate View of Joseph Smith.” Forum Address, BYU, 27 January 1976. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

“Joseph Smith’s Insights into the Olivet Prophecy: Joseph Smith 1 and Matthew 24.” In *Pearl of Great Price Symposium*, 22 November 1975, 48–61. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1976.

“Paul and the Athenian Intellectuals.” *Ensign* (February 1976): 50–55.

## 1977

“By the Gift and Power of God.” *Ensign* (September 1977): 78–85.

“The Path of Jesus: The Full Dimension.” *New Era* (February 1977): 20–24.

“Production and Publication of Lucy Smith’s History.” Provo, Utah: n.p., 1977. Copy in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU.

## 1978

"The Emotional Dimensions of Lucy Smith and Her History." In *Dedication Colloquium, Harold B. Lee Library, March 15*–"March 17, 1977, 129"–37. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1978.

"History of the Prophet Joseph by Lucy Mack Smith." In *First Annual Church Educational System Religious Educators Symposium, Transcripts and Abstracts, 19*–"20 August 1977, 32"–33. N.p. [1978].

"The Latter-day Saints in New York and Pennsylvania (1816"–1831)." *First Annual Church Educational System Religious Educators Symposium: Transcripts and Abstracts, 19*–"20 August 1977, 33"–35. N.p., [1978].

## 1979

"Joseph Smith's Brothers: Nauvoo and After." *Ensign* (September 1979): 30"–33.

"What changes have been made in the name of the Church? Its full designation does not appear in the revelations until 1838. (D&C 115:4)." I Have a Question. *Ensign* (January 1979): 13"–14.

"What Were Joseph Smith's Sisters Like and What Happened to Them after the Martyrdom?" *Ensign* (March 1979): 42"–44.

"The Whitmers: A Family That Nourished the Church." *Ensign* (August 1979): 34"–40.

## 1980

"Jackson County in Early Mormon Descriptions." In *A New Light Breaks Forth: Essays in Mormon History*, edited by Lyndon W. Cook and Donald Q. Cannon, 155"–77. Salt Lake City: Hawkes, 1980.

"Joseph Smith's Prophecies of Martyrdom." In *The Eighth Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium: A Sesquicentennial Look at Church History, 1*"–14. Provo, Utah: BYU College of Religious Instruction, 1980.

"Methods Used in Discovering Joseph Smith's Family History." In *World Conference on Records: Preserving Our Heritage, August 12*"–15, 1980. Vol. 4, North American Family and Local History, Part 2, Series No. 343. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1980.

"Who were the six who organized the Church on 6 April 1830?" I Have a Question. *Ensign* (June 1980): 44"–45.

## 1981

Foreword to Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, ix. Provo, Utah: Seventy's Mission Bookstore, 1981.

*Guide to Acts and the Apostles' Letters*. Provo, Utah: Alexander's Print Stop, 1981"–96. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

*Guide to the Life of Christ*. Provo, Utah: Alexander's Print Stop, 1981"–96. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

*Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1981.

- “Assistants and Eyewitnesses”
- “Informal Witnesses of the Plates”
- “Oliver Cowdery: Non-Mormon Lawyer”
- “Oliver Cowdery: The Scribe as a Witness”
- “David Whitmer: Independent Missouri Businessman”
- “David Whitmer: The Most Interviewed Witness”
- “Martin Harris: Honorable New York Farmer”
- “Martin Harris: Certainty from the Skeptical Witness”
- “The Whitmer Family Who Handled the Plates”
- “The Smiths Who Handled the Plates”
- “The Case against the Witnesses”
- “The Challenge of the Witnesses”

“Types of Christian Revelation.” In *Literature of Belief: Sacred Scripture and Religious Experience*, edited by Neal E. Lambert, 61–78. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1981.

## 1982

“The Credibility of the Book of Mormon Translators.” In *Book of Mormon Authorship: New Light on Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds, 213–37. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1982.

## 1983

“Misleading Translations of Paul.” In *The Eleventh Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium, 29 January 1983*, 17–26. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Education, Church Educational System, 1983.

“Parallel Prophets: Paul and Joseph Smith.” *Brigham Young University 1982–83 Fireside and Devotional Speeches*, 177–83. Provo, Utah: University Publication, 1983.

*Understanding Paul*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983.

- “Two Restless Worlds”
- “Paul’s Preparation: ‘Fire on Earth’”
- “The Missionary Message in Acts”
- “Early Letters to Converts”
- “Letters of Reconversion”
- “Letters Preaching Christ”
- “Roman Imprisonment Letters”
- “Letters to Leaders”

## 1984

Review Essay. “Editing the Prophet: Dean C. Jessee’s *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*.” *Journal of Mormon History* 11 (1984): 113–18.

“The Organization Revelations (D&C 20, 21, and 22).” In *Studies in Scripture Vol. 1: The Doctrine and Covenants*, edited by Robert L. Millet and Kent P. Jackson, 109–23. Sandy, Utah: Randall Book, 1984.

“Ray County in Mormon History.” In *Ray County Mirror* 6/1 (April 1984): 3–6.

“What do we know of the life of John the Apostle after the Day of Pentecost? Why was he exiled to the Isle of Patmos?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (January 1984): 50–51.

## 1985

“Parallel Prophets: Paul and Joseph Smith.” *Ensign* (April 1985): 12–17.

## 1986

“Atchison’s Letters and the Causes of Mormon Expulsion from Missouri.” *BYUS* 26/3 (1986): 3–47.

“Imitation Gospels and Christ’s Book of Mormon Ministry.” In *Apocryphal Writings and the Latter-day Saints*, edited by C. Wilfred Griggs, 53–107. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1986.

“The Mature Joseph Smith and Treasure Searching.” *BYUS* 24/4 (1984 [published in 1986]): 489–560.

“A Tested Testimony.” In *A Thoughtful Faith: Essays on Belief by Mormon Scholars*, edited by Philip L. Barlow, 277–91. Centerville, Utah: Canon, 1986.

“The Testimony of Luke.” In *Studies in Scripture Vol. 5: The Gospels*, edited by Kent P. Jackson and Robert L. Millet, 88–108. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986.

## 1987

“The Alvin Smith Story: Fact and Fiction.” *Ensign* (August 1987): 58–72.

“Did Oliver Cowdery, one of the three special Book of Mormon witnesses, express doubt about his testimony?” I Have a Question. *Ensign* (April 1987): 23–25.

“Parables of Mercy.” *Ensign* (February 1987): 20–24.

“The Personality of the Prophet.” *New Era* (December 1987): 14–19.

## 1988

“Did Oliver Cowdery, one of the three special Book of Mormon witnesses, express doubt about his testimony?” In *A Sure Foundation: Answers to Difficult Gospel Questions*, 39–45. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

“The First Presidency of the Early Church: Their Lives and Epistles.” *Ensign* (August 1988): 16–21.

“Joseph Smith’s Final Self-Appraisal.” In *The Prophet Joseph: Essays on the Life and Mission of Joseph Smith*, edited by Larry C. Porter and Susan Easton Black, 320–32. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

“What changes have been made in the name of the Church? Its full designation does not appear in the revelations until 1838. (See D&C 115:4).” In *A Sure Foundation: Answers to Difficult Gospel Questions*, 194–96. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988.

## 1989

“David Whitmer: Unique Missouri Mormon.” In *Missouri Folk Heroes of the 19th Century*, edited by F. Mark McKiernan and Roger D. Launius, 43–59. Independence, Mo.: Independence Press, Herald Publishing House, 1989.

*Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Issued in paperback with minor corrections. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989.

“Religious Validity: The Sacrament Covenant in Third Nephi.” Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1989.

## 1990

“Religious Validity: The Sacrament Covenant in Third Nephi.” In *By Study and Also by Faith: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley*, edited by John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks, 2:1–53. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990.

*Understanding Paul*. Issued in paperback with minor corrections. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990.

## 1991

“Peter’s Letters: Progression for the Living and the Dead.” *Ensign* (October 1991): 6–10.

Review essay of *Joseph Smith’s New York Reputation Reexamined*, by Rodger I. Anderson. *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 3 (1991): 52–80.

## 1992

“Book of Mormon Witnesses.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 1:214–16. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

*Guide to the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Provo, Utah: Alexander’s Print Stop, 1992–96.

“Lucy Mack Smith.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 3:1355–58. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

“Oliver Cowdery.” In *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 1:335–40. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

“The Restoration of the Sacrament: Part I: Loss and Christian Reformations.” *Ensign* (January 1992): 40–46.

“The Restoration of the Sacrament: Part II: A New and Ancient Covenant.” *Ensign* (February 1992): 11–17.

## 1993

“The Religious Dimension of Emma’s Letters to Joseph.” In *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, the Man*, edited by Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr., 117–25. Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1993.

"Transcript of Interview with Richard L. Anderson, March 12, 1993." Appendix F, pp. 34-51. In Robert E. Lund, "A Review of the Missionary Lessons for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." Provo, Utah: School of Library and Information Science, BYU, April 1993.

## 1994

"Book of Mormon Witnesses" [transcript, audiotape, and videotape]. *FARMS Book of Mormon Lecture Series*. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1994.

"Clarifications of Boggs's 'Order' and Joseph Smith's Constitutionalism." In *Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History: Missouri*, edited by Arnold K. Garr and Clark V. Johnson, 27-83. Provo, Utah: BYU Department of Church History and Doctrine, 1994.

"Joseph Smith's Ancestors." In *Historical Atlas of Mormonism*, edited by S. Kent Brown, Donald Q. Cannon, and Richard H. Jackson, 4-5. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

"Paul's Witness to the Early History of Jesus' Ministry." In *The Apostle Paul: His Life and His Testimony*, edited by Paul Y. Hoskisson, 1-33. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1994.

Review essay of "A Rhetorical Approach to the Book of Mormon: Rediscovering Nephite Sacramental Language," by Mark D. Thomas. *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 6/1 (1994): 379-417.

Review of *David Whitmer Interviews: A Restoration Witness*, by Lyndon W. Cook. *Journal of Mormon History* 20/1 (1994): 186-93.

## 1995

"Book of Mormon Witnesses." In *Scriptures of the Church: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 208-12. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

*Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (GospelLink).

*Joseph Smith's New England Heritage: Influences of Grandfathers Solomon Mack and Asael Smith*. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (GospelLink).

Letter to the Editor. "LDS Standards Upheld." *The Daily Herald*, 28 July 1995.

"Lucy Mack Smith." In *Church History: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 534-40. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

"Oliver Cowdery." In *Church History: Selections from the Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, 73-80. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995.

"Sidney B. Sperry: Steadfast Scholar." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 4/1 (1995): xxi-xxiii.

*Understanding Paul*. Electronic edition, Deseret Book, 1995 (GospelLink).

## 1996

“Christian Ethics in Joseph Smith Biography.” In *Expressions of Faith: Testimonies of Latter-day Saint Scholars*, edited by Susan Easton Black, 155–71. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1996.

“Joseph Smith’s Testimony of the First Vision.” *Ensign* (April 1996): 10–21.

## 1997

“Oliver Cowdery’s Voice in Modern Scripture: Priesthood Restoration, Book of Mormon, and the Articles of Faith.” Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997.

“Personal Writings of the Book of Mormon Witnesses.” In *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds, 39–60. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997.

## 1998

*The Book of Mormon Witnesses: A Resource Guide*. 1998. With Scott H. Faulring.

“The Prophet Joseph Smith and His Plural Wives.” Review essay of *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith*, by Todd Compton. *FARMS Review of Books* 10/2 (1998): 67–104. With Scott H. Faulring.

## 1999

*Guide to Acts and the Apostles’ Letters*. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

*Guide to the Life of Christ*. Rev. ed. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.

## 2000

*Witness of the Second Elder: The Documentary History of Oliver Cowdery*, 4 vols. Forthcoming. With Scott H. Faulring.



# Contributors

James B. Allen (Ph.D., University of Southern California) is Professor Emeritus of History at Brigham Young University.

Davis Bitton (Ph.D., Princeton University) is Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Utah.

Susan Easton Black (Ed.D., Brigham Young University) is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University.

Donald Q. Cannon (Ph.D., Clark University) is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University.

Richard O. Cowan (Ph.D., Stanford University) is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University.

Scott H. Faulring (M.P.A., Troy State University) is Research Historian at the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History at Brigham Young University.

John Gee (Ph.D., Yale University) is Assistant Research Professor of Egyptology at the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) and Research Associate for the Center for the Preservation of Ancient Religious Texts (CPART) at Brigham Young University.

Gary P. Gillum (M.L.S., Brigham Young University) is Religion, Philosophy, and Ancient Studies Librarian at Brigham Young University.

Kenneth W. Godfrey (Ph.D., Brigham Young University) is retired from the LDS Church Education System and is a historian, writer, and newspaper columnist.

Andrew H. Hedges (Ph.D., University of Illinois) is Assistant Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University.

Kent P. Jackson (Ph.D., University of Michigan) is Professor of Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University.

Glen M. Leonard (Ph.D., University of Utah) is Director of the Museum of Church History and Art in Salt Lake City.

Robert J. Matthews (Ph.D., Brigham Young University) is Professor Emeritus of Ancient Scripture, Brigham Young University.

Donald W. Parry (Ph.D., University of Utah) is Associate Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at Brigham Young University.

Noel B. Reynolds (Ph.D., Harvard University) is Associate Academic Vice President and Professor of Political Science at Brigham Young University.

Stephen D. Ricks (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, and Graduate Theological Union) is Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Learning at Brigham Young University.

Royal Skousen (Ph.D., University of Illinois) is Professor of English and Linguistics at Brigham Young University.

John A. Tvedtnes (M.A., University of Utah) is Associate Director of Research at the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) at Brigham Young University.

John W. Welch (J.D., Duke University) is the Robert K. Thomas Professor of Law at the J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, and Editor in Chief of *BYU Studies*.

David J. Whittaker (Ph.D., Brigham Young University) is Curator of Western and Mormon Manuscripts, Harold B. Lee Library, and Associate Professor of History at Brigham Young University.