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At the beginning of this new academic year, which also comes with the inauguration of Kevin J. Worthen as president of Brigham Young University, all of us at BYU Studies are pleased to release this latest issue of the BYU Studies Quarterly. In his first five months in office, President Worthen has already emphasized the mission and destiny of BYU, and as I glance over the table of contents of this issue, I am struck by the many ways in which all of these items reflect and promote the foundational mission statement that stands behind the aims of a BYU education. The pages in this issue offer readers a bounty of stimulating learning. Its wide variety of topics grounded in a diversity of disciplines offers an array of scholarly productivity that is unusually rich. Each contribution has been made possible by commitment to excellence, striving for the full realization of human potential.

Featured in the color section of this issue and on the front and back covers is work by Professor of Chemistry John D. Lamb, whose Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecture and portfolio of paintings offer lessons learned through a lifetime of scientific investigations while still seeing God as the dispenser of all truth. This article, like all instruction and services at BYU, is bathed in the light of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Leading off this new issue, Jack Harrell articulates the constitutive elements of a Mormon literary theory. A new thrust in LDS intellectual interests is to develop Mormon theoretical approaches to give LDS thinkers greater traction in engaging in academic pursuits. Recent BYU publications have probed Mormon fundamentals pertinent to such subjects as aesthetics and art criticism, family sciences, jurisprudence,
From the Editor

psychology, and counseling. Harrell’s literary criticism makes better readers of us all and beckons others to articulate more explicitly comparable Mormon theoretical approaches to history, religion and science, dance and music, biblical criticism and theology, political science, and to just about any other self-reflective discipline within academia.

Following the goals of the BYU mission statement, BYU students and lifelong learners are drawn to subjects ranging throughout the curriculum of arts, letters, and sciences, while being enlightened by prophetic insights and the teachings of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Disciplines and academic skills brought together in this issue include chemistry, history, law, architecture, documentary editing, poetry, personal essays, statistics, and scriptural interpretation.

It is hard for me to say which of all of these submissions are my favorites, for in the process of encouraging, receiving, peer reviewing, evaluating, selecting, editing, revising, and preparing each of these articles for publication, and together with the unflagging assistance of all of the members of the BYU Studies editorial boards and staff, we have gotten to know these authors personally and to admire their dedication to the pursuit of clear and effective communication, uncompromising research, and their consecrated eagerness to make their scholarly productivity available to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and to people all over the world.

Not only what these articles say but also how they are phrased has come to characterize BYU Studies Quarterly issue after issue:

- What could be more character building than a personal interview with Emma Lou Thayne, a humanitarian par excellence?
- What could help to broaden perspectives in today’s narrowing world of specialization than Cheryl Preston’s multi-disciplinary insights about both the horizontal and vertical forms and functions that produce a unique unity within the living practices of the LDS Church?
- Who could drill deeper than Mark Staker and Robin Jensen into the details of a newly discovered document from the late 1820s, helping us understand more about the daily life of Joseph and Emma Smith in Harmony, Pennsylvania, the historic site where the Church is now constructing a visitors’ center at the place where the majority of the Book of Mormon was translated and the priesthood restored?
And not to be missed are four very engaging reviews. One explores what other Christians can learn from the Latter-day Saints, and another describes the self-sacrificing service of Jacob Hamblin as a frontier missionary to native Americans. A third covers a theatrical tour de force produced in conjunction with the Illinois Supreme Court about the constitutional importance of individual liberties and the right of habeas corpus from the times of Joseph Smith and Abraham Lincoln to modern political and judicial decisions regarding detainees at Guantanamo. The review essay advances our understanding of issues relating to Book of Mormon authorship, especially generating useful results through statistical analysis.

In the end, as the BYU mission statement sets forth, “Any education is inadequate which does not emphasize that [the name of Jesus Christ] is the only name given under heaven whereby mankind can be saved.” So, the scriptural meditation by David Randall Scott on the book of Jonah offers a reading that encourages attentive students of scripture to consider each passage in that book as testifying of and foreshadowing the self-sacrificing life and atoning victory of Jesus as the Christ. Although modern approaches to scripture do not generally employ this symbolical approach, Jesus himself spoke of the “sign of Jonah,” and his early followers took it as a given that “all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken,” in some way had foretold the events of Jesus’s life and ministry (Acts 3:24). Indeed, the book of Jonah was one of the principal places where the early Christians found numerous typological allusions to the death, resurrection, and saving mission of Jesus Christ, and in this light Scott offers viewers a chance to see Jonah anew through this typological lens.

My thanks go without reservation to the many students, coauthors, and editorial boards whose collaborative efforts have brought this issue together. This issues offers the voices of immensely promising young scholars as well as intrepid authors offering their wisdom toward the end of their careers. Intellectual excellence and spiritual strength abound on the pages of this quarterly contribution to the mission of our unique university. We hope it offers all readers something they did not yet even know they were looking for.
Toward a Mormon Literary Theory

Jack Harrell

Last year I walked into a literary theory course on the campus of Brigham Young University–Idaho. The teacher was a colleague of mine, Jeff Slagle, a gifted young professor well-versed in criticism and theory. I was auditing the course that semester, revisiting theories and approaches I’d first encountered years before as a BYU undergraduate. The main text for the course was The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, and the names on the reading list were familiar—Cleanth Brooks, Louis Althusser, Wolfgang Iser, Jacques Derrida, Annette Kolodny, Henry Louis Gates Jr. But this was dense material—complex writing, challenging ideas, texts that can forever change the way a person thinks and reads. Just as I had experienced at BYU, taking similar courses from Bruce Young and Cecilia Konchar Farr, I found value in each of the texts Jeff assigned—feminists extolling the roles of women, cultural critics challenging modern materialism, language theorists writing of the presence or absence of extralinguistic reality. As a reader and thinker, and as a Mormon, I found great worth here, new vistas that demanded constant reexamination of past certainties.

I had come to Jeff’s class with a question, though just an inkling at first. Sitting there on the first day, I wondered, “Is there a Mormon literary theory?” Is there an approach to literature, or a criterion for judgment, that could function as a unique theoretical lens, that could be called Mormon, that could offer a new perspective, or even a fresh synthesis of previous theories, to add to the ongoing conversation about the evaluation and appreciation of literature? I talked with Jeff about this, and I brought the question to the rest of the class. Perhaps a Mormon literary theory did exist. Or perhaps an implicit approach had already
In January 1991, I stepped into Eugene England’s Literature of the Latter-day Saints course. At the time, I hardly knew such a thing as Mormon literature or criticism existed. England soon introduced our class to a rich legacy of work that opened my mind to the potential for creative literature among the Latter-day Saints. Beginning with Parley Pratt’s short fiction “A Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil,” published in 1844, England showed us that Mormon creative writing was as old as Mormonism itself. He also taught us that truth could be effectively communicated through fiction. In the years since, I’ve heard many people say, “I don’t read fiction; I’m only interested in the truth.” Experience has shown me that the person who says this misunderstands both fiction and truth.

My research for this paper took me through decades of Mormon writings. Time and again I marveled at the substantive work of those who came before us. Yes, the decade of the 1970s was “The Dawning of a Brighter Day,” as England wrote in the pages of BYU Studies in 1982, a period of exciting literary growth among Mormons, but every decade of Mormonism has had its proponents of literature and thought. The intellectual life of the early Saints in Nauvoo featured formal public debating sessions. Early Utah periodicals regularly sponsored poetry, fiction, and essay contests. In 1948, P. A. Christensen published his collection of essays All in a Teacher’s Day. I don’t think a Mormon lover of literature today could gainsay the things Christensen said way back in 1948. Yet it seems that every generation must learn the same lessons for itself.

I wouldn’t dare to predict the future of Mormon literary theory. Perhaps Mormons are simply too practical to develop an across-the-ranks interest in such esoteric pursuits. But Mormon theology, faith, and culture, I believe, are strong enough to bear the weight of this effort. If Mormons don’t advance in literary studies, I believe the fault will rest with us, not the religion.
taken shape among Mormon readers, a de facto Mormon literary theory that had yet to be delineated.

I wrote a short speculative paper on this topic for Jeff’s course, one I presented at the 2013 annual conference of the Association for Mormon Letters (AML). The thesis for my paper was that no such theory existed, as far as I knew, but its ingredients were all around us—in Mormon theology itself and in the writings of Mormons who had studied and celebrated literature since the beginning of the Church. After presenting my paper, I knew I had to take the next step: I had to go beyond speculation and do a thorough literature review. If a Mormon literary theory existed, I would find it—whether explicitly defined or implicitly applied.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF LDS LITERARY CRITICISM

My own experience with Mormon literature and criticism began at BYU in January of 1991, when I walked into another classroom: Eugene England’s Literature of the Latter-day Saints course. At the time, I was twenty-nine years old, a husband, a father of three, and a late bloomer on the college scene. Having joined the LDS Church eight years before, I had read every Mormon book I could get ahold of, but I had yet to read anything that could be called “Mormon literature.” The first assignment Professor England gave was his 1982 BYU Studies publication “The Dawning of a Brighter Day: Mormon Literature after 150 Years,” an essay that came as a revelation to me—as it did for most of the students in the class. Mormon literature, England explained, was substantial enough to divide into four periods: “Foundations,” “Home Literature,” the “Lost Generation,” and “Faithful Realism.” England wrote of the candid poetry of the Mormon pioneers, the didactic novels that followed Elder Orson F. Whitney’s statement “We will yet have Miltons and Shakespeares of our own,”1 and reasons why the personal narrative was particularly suited to contemporary Mormon writers. But England didn’t merely delineate genres and periods. He situated Mormon literature in a philosophical framework that justified its significance. “Unlike religions such as Lutheranism or Christian Science,” England said, Mormonism “makes a large number of rather absolute claims about the nature of the universe and God and human beings, about specific historical events, past and

future, about language and form and content.” 2 England made a promising case for LDS literature, for works expressing a uniquely Mormon worldview, giving the Church and its religion a human and literary face. This wasn’t just partisan praise. England’s essay met the highest of scholarly standards: it was a reasoning- and evidenced-based assertion that a Mormon literature existed, as well as a Mormon criticism.

England’s LDS literature course, the theory courses I took from Professors Young and Farr, and the creative writing courses I took from Bruce Jorgensen and others at BYU prepared me well for the years to come. After graduate school, I continued to study Mormon literature and began my teaching at Ricks College, which soon became Brigham Young University–Idaho. I published a Mormon literary novel and a collection of short stories. I took part in the Association for Mormon Letters, which England had founded in 1976. And for five years I coedited Irreantum, AML’s official journal, publishing the best in contemporary Mormon poetry, essays, stories, and criticism. This was the path that led me to Jeff Slagle’s class and to the question, “Is there a Mormon literary theory?”

Having determined to do a literature review, I knew I had to begin with the works of Eugene England himself. Lest anyone accuse me of a bias concerning England’s role in Mormon literature and criticism, I’ll reference his colleague of many years, Richard Cracroft. In 2001, shortly after England’s death, Cracroft wrote a tribute to his friend and former colleague, saying that “Gene’s remarkable contribution to these ends [the blossoming of Mormon literature] constitutes the single major literary force and influence during the last quarter century—an era in which Mormon letters, slow aborning, stood up, stretched, and self-consciously fluffed its youthful feathers. And . . . Eugene England was the principal fluffer!” 3 Cracroft called England’s 1996 book Tending the Garden: Essays on Mormon Literature, coedited by Lavina Fielding Anderson, “the basis for Mormon literary studies of the twenty-first century.” 4

In truth, England and Cracroft stood together as pioneers in this work. Six years before England’s death, he wrote that Cracroft “could

be called the father of modern Mormon literary studies for his pioneer-
tury has seen the publication of *Dispensation: Latter-day Fiction*, edited by Angela Hallstrom in 2010, and Tyler Chadwick’s *Fire in the Pasture: Twenty-first Century Mormon Poets*, in 2011.

Even before I began my review of Mormon criticism, I was familiar with the only two existing histories of Mormon literature. Terryl Givens, in *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture*, dedicated two insight-
ful chapters to Mormon literature. Throughout the book, Givens refers to an extraordinary notion in Mormon theology, one that sets it apart from any other faith—a “radical paradigm shift instituted by Joseph Smith,”7 Givens calls it. Joseph’s many revelations, his angelic visitations, the literal heft of the golden plates, even the nature of God as revealed in the First Vision contribute to a “collapse of sacred distance, . . . the concretization of the abstract.”8 Givens reminds us that Parley P. Pratt went so far as to assert that “God, angels, and men are all of one species.”9 This is a view that is radically different from traditional Christianity, which asserts in *The Westminster Confession of Faith* that God is “infinite in being and perfec-
tion, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immu-
table, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy,

most free, most absolute.”10 “But central to Joseph Smith’s thought,” Givens explains, “is the collapse of the sacred distance that consigns man and God to existentially and ontologically separate spheres.”11 The consequence of this, for everything about Mormonism, Givens observes, is “a culture that sacralizes and exalts the mundane even as it naturalizes and domesticates the sacred.”12

Givens’s insights into Mormon culture are invaluable. But the more exhaustive history, not surprisingly, comes from Eugene England, in his “Mormon Literature: Progress and Prospects,” from the 1995 BYU Studies publication Mormon Americana. Here he expands his earlier analysis of the four periods of Mormon literature, seeing the first 150 years of Mormon literature “in terms of three fifty-year periods and three kinds of rebels.”13 In the first fifty years, the early pioneers rebelled against Babylon, the world in general. In the second fifty, the Utah Saints of the “Home Literature” period rebelled against the “worldly literature” to be had outside of Zion, creating their own literature for their own consumption. In the third period, the “Lost Generation” rebelled against a seemingly naïve and provincial Mormonism its writers felt bound to outgrow.

The Foundations period of Mormon literature (1830–1880) was “an initial outpouring . . . of largely unsophisticated writing, expressive of the new converts’ dramatic symbolic as well as literal journeys to Zion.”14 That period saw the remarkable sermons and writings of Joseph Smith, the pamphlets and books of Orson and Parley Pratt, the poetry of Eliza Snow, and countless letters and conversion narratives from ordinary Latter-day Saints. This was a period that prized poetry, even if it disparaged fiction. In 1856, Franklin Richards, president of the European Mission, said, “It is the duty and privilege of the Saints . . . to procure and study the poetical works of the Church, that their authors may be encouraged and the spirit of poetry cultivated in the bosom of the readers.”15 Three years earlier, in 1853, “Church funds were used to...

12. Givens, People of Paradox, 42.
pay for the publication and distribution costs of the first book of LDS poetry, 16 The Harp of Zion, by the “Scottish bard” of Mormonism, John Lyon. Between 1853 and 1854, this anthology sold a thousand copies in Britain alone. 17

The next period in Mormon literature, Home Literature (1890–1930), was sparked by Orson F. Whitney’s call for “Miltons and Shakespeares of our own.” This era saw a great deal of poetry and nonfiction, as well as a surge in fiction written to counter the “lying novel, that is calculated to lead the mind to lightness and lechery.” 18 Speaking of the potential for writing and creativity among Latter-day Saints, Whitney asserted that “God’s ammunition is not exhausted.” 19 Whitney and others, such as B. H. Roberts, Emmeline B. Wells, and Susa Young Gates, published in Church periodicals like the Juvenile Instructor, the Contributor, Women’s Exponent, Utah Magazine, and Young Woman’s Journal. However, despite the thousands of pages written in this era, Eugene England damns it as a period of “highly didactic fiction and poetry designed to defend and improve the Saints but of little lasting worth.” 20

The next period (1930–1970) brought “the first flowering of an artistically excellent Mormon literature that was able to be published nationally and gain national recognition.” 21 Authors such as Vardis Fisher, Maurine Whipple, and Virginia Sorensen published award-winning novels with Boston and New York publishers. Writing in 1977, Edward Geary dubbed this period the “Lost Generation,” borrowing the term used for American writers whose values had been shaken by World War I. Geary said the works of the best Mormon writers in this period “resemble the works of the so-called ‘lost generation’ of the 1920s in their ambivalence towards a tradition which seems to have failed yet which still offers the only available spiritual anchor against a tide of meaninglessness.” 22 According to Geary, members of the Mormon Lost Generation “grew up when regional isolation was breaking down and rural Mormondom

17. Givens, People of Paradox, 167.
was experiencing widespread depopulation.”

He further states, “There is a pervasive view in these writers that Mormonism is something to be outgrown.” Their goal was “not to create an altogether new literature or an art subservient to the building up of Zion [as those in the Home Literature period had attempted] but to capture in their fiction the life of their region as the New England and Midwestern regional writers had done and as the Southern writers were beginning to do.”

England adds that “urban Mormonism was apparently becoming crassly materialistic. It was easy for them [the Lost Generation] to see the Church, however heroic in the nineteenth century, as failing, the Mormon experiment as rapidly ending. And they saw themselves as the first well-educated generation of Mormonism, able to look with some amusement upon the naïveté of Mormon thought.”

In these first three periods of Mormon literature we see forces that remain with us today—the didactic, insular writing popular in the contemporary commercial Mormon bookstore and the more complex literary writings of disaffected writers who believe they have outgrown the nursery of their once-beloved Mormonism.

For England, the fourth period, which he calls “Faithful Realism” (1960–present), stands as a compromise. He cites Clinton Larson, the founder of BYU Studies, as “the spiritual father” of this period, as someone who wrote “a unique Mormon poetry of modernist sensibility and skill but also informed and passionate faith.”

Incidentally, this was the era that England focused on in his Literature of the Latter-day Saints course when I took it, featuring writers like Levi Peterson, Doug Thayer, Margaret Young, Thomas Rogers, Susan Howe, and Lance Larsen. As Givens puts it, “These writers demonstrate the seriousness of intent of the Lost Generation, but rely mostly upon humor and irony to interrogate affectionately their own culture's paradoxes.”

My literature review took me through a dozen books and scores of articles in BYU Studies, Dialogue, Sunstone, Irreantum, The Proceedings of the Association for Mormon Letters Annual Conference, and elsewhere. Much of this literature, in the footsteps of England, comments on the

---


history of Mormon writing and its potential—realized or not. A great deal of effort is made to explain why Mormons have not lived up to Orson F. Whitney’s prophecy, while just as much energy is applied to point the way toward that goal. Women writers, especially in the 1980s and 1990s, drew connections between Mormonism and feminism, as did Stacy Burton in her 1995 essay “Rethinking Religious Experience: Notes from Critical Theory, Feminism, and Real Life.”30 Some writers, such as Robert Bird, make connections between Mormonism and postmodernism, asserting that “Mormon postmodernism affirms the intrusion and influence of one world upon another.”31 The most perennial topic in Mormon criticism is the question, “What is Mormon literature?” This question saw special prominence in a dialogue between three pioneers of the Faithful Realism period—England, Cracroft, and Bruce Jorgensen.

After the publication of England and Clark’s _Harvest: Contemporary Mormon Poems_, Cracroft wrote a review for _BYU Studies_ in which he said that too many of the later poems in the book, the contemporary poems, “could have been written anywhere in Western culture.”32 Cracroft further declared that “the educated modern Mormon poet has assimilated the secular culture and modes of poetry, repressing and replacing soaring spirituality with earth-bound humanism.”33 Later, in an AML presidential address, Cracroft would say, “Lacking a firmly founded center stake, then, Mormon criticism, like Mormon literature, is unsettled and uncentered, too prone to follow Corianton in a-whoring across distant and exotic horizons after the shallow attractions of blind secularism, visionless and perverse fault-seeking, skeptical and compromising humanism.”34 England himself would later summarize the argument, saying that Cracroft “strongly objected to recent directions in most Mormon literature as being too imitative of flawed contemporary critical and moral trends and thus untrue to Mormon traditions and values.”35

33. Cracroft, review of _Harvest_, 122.
In his 1991 AML presidential address, Bruce Jorgensen responded to Cracroft’s review of Harvest with a talk entitled “To Tell and Hear Stories: Let the Stranger Say.” Jorgensen said that stories which seem alien should be heard before being judged. Applying a metaphor of ancient hospitality, he said, “The stranger/guest is always, if the means are available, washed, sometimes bathed and clothed in clean garments, and fed to repletion—all this before being asked his name and story.”

Where Cracroft called for a certain kind of Mormon story and decried those written after “the world,” Jorgensen invited all stories, saying, “A Mormon criticism will surely not judge very quickly by superficial elements such as the presence of the always-ready-to-hand clichés of pop Mormon ‘spirituality’ or ‘virtue,’ or, negatively, by the presence of topics we disapprove or words we must not say.”

Joining the discussion, Gideon Burton later attempted a middle ground in his essay “Is This Mormon Literature?” Burton said, “‘Entertaining the stranger’ does not necessarily equate with ‘pluralism’ or ‘diversity’; acknowledging and seeking truth in all realms isn’t tantamount to relativism.” According to Burton, “Cracroft urges us to be grounded in the Mormon ‘mythos’ in both our criticism and our literature. . . . He is right, for if our roots are not deep in the soil of Mormon experience and in the spiritual reality of the Restoration, we are only voices in the relativistic maelstrom of modern Babel and Babylon. But to be grounded [thus] is to be willing to journey into the unknown with faith that in entertaining the stranger, as Jorgensen urges us to do, we might be entertaining angels unawares, messengers of truth.”

In many ways this debate continues as established decades ago, when Home Literature Mormons strove to assert Zion through moralistic pablum, while the Lost Generation expatriated from the fold and exchanged faith for artistry as though the two were mutually exclusive. Sadly, it seems that the discussion in this century has lost both depth and muscle. What remains are publishers’ book reviews and knee-jerk commentaries on the “Bloggernacle,” the Mormon blogosphere concerned

with Latter-day Saint matters. No Englands or Cracrofts remain to stir up the fight for or about the future of Mormon literature.

My literature review yielded a great deal of Mormon criticism—reaching back to the 1940s and 1950s. But nowhere did I find a Mormon literary theory—though many writers called for one. Richard Cracroft said, “There is no solid center to Mormon criticism.” He added, “We need, for a change, an alternative criticism, a Latter-day Saint criticism centered in the gospel, in Mormon faith, not in the Sophic creeds of secularism.” In the 1984 book Dialogues with Myself, Eugene England said he had “become increasingly uneasy in the past twenty years about the inadequacy of formalist criteria (I mean those concerned with aesthetic qualities—structure, style, organization, etc.)” England felt that formalism—the 1950s’ New Criticism of Cleanth Brooks and John Crowe Ransom—failed to recognize significant ethical and social qualities worthy of note, especially regarding the less-sophisticated literature of early Mormons. England further said, “No systematic criticism has emerged that successfully identifies Mormonism with any one theory of language or poetics.”

Richard D. Rust, in his essay “Virtuous, Lovely, or of Good Report: Thoughts on a Latter-day Saint Criticism,” called for “methods of criticism implied in scripture and latter-day prophetic statements.” Many writers called for such a theoretical framework, but none articulated a coherent approach.


CRITICISM AND THEORY: WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

*The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms* offers this definition of literary criticism: “Reflective, attentive consideration and analysis of a literary work.”46 Such consideration could run the gamut from book reviews, publishers’ statements, or readers’ blogs (on one hand) to erudite analyses (on the other hand) performed through a complex theoretical lens, such as deconstruction or postcolonial studies.

In common usage, the word *theory* can be a synonym with *conjecture*. In science, the word is often taken to mean a widely accepted and tested statement used to make predictions or describe the natural world. Similarly, in literary studies, “*theory* has traditionally referred to a set of general principles applicable to the classification, analysis, and evaluation of literary works.”47 As Holman and Harmon put it in their *Handbook to Literature*, theory “attempts to arrive at general principles and to formulate inclusive aesthetic tenets.”48 Similarly, *The Bedford Glossary* says, “Whether or not critics openly draw on particular theories of literary interpretation, their readings are usually informed by some theory about literature that provides a basis for their questions and conclusions.”49 I found this true of the Mormon criticism I read, in which the readings were informed primarily by formalist, historical, feminist, or ethical approaches. *The Bedford Glossary* cautions: “Critics who operate without a theoretical framework are vulnerable to the charge of making arbitrary, idiosyncratic, or impressionistic judgments.”50 This was especially true of the many blogs, book reviews, and conference papers I read.

Put simply, *criticism* is the act of examining works, whether or not through a specific theoretical lens, while *theory* calls for a framework from which literature is examined—feminist theory, deconstruction,

---

or reader-response, for example. In short, theory is a lens, a rationale through which texts can be read, interpreted, judged, and valued.

**A Theory Rooted in Mormon Theology**

In a 1974 *Dialogue* article entitled “The Example of Flannery O’Connor,” Karl Keller discussed the lessons Mormon fiction writers can learn from O’Connor, a writer whose novels and stories were deeply rooted in her Catholic theology. Though her works were religious—above and below their surfaces—they were void of didacticism or propaganda. Comparing O’Connor’s work to Mormon fiction, Keller said, “The usual complaint is that Mormon fiction tends to two extremes, the historical-regional and the didactic.” He’s speaking here of the same dichotomy discussed above—didactic Home Literature on one hand and skeptical Lost Generation writing on the other. Keller says, “The one articulates the teachings of the Church only incidentally and has as its subject the life-style, the manners, the ethics following from and incidental to the theology, without coming close to the doctrinal heart, the intellectual core, of the Church. The other type of fiction, the didactic, sells the Church without making it very believable. It cannot be read in this world.”

Sadly, Keller concludes that it’s “virtually impossible to deduce a theology from works of Mormon fiction.” What Keller asks of Mormon fiction—that it be based in Mormon theology—should be expected of a Mormon literary theory as well. Keller offers a solution for Mormon fiction writers, one useful for Mormon literary critics: “A particularly good source for material . . . is, I believe, a work like Sterling M. McMurrin’s *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion*. Whatever its philosophical intent, it is essentially an outline of esthetic possibilities of Mormon articles of belief.” England echoes this endorsement: “Mormon writers, to achieve the theological literacy needed to create their unique imaginative worlds, should read Sterling M. McMurrin’s *The Theological

---

Foundations of the Mormon Religion.” 56 To this recommendation can be added many recent works on theological and philosophical expressions of Mormon thought and experience. What aspects of Mormon theology, therefore, would be relevant to a basis for a literary theory?

The Mormon Cosmology

In Mormon teachings, God the Father and his Son exist as embodied eternal beings: “The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also” (D&C 130:22). The God of Mormonism does not precede all existence, nor is he a deity from whom all things spring, ex nihilo. The Mormon God, having not always been God, obeyed the same principles of eternal progression he now teaches his children. As Joseph Smith is reported to have said in the “King Follett Discourse,” “God that sets enthroned is a man like one of yourselves—that is the great secret.” 57

Furthermore, the God of Mormonism lives in time. Kent Robson’s entry “Time and Eternity” in the Encyclopedia of Mormonism states, “Scriptural passages that ascribe eternity to God do not say or imply that God is independent of, or outside of, or beyond time. Nor do they say, with Augustine, that God created time out of nothing.” 58 In LDS understanding, Robson says, “eternity is time with an adjective: It is endless time. Eternity is not, as in Platonic and Neoplatonic thought, supratemporal or nontemporal.” 59 Nevertheless, Robson reasons from the book of Abraham to say, “It is presumed that God, angels, men, and prophets reckon time differently.” 60 These notions—of a temporal, corporal, progressing God—radically set Mormonism apart from traditional Christianity and, therefore, much of Western thought.

---


Rather than viewing God as absolute and existentially apart from humanity, Mormonism espouses a God who is a literal Father, a God who needs our cooperation if our own salvation is to occur, a God who is affected by our victories and tragedies, as Mormon scripture illustrates: “And it came to pass that the God of heaven looked upon the residue of the people, and he wept; and Enoch bore record of it” (Moses 7:28). This not the absolute and detached God of traditional Christianity; instead, this is the God whom England called “the weeping God of Mormonism.”61

What of humanity in Mormon cosmology? England explains, “All human beings are fundamentally uncreated, noncontingent intelligences with infinite potential, literally gods in embryo. Like God, we are indestructible but bound forever in a real environment of spirit, element, and other beings that both limit and make demands on us and also make genuine joy and eternal progression possible.”62 In the universe of Mormonism, human “freedom is not an illusion but is of tragic proportions. God did not make us or the world out of nothing and cannot force salvation upon us, and our choices have real consequences for good and evil.”63

In the Mormon cosmos, paradox abounds. B. H Roberts said, “There are eternal opposites in existence, light—darkness; joy—sorrow; pleasure—pain; sweet—bitter; good—evil; and so following. Evil is an eternal existence, the necessary co-relative of the good, uncreate and may not be referred to God for its origin.”64 In England’s words, Mormonism presents us with “an ultimately paradoxical, because nonabsolutistic, universe, where opposition ‘must needs be’ or otherwise there is no existence, where God cannot achieve his purposes through his will alone and therefore has problems and suffers, not only through choice but through necessity, because he has perfect power to bring salvation with our cooperation—but not without it. The consequences include terror and awful responsibility as well as the hope of exciting eternal adventure.”65

Finally, in this Mormon cosmos of paradoxes, of spiritual beings housed in corporeal bodies, two additional paradoxes hold sway, both arising from the notion that gods, angels, and people are sexed beings. The first paradox is this: the sexes are different in their characteristics but equal in their worth. The second paradox was best defined by Benjamin Cummings in his book *The Eternal Individual Self*: “Each being is a distinct identity, an eternally existing individual. He does not trace his origin back to some undifferentiated ‘mass’ of being, nor is he destined for ultimate absorption into any sort of undifferentiated state.”

This “cosmic loneliness,” as Cummings names it, causes us to seek “affiliation.” Thus the paradox: we are alone, yet we need one another. Among the covenants Mormons make with God and each other, the highest is marriage. In England’s words, “Eternally separate and impenetrable as each of us is, we cannot realize our fullest nature and joy except in the fully sexual unity of an eternal marriage—an idea, together with the divine equality of the sexes, given the very highest status in the unique Mormon understanding of God being God only in the male and female oneness of Heavenly Parents.”

The Fortunate Fall into a lone and dreary world; Christ’s atonement; opposition that “must needs be”; the eternal nature of good and evil; the materiality of matter and spirit; the eternal individuality of the self; the need for affiliation through marriage, family, and friendship—what do these tenets have to do with the reception, judging, and valuing of literature? If Mormons see the world differently than others, it may be reasoned that Mormons read—and should read—differently as well.

**A Mormon Literary Theory: One Approach**

What then of a Mormon literary theory? How should it be defined? What follows is not a once-and-for-all answer. Instead, it’s a possible framework. I propose a theory grounded in Mormon cosmology; a theory that accounts for the mythic proportions of Mormon thought; that seeks to build culture, specifically a Zion culture; that values language and “The Word” and the redemptive power of art; that utilizes...

---

elements of ethical criticism as it assumes an inherently moral force in literature; and that aligns with the current movement called “Post-Postmodernism,” or the “New Sincerity.”

The Mythic Proportions of Mormonism

England wrote that Mormonism involves “a certain epic consciousness and mythic identification with ancient peoples and processes: the themes of exile and return, of the fruitful journey into the wilderness, the pilgrim traveling the dark and misty way to the tree of salvation; the lonely quest for selfhood that leads to conversion and then to the paradox of community; the desert as crucible in which to make saints, not gold; . . . [and] the fortunate fall from innocence and comfort into a lone and dreary world where opposition and tragic struggle can produce virtue and salvation.”

In this sense, Mormon literary theory would draw unabashedly from mythic or archetypal critical approaches founded by Carl Jung, Northrop Frye, and others.

In literary terms, a myth is a dramatic or narrative embodiment of a people’s perception of life’s deepest truths, while an archetype is a character, setting, or plot element with ancient and universal significance. Frye described an archetype as “a symbol, usually an image, which recurs often enough in literature to be recognizable as an element of one’s literary experience as a whole.” According to T. S. Eliot, the mythic vision of literature “becomes available only to or through the poet.”

Very much out of vogue today, mythic criticism “explores the nature and significance of the archetypes and archetypal patterns in a work of art.” For the Mormon, who identifies him- or herself with Adam or Eve, Abraham, the Mormon pioneers, or other scriptural or historic characters and their quests, an archetypal approach is second nature—one result of following the words of Nephi in the Book of Mormon, who said, “I did liken all scriptures unto us” (1 Ne. 19:23). The work of Northrop Frye, especially his 1957 book Anatomy of Criticism, was exactly the kind of structuralist approach that fell victim to the poststructuralism of the

72. T. S. Eliot, quoted in Holman and Harmon, Handbook to Literature, s.v., “Archetype.”
73. Holman and Harmon, Handbook to Literature, s.v. “Mythic Criticism.”
1960s and 1970s, being itself a “conception of literature as constituting a total order or universe.”\textsuperscript{74} The fragmentation of postmodernism, especially its “incredulity toward metanarratives,”\textsuperscript{75} pushed the study of myths and archetypes to the margins. But the myths and archetypes themselves remain. They wait patiently, ready to be mined once more. A Mormon literary theory surely would seek and value those elements of literary texts that are rich in mythic significance—whether they come in the form of narrative, plot, character, or setting.

**Building Culture, Building Zion**

Matthew Arnold, the nineteenth-century British poet and cultural critic, advocated an “endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world.”\textsuperscript{76} Similarly, Spencer W. Kimball said, “Our art must be the kind which edifies man, which takes into account his immortal nature, and which prepares us for heaven, not hell.”\textsuperscript{77} Because the Mormon universe is neither nihilistic nor determined, Mormons feel responsible to make something of themselves and the world around them—“to dress . . . and to keep” their gardens (Gen. 2:15).

In this way, Mormonism aligns with a Renaissance spirit, whose fundamental message was that “human beings [are] glorious creatures capable of individual development in the direction of perfection.”\textsuperscript{78} In 1486, Giovanni Pico Della Mirandola gave his “Oration on the Dignity of Man,” declaring that God had said to Adam, “Constrained by no limits, in accordance with thine own free will, in whose hand We have placed thee, [thou] shalt ordain for thyself the limits of thy nature.”\textsuperscript{79}

The Renaissance itself had broken forth from a medieval cosmology

\textsuperscript{74} Vincent B. Leitch and others, “Northrop Frye,” in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 2d ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010), 1302.


\textsuperscript{78} Holman and Harmon, *Handbook to Literature*, s.v. “Renaissance.”

based on the Great Chain of Being, which urged individuals to remain and serve well in their fated station. But Mirandola said, “Let a certain holy ambition invade our souls, so that, not content with the mediocre, we shall pant after the highest.” Renaissance humanism exalted man and brought about the Protestant Reformation, the Scientific Enlightenment, the discovery of the New World, and the Copernican solar system. The Romantics who followed championed the individual as well. Emerging in the nineteenth-century American Romantic context, Mormonism gave divine approval to the value and growth of the individual human soul, elevating human progression to the notion of eternal progression.

No one championed the growth of the individual—the individual and his friends, his whole community—better than Joseph Smith, who said, “Friendship is one of the grand fundamental principles of ‘Mormonism’; [it is designed] to revolutionize and civilize the world, and cause wars and contentions to cease and men to become friends and brothers.” As BYU English professor Gideon Burton states it, “The Restoration comprises the very renaissance of the world and its culture.” Burton further says, “Our literary enterprise is itself an effort to salvage, perfect, and redeem world culture.” But when Burton advocates “culture,” he is not merely advancing a decadent, overripe sophistication. “Mormon literature and criticism can only progress,” Burton says, “within a vision of the rise of Mormon culture to its culmination into a Zion culture.” As Richard Cracroft said, “The Latter-day Saint sees as his or her mission the preparation of a Zion people.” Mormonism demands “cross[ing] the spiritual plains to Zion, forging enroute an evolving latter-day mythos that becomes the soil—not merely a sprayed-on nutrient.”

A Mormon literary theory would champion literature, education, and culture, and value any text that builds and develops individuals, friendships, communities, and, thus, Zion itself.

---
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The Word

Fundamentally, every literary work is made of words. St. John 1:1 calls Jesus Christ "the Word," a translation of the Greek "logos," applied by Hellenistic philosophers to indicate "word, speech, discourse, [and] reason."\(^{88}\) In this sense, Christ is language and reason itself, making communication and meaning possible. Lectures on Faith asserts that words make faith possible as well: "It is by words, instead of exerting his physical powers, with which every being works when he works by faith... Faith, then, works by words."\(^{89}\) In Hebrew, Memra, "the Word," as in "the Word of the Lord," is "the creative or directive word or speech of God."\(^{90}\) The creation narrative in the book of Abraham tells us that the Gods "said: Let there be light," "called the light Day," "ordered the expanse," and "pronounced the dry land, Earth" (Abr. 4:3–10, italics added). A Mormon literary theory would acknowledge the remarkable power of words that make reasoning, faith, and creation possible.

Mormonism began with a book, with words given by revelation "after the manner of [our] language" (D&C 1:24). A Mormon literary theory would view words and language as centered in Christ and would privilege meaning and reason: "A truly Mormon literature would stand firm against secular man's increasing anxiety about the ability of language to get at the irreducible otherness of things outside the mind."\(^{91}\) Similarly, England said, "Mormon writers [should] take seriously their faith that language is a gift from God... There should be in Mormon writers a special respect for language and form, attention to their tragic limitations but also to their real possibilities."\(^{92}\) Truly, a Mormon literary theory would respond with a skepticism all its own regarding the "prison-house of language."\(^{93}\) Learning exactly what it means for Christ to be "the Word"—to be the origin of language and reasoning itself—is a formidable task, to be sure. But the difficulty of the task should be enough to recommend it.

\(^{88}\) Oxford English Dictionary, 1st ed. (online version), s.v. "Logos."

\(^{89}\) N. B. Lundwall, comp., A Compilation Containing the Lectures on Faith (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, n.d.), 61 (Lecture Seventh, paragraph 3).


The Redemptive Power of Art

In the creation of the universe as Mormons envision it, God took unorganized matter and created worlds. Similarly, the writer takes the unorganized “matter” of random events and shapes them into something meaningful, such as a story. Christ is not just “Logos”—reason and language—he is also the Redeemer. “To redeem” means to restore, to pay off. What does a writer do in creating a story or poem? He takes experience—his own, others’, or imagined experience—and shapes it into something meaningful. The best writing is a gift from one person to another. But more than that, good writing redeems—or buys back—experience and transforms it into something greater. Consider what might happen if I chose to write about my own late father, a man who was a drinker, a liar, and a cheat. What should I do with such a man’s experiences? I could forget them, I could repress them, I could bitterly shout them from the housetops. Or I could do something nobler: I could redeem them by transforming them into literature. Writing calls for reflection, revision, plotting, the crafting of language, finding metaphorical implications. Through the writing process, layers of meaning emerge. If I genuinely invest in this task, soon my father’s deeds no longer appear one-dimensional. His character becomes more human, more complex and interesting.

This is not just a smoothing over, a cleaning up of ugly reality—the way we write obituaries or the way some people keep journals, telling only the good stuff. This is redemption—fall and atonement. When such stories resonate with readers, they find catharsis, redemption. What was once base and toxic in experience comes to serve a higher purpose: the weight of the conflict brings gravity to the subsequent redemption. In Mormonism, the Atonement of Christ is the central act of our existence, an act that offers salvation and exaltation to the entire human family. In small ways, then, literature can also atone, can close the emptiness between us. Art and literature can serve as atonement with a small a. Inasmuch as a work of literature is redemptive—and I assert that all great literature is—it would be valued by a Mormon literary theory.

Ethics and Literature

John Steinbeck writes in *East of Eden*, “All novels, all poetry, are built on the never-ending contest in ourselves of good and evil.” He goes on to say, “Virtue and vice were warp and woof of our first consciousness, and they will be the fabric of our last. . . . There is no other story.” Similarly, David Foster Wallace, in his remarkable 2005 Kenyon College commencement speech entitled “This Is Water,” spoke of the verities—love, fellowship, the mystical oneness of all things—that have been “codified as myths, proverbs, clichés, epigrams, parables: the skeleton of every great story.” While it is true that literary works portray liars, thieves, adulterers, murderers—every shade of wrongdoer—these individuals are typically the antagonists of their stories, not the protagonists. Even when readers are led to sympathize with the worst of humanity, such characters are not portrayed as healthy or ultimately admirable—indeed, cannot be. Ronald B. Tobias of Montana State University said it this way, “Either directly or indirectly, fiction tells us how to behave and how not to behave, what is right and what is wrong.”

According to Marshall W. Gregory of Butler University, “For roughly 2500 years, ethical references constituted the starting point (and often the ending point) for most literary commentary.” But throughout the twentieth century, says Gregory, “at the academic and professional levels ethical criticism was killed, crushed, annihilated.” This occurred through a shift in focus to the text rather than its impact, and through poststructuralist fragmentation: “The higher the prestige of other modes of criticism ascended—first, New Criticism, and, second, postmodernism—the lower the prestige of ethical criticism descended.”

Of course, ethical questions themselves didn’t vanish, nor did the frequency or intensity of the ethical mandates springing from every corner of criticism. Value judgments about what to read and why, which voices to advance or censure, what forces to deem oppressive or liberating

abounded under the banners of rhetoric or politics—veiling, however slightly, their ethical or moral injunctions.

Nevertheless, Gregory believes the tide is turning: “In this first decade of the 21st century, intellectual room for a renewed ethical criticism is expanding as the credibility of postmodernism is shrinking.”

Certainly a Mormon literary theory would align with the best methods of ethical criticism—regardless of whether or not that approach is in vogue. Gregory concedes there is real work to be done here: “Analyzing the ethical content of literary art is a much more complex intellectual challenge than most ethical critics have ever understood.”

A critic cannot simply “run on brainlessly and tediously about [teaching] lessons.” Speaking in terms that resonate with Mormon thought, Gregory says, “Works of literary art have a kind of agency about them that belies their fixed structure.” He speaks of three kinds of invitations made by a work of literature. The first is “invitations to feeling. Every work invites its readers to respond in specifically emotional ways to the represented content: dread, suspense, indignation, gratification, curiosity, and so on.”

Second, there are “invitations to belief [that ask the] reader to believe certain facts or notions that the effects of the work depend on.” And, third, each work of literature calls for “invitations to ethical judgment. At a fundamental level, readers interacting with artistic representations have to make judgments about who the good guys and the bad guys are, whose successes are deserved and are therefore gratifying, whose actions, thoughts, and speech demand disapproval, whose inner selves hang uncertain in the moral balance, and so on.”

Eugene England advocated a connection between Mormon literature and ethical criticism as far back as 1982: “Critics like Yvor Winters, Ian Watt, Wayne Booth, Robert Scholes, E. D. Hirsch, and John Gardner have explored some of the neglected social, moral, and religious values in literature and the critical means for understanding and evaluating literature in terms of them. If we are to evaluate properly . . . , we must build on their work.” In a 1999 essay called “Danger on the Right, Danger on the Left: The Ethics of Recent Mormon Fiction,” England began

100. Gregory, “Redefining Ethical Criticism,” 278.
with a gloss of the first Mormon short story, Parley P. Pratt’s “A Dialogue between Joe Smith and the Devil.” After summarizing and then praising the story, England says, “Ethical fiction . . . gives the Devil his due, brings opposites together metaphorically.” But England is not advocating didacticism: “Good ethical fiction [cannot] be produced by mere commitment to ethical positions, by an ideological design, one that is either already in favor of certain didactic premises or already against them, with either a right-wing or a left-wing cultural agenda. That leads directly to ethical manipulation.” Writing that is beholden to social agendas is propaganda, not literature. Political partisanship, institutional policy, and commercial promotion have their place. But literature and art, by definition, are more complex than dogmatism.

There’s a paradox here. Though literature may deal with morality in a broad sense, it is not bound to political or institutional values. Literary critic Jonathan Culler says literature is “based on the possibility of saying anything you can imagine. This is central to what literature is: for any orthodoxy, any belief, any value, a literary work can mock it, parody it, imagine some different and monstrous fiction.” Culler further says, “Literature cannot be reduced to [a] conservative social function: it is scarcely the purveyor of ‘family values.'” Therefore, a Mormon literary theory would have to make the distinction between art and propaganda, would have to know the difference and be able to articulate it.

My own late colleague, former BYU–Idaho professor Stephen K. George, was in the advanced company of those advocating a new ethical literary theory. Publishing his book *Ethics, Literature, Theory: An Introductory Reader* in 2005, George wrote of the current “lively discussion among scholars, artists, and teachers concerning the ‘moral’ role of literature, a debate that extends back at least to Plato and continues today with Wayne C. Booth, Marshall Gregory, Richard A Posner, and others.” Surely a Mormon literary theory would be unafraid to take up the difficult—and perhaps unpopular—task of ethical literary

criticism in order to advance the conversation about what works are worth reading, and are good reading, and what works are not.

**Postmodernism**

One might ask, how can such meaning-centered, ethically based, humanistic notions as I’ve advanced here find a place amid contemporary post-structural theories with their “criticism of humanism”? Our current climate is deeply influenced by Derridian deconstruction, in which “the signifier (word) is disconnected from the signified (concept).” In such a context, “meaning is sliding, abyssal, undecidable.” What happens to truth, ethics, and culture in such an environment?

Or one might simply ask, “Isn’t deconstruction deeply problematic from a Mormon standpoint?” True, deconstruction unravels meaning and language itself, but such is not completely at odds with concepts dear to Mormonism. The Book of Mormon frequently addresses problematic issues concerning language. Moroni seemed especially concerned with his “weakness in writing” (Ether 12:23, 40), saying, “when we write we behold our weakness, and stumble because of the placing of our words” (Ether 12:25). While much mainstream Protestantism views scripture as immutable, relying on “biblical inerrancy,” Mormonism, since its beginning, has allowed for continuing revelation as well as ongoing revisions of sacred texts—from the several versions of Joseph’s First Vision to the most recent changes in the LDS standard works. In 2 Nephi 2:11, we read

---
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that “all things must needs be a compound in one.” Can one find anywhere a more concise summation of deconstruction? For the Mormon as well as the student of deconstruction, all things, including words and language, have two faces. The same knife used by the surgeon to heal can be used by the murderer to kill. Postmodernism has much in common with “the Mormon sense of an ongoing, continually developing universe in which God is a genuine and nonabsolute participant, himself in important ways a creature of language and its limitations.”

Writing in The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, Vincent B. Leitch says that “Post-structuralist theories of language . . . bring traditional mimetic, expressive, didactic, and formalist theories into crisis but do not invalidate their claims.” Leitch concludes that “a reading or interpretation of a text does not prove but persuades: it is more or less compelling, productive, original, or useful.” In other words, though notions of truth may be slippery, persuasion is still possible, which is the same assertion made in Doctrine and Covenants 121:41: “No power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood, only by persuasion” (italics added). Perhaps a Mormon literary theory cannot prove anything, but it can seek to persuade—which is all any theory can do.

The New Sincerity, or, Post-Postmodernism

A final appeal for a Mormon literary theory cannot reside in postmodernism, however, since, as Fredric Jameson points out, one defining aspect of the postmodern is “the disappearance of a sense of history,” a “perpetual present.” Indeed, Christopher Butler says in his book Postmodernism: A Brief Insight that “much postmodern analysis is an attack on authority and reliability—in philosophy, narrative, and the relationship of the arts to truth.” Butler concludes, “The best that one can say here, and I am saying it, is that postmodernists are good critical deconstructors, and terrible constructors.” Such is far from a hand-in-glove philosophical fit for a Mormon literary theory.

118. Leitch and others, Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, 23.
121. Christopher Butler, Postmodernism: A Brief Insight (New York: Sterling, 2010), 143.
122. Butler, Postmodernism, 151.
Postmodernists speak pejoratively of “logocentrism,” their term for a “fundamental error of mistaking . . . an arbitrary and artificial construct for a verifiable event.”¹²³ But a new movement is afoot. Some have begun to argue that postmodern skepticism has gone far enough, that its retreat into mere irony and linguistic play has made literature and culture hollow at best, totalitarian at worst. Listen to David Foster Wallace: “I’m going to argue that irony and ridicule are entertaining and effective, and that at the same time they are agents of a great despair and stasis in U.S. culture.”¹²⁴

It is in this spirit that some are calling the present moment “Post-Postmodernism” or, in the words of others, the “New Sincerity.” We are now seeing a generation of thinkers who concede the major tenets of poststructuralism: they recognize that culture, literature, governance, and institutions are reducible to language; that language is constructed of arbitrary signifiers; and that one must search in vain for the transcendental signified. This generation has breathed this air their whole lives. However, being born into the postmodern condition of “incredulity toward metanarratives,”¹²⁵ they also know that they must still do something, they must build something, and believe in something if they are to make art, literature, and lives that are worth living.

The late David Foster Wallace was one of the prominent voices in this movement. Wallace made a distinction “between the Logical Appeal and the Ethical Appeal.”¹²⁶ In his work of nonfiction, Consider the Lobster, Wallace said this: “What the Ethical Appeal amounts to is a complex and sophisticated ‘Trust me.’ It’s the boldest, most ambitious, and also most democratic of rhetorical Appeals because it requires the rhetor to convince us not just of his intellectual acuity or technical competence but of his basic decency and fairness and sensitivity to the audience’s hopes and fears.”¹²⁷ Adam Kelly recognizes that “the gift of trust is always open to abuse,”¹²⁸ but the post-postmoderns are willing to

¹²³. Harmon and Holman, Handbook to Literature, s.v. “Logocentrism.”
¹²⁵. Lyotard, Postmodern Condition, xxiv.
exercise their conviction that sincerity, trust, faith, action, and discussion can rise above postmodern irony.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of a Mormon literary theory would be this: faith in meaning itself, faith in *logos*. Such faith aligns with the particular philosophical moment in which we live—a moment and movement that accepts agency and accountability, that rejects nihilism and determinism, that challenges the victim-forging constructs of postmodern “subjectivity” that have found such purchase in critical theory—especially those of ethnic, gender, and sexual studies. As Christopher Butler writes, “The term preferred by postmodernists to apply to individuals is not so much ‘self’ as ‘subject,’ because the latter term implicitly draws attention to the ‘subject-ed’ condition of persons who are [bound] by the ideologically motivated discourses of power which predominate in the society they inhabit.”  

Such a rhetorically constructed surrender of agency and accountability is antithetical to Mormonism and is antithetical to a Mormon literary theory, just as it is alien to the thoughts taking hold among those of the New Sincerity.

Conclusion

Of course, the application of a Mormon literary theory would not be limited to Mormon texts: “Since Mormonism—like Marxism, psychoanalysis, structuralism, or existentialism—contains its own philosophical assumptions and values, it does not matter what we ultimately write about but who we write as. Marxist and feminist literary critics are Marxists and feminists, not because of the kinds of literature that they read, but because of the kinds of criticism that they write.” 130 The same holds true for a Mormon theoretical approach.

As I’ve imagined it, then, a Mormon literary theory would

- grow out of Mormon cosmology;
- draw upon and develop tenets of myth criticism, aligning with the Mormon notions of the mythical proportions of life;
- advance the building of culture and of Zion;
- value language and “the Word”;
- seek the redemptive power of art;


• accept the challenge of ethical criticism, assuming an inherently moral force in literature; and
• align with the movement of New Sincerity in literature and the arts.

This is only the beginning of a conversation, however. In his book *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*, Jonathan Culler says literary theories are speculative, “not easily confirmed or disproved.” Other writers might value different characteristics in Mormonism and thus come to different conclusions. Such differences should be welcomed and explored.

I would assert that a Mormon literary theory does exist—all the ingredients are present. What I’ve described appears to be, from my experience, the way most literary Mormons read—and have read for a long time. But my own attempt to define this theory will not suffice. More work should be done. Perhaps the next step should be one of application, an analysis of one or more literary works, whether Mormon or not, based on the tenets I have delineated above. In his “Home Literature” address, Elder Orson F. Whitney said, “Let us onward, then, and upward, keeping the goal in view; living not in the dead past, nor for the dying present. The future is our field. Eternity is before us.” My hope is that this essay will serve as a springboard, one from which others might expand or challenge the discussion of Mormonism and literature and criticism that has been ongoing now for more than 175 years.

Jack Harrell has taught English and creative writing at Brigham Young University–Idaho since 1995. He has published two books of fiction—*Vernal Promises* and *A Sense of Order and Other Stories*. He has degrees in English from BYU and Illinois State University, and a PhD in Education from the University of Idaho.

Eared grebes

You were the one told me, though you called them *ducks*,
Of the eared grebes, fifteen hundred of them,
Found stunned and dying on the solid ground
They thought was water. You saw their bodies,
Heaped like feather pillows, in your sleep.
The sky, you said, was what confused them—
Something about the clouds, the storm-light—
That, and their own certainty as they hurtled
Toward what they thought was only temporary
Rest.

Next time we stand under the sky,
Hands linked, marveling at the synchronicity
Of flight, you will remind me that it doesn’t always
End well, that breathtaking consensus. And I will
Say, the way I always say, that miracles are rooted
In the trivial, that there is always risk in plunging
Toward the unseen, that after those birds fell
They were carried, one by one and trembling,
To the real water by a hundred clumsy human hands.

—Marilyn Nielson

This poem won second place in the BYU Studies 2014 poetry contest.
“The Spiritual Concept of Form and Function as One”¹

Structure, Doctrine, and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Cheryl B. Preston

A New Yorker lured to Scottsdale, Arizona, with the promise of an architectural wonderland will likely be disappointed. Unlike the dramatic skyline of New York, Paris, or Rome, the homes and buildings of Scottsdale are relatively flat, squat, and unadorned. Driving through northeast Scottsdale, only the astute will spot the treasure there. The buildings rise almost imperceptibly within their surroundings. They do not jut dramatically skyward to demonstrate the creative power of their designer. They do not flaunt the owner’s wealth with pillars, gilding, or ornamentation. Rather, the unpretentious structures quietly perform the function for which they were designed. In their designer’s own words: “Conceive now that an entire building might grow up out of [natural] conditions as a plant grows up out of soil and yet be free to be itself, . . . [d]ignified as a tree in the midst of nature but a child of the spirit of man.”² The buildings that house the Frank Lloyd Wright Institute of Architecture, collectively called Taliesin West, have managed to survive magnificently the vagaries of fashion and style trends—survive quietly, almost spiritually.

In this article, I will illustrate how the structure (form) of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints interacts with theological substance and doctrine (function) to create an entity in harmony with the ideals

¹ Frank Lloyd Wright, Frank Lloyd Wright: An Autobiography (1943; Petaluma, Calif.: Pomegranate Communications, 2005), 146.
² Wright, Autobiography, 147.
This article evolved from thinking about how to translate the language of religious studies into the world of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. As I analyzed concepts behind such common terms as “canon” and “lawgivers,” I was surprised to discover that Church structure is, in many ways, less hierarchical than might be expected by an outsider. The LDS Church offers unique opportunities for integrating the individual member-worshipper in theological knowledge and practice. The intersection of horizontal and vertical forms in the Church functions to enhance the experiences that carry substantive significance in LDS theology. Seeing this intersection of form and function, reminiscent of the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, was for me spiritually affirming.

expressed by Frank Lloyd Wright’s theory of architecture. As Wright said, “Form and function thus become one . . . if the nature of materials and method and purpose are all in unison.”3 The Church achieves such spiritual unity because the materials that constitute the vertical and horizontal administrative structures (form) of the Church are in harmony with the substance and purpose (function) for which the Church exists. In the Church, the “spiritual and material are naturally of each other.”4

When I first undertook this exploration of the form of the Church, it was for the purpose of responding to a request from the editors of an international publication on comparative religions. I was asked to describe the Church in relation to several fixed questions: What is the

---

canon? Who are the lawmakers? Who forms the theology? Specifically, who are the official interpreters, what comprises the body of theological works, and what are the methods of interpretation? These are quite intriguing questions in the Latter-day Saint context since we do not customarily speak of “canon,” “lawmakers,” or “theology” with the meanings these words have in many world religions. I published my chapter, but my interest in the topic did not wane. In the process of transcribing the concepts of canon, lawmakers, and theology from Church contexts, I was awed by the realization of the extent to which the organization of the Church fosters particular spiritual objectives.

This article consists of two parts. Part 1 considers the question of Latter-day Saint structure from an academic perspective, along the line of a comparative religion study. It is not derived from the discipline of structuralist analysis, but rather from the perspective of legal systems. It considers the Church as a formal, but not always expressly articulated, institution system. Part 2 is a personal and religious discussion of how the structure described in part 1 interacts with and enhances doctrine and spiritual concepts. This change of focus may mean the two parts will appeal to different audiences or to the same audience on different levels.

While it may seem unnecessary to describe Church structure to a largely Latter-day Saint audience, part 1 provides a framework for thinking about the Church’s organization in comparison to other churches and institutions. Part 1A describes the two elements of the vertical structure of the Church—leaders and canon—and the importance of the lack of a third pillar in the form of official theological interpreters. Part 1B turns to horizontal structural forms, noting that in many respects these are dissimilar to the structure of other churches. Horizontally, the Church is formed by the use of lay leaders, councils, and the communitarian and experiential learning processes.

Part 2 considers how the structure of the Church, both vertical and horizontal, facilitates the learning and application of certain doctrinal tenets. Part 2A discusses individual ownership of the religious experience. Part 2B considers the significance of experience in the Church’s theology. Part 2C addresses the related concept of individual light and

knowledge. The whole of Part 2 concludes with the design of a modern temple as an illustration of the integration and unification of the Church’s form and function.

One important substantive aspect of Latter-day Saint doctrine greatly impacts the structure of the Church and so merits mentioning upfront: the kingdom of God in a fallen world operates through imperfect mortals. As a result, some elements of structure and form may become unnecessary, along with the personnel who compose them. On the other hand, these elements may be reconceived as we accept more light and move toward a perfect system in the Millennium and throughout eternity. I am not arguing that every detail of the current form of the Church is perfect or that none of the individual components will ever be changed. I only argue that the design of these forms facilitates the development of core spiritual principles currently needed by members of the Church.

PART I: STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH

A. Latter-day Saint Vertical Form

Part 1 articulates the vertical structure of the Church in the terms of comparative religious study. While the Church has lawmakers and canon like other Western Christian denominations, the details in how these play out are in many ways dissimilar. Moreover, the Church does not have what most academics would consider a systematic theology—official scholarly interpretation of the canon.

1. Latter-day Saint Lawmakers. Latter-day Saints are unlikely to speak in terms of “lawmakers,” other than with respect to Jesus Christ. But law exists and is made at several levels of the Church, and the individuals invested with this function are set apart and publicly sustained. This part delineates Latter-day Saint lawmakers from those with the broadest jurisdiction to those with the narrowest—from grand eternal law to the decisions that organize a person’s individual relationship to the Church.

6. See Isaiah 28:10 (“For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little”); Luke 8:18 (“Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have”).
The highest source of authority in Latter-day Saint doctrine is God, who governs the universe by “law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundations of this world” (D&C 130:20). The principles of this first-level eternal law and its makers are little understood in human terms, although Latter-day Saints believe these laws to mandate choice and accountability, as well as justice and mercy. Within the governance of

7. Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (Liverpool: F. D. Richards, 1855–86), 13:140–41 (teaching that God works within natural physical laws). See also James E. Talmage, *The Articles of Faith: A Series of Lectures on the Principal Doctrines of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1919), 220–23 (explaining miracles as the operation of natural law). See generally David H. Bailey, “Mormons and the Omnis: The Dangers of Theological Speculation,” *Dialogue* 37, no. 3 (2004): 29, available at http://www.dhbailey.com/papers/dhb-omnis.pdf (explaining the LDS view of Deity as bound by the same laws set forth to bind his mortal children). The exact relationship between God and pre-earth life law remains unclear. James E. Faulconer, professor of philosophy at Brigham Young University, comments on this dispute: “At least beginning in 1855 and continuing for ten years or more, Orson Pratt and Brigham Young had a running battle over the nature of the Godhead. . . . Pratt argued in a variety of ways that to be a God was to partake of an already existing divine perfection and that to worship those perfections was to worship God. . . . In one of several condemnations of Pratt’s teachings, Brigham Young said, ‘It was neither rational nor consistent with the revelations of God and with reason and philosophy, to believe that these latter Forces and Powers had existed prior to the Beings who controlled and governed them.’” Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Daniel H. Wells, “Hearken, O Ye Latter-day Saints, August 23, 1865,” in *Messages of the First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1833–1964*, comp. James R. Clark, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965–75), 2:232. “It seems to me,” Faulconer continues, “that if there were not forces and powers prior to the Gods who control them, then there were not laws pre-existing God that he must obey. The primary philosophical argument against there being laws that God must obey can be reduced to a rhetorical question: ‘If God must obey Law, then why isn’t Law God?’ In other words, if there is something perfect that preexists God, isn’t Pratt right that we should worship it? Of course the idea that God does obey eternal laws has [nonetheless] gained currency in the Church.” James E. Faulconer to author, email, January 28, 2006.

8. See Gene R. Cook, *Receiving Answers to Our Prayers* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), 120–27 (explaining the LDS concept of grace as God’s power contributed after one has given her best efforts).
this eternal law, Jesus Christ is the “one lawgiver” for this world (James 4:12), acting for the entire Godhead because they are one in purpose.10

As Christ’s representatives on earth, the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles11 are known as “prophets, seers, and revelators,”12 and each is sometimes referenced in shorthand as a “prophet.” The prophets in this collective sense form the primary avenue through which Christ reveals his law to his people, and Latter-day Saints are to receive their official words as if they were the words of the Lord.13 Scripture is replete with warnings to those who would reject the prophets.14 As discussed below in part 1B, the belief that the Lord continues to communicate to the world through his prophets is a foundational tenet of the Latter-day Saint faith (see A of F 9). Prophets, seers, and revelators are the only lawgivers for the entire Church, and they are the only lawgivers who are authorized to establish doctrine.15 They also promulgate

9. See also, for example, 3 Nephi 15:9 (“Behold, I am the law, and the light. Look unto me, and endure to the end, and ye shall live; for unto him that endureth to the end will I give eternal life”); Doctrine and Covenants 88:13 (“[Jesus Christ is] the light which is in all things, which giveth life to all things, which is the law by which all things are governed, even the power of God who sitteth upon his throne, who is in the bosom of eternity, who is in the midst of all things”). Latter-day Saints also believe that Christ’s role as lawgiver will continue after his Second Coming, while he reigns personally on the earth. See Doctrine and Covenants 45:59 (“For the Lord shall [then] be in their midst, and his glory shall be upon them, and he will be their king and their lawgiver”).

10. See John 10:30 (“I and my Father are one”).


13. Doctrine and Covenants 1:38 (“What I the Lord have spoken, I have spoken, and I excuse not myself; and though the heavens and earth pass away, my word shall not pass away, but shall all be fulfilled, whether by mine own voice or by the voice of my servants, it is the same”); Doctrine and Covenants 21:5 (“For his word ye shall receive, as if from mine own mouth, in all patience and faith”).


policies, the practical rules of administration, as discussed below in part 1B on canon. They determine the canon of the Church, and any purported change in doctrine and churchwide policy must come from them.

While the Apostles set forth the law for the entire Church, regional leaders such as Area Seventies, stake presidents, and bishops interpret and apply that law for those over whom they have stewardship. The stewardship of each lower-level authority is defined by the priesthood keys each leader holds. The keys are vested in a strict vertical line-order format and give specific stewardship to those upon whom the keys are conferred. Bishops, stake presidents, and regional authorities may always seek counsel from the priesthood leader above them in the line of authority. Nonetheless, the emphasis is on the ability of local leaders to receive the personal revelation necessary to adjudicate questions that require divine inspiration, the First Presidency . . . and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles . . . counsel together to establish doctrine”); see also Nathan Oman, “A Defense of the Authority of Church Doctrine,” Dialogue 40 (Winter 2007): 1 (defending the concept of authority in the Church on the basis of covenant, divine involvement, and community participation). Although the Church clearly states where doctrine comes from, “distinguish[ing] doctrine from beliefs, teachings, or policies” is not so straightforward. Loyd Ericson, “The Challenges of Defining Mormon Doctrine,” Element 3 (Spring & Fall 2007): 69.

16. This pattern is similar to common law legal systems in which there is a high court with supreme jurisdiction and lower courts with progressively smaller geographic areas and corresponding jurisdiction. Within their stewardship, priesthood leaders are common law judges in that they both interpret the law from canon and higher authority and then state their own conclusions, which become binding in their jurisdiction unless overturned by a higher authority.

17. Russell M. Nelson, “Keys of the Priesthood,” Ensign 35 (October 2005): 40, available at http://www.lds.org/ensign/2005/10/keys-of-the-priesthood. “Those keys refer to the right to preside over priesthood authority in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Keys carry the right to preside over a local organization of the Church, such as a stake, a ward or branch, a mission or district, a priesthood quorum, or a temple.”

arise within their stewardship. This means that local leaders should promulgate the same doctrine and churchwide policies, or law, throughout the Church, but the focus, style, or particular applications may vary through the exercise of stewardship in different geographical regions, or even as leadership in a certain area changes.

With respect to an individual in the Church, the most critical lower-level lawgiver is the bishop. The bishop acts as a judge as well as an advocate for the individual in cases involving higher authorities, if necessary. The bishop is a lawgiver who can adapt, as well as interpret, guidelines and procedures of general application for those in his stewardship; he is also a lawgiver of specific requirements for an individual who is in the process of seeking repentance. An individual may also be subject to the policies of the rotating lay leader of a particular organization within the local Church unit.

19. Doctrine and Covenants 128:11: “For him to whom these keys are given there is no difficulty in obtaining a knowledge of facts in relation to the salvation of the children of men.” This concept of local inspiration is explained by Boyd K. Packer, “Principles,” Ensign 15 (March 1985): 8, available at http://www.lds.org/ensign/1985/03/principles (“If you do not know the principles—by principles I mean the principles of the gospel, the doctrines, what’s in the revelations—if you do not know what the revelations say about justice or mercy, or what they reveal on reproof or forgiveness, how can you make inspired decisions in those difficult cases that require your judgment? . . . There are principles of the gospel underlying every phase of Church administration. These are not explained in the handbooks. They are found in the scriptures. They are the substance of and the purpose for the revelations. . . . Now, listen carefully. I do not imply that you should ignore the handbooks or manuals, not for one minute would I say that. What I do say is this: there is a spiritual ingredient not found in handbooks that you must include in your ministry if you are to please the Lord. . . . The prophet Joseph Smith gave us the key. He said, with reference to administration, ‘I teach them correct principles, and they govern themselves’”).

20. See Bruce C. Hafen, “Disciplinary Procedures,” in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 1:386 (“Because bishops are primarily concerned with the spiritual development of each member, they have wide discretion to make judgments and to give the counsel most likely to assist the member’s spiritual progress and, where needed, the member’s repentance”). Cheryl B. Preston, “An Itty-Bitty Immunity and Its Consequences for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: A Response to Professors Lupu and Tuttle,” BYU Law Review (2004): 1978–79 (noting the role of and relationship among local leaders).

21. Using the legal analogy, a bishop acts as all three branches of government, but all of his decisions are subject to appeal.
At another level, the family is a unit of the Church, and parents are the lawgivers within their family. The concept of stewardship finally flows down to the individual, who is ultimately responsible for his or her own spiritual standing and relationship with Christ. Individuals are encouraged to read scriptures, pray, and seek personal revelation before making decisions. In this sense, individuals are “lawgivers” to themselves, as they interpret, apply, and follow the law that has been promulgated by lawgivers in other capacities. Members of the Church are taught that they should strive to have personal confirmation of the truth in a relationship with God that is unmediated by anyone else.

Not everyone called to positions in the Church involving lawgiving remains faithful and acts without guile. Because it is “the nature and disposition of almost all men, as soon as they get a little authority, as they suppose, [to] immediately begin to exercise unrighteous dominion” (D&C 121:39), the Doctrine and Covenants specifically instructs that the “rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principles of righteousness” (D&C 121:36). The offices in the Church’s vertical structure are inspired, but the power depends on righteousness.

2. Latter-day Saint Canon. The second vertical structure of the Church is the written canon. The term “canon” derives from Greek kanon, literally meaning a reed or cane, and came to be understood in Latin as a measuring rod, rule, model, or standard.

Latter-day Saint canon is not a simple concept, especially for persons of other faiths who see the scriptures as the ultimate or final source of written truth. The canon of the Church—in fact, the entire Latter-day

22. See Doctrine and Covenants 68:25 (“And again, inasmuch as parents have children in Zion, or in any of her stakes which are organized, that teach them not to understand the doctrine of repentance, faith in Christ the Son of the living God, and of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands, when eight years old, the sin be upon the heads of the parents”). See also The First Presidency and Council of the Twelve Apostles of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “The Family: A Proclamation to the World” (1995), available at http://www.lds.org/family/proclamation (“Parents have a sacred duty to rear their children in love and righteousness, . . . to teach them to love and serve one another, to observe the commandments of God and to be law-abiding citizens wherever they live”).

23. This difficulty is discussed by Robert L. Millet, who also gave a list of sources of doctrine, which are very similar to the sources discussed below. Robert L. Millet, “What Do We Really Believe?” in Discourses in Mormon Theology,
Saint experience—must be viewed against the backdrop of continuing revelation: at the core, one cannot subscribe to the Latter-day Saint faith without believing that communication with Deity continues as in ancient times.24 Thus, this concept of canon differs slightly from that of most religions, even though it similarly begins with scriptures and goes through various levels of authoritative and semi-authoritative texts. Latter-day Saint scripture may be amended with latter-day prophetic declarations, and thus the LDS canon envisions a less rigid and historically fixed documentation.

Some contend that the changeable nature of Latter-day Saint canon necessarily means that it cannot claim to contain ultimate and absolute truth.25 However, members are encouraged to receive from God a personal testimony of truth through the authority of the Church—its leaders and scriptures. With this testimony, Latter-day Saints believe that Mormon doctrine has an “epistemological advantage” over their own judgments and so are willing to regard the Church’s teachings as authoritative.26

ed. James M. McLachlan and Loyd Ericson (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2007), 266–67 (“In determining whether something is a part of the doctrine of the Church, we might ask: is it found within the four standard works and/or within official declarations or proclamations? Is it taught or discussed in general conference or other official gatherings by general Church leaders today? Is it found in the general handbooks or approved curriculum of the Church today? . . . The content of the temple endowment today would certainly be considered a part of the doctrine of the Church”).

24. “We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things.” Article of Faith 9; see also Joseph Smith—History 1:16–20, 49–50 (hereafter cited as JS–H); Doctrine and Covenants 90:12–14 (indicating that from time to time Joseph Smith received revelations to unfold the mysteries of the kingdom).

25. See, for example, Ericson, “Challenges of Defining Mormon Doctrine,” 80–85; but compare Robert L. Millet, “Defining Doctrine: A Response to Loyd Ericson,” Element 5 (Spring 2009): 1 (“Unless one is caught up with a notion of prophetic or apostolic infallibility, he or she is not greatly troubled by such an idea [of continuing revelation]”).

26. Nathan Oman, “Truth, Doctrine, and Authority,” Element 5 (Spring 2009): 13. In a recent general conference address, President Dieter F. Uchtdorf acknowledged that “there have been times when . . . leaders in the Church have simply made mistakes,” but he then concluded the thought by assuring members of the Church that “no decision of significance affecting this Church or its members is ever made without earnestly seeking the inspiration, guidance, and approbation of our Eternal Father.” Dieter F. Uchtdorf, “Come, Join with Us,”
a. Scriptures. Any discussion of canon must begin with the scriptures, which are referred to as the “standard works” and consist of the King James Version of the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price. In the language of law, the standard works perform the function of a Constitution, a foundational document to which amendments may be added. Elder Dallin H. Oaks, a former lawyer, law professor, and judge, explains: “Because of our belief in continuing revelation, we Latter-day Saints maintain that the canon (the authoritative body) of scriptures is open. In fact, the scriptural canon is open in several ways, and continuing revelation is crucial to each of them.”27 Thus, the LDS canon is based on the scriptures, but they are situated within the context of ongoing revelation.

The Church couches its beliefs regarding scriptural canon in qualifiers: “We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly.”28 The preamble to the Book of Mormon contains this caveat: “If there are faults they are the mistakes of men.”29 Although the Church teaches that the “Book of Mormon [is] the most correct of any book

---


28. Article of Faith 8 (emphasis added). See also Robert J. Matthews, “Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible (JST),” in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 3:764 (“When [Joseph Smith] said the Bible was not translated correctly, he not only was referring to the difficulties of rendering the Bible into another language but he was also observing that the manuscripts . . . have suffered at the hands of editors, copyists, and revisionists”).

29. Book of Mormon, title page. According to Joseph Smith, “the title-page of the Book of Mormon is a literal translation, taken from the very last leaf, on the left hand side of the collection or book of plates, which contained the record which has been translated, the language of the whole running the same as all Hebrew writing in general; and that said title page is not by any means a modern composition, either of mine or of any other man who has lived or does live in this generation.” Joseph Smith Jr., History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed., rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 1:71 (hereafter cited as History of the Church). The original 1830 printing of the Book of Mormon included this title page, and it has been part of the Book of Mormon ever since. See Daniel H. Ludlow, “The Title Page,” in First Nephi: The Doctrinal Foundation, ed. Monte S. Nyman and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1988), 19–22.
on earth,”30 it is not a perfect book. Saints recognize that between the word of God and the written work is a human scribe—saintly, perhaps, but still human. Thus, according to Elder Oaks, “God will give new revelations on the meaning of scriptures previously canonized, meanings that were not evident in earlier times. . . . We believe that the scriptures, which are the revelations of the past, cannot be understood without openness to the revelations of the present.”31 The scriptures unfold, as do Jesus’s parables, only when we develop “ears to hear.”32 In addition, entirely new material can be added to scriptural canon through the process discussed below.

b. Latter-day Prophetic Declarations. Although the scriptures are the “standard,” official declarations by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, made collectively in their official capacities as prophets, seers, and revelators, are also canon, or at least very closely associated with the canon, although in different form.33 This is true even if such declarations are not included in printed scriptures, although some are.

In their roles as prophets, seers, and revelators, the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve have, as a collective, “from time to time issued formal written proclamations, declarations, letters, and various

30. Book of Mormon, introduction (emphasis added). President Spencer W. Kimball taught: “This inspiring book was never tampered with by unauthorized translators or biased theologians but comes to the world pure and directly from the historians and abridgers.” Spencer W. Kimball, The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball: Twelfth President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. Edward L. Kimball (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1998), 133.


32. This phrase with respect to Jesus’s parables appears in Matthew 11:15, 13:9, 43; Mark 4:9, 23, 7:16; Luke 8:8, 14:35. See part 2c.

33. Although most Latter-day Saints would initially identify the “canon” as the standard works, in practice the pronouncements of the fifteen prophets, seers, and revelators are very similar to canon. “The First Presidency performs the central and authoritative role of receiving revelation and establishing policies and procedures for the Church. . . . The Council, or Quorum, of the Twelve Apostles is a quorum ‘equal in authority and power’ to the First Presidency, meaning that when the First Presidency is dissolved (which occurs upon the death of the President of the Church) the Council of the Twelve exercises all of the power and authority previously reserved to the First Presidency until a new First Presidency is organized (D&C 107:23–24).” Perry and others, “Organization: Contemporary Organization,” 3:1046. The Church has stated that Church doctrine is established by the Council of the Twelve and the First Presidency, and that doctrine “is consistently proclaimed in official Church publications.” The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Approaching Mormon Doctrine.”
public announcements.  

Most of these documents have not yet been incorporated into the body of scriptures through the prescribed formal approval action necessary to codify them in the standard works. Two declarations have been subject to that process and are now included in more recent editions of the standard works. The process requires them to be proposed to the general membership and approved by “common consent.” Other declarations, such as “The Family: A Proclamation to the World” issued in 1995, remain in declaration form.

In addition to official declarations, the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles approve temple ceremonies, which are not published or available outside a Latter-day Saint temple, but are clearly a form of oral canon—binding and authoritative.

34. Robert J. Matthews, “Proclamations of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles,” in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 3:1151. These formal pronouncements are similar to decisions from the supreme court of a jurisdiction: in that they are not subject to appeal and are final until overturned by that same body.

35. Although LDS canon is open, it is not without boundaries, and it is not subject to willy-nilly revision. See generally, John W. Welch and David J. Whittaker, “Mormonism’s Open Canon: Some Historical Perspectives on Its Religious Limits and Potentials,” paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, November 24, 1986, copy on file with author and available as a Preliminary Report in 1987, in L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. With respect to material added to the standard works, procedures for canonization restrict the ability of new works to be accepted into the tenets of the faith. See Doctrine and Covenants, Official Declaration—2 (exemplifying this process). For a text to be canonized, it must be first unanimously accepted by the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, and then presented to the general membership of the Church, who must vote to sustain the decision of the leadership by common consent. In addition, declarations of the modern-day prophet that are a form of canon are rare and come published over the signatures of all fifteen of those who are ordained as prophets, seers, and revelators. See note 14 and accompanying text.

36. A vote of the members held during meetings.

37. See note 24.

Not all collective statements of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve are official proclamations or declarations. Some are administrative or deal with a transitory issue. Deciphering which of their statements are “official” in the sense of being like canon depends on their form and the method of delivery. In any event, any statement issued by this body is at least highly authoritative.

c. Churchwide Policies. Legal practitioners and scholars know that U.S. law does not stop at the Constitution or anywhere near it. Those of us who have practiced tax law know that the Constitution gives Congress the power to tax. Congress gives us the Internal Revenue Code and establishes the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department gives us regulations and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The IRS generates revenue rulings, which have general application and are binding with respect to all taxpayers. Moreover, the IRS generates private letter rulings, which are binding only with respect to the taxpayer who requested them. And then, of course, the courts at every level become involved in interpreting all of these. Similarly, in the Church, there are various authoritative publications below the level of canonized scripture.

d. Handbooks and Church Directives. Next to the canon of scriptures and Official Declarations, Church handbooks and letters from the First Presidency may be considered the most authoritative Church publications. Church Handbooks 1 and 2 include statements of policy and procedure. The first volume is reserved for bishoprics and stake presidencies; the second volume covers all other organizations and auxiliaries. For instance, the policies regarding musical numbers in Church meetings are outlined in volume two of the handbook.39

e. Correlated Church Publications. Below the Handbooks and First Presidency letters are “correlated” Church publications that are prepared under the direction of the various Church departments and approved by the Correlation Review committees,40 which include various members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. At this level, these publications include “(1) materials related to the curriculum, such as lesson manuals, . . . ; (2) magazines; (3) administrative documents,

such as . . . leadership training materials, organizational guidelines and bulletins, etc.; and (4) missionary discussions, tracts, and support materials.” Correlated materials are easily identified because they are the only publications that “carry the designation ‘Copyright © Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.’” Books written by members of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles and other General Authorities are generally not considered official in this sense; however, a “careful selection” of books not published by the Church or created through the Correlation process have been approved before by the First Presidency and the Twelve to be placed in Church meetinghouse libraries. Moreover, a speech given by any of the fifteen members of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles at a Latter-day Saint semiannual general conference, which proceedings are later published, is also highly authoritative but is not canonized.

f. Semi-Authoritative Texts. Below “authoritative” texts, as described in the prior subsection, are numerous nonfiction books and other source materials, published either through Church-owned Deseret Book Company or under the auspices of Brigham Young University (BYU). Because these publishers are closely connected to the Church, their editors are unlikely to take manuscripts that are very controversial. While the Church makes no official endorsement of these works, other than allowing their publication by a Church-owned publisher, many members see these publications as higher in doctrinal reliability than others. Nonetheless, these are not official publications and not considered doctrinal.

The list of these semi-authoritative sources includes the publications of BYU’s Religious Studies Center, whose publications on modern Mormonism are primarily apologetic rather than strictly scholarly.

41. Larsen, “I Have a Question,” 38.
42. Larsen, “I Have a Question,” 38.
43. Larsen, “I Have a Question,” 38. These items not published by the Church are placed in church libraries by the wards or branches and can be found at store.lds.org. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Meetinghouse Library Materials,” LDS.org, https://www.lds.org/callings/sunday-school/leader-resources/meetinghouse-library-materials.
44. See Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center, “Frequently Asked Questions,” http://rsc.byu.edu/frequently-asked-questions. “The Religious Studies Center is the research arm of Religious Education at Brigham Young University. Established in 1975 under the direction of Dean Jeffrey R.
although many are sophisticated apologetics;\textsuperscript{45} the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship;\textsuperscript{46} and BYU Studies, a BYU-sponsored publisher of peer-reviewed articles and books.\textsuperscript{47}

3. The Absence of Official Scholarly Interpreters. Most organized religions have lawmakers and a settled canon; the Latter-day Saint faith also has a kind of canon, even if somewhat fluid. The main vertical distinction of the Church is its lack of the common third pillar: official interpreters. The Church has no official scholarly tradition that has become a recognized “body of theology” and no official “methods of interpretation.”

While the Church puts vast resources into education, it does not provide education of a purely theological nature to produce professional theologians. The Church also does not invest much in the way of direct financial support for theological scholars in its university system or for the few scholars in the Church’s historical department.\textsuperscript{48} With respect to this limited group, much of their work is apologetic and documentary history rather than theoretical exploration.

The Church provides religious education in the form of seminary for high school students, religion classes for BYU students, and institute classes for other college-aged members. These classes place emphasis on the spiritual conversion of the students and on motivating students to conform their behavior to Latter-day Saint standards.\textsuperscript{49} The materials

\begin{flushleft}
Holland, the center has funded research and published groundbreaking works on Latter-day Saint scripture, doctrine, history, and culture.”
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{45} See http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/apologetic?q=apologetic for a definition of apologetic (“constituting a formal defense or justification of a theory or doctrine”).


\textsuperscript{47} See BYU Studies, “Mission, Purpose, and History of BYU Studies,” https://byustudies.byu.edu/Mission.aspx. “BYU Studies is dedicated to publishing scholarly religious literature . . . that is qualified, significant, and inspiring.”

\textsuperscript{48} For information on some of the scholars working there, see, for example, Mormon History Association 48th Annual Conference program available at http://mormonhistoryassociation.org/pdf/2013-conference-program.pdf; and The Joseph Smith Papers Project Team and National Advisory Board, listed at http://josephsmithpapers.org/projectTeam.

\textsuperscript{49} For example, the institute manual on the Old Testament states, “This course of study is designed to give you the opportunity to come to know the God of the Old Testament in an intimate, personal, and powerful way. . . . From these accounts we can learn much about how to come unto Christ.” Old
are compilations from the canon and semi-authoritative statements of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles cited earlier.\textsuperscript{50} Many of the teachers of the required college-level religion classes are Latter-day Saint professors from other disciplines at the university, rather than from Religious Education. Although active on the campus of BYU in Utah, Religious Education\textsuperscript{51} does not offer a major course of study or grant undergraduate or graduate degrees. The emphasis in Religious Education has been the practical application of religious principles in the lives of students, although that is changing to some extent.\textsuperscript{52}

The absence of a theological branch in the Church is unsurprising if one considers the concept of continuing revelation. Churches that derive doctrine from fixed and unchanging canon need to have a way to interpret that canon. The Latter-day Saint faith, on the other hand, has a flexible canon that leadership can change or add to.\textsuperscript{53}

\textit{Testament Student Manual Genesis–2 Samuel} (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2003), v.

\textsuperscript{50} Manuals include, in addition to background information, “interpretive and prophetic commentary on the most important passages and some of the difficult passages.” \textit{Old Testament Student Manual Genesis–2 Samuel}, vi.

\textsuperscript{51} Note that it is not named the College of Theology or even the College of Religion. It is not officially a college but is a support unit within the university that offers courses in Church history, doctrine, and scriptures.


\textsuperscript{53} See Millet, “What Do We Really Believe?” 277 (“The fact that God continues to speak through his anointed servants; the fact that He, through those servants, continues to reveal, elucidate, and clarify what has already been given; and the fact that our canon of scripture is open, flexible, and expanding—all of this militates against what many in the Christian world would call a systematic theology”).
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Thus, in the Church there are no professional theologians in the sense of trained scholars attempting to systematize a comprehensive, closed, rational, scholarly, or complex statement of Latter-day Saint religious belief and doctrine, using traditional scholarly methodology comparable to that found in many Christian churches and in Judaism. On the other hand, every Latter-day Saint member is a sort of aspiring theologian. Members of the Church engage in extensive “theology” in the sense of “talking about God” and seeking to conform their lives to Church principles. “Every member of the Church . . . has the duty to pray daily, study the scriptures, [and] draw close to the Savior.” 54 To ensure that “Latter-day Saint children are taught from their youth to know the scriptures,” 55 mothers are advised of the need to study religion. “We want our homes to be blessed with sister scribes” who “become scholars of the scriptures—not to put others down, but to lift them up!” 56

As with any text, the canon or doctrine of the Church does not unambiguously answer all questions in all situations. Members and leaders alike need to engage in some interpretation. Nathan Oman has suggested that the way members interpret doctrine is by surveying the content, history, and purpose of promulgated doctrine and using all of this to tell a comprehensive story to determine what should be done in certain instances. 57 In this way, all Church members make up for the lack of a third pillar as they engage in a relatively sophisticated interpretation analysis, albeit without uniform methods of interpretation.

In summary, the Latter-day Saint canon comprises the “law” of the Church and includes the standard works, similar in status and authority to the U.S. Constitution. This canon may be expanded or clarified by modern-day revelation, and like the complex structure of laws that support the Constitution, the Church’s standard works are supported by laws of lesser authority such as the Church handbooks and directives, correlated Church publications, and semi-authoritative texts.

56. Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Spencer W. Kimball (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2006), 221.
Two vertical structures or pillars exist in the form of Church canon in union with Church lawmakers. The lack of a third, professional theologians and scholarly theological method, actually allows the remaining vertical and horizontal elements of the Church to combine in a unique way, discussed below in part 2.

As described by Frank Lloyd Wright, the vertical structure does not achieve the “spiritual union” of a living whole without all things being in unity. The vertical and horizontal forms of the Church strike the necessary balance to create unity with the Church’s function. While the vertical structure is necessary to organize a worldwide Church with more than fifteen million members, the horizontal elements give the Church the personal and equal forum for meeting the spiritual principles discussed in part 2. The next part, 1B, describes these horizontal elements.

B. LDS Horizontal Form

This part will discuss briefly the horizontal features of the structure of the Church and how they connect and meld with the twin vertical poles discussed in part 1A. The horizontal structures include the limited-term, lay leadership; the role of counselors and councils; and the use of peer teaching and discussions.

1. Lay Leadership. One extraordinary feature of institutional Mormonism is its lay leadership. Units of the Church all over the world are run by local bishops or branch presidents, stake or district presidents, and Area Seventies, none of whom are trained theologians or even required to have attended college. Sometimes they also have no prior formal leadership experience, little training in the Church, and a short time in which to learn on the job because their tenure as leaders is typically limited to about five years. Some of the local leaders in growth

59. For a discussion of the characteristics and duties of LDS priesthood leaders, see Preston, “Itty-Bitty Immunity,” 1976–78.
60. William G. Dyer, “Leadership Training,” in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 2:818 (“Sometimes [a person] is appointed to a position to which he has had no training, as the bishop or stake president follows the impressions of the Spirit in extending calls to service”); Don M. Pearson, “Bishop,” in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 1:117 (noting that leaders are chosen based on revelation and the characteristics considered are “testimony, judgment, commitment, and charity toward ward members”).
areas have not even been members of the Church for extended periods of time.

There are prerequisites to holding certain leadership positions within the Church beyond living in accordance with LDS spiritual principles. For positions in the vertical structure described above, members must be ordained to the priesthood, which is conferred only on males, and they must be or have been married, meaning that not all faithful members have equal opportunity to serve in every calling. However, this does not negate the uniqueness of the LDS structure, where leaders are chosen without respect to education, social status, prior positions, or length of membership. In this respect it is unlike other religious and legal institutions.

The second feature of LDS Church leadership is that most of the leaders live and work outside the Church. In the LDS faith, the vast majority of leaders, including all local leaders, are part time and live in the same neighborhoods as other members, working other jobs to support their families. They are not paid by the Church and face the same financial challenges as other members. There are a few exceptions: the Quorum of the Twelve and Presidency of Church have lifetime appointments; the First Quorum of Seventy, who assist the Quorum of the Twelve in their duties, generally serve until age seventy; and the Second Quorum of the Seventy, who serve for three to five years. These general, church-wide priesthood authorities (just over one hundred) are financially supported and discontinue any other employment. A few other leaders, such as mission presidents and other central administrators, serve full time for three to five years and also receive a modest financial stipend.

In contrast to LDS leaders, most priests and pastors of other organized religions are paid, typically receiving a modest salary and perhaps
a parsonage or a housing allowance. I do not suggest paid pastors are less sincere or that paying full-time ministers is necessarily inconsistent with Christian doctrine. The point is that having unpaid clergy in the LDS faith contributes to its horizontal structure to the extent that being unpaid and living like other members vastly reduces the distance between the leader and member.

A third difference is the length of service. Other than the slim exceptions mentioned above, leaders in the Church serve for very limited periods and then the position rotates to another lay member. Additionally, a person seldom receives the same appointment twice. The frequent rotation from leader to follower is very effective in dispersing power and preventing legacy calcifications in the system.

These three characteristics of LDS lay leadership—an absence of education or similar status requirement for leadership positions, unpaid clergy, and frequent rotation of assignments—all reduce the gap between Church members and their leaders, thus adding a horizontal element to the Church. One way in which the LDS leadership is actually more vertical than other religious organizations is found in its selection process. Leaders in the Church, while ratified by “common consent,” are appointed and do not purport to represent a majority view of the congregation.66 As discussed in part 2, the combination of these vertical and horizontal structures is beneficial to the functions of the Church.

2. Councils and Auxiliaries. The Church benefits from a second web of lay leadership in the form of members acting as counselors, councils, committees, and auxiliary officers with various functions. These advise the leaders and assist in carrying out the leaders’ responsibilities.

Elder M. Russell Ballard acknowledged this key feature of Church composition: “When we support one another in Church councils, we begin to understand how God can take ordinary men and women and make of them extraordinary leaders. The best leaders are not those who work themselves to death trying to do everything single-handedly; the

variable, according to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The median annual income for religious clergy, as of 2010, is $42,950, but there is a broad pay scale for these professionals. Some pastors get paid far more than average while others receive far less. The lowest-paid 10 percent made just $11.03 per hour in 2009, equivalent to an annual salary of $22,940 per year. At the high end, pastors made an average of $36.21 per hour, or $75,320 per year”).

66. This is a key difference between the LDS structure and modern legal structures, but democratic systems have problems of their own, such as unwanted influence through money, power, and personal connections.
best leaders are those who follow God’s plan and counsel with their councils.” Councils and committees are found at all levels of administration—the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles acts as a council; a high council is used on the stake level; and on the ward level, there is the priesthood executive committee, the ward welfare committee, and the ward council. Auxiliaries may also set up committees and councils. In addition to councils, officers at all levels have two counselors who advise and assist them.

Auxiliary organizations—the Primary, youth programs, Sunday School, and Relief Society—address the particular issues of these groups. These organizations are vertically similar in internal structure to the twin columns of the whole Church described above, with a churchwide general president for each organization down to local ward president, with two counselors, and with manuals and particularized publications. These organizations are under the stewardship of the local bishop, who coordinates all local affairs.

Councils provide a way through which members of the Church who cannot hold priesthood leadership positions can still participate and influence the affairs of the Church in a positive way. Also, because of the sheer volume of positions available, a large percentage of a local Church unit is involved in leadership and counseling functions at any one time. This connection between the vertical priesthood leader structure and the horizontal member involvement creates a continuity that melds these elements together, as Frank Lloyd Wright would describe: “Here [is] the direct means of expression of the more spiritual idea that form and function are one . . . the expressive flow of continuous surface.”

---


69. See Ballard, “Counseling with Our Councils,” 26 (telling stories of council members, particularly women, influencing the decision of the bishop in problems the ward was facing).

70. Wright, Autobiography, 146: “Plasticity may be seen in the expressive flesh-covering of the skeleton as contrasted with the articulation of the skeleton itself. If form really ‘followed function’—as the Master declared—here was the direct means of expression of the more spiritual idea that form and function are one: the only true means I could see then or can see now to eliminate the separation and complication of cut-and-butt joinery in favor of the expressive flow of continuous surface. Here, by instinct at first—all ideas germinate—a
3. **Peer Learning.** The concept of peer learning is solidly rooted in modern scripture, as the early members of the Church were commanded to “teach one another the doctrine of the kingdom” (D&C 88:77). This imperative is still carried out today. Sacrament meeting talks are given almost exclusively by members of the local congregation, rather than by regional or churchwide authorities, experts in religious studies, or professional preachers. Almost every member of the congregation has a turn at the podium. In addition, once a month, spontaneous volunteers from the congregation offer personal witnesses and bear testimony of Jesus Christ and his influence in their lives during fast and testimony meeting.

On a more personal level, gospel teachers for the adults’ and children’s Sunday schools and all other LDS teaching and training organizations are called from members of the congregation. Teachers are assigned to that role for short terms, typically one or two years. The job then rotates to another member of the congregation. In addition, those serving as teachers at any given time are expressly encouraged to invite class discussion.⁷¹

The Church depends on the members of local congregations to speak in services, to teach classes, and to join in class discussions; all members are expected and encouraged to be knowledgeable about the scriptural canon. The rotation of lawmakers and the participation of all members of the congregations create a horizontal structure. These horizontal features are critical to softening the inherent rigidity of the vertical forms and, combined with the absence of a type of structure common to most

---

⁷¹. Brent A. Barlow, “When All Have Spoken,” *Ensign* 21 (January 1991): 28, available at [http://www.lds.org/ensign/1991/01/when-all-have-spoken](http://www.lds.org/ensign/1991/01/when-all-have-spoken) (“Class participation is being emphasized more and more in Church instruction. For example . . . : As a teacher you should focus on helping class members participate. . . . Class members should teach and edify one another. . . . Participation helps invite the Spirit into the class and motivates members to apply and live scriptural principles”). See also, for example, “Helps for the Teacher,” in *New Testament: Gospel Doctrine Teacher’s Manual* (Salt Lake City: Intellectual Reserve, Inc., 1997), vi, available at [http://www.lds.org/manual/new-testament-gospel-doctrine-teachers-manual/helps-for-the-teacher](http://www.lds.org/manual/new-testament-gospel-doctrine-teachers-manual/helps-for-the-teacher) (“It is more important to help class members understand and apply the scriptures than to cover all the lesson material you have prepared. If class members are learning from a good discussion, it is often helpful to let it continue rather than try to cover all the lesson material”).
other churches, as discussed below, are critical to the melding of form and theological substance.

**PART 2. FORM AND FUNCTION CONNECTED**

The Church’s two vertical structures, discussed in part 1A, form a scaffold, providing the support needed for the Church to maintain its identity, organization, and authority for administering ordinances. These are woven together with some remarkable horizontal and communitarian forms, discussed in part 1B, which give the Church its vitality and its unparalleled sense of member engagement. In part 2, I will draw three important connections between LDS form or structure and its doctrinal or substantive function. I argue that the Church’s form is both created by and creates certain religious practices and beliefs. While parallels may be drawn among all kinds of spiritual and practical Church functions, I am going to discuss three uniquely LDS spiritual principles that I consider key to the purpose of the kingdom on earth. I categorize them as gospel ownership, personal experience, and direct light.

**A. Gospel Ownership**

As detailed above, the LDS faith organizes the structure of religious learning horizontally, requiring everyone to teach and be taught, lead and be led, administer and be administered to. Consider this observation of non-LDS historian Mark Leone: “Whereas the audience in other Christian churches receives, more or less passively, meaning declared from the pulpit, Sunday school teacher, or other authoritative religious source, every Mormon is the preacher, teacher, exegete, and definer of meaning before an audience of peers, who a moment or a month later may switch positions with him.” The LDS gospel learning experience is community based, taught by members of the congregation with a

72. Some of this horizontal structure may perhaps be described as the “marked Congregationalist tendencies that [the LDS Church] retained in some form throughout its career.” Thomas F. O’Dea, *The Mormons* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 167. The Church is not congregational in the sense that the local unit is entirely self-sustaining and subject only to its own rules. But LDS local units retain in many respects their own environment and learning processes.

teacher’s manual and ample class discussion. This type of teaching has many benefits that contribute to gospel ownership by members.

The Church has recently introduced a program that puts even more emphasis on discussion-based horizontal teaching and learning. The course of study for the missionary program, Preach My Gospel, is designed to be more interactive between missionary and investigator, and a new youth program is more focused on having the youth take responsibility for teaching themselves and each other.

One benefit of discussion-based teaching is that it increases motivation. The goal is to change the heart of the student. The student is much more likely to change to conform with the spiritual principles taught if the student internalizes, and the student is much more likely to internalize if he comes to knowledge actively, rather than merely allowing words to enter one ear and exit right out the other. Further, in a discussion, the student has opportunity to clear up questions that might hinder actual application of principles and to ask questions based on particular circumstances. The concept of learning through question and answer is not unique to the Church. The Socratic method, a pillar of legal teaching, seeks to “hone students’ reasoning skills through active engagement with the teacher—or observation of another student’s active engagement.”

The process of the Socratic Method revolves around applying legal theories and doctrines to practical applications, which has led legal educators to believe that “if we want our professionals-in-training to get practice in responding to novel circumstances, this is it.” Likewise, if we want religious students to get practice in applying gospel principles to the situations that may arise in their lives, a question and discussion method

74. See The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Teaching the Gospel in the Savior’s Way (Salt Lake City: Intellectual Reserve, 2012), 3.
75. See Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Teaching the Gospel in the Savior’s Way, 7.
is best. As in legal education, Church teaching is aimed at training individuals to find their own answers rather than teaching students the rules and answers. When the goal is to make spiritual “professionals” who can become like Jesus Christ, such active “process” training is particularly helpful.

A careful look at the Bible reveals that God frequently employs a question-and-answer teaching method. For instance, although he knows the answers, he asks Adam and Eve a series of questions in Genesis 3:9–13, and also Cain in Genesis 4:9–10, leading them through his questioning to acknowledge the truth of their situations. Jesus did likewise with his disciples, as in Matthew 5:13, 46–47, and 6:25.\(^79\) In addition, participation denotes individual responsibility for the subject. President Gordon B. Hinckley articulated, “The Lord expects us to think. . . . That which comes easily departs easily. That which comes of struggle remains.”\(^80\)

This horizontal teaching-learning interchange also enhances the sense of community, as “hearts knit together” (Mosiah 18:21). The basic LDS teaching manual explains, “When we meet to learn the gospel, we do not come together merely as teachers, students, and friends. We come together as brothers and sisters—children of Heavenly Father. Our baptismal covenant further unites us. . . . [In Mosiah 18:21, we are urged to] ‘look forward with one eye, having one faith and one baptism, having [our] hearts knit together in unity and in love one towards another.’”\(^81\)

Learning is enhanced for students who feel part of the interpretive community, who feel loved and understood in their struggles, and who understand how their peers apply gospel principles in similar situations. Since Church teachers are not trained theologians, exploring doctrine and its applications together becomes a means of making and cementing

79. For a detailed listing of the thought questions Jesus asked, see John W. Welch and John F. Hall, Charting the New Testament (Provo, Utah: Maxwell Institute, 2002), chart 9-16. For information on the questions answered by Jesus, see Welch and Hall, Charting the New Testament, chart 9-17.

80. Elise Soukup, “The Mormon Odyssey,” Newsweek, October 17, 2005, 55, 57 (quoting President Gordon B. Hinckley), available at http://www.newsweek.com/mormon-odyssey-121109. Soukup then observed, “Within limits, the church encourages internal debate, arguing that doubt can be an important precursor to faith.”

community. It is the immediacy and vitality of these local institutions that brings Mormons back to church every week. According to LDS historian Richard Bushman, “The sacred stories of [Mormonism] envelop Mormons in the realities of divine power and the redemption of Christ, without confining them to the specific formulation of a historic creed.” The concept of “envelop” without “confining” astutely represents the sense of LDS religious understanding. The importance of these horizontal groupings in the Church may be part of what makes the faith a truly “American” religion. A *Newsweek* author suggested, “Smith’s vision—optimistic, vigorous, a source of continuing personal growth for all who accept its blessings—in many ways echoes the American Dream.”

Harold Bloom’s assessment of the LDS religion notes the emphasis on “every individual’s responsibility, perfectibility, and immediate accessibility to divine revelation coupled with its this-worldly communitarian imperatives.” The sophistication and structure of a professionally developed theology would stunt this dynamic. This insight reflects not only on the synergy of this interactive learning, it also suggests the LDS focus on experience discussed in the next subsection.

Latter-day Saints have ownership over their religion not only through teaching and learning, but also from serving in other Church positions. All members are expected to contribute to the Church by holding a calling. In addition to the fact that most members regularly rotate in and out of positions as teachers, every member “owns” responsibility for learning and applying principles in evolving circumstances. The importance of this becomes clearer as we look at the next two spiritual principles.

**B. Personal Experience**

The sharing of leadership opportunities among lay members and the nature of the LDS classroom are forms that require active member engagement. An outside scholar, Mark Leone, claims that “Mormonism has meaning only in use.” Such a statement could suggest that

83. Soukup, “Mormon Odyssey,” 60.
there is no LDS theology, only practical applications; however, this is not an accurate assumption. Latter-day Saints are encouraged to read, study, and seek inspiration in understanding God’s eternal plan—every member a scriptorian. However, while knowledge at a theoretical level is desirable, ultimately it has little real value if not put to use. This sentiment is perhaps best understood in the context of James 2:14, 17: “What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? . . . Even so, faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.” Frank Lloyd Wright put it this way: “The apprentice will be a true workman with proper pride in the doing, loving to see that doing well done. To be able to work at and for what one most wants to do well should be gospel in our democracy. For a democratic slogan try ‘What a man does that he has.’”

Leone continues, “At the heart of Mormonism is a continuous revision of meaning by the individual believer, a process facilitated by the immediacy and availability of revelation and the freedom to discuss all religious topics in the conviction that all can be equally well understood.” The horizontal structure of the Church and the absence of trained theologians focuses us less on “orthodoxy,” from the Greek ortho + doxa (opinion), and more on “orthopraxy,” from the Greek ortho + praxis (doing, action, or performance). Uniform doctrine is important and desirable, but that is not a central mission of the Church. Instead, the self-stated missions of the Church are all principles of action: perfect the saints,

86. See text accompanying notes 62–64 above.
87. See Doctrine and Covenants 90:15 (“Study and learn, and become acquainted with all good books, and with languages, tongues, and people”); Doctrine and Covenants 130:18–19 (“Whatever principle of intelligence we attain to in this life, it will rise with us in the resurrection. And if a person gains more knowledge and intelligence in this life through his diligence and obedience than another, he will have so much the advantage in the world to come”).
88. See 2 Nephi 9:28–29: “O that cunning plan of the evil one! O the vanity, and the frailties, and the foolishness of men! When they are learned they think they are wise, and they hearken not unto the counsel of God, for they set it aside, supposing they know of themselves, wherefore, their wisdom is foolishness and it profiteth them not. And they shall perish. But to be learned is good if they hearken unto the counsels of God.”
89. Wright, Genius and the Mobocracy, 85.
90. Leone, Roots of Modern Mormonism, 171.
proclaim the gospel, help the needy, and redeem the dead.92 The horizontal structure of the Church with the accompanying benefit of personal experience is vital to the fulfillment of these goals.

This orthopraxy gives life to a substantive LDS principle. The concept of “experience” is of special importance in LDS doctrine. The more valiant spirits in the premortal existence chose to come to earth to prove themselves and gain experience.93 Joseph Smith was counseled that adversity “shall give thee experience, and shall be for thy good” (D&C 122:7). The need for personal experience is also taught by Paul in Romans: “We glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope” (Rom. 5:3–4).94

Many careers are enhanced by on-the-job training, an apprenticeship, or some sort of clinical programs. Similarly, new Church members are given assignments immediately. Some quickly become bishops, Relief Society presidents, and other leaders; then they rotate out and have opportunity to serve in new capacities. Latter-day Saints read scriptures

92. “The Purpose of the Church,” in Handbook 2: Administering the Church, 2.2, available at https://www.lds.org/handbook/handbook-2-administering-the-church/priesthood-principles (“The Church focuses on divinely appointed responsibilities. These include helping members live the gospel of Jesus Christ, gathering Israel through missionary work, caring for the poor and needy, and enabling the salvation of the dead by building temples and performing vicarious ordinances”).

93. See, for example, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Guide to the Scriptures, s.v. “Premortal Life,” http://www.lds.org/scriptures/gs/premortal-life (“All men and women lived with God as his spirit children before coming to the earth as mortal beings”); The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Guide to the Scriptures, s.v. “Council in Heaven,” http://www.lds.org/scriptures/gs/council-in-heaven (“The occasion in premortal life when the Father presented his plan to his spirit children who would come to this earth”); Doctrine and Covenants 49:17 (“And that it might be filled with the measure of man, according to his creation before the world was made”); Doctrine and Covenants 138:53–56 (“Before they were born, [the leaders of the church and] others, received their first lessons . . . and were prepared to come forth”); Job 38:4–7 (“When [God] laid the foundations of the earth . . . the sons of God shouted for joy”); Abraham 3:22–25 (saying Abraham was chosen before he was born).

and attend classes, but the form and function of the organization pushes them toward hands-on, experiential learning.

The importance of experience leads to what is perhaps an even more fundamental LDS principle. The goal in this mortal life for a member of the Church is a matter of experience or being, more than knowledge and intellect. The point is a change of heart—the changing of the “natural” or “carnal” person into a person who knows Jesus Christ (see Mosiah 3:19; Moro. 10:32, 33). Church historian Steve Olsen captured the subtle difference: “From a Mormon perspective, coming to know God is like getting to know a dear loved one, like a Heavenly Father. . . . The process is not so much rational as relational.”95 And being relational, it is personal, individual, and lived rather than cerebral.96

The change of heart that Latter-day Saints seek is not a one-time “born again” event but is an ongoing state of being. Alma asks, “If ye have experienced a change of heart, and if ye have felt to sing the song of redeeming love, I would ask, can ye feel so now?” (Alma 5:26). The result of this change of heart is to have no more desire to do evil (Alma 19:33). As this change of heart becomes ongoing, we are led to another principle: the goal of actually becoming like Jesus and as God is.

This sense of experience and change is a theme running through from the beginning of the LDS faith. Olsen concludes, “As in Mormon historiography, so in Mormon theology: the foundations are events—spiritual experiences—that change the nature not just of a person’s inner self, but also of the very essence of his world.”97 Thus, the emphasis on orthopraxy is empowered by the horizontal structure of the Church and by its lack of trained theologians and scholarly interpretive methods, as discussed in the next subsection.


96. The idea of relational theology is that “God . . . allows itself to be known only to the extent that people are willing to engage it through personal relationship.” Peter C. Hill and Todd W. Hall, “Relational Schemas in Processing One’s Image of God and Self,” Journal of Psychology and Christianity 21, no. 4 (2002): 365. Likewise, “the elementary impressions and emotional stirrings that waken the spirit of the ‘natural man’ proceed from incidents—experience of a being confronting him—and from situations—life with a being confronting him—that are relational in character” Martin Buber, I and Thou, trans. Walter Kaufmann (1923; London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004), 22.

97. Olsen, “Theology as a Cultural System.”
C. Direct Light

In addition to the emphasis on personal experience, the hierarchy of religious authority and canonical texts is balanced in the Church by the horizontal concept of individual revelation. The lay leadership and participant/learner forms in the Church translate into function: the canonical structure relies on continuing revelation and expects that individuals will receive personal revelation.98 Similarly, the lawmakers are part of a vertical structure with chains of authority, and yet each lawmaker is also expected to seek and obtain personal revelation to fill in the details of the application of doctrine in the exercise of such lawmaker’s stewardships. Even the standard works and official prophetic declarations can only be rightly understood by the individual’s active involvement in revelation.

The preeminence of direct light is illustrated by its relation to the canon of the LDS faith. Elder Dallin H. Oaks states, “For us, the scriptures are not the ultimate source of knowledge, but what precedes the ultimate source. The ultimate knowledge comes by revelation.”99 Members read scriptures to open their hearts and minds to communication from God.100 As Joseph Smith once stated, “I have . . . the oldest book in my heart, even the gift of the Holy Ghost.”101 A criticism of LDS doctrine is that it is circular—prophets will lead the Church in the right direction because a prophet said that is what will happen.102 This argument shows a lack of understanding as, in fact, members are encouraged to rely on personal revelation to receive a testimony of the authority and truthfulness of prophetic declarations.103 In this way, the horizontal elements of the Church strengthen and support the vertical structures, as the vertical structures could not stand alone.

98. See Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Approaching Mormon Doctrine” (“This doctrine resides in the four ‘standard works’ of scripture, . . . official declarations and proclamations, and the Articles of Faith. . . . Individual members are encouraged to independently strive to receive their own spiritual confirmation of the truthfulness of Church doctrine”).

99. Oaks, “Scripture Reading and Revelation,” 7. “Because we believe that scripture reading can help us receive revelation, we are encouraged to read the scriptures again and again. By this means, we obtain access to what our Heavenly Father would have us know and do in our personal lives today. That is one reason Latter-day Saints believe in daily scripture study” (italics in original).


101. History of the Church, 6:308.


Heber C. Kimball articulated the need for personal revelation: “The time will come when no man nor woman will be able to endure on borrowed light.”\textsuperscript{104} The theme of knowing for oneself, without “borrowed light,” has persisted as an important doctrine of the Church.\textsuperscript{105} It was expressed more recently by Elder James E. Faust: “We will not be able to travel through life on borrowed light. The light of life must be part of our very being. The voice we must learn to heed is the voice of the Spirit.”\textsuperscript{106}

Even though this concept of direct light is fundamental in its importance to the Church, the flexibility of continuing and individual revelation potentially could be a very dangerous and subversive horizontal concept in the sense that each person could become “a law unto himself.”\textsuperscript{107} However, this danger is restrained by the vertical structure of unambiguous hierarchical authority in the Church and the concept of stewardship—genuine revelations are only given about the recipient’s stewardship—as well as the canon, the “measuring stick” against which to gauge impressions and visions to verify that individual revelation is harmonious with Church teachings. Thus, members must learn not only to seek and receive

\begin{enumerate}
\item[105.] See, for example, J. Golden Kimball, “Conference Report,” in \textit{Seventy-Fourth Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints} (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Book Store, 1904), 28, available at http://scriptures.byu.edu/gc-historical/1904-A.pdf (“Latter-day Saints, you must think for yourselves. No man or woman can remain in this Church on borrowed light”); John Taylor and George Q. Cannon, “Defense of the Constitution of the U.S., May 26, 1885,” in Clark, \textit{Messages of the First Presidency}, 3:17 (“Those who have been careful to keep oil in their lamps, now have the needed light to guide them; and those who have been living in borrowed light, or in that furnished by others, may find themselves in perplexity and uncertain as to the path to pursue.”); Harold B. Lee, “When Your Heart Tells You Things Your Mind Does Not Know,” \textit{New Era} 1 (Feb. 1971): 4, also available at https://www.lds.org/iahona/1978/03/when-your-heart-tells-you-things-your-mind-does-not-know?lang=eng (“The time is here when each of you must stand on your own feet. Be converted, because no one can endure on borrowed light. You will have to be guided by the light within yourself”).
\item[107.] Reynolds v. U.S., 98 U.S. 145, 167 (1878) (expressing disapproval at the idea that people could act contrary to U.S. law by excusing their actions with “religious belief”); see also Oman, “Truth, Doctrine, and Authority,” 16–17 (saying that the concept of direct revelation is “radical spiritual egalitarianism” that is tempered by limits set by Church leaders).
\end{enumerate}
individual revelation, but to identify and weigh impressions to ascertain their veracity.

The concept of direct light is strengthened and reinforced in the Church by the absence of a vertical pillar of theologians. The fact that there is no formal theological training, no official trained interpreters, and no set methods of interpretation may function to give members of the Church greater flexibility in approaching the original texts. Members study in ways that suit them best, and receive individualized understanding of the scriptures that fits their particular circumstances. As members meet to share personal experiences, they can also share suggestions on how to best study the scriptures and seek revelation, a stark contrast to the rigidity of official interpretations from intellectuals handed down from acknowledged interpreters.

The absence of a theological pillar has a downside in that nonofficial LDS theologians can disseminate ideas that can become accepted or distorted by members of the Church, threatening the structure of stewardship. The concept of direct light balances this danger if members do not adopt credentialed people’s ideas without first seeking direct light. Just as the horizontal concept of direct revelation can be a dangerous one, the opportunity to circulate misleading and even false doctrine in a Church that has limited official interpretations is staggering. Of course, there is a risk that a lack of official theologians may lead members to see themselves as LDS theologians charged to proclaim the “real” interpretation, not just for themselves and their stewardships but for everyone. In contrast to the informal applications discussed orally in local Sunday School classes, potentially misleading information or opinions published in widely circulated works by authors with impressive educational credentials, but not in the appointed chain of authority, have an even greater potential for harm. As discussed above, only the Apostles as a body have the authority to declare doctrine for the whole Church. LDS philosophers, like all other members, have authority

108. See The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Approaching Mormon Doctrine” (“The Church exhorts all people to approach the gospel not only intellectually but with the intellect and the spirit, a process in which reason and faith work together”).

to interpret gospel meaning only in their own individual stewardship. While the Church has a firm tradition of exploring ideas among and between members, including those who write scholarly works,\footnote{See The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “Approaching Mormon Doctrine” (“Journalists, academics and laymen alike are encouraged to pursue their inquiries into the Church by recognizing the broad and complex context within which its doctrines have been declared, in a spirit of reason and good will”).} challenges to the direct interpretations that have been issued through the lines of priesthood authority are unacceptable.

One concern is that statements or assumptions in publications by LDS intellectuals may eventually distill by word of mouth, through the media, or through the Internet, to groups whose gospel sophistication is not sufficient to properly process them. As Paul put it, “I have fed you with milk, and not with meat, for hitherto you were not able to bear it” (1 Cor. 3:2). In addition, statements in widely publicized works are often taken out of context. Finally, an idea which is neither endorsed by nor contrary to the Church authorities can become mistakenly accepted as Church doctrine and make its way into Sunday School classes and to members teaching from the podium. The risk that some may subtly claim authority or be taken as authorities exists even in the publication of articles such as this one, and I urge readers to take my statements as part of the horizontal teacher-learner discussion pattern. For these reasons, LDS scholars should exercise reasonable restraint when they publish their doctrinal “musings.”

As a balance to the dangers of an unauthorized vertical propagation of theology, Church members are urged to seek direct light (a horizontal concept because it seeks confirmation outside the vertical human chain of authority) and that light should illuminate their own lives and their stewardship responsibilities. Light for the entire Church will come through the proper vertical channels. Thus, the forms join with the substance into one unified whole where the expectation is direct revelation, but the result is not anarchy.

In addition, the need of formal theology and theologians is lessened in the Church precisely because of the concept of direct light through priesthood stewardships.\footnote{See Wirthlin, “Let Every Man Learn His Duty,” 69–71.} One quite apparent benefit of continuing revelation is that current prophets speak to new issues as they arise, and
their revelations may clarify and interpret words of ancient prophets from time to time.\textsuperscript{112} All LDS leaders from the prophet down to the lowliest are entitled to continuing revelation to answer questions and guide those within their stewardships, as discussed above. Thus, members of the Church have other routes to find the answers historically provided by theologians in other religions.

The authority hierarchy in the Church is made of individuals with no particular claim on education or expertise but who are generally chosen, by revelation, for their spiritual qualities or peculiar talents or to forward some other purpose known to God. As discussed above, inserting at any point an erudite elite would fundamentally change the form of the Church and the substance of the doctrine.\textsuperscript{113} Latter-day Saints take

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The fact that we believe in continuing revelations given through anointed authorities (both as lawgivers and interpreters) and given directly to individuals does not mean that other meaningful study and commentary is not useful. Members of the LDS Church are strongly urged to pursue “book learning” and education of all kinds, and volumes of scholarly work by members about the Church, the scriptures, and doctrine have been, and are being, written. See Doctrine and Covenants 109:7; 88:117–41; 90:15; Article of Faith 13. Nonetheless, such research is not seen as essential to understanding God’s will for us. See Gordon B. Hinckley, “Four Cornerstones of Faith,” Ensign 34 (February 2004): 6, available at http://www.lds.org/ensign/2004/02/four-cornerstones-of-faith.

In fact, we are strongly warned that “to be learned is good [only if we] hearken unto the counsels of God” (2 Ne. 9:29). LDS writers have devoted many pages to reservations about “intellectuals” based on this scripture. See, for example, Robert L. Millet, To Be Learned Is Good, If . . . (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1987); Boyd K. Packer, “To Be Learned Is Good If . . . ,” Ensign 22 (November 1992): 71, available at https://www.lds.org/general-conference/1992/10/to-be-learned-is-good-if?lang=eng. Harold B. Lee, “The Iron Rod,” Ensign 1 (June 1971): 5, 8, available at http://www.lds.org/ensign/1971/06/the-iron-rod (containing Harold B. Lee’s assertion that “I heard one . . . say . . . that he believed more professors have taken themselves out of the Church by their trying to philosophize or intellectualize the fall of Adam and the subsequent atonement of the Savior. This was because they would rather accept the philosophies of men than what the Lord has revealed”); Joseph F. Smith, Gospel Doctrine: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Joseph F. Smith, Sixth President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1939), 373 (containing Joseph F. Smith’s suggestion that secular scholars “read by the lamp of their own conceit”); Dallin H. Oaks, The Lord’s Way (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1991), 64–67 (expounding the sequential relationship between reason and revelation—first one reasons and ponders and studies for the correct answer and then supplements or replaces that with spiritual knowledge).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
an active ownership in religious knowledge and practice and rely on intimate, personal insight.

Joseph Smith, the first prophet of the Restoration, resisted creeds because they stifled discovery of further truth.114 Louis Midgley in the Encyclopedia of Mormonism explains: “The core of [LDS] faith is not a confession to a creed but a personal witness that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ.”115 President Gordon B. Hinckley offered a telling insight on the relationship of commentary, scriptures, and revelation in the LDS tradition: “I do not concern myself much with reading long commentary volumes designed to enlarge at length upon that which is found in the scriptures. Rather, I prefer to dwell with the source, tasting of the unadulterated waters of the fountain of truth.”116

Thus, the horizontal organization of the Church—including gospel ownership, personal experience, and direct light—is critical to the continuity of the Church and is balanced by the more formal vertical structures. Both the horizontal and vertical structures of the Church exist to facilitate the Church's function: to effect God's plan of bringing about the salvation and exaltation of his children.

**D. Cardston Alberta Temple as Example**

One modern-day temple reflects the theory Frank Lloyd Wright proposed and also stands as an example of the unity achieved between the form and function of the Church. The Cardston Alberta Temple was built in 1912 and was designed by Hyrum Pope and Harold Burton. The designers of the temple followed Frank Lloyd Wright's style but also incorporated what may have seemed disjointed to some: remembrances of the “pre-Columbian ruins of Mexico and Latin America.” The bold design of the temple rose naturally from its surroundings to encompass the eternal function for which it was built. Paul L. Anderson beautifully described the brilliance of its integrated design:

As [the designers] envisioned them, the four ordinance rooms would be arranged around the center of the building like

![Plaque at the Cardston Alberta Temple pointing to the influence of architect Frank Lloyd Wright.](image)

---


the spokes of a wheel, each room facing one of the cardinal directions. The celestial room would be placed in the center at the very top of the building, with the baptistry directly below. This arrangement placed the rooms in a practical and symbolically appropriate relationship to each other. As a person moved through the ordinance rooms he followed a circular path, finally coming through into the center in the celestial room. Each room was also a few steps higher than the one before, with the celestial room and the adjacent sealing rooms being the highest of all. Thus, the architectural arrangement expressed the same idea of progression that is found in the temple ceremony itself.

The design of the outside of the building was equally satisfying. The unity of interior and exterior, a basic principle of modern architecture, was evident in the fact that the major rooms inside were the most prominent features outside as well.119

The interior furnishings and ornamentations of the Cardston Alberta Temple were all similarly designed to incorporate natural local elements

and woods. The temple’s beautiful form naturally serves its function while, at the same time, the function gives meaning and value to each element of the form. Such was the fulfillment of Frank Lloyd Wright’s intent that form and function be one, as well as the LDS concept that heaven and earth can be joined in a temple.

**Conclusion**

Outsiders trained in traditional theological method may agree with Bernard DeVoto’s 1936 critical assessment that a “complete bibliography of [theological] articles by qualified [LDS] scholars would not fill [a single] page.” But perhaps they drive by too fast. Perhaps they do not notice a building unadorned, plain as a tree. A closer examination may reveal a structure that gives both vitality and meaning to LDS thought.

The Church has at its core a spiritual union of form and function, which gives independent life to the organization. The materials (people and organizations) that constitute its internal form are woven together into a living fabric by the functions those materials serve. In his architecture, Frank Lloyd Wright sought “a spiritual union” of form and function to overcome the limitations of time. “Frank Lloyd Wright’s organic architecture . . . involves a respect for the properties of the materials . . . and a respect for the harmonious relationship between the form/design and the function of the building. . . . Organic architecture is also an attempt to integrate the spaces into a coherent whole: a marriage between the site and the structure and a union between [structure] and . . . context.”

This critical connection of form and function is evident in the LDS Church. The Church has its lawgivers and its canon—its vertical structures; it also has its horizontal structures—just as a building has both

120. See generally, Anderson, “First of the Modern Temples,” 6–11 (discussing the detailed work of the interior and exterior design and the way each element lends itself to the function of the temple).


walls and floors. Like the Frank Lloyd Wright ideal, the Church’s function, joined to its form, creates the opportunities for the development of spiritual substance, a spiritual edifice in which members are owners who learn through personal experience and receive direct light from God as they strive toward salvation and exaltation.

Note how Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians describes how both the horizontal and vertical elements discussed above unite with the spiritual function they serve: “Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God [horizontal structure]; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone [vertical structure]; in whom all the building fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit [substantive function]” (Eph. 2:19–22). Latter-day Saints would do well to “seek for a greater understanding as to why we are thus organized and then to seek to fulfill the vision [God] has for us.”

Cheryl B. Preston is Edwin M. Thomas Professor of Law in the J. Reuben Clark Law School at Brigham Young University. She would like to express her gratitude for the editing assistance of Alison Craig and Brandon Gardner; the helpful comments on earlier drafts given by Frederick Mark Gedicks, John W. Welch, David H. Bailey, Brett Scharffs, Galen Fletcher, Ross Boundy, and the participants in the J. Reuben Clark Society conference in Washington, D.C.; and the research assistance of Bradley Schmidt, Debra Linford, Jill Rencher, Javier Farfan, Nate Whittaker, and the entire reference staff at the Howard W. Hunter Law Library. She adds, “I dedicate this article to LaMont Erickson, a good friend who helped me formulate the concepts of structure and form and who recently thereafter moved on to a better place.”

As gossip filtered from one Wayne County, New York, farm to another that Joseph Smith Jr. claimed to have a collection of ancient artifacts, including an impressively heavy set of golden plates, it became increasingly difficult in October 1827 for him to keep the plates safe. But even before he had them in hand, Joseph and his wife, Emma Hale Smith, had arranged with Emma’s brother Alva Hale to help the couple move with the plates to northeastern Pennsylvania. The newly married Joseph agreed with his father-in-law, Isaac Hale, that he would buy a small farm there where he “expected to work hard for a living, and was willing to do so.”¹ He would need to work hard, since his parents’ family had limited financial resources to draw from as Joseph was starting his own family. But he also planned on translating the Book of Mormon in his new home.

Joseph and Emma arrived in Pennsylvania’s Susquehanna Valley in early December 1827, and because they had little money the need to work hard was immediate and hampered whatever hopes the young couple had of quickly completing a translation. Fortunately, Emma’s older brother David Hale kept a store nearby where Joseph could trade labor and goods, which he did between January 1, 1828, and March 20, 1829, as he sought to establish his family and work on the translation.

Just as with any good country shopkeeper of the 1820s, David kept track of his barter exchanges with Joseph and their neighbors in an

¹ Isaac Hale, “Affidavit,” in Eber D. Howe, Mormonism Unvailed: or, a Faithful Account of That Singular Imposition and Delusion, from Its Rise to the Present Time (Painesville, Ohio: By the author, 1834), 264.
account book. This book preserves only a small part of Joseph’s economic activities but still helps place Book of Mormon translation efforts into their broader cultural setting.

In 2010, John M. Murphy, curator at BYU’s L. Tom Perry Special Collections, acquired this ledger and has made it available for study as part of the David Hale Family Papers. We have reproduced here a transcription of portions of the ledger for greater accessibility (see pages 108–12). In addition, a lengthier article that provides additional historical analysis, a provenance of the collection, and a transcription of all ledger entries made before or during Joseph Smith’s residency in Harmony is available online at https://byustudies.byu.edu/showTitle.aspx?title=9407.

**David Hale**

David Hale, the principal author of the ledger, was the second oldest of Isaac and Elizabeth Hale’s nine children. Born on March 6, 1794, in the same fifteen-by-thirty-foot log home where his sister Emma was born ten years later, David may have been particularly close to Emma, as is implied by Emma’s selection of the name David Hyrum for her last child—giving her son a middle name from Hyrum Smith, a close brother of her husband, and a first name from her own brother, David. When Emma wrote a letter to her family after more than a decade of no contact, she addressed it to her brother David.

David was likely named after his father’s uncle David Ward, who had served with his father in the Revolutionary War. David Hale grew up on family land that began on the north bank of the Susquehanna River and ascended up the foot of Oquago Mountain. He joined the Methodist Episcopal congregation in 1811 at age seventeen. His seven-year-old sister, Emma, joined the same year. This experience may have been part of what induced a close relationship between the two. The following year, 1812, David was “drafted” (in his own words) into military

---

2. For further documentation of details about the Hale homes, property, and additional historical context, see forthcoming articles by Mark Lyman Staker in the journal *Mormon Historical Studies*.


service as war broke out with Great Britain.⁵ As privates, David and his older brother, Jesse Hale, along with their friend and neighbor Jonathan Treadwell, served as part of Luzerne County’s 129th Regiment and rode on rafts down the Susquehanna River, disembarking at the Danville docks, where they joined about a thousand men awaiting further orders.⁶ Danville was a major shipping point on the Susquehanna River. Boatmen lined up their rafts and barges to unload lumber, farm produce, meat, and other goods onto wagons that carried them to market in Philadelphia and elsewhere.⁷ It is likely that during this trip David was first introduced to the business of merchandizing and shipping.

The following March, David turned twenty-one and reached legal adult status. He did not immediately begin running his small country store in 1815, however, and although he was listed in the 1816 township tax records as an adult, he was the only man in his age group not taxed for an occupation.⁸ He still lived at home when the census enumerator in 1820 identified the Isaac Hale family’s business as commerce,⁹ but the enumerator had likely focused on Isaac’s meat-shipping business rather than the work of his sons.¹⁰ David learned to hunt with his father.

⁵. Kennedy, Recollections of the Pioneers of Lee County, 142.
⁷. We are grateful to Helen Sis Hause, the local historian of Danville, Pennsylvania, who generously spent her time helping us understand the early history of that community and its influence on Hale family life.
⁸. David Hale, Tax Assessment, Harmony Township, 1816, Susquehanna County Courthouse, Montrose, Pennsylvania.
⁹. An individual of David Hale’s age range was listed in the Isaac Hale household for the year but may have been living elsewhere on the property. The following year, David Hale began renting property from James Westfall, but he apparently continued to live on his father’s land. Isaac Hale and James Westfall, Harmony Township, Pennsylvania, 1820 Census. See Mark L. Staker, “Isaac and Elizabeth Hale’s Pennsylvania Farm and Home: The Physical Setting for Some of Joseph Smith’s Most Influential Work,” Mormon Historical Studies, forthcoming.
¹⁰. Although the records do not clarify how the occupation of the household was determined, since the census records listed only the head of household by name, it is likely that it was the head of household’s occupation that was also listed.
He was the principal tracker when searching for the murderer of a local boatman, Oliver Harper, and his account book documents his continued work in dressing and preserving meat along with heavy involvement in leather production and the making of leather goods from wild animal skins.

In 1822, David began to run lumber downriver with his younger brother Isaac Ward Hale (known as Ward) during that spring’s high water runoff. Ward became a pilot of his own craft two years later. It is possible David learned some accounting practices on these trips while trading with urban merchants, and he certainly had access to better information about accounting practices in

ISAAC WARD HALE. David Hale’s brother Isaac Ward Hale worked with him as a boatman on the Susquehanna River and later piloted river arks on his own until he moved to Wisconsin, where he became a local judge. Courtesy of Clarence F. and Marie A. Hill, and Gordon L. and Beverly G. Boe.

11. Commonwealth v. Jason Treadwell, Susquehanna County Court of Oyer and Terminer, August 1824, Susquehanna County Courthouse. Mark Lyman Staker has transcriptions of official court documents connected to this trial on file and has placed copies with Betty Smith, director of the Susquehanna County Historical Society, Montrose, Pennsylvania.

12. Augustus B. Easton, ed., History of the Saint Croix Valley, 2 vols. (Chicago: H. C. Cooper, Jr. & Co., 1909), 2:1115; Commonwealth v. Jason Treadwell. David later hired others to do the raft work as he emphasized other trades. He noted in his ledger that he paid Alan Treadwell a dollar “for steering a raft from Marietta to Charleston” in May 1832. Marietta was a docking point in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, where lumber was typically unloaded and taken overland to Philadelphia. Charleston was a village further upriver. His other brothers were also likely involved in river traffic: Reuben Hale’s son noted in his obituary, “Father came down the Alleghany and Ohio River on a pine log raft, landing at Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio, [and] settled on the Virginia side of the Ohio River.” Byron Hale, “Reuben Hale’s Obituary,” a copy of which is in Reuben Hale’s family Bible in the possession of a descendant in Aurora, Colorado; photocopy in the possession of Mark Lyman Staker.
the major Philadelphia shipping markets than he would have in Harmony Township. David was elected as town constable that same year, a position he also held the following year in 1823.  

David’s earliest dated ledger entry was made August 31, 1824. This entry and a few others were for unpaid accounts carried over from an earlier, now lost, ledger, and confirm he was in business by that date but do not provide a beginning date for David’s mercantile activities. It is likely he started his store around the date of his earliest entry, however, since the twenty-nine-year-old David married eighteen-year-old Rhoda Jane Skinner in 1823, and they had their first child the following year. It was customary for a young man to show a means of making a living when he married, and David’s brothers followed this tradition.

David’s new wife was the oldest daughter of Jacob and Rhoda McDowell Skinner, who lived on a farm just a few hundred feet west of the Hale family. The Skinner and Hale extended families made up the principal customers of David’s store and were recorded in some of the earliest transactions. The tax records confirm that although the Hale family had moved into a substantial frame home by 1813, someone continued to occupy the original log home on the Hale farm for several decades. During the same years Isaac Hale was not taxed for the $10 log home, David was taxed for a $10 home, and he likely used the log home as his store for specific periods of time. Since his father was taxed for the log home in 1825, Isaac may have displaced David briefly and rented the residence to a work party headed by Josiah Stowell. David’s cousins later recalled a relative of Isaac’s being involved in these efforts. Although they remembered this relative as William Hale, Isaac did not have a relative named William Hale, and so it was likely the William Ward listed in the ledger, since Isaac was raised in the Ward family. David appears to have moved into Jesse Hale’s small frame home after Jesse moved across the river. But David was later displaced again when Joseph and Emma Smith occupied that home.

15. See forthcoming articles by Mark Lyman Staker in Mormon Historical Studies for additional information on the Hale family homes and their history.
David’s ledger recorded few business transactions during April and May of each year, which was generally when boatmen took lumber down the flooding spring river to market. He likely continued some river running activities in addition to his other occupations. The ledger also indicates David hired others to assist him on his farm, and he kept track of some exchanges of goods, labor, or food products between other neighbors for a fee. His principal store products were the leather goods he made and sold locally, probably as a byproduct of his or his father’s hunting activities.

David’s store offered some shopping convenience for his neighbors because it was between the two small villages in the valley where the primary merchants had their stores. The largest of these villages was Lanesville—about three miles east of the Hale property, in Harmony Township—which was renamed Lanesboro in 1829. It included a small
collection of businesses surrounding Martin Lane’s sawmill and gristmill operating at the eastern bend of the Susquehanna River. The store was run by George H. Noble, who had left the store of his father, Curtis Noble, in Unadilla, New York, and established his own in Lanesville. It was a large, well-financed store that Noble opened sometime between the tax assessments of December 3, 1827, and December 4, 1828. Since taverns often served as places of informal trading and occasional moving sales or estate auctions, the local public house may have also served as competition. In February 1828, Lanesville got Harmony Township’s first registered tavern when Charles Hatch was issued a license, which he renewed the following year.

David Hale’s principal competition was not in Lanesville, however, but in Taylortown, a small hamlet that straddled the Harmony and Great Bend Township lines two miles west of the Hale property and known today as Hickory Grove. Taylortown had the only tavern in the valley for many years, and its store was closer to the Hale family than the Noble

16. George Noble’s property was a half-acre lot that was worth two to three times more than an average home in the region, suggesting a good-size operation. George Noble later sued Joseph Smith in amical transaction to cover the cost of Joseph’s home, allowing Joseph to leave Harmony when he did. Joseph entered into a transaction with George Noble that appeared on David Hale’s books, showing he was doing business with Noble early on. It appears that Noble was helping Joseph, but we do not have his store ledger to study the relationship.

17. The tax assessment for “George H. Nobles” indicated he “came to live here [in Harmony Township] since the last assessment” when it was submitted on December 27, 1828. Harmony Township Tax Assessment, 1828 and 1829, Susquehanna County Courthouse. This means he arrived after the previous tax assessment was submitted on December 3, 1827. The daybook confirms Joseph Smith did business with Noble on December 4, 1828, documenting that Noble’s store had opened by that date.

18. “February 1828 Petitions to Keep a House of Public Entertainment,” Quarter Sessions Docket Book, Susquehanna County, vol. 3, 1824–32, 118, Susquehanna County Courthouse. Sylvanus Hatch operated the “Log Tavern” in the valley during the 1790s before official records were kept, apparently in the vicinity of the bend in the Susquehanna River, but little is known about that tavern other than a passing reference in a historical article published in the local newspaper. Emily C. Blackman, History of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: Susquehanna County Historical Society and Free Library Association, 1873), 496. It was never legally registered as a tavern and apparently had only a brief existence.
store in Lanesville. As the first tavern keeper, William Taylor had given the hamlet its name, but Almon Munson acquired the tavern by 1824, and he continued to pay his county license fee throughout the period Joseph Smith lived in the valley.

In addition to the Munson tavern, a few other structures stood nearby, shaping the hamlet. Among them was a store owned by John McKinney. McKinney took over a sawmill from Jonathan Treadwell and John Harris on the river just east of the tavern sometime shortly before December 1, 1826. His store likely stood on the sawmill property across the road from the tavern. When the county merchants registered their stores on October 13, 1830, McKinney’s ranked as one of the larger stores in the region. It was about a mile closer to the Hale farm than was the Noble store, and, since the Hale family and their neighbors frequented the Munson tavern for business and social occasions, it was convenient for trading. David’s first notation in the front flyleaf of his ledger reads, “David Hales Book Bought of John McKinney Price $075.”

Farther to the west, as the river turned again to the north and entered New York State, the narrow mountain valley opened to accommodate rolling hills and a wider region that included additional small villages, most notably Great Bend village (within the larger Great Bend Township) and Hallstead. Although Emma and her brother Alva were baptized

19. Almon Munson was licensed to keep a house of public entertainment in the house where he resided in Great Bend Township during the August 1824 Session of the County Court, Quarter Sessions Docket, Susquehanna County, vol. 3, August 1824.
23. The family that has lived in the Munson Tavern for six generations has had an oral tradition that a large store once stood across from the tavern on the south side of the road. Mary Parks, Personal Communication, August 13, 2009.
in the Hallstead Congregational Church as infants, these villages were far enough away that they were not convenient for most of the settlers in Harmony Township. Joseph Smith and other neighbors of David Hale likely did little trade with merchants so far west.

**Joseph Smith’s Ledger Entries in Context**

David Hale began this second ledger just a few weeks before his sister Emma married Joseph Smith and settled with her husband’s family in Manchester, New York. The newlyweds returned to the Susquehanna Valley during the hay and rye harvest when a neighbor, Peter Ingersoll, took them to see Emma’s parents in August 1827. It was during this trip, Ingersoll recalled, when Joseph and Emma agreed to move to Pennsylvania. Willard Chase, a neighbor of Joseph’s, remembered first learning about the plan to move to Pennsylvania just after Joseph returned to New York. While David’s ledger does not include any transactions from Joseph during this period, it documents the activities of his future neighbors during the month.

Just after Joseph announced his planned move to Pennsylvania, he and Emma went to a nearby hill to get the golden plates. Martin Harris, a prominent gentleman farmer in Palmyra Township, later reported he heard “about the first of October” from his brother Preserved Harris, who lived in Palmyra village, that Joseph had the plates, and Martin went into the village the following day, where it was the central topic of discussion. News spread a great distance quickly, and public interest in trying to get the plates increased with alarming intensity until Martin,  

26. See Register of Baptisms, First Presbyterian Church Records, Hallstead, p. 138, January 11, 1797, Susquehanna County Historical Society. When the entire volume was copied over into a new book during the Civil War, Emma’s baptismal record was copied underneath the baptism of her brother Alva and her own baptismal date was not included.


29. Joel Tiffany, ed., “Mormonism,” *Tiffany’s Monthly Devoted to the Investigation of the Science of Mind* 5 (May 1859): 170. While Harris implies this was the first time he had heard about the plates, or the reporter misquoted him, it was more likely the first time he heard they were in Joseph’s possession. Joseph’s mother recalled her husband “mentioned [to Harris] the existence of the plates, some two or three years prior to their coming forth.” Lavina Fielding Anderson, ed., *Lucy’s Book: A Critical Edition of Lucy Mack Smith’s Family Memoir* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2001), 394.
as he later recalled, told Joseph “it was unsafe for him to remain.”

Martin said he was the one who insisted Joseph go to his father-in-law’s farm in Pennsylvania. Since others suggest Joseph had already planned on moving there, it is likely Harris encouraged Joseph to leave earlier than he had initially planned rather than initiating the idea himself. This is supported by the arrival of Joseph and Emma in Pennsylvania a few months before the home they intended to occupy was available.

Martin recalled that Joseph sent a letter to his brother-in-law Alva Hale asking for help in moving. The letter must have been sent shortly after news circulated about the plates since Alva would have needed to begin traveling in early October to arrive in Manchester in late October with a horse-drawn farm wagon prepared to take Joseph and Emma to the Susquehanna Valley. When Alva arrived, he stayed with Joseph’s parents while the young couple made arrangements to leave. They still had debts to pay before their move. Joseph borrowed twenty-eight dollars from Lucy (Dolly) Harris, the wife of Martin Harris, which she had initially offered as a gift until Joseph insisted on

---

32. Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170. Joseph’s mother also noted that “word had been sent to [Joseph’s father-in-law] that Jospeh [sic] desired to move there as soon as he could settle up his business.” Anderson, Lucy’s Book, 400.

Alva Hale. Alva Hale, a local constable in Harmony Township, guarded the plates hidden in a barrel of beans as he took Joseph and Emma Smith to Harmony. This 1850s ambrotype of an earlier daguerreotype was donated to the LDS Church Historian’s office by a grandson of Alva’s sister Phoebe Hale Root. But it was misidentified for many years until an 1860s tintype of the same man recently turned up in the collection of his descendants in the Beverly Boe family. Courtesy Church History Library, © Intellectual Reserve Inc.
signing a promissory note.\textsuperscript{33} It is probable that Lucy Harris used this debt to prevent Joseph from leaving somehow, which required he settle it, and he did not have the immediate means to pay it off. Not only were he and Emma poor in Joseph’s estimation, but persecution was so heavy he doubted they could change their circumstances.\textsuperscript{34} It was during the first weeks of October that Joseph had “gone away to work for Peter Ingersoll[1] to get some flour,” which may have been an attempt to gather resources to move.\textsuperscript{35} Joseph also hoped Ingersoll would lend him some money to pay off his previous debts and transfer the debt to Ingersoll. “His brother-in-law had come to assist him in moving, but he himself was out of money. He wished to borrow the money of me,” Ingersoll recalled, “and he presented Mr. Hale as security.”\textsuperscript{36} Ingersoll refused. The fact Joseph was willing to create a new debt to pay off an established one suggests his previous debts encumbered his leaving for some reason and suggests the lender, most likely Lucy Harris, was trying to influence Joseph through their financial relationship.

Joseph and Alva Hale went to a public house to transact some business with the landlord. They may have intended to sell some of Joseph and Emma’s furniture, which was eventually moved to Harmony, since such sales were frequently held in taverns. This is where Martin Harris approached them and offered Joseph fifty dollars as a gift to cover current

\textsuperscript{33} Anderson, \textit{Lucy’s Book}, 398–400.
\textsuperscript{35} Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 169.
\textsuperscript{36} Ingersoll’s account is somewhat contradictory internally and when compared against other sources, and it cannot be taken as entirely accurate. Ingersoll claimed he refused to help Joseph because he did not have the money; he then noted in his account he told Joseph “in case he could obtain assistance from no other source, I would let him have some money,” thus claiming he really did have money to help. Then he said Joseph Smith played into Martin Harris’s vanity to get money and thus received a gift from Martin, even though Harris is clear in his own account that Joseph wanted to repay the money and it was Harris who insisted it was a gift. Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170. Ingersoll claimed Joseph told him that he (Joseph) had deceived Martin Harris but still suggests he (Peter) was willing to loan Joseph the money if Harris had not given it. Ingersoll’s account is full of contradictions, but some of his details are supported by other sources, suggesting he is drawing from actual knowledge of events in some cases. Ingersoll, “Affidavit,” 236.
debts and provide money for the journey.\textsuperscript{37} Joseph at first refused the gift and offered to give Martin a note promising to pay him back. Alva Hale agreed to sign the note, too, willing to become a cosigner on Joseph’s loan. Martin, however, insisted on giving the money as a gift. Fifty dollars was at least thirty more than Joseph needed for his move to Pennsylvania, and Harris later recalled, “I advised Joseph that he must pay all his debts before starting. I paid them for him, and furnished him money for his journey.”\textsuperscript{38} This suggests there may have been sufficient money to pay the twenty-eight-dollar debt to Lucy Harris with about twenty dollars left over to cover travel expenses to Pennsylvania, a conclusion supported by Joseph’s business records with David Hale.

Martin then advised him [Joseph] to take time enough to get ready, so that he might start a day or two in advance: for he would be mobbed if it was known when he started. We put the box of plates into a barrel about one-third full of beans and headed it up. I informed Mr. [Alva] Hale of the matter, and advised them to cut each a good cudgel and put into the wagon with them, which they did. It was understood that they were to start on Monday; but they started on Saturday night and got through safe.\textsuperscript{39}

Alva was an elected constable in Harmony Township, Pennsylvania,\textsuperscript{40} and as the small company crossed the border into Pennsylvania, protecting his family from mob violence and the plates from ruffians would fit within his sworn duties to uphold the law. It appears, however, that he served as protector not just when they arrived into the township but along the way as well. Alva may have believed Joseph when told of the ancient record. His cousin Gehiel Lewis (known as Hiel) implied this was the case, remembering years later that “the Hales seemed, for a time, to be kept in awe by Smith’s statements, but that awe did not last long.”\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{37} Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170.
\bibitem{38} Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170.
\bibitem{39} Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170.
\bibitem{40} The position of town constable was an elected position, and Alva Hale was elected and duly sworn in as constable numerous times over the years. See “Returned to the Court as Elected Township and Burough [sic] Officers for the Ensuing Year,” Harmony Township, Quarter Sessions Docket Book, Susquehanna County, vol. 3, 1824–32, “1825 Elected Officials,” pp. 36–37, “1826 Elected Officials,” pp. 70–71, “1827 Elected Officials,” pp. 100–101. Alva was replaced as constable in May 1828, while Joseph Smith and Martin Harris were translating the Book of Mormon, see “1828 Elected Officials,” p. 122.
\bibitem{41} “Prophet Smith’s Family Relations,” \textit{Salt Lake Daily Tribune}, October 17, 1879, 2.
\end{thebibliography}
Hiel remembered that shortly after Alva’s return to the Susquehanna Valley he reported “the ‘Gold Bible’ was in a barrel of beans in his wagon, and that he (Hale) slept in his wagon to guard that barrel of beans and its treasure” during the journey.42

The wagon would have had a bonnet, a linseed oil–soaked canvas covering, to keep off the rain, but if Alva slept in the small goods-laden farm wagon with cudgel clasped in hand on the cold, wet fall nights, there would not have been room for Joseph and Emma. Emma, in her first trimester of pregnancy, likely slept in a tavern with Joseph during the journey, which would have been an additional drain on the travel funds.

Martin Harris, who lived at the point of departure, recalled with some uncertainty that Joseph and Emma left Manchester on the last Saturday in October or the first Saturday in November (October 27 or November 3).43 Joseph Knight Sr., who lived along the route of travel and was likely visited as the group went south, recalled Joseph left “sometime in November.”44 And Joseph Smith, focusing on the safe end of a long journey, recalled “I arrived at the house of my wife’s father in the month of December.”45 A stagecoach could make a typical journey of 135–40 miles in about four days during summer months.46 Travel

42. “Prophet Smith’s Family Relations,” Salt Lake Daily Tribune, October 17, 1879, 2.
43. Tiffany, “Mormonism,” 170.
44. Joseph Knight Sr. recalled of Joseph that “some time in November he obtained fifty Dollars in money and hired a man to move him and his wife to Pennsylvania to hir Fathers.” Joseph Knight Sr., “Manuscript of the History of Joseph Smith,” circa 1835–47, CHL. A transcription of this account is available in Dean C. Jessee, “Joseph Knight’s Recollection of Early Mormon History,” BYU Studies 17, no. 1 (1976): 29–39. Knight appears to have focused on the period the family traveled, while Harris’s mention of October as the month they traveled focused on the time he gave Joseph the money. And Joseph’s identification of December as the month he moved to Emma’s parents’ home focused on the month they arrived there. These conflicting dates can be reconciled by understanding those reporting the incidents were focusing on different parts of the journey.
45. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 240. When Joseph Smith stated in his 1832 history, “I obtained the plaat[e]s—and the in December following we mooved to Susquehana,” he appears to have intended to give the month they arrived in Harmony rather than the month they left Manchester. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 15.
by farm wagon when Alva Hale owned only a single horse would have taken longer. Even acknowledging Martin Harris was not sure exactly which Saturday marked their departure, however, and allowing for the possibility the group left as late as the second Saturday in November, it is clear the journey took longer than it would under normal conditions.47 Rain and snow hampered travel as did the cows Joseph and Emma had with them. They had one cow over four years old and a second about two years old.48 If these cows were well managed, they were pregnant, needing to be fed regularly, and there may have been young cows traveling

47. A stagecoach made such good time because the driver changed horses every fifteen miles along the road that went past the Hale home and every ten miles through Bainbridge and further north. When Peter Ingersoll took Joseph and Emma to Harmony earlier in the year (Ingersoll, “Affidavit,” 234–37), he recalled Joseph paid to the Ithaca turnpike gatekeeper the standard fee of one bit (12½ cents) for two oxen and a cart. The Catskill Turnpike gatekeeper at Ithaca was Hezekiah Watkins. Gallagher, “Catskill Turnpike in Stage Coach and Tavern Days,” 8. Oxen pulling carts traveled at about six miles per hour. But, unlike Ingersoll, who was hired to move Joseph’s family, Alva did not own oxen. He had a farm wagon and one horse valued in the tax records at less than most horses. Alva Hale, Tax Duplicates, Harmony Township, Susquehanna County, 1828, Susquehanna County Courthouse, Montrose, Penn. A single-horse-drawn wagon was comparatively small in turnpike terms such that a driver was charged only a six-cent fee, and it would have been strenuous for the horse to pull a loaded wagon by itself for many days in succession.


48. Emma’s father, Isaac Hale, recalled she requested to retrieve her “cows,” but did not say how many she had. Isaac Hale, “Affidavit,” 264. Immediately after Joseph and Emma arrived in Harmony, they were assessed a tax on one cow. Joseph Smith Jr., Tax Duplicates, Harmony Township, Susquehanna County, 1828, Susquehanna County Courthouse. Only cows over four years old were taxed, and because Joseph was assessed for a second four-year-old cow two years later for the coming 1830 tax season, the “cows” Emma mentioned likely included at least one cow that was two or three years old. Emma may have had younger cows or calves as well that did not get assessed in the tax record because they were sold or eaten before reaching four years of age.
as well. They would be easily injured if pushed too hard as they traveled. Even cattle drovers interested only in moving beef cattle to market usually traveled ten miles a day or less to avoid damaged hooves or other health problems, and on muddy or rainy days they might travel only one mile.\(^{49}\) When Joseph and Emma arrived in Harmony, their four-year-old cow was valued at ten dollars, when other cows in the valley were taxed at nine dollars. Even allowing for animosity from the tax collector, Emma’s brother Jesse, which is evident in the record, the cows still likely arrived in good condition after the long journey.\(^{50}\)

In addition to the normal challenges of travel, Emma was also pregnant, which may have added to complications. Joseph Knight Sr. noted Emma “being onwell . . . wanted to go to her Fathers.”\(^{51}\) Emma was far enough along in her pregnancy that she knew of her condition, and her sixteen-year-old cousin Elizabeth Lewis came to help her immediately after her arrival in Harmony.\(^{52}\) During that time, women in general were seen as delicate and sensitive to strenuous travel, especially if pregnant. If a woman lived “unphysiologically,” Joseph and Emma’s contemporaries believed, which may include strenuous activities outside of the home, it could produce “weak and degenerate offspring.”\(^{53}\) If the young couple shared the beliefs of those around them, they would have been

---

\(^{49}\) Mel Bashore, personal communication, December 14, 2012, detailed memo in author’s files. Bashore, author of the Mormon Trail database and a trail historian, has done an extensive study of the rate of travel for cattle in the mid-nineteenth century. His careful analysis of the records for cattle drovers in the 1849 Silas Richards Company, an 1850 California-bound gold rush company documented in the Thomas Christy Journal, the 1852 Higbee-Bay Company, and the 1859 Haight/Kesler Train, along with anecdotal data drawn from hundreds of trail journals, suggests the average speed of travel for cattle without sustaining injuries or creating significant feet problems was 9.5 miles per day during summer months. These drovers also expected to still lose a certain percentage of their cattle because of the fast rate of travel. This study is consistent with the experience of Benjamin Hayden, who traveled 223 miles one summer from Harford, Connecticut, to New Milford, Pennsylvania, near the Hale home using an ox-team-pulled cart and did so in twenty-eight days. Blackman, *History of Susquehanna County,* 145. Because Joseph and Emma traveled during the fall rains, they would have traveled at a slower rate.

\(^{50}\) Joseph Smith Jr., Tax Duplicates, 1828.

\(^{51}\) Jessee, “Joseph Knight’s Recollection of Early Mormon History,” 34.

\(^{52}\) “Prophet Smith’s Family Relations,” *Salt Lake Daily Tribune,* October 17, 1879, 2.

particularly careful while traveling as soon as they learned of Emma’s condition.

The combination of the need to provide good care for Alva’s horse and their cattle, poor weather conditions, and Emma feeling unwell as she traveled pregnant helps explain the slow rate of travel. Thus, while Martin Harris’s recollection that the group left the last Saturday in October or first Saturday in November seems unreasonable in the context of typical summer travel rates and the group’s documented arrival in December, Martin may have accurately remembered the beginning of their trip. A lengthy trip with high expenses would help explain Joseph’s lack of money beginning January 1828.

The group likely arrived the first week of December. Joseph’s brother-in-law Jesse Hale began an assessment of property taxes in Harmony Township for the coming year beginning on Monday, December 3, 1827. While he formally submitted the assessment on January 2, 1828, it was intended to reflect the makeup of the township on the initial assessment date and suggests Joseph and Emma had arrived by December 3.54 Jesse included Joseph Smith Jr. in his records as a permanent occupant of the village and taxed him for twenty dollars’ worth of property—a ten-dollar cow (four years old) and a ten-dollar rented house. Although Jesse could have ignored Joseph and Emma’s recent arrival and given them a complete year tax free, as if to defend himself for taxing them just as they arrived, he added a note to his record that they planned to live permanently in the area. Jesse wrote underneath Joseph’s name, “come to inhabit in this township since the last assessment.”55 Joseph had likely already been in the Susquehanna Valley for about a month before the David Hale ledger included its first entry under his name on January 1, 1828.

Joseph’s Earliest Transactions

A few weeks after Joseph arrived in Pennsylvania, he made his first recorded credit purchase on January 1, 1828. This suggests Martin Harris’s fifty-dollar gift was already spent. Joseph’s first purchase was for work by David Hale, who covered Joseph’s work mittens56 with new

56. Although “mitts” or, sometimes, “mittens” were also women’s high fashion fingerless gloves, the numerous entries in the Hale daybook were for mittens for men. Rebecca Beall, Clothing Curator at Old Sturbridge Village, has identified a pair of leather work gloves dating from the 1830s, but no known
leather. While recording the purchase, David wrote “Joseph Smith” at the top of page 14 of his ledger in anticipation of future debits and at the top of page 15 in anticipation of future credits with the expectation the two would continue to do business over time.

Joseph could work in the winter cold better with the mittens as he began gathering supplies for his livestock and family, and they helped pay for themselves since the first credit to his account, entered on January 22, 1828, was the cost of the mittens for “drawing hay and wood” at 25 cents. Joseph worked for someone else “drawing” (hauling or pulling along) supplies rather than selling his own product, since those who sold their own materials were listed in David’s ledger in terms of number of cords of wood or pounds of hay sold (recorded by David as numbers of “cwt” or centum weight for each 100 pounds sold). Joseph’s employer was likely James Westfall, who purchased a pair of work mittens on the same day. Westfall was a local farmer on whose property Josiah Stowell and others had recently searched for a lost Spanish silver pair of leather work mittens from the first third of the nineteenth century has survived in America to suggest exactly how Joseph’s mittens may have looked. They were used widely, however, and account books from Palmyra, New York, confirm they were sold there as well. Entries in David Hale’s daybook suggest these mittens were initially knitted, probably with wool yarn, and then covered with leather to extend their life as they were used in harsh conditions that would wear them quickly otherwise. Rebecca Beall, personal communications with Mark Lyman Staker, October 7, 2012, and October 24, 2012.

---

**Men’s 1820s Mittens.** The first purchase Joseph Smith made after arriving in Harmony was the covering of a pair of mittens with leather. Nineteenth-century workmen commonly used leather-covered mittens so they would last longer under heavy use. No 1820s leather-covered mittens have survived. These 1820s men’s mittens were likely similar to the ones Joseph Smith wore, but these examples have no leather reinforcement. Collection of Old Sturbridge Village, used by permission. Photograph by Mark Lyman Staker.
mine. Joseph may have already established a relationship with the Westfall family or other neighbors when he worked for Stowell.57 Westfall had an economic relationship with the Hale family and hired Emma’s brother-in-law Michael Morse a week later to work for him. Westfall also rented some of his property to David Hale, including possibly the land where the work party had looked for the lost mine.58

When David Hale entered Joseph’s name on pages 14 and 15 of his ledger, he followed his typical pattern of leaving large spaces to document regular transactions over a series of years, and Joseph’s name was initially followed by a blank section underneath for future business. Then David did something unique in his ledger. He added a new name beneath Joseph’s, leaving no room for additional transactions. Immediately underneath Joseph’s entry in the credit column David wrote the name of John Gillfeather and recorded the purchase from Gillfeather of a hoe for 75 cents on May 21, 1828. He also included Gillfeather’s name in the debit column but never sold him anything. The addition of Gillfeather’s name effectively ended Joseph’s account on May 21 and left no room for him to continue trading. The Gillfeather account was later crossed out with an “x” to indicate it was settled, but it was also deleted with a series of loops drawn across the credit entry and across John Gillfeather’s name on both pages (see illustrations on pages 108–9). Beneath the Gillfeather deletions Joseph Smith’s name was included again and his accounts began again with an August 8, 1828, entry.

This unique activity in Joseph’s account cannot be explained as a need for more space in the ledger. David had numerous empty pages in his ledger, where he continued to add names for decades. It was also not an attempt to clear out the names of former customers with which he

57. Emily Blackman’s map of what she believed was Stowell employees’ digging activity shows locations that were on the farm owned by Jacob Israel Skinner when she published her book in 1873. Blackman, History of Susquehanna County, 581. This farm was owned by James Westfall when Stowell was active in the area and Joseph Smith moved to Harmony. Westfall had purchased it from Samuel and Mary Hodgdon of Philadelphia on April 21, 1823 (see Samuel Hodgdon and wife to James Westfall, Susquehanna County Deed Books, v. 23, p. 615–16, Susquehanna County Courthouse), and reaffirmed the purchase of the land through Timothy Pickering’s attorney on June 15, 1825 (see Timothy Pickering to Levi Westfall and James Westfall, Susquehanna County Deed Books, v. 5, p. 418–19). See also Israel Skinner and Wife to Joseph McKune, Susquehanna County Deed Books, v. 23, p. 616, and Levi Westfall and Wife to John Westfall, Susquehanna County Deed Books, v. 10, p. 318–19.

58. See forthcoming article by Mark Lyman Staker in Mormon Historical Studies.
no longer did business. David left the names of individuals in the ledger for decades after a single transaction. It was not a business decision that led David to put Gillfeather’s name on what had been Joseph’s account as though Joseph would no longer do business with him. The failure to leave room under Joseph’s name was clearly intentional. The addition of the Gillfeather account was a visual means of showing Joseph and David would no longer be trading together. Later, the Gillfeather account was scratched out, and on August 8–9, 1828, Joseph again began doing business with David and was added back in both the debit and credit columns when he purchased two days of work for $1.25 to help him get his hay gathered. The inclusion of the Gillfeather entry in May 1828 occurred the same month Alva Hale was replaced as a constable and Jesse Hale elected as an Overseer of the Poor. It was also the same month Joseph Smith and Martin Harris worked consistently on the translation of the Book of Mormon. While we do not know why David Hale added Gillfeather’s account on Joseph’s page, it visually indicated he would not be doing business with Joseph, and David had to later cross out and write over the Gillfeather account when he began trading with Joseph again in August. It suggests a shift in David and Joseph’s relationship during that time.

**Translation and the Ledger**

Joseph and Emma lived with Emma’s parents in the Susquehanna Valley from the time of their arrival in early December 1827 until February 1828. They agreed before moving to Pennsylvania that they would purchase a small frame home built in 1813 by Emma’s oldest brother, Jesse Hale, who had recently built a new home across the river. It is probable that at the urging of Martin Harris they had come to the valley sooner than planned, only to find David and Rhoda Jane Hale then living in the old home with their family. It took a few months for David to find a new place for his family, but Joseph did not wait for the move to begin his work. He recalled, “Immediately after my arrival there [in Pennsylvania] I commenced copying the characters of the plates. I copyed a considerable number of them and by means of the Urim and Thummin [sic] I translated some of them which I did between the time I arrived at the house of my wife’s father in the month of December and the February

following." His friend Joseph Knight Sr. recalled that during this early period Joseph did not work alone. “He now Began to be anxious to git them Translated he therefore with his wife Drew of the Caricters exactly like the ancient.” Knight noted Joseph was already strapped financially on his arrival. “Now when he Began to translate he was poor and was put to it for provisions and had no one to write for him But his wife and his wifes Brother [Reuben] would sometimes write a little for him through the winter. . . . The next Spring Came Martin Harris Down to pennsylvany to write for him.” Since Joseph mentioned he “translated some” during the period, this was likely concurrent with the “little” that Joseph Knight remembered Emma and her brother wrote as scribes.

Joseph recalled that Martin Harris arrived sometime in February, about the time he had moved into his own home, when Martin took a copy of the curious characters to show various scholars. After returning from his trip, Martin arranged his affairs in Palmyra, New York, and came to the Susquehanna Valley about April 12, when he began to assist Joseph in his translation efforts. The David Hale ledger includes a few business transactions

60. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 238, 240, deletions in the text silently omitted. This is the longest account Joseph gives of his experience copying the characters. In a subsequent, third draft of the account, he provides a shorter version but retains the sequence of arriving in Pennsylvania, copying the characters, translating some of them, and Martin Harris arriving “sometime in the month Feb.” (241). Joseph’s earlier chronology of events emphasizes copying and translating some characters after Martin Harris arrived. In 1832, he wrote, “[Martin] imediately came to Susquehannah and said the Lord had shown him that he must go to new Y ork City <with> some of the characters so we proceeded to coppy some of them and he took his Journy to the Eastern Cittys and to the Learned.” Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 15. But this does not preclude the possibility that he also copied and translated characters before Harris arrived as he stated in his later accounts, or that he had done all of the copying work before Harris arrived, and he clarified this in more carefully produced later accounts. In his earliest account, Joseph emphasized Martin Harris’s role; in his later accounts he expanded the narrative to include further details of the experience.


62. Jessee, “Joseph Knight’s Recollection of Early Mormon History,” 35. Joseph Knight initially begins to tell about Oliver Cowdery’s arrival in Harmony, throwing off the chronology. He appears to be getting ahead of himself and returns to Martin Harris’s arrival in the next sentence and then continues to narrate events as he recalled them occurring, returning to Oliver Cowdery later in his narrative.


64. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 245.
with Joseph during the initial period when he “translated some”; but when
David Hale included the Gillfeather entries in May, it effectively marked
what David believed would be the end of their business together.

Martin continued to work as Joseph’s scribe from about April 12 until
June 14. He wanted to show the manuscript to a few select individuals
and asked Joseph if he could. Joseph initially denied the request, but
Martin persisted until Joseph prayed on the subject. According to David
Whitmer, “Harris wanted to take the manuscript home with him to
show to his family and friends [first request]. To this Joseph demurred
[first denial], but finally asked the Lord if Harris might be allowed to
take it [second request]. The answer was ‘no.’ [Second denial.] Harris
teased Joseph for a long time and finally persuaded him to ask the Lord
a second time [third request], pledging himself to be responsible for its
safe keeping. To this second inquiry the Lord told Joseph that Harris
might take the manuscript, which he did.”

After asking the Lord a second time, Joseph let Martin take a sig-
nificant portion of the manuscript to show to a few select individuals.

An epidemic raged through the narrow Susquehanna Valley at the time,
and a number of local residents died, including Nancy Hale, the three-
year-old daughter of Jesse and Mary (Polly) McKune Hale, who died
in January. Joseph and Emma’s child died on June 15. Emma was also
ill and Joseph attended her for a brief period until her mother could

65. David Whitmer Interview, “Mormonism,” originally published in the
Kansas City Journal, June 1, 1881, reprinted in Lyndon W. Cook, ed., David Whit-

66. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 15 n. 59, suggest the number of
lost pages “may be a retrospective approximation” based on the fact the book of
Mosiah in the printer’s manuscript of the Book of Mormon begins on page 117.
Although Oliver Cowdery later sewed his pages into gatherings that had spe-
cific numbers of sheets that were easy to count, we do not know if Martin Har-
riss did the same. It seems unlikely that the lost material would have included
exactly the same number of pages as the material that replaced it.

in the Latter Days, Volume One, 1775–1820, ed. Richard E. Turley Jr. and Brit-

68. Lucy’s dating of these events is off by almost a month in her account.
She notes that Martin Harris left with the manuscript “in july” (Anderson,
Lucy’s Book, 411), then she suggests Emma delivered her child “Shortly after
Mr. Harris left” (Anderson, Lucy’s Book, 412). She then suggests Joseph cared
for Emma for two weeks after the delivery. “Mr. Harris had been absent nearly
three weeks” when he began to worry about the loaned manuscript. Then, “in a
continue her care; then he traveled to his parents’ home to check on
the manuscript, which he learned had been lost. Joseph’s mother, Lucy,
later recalled that Joseph understood as he traveled north to check on
Martin Harris that if Martin were to lose the manuscript pages it could
well mean Joseph would lose the privilege of possessing the plates. He
pondered, according to his mother, what would happen if Martin lost
the manuscript and “the consequence which must ensue was inevitable
that which was he would not be permitted to retain the plates.”69 Joseph
learned that indeed the manuscript had been lost. He stayed with his
father’s family for “a short season,” after which he returned to his own
home in Pennsylvania.70 Joseph’s journey to and from the Manchester/
Palmyra area would have taken several days if not as many as eight days
of travel time. The length of travel time and Joseph’s brief stay at his par-
ents’ home in Manchester would place Joseph back in the Susquehanna
Valley sometime in late July or early August. David Hale’s ledger places
him back in the valley at least by August 8, but his receipt of a revela-
tion (D&C 3) before then places his arrival at sometime in the last days
of July.71

According to his mother, Joseph told her that after he returned home
the angel visited him and because he had “delivered the manuscript into
the hands of a wicked man . . . he would of necessity suffer the conse-
quence’s of his indiscretion that he must now give back the plates into
the hands of the angel from [whom] he had received them but said he it
may be if you are sufficiently humble and penitent that you will receive
them again on the 22 september—”72 It was “soon after” his arrival home,
his mother recalled, and probably during the same meeting with the
angel that the Lord chastised Joseph Smith in a July 1828 revelation for
allowing Martin Harris to lose part of the Book of Mormon manuscript.
In the revelation, Joseph was also instructed “he will only cause thee to

70. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 246.
71. Michael Hubbard MacKay and others, eds., Documents, Volume 1: July
Dean C. Jessee, Ronald K. Esplin, and Richard Lyman Bushman (Salt Lake City:
be afflicted for a season.”73 When Lucy’s history was originally edited for publication, her mention of Joseph losing the plates was edited out of the manuscript, leading some to believe she was incorrect on that point and that Joseph lost only the interpreters used to translate the plates. He was clear in his own accounts, however, that he lost both items.

“Immediately after my return home [to Harmony],” Joseph recalled, “I was walking out a little distance, when Behold the former heavenly messenger [Moroni] appeared and handed to me the Urim and Thummim again (for it had been taken from me in consequence of my having wearied the Lord in asking for the privilege of letting Martin Harris take the writings which he lost by transgression) and I enquired of the Lord through them.”74 Joseph later recalled because of his letting Martin Harris take the manuscript “the Plates was taken from me by the power of God and I was not able to obtain them for a season.”75 According to his mother, he was then told, “If you are very humble and penitent, it may be you will receive them again; if so, it will be on the twenty-second of next September.”76

These descriptions of an interruption in the translation process during the summer of 1828 were given many years after the events they recounted, and Joseph did not specifically define a date for resumption of translation in his own account, simply suggesting he did not “go immediately to translating” after his return to Pennsylvania, but he

73. Robin Scott Jensen, Robert J. Woodford, and Steven C. Harper, eds., *Manuscript Revelation Books*, facsimile edition, first volume of the Revelations and Translations series of *The Joseph Smith Papers*, ed. Dean C. Jessee, Ronald K. Esplin, and Richard Lyman Bushman (Salt Lake City: Church Historian’s Press, 2009), 9; MacKay and others, *Documents, Volume 1*, 6. While preparing this revelation for publication, after Joseph had shown he was able to continue faithful and complete the translation of the Book of Mormon, Sidney Rigdon edited the first phrase to read: “because of transgression if thou art not aware thou wilt fall.”

74. Davidson and others, *Histories, Volume 1*, 246.

75. Davidson and others, *Histories, Volume 1*, 16.

76. Anderson, *Lucy’s Book*, 424–25. Joseph’s mother suggested in her recollection of the experiences her son related to her that Moroni appeared only once and then took the Urim and Thummim until September. Joseph suggested in his own account that it was returned briefly to him a second time when he received parts of Doctrine and Covenants 10. Since later sources suggest Doctrine and Covenants 10 was received in April 1829, however, the timing and nature of a second visit by Moroni are unclear. See Davidson and others, *Histories, Volume 1*, 252–66. The entries in David Hale’s daybook, however, strongly suggest Joseph was aware by early August that he would begin translation again by the end of September.
“went to laboring with my hands upon a small farm which I had purchased of my wife’s father, in order to provide for my family.”

Nevertheless, David Hale’s ledger indirectly confirms Lucy’s chronology of events and suggests that decades later she was correctly describing the translation schedule as it occurred at the time.

The ledger records that on August 12, a few weeks after Joseph received the revelation now published as D&C 3, he bought a broad shovel, a pocketbook, and a pocketknife. In 1828, pocketbooks were typically used to hold deeds or other legal papers but were occasionally also used to hold other documents. Pocketknives were frequently used to cut pen tips on quills or scratch out inked mistakes on paper. When considered together with Joseph’s other transactions, his pocketbook and pocketknife suggest he possibly planned to do some writing. A broad shovel was a general flat nosed shovel useful in many farm tasks, from cleaning out stalls of manure to winnowing grain before storing it. It was not the ideal shovel for digging into the ground since a spade (with a pointed nose) worked much better for that purpose. Because Joseph began to dig a well shortly after purchasing the shovel, however, he may have purchased the broad

---

77. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 266.
shovel to serve a dual purpose of moving dug earth and farm labor.

Joseph may have begun digging a well by himself shortly after purchasing the shovel, but this was a task that, once it reached a depth of around four feet, required an additional laborer to help. Wells at the time were constructed by first digging a few feet before beginning to lay down stone lining the walls. The stone was then slowly lowered into the well on a circular shaped wood support with a hole in the center to allow digging (something like a large wooden doughnut). One man dug underneath the support so that it slowly descended into the well, while another man stacked the stone and held it into place as it descended so the walls of the well were lined as they worked. While there was still a measure of risk in digging a well in this fashion—especially if the stone was not skillfully placed, the alternative, to dig the entire well and begin lining it with stone from the bottom up, would consistently create problems as large amounts of dirt could fall at any point along the well shaft down onto the digger and any change in weather would virtually guarantee an injury or worse.

The water table would be at its lowest by the end of August, which would assure when Joseph found water it would be accessible during most of the year. Joseph hired someone to assist him from September 8 to 13; they took a break on Sunday, September 14, then worked again from September 15 to 17. Since the ledger indicates Joseph hired someone to dig for the first five days and only work in a well for the remaining three days, it appears that someone else did the initial digging while Joseph started laying the initial courses of stone, which required more skill to build a stable foundation, and then he did the deeper digging while someone else continued to lay the stone, since the last portion of the digging required more skill to keep the wall stable as it descended.

The well was expensive but would have lessened Emma Smith’s work-load significantly. While there was a spring at the bottom of a steep slope

The 1820s Pocketknife. This pocketknife is likely similar to the one Joseph Smith purchased from David Hale. Commonly known as “pen knives” at the time, they played a pivotal role in writing. They were used to trim fletching and cut nibs for quill pens, and they could scratch out mistakes on a page. This pen had measurements along the handle that could be used to rule paper so the lines ran straight across the page. Collection of Old Sturbridge Village, used by permission. Photograph by Mark Lyman Staker.
about a hundred yards behind the home, it would have been difficult to carry much water up the incline during each trip back to the house. Even simple tasks such as preparing cows for milking, cleaning up from fieldwork, or cooking meals would have required water. Major tasks such as doing laundry or making cheese would need a lot of water and require numerous trips up and down the hill to the spring. The well would have freed up more time for Emma to assist as a scribe. It appears Joseph expected her to fill this role again after Martin Harris lost the manuscript. The day after Joseph finished the well, he slaughtered farm animals to provide meat for the winter and sold 15½ pounds of pork to David Hale on September 18 for 81 cents. David initially wrote 75 cents cash but crossed it out and wrote 81 cents. Had Joseph been paid in cash, there would not have been a need to record the transaction, and so it is likely that David had offered Joseph the cash price for his meat and Joseph insisted on the slightly higher barter price. David credited Joseph’s account rather than paying him.

Joseph slaughtered his animals almost two months before his neighbors did theirs. Isaac Post, who lived in the nearby county seat at Montrose, noted in his journal spending most of November that year slaughtering cattle, pigs, and other animals and smoking their meat for winter use. Joseph’s childhood experience in Vermont would have been similar to that of a contemporary Vermonter, Hosea Beckley, who wrote of his neighbors how, “as winter closes in upon them, as is the case generally in December, they kill their pork and beef for the year.”78 The cold weather aided in helping preserve the meat as it properly cured, and the late date extended the opportunity to fatten the animals before slaughter.

Despite Joseph’s September preparations for winter, which brought in some income, his purchase of a few supplies and his digging of a well to make Emma’s workload noticeably lighter put him in significant debt for the first time since his arrival in the Susquehanna Valley. He would continue to work off those debts into the next spring. Thus, although Joseph noted, “it came to pass after much humility and affliction of Soul I obtained them [the plates] again,”79 he and Emma were likely not able to make much progress in the translation efforts. Joseph Knight Sr. recalled, “Now he Could not translate But little Being poor and nobody

79. Davidson and others, Histories, Volume 1, 16.
to write for him. But his wife and she could not do much and take care of her house and he being poor and no means to live but work.”

The ledger confirms Knight’s memory as Joseph continued to work to support his family. Joseph was now in debt after he bought some materials in August and hired a laborer in September. Over the next few months he labored on numerous occasions working toward paying off his debts. On October 18, 1828, Joseph threshed buckwheat for a neighbor for half a day. He would also have harvested and processed his own buckwheat that month and likely spent the time preparing for winter. On October 24, he used his oxen to plow one of his neighbor’s fields for a day, and on November 5, he spent two days husking corn for a neighbor, both tasks he would also have needed to do for himself.

Since Joseph had spent a good portion of the planting season during the spring of 1828 translating the Book of Mormon with Martin Harris, he may not have had sufficient crops of his own to harvest that fall in preparation for winter. As the river froze, limiting fishing as a source of food, and winter made hunting harder and less productive, Joseph may have anticipated a difficult winter ahead. Joseph Knight recalled that Joseph and Emma “came up to see me the first of the winter 1828” seeking some help. Knight recalled his own “wife [who did not believe Joseph Smith was a prophet at the time] and family [were] all against me about helping him” and Knight “Did not know what it mite amount to” if he were to make such a commitment, and so he offered very little to the young couple. He gave “some little provisions and some few things out of the Store a pair of shoes and three Dollars in money to help him a little.”

If Joseph and Emma needed supplies at the beginning of winter, their circumstances as the cold months progressed must have been desperate. The David Hale ledger indicates Joseph earned three dollars working for another person from December 1 to 4. The ledger also records a neighbor, Andrew Day, hired someone to work for him from December 1 to 4 for three dollars and one bit ($3.12½). Because the dates are identical matches, Day may have hired Joseph Smith on those days. In a credit transaction, the extra bit would have been David’s fee for putting it on his books. If Andrew Day hired him, Joseph chopped eight cords of wood and dressed two deer skins during the four days. Since Joseph was paid 75 cents a day, whatever work he did during December earned thirty percent more than an average day’s labor and required some skill or extra exertion.

---

Although the work Joseph did would have been sufficient to purchase enough of a staple such as beans or potatoes to last for a couple of months, the work listed in the ledger did not bring in additional supplies for the winter and no money apparently changed hands since it covered most of Joseph’s debts still on the books. Joseph was also likely doing work for others not recorded in the ledger, however, and doing the December jobs may have allowed him to feel comfortable in spending a little additional money: he hired someone on December 4 to help him fix his own well, paying him 50 cents—the going rate for an unskilled laborer. On the same day Joseph bought a comb from George H. Noble & Company in Lanesville, using David Hale to carry the transaction in his ledger.

Joseph worked for a half day on January 3 chopping wood and doing other tasks for 25 cents, which would cover the cost of the comb but not completely eradicate all of his debt. The wood chopping was likely that of cutting down trees. While the ground was frozen and the lumber could be easily moved over ice to the river, many local boatmen prepared to take lumber downriver with the spring floods. The Knight family did the same thing. Joseph Knight Sr. recalled, “In January [1829] his [Joseph’s] father and Samuel [his brother] Came from Manchester to my house when I was Buisse a Drawing Lumber[,] I told him they had traveled far enough I would go with my sley and take them Down [to...
Joseph’s house] to morrow[.] I went Down and found them well and the[y] were glad to see us . . . in the morning I gave the old man a half a Dollar and Joseph a little money to Buoy paper to translate I having But little with me."82

It is not clear when Joseph Sr. returned to New York, but he was back home in Manchester before preparations for spring planting time in mid-March began, and he likely had left by the end of February. Samuel Harrison Smith stayed at Joseph’s through spring planting and helped Joseph get the work done on the property so Joseph could focus on translating the record. Emma and Samuel Harrison Smith, who went by “Harrison” in his youth (including in the David Hale ledger, page 15), both assisted Joseph as scribes. The ledger confirms that Harrison Smith stayed in Harmony and helped Joseph finally get out of debt to his brother-in-law. On March 20, Joseph spent half a day chopping trees for 25 cents while his brother worked for a day and a half for 81 cents. They must have also worked for someone else, since Joseph was able to pay off the last one dollar of debt in cash and settled his account.

The settlement of Joseph’s debts with David marked the end of their business relationship. Oliver Cowdery arrived a few weeks later, just in time to help make the first payment on Joseph and Emma’s farm on April 7, 1829.83 But Joseph and David never did business after Oliver’s arrival.

Editing Conventions

While David Hale continued to use his ledger for many years after he stopped doing business with Joseph, due to space considerations we have published only the pages dealing with Joseph Smith. We did not include text from the ledger that was added after 1829, but a brief description of that information is provided in brackets [ ]. Because placement of dates, places, numbers, and names carry significance in bookkeeping, this transcription standardizes the formatting of the ledger book. Hale occasionally finished some entries above the line due to space limitations. These have silently been brought inline, except in cases when the limitations of space in this publication prevent such standardization. When Hale wrote over a base text, braces with a slash have been employed (that is, “{original text\revised text}”). As discussed in the introduction,

83. See forthcoming articles in Mormon Historical Studies.
The David Hale Ledger is housed at L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University. The full document is available for viewing online at http://cdm15999.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/SCMisc/id/75248. The Harmony, Pennsylvania, entries in the ledger date from 1827 to 1839, with notations carrying over business as early as 1824 and, after a move to Amboy, Illinois, continuing to 1869. The ledger contains 190 pages. Robin Scott Jensen has transcribed the ledger pages from the first pages of the ledger to page 27, which records transactions in December 1829. This transcription is found in a long version of this article, available at https://byustudies.byu.edu/showTitle.aspx?title=9407. The library staff will continue the transcription as time allows and will post the transcription on the library website.

The long version contains Robin Scott Jensen’s transcription of the ledger’s first twenty-seven pages along with extensive footnotes provided by Mark Lyman Staker on the items bartered and what they reveal about everyday life in the 1820s in early Pennsylvania. People traded carded wool, plow chains, barrels, foodstuffs, clothing, animals, and more for labor in chopping, plowing, and manufacturing work.

The long version also includes:

- More history of the Hale family.
- Discussion of the limited supply of money in the economy of the 1820s and how the store exchanges (a barter system) worked.
- The provenance of the store ledger.
- Description of travel conditions likely experienced by Joseph and Emma as they traveled with Alva Hale from Palmyra to Harmony.
many of the entries were later canceled by Hale with a large X through the entire entry. These have not been represented typographically but in explanations in footnotes. When single lines have been canceled by a smaller X, these have been indicated with the use of angle brackets < >, which brackets also mean additions or insertions of text at a later time. When Hale used lines of any length to fill out the end of a line, these have been standardized to a single em dash (—). Hale at times supplied a horizontal rule to separate entries or lines within entries. These lines have been ignored, though blank lines have been silently added to separate all entries. Brackets [ ] are used to enclose clarifying information not part of the original text. Spelling has been kept as it appears in the original. Footnotes provide additional information about items and individuals readers may find unfamiliar. An illegible character is represented by ◊. The daybook is held at the L. Tom Perry Special Collections at Brigham Young University, and interested readers should consult the original for detailed analysis of this book.

Mark Lyman Staker is Lead Curator of Church Historic Sites at the Church History Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He earned his PhD at the University of Florida. He has received both the Mormon History Association and John Whitmer Historical Association’s Best Book awards for *Hearken O Ye People* (Kofford Books, 2009). He received the Mormon History Association’s J. Talmage Jones Award of Excellence for an Outstanding Article for “Thou Art the Man: Newel K. Whitney in Ohio,” *BYU Studies* 42, no. 2 (2003): 74–138.

Robin Scott Jensen is Associate Managing Historian and Project Archivist for the Joseph Smith Papers Project and coedited the first two volumes in the Revelations and Translations series (published 2009 and 2011, respectively). He specializes in document and transcription analysis. In 2005, he earned an MA degree in American history from Brigham Young University, and in 2009 he earned a second MA in library and information science with an archival concentration from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. He is now pursuing a PhD in history at the University of Utah. He completed training at the Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents in 2007. He has published several articles and edited documents, including “A Witness in England: Martin Harris and the Strangite Mission,” *BYU Studies* 44, no. 3 (2005): 78–98.
David Hale Ledger, page 14. Note Joseph Smith’s account is crossed out as settled, but Nathaniel C. Lewis’s account was never settled. Image courtesy L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU, Provo, Utah. Image available online at http://cdm15999.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/SCMisc/id/75248
David Hale Ledger, page 15. Note the flurry of activity in Joseph’s account during September 1828 and the work by Harrison (Samuel Harrison Smith) to help pay off Joseph's debts. Image courtesy L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, BYU, Provo, Utah.
### David Hale Store Ledger, pages 14–15

(14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1st</td>
<td>Joseph Smith</td>
<td>to covering a pair of mittens with leather</td>
<td>$25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Gillfeather</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8</td>
<td>Joseph Smith</td>
<td>to two Days work in haying</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>to one broad Shovel one Dollar—</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>to one pocket Book 5/6—</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to one pocket Knife 5/6—</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>to five Days Diging in a well</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>to three Days work in a well—</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>to one hair comb of G. Nobles² 2/-</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to one Day fixing well &amp;c—</td>
<td>$5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 31st</td>
<td>Nathaniel C Lewis</td>
<td>to Balance on old Book 44 cents</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>James Westfall</td>
<td>&lt;to Balance on my old Book</td>
<td>$3.361/2&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>to leather to face a pair of mittens</td>
<td>$0.12 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>to carrying wool to machine and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back again — 2/6</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
<td>to carrying paying for carding of wool 8 Lb</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Entry canceled at a later date.
2. George H. Noble owned a store in Lanesville. It appears Joseph Smith purchased the comb from Noble but arranged his debt in such a way that it would be paid through David Hale, who owed Joseph money.
3. Entry canceled at a later date.
Oct 1
   2
   3 to three Days and a half Diging
      in a well 6/ per day—  2  62 ½
   4 to Drawing two load of wood —
      May the 7 AD 1830 <passed receipts to D. Hale>  25
      <6 94 ½>

1830 James Westfall D$ 
May 22  
24th to Oxen and plow two Days —  1  00
   to seed potatoes & planting & —  0  50
   to paying road tax two Dollars —  2  00
Nov 24 to foddering Cattle &c —  25
Dec 1st

[Additional accounts dated 1833]

[Additional accounts of Collings Dulling, dated 1845]

[end of p. 14]

1828 Joseph Smith C£ 
Jan 22nd by Drawing hay and wood —  25

1828 John Gillfeather C£: $  [[c]ts
May 31st By one hoe seventy five cents  75

1828 Joseph Smith C£ $ Cs
Sept 18th By fifteen pound and a half of pork 75
   By cash seventy five cents  81
Oct 18th By half a Day threshing Buckwheat  37 ½
   24th By oxen one Day plowing &c—  50
Nov 15) By two Days and a half husking corn  1  87-

4. Entry canceled at a later date.
5. Entry canceled at a later date.
6. Entry canceled at a later date.
7. Entry canceled at a later date.
1829
Jan 3 By half a Days work- chopping &c— 25

March 20th By one Day choping — 50
By Harrison one Day & a half 81
By cash one Dollar 1 00

1828
James Westfall

Ja 29th By one dollar and twenty five cents $ C 125
to Michael Morse 1 25

March By making a pair of shoes for
Anna Hale— 9 50

6th By Sideing and Boards cullings 75

June
17th By two Bushel of patatoes 3/ per B 75

August 11th
By pastureing Cows three months 3 19

1829
Ja 6th By one Day Butchering fifty cents 50

6 {◊5\84} 10

<Passed receipts May the 7 AD 1830>

1830
June
15th By one Day makeing fence — 0 50
By Damage Done by my hogs &c — 3 00

[Additional accounts of James Westfall, dated 1832]
[Additional accounts of Collings Dulling, dated 1845]
[end of p. 15]

8. Entry canceled at a later date.
9. It is not clear who this is. The Hale family did not always use given names to refer to family members. Since David’s wife, Rhoda Skinner Hale, had the same name as her mother, this may refer to her.
10. Entry canceled to this point at a later date.
11. Remainder of entry canceled at a later date.
Hunting

Elizabeth Knight

I married a hunter.

Doing so has forced me to consider the consequences and complications of that word, that world, which would have otherwise remained distorted in simple black-and-white terms. Lad is a hunter, not a killer, a distinction important to him in the face of the gun-crazed, shoot-anything, “D’ja gitcha a buck?” culture that surrounds the sport. He is a scientist, a wildlife biologist who spends his summers tracking mule deer fawns, monitoring their survival rates and writing scientific articles about his findings. He devotes his autumns to watching adult male deer and elk, finding “the one” for that year, spending weeks hiking into remote locations and observing its behaviors and patterns, before the season opens and he finally hunts and sometimes kills it. It’s tempting as I write this to draw some parallel between his approach to hunting and the development of our relationship, which involved a six-year observation period as good friends, then, with a single conversation, an abrupt transition to dating, and, very shortly after, engagement and marriage. Though I’m hardly a trophy wife in any sense of the word.

When we married, people said to us, “You two have so much in common!” and “You are so perfect for each other!” which was surprising to me. They were speaking of the time we spend outside, but I am an outdoor enthusiast for the sake of being in nature, and he is a wildlife enthusiast, an interest that often takes him into nature. We spend most of our leisure time outside, but we argue over whether it’s going to be spent ice fishing or cross-country skiing, running rivers or looking for elk. While the end result of being outside is the same, we are worlds...
apart in our motivation, and I often wonder if life might be easier if we each simply lived our respective lifestyles and had dinner together in the evenings.

But there are things that transcend this cultural divide. He is one of the kindest and most intelligent people I’ve ever met. He plants his grandparents’ garden every year and takes my young nieces fishing and lets them reel in every fish he catches. He drives a purple truck with lightning bolts painted on the hood (such a great price and so dependable!), and his complete lack of conceit prevents him from understanding why I’m a little embarrassed by its gaudiness. We laugh together often—hysterical, snorting, hooting laughter—and when he says to me “You’re a huge dork,” I know he means he loves me.

Once, during our friendship, I went elk hunting with him in the Uinta Mountains. We left his family’s cabin in the dark of 3 a.m. and didn’t return until that evening, after seventeen miles of intense elevation changes, hellacious wind, and bitter cold. We stopped several times throughout the day for Lad to “glass,” part of the lingo I had yet to learn, across whichever basin we sat atop. At our first stop, he lit a fire and I tried to dry out the wet socks that had numbed my feet. Our next stop a few hours later revealed that the matches Lad was carrying had gotten wet. We tried our best to dry them out, and I could do nothing but stare blankly as Lad tried one by one to light each match and each failed. He paused before the fifth and final match, and he might have prayed. The fire was entirely for my benefit; he was better prepared both mentally and physically for the day and so accustomed to believing we had so much in common that he assumed I would know to bring more layers and my own matches or lighter. When that final match broke in half, he shrugged, handed me his extra fleece jacket, and went back to his spotting scope. I had been cold and miserable in the outdoors many times before, but always for the sake of something I loved or had a stake in. Here I was neither passionate nor a leader, and that void, that acceptance of his jacket, that sense of being superfluous, left me colder than I’d ever been.

As a child, I’d had friends whose fathers and brothers hunted, and I would sit uncomfortably in their living rooms beneath the glassy-eyed stuffed heads of large mammals, trying not to think about the process that morphed a life into such a garish display. When Lad had asked me to come with him on that first hunting trip, I’d said yes, envisioning
simply a nice hike, and only later considered the idea that he might actually kill an animal. We didn’t see any elk that day, or at least not any old enough for Lad to feel okay about shooting, and I was relieved. I hated that relief as I sat nestled in my down coat at our next stop, wearing leather hiking boots, eating the jerky that Lad had brought for us. Relief felt like hypocrisy while I continued to benefit from the bodies of countless animals. For me, there was no justification if I wasn’t willing to do the dirty work of killing an animal. And I wasn’t ready for that.

Lad is the oldest son of Terry, a tense worrier, and Dennis, an easygoing hunter. Or perhaps he was a killer. And maybe he wasn’t as easygoing as he’s remembered. I’m trying to piece together the strands of information available about the man who developed a brain tumor when Lad was eight years old and died only a few months later, and all memories of the dead tend to be romanticized a little. Lad spent the rest of his childhood and much of his adolescence quietly angry, learning to do on his own all the things his father would have taught him and leaving the room when Terry tried to start conversations about Dennis. She is stalwart in her refusal to acknowledge the nickname Dennis’s family has given her son and only ever calls him by his given name, Eric. Eric Dennis.

When Dennis died, his family closed ranks around the widow and her three young children. Lad’s love for wildlife and the outdoors was nurtured by two of his father’s siblings who, single and childless, had time to devote to a young nephew. When his aunt Patti married another Eric, Lad received his nickname, “the young lad,” to distinguish between the two Erics. Big Eric sat in the front of the temple sealing room with my father as a witness during our wedding ceremony, fulfilling all the terrestrial responsibilities that a father would have, and—at Lad’s request—leaving an empty chair on the front row, in case the spirit of Dennis stopped by.

I seldom think about Dennis and wonder if I should feel ashamed of that. The family rarely talks about him, save for the occasional caustic joke on Father’s Day or in reference to some cancer awareness event. I know his death still weighs heavily on Lad’s mind, yet I seldom pause to consider that their family once had a father. My sister’s father-in-law passed away recently, and after visiting her family and seeing the sadness in her husband’s eyes, without thinking I commented to Lad that it must be horrible to see your father die. He smirked and responded, “No kidding!”
I went elk hunting again with Lad near the family cabin the autumn after we got married, this time accompanied by his uncle Eric. We started out much later, at 6 a.m., which may have been in kindness to me, and I knew better what to expect and packed accordingly. But even my best efforts, my pastel green rain jacket and swishing black pants, felt like an intrusion alongside the camouflage that made Lad and Eric silent and invisible.

We had been hiking for just over an hour when we came to a thick stand of trees. Eric went around one side, Lad around the other, and I docilely followed him. Then, in a wave so strong that it should have been seen or heard, the gamey smell of elk surrounded us and Lad was walking faster and for a second, even though I don’t like elk meat and didn’t want to see death, my heart leapt and I felt the thrill of the hunt. This smell meant almost sure success, and success meant a kill.

One shot. “Was that—” Eric, I was about to say, but didn’t finish.


Lad started running toward Eric and the dying animal. I stood still. I walked a few steps. Stopped again. Turned around and walked away. Turned around again. Stood still. Maybe they would finish whatever they were going to do before I had to go see it. Of course they wouldn’t. But maybe the elk would stop making those noises before I got there. Maybe it would stop thrashing.

When I finally joined them a minute later, Eric was grinning, in the midst of narrating the sequence of events. Of the three shots he had fired, one had delivered a mild wound to the gut, one had missed, and the third—we saw later—had obliterated the animal’s heart.

“Finally!” he said. This was the first elk that Eric had killed in the ten years that the two of them had hunted in this area, and he was more inclined than Lad to evaluate the success of a hunting trip based on the amount of meat brought home. Lad had always claimed to be just as happy in the mountains with a spotting scope as with a gun, and though I suspected that he was exaggerating, I loved that he believed it of himself.

Eric had fired uphill at the bull elk as it stood atop a ridge, silhouetted against the lightening sky. After the final shot, the animal had thrashed down fifty feet of steep hill and died where it lay. Together we hiked the last hundred feet uphill toward it. Its eyes were open, glowering, and already revealing the glassy look that, had it sported a larger
Hunting, they would display for years to come on someone's wall. Its skin was twitching.

My cousin and close friend Laurie was killed in an accident on a river trip four years before this second hunting trip, and I've wondered ever since if the accident could have been prevented if I'd been there. I wasn't; I was out of the country and wrote about it in my journal the day after my mom called to tell me. I danced around the issue for several paragraphs but finally wrote the words “Laurie is dead,” then wrote them over and over as if the page needed convincing, as if putting those words to paper would end the otherworldly uncertainty I felt from being several thousand miles away.

Laurie was dead, but not fully so until I returned home two months later and saw the river equipment that had been damaged in the accident, until I saw her sisters wearing her clothes, until I lay awake all night underneath one of her quilts, until I saw her death date engraved on her headstone. Lad and I were merely friends at that time, but during one long drive in his purple truck through the Uinta Mountains I found that I could tell him everything I'd been holding in. He listened, with none of the religious platitudes I'd been hearing and none of the distracting sarcasm that surrounded his own father's death. Our friendship started to change after that.

The elk's tongue was hanging limply out of its mouth, looking unnaturally long. How strange to see a completely limp tongue. I relaxed my mouth, focusing on each of the muscles I was aware of, trying unsuccessfully to allow my tongue to go completely limp. I'd seen what I assumed were embellished artistic depictions of dead animals with long, limp tongues, and I realized now that they had hardly been exaggerated.

I remember playing some game with imaginary guns as a child. Whenever anyone got shot, there was always a dramatic death scene, full of spasms, groanings, and clutches, and inevitably ending with the victim splayed out on her or his back, tongue lolling out in complete defeat. The limp tongue was always a symbol of death.

The elk's blood covered the few inches of snow on the hillside, pooling into a dramatic red slush underneath the animal and diffusing outward into a pinkish spray. I was hesitant to step directly in the blood. Even stepping over the body felt disrespectful.
I found a dead body on a river once. I was nineteen years old and in my first summer guiding commercial river trips on the Colorado River. I came upon it with two other guides and our group of passengers on the second day of an overnight trip. It was halted by a group of rocks in the swift water that rushed along the right bank, an island in between it and the boat ramp. Its limbs were gray and bloated and covered with swarming flies, which we could hear buzzing from where we pulled over on shore twenty feet downstream, discussing what to do next. As we stood deliberating, the current moved one of its legs, bobbing it up and down in the kicking motion I saw every day from people swimming in the river. And each time that happened, I caught myself inhaling the breath that would have voiced the words, “Wait, maybe he’s not dead.”

Later, after we’d crossed the river to the boat ramp and after the sheriff, the search and rescue team, the National Parks Service, and the EMS team had arrived, I asked my passengers in my chirpy guide voice if they were ready to get back on the river, only to receive glares and stares of incredulity. They couldn’t think of it, under the circumstances, and seemed appalled that I would suggest it. I suspected that several of them were simply trying to ante up the drama of the situation, based on earlier interaction with them, but realized the impropriety of openly judging anyone’s response to death. I was left to call in to our company office and request several vans to come pick us up four hours early, and to wonder about the state of my insensitive soul.

The man’s death was a suicide, I found out later. He had driven from his home in Grand Junction, Colorado, to Moab, to stand on the bank of the Colorado River and shoot himself in the head. We found him several days afterward, obviously, and five miles downstream from his car, which had offered no note and no identification other than the registration. I could never generate much sadness for him, even after learning how he’d died. Perhaps the news came too late. Having never known the man or witnessed whatever it was that drove him to take his own life, or even seen him as human, I had approached his already decaying body with the same benign and impartial curiosity with which I would approach an unusual rock or tree. And, indeed, he might have been a rock on the opposite bank, given the casual and desensitized nature of conversation among the emergency response teams who retrieved his body.

And yet this elk felt so sacred. I knew that Lad felt the weight of the animal’s life and would express gratitude when we prayed together
that night. I felt a strange and uncharacteristic desire to pause and pray openly over the elk’s body. But along with that, I also wanted desperately to justify my presence there by being helpful, to show myself and Lad and Eric and their extended family back at the cabin that I could subsist in this world, that Lad and I were—in fact—equally yoked if not perfectly matched in lifestyle and interests.

The same motivation that forces me to look straight at my vein when I’m having blood taken forced me to watch as Lad sawed the testicles off the elk. On the drive out of the Uinta National Forest, hunters with bull elk tags are required to show either the antlers or the testicles to prove that their kill had in fact been male. Those inclined to not follow these regulations could easily remove either of these items from someone else’s unattended bull elk and show them to an official, knowing that the meat, once butchered, is gender neutral. Eric and Lad would leave the gutted and cleaned elk hoisted in a tree overnight to drain the fluids and allow the animal’s natural enzymes to tenderize the meat.

As the valedictorian of her class in medical school, my friend Marian spoke at her class graduation. In her speech, she thanked the family of the cadaver she had worked on consistently in several of her classes, for the priceless donation they had made to her education. Whenever she treats a patient for a heart ailment, she said, and considers that mysterious machine, it will be the heart of that cadaver she envisions. That person’s bone structure, internal organs, and muscular system will be the standard by which all others are measured. One life represented all others.

Eric and I each held a hind leg, splaying them out while Lad worked. Such an undignified position, like he should be a she and we should get her an examination table and a set of stirrups and a creepy gynecologist who tells her to “scootch” to the edge of the table.

I thought of the surgery I had had the previous summer. I had a tumor growing on—eclipsing—my left ovary. It was the size of a medium grapefruit when a doctor confirmed to me what it was, but it grew to the size of a honeydew melon by the time I had it removed six weeks later. I could have had it cut out sooner but was clinging to the statistics I’d heard from the doctors indicating that it probably wasn’t that big a deal.

The night before the surgery I drove from my house in Salt Lake City over to the Huntsman Cancer Institute, just to look around. As I drove,
the reality that I was having this procedure done at a cancer hospital sank in, and I had to consider the possibility that the tumor might be cancerous. After weeks of being glib about this tumor, making jokes about looking pregnant, it occurred to me that I might die.

I didn’t die. I reverted to my flippancy when accompanied by my mom to the hospital the following morning. I had tried to convince her that she didn’t need to sit around and wait during the whole thing. I could take the bus to the hospital and she could come find me afterward. Had she done that, she wouldn’t have been told by the doctor midsurgery that it was likely the tumor was cancerous, and she wouldn’t have spent the next two hours reliving her experience with my sister’s cancer, petrified at the thought of having to face that a second time.

The panicky fear returned to me as soon as the anesthesia kicked in. The doctor held my hand, saying reassuring things while I drifted off, uncharacteristically clinging to him. Once unconscious, according to the surgery report, I was moved into the “frog leg” position and sliced open. The tumor was removed in three pieces, along with my left ovary, and the eight-inch vertical cut on my lower stomach was sealed with twenty staples. And fortunately, they remembered to tell my mom that it wasn’t cancerous after all.

We arranged the elk into the “frog leg” position, and Lad sliced cleanly through its skin from anus to sternum. A thin layer of fat, skin, and hair was all that protected this animal’s internal organs from the outside world. Eric peeled back this layer to expose and loosen the mass of guts inside the body cavity, and I wondered at how easily this once living body, with the loss of a conscious spirit, had become an object. The animal’s guts went sliding down the hillside in an amoeba roll; they would later feed coyotes and other animals in the forest. Pink foam boiled up out of its mouth, and all I wanted to do was prod the limp tongue back in.

Lad’s best friend got married six months after he did. Lad and Nathan have known each other since they were two years old and have a type of friendship that I’m not sure I’m capable of—their anger at each other occasionally took them to blows as adolescents, but nothing can ever damage or diminish the friendship, according to Lad. I can generally do a fine job getting over a friendship and moving on when I feel that circumstances dictate. This may be indicative of the different approaches to life that Lad and I have. He keeps his world full of the comfortable,
the reliable, the secure, which is always good enough, whereas I keep mine easily escapable.

Nathan married Tamara at a restored turn-of-the-century dairy farm on an August afternoon. The wedding’s western theme reflected the couple’s mutual interests. Both are team ropers, both own horses, both drive enormous Dodge trucks, both enjoy fishing and hunting, and both share the same harsh sense of humor that I’m still trying to understand. The groomsmen all wore blue jeans and cowboy boots with their white shirts and sage green vests, and the bridesmaids all wore cowboy boots under their ruffled purple dresses. The bride was tanned against her white strapless dress and artificially blonde hair, and the wedding party danced down the aisle.

I stood behind Terry as she signed the guest book: “I hope you have a long and happy life together.” I hadn’t realized that I was peering over her shoulder until she looked up and said a little defensively, “Mine wasn’t as long as I’d hoped.”

I asked Lad once if he wished that I actually hunted with him instead of just coming along for the hike, and he said it didn’t matter: we both knew I’d never be able to pull a trigger, and we certainly wouldn’t need any meat as long as he kept hunting. But I wondered, and I looked at the pictures Nathan and Tamara displayed at their wedding—several showing them dressed in matching camouflage, each holding a dead deer at the base of the antlers in the traditional “trophy” pose—if that practicality was answer enough.

Once we were able to look inside the empty cavity of the animal, we hauled it a little further down the hill to the base of a tree. Eric took a length of rope out of his backpack and threw it over a branch above our heads. Then, fitting the end of the noose around the antlers, he and Lad hoisted the animal until it was about eight inches off the ground and could drain all remaining fluids overnight. Lad tied the other end of the rope off securely, and we started back for the cabin.

We hiked back in the following afternoon to butcher and pack out the elk meat, accompanied by Eric’s family, including nine-year-old twin boys. For three hours, I was helpless, inexperienced, and unsure of what needed to be done. I tended the fire that we built to keep warm, as if it required constant attention and care, but not very well, apparently; every time anyone else came over to where I stood, they would rearrange what I had just done.
The animal’s head was removed from its carcass and set aside to be packed out, not to have it mounted—its rack was not impressive—but so that Eric could cut out its ivory teeth later.

Elk ivory is evidence of the evolution undergone by elk over the centuries. Their upper rear teeth are composed of the same material that once made up the large tusks they used for fighting, foraging, and other tasks now fulfilled by antlers. As their antlers developed, these tusks receded into the two small teeth now found in the back of their mouths. Most of the Native American tribes that relied on elk for sustenance held these ivory teeth sacred. The Lakota gave every newborn male an elk ivory, which they believed to represent long life. The Crow people believed that these teeth promoted health and healing. The Ouray tribe, which inhabited the area that is now the Uinta-Ouray National Forest where I tended that fire, used elk ivory to decorate the ceremonial clothing worn by women of their tribe; some ceremonial dresses had up to a thousand ivories on them. Good hunters were extremely valuable, and a woman’s status in the tribe was more tied to her husband’s abilities than to her own.

This essay by Elizabeth Knight won first place in the BYU Studies 2014 personal essay contest.
“If there be faults”¹
Reviewing Earl Wunderli’s *An Imperfect Book*

Matthew Roper, Paul Fields, and Larry Bassist

Earl M. Wunderli is a retired attorney who has presented at the Sunstone Symposium, published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought,*² and now has completed a major work. Based upon years of research, *An Imperfect Book: What the Book of Mormon Tells Us about Itself* is a manifesto of sorts for his rejection of the Book of Mormon as “a literal history of ancient America” (328). Beginning with an overview of the Book of Mormon, he outlines examples of what he feels are mistakes in the text and indications that it is a modern forgery by Joseph Smith. The most inventive part of *An Imperfect Book* is chapter 3, in which Wunderli argues that the usage of words and phrases in the Book of Mormon shows it to be the work of a single individual. After some initial observations on the questions Wunderli poses about anachronisms, we focus on evaluating his evidence for single authorship.

¹. Mormon 8:17, emphasis added.
Alleged Anachronisms

“Throughout my study of the Book of Mormon,” writes the author, “I have been surprised by the anachronisms others before me have identified” (322). None of these issues are new; others have addressed them in the past. These include references in the text to Jews, steel, cimeters, silk, synagogues, and horses (36). While Wunderli views these as problematic, it is not always clear why others should agree. We will deal here briefly with a few of these topics; longer responses have in many cases been written to each of these points, if readers wish to consult them.

For example, we find nothing inconsistent about Nephi’s use of the term Jew. By the time of the divided kingdom, “the term ‘Yehudi’ applied to all residents of the Southern Kingdom, irrespective of their tribal status.” The translators of the King James Version of the Bible saw nothing wrong in rendering the term Jew in passages describing the last days of Judah, including within the book of Jeremiah, which was written by Lehi’s contemporary (2 Kgs. 16:6; 18:26, 28; 25:25; Isa. 36:11, 13; Jer. 32:12; 38:19; 40:11–12, 15; 41:3; 44:1; 52:28). Nephi says he has charity for the Jew and adds, “I say Jew, because I mean them from whence I came” (2 Ne. 33:8). The author finds this wording “jarring” (93), but the phrase makes sense in context. Nephi had been a Jew politically, but his ancestors were of Manasseh with roots in the Northern Kingdom (1 Ne. 6:2; Alma 10:3). The fact that the Jerusalem elite had tried to kill him and his family, forcing them to flee their home, makes Nephi’s language understandable.

The allegation of anachronism in the translation of a text sometimes later proves to be misguided based on unexpected new discoveries. Wunderli recycles old concerns about the use of the word steel. True, Nephi’s reference to Laban’s sword of “most precious steel” was once considered ridiculous, but the subsequent discovery of a meter-long steel sword at the ancient site of Jericho dating to the time of King Josiah, another of Lehi’s contemporaries, put Nephi’s description in a


5. Eber D. Howe, Mormonsim Unvailed [sic]: or, a Faithful Account of That Singular Imposition and Delusion, from Its Rise to the Present Time (Painesville, Ohio: By the author, 1834), 25–26.
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new light. Similarly, references in the text to “cimeters,” or scimitars, which Wunderli sees as problematic, are no longer so. Historians have revealed that scimitars were known in the ancient Near East from at least 2000 BC. The pre-Columbian repertoire of weapons in Mesoamerica also included curved swords inset with sharp obsidian blades, as can be seen in pre-Columbian art. These weapons appear to have had a long history dating back to Olmec times.

Similarly, Ezekiel refers to a substance rendered silk in our King James Bible and several other translations (Ezek. 16:10, 16). Some translators, influenced by the assumption that silk could not have been known in Bible lands so early, have rendered it otherwise. Fragments of silk textiles, however, have now been found in Eastern Turkey dating to 750 BC, well before Ezekiel’s time. Besides, Book of Mormon references to silk, as John Sorenson and others have pointed out, need not refer to the fiber spun by the silk moth; they may simply refer to something silk-like or resembling silk in softness or texture. Pre-Columbian Mesoamerica produced a number of silk-like fabrics.


As for the word synagogue, some of what An Imperfect Book characterizes as mistakes are actually matters of vigorous scholarly debate. Why need one conclude that these are a problem for the Book of Mormon? The origins of the synagogue are unknown and may never be fully determined. What we do have are different competing theories. Many scholars believe the institution, as it later came to be known, arose following the Babylonian exile, but others argue that it had its origins in pre-exilic times, in which case Book of Mormon knowledge of some form of synagogue makes sense.

The author ignores or is perhaps unaware of important critiques of his work and the issues he discusses. In An Imperfect Book, he provides a truncated version of his critique of Book of Mormon geography from an earlier Dialogue article (254–67) but does not address Brant Gardner’s thoughtful critique of that article. He insists that the text


reviews readers to see Native American peoples as exclusive descendants of Book of Mormon peoples (267–78) and asserts that defenders of the Book of Mormon “have found little evidence of other people” in the Book of Mormon text. This claim, however, overlooks relevant literature on that matter.\textsuperscript{16} Knowing of possible reconciliations would probably be of interest to most readers.

Neuropathologist M. Gary Hadfield has noted that the account of the decapitation of Shiz in Ether 15:30–31 seems to describe a classic example of extensor decerebrate rigidity.\textsuperscript{17} Wunderli dismisses this explanation as “the stuff of fiction” (318). Oddly, he never names Dr. Hadfield, nor cites his published study, which both John Welch and Daniel Peterson have referenced (225–26). He wonders, in a case of decerebrate rigidity, “whether Shiz’s gasping for breath would also be plausible” (226). Hadfield, an authority on such cases, has explained the following:

The blood pouring into his trachea would help enhance the eerie sound of “struggling for breath.” For just as brainstem reflex activity would force the extensor muscles in Shiz’s extremities to contract and elevate his frame, it would also cause his rib cage to expand and contract automatically, as it does in all of us when we are sleeping, or not trying to control our breathing, which is most of the time. This unconscious respiratory reflex is controlled by the lower brainstem.\textsuperscript{18}

The author of An Imperfect Book argues that the documentary hypothesis contradicts what the Book of Mormon suggests about the compilation of the Bible. It would be wrong, he says, “to think that the documentary ‘hypothesis’ is not accepted as fact” (79–80), and he dismisses an appeal to the Book of Mormon as evidence against it as circular reasoning (81–82). We do not know exactly what version of the five books of Moses was found on the plates of brass, but the Book of Mormon suggests that much of what has been assumed about the Bible and its compilation may be inconclusive if not incorrect. The author


\textsuperscript{18} M. Gary Hadfield, “My Testimony, as an Academician, of God and of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” April 2010, \textit{Mormon Scholars Testify}, \url{http://mormonscholarstestify.org/841/m-gary-hadfield}. 

Published by BYU ScholarsArchive, 2014
sees this as a problem. Others might see it as an incentive to conduct further research on the question. For instance, observations by Kenneth Kitchen are worth noting:

The basic fact is that there is no objective, independent evidence for any of these four compositions (or for any variant of them) anywhere outside the pages of our existing Hebrew Bible. . . . This very simple fact needs to be stressed. Our resourceful biblicists are not sitting on some store of papyri or parchment that contain any such works. The Dead Sea Scrolls show no sign of them whatever; stubbornly, they know only of the canonical works that we have, and of commentaries and ‘romances’ (e.g., the Genesis Apocryphon) based upon them. Modern guesswork, as we all know, is often extraordinarily and breathtakingly clever and ingenious—and one can only reverently take one’s hat off to it all, in respectful amazement, sometimes. But . . . it does not constitute fact, and cannot substitute for it. I might choose to dream up a theory that the Ramesside kings of Egypt also once built pyramids in Egypt, twice as big as the Great Pyramid. But absolutely nobody is going to believe me unless I can produce some tangible, material evidence in its favor. And we require, likewise, some kind of clear, material evidence for a J, E, D, or a P or an H, from outside of the extant Hebrew Bible. The standards of proof among biblical scholars fall massively and woefully short of the high standards that professional Orientalists and archaeologists are long accustomed to, and have a right to demand. Some MSS, please! If an excavation tomorrow produced a substantial chunk of a scroll that indubitably contained a copy of precisely J or E, and found in a clear, datable stratigraphic context, then I would welcome it with open arms and incorporate it into my overall appreciation of the history of the Hebrew Bible. But not just as unsubstantiated guesswork out of somebody’s head.

In a recent monumental and very significant work, Kitchen and Lawrence compiled and analyzed over one hundred ancient Near Eastern documents (treaties, collections of laws, and covenants) spanning three thousand years. They found “very clear affinities” in the contexts of Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and the legal material from the third and second millennium BC, as well as treaties from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC. In contrast to these earlier materials, links between these biblical materials and documents from the

first millennium materials were “few and banal.”

The theory of multiple authorship of Isaiah, though widely believed, has likewise never been proven, and there are good reasons to question its usefulness as an ironclad theory. The oldest manuscripts of Isaiah date hundreds of years after the time he prophesied, and none of them support the theoretical division first proposed by nineteenth-century scholars. Latter-day students of the Book of Mormon have noted that while Nephite prophets cite portions of early Isaiah (Isa. 2–14, 29) and “Second Isaiah” (Isa. 40–55), they do not quote block texts from “Trito-Isaiah” (Isa. 56–66). This could be coincidental, but it might be interpreted as an indication that perhaps parts of Isaiah were not on the plates of brass. Richard Coggins notes, “A great deal of recent study of Isaiah renders the use of the term ‘Deutero-Isaiah’ questionable.”

We need to remember that though the existence of a prophet conventionally identified as ‘Deutero-Isaiah’ among a group of exiles in Babylon in the 540s BCE has come to be taken for granted, the onus of proof still remains with those who have argued in that sense. There is no external evidence to support the proposal. And it does appear that the readings of the evidence here briefly outlined render our knowledge of


the historical situation of that period much less certain than we have supposed.25

This unsettled issue is much more complex than it may appear.

**Single or Multiple Authorship**

Turning now to our main investigation, “defenders of the Book of Mormon,” the author observes, “believe the book is exactly what it purports to be, a history written by several men. Critics believe the Book is not authentic history and that just one person, Joseph Smith, wrote the entire text.” If the Book of Mormon is what it purports to be, he argues, differences in the vocabularies of these purported writers should be detectable (97). For those who reject Joseph Smith’s account of the origin of the Book of Mormon, the issue of single or multiple authorship has been a controversial one. In 1831, Alexander Campbell claimed, “The book professes to be written at intervals and by different persons during the long period of 1020 years. And yet for uniformity of style, there never was a book more evidently written by one set of fingers, nor more certainly conceived in one cranium . . . than this same book.”26 Other writers have argued that the Book of Mormon was a composite of the writings of Sidney Rigdon and a would-be novelist named Solomon Spalding,27 a theory that persists among some even today.28 Most

27. E. D. Howe, whose book *Mormonism Unvailed* (1834) introduced the Spalding-Rigdon authorship theory, reflects confusion or inconsistency when he claims, on one hand, “that no one can be left in doubt in identifying the whole [Book of Mormon] with one individual author” (23) and that it “was framed and written by the same individual hand” (56), while also claiming that it was “the joint production of Solomon Spalding and some other designing knave,” namely Rigdon (288–90, emphasis added).
contemporary critics, however, pay little attention to the distinctions between authors suggested in the text and tend to see Joseph Smith as the sole author.

Latter-day Saint readers of the Book of Mormon have noted distinctions in style that seem consistent with the authors identified in the text. For example, John Tanner argued that Jacob, the brother of Nephi, had a particular style that contrasts sharply with that of other writers and that this would be consistent with the events of his life as described in the account. Tanner has noted several significant findings. (1) Words such as *anxiety*, *grieve*, and *tender* are found with disproportionate frequency in Jacob's writings. Half of the references to *anxiety* in the Book of Mormon are found in Jacob and more than two thirds of the references to *grieve* and *tender* are found there. (2) Jacob is the only person to use the words *delicate*, *loathsome*, and *contempt*. (3) Jacob is the only Nephite writer to use the word *wound* in an emotional rather than a physical sense. (4) Only Jacob uses the word *pierce* exclusively in a spiritual sense. (5) No other Nephite writer uses the words *dread* and *lonesome*. (6) He uses the word *reality* in connection with the phrase “things as they really are” and is the only Book of Mormon writer to do so (Jacob 4:13). (7) Jacob’s writings express a certain vividness of description that seems peculiar to him. (8) A distinction of style between the farewells of Jacob and Nephi is also noticeable.


In another interesting study, Roger Keller examined the use of content words by Book of Mormon writers. He found that Mormon’s usage was distinct from others’ in significant ways. These include (1) Mormon’s use of the word *command* to mean leadership, (2) his use of the word *earth* to refer to the ground, and (3) Mormon’s almost exclusive use of directional language in connection with the land. “He is the geographer par excellence.” In contrast to other writers in the record, Mormon “has almost no emphasis in the theological arena.” Moroni speaks of the land as one of promise and inheritance, while his father focuses on the land “as a geographic, and often localized, entity.”

Grant Hardy has observed that Mormon rarely speaks of war in a figurative or metaphorical sense. Mormon is not a visionary and does not reinterpret scripture as Nephi does. These and other elements, according to some readers, seem to set him apart from other writers in the Nephite text. Recent research by John Hilton also highlights the intertextual complexity of the book. A separate approach is exemplified in the work of other scholars who have studied the use of noncontextual words in the Book of Mormon text. We have outlined the history of this approach elsewhere. Such studies indicate a diversity of style that is consistent with the idea of multiple writers behind the English text.

---

34. Grant Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon: A Reader’s Guide* (Oxford University Press, 2010), 108. The only possible exception being Alma 11.
35. Grant Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 84.
In chapter 3 of *An Imperfect Book*, Wunderli discusses the frequencies of words and phrases for several major authors in the Book of Mormon and concludes that Joseph Smith wrote the whole book. However, he describes mostly grammatical uses of words and provides only raw word counts and summaries to make comparisons. Statistical analyses today do not rely on these approaches.

The following are six more appropriate and relevant statistical methods and conclusions, each contrasted with the author’s methods and conclusions. When these methods are utilized, it becomes clear that the methods used in *An Imperfect Book* are deficient, that its conclusions are misleading, and that the evidence actually supports the assertion that the Book of Mormon is the product of multiple authors.

**Method 1: Use standardized frequencies, adjusting for total words written by an author, rather than raw counts of word usage**

For an apples-to-apples comparison of word usage, researchers must standardize all word counts to a common base rather than simply comparing the number of words that come from texts of different sizes. An analogy that illustrates this point is as follows: A rare disease kills fifty people in Dallas, Texas, and fifty people in Billings, Montana. Would the Centers for Disease Control use raw counts to conclude that the two cities have the same health status? They would not. Dallas’s population is about 1,250,000, and Billings’s is about 100,000. When looking at these deaths as standardized frequencies—deaths per hundred thousand people—Dallas would have only four deaths per hundred thousand and Billings would have fifty deaths per hundred thousand. This is a very large difference. Standardized frequencies are the most appropriate measure for comparing diseases, and the same applies to word usage.

Wunderli uses raw counts of *power, faith, blood, destruction, suffer,* and *miracles* (142–43) to assert that “these data do not show affinity on Moroni’s part for these six words over and above their usage by Mormon.” Figure 1 shows his data in chart form.

When obtained from unstandardized raw word counts as shown in figure 1, the data suggests that there is not much of a difference between the word usage of Moroni and Mormon.

Using Wunderli’s counts of total words, Mormon wrote 170,783 words and Moroni wrote 26,016 words (98). Standardizing the counts for each author to occurrences per hundred thousand words, we have the apples-to-apples comparison shown in figure 2.
Thus, when standardized, these word counts run contrary to Wunderli’s assertion. Moroni’s affinity for these six words is five to twenty-six times greater than Mormon’s.

Method 2: For tests of hypotheses, use statistical procedures like analysis of variance, rather than just summary statistics, to make inferences

Compelling inferences must be based on more than summary descriptive statistics. There are well-known procedures for making inferences using statistical tests of hypotheses, yet Wunderli regrettably uses none.

Figure 1. Unstandardized Raw Word Counts for Moroni (blue bars) and Mormon (red bars). Viewed this way, the word pattern usage frequencies look misleadingly similar.

Figure 2. Standardized Frequencies per 100,000 Words for Moroni (blue bars) and Mormon (red bars). Standardized word frequencies clearly show affinity on Moroni’s part for the six words compared to Mormon’s use of the same words.
of these. A fundamental concept of statistical hypothesis testing that provides an objective basis for drawing conclusions about data is to compare differences among groups to the variation within those groups. Such statistical methods are well established and have been used over the last century in medicine, agriculture, manufacturing, and technology. These and other fields have relied heavily on statistical hypothesis testing to determine whether a proposed change actually creates a better medicine, crop, or product, for example. Similarly, statistical tests can detect differences that exist between authors based on differences in frequencies of word usage.

To analyze variance, we can break each Book of Mormon author’s writings into roughly 2,000-word blocks and calculate standardized frequencies of word usage within each block. Then we can use these frequencies to obtain measures of variation within each author. We then compare the variation among authors to the variation within each author. If the former is large compared to the latter, then there is statistical evidence of differences between authors.

Wunderli picked twenty-seven “idiomatic” words (97–115) to assert that the Book of Mormon was not written by multiple authors but by one author, Joseph Smith. Then he analyzed the use of these words with a simplistic descriptive method and found no significant difference among the writing of the different authors in any of these twenty-seven cases. When we performed analysis of variance for each of Wunderli’s twenty-seven words to see if there was evidence of differences between Nephi, Jacob, Mormon, and Moroni, we found that seven of the words actually show a statistically significant difference between authors. These are wherefore, therefore, O, thus, hearken, now, and concerning. Figure 3 shows the strength of evidence for a statistically significant difference across all twenty-seven words on Wunderli’s list. The red line
is the threshold above which there is sufficient evidence for concluding a difference probably exists between authors with respect to a word.

If Wunderli’s claim of a single author were true, the chance of seeing seven or more such significant results would be extremely small. Therefore, contrary to Wunderli’s claims, the evidence argues strongly for multiple authors.

**Figure 3.** Strength of Evidence of Differences between Nephi, Jacob, Mormon and Moroni. The difference between the four major Book of Mormon authors is seen clearly in seven of Wunderli’s twenty-seven words. The strength of evidence for a word exceeding the threshold (the red line) indicates sufficient evidence of a statistical difference.41

**Method 3: Use the truly distinguishing words and analyze them simultaneously rather than one by one**

Statisticians can analyze many variables simultaneously, called the multivariate approach, or one variable at a time, called the univariate approach. Multivariate approaches are more revealing; a univariate approach can obscure differences, whereas a multivariate approach can better show both differences and similarities among variables when they exist. Of noncontextual usage rates for the authors were actually all equal. The lower the p-value, the stronger the evidence.

41. The threshold is conservatively adjusted for multiplicity of tests.
course, anyone can fail to see a difference if they choose words that do not show a difference using inappropriate analyses.

Applying a multivariate approach to Wunderli’s twenty-seven words and analyzing them all at once using discriminant analysis shows evidence of separate authors. Figure 4 shows the discriminant scores from the first and second discriminant functions.

The plot shows distinguishable groups for the four authors with very little overlap. In fact, 96 percent of the seventy-four blocks of text were correctly classified to their claimed authors. Thus Wunderli’s list of twenty-seven mostly noncontextual words turns out to differentiate between the Book of Mormon authors—when a multivariate analysis is applied, as seen in figure 4.

---

42. Discriminant analysis takes groups of items each measured in multiple dimensions and finds the best discriminant functions to categorize items by group. In this case, there are four groups (one for each author) and twenty-seven dimensions (one dimension for each word). Since using robust nonparametric methods in all other analyses in this paper shows virtually the same results as the parametric methods, the requirements for discriminant analysis (normality and equal covariance) are deemed sufficiently met for its use.
Wunderli’s computations also failed to consider many noncontextual words that could more clearly show separations. Performing a stepwise discriminant analysis with an augmented list of noncontextual words produces the plot shown in figure 5.43

The plot shows complete separation between Nephi, Jacob, Mormon, and Moroni, with 100 percent correct classification. The distances between authors (between clusters) are much larger than the variations within each author (within clusters). The stepwise procedure that we used selects the most discriminating set of noncontextual words. In this case, twenty-six words were selected, which include only three from Wunderli’s list: wherefore, O, and insomuch.44 The rest of Wunderli’s

---

43. Stepwise discriminant analysis starts with a candidate set of variables and selects the most discriminating variable between groups of items. Then it finds the next variable that in combination with the first provides the largest increase in discrimination. The process continues until selecting another candidate variable no longer helps discriminate between the groups. The first two discriminant functions can be used to create a two-dimensional view of items categorized by group.

44. The twenty-six words in order of stepwise selection are: wherefore, I, your, has, may, nay, my, why, do, are, O, until, will, language, without, the phrase
words do not add discriminating power beyond those selected by the stepwise procedure. Despite Wunderli’s assertions, this evidence shows a clear separation of authors.

**Method 4: Use methods that lead to valid conclusions when applied in known situations**

Wunderli discusses nine “recognizably biblical” words that he claims distinguish between “two Jesuses,” one he calls “the biblical Jesus” and the other he calls “the Book of Mormon Jesus” (102–3). The words are *behold*, *cast*, *even*, *forth*, *hearken*, *lest*, *O*, *wo/woe*, and *yea*. He sees differences in raw counts for these words and says, “The use or non-use of these words make the two Jesuses sound like two distinct individuals.” Later, he uses others of his twenty-seven words to make similar claims.

The results of t-tests for comparing Jesus’s use of the twenty-seven words in 3 Nephi to his combined use of them in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are shown in figure 6 below. The strength of evidence is shown for each comparison. The red line is the threshold for concluding a statistically significant difference between the “Book of Mormon Jesus” and the “biblical Jesus.” The nine “recognizably biblical” words are shown with asterisks.

If Wunderli’s suggestion of “two Jesuses” were true, we would expect more of these words to show statistically significant differences. But, as can be seen, only one word, *behold*, shows such a difference. For the other twenty-six words there is not enough evidence to conclude a difference between the Jesus in 3 Nephi and the Jesus in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Compare figure 6 to figure 3. In figure 3, the total evidence for multiple authors of the Book of Mormon is many orders of magnitude stronger than the evidence for “two Jesuses.”

Even when we recognize that there is a statistical difference for the word *behold*, this data does not provide a sufficient basis to conclude that there are “two Jesuses.” Indeed, if Wunderli wants to claim that there are “two different Jesuses” based on this level of alleged distinction, then he must also agree that Nephi, Jacob, Mormon, and Moroni are four different authors.

---

*it came to pass, whereby, work, through, always, also, ever, insomuch, by, little, and am.*

45. The robust nonparametric Mann-Whitney test gives virtually the same result. Therefore the requirements for using a t-test are sufficiently met to produce useful comparative results.
For comparison, we examined the use of the word *woe* in Jesus’s words in the four Gospels. In Matthew, Jesus uses it fourteen times and in Luke he uses it fifteen times, whereas in Mark, Jesus says it only twice and in John he does not say it at all. By Wunderli’s reasoning, he should have concluded that there are “two Jesuses” in the Bible: the “Matthew and Luke Jesus” and the “Mark and John Jesus.” Unless one is willing to accept that there are two Jesuses in the Bible, one cannot conclude that there is a “different” Jesus in the Book of Mormon.

Examine the three quotations of Jesus’s prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, written by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to further see the weakness in Wunderli’s reasoning. Figure 7 shows the words of Jesus’s prayer in Matthew 26:39, Mark 14:36, and Luke 22:42 aligned with each other.

The green highlighted words are the nine words common to all three authors in the same part of the quotation. The yellow highlighted words are the seven words shared by two writers at the same locations in the prayer. And the blue highlighted words are the twenty-two words used uniquely at similar locations in these accounts.

Because of the wording differences, if we applied Wunderli’s logic, we would need to conclude that this “sounds like” not two but three “distinct individuals.” Therefore, by his logic, the Bible testifies of three distinct Jesuses, each performing the same divine mission. If these small differences in wording in the Bible do not argue for three distinct Jesuses, then
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the minor wording differences between Jesus in the Book of Mormon and Jesus in the Bible do not argue for a “different” Jesus in the Book of Mormon.

Wunderli implies that if there are “two Jesuses,” one in the Bible and one in the Book of Mormon, then the Book of Mormon Jesus must have been made up by Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon must be a fabrication. But, as we have seen, this logic is flawed and results in assertions that would lead to a “three Jesuses” conclusion about the Bible. Are we to also conclude that Matthew, Mark, and Luke are one person, or that one or two of them fabricated their stories? We assume that Wunderli and others would not make such a claim based on such statistical computations.

Method 5: Use a standard linguistic measure of “vocabulary richness” rather than the raw number of words used uniquely by an author one, two, or three times

Because one author may use an extensive vocabulary whereas another may not, measuring the richness and breadth of vocabulary is one way to distinguish among authors. One standard measure of vocabulary richness generally accepted by analysts is called Yule’s K. It takes into
account all the words used in a text and the frequencies with which the author used each word.46 Wunderli, however, uses simple word counts and focuses on words that are uniquely used by an author one, two, or three times to measure vocabulary richness (122–29). He claims that the parts of the Book of Mormon that are not biblical quotes have a consistently lower richness than the Bible, and so the Book of Mormon must be the product of only one author. As shown below, Yule’s K is a more informative measure of vocabulary richness and does not adequately support his claim.

Calculating K for 2,000-word blocks for each of the four major Book of Mormon authors and for the four Gospel writers in the Bible and calculating the average K for each author gives the results shown in figure 8. There is a statistically significant difference between the average Book of Mormon K, 196, and the average Bible K, 146, for these authors.47 The King James Gospels have about a 25 percent lower average K, indicating richer vocabulary. Wunderli might take this to indicate a single author for the Book of Mormon. Note, however, that the King James Version of the Bible is the translation product of fifty-four learned men, who were also instructed by King James “to secure the suggestions of all competent persons,”48 and who worked for more than four years using numerous previous transcriptions and translations. In contrast, the major part of the Book of Mormon considered by Wunderli is the product of only one translator who completed the work in only three months. That the King James Version of the Bible is somewhat richer in vocabulary than the Book of Mormon is not evidence that the Book of Mormon has only a single author. It may just reflect that fifty-four or more translators together are superior to one translator in language variance.

46. Yule’s K is based on a weighted average of the number of times each word is used by an author relative to the total number of words in a text and is scaled to a range from zero to 10,000, with lower Ks indicating greater vocabulary richness. For example, if most of the words in a text are each used only once, K will be closer to zero and indicate rich vocabulary (the author is using many different words). On the other hand, if there are only a few unique words, each used many times in a text, K will be closer to 10,000, reflecting a less rich vocabulary.

47. The results are the same with parametric and nonparametric analyses.

Applying analysis of variance to each group separately shows that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John have discernibly different average K’s in the Bible texts, and Nephi, Jacob, Mormon, and Moroni also have discernibly different average K’s in the Book of Mormon texts. The magnitudes of the strength of evidence are 2.37 and 2.14, respectively, meaning they have about the same order of magnitude. Thus the evidence for multiple authors in the Book of Mormon is about as strong as the evidence for multiple authors in the Gospels, and differences in the vocabularies of the Book of Mormon writers are detectable.

Method 6: Ascribe reasonable talents and abilities to mortals and do not limit the abilities of God

When we recognize from the discriminant analysis (Method 3) that the relative frequencies of twenty-six noncontextual words clearly distinguish the four main authors of the Book of Mormon, it is beyond reason to assert that Joseph Smith, or anyone for that matter, could consciously adjust his usage of so many noncontextual words in a manner consistent within many blocks of text for a given author, but differently between

49. The Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test gives virtually the same result, again indicating that analysis of variance can be used to make these comparisons.
blocks of text for different authors. Besides, in Joseph Smith’s day no one knew that noncontextual word frequencies could be used to identify a writer’s style. If Joseph consciously did this, he should be deemed one of the world’s greatest literary geniuses of all time. Such facts require of Joseph Smith talents that would be unexpected if he were relying exclusively on his own limited abilities. His resultant work product is consistent with his explanation that he was inspired of God.

As understood by Latter-day Saints and Christians alike, God knows all languages used by man, can readily switch between them, and can inspire words and terminology specifically tailored to his audience. Thus, even if there were more striking evidence of differences of words used by Jesus when speaking in the Holy Land as compared to speaking to the Nephites, it could simply be viewed as evidence of God’s infinite abilities to communicate with different groups of mortals.

Conclusion

Nephite prophets freely acknowledge possible imperfections in the text and its writers, but as the author of An Imperfect Book inadvertently demonstrates, not all alleged mistakes are what they first appear to be (1 Ne. 19:6; 2 Ne. 33:4; Jacob 4:18; Morm. 9:31; Ether 12:23–27). A careful analysis shows that Wunderli’s methods are statistically inadequate, his word list ill chosen, and his logic inconsistent. Consequently, his assertions are unfounded. In contrast, by using appropriate statistical techniques and a properly chosen set of words, the evidence argues strongly in favor of multiple authors in the Book of Mormon text. Of course such evidence does not prove that the Book of Mormon is true, but it does suggest that some long-held objections to the Book of Mormon are baseless. Moroni tells us, “And whoso receiveth this record, and shall not condemn it because of the imperfections which are in it, the same shall know of greater things than these” (Morm. 8:12). Those who cherish the value of faith and who are willing to dig a little deeper may be surprised by what they find.
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All Ye Need to Know

John D. Lamb

BYU Studies has a long history of publishing the annual lecture given by the recipient of the Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Award, BYU’s highest faculty honor. And so it is with great pleasure that BYU Studies Quarterly publishes this year’s lecture by Dr. John D. Lamb, a professor of chemistry and biochemistry, this year’s Maeser lecturer. His speech was delivered as a forum address on May 20, 2014, at Brigham Young University.

Let me begin by inviting you to step back and consider your current GPS coordinates—no, don’t pull out your smart phone, just use your smart cortex. Where are you? The answer is that you happen to be at one of the most privileged places, at one of the most privileged times, in all of human history—a twenty-first-century, fully functional university; and not just any university, but a great university. Now, I know you’ve already spent twelve or more years of your life in school, and more to come (maybe many more if you plan to be a doctor like 150 percent of the students in my chemistry classes). You’re probably weary and may have asked yourself—is this all really worth it? Is this the best way to spend a quarter to a third of my life expectancy? I think that’s a fair question and one that I’d like to spend a few minutes talking with you about today. Because my hope is to convince you, or perhaps to deepen your conviction if it is there already, that learning and knowledge have real intrinsic value, not just as the world sees it in the form of dollars and cents, but real eternal value. And so I’ve entitled my talk “All Ye Need to Know.”
Graduates of the Keats 101 class will recognize this phrase as a snippet from his famous “Ode,” wherein he assures us that “Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.” Like all good poetry, these lines are open to multiple interpretations; and the first interpretation goes something like this: “Well, that’s enough; don’t bother learning anything else.” This is the interpretation preferred by many Chem 105 students, and, indeed, I know many Chem 105 students who wish that John Keats rather than John Lamb were their chemistry instructor for this very reason. But that’s not the interpretation I wish to apply here today. Let’s put the accent on the word “all,” and you see that it comes out “ALL ye need to know,” which in my native Canadian means you really need to become a “know-it-all.”

Now I recognize that know-it-all is normally considered a pejorative term; but when you stop and think about it, would knowing it all in real fact be such a bad thing? To find an answer, let’s talk a little about God’s perspective on this important question. Of course, we typically query the mind of God through the pronouncements of his prophets. And the question at hand is: What is the value of knowledge, and is it really worth all the effort of getting it?

I don’t know about you, but when I’m faced with a difficult question, my first inclination is to see if Brother Joseph had something to say about it. It turns out there was plenty, much of it found in the scriptures, with which I am sure you are familiar—D&C 88, for example. But in addition, let’s turn to the sayings of Joseph Smith. Joseph states: “In knowledge there is power. God has more power than all other beings, because he has greater Knowledge, and hence he knows how to subject all other beings to him.”¹ Did Joseph say God was all-powerful because (a) he was in possession of more money, (b) was better looking, (c) had more influential friends, or (d) possessed the Elder Wand? No, rather, because he has great knowledge.

You might be thinking—okay, when I’m resurrected as a celestial being (hopefully), I’ll know everything, and then I’ll have all power too. But I’m afraid that’s not the way it works. Notice what else Brother Joseph had to say: “It is not wisdom that we should have all knowledge at once presented before us but that we should have a little then we can comprehend it.”² And elsewhere: “Whatever principle of intelligence we attain unto in this life, it will rise with us in the resurrection. And if a person gains more knowledge and intelligence in this life through his diligence and obedience than another, he will have so much the advantage in the world to come” (D&C 130:18, 19). And finally: “It is plain
beyond comprehension and you thus learn that these are some of the first principles of the Gospel, about which so much has been said. When you climb a ladder, you must begin at the bottom rung. You have got to find the beginning of the history and go on until you have learned the last principle of the Gospel. It will be a great while after the grave before you learn to understand the last, for it is a great thing to learn salvation beyond the grave and it is not all comprehended in this world.”3 “This is clearly good doctrine and presents a pleasing outlook to the billions of years that lie before us—the excitement of discovery is in knowing that every discovery will open up new questions to be answered. Knowing all the answers would be like always being full and never being hungry, and I don't think that sounds very fun at all.

Forgive me if I get a little personal at this point. I’ve been privileged to walk these halls nigh on forty-seven years now, as student and professor. I’ve been mentored and nurtured intellectually and spiritually by great men and women whom I’ve admired and attempted to emulate. Over the years, students have often asked me why I chose science and a career in teaching. So I’ve tried to come up with a logical answer aside from the fact that it just felt good. Actually, part of the answer lies in the very roots of the word science itself: the word derives from the Latin scientia, meaning knowledge, and so literally a scientist is a person who makes it his or her business to know stuff. Of course, in modern times the word has taken on a focus that perhaps fits better the more traditional title “natural philosopher,” a label that I actually prefer for my profession. But to the point, being a scientist, getting to know stuff and to understand the world a little better is a rewarding endeavor for me, indeed an endeavor that yields a certain benefit well beyond the obvious professional ones enjoyed by those of us who carry the official title “scientist.” Gaining knowledge is something everyone can do, and in this regard, in the broadest sense of the word, everyone can be a scientist. And if we really believe those words from Joseph Smith, everyone should strive to be a scientist, a knower of things, a seeker of light and knowledge like Abraham, our father. There is intrinsic and eternal value in gaining knowledge. It is one way of drawing closer to God; it is one way of becoming more like him.

Of course, one way of gaining knowledge is by study. On this point, I know I’m preaching to the choir, and I’m sure you students don’t need to be reminded any more than you already are about that! Another way is by faith, and surely hearing the word of God with faith in him and his servants has edified the understanding of everyone here many times over. A third way that mankind as a whole enlarges in knowledge is by observation and reason, an endeavor that we commonly call “research” and that finds its most productive home in the university setting. That’s an interesting word, isn’t it—university—because it captures the scope of what we humans by nature seek to understand, the whole universe (and by the way, you cosmologists seeking proof of the multiverse, I appeal to you that one is just enough for now, thank you). So at a university like ours, we seek knowledge about everything, and specifically we seek to expand our knowledge and understanding about everything by observation and reason.

So much has been learned, so much progress achieved in the last few centuries. But let’s not get big heads over that fact . . . you see, it
isn’t entirely of our own doing. Where research is concerned, where the advancement of human knowledge is concerned, it turns out we have a powerful partner, one who seldom gets much, if any, credit. You never see his name on a peer-reviewed scientific publication; you never see his picture on the cover of *Nature*; he has never won the Nobel Prize in chemistry or physics or anything. He is Jesus Christ. And what, you may ask (as I’m sure our atheist friends would ask with some measure of indignation), is his contribution to the advancement of science, of knowledge of the universe at this and at every university or research laboratory? I invite an answer from Brigham Young: “Every discovery in science and art, that is really true and useful to mankind, has been given by direct revelation from God, though but few acknowledge it. It has been given with a view to prepare the way for the ultimate triumph of truth, and the redemption of the earth from the power of sin and Satan.”

Now, I know this is supposed to be a forum assembly, not a devotional; but you see, where knowledge is concerned, on the highest level at least, we don’t make a distinction between sacred knowledge and secular knowledge. And why is that? Because God does not make this distinction himself. All truth (“all ye need to know,” remember) is circumscribed into one whole—in other words, it fits together seamlessly—and the knowledge that has poured out upon the Latter-day Saints, and clearly on the whole world in the latter days, has just one source. Further, it has just one scope: to bring man closer to living in the kind of world God lives in, to live the kind of life God lives. It’s interesting to me that LDS doctrine about the relationship between God and mankind, between the nature of God and mankind’s capacity for knowledge, differs so markedly from that of traditional Christianity. You see, we don’t believe in “mysteries” in the traditional philosophical sense of the word, that is, mysteries being not just things that we don’t understand, but that we cannot ever understand because the answer is inherently incomprehensible to humans, locked away in the unknowable mind of God. On the contrary, we have faith (because Joseph had faith) that reasonable, comprehensible answers exist for every question, just waiting for God to reveal them, and waiting for our capacity to rise to the occasion. As Eliza Snow pointed out, and as we sing in “O My Father,” “truth is reason.” The LDS perspective maintains that truth is reasonable, nature is reasonable, God is reasonable. We certainly don’t have all the answers now, but we look forward to getting them one day, line upon line, precept upon precept. In a way, Joseph Smith has done for the sacred what Newton did for the secular: just as Newton showed that the laws that
governed the earth and the heavens were not different (as had been thought up until that point), so Joseph brought the religious heaven and earth into a degree of harmony, in that physical bodies—ours, the earth, and others—once thought by many to be antithetical to heaven, are actually part of a long-term plan to build for the eternities; these are in fact to be maintained into the eternities, albeit in a more exalted form.
Thus, in Latter-day Saint philosophy, the temporal study of the material world is given a degree of sanctity and eternal value that it otherwise does not possess.

Of course, given the value of knowledge in bringing men and women closer to God, is it any wonder that over the ages Satan has done everything in his power to impede its progress? Short periods of enlightenment have come and gone, only to be replaced by droughts of darkness: the library at Alexandria burned; the schools of the Roman Empire were destroyed; the works of Beethoven and Goethe were replaced by Nazi barbarism. Furthermore, holding back knowledge has been a means of enslavement of men and women from time immemorial. Among many examples across many cultures, consider these:

- Ancient priests in Egypt subjugating peasants by their knowledge of heavenly motions and the Nile flood to engender awe and obedience
- Medieval priests making it a capital crime to read or translate the Bible in the vernacular
- Taliban goons shooting little girls for going to school

It is amazing to me that the last event could happen in this day and age, but I think it illustrates how desperate the forces of evil are to prevent knowledge from spreading over the earth as the Lord has intended. As Latter-day Saints, we need to stand as strong opponents of these evil forces and as standard-bearers of enlightened learning. Learning is an integral part of building Zion and a central feature of our mission. That is why one of the first things Joseph did in Kirtland was to establish a School of the Elders, and in Nauvoo a university. That is the main reason BYU exists and you and I are here. It is more than preparing for a profession. It is preparing for the millennial reign of Christ. It is preparing for eternity.

Anyone who watches the news knows that the forces of darkness and ignorance are alive and prospering in the world even today. But there is a flood of light and knowledge that is pushing back the darkness as knowledge becomes ever more readily available through the technologies brought about by advances in human understanding. These advances have greatly aided the development of our civilization. But the freedoms and prosperity we enjoy in the West are fragile flowers at a green oasis in the midst of a vast historical wasteland of human ignorance and suffering. That flower could easily wither if we don’t cherish and nurture it in our own lives and the lives of our children and grandchildren. As spoken by the Ghost of Christmas Present in Dickens’s
A Christmas Carol, ignorance spells the doom of civilization, and we must oppose it at every turn. A broad education for every individual and the advancement of knowledge as admonished by the Lord in D&C 88 underpin the freedoms and the prosperity we enjoy.

Now let me pause here for a bit of clarification. Lest I be misunderstood, I want to explain that in speaking of the value of “knowledge” I mean more than familiarity with facts, but not exclusively. It is true that in the twenty-first century we are faced with an interesting, and to some degree unprecedented, challenge when it comes to deciding what to store in our heads. Today, facts are easily stored and retrieved from our exobrains, namely our computers, much more easily than was true using books in the predigital world. For example, I can remember spending many grueling hours in the library researching a topic for a term paper to find information that today I could find on the Internet in seconds. So, it could be claimed that in this day the other (and for the moment uniquely human) intellectual talent for understanding and wisdom is the most important, if not the only, aspect of knowledge that we need to nurture in ourselves. After all, didn’t the Lord admonish, “With all thy getting, get understanding” (Prov. 4:7)? Indeed, one might be tempted to go to the extreme of claiming that in the twenty-first century knowledge of facts has become altogether outdated. After all, you can always look it up in Wikipedia, right? But let’s ask ourselves, “Can understanding be achieved without learning some facts?”

Along these lines, Hugh Nibley makes an important point about the interesting interplay between facts and understanding. In his essay “Zeal without Knowledge,” he states, “If we try to evade the responsibility of directing our minds to the highest possible object, if we try to settle for a milder program at lower stakes and safer risks, we are immediately slapped and buffeted by a power that will not let us rest. . . . We must think—but about what? The substance of thought is knowledge. . . . If the mind is denied functioning to capacity, it will take terrible revenge. . . .; in particular, it will invent knowledge if it has to.” What he’s saying, in essence, is that our minds demand knowledge—it is in our nature—and it is important that we fill the mind with true knowledge, or it will absorb the false or the imaginary. Beyond this, I have to say that it is mighty difficult to think intelligently about something of which you know nothing. I’ve tried that, and it doesn’t work. I’ve heard radio commentators try it, and to disastrous effect, inventing fallacious knowledge right and left leading to even more fallacious conclusions. If we are to direct our minds to the highest possible object, we do well to
fill our minds with true knowledge about that object and use the discernment that is uniquely human to come to “understand” the world in ways that computers just can’t achieve. Furthermore, without making the effort to check our facts, it will be easy for us to be caught up in a world that has lost the distinction between medicine and fruit juice, between music and noise, and between science and fraud.

We have a lot to do in a short time to build up Zion, and God has given us a very fertile field in which to cultivate our knowledge in support of that effort. Indeed, we live in a golden age of learning; and yet I worry that many of us are prone to squander this precious gift. My encouragement to you is this: don’t let opportunities to engage in deep and meaningful learning pass you by unnoticed. Open your eyes to light and minimize the things that distract you from what has real value.
There are so many inviting but hollow distractions around us these days. Pop culture is well named—it has all the nutritional value of soda pop or cotton candy—all empty calories and air. I like a little soda pop or cotton candy now and then; it’s fun. But a constant diet morning, noon, and night would ruin my health, and a constant diet of nothing but pop culture will ruin the health of the soul. One of the problems, of course, is that many of these distractions can be addictive. Let me invite you to be an iconoclast of pop-culture distractions—smash those game platforms (figuratively, I mean); apply the mute button unmercifully to MTV; tell those purveyors of the latest fashions to take a hike. Or at least, if you can’t put these things away altogether, put them in their place on a far back burner. Instead, why not use the precious little time you have on earth while your brain still functions to drink deeply from the Pierian spring and apply that knowledge you’ve gained to good ends. Oh, and, by the way, just to help you understand what I mean when I say to do this “while your brain still functions,” let me make you aware of the kinds of dangers that lurk about you with a little story from my younger days. When I was about twenty-five, a fellow player threw a heavy wooden racquetball racquet with all his might into my head and knocked me unconscious (I don’t think on purpose!). I had to have thirteen stitches in my head, and I’m sure my IQ dropped ten points that day. So take a lesson from me, take every advantage of every opportunity to learn while you can. You never know what a friend might do.

We human beings have an inherent need, indeed craving, to learn—we inherited that from our Heavenly Parents. We are inveterate information gatherers; now, I don’t like that word information so much—it sounds rather sterile; but the word does have one redeeming value—it reminds us that we are informed by the information we invite into our heads. Will that be information junk food (I refer to most of pop culture), or will we ingest the best that the universe has to offer? I say let’s aim for the latter. Our destiny is to be better than what this world alone has to offer. Don’t let Lady Gaga or ESPN or Wall Street rob you of that. Your destiny is to build Zion; you were sent here to change the world. You are the last great hope of the world. There is a shining city on a hill that Joseph Smith pointed our minds to—we need to seek it out. It’s up to us to build it! Let’s make it the focus of our waking moments. Joseph knew that the only way for light to overcome darkness, for truth to overcome error, is for the children of light to grow in knowledge and apply that knowledge with diligence. That’s why he was so keen on education, and why we should be also. He had a vision that we could be better than the beasts and live not for today but
for eternity. Speaking of eternity, let me ask you: Can you imagine living forever? What are you going to do? Get up in the morning and watch the ten millionth superbowl on TV . . . eat your 457 billionth pepperoni pizza? Really? What are you going to do for all those billions of years? Whatever it is, it will be an extrapolation of what you spend your time doing now. Now is the time to lay the foundation for eternity. We’ve got to divest ourselves of the idea that eternity is something we face after we die. Eternity isn’t tomorrow; it’s now.

There are a great many things we should be doing to lay the foundation for a happy and productive eternity. Learning is just one of them, but certainly not the least. It just happens to be the one I’m focusing on here. So let me encourage you to be not only diligent but to be eclectic in your learning. There are wonderful things to learn in every discipline, and answers to many interesting questions are found there. Here are just a few:

- **Mathematics:** here we find the language of creation—Pythagoras was right, as we are now learning: reality really is based on numbers.
- **Economics:** here we learn why they are rich and we are poor.
- **Literature:** here we can live a thousand lives in a single lifetime—we can see the world through the eyes of Job, Falstaff, Horace Rumpole, and Jack Ryan.
- **Physics:** here we come to know that the world is weirder than we could possibly imagine.
- **Music:** here we can learn to resonate with the heartbeats of others.
- **And chemistry:** the ultimate in human intellectual achievement, which unveils the tiny world that underpins all we see around us.

As a scientist, I’d like to share with you a couple of examples of things I get excited about having learned in my lifetime. In the first place, what I have learned about chemistry has given me a totally new and unique perspective on the people in my life. For example, when I look at my wife, Betty, I see with my eyes only the light that reflects off her skin. But science has revealed that her skin is made up of trillions of tiny cells that I can’t see; and inside each of those cells are organelles and a nucleus; and these in turn contain trillions of protein molecules all working in a wonderful harmony; and these are made of atoms so tiny that we cannot see them even with the most powerful light microscope, particles of matter that operate according to exotic, sometimes mind-boggling rules. Notice that Betty is much more than what I can see with my naked eye. Now, I can see her not only as a loving human being, a
wonderful wife and mother, but in addition I can envision her as one of the most complex molecular machines in the universe—a veritable miracle of biochemistry—a kind of Wonder Woman. Chemistry has given me a whole new way of seeing the world . . . and probably a whole new reason for sleeping on the couch tonight.

Here’s another example, this time from astronomy. What if I had eyes like the Hubble telescope and could see far into the distance and in many wavelengths of light? I could look over there and see the great storm on Jupiter in retinal clarity; or over there and see through the clouds of the Orion Nebula to witness a star being born; or over there and see a quasar as an enormous black hole devours nearby stars in a storm of super-hot debris. How could I even be aware that such awesome wonders exist, let alone envision them, if I hadn’t sought out and been blessed with knowledge?

One last point: Are we ever going to run out of things to learn? The longer I live, the more I doubt it. You see, at the beginning of the twentieth century, some in the scientific community claimed that all that was important to know had now been discovered, and that the only work left to do was to tie up a few loose ends. Of course, that was before Einstein and others upset the applecart in multiple ways, and look how our understanding has changed since then! Fast forward even further into the twenty-first century, and another heart-stopper. Here we thought we were making such great progress in understanding the natural world, only to discover that all this time we’ve been studying only about 5 percent of the matter and energy in the universe. The rest was invisible to us! Why? Because we are creatures of electromagnetism, and the rest of the matter and energy in the universe pretty much just ignores those rules. If we keep going on like this, we’ll soon find that the more we know, the closer we approach knowing relatively nothing at all. But is that discouraging? No, that’s not discouraging in the least. In fact, it opens up the wonderful prospect of an eternity of never running out of new things to learn about.

I hope that in some small way I have managed to strengthen your commitment to learning. As the hymn “The Spirit of God” expresses, here in the latter days “the knowledge and power of God are expanding,” and surely, gaining knowledge and understanding is a godly endeavor. It can be hard work, but it can also be thrilling, it can be exciting, and it can be intoxicating. You’ve heard of a “runner’s high”? Well, sometimes I feel like I’m experiencing a “learner’s high.” I hope you have experienced this too. I hope you will continue experiencing it here at BYU, throughout your lives, and on into an endless eternity. God bless you all.
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The Old Testament book of Jonah is a remarkable story perhaps best known for the stubbornness of a prophet, the great fish that swallows and then regurgitates Jonah, the conversion of the whole city of Nineveh, and the rapid growth and death of a gourd. But this small book has a much deeper, more powerful message that has been obscured through the ages: that the Messiah would live and die to make salvation available to all humankind. This article outlines the parallels between elements of the book of Jonah and Jesus’s future life, agony, crucifixion, spirit world ministry, and resurrection.

Symbolic incidents in the book of Jonah are revealed in the New Testament as Jesus explicitly referred to “the sign of Jonah”¹ and then fulfilled its typological allusions. Most prominent is the image of Jonah’s three days and three nights “in the whale’s belly” being a sign of Jesus’s three days and three nights “in the heart of the earth” (Matt. 12:40).² But there are several additional parallels between Jonah and Jesus. While many scholars, dating back at least to Hugh of St. Cher (d. 1263),³ have noticed elements in the book of Jonah that parallel events in the life and mission of Jesus, I have not found any modern author who lists all the possible elements that may well foreshadow the life and mission of Christ, although at least half of the items discussed in this article were identified and written about by Early Christian Fathers.⁴ It is not my goal to force a parallel between every part of the book of Jonah with something in the life and mission of Christ but rather to point out parallels that appear to have gone unnoticed. All of these foreshadowings—especially those that seem particularly obvious—make Jesus’s statement about the sign of Jonah even more meaningful.
Jonah as a Dove

Latter-day Saint scholars have noted that all prophets, in a way, are types of Christ. Prophets are known by their fruits and their messages that lead to Christ, and the book of Jonah is no exception. The name Jonah in Hebrew means dove. The dove is a symbol of peace, as in Noah’s sending out a dove from the ark, signaling the end of the Flood (Gen. 8:8). Doves were used for sacrifice at the temple (Lev. 1:14). For Isaiah, the dove is one who mourns (Isa. 38:14; 59:11). The dove is harmless (Matt. 10:16). The dove is also the “form” in which the Holy Ghost descended upon Jesus after his baptism, when the Father affirmed that Jesus is his Son. When Jesus told Pharisees they could look for the sign of Jonah, he evoked many images of the dove, his baptism, his mission and messiahship, as well as his overcoming death. All of these images may be seen as pointing to Jesus, his attributes, his sacrifice, and his divine roles.

The History and Purpose of the Book of Jonah

The language, style, and theology of the book of Jonah suggest that it was most likely written between 450 and 300 BC. This range of time is well past the life of the Old Testament prophet Jonah associated with the reign of King Jeroboam II in 2 Kings 14:25 (788 BC). The author of the book is unknown. One scholar notes that it is much more useful to ponder about the meaning of the book rather than its authorship and history: “Since the book was considered to provide legitimate knowledge about YHWH and YHWH’s ways, and as such was included in the accepted repertoire of prophetic books, the communicator must have been construed as ‘authoritative.’ Had this not been the case, there would have been no reason to continue studying, copying, reading and reading to others this text. But the authoritative communicator was certainly not the actual historical author of the book.”

Much discussion about the book of Jonah has debated whether its story reflects literal history or not, what the book’s literary form is, and how its purpose should be understood. This article focuses instead on the book’s typological mode of prophecy of Christ. I propose that the story of Jonah, whether literal or not, was written in a typological style to mask the book’s Christ-centered prophecy. Written in this manner, these prophecies of Jesus’s future life and atonement would have been protected from censorship by those who might obliterate or obfuscate them.

As images from the book of Jonah are discussed in the following sections of this article, readers may find it enlightening to remember that
the Old Testament Jehovah is the premortal Jesus. Thus it was Jesus who interacted with Jonah and created the situations of the story as prophecies which he himself would later fulfill.

**Jonah’s Call to Preach to Gentiles Prefigured Christ’s Salvation for All**

The Israelite Jonah’s attempted flight from the Lord (Jonah 1:3) was motivated by his angry refusal to accept that God in his kindness and mercy would accept Gentiles into his kingdom (4:1, 4, 9). Jonah’s view that Gentiles were unworthy of a chance for eternal reward is reflected in the anger of first-hour laborers Jesus taught about in his New Testament parable of the laborers. In this parable, the first-hour laborers (Israelites or tribe of Judah) were angry with the householder (the Lord) for allowing the same pay (eternal reward) to his last-hour laborers (non-Israelite) (Matt. 19:30; 20:1–16; see also 1 Ne. 13:42). This parable is itself a prophecy of the coming instruction from the Lord to go out “and teach all nations” (Matt. 28:19). Not coincidentally in the same port city of Joppa (Jonah 1:3; Acts 10:5), Peter faced the same issue as Jonah, being surprised that Gentiles would be welcome in God’s kingdom and that “in every nation he that feareth [God], and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him” (Acts 10:35). All of the worldwide missionary work among Gentile nations, conducted both in the primitive Church and also in these latter days, can be seen as being foreshadowed in Jonah’s calling to preach to the foreign people of Nineveh.

**Jonah/Jesus Typologies in Jonah 1:3–16**

The first chapter of the book of Jonah offers several parallels to Jesus’s life and ministry.

*Going down and paying the fare.* Jonah went “down” to Joppa, paid the fare, and went down into the boat. Likewise, as one may see, Jesus came “down from heaven” (for example, John 3:13; 6:33), as he became flesh and would descend below all things. Jonah paid the fare, just as Jesus paid all that was required to do the will of the Father.

*Asleep in a storm-tossed boat.* Upon Jonah’s flight from God aboard a ship sailing to Tarshish, “the Lord sent out a great wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken. . . . But Jonah was gone down into the sides of the ship; and he lay, and was fast asleep” (1:4–5). Jesus, like Jonah, slept on his disciples’ ship despite a violent storm on the Sea of Galilee that threatened to sink
them, all of which is described with several similar words: “And when
he was entered into a ship, . . . behold, there arose a great tempest in
the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was
asleep” (Matt. 8:23–27; see also Mark 4:36–41; Luke 8:22–25).

Awakened with pleadings to save. As the crew fearfully prayed to their
gods, Jonah was awakened by the shipmaster saying, “What meanest
thou, O sleeper? arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think
upon us, that we perish not” (1:5–6). Likewise, Jesus’s panicked crew of
disciples awakened him as “the waves beat into the ship, so that it was
now full. And he [Jesus] was in the hinder part of the ship asleep on a
pillow: and they awakened him.” They then said “unto him, Master, car-
est thou not that we perish?” (Mark 4:37–38; see also Matt. 8:24–25; Luke
8:24). Jesus’s calming the storm showed his power over the elements and
his place as Lord of all the earth, and thus Old Testament prophecies
of the Messiah would plausibly look to this event as very significant in
his life.

The reaction of great fear on the part of all aboard the ship to Tarsh-
ish also prefigures the great fear that many people felt as they witnessed
the powerful events in the life of Jesus, especially at the time of the
Crucifixion: prominent people of Jerusalem were alarmed about Jesus’s
miraculous power and feared him; Pilate was fearful of potential rioting;
the Roman soldiers “feared greatly” (Matt. 27:54); the disciples, espe-
cially Peter, were also fearful.12 Everyone involved with the crucifixion
was fearful—except Jesus. He knew what he had to do and prevailed
without fear, just as Jonah expressed no fear.

Gentiles failed in their attempts to save either Jonah or Jesus. Jonah,
knowing he was the cause of the life-threatening storm, volunteered to
sacrifice his life (as a type of Christ’s sacrifice to save humankind) to save
the Gentile crew and their ship. He told the crew to “take me up and cast
me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you” (1:12). But rather
than cast Jonah overboard, the Gentile crew “rowed hard to bring it to
the land; but they could not: for the sea wrought, and was tempestuous
against them” (1:13). In a similar manner, the Gentile Roman praefectus
Pontius Pilate and his wife attempted to save Jesus. Pilate’s wife said to
him as he sat in judgment of Jesus, “Have thou nothing to do with that
just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of
him” (Matt. 27:19; see also Mark 15:15; Luke 23:12–24; John 18:38). “And
from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him” (John 19:12). In the cases
of both Jonah and Jesus, it was Gentiles who failed in their efforts to
preserve them from death.
Gentiles feared shedding innocent blood. The ship's crew expressed their fear of having innocent blood on their hands. “Wherefore [the crewmen] cried unto the Lord, and said, We beseech thee, O Lord, we beseech thee, let us not perish for this man's life, and lay not upon us innocent blood: for thou, O Lord, hast done as it pleased thee” (1:14). Pontius Pilate expressed his fear of responsibility for shedding Jesus’s innocent blood (Matt. 27:17–22, 24). Thus this image from Jonah prophetically foreshadows another detail of Jesus's first-day ordeal.

Casting lots. At the point of Jonah's and Jesus's voluntary sacrifices, both the Gentile crewmen and the Gentile Roman soldiers cast lots regarding their victims. Psalm 22:18 also predicted the casting of lots during Jesus's time on the cross.¹³ The purposes of the casting of lots was admittedly very different in the two cases: for Jonah, it was to determine who was causing the storm, and for Christ, to divide his raiment.

Being taken up or lifted up. When asked by the crewmen, “What shall we do unto thee, that the sea may be calm unto us?” Jonah said unto them, “Take me up, and cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you” (1:11–12). Here Jonah decidedly becomes a type of Christ in his voluntary sacrifice. Jonah’s sacrifice of his own life to save others parallels Jesus voluntarily allowing himself to be lifted up on the cross.

The concept behind Jonah’s and Jesus’s words is similar. Jesus’s words were, “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me” (John 12:32). Numerous prophesies emphasize that the coming Messiah would be “lifted up” in being put to death. John refers to Moses’s serpent: “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up” (John 3:14–15). The prophet Enoch “beheld the Son of Man lifted up on the cross” (Moses 7:47, 55). Speaking to the Nephites on the American continent, the resurrected Jesus said, “And my Father sent me that I might be lifted up upon the cross . . . , that as I have been lifted up by men even so should men be lifted up by the Father . . . to be judged of their works” (3 Ne. 27:14). Thus Jonah’s “take me up and cast me forth” sacrifice image portends and testifies of Jesus being lifted up in his ultimate, future sacrifice.

Calming the storm. “So they took up Jonah, and cast him forth into the sea: and the sea ceased from her raging” (1:15). With Jonah’s sacrifice, Jehovah miraculously calmed the storm. This part of the story notice-ably foreshadows the mortal Jesus’s intervention by calming the storm on Galilee. Jesus’s disciples were desperately trying to save their lives because “they were filled with water, and were in jeopardy” (Luke 8:23). Matthew recorded that in the “great tempest . . . the ship was covered
with the waves” (Matt. 8:24). When the disciples woke Jesus, “he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm” (Mark 4:38–39).

Gentiles praised Jehovah. Seeing the miraculous calming of the sea following their taking up and casting forth of Jonah, the crew “feared the Lord” for his power over sea and land (1:9–10, 16) and “offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, and made vows” (1:16). This animal sacrifice to the Israelite God Jehovah by these apparently converted Gentiles is similar to the response of Roman soldiers at the Crucifixion. At the time of Jesus's death, Roman soldiers feared and praised Jesus. “Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God” (Matt. 27:51, 54; Mark 15:39). Luke reports that at Jesus's death “when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man” (Luke 23:47–48).

Atonement Images from within the Great Fish in Jonah 1:17–2:10

The parallels between the story told in the book of Jonah and the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ become even more striking as the story continues.

*Jonah was swallowed into the Lord's great fish.* “Now the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah. And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights” (1:17). In the belly of Jehovah's great fish, Jonah suffered a Gethsemane-like affliction in unfathomable darkness. Such a vivid image of horror brings to mind the graphic answer this same Lord described to the sorrowful Prophet Joseph Smith while imprisoned in the Liberty Jail dungeon: “If thou be cast into the deep; if the billowing surge conspire against thee; if fierce winds become thine enemy; if the heavens gather blackness, and all the elements combine to hedge up the way; and above all, if the very jaws of hell shall gape open the mouth wide after thee, know thou, my son, that all these things shall give thee experience, and shall be for thy good. The Son of Man hath descended below them all. Art thou greater than he?” (D&C 122:7–8).

Some scholars propose that the text implies that Jonah was not swallowed by a great fish, but he actually died by drowning in the sea.14 The great fish may be a metaphor for the leviathan, the mouth of hell, the great deep, Sheol, and death.15 By this reasoning, the Lord pulled Jonah back from the watery grave, revived him, and gave him a second chance to obey. If so, the parallel between Jonah's experience and Jesus's three days in the tomb is even stronger.
One scholar notes, “Some later Jewish interpretations describe Jonah’s stay in the fish in imaginative detail. According to the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, Jonah saves his host fish from being devoured by the monster Leviathan. In return for this, the fish takes Jonah on an extensive tour of the suboceanic world. In the *Zohar*, Jonah’s sojourn in the belly of the fish and his subsequent ejection is understood as an allegory of death and resurrection.” Whatever the Lord’s great fish was, Jonah’s prayerful suffering in a place of darkness for three days and nights is a clear parallel to Jesus’s prayerful suffering in Gethsemane, death, and time in the spirit world.

Three days and three nights in darkness (the sign of Jonah). The book of Jonah became important in the New Testament world when Jesus spoke of “the sign of Jonah.” Matthew recorded that the scribes and Pharisees tempted him for a sign, a proof, of his messiahship: “Master, we would see a sign from thee.” Jesus responded, “An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here” (Matt. 12:39–41). Matthew reported a second, similar time that Jesus referred to the sign of Jonah: “A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas” (Matt. 16:4). Luke reports, “And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation” (Luke 11:29–30). Jesus used Jonah’s story as a representation of his own coming three days and three nights in darkness and that he would rise again, just as Jonah had come forth from the darkness of the great fish. He also used the story to tell certain people that their failure to repent placed them in condemnation.

LDS scholar Richard D. Draper expounds on this statement by Jesus. The problem with the request [of the scribes and Pharisees] was that it attempted to bypass faith. The Lord returned their insincere request with a strong rebuke. . . . Because of their apostasy, they would not accept any sign, and therefore the Lord was under no obligation to give them one. Nonetheless, He did, albeit in the form of a riddle. Ironically, He gave them, if only they could have understood it, the ultimate
sign, the one that would prove conclusively the validity of His claims—namely, His death and subsequent resurrection. . . . The real importance of this interchange is that it marks the first instance where the Lord predicted His death and resurrection, if veiled, to the Pharisees.  

Some propose that the three days and three nights measure of time is symbolic. Three is a number of reality or divinity and appears several times in the book of Jonah. One scholar notes that a reasonable theory for the three days and three nights motif is that a new moon is dark for three nights; it disappears and then reemerges, so three nights is symbolic of death and revival.

Was Jesus’s body in the tomb exactly three days and three nights, thus matching the prophecy “three days and three nights in the heart of the earth”? Tradition and much modern scholarship suggest that the Crucifixion occurred on a Friday, but many scholars believe evidence points to a Wednesday or Thursday crucifixion instead. Any of these days will suit the comparison to Jonah’s three days and three nights because we cannot know for certain the method of reckoning of Jonah’s time of suffering, let alone the exact amount of time Jesus was dead.

As I have pondered the timing of Jesus’s crucifixion and time his body was in the tomb, I see a poetic beauty in considering that Jesus’s night of suffering in Gethsemane might be counted as part of his prophesied “three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” It was in Gethsemane that Jesus began his descent into “the heart of the earth,” for this is when the sins of humankind were swallowed up. This descent included both the agony of Gethsemane and the Crucifixion, immediately followed by his ministry in the spirit world while his body lay in the tomb. If the Crucifixion occurred on a Friday, including Thursday night in the reckoning would make the time of suffering three nights as well as three days.

Jonah and Jesus committed to divine callings during their sufferings. While in “the belly of hell” (2:2), Jonah offered a prophetic prayer in which he described some images that foreshadow Jesus’s suffering. Here in this hellish darkness Jonah composed a psalm still today considered a literary masterpiece (2:1–9). His prayer of affliction prophetically symbolized the Savior’s future suffering in Gethsemane and on Calvary: “Then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his God out of the fish’s belly, And said, I cried by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord, and he heard me; out of the belly of hell cried I, and thou hearest my voice” (2:1–2).

Jonah covenanted to put God’s will before his own, saying, “But I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that that I
have vowed. Salvation is of the Lord” (2:9). This description of Jonah’s bleak and sorrowful state within the belly of hell where he accepted God’s will is comparable to Jesus’s test in Gethsemane when he “fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt” (Matt. 26:39). The Father, hearing his Son, sent an angel to strengthen him (Luke 22:42–43).

Upon accepting his Father’s will over his own, Jesus partook of the bitter cup. Luke describes, “And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground” (Luke 22:44). About his bitter cup of sacrificial agony the Lord revealed, “Which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit—and would that I might not drink the bitter cup, and shrink—Nevertheless, glory be to the Father, and I partook and finished my preparations unto the children of men” (D&C 19:18–19).

Being swallowed up in the heart of the seas. Jonah’s plea continues, “For thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about: all thy billows and thy waves passed over me.” The phrase “midst of the seas” is in other Bible versions “heart of the seas,” which is similar to Jesus’s phrase “heart of the earth,” referring to the place of atoning for sins (Matt. 12:39–40). Micah 7:19 describes this place: The Lord “will cast all their sins into the depths of the seas.” This is where “men’s sins will be swallowed up out of sight.” Jesus fulfilled the swallowing up of all sins.

Being forsaken. Jonah mourned, “I am cast out of thy sight” (2:4). This description of separation from his Lord Jehovah calls to mind the words of Jesus while on the cross, when he cried out, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34).

Weeds and thorns. In his three days of torment, Jonah described that “the weeds were wrapped about my head” (2:5). The weeds recognizably foreshadow the crown of thorns placed on Jesus’s head as an instrument of torture and mocking (Matt. 27:29, Mark 15:17; John 19:2).

My soul fainteth. Though according to the text Jonah is still alive during his three nights and three days in the great fish’s belly of hell, Jonah describes a deathlike experience, saying, “The waters compassed me about, even to the soul: the depth closed me round about . . . [and] my soul fainted within me” (2:5, 7). Jonah’s experience foretells Jesus’s death by crucifixion. Luke recorded, “And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost” (Luke 23:46).
The holy temple. After feeling cast out of his Lord’s sight, Jonah said, “Yet I will look again toward thy holy temple . . . [and] When my soul fainted within me I remembered the Lord: and my prayer came in unto thee, into thine holy temple” (2:4, 7). In his psalm, Jonah invokes the temple. The temple played a role at the time of the Crucifixion: “the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom” (Matt. 27:50–51; see also JST Matt. 27:54–55; Mark 15:37). During Israel’s annual Day of Atonement rite, sacrificial lamb’s blood was taken through the temple veil.26 With Jesus’s blood sacrifice completed, he fulfilled that temple rite as he passed through the veil of mortality represented in the rending of the veil.

“The earth was about me.” Jonah described his descent: “I went down to the bottom [or roots] of the mountains; the earth with her bars was about me for ever” (2:6). James D. Smart explains, “The Hebrews conceived of the earth as floating upon the great deep of waters (Ps. 24:2). Therefore one who was plunged to the very bottom of the deep would find himself below the foundations of the mountains,” which was thought to be the land of the dead or spirit world, “lying beneath the great deep.”27 This image of Jonah’s visit to the land of the dead is a potent foreshadowing of Jesus’s descent as a disembodied spirit into a world of spirits. Peter described Jesus’s spirit world experience. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison” (1 Pet. 3:18–20). This spirit world ministry is described in a 1918 revelation to the Prophet Joseph F. Smith as he pondered on the Apostle Peter’s words. “And as I wondered, my eyes were opened, and my understanding quickened, and I perceived that the Lord went not in person among the wicked and the disobedient who had rejected the truth, to teach them; But behold, from among the righteous, he organized his forces and appointed messengers, clothed with power and authority, and commissioned them to go forth and carry the light of the gospel to them that were in darkness, even to all the spirits of men; and thus was the gospel preached to the dead” (D&C 138:29–30).

“Salvation is of the Lord.” At the end of Jonah’s prophetic prayer in which he identified key events of Jesus’s atonement, he powerfully declared that the Lord Jehovah is the ultimate Savior of humankind: “Salvation is of the Lord” (2:9). These words of Jonah look to Jehovah’s triumph over the grave and sin, bringing salvation to all people.

Deliverance from the great fish. After Jonah’s three nights and three days in the great fish he was miraculously delivered: “The Lord spake
unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land” (2:10). This coming forth alive on the third day is widely embraced as a type of Jesus, who came forth from the sepulcher united with his body as a glorified resurrected being to a state of divine perfection.

**Resonances in Jonah’s Mission to Nineveh in Jonah 3:1–4:11**

*The gospel is for all nations.* After Jonah was delivered, the Lord spoke a second time to Jonah, “Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee” (3:1–2). Not only was Nineveh a Gentile city, it was the major city of Assyria, the great enemy of Israel and Judah, and it represents the epitome of wickedness. Both the Lord’s first and second calls to Jonah to go to Gentile Nineveh (1:1–2; 3:1–2) signify God’s universal love and concern over all nations. It was to be Israel’s charge as the seed of Abraham to eventually be a blessing to all the world’s nations (Acts 3:25). The import of this second call also extends to Jesus’s restoration of the gospel to Joseph Smith.

*The forty-day warning.* “So Jonah arose, and went unto Nineveh, according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city of three days’ journey. And Jonah began to enter into the city a day’s journey, and he cried, and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown” (3:3–4). Having arrived in Nineveh, Jonah used two numbers with symbolic meaning, three and forty. Archeologists have found that ancient Nineveh was nowhere near “three days’ journey” in size, so the description is one more symbol of three (symbolic of perfection), again pointing to Christ. The time allotted for Nineveh to repent was forty days. Forty is symbolic of probation and testing and may represent mortality as a time to prepare to meet Christ. Forty represents the need to prepare for an unknown time in the future such as Jesus’s second coming. Jesus’s teachings are replete with warnings to prepare for the kingdom of heaven without saying when that kingdom will come.

*All people turn to God and peace reigns in the land, even among the animals.* “So the people of Nineveh believed God and proclaimed a fast and put on sackcloth from the greatest of them even to the least of them” (3:5). This account of total conversion of Nineveh is not verified in ancient historical records, but it prefigures that millennial day when “every ear shall hear [the fifth angel’s trump], and every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess . . . saying: fear God, and give glory to him . . . for the hour of his judgment is come” (D&C 88:104; see also Isa. 45:23 and Philip. 2:10–11).
Nineveh’s king (with no name given, representing all the world’s kings) proclaimed a decree that every man, beast, and flock fast and “be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God: yea, let them turn [both man and beast] every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands” (3:6–8). This image of Nineveh’s complete turning from evil and from violence invites readers to look forward to the time when the Lord “shall judge among the nations . . . and they shall beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks—nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more” (2 Ne. 12:4; Isa. 2:4) and the day when “the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together” (Isa. 11:6; see also 2 Ne. 30:12; D&C 101:26).

Looking from the east for the Lord’s judgment. At the conversion of Nineveh, Jonah became angry and “went out of the city, and sat on the east side of the city, and there made him a booth, and sat under it in the shadow, till he might see what [judgment from God] would become of the city” (4:5). Throughout the scriptures, east is the direction from which God’s power comes. In this story, it represents the Lord’s coming judgment from the east. “For as the light of the morning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, and covereth the whole earth, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be” (JS Matt. 1:26; see also Ezek. 43:2; Matt. 24:27).

The gourd. As Jonah watched for the Lord’s judgment from the east, “the Lord God prepared a gourd, and made it to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head, to deliver him from his grief. So Jonah was exceeding glad of the gourd. But God prepared a worm when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered. And it came to pass, when the sun did rise, that God prepared a vehement east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted, and wished in himself to die, and said, It is better for me to die than to live” (4:6–8). With a vehement east wind and hot sun to again humble Jonah, who was still angry over the short-lived, withered gourd, the Lord asked, “Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? And he said, I do well to be angry, even unto death” (4:9). The Lord next asked his most revealing question: “Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city [representative of all nations], wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?” (4:10–11).
This abrupt ending with a sharp contrasting image between Jonah’s cares and those of his Lord reveals the story’s main message. Jonah’s anger and pity is spent solely on the withered gourd, whereas the Lord’s care is for the eternal salvation of an entire population of Gentiles. Readers are brought to clearly see the great humanity and universality of the Lord’s divine love. All will eventually be judged, whether accountable or considered innocent (that is, unable to “discern between their right hand and their left hand”). He is the Lord God, the great Jehovah, of both the Old and New Testament, and as Jonah declared, the Savior of all the world.

The book of Jonah ends as it began, by revealing the Lord and Savior of both the Old and New Testaments extending his universal love and justice to the entire world.

**Chiasmus in the Book of Jonah**

Unifying these many elements in this prophetic account, the chiastic structure of the book of Jonah suggests that it was intentionally composed to center on Jonah’s exclamation of salvation (2:4–6), the physical midpoint as well as spiritual crux of this text. Others have seen chiastic elements running throughout all or parts of the book of Jonah. The following arrangement, as found by this author, ties the book together as an integrated literary unit, contrary to the views of some others.

A The Lord showed his *universal love* extended to Gentile nations by calling Jonah to “Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it.” (1:1–2)

B Jonah expressed his *anger* with the Lord’s mercy to Gentiles by rising “up to flee . . . from the presence of the Lord.” (1:3)

C “The Lord sent out a great *wind* into the sea” in response to Jonah’s angry flight over the Lord’s reaching out to call Nineveh’s Gentiles to repent. (1:4)

D As “the mariners were *afraid*, and *cried* every man unto his god,” the shipmaster commanded that Jonah “arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we *perish not*.” (1:5–6)

E Jonah *yielded his life* (1:14) to save the Gentile crew; they feared God, offered a sacrifice, and made vows. “Jonah was in the belly of the *fish* three days and three nights.” (1:11–17)
Jonah's voice was heard: “Out of the belly of hell cried I, and thou hearest my voice.” (2:2)

Jonah looked to the temple: “I am cast out of thy sight; yet I will look again toward thy holy temple.” (2:4)

Jonah despaired, “The waters compassed me about, even to the soul: the depth closed... the depth closed... weeds were wrapped about my head. I went down to the bottoms of the mountains... the earth with her bars was about me for ever.” (2:5–6)

Jonah saw salvation: “Yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God.” (2:6)

Jonah's prayer ascended to the temple: “When my soul fainted within me I remembered the Lord: and my prayer came in unto thee, into thine holy temple.” (2:7)

Jonah's sacrificing voice offered thanks and vows: “I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that that I have vowed.” (2:7–9)

Jonah was miraculously delivered on the third day, “the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.” (2:10)

The king of Nineveh feared Jonah’s warning from God, and he commanded his people to “cry mightily unto God... that we perish not.” (3:1–9)

Jonah was angry, and “God prepared a vehement east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah.” (4:1–8)

Jonah was lastly angry over the Lord’s withering of the gourd. He said, “I do well to be angry, even unto death.” (4:9)

The Lord taught Jonah that his merciful, universal love extended to Gentile nations saying, “Should not I spare Nineveh, that great city?” (4:11)

The structure of this composition is relatively self-evident, but it bears an important explanatory message. Broadly speaking, the book is tripartite: (1) Jonah’s ill-fated attempt to avoid his first call to Nineveh, (2) his covenantal acknowledgement in the belly of hell, and (3) his hard-learned lesson in his attempt to fulfill his second call to Nineveh. Significantly,
Jonah 4:1–2 describes Jonah's motive for both his angry flight at the narrative's beginning (1:3) and his unbecoming anger at the story's end (4:1–9), a cord that ties together the opening and closing sections. Jonah's last anger (4:1–9), over having seen the Lord spare Nineveh's Gentiles from destruction, is puzzling, however, since it follows Jonah's humble expression of obedience to God's will which he offered in his prophetic psalm-filled prayer (2:1–9, FGHHGF) and also his determined commitment to sacrifice and pay to God that which he had vowed or consecrated (2:9). Moreover, after Jonah's extraordinary salvation from certain death, he had obediently gone to Nineveh, as he was called the second time to preach repentance there. But surprisingly, the people of Nineveh responded immediately to Jonah's brief warning (3:5), which induced the Lord to spare all Nineveh's Gentiles due to their newfound obedience to God (3:10). This dramatic result “displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry” (4:1), all of which seems illogical and contradictory. But Jonah's disclosure in 4:2 confesses to the Lord that the motive for his anger at both the beginning and ending of this narrative was his knowledge that God is “a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness” (4:2), and therefore Jonah knew that God would not destroy repentant Gentiles (whom Jonah, as an Israelite, detested regardless of their spiritual status). Though illogical, the book of Jonah's chiastic return to this theme of anger allows the story to end as it began, at both points with images to symbolize God's universal love. By starting with the Lord's call of Jonah to Gentile Nineveh, then ending by having him spare all Nineveh, the book of Jonah illustrates the universality of Jehovah's love among all the nations of the world. Within this repeated beginning and ending message, a merciful prophecy unfolds of Jesus's atoning sacrifice and eternal mission for mankind's salvation.

Summary

Through symbolic imagery, the book of Jonah foreshadows Jesus Christ's atonement and his plan for early Christian and latter-day Apostles to oversee the seed of Abraham in carrying out their prophesied missionary charge. Moses and Luke recorded the prophecy that “in thee [Abraham's seed] shall all families of the earth be blessed” (Gen. 12:1–3; see also Acts 3:25).

Are all these parallels between the book of Jonah and the life of Christ equally significant? No type or symbol is a perfect match for what it represents. Yet I see the whole of the book as prophetic. In images from Jonah's storm-tossed sea experiences to those in his prophetic prayer of
affliction while in the Lord’s great fish (belly of hell), the book contains a prophecy of Jesus’s future ministry. These Jonah images portray and pre-figure Jesus’s prayerful agony as he accepted his bitter cup of suffering in Gethsemane, his being lifted up, and his feeling forsaken on Calvary. These were followed by the images of his death and spirit-world ministry. In Jonah’s miraculous third-day deliverance from the Lord’s great fish, readers can easily visualize the unmistakable image of Jesus’s rising from the dead with his third-day resurrection. Jesus himself called attention to this likeness when he referred to it as the sign of Jonah. The just as miraculous missionary image of Nineveh’s total conversion and era of peace among men and beasts in that worldly city provides images that symbolize the Lord’s second coming as the world’s Savior and Judge.

Jonah’s declaration of the Lord Jehovah as the world’s Savior is similar to declarations of prophets throughout the scriptures, as proclaimed three times in Peter’s words to the Jews on the day of Pentecost: “Those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled” (Acts 3:18; see also 3:21, 24). Moses sang, “The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation” (Ex. 15:2). Isaiah promised, “Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength” (Isa. 26:4). In his reply to Jesus’s question as to who he was, the Apostle Peter, the son of Jonah (Matt. 16:17), declared, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:15–16). One purpose of the book of Jonah is to preserve an elaborate declaration and coded testimony of who this Messiah is.

Now in fulfillment of Jonah’s prophetic missionary calling and of Jesus’s commission to teach all nations, tens of thousands of the descendants of Abraham (Israel) by birth or adoption are, in these latter days, reaching out with their missionary callings to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. They declare, as did the prophetic book of Jonah, “Salvation is of the Lord” (2:9), as they invite all to come unto Jesus the Christ, the Savior of the world.
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Emma Lou Thayne and the Art of Peace

Casualene Meyer

We live in a world where peace exists only by reason of a balance of terror. I have often thought that if great numbers of the women of all nations were to unite and lift their voices in the cause of peace, there would develop a worldwide will for peace which could save our civilization and avoid untold suffering, misery, plague, starvation, and the death of millions.

—President Gordon B. Hinckley, September 1985

She has a very real gift that allows her always to see the best in people and situations and lets her deal with things with compassion.

—Becky Thayne Markosian, 1992

Anyone who has been spiritually nourished by the hymn “Where Can I Turn for Peace” knows something of the poetry of Emma Lou Warner Thayne. Thayne, now in her ninetieth year, has fostered peace in fourteen books of prose and poetry as well as in her public service, her antinuclear activism, and her family and personal relationships. Throughout her life, she has held positions of significant responsibility, serving on the Young Women’s General Board of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, on the Deseret News editorial board, and for decades as an adjunct instructor of English at the University of Utah. Thayne has also made many friends and done much to promote peace as an antinuclear activist, a current member of the Salt Lake City Citizen’s Council, and a longtime participant in collaborative art projects. An abiding love of family informs all of her achievements. Thayne’s
culminating creative work, *The Place of Knowing: A Spiritual Autobiography*, published in 2011, gives readers a look into the life of this gracious woman and artist whose love of the word and the world join in her concern for bringing about peace. This book enables readers not only to admire what Thayne has achieved in her “peaceable walk with the children of men” (Moro. 7:4) but also to comprehend how grace and power operate in every life.

The interview that follows is a condensed and blended version of conversations that occurred on September 9, 11, 14, 25, and 29, 2013; November 14, 2013; February 20 and 22, 2014; and March 1, 2014. With poetic precision, Thayne helped to compile and edit the text. Additionally, she provided two new poems, published for the first time in these pages.

**Meyer:** We begin with “Where Can I Turn for Peace,” perhaps your best-known work. You explain in great detail the emotional situation that hymn responds to in the book you coauthored with your daughter Becky, *Hope and Recovery: A Mother-Daughter Story about Anorexia Nervosa, Bulimia, and Manic Depression*. Will you briefly describe the hymn’s genesis for *BYU Studies Quarterly* readers?

---

### Where Can I Turn for Peace?

1. Where can I turn for peace? Where is my solace
   When other sources cease to make me whole?
   When with a wounded heart, anger, or malice,
   I draw myself apart, searching my soul?

2. Where, when my aching grows, Where, when I languish,
   Where, in my need to know, where can I run?
   Where is the quiet hand to calm my anguish?
   Who, who can understand? He, only One.

3. He answers privately, reaches my reaching
   In my Gethsemane, Savior and Friend.
   Gentle the peace he finds for my beseeching.
   Constant he is and kind, love without end.

---
Thayne: I was desperate. I felt there wasn’t going to be any life for our Becky; she was terribly sick, suffering from bipolar and severe eating disorders. She was in the hospital, and I was on the general board of the Young Women [Mutual Improvement Association, or YWMIA]. Every year the YWMIA held a June conference; teachers came from all over the world, and the board presented an elaborate program to introduce the activities and curriculum for the coming year. My friend Joleen Meredith and I, both of us serving on the Laurel committee, had written other songs for this program; she was the musician, and I was the lyricist. The program was just days away, and we needed a finale. I had always wanted to write a hymn, and she had too. Because of Becky’s illness, I had been desperately asking myself, “Where can I turn for peace?” and praying for answers for what I didn’t understand. Actually, once I began the hymn, it was easy for me to write. Within an hour, I had my three verses and called Joleen. She had a history of depression in her family, so she understood exactly what I was talking about. As I read a line, she composed a line; this was over the phone. By noon we had our hymn. We didn’t change anything.

Meyer: You were the first woman to serve on the board of the Deseret News, one of the two daily newspapers in Salt Lake City. Talk about that experience.

Thayne: For seventeen years in the eighties and nineties, I served on the Deseret News board, the only woman. Tom Monson [President Thomas S. Monson] liked me and chose me for the position. He and I were friends, and we could talk. The board met every week in the room where the Quorum of the Twelve meets, and because of my smaller stature, I had to dangle or slump in one of the big chairs. I never had more calls or letters than I did on
my appointment to this board, because women were just not on such boards. But it was a beginning.

My fellow board members were wonderful, and we became good friends. I knew I was a token on the board, but they never treated me like one. Usually in board meetings they just went in and talked bottom line, but I was curious. I didn’t know an awful lot of things, and I asked lots of questions. I felt that I was an advocate for people who had no voice: for women, for the staff, and for readers. I was on the news content committee and had to read every word in both of the Salt Lake City daily papers. And you know, it’s still a habit—I can’t go to bed without reading the papers.

Meyer: You have used your talent with the written word on a grand, public scale but have also shared that talent, as a teacher, to nurture others one-on-one. Tell us about your work in education.

Thayne: I started teaching at the University of Utah soon after I graduated; I was only twenty. It was after World War II, when the student body swelled from 2,000 to 20,000 students, so there was a great need for teachers. Teaching freshman composition was a new adventure, because most of “the boys”—they were all men, of course, and older than I—were on the GI bill, and having been part of the war, they wrote these marvelously interesting things. It was pretty scary, but it was also really, really fun. Teaching got in my blood as a consequence of that first invitation, and I’ve taught ever since, in the Church as well as in the education world.

I turned down administrative jobs in the Church until I was invited to be on the general board of the YWMIA, and I left teaching in the ward very reluctantly; I taught M-Men and Gleaners (the over-eighteen singles). The lessons then were by such fine thinkers as Lowell Bennion, and they dealt with the application of gospel principles to real-life situations. Pretty consistently we’d have thirty-six or so in our class. As they later married, some invited me to go as their escort in the temple.

I am eighty-nine years old now. For the past eight winters, I have taught a class as part of the Oscher Institute at the University of Utah called We Are Our Stories. The students are all over fifty-five. I keep it to twenty—you just don’t want to overcrowd a writing class—and there’s a waiting list every time. People want to tell their stories, and I help them to—that’s
what the class is about. The students find themselves writing deep things, the kinds of things they’ve never really expressed, and I feel as if this can be such a gift for their families.

**Meyer:** You mention teaching as a young graduate right after World War II. Did the realities of this war—especially the atom bomb and the subsequent threat of nuclear wars—contribute to your participation in the peace movement?

**Thayne:** World War II was the good war for us; we wanted to be in war; we wanted to save ourselves from the powers that were out there in the world. When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, I was a seventeen-year-old freshman at the University of Utah. I remember standing in the union building with the whole student body the next morning, Monday. There we were in the ballroom, where we had come for dances and celebrations, and instead we were all very somber. President Roosevelt came on the radio to declare war on Hirohito, Hitler, and Mussolini. For the next four years, we students were heavily involved in what was happening to our troops abroad. During the war, I would regularly go to the library and look at the *Salt Lake Tribune*, which at the time was the only morning paper, to find out who had been listed as missing, wounded, or dead. Very often I would know someone listed, so the war was very close. Meanwhile, almost all the men from the campus were gone to war, and army troops were stationed in the field house. We rolled bandages at the Red Cross and danced with troops at the USO. Silk stockings, gas, butter, and sugar were rationed by coupon; our lives were very much affected by the war. When the atom bomb was dropped and the war ended, we were thrilled. The destructiveness of the bomb we didn’t even think about. Our boys were coming home.

Later, when I was teaching freshman English at the U and we were writing a research paper based in part on Jonathan Schell’s *The Fate of the Earth* [copyright 1982], I began to get a new perspective, both from this book and from what I learned from my students. They had very different ideas about the morality of nuclear weapons. I didn’t consider the loss of life at the time the bomb was dropped; I was just glad the war was over. My being involved in antinuclear activism came very naturally from that initial realization.
Meyer: Let’s talk more about that antinuclear activism and those you call your “peace friends”; your activism has been a facet of your art and relationship with other artists.

Thayne: In 1983, David Freed, the retired first cellist of the Utah Symphony and a peace activist, called to invite me to write poems about peace among nations. We were to be sponsored by the Utah Arts Council to perform around the state a peace message. This was my first experience with any kind of making peace. He was going to play Bach, and I was to read a poem about peace between the movements. Can you imagine what a challenge this was for me?

David made a tape of himself playing Bach to let me know when a poem should occur for the program, and each time I was to come in, he said “pome!” This was amusing to me. Very often people pronounce “po-em” as “pome.” At night I went out to my studio and I'd listen to his playing, and then I'd go to sleep with Bach ringing through me. I'd sleep with the notion of a peace poem, and the night would deliver one to me. I ended up with a suite of six poems that were for me chronological.

Right at that time, a friend of mine called attention to a piece in Time magazine, in which Catholic bishops had written a message to their people saying, “We ask you to consider as we have considered the possibility of nuclear war.” I fell in love with the word “consider”—just think of how seldom we’re asked to consider—so then I ended up with six considerations called How Much for the Earth?

I was at the Virginia Center for the Creative Arts (VCCA) in 1983 for three weeks. You'd apply, and if you were accepted it was like being sponsored by the Medici: it was only ten dollars a day for everything—board and room and this beautiful place and the experience of associating with all the other artists. At VCCA, in the evening after dinner, we would gather in the library and hear poets and writers read, see painters’ work, and hear composers—whatever they’d created during the day. Walter Arndt, foremost translator of Pushkin, heard my reading of these peace poems, which I was revising during my stay, and he said, “Those poems must not stay in Utah.” He offered to translate them into Russian and German at Dartmouth, where there was a chair in his name.
Later, after I’d been in the Soviet Union in 1984 and read these poems in various places, I received a contract from a publisher in the Ukraine. The contract was made out to Lou Thayne Emma (Russians had never heard of a double first name like Emma Lou) to publish 40,000 copies of these poems, all proceeds to go to the Soviet Peace Fund. What kind of a dream is that? Here I’d been on a trip to promote peace, and this happened, and I thought, what could I ever hope for better than that?

Meyer: Tell us about that trip to the Soviet Union.

Thayne: It was in 1984, thirty years ago. I went to the Soviet Union as part of an educational exchange tour. We were definitely behind the Iron Curtain and very aware of the deprivation of a Communist society. I wrote a 600-page book about it but didn’t have it published. Now it would be a real period piece. Watching the Sochi Olympic Games made me realize what a different place Russia is now.

Meyer: And didn’t you also attend a nuclear test ban conference? What impressions remain with you, and why do you feel that such involvement was fitting for a poet? I’m thinking Shelley—“Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.” Do you think there’s anything to that?

Thayne: It’s been twenty-four years since I attended the Nevada-Semipalatinsk congress in Kazakhstan to urge all nations to sign the nuclear test ban treaty. From that congress I realized that the world would be a lot less dangerous if we could have that test ban treaty signed. The treaty could have made a huge difference then; it still could today.

My talk to the congress was about people and our connectedness. Everything at the conference had been very factual but not moving. We needed to connect with each other and with our purpose emotionally. Poetry is about feeling; that is why in my talk I read from my book How Much for the Earth. People seemed to respond to what I was saying.

I still find occasion to use these poems in the cause of peace. More than twenty years after the test ban treaty conference, I was invited to read from the book together with the saxophone of Clifton Sanders at Utah Valley University for a peace-among-nations celebration. What a glorious serendipity to have
the keynote speaker be Jonathan Schell. I told him how much his book *The Fate of the Earth* had meant to me, how it changed everything; it changed my point of view on the atomic bomb.

I’ve recently been working with friends about the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which is going to come up for a vote again. The United States, Israel, and China are among the twenty-one nations that have signed but haven’t ratified the test ban treaty. Thirteen other countries, including India, Pakistan, and North Korea, have neither signed nor ratified it. So that’s still on the table. Last August three of my peace friends and I had a telephone meeting with former senator Bob Bennett and invited him, if he could, to talk to people in Congress who oppose it, about why he favors it. That’s what we’re doing right now.

On another front, I have a friend who is extremely interested in ridding the world of landmines. Another friend who had recently returned from Iraq told me that a landmine is the perfect soldier, who never gets tired or afraid, but stays right there on the job ready to kill people.

Meyer: It seems your talent for loving others and your talent with the word empowered you to participate in the cause of peace. What is the relationship between art and advocacy?

Thayne: It has every relationship. There are so many people working behind the scenes to make good things happen—it was these peace friends who helped me go to the Soviet Union and later on to the 1990 Kazakhstan test ban treaty conference. They are this nucleus of people who are constantly finding ways to push our civilization toward peace; I’m the recipient of their good work. What I do is write things for publications and for people; that’s been my main thing. Sometimes they ask me to write something for a given cause, but most of the time I just do it on my own. Writing’s my deal, you know.

I’ve never been one who has marched or joined protests. I have done my activism on the page mostly, writing articles and letters to editors. I have friends whom I respect enormously, who do march and protest, but the spoken and printed word have been my way to voice my opinions.

Meyer: Most people would consider you “old,” and yet you are still an artist and activist in the cause of peace, lifting others with the power of your words and social consciousness. Talk about this.
Emma Lou Thayne and the Art of Peace

Thayne: I thought by the time I was eighty-nine things would slow down. Nelson Mandela in Africa felt that older people who had been active in the community should not be put on a shelf but be called into some kind of service to help with present problems. Along with Richard Branson and Peter Gabriel, he came up with what he called a council of “Elders”; these councils are all over the world now. But in Salt Lake we could not be called the council of Elders, so we are the Citizen's Council. We started out with two former governors and people from all walks of life, all past retirement age. We still want to have something to say about how our state is run. We work on things like redistricting, ethics, and Medicaid extension. We don't make a lot of progress sometimes, but we keep working. I just love our meetings; everyone knows more than I do. I go and learn. They are former legislators, people who have been in every branch of government, educators, businesspeople—they represent a wide spectrum of skills. You can imagine how much fun those meetings are, even as I hobble in on my walker.

On September 29, 2013, I was given the Gandhi Peace Award at the aviary in Liberty Park. Of course it was an honor, but I feel I’ve been led in every direction I’ve gone. For example, last fall I was invited by BYU and the gifted Jared Oaks to write
a suite of five poems about the beauty of Utah to be set to music and performed by soprano and mezzo-soprano; I love soprano duets, so this has been fun. I think I’m being invited to do a lot of things because people think I’m going to die, which I will . . . any minute. That’s fine. But still, life is a kick when all these fine things are happening.

Meyer: We have talked about your public life and influence; now let’s talk about the loving family relationships that very much inform your poetry and prose, that give you reasons for publishing peace. What was your birth family like?

Thayne: I don’t have to think, “Now I will love someone.” I just do. It’s a simple imperative, a gift from my family. My mother and father loved each other; they were in a honeymoon marriage. They were happy people, both interested and interesting, and that’s a pretty good combination. My father was an athlete and a referee. His saying was, “Try hard. Play fair. Have fun.” Imagine having someone you live with teach you to live your life like that. In our family, we cheered for each other. Mother and Father made sure that we were always cheering for the other people, too. He was the athlete and the people person; he was out in the business world, and everybody loved him. Mother was at home. A poet and a painter, she brought aesthetic balance to our home. It was amazing that they were so good together, because they were so very different. He’d go to the opera with her, and she didn’t miss a football game with him. She had a literary club and a sewing club, and that was the extent of her leaving the home. It was she who killed the rattlesnakes. It was also she who taught us how to hammer and saw. Her thing was to pray at night, plan in the morning. Her faith was just unlimited, and so that’s something we also learned by osmosis.

All three of my brothers, Homer, Rick, and Gill Warner, have recently died—oh! I miss them. We grew up knowing that we were loved, so we loved each other. We liked people, so we were invited into rewarding groups, places, and relationships. My husband, Mel, now takes my brothers’ three widows and me to our traditional Thursday lunch.

Meyer: And what about your own marriage? How has it contributed to your art and achievements?
Thayne: Mel and I met on a blind date. He was running a boating concession on Pine View Reservoir in 1949 while he waited for a scholarship for his master’s program in American history at Stanford. At that time nobody had a boat or water skis, so they had to come to him to buy time on the lake. He taught them to water-ski or took them for a boat ride. One of my best friends lined us up for a date to go waterskiing, which was a little strange because that winter I had broken my back—I went over a cliff skiing and landed in pine trees. I was barely out of a body cast and into a brace, but Mel said he wasn’t concerned; he just gave me a big Mae West life jacket. He was such a good teacher that I got up the first time I tried, and that’s very unusual. It probably helped that I was a snow skier, too.

That waterskiing date has always seemed to me to be a good metaphor for our marriage: I always feel connected to this wonderful rope that’s pulling me in a certain direction. Mel knows where he’s going, and I’m free on my end of the rope to play any way I want to in the wake. Of course, sometimes I get to drive the boat, too. But for a big part of our lives, Mel has supported me financially, socially, and spiritually, and it has made for a wonderful life.

Meyer: In reading your work, I think it is clear that your family—five daughters, sons-in-law, and grandchildren—are also part of your wonderful life. What would you like to say about them?

Thayne: My daughters and I have had a very close and supportive relationship throughout all of our years together. We go to lunch every week—anyone who’s in town, usually at least four of us—and we have a girls’ trip every spring, twenty-eight crazy times so far, mostly near home (St. George or the West Coast), but occasionally to such destinations as Ireland and New York. My daughters are my fun and my support, maybe especially in these later years, and each is her own unique self.

My sons-in-law are dandy guys; I like them a lot, and they like each other. I’ve got a son-in-law here at the table with me right now. He’s my physical therapist; he makes me move!

Mel and I have eighteen grandchildren, and in the spring we’ll have eighteen great-grandchildren. Most of the time when our whole family meets, it feels like a cast of thousands; there are so many of us.
One Will Be Gone

Making the Bed with My Husband, Both 88

Any day now one of us will be gone
the other fumbling in irrelevance
sinking into puppet tasks
betrayed by memory
that lurks beneath the making
of a bed the shower spray
the phone now someone else
the neighbor’s mower the car
idling in the drive the tasteless
Cheerios in skim milk
the CD of the Choir the mixed up
photos on the fridge the air.
The very air.

—Emma Lou Thayne
For me to get really acquainted with my grandchildren, we need to have time alone together, so starting when they turn four, we go on “birthday sprees”; a spree is being together for an evening and doing anything they want to do. I love to have my private time with them. I used to drive and pick them up; now in the last little while they’ve had to pick me up, and that’s pretty exciting when they’re just sixteen. Mel doesn’t go on the sprees; he says one-on-one is better than two-on-one, so all these years he’s sent me. I love to have my private time with my grandkids—one is now thirty-nine.

Meyer: Thank you for telling about your family; your love for them is evident in the way you write and talk about them. Perhaps it is fitting, as we conclude our interview, to discuss your newest book, *The Place of Knowing*. How did you come to write it?

Thayne: This book grew around a death experience I had many years ago: an iron bar smashed through the windshield of the car I was riding in and struck me in the face. It did horrendous damage; I nearly didn’t survive. My prolonged suffering resulted in a time when it seemed I actually died and experienced unsurpassed love and peace. The book explores this sacred event in the context of a life of love. It took me a long time to begin to write it—about twenty-five or twenty-six years. As I say in the introduction, it was gestating under everything I was writing; it’s always been with me, and other people helped me define the experience.

In this death experience, I felt a harmony I had sought all my life. Where I had felt some conflict between my tomboy identity and my identity as a lady, in my death experience I was one person—an eternal essence, whole, loved beyond the expectations of my culture or even my family. In my “childness,” I simply was.

If that experience sounds mystical, well, I am a mystic. As I assimilated my accident, I learned this: I went away and returned with a promise to keep. Keeping that promise of offering peace would take the rest of my life. Love would be the directing force, love that is infinite. This is what I have to teach: The more we love, the more we are privileged to love. My mentor, Lowell Bennion, taught me that what matters most is relationships, vertically to the divine and horizontally to the human. Always.
Meyer: I urge those who want to know more to read your books *Hope and Recovery*, *As for Me and My House*, and *The Place of Knowing*, because love, received and given, has been your guide in your peaceable walk. How does one cultivate the arts of love and peace?

Thayne: I don’t want to sound like a do-gooder. I was never a do-gooder. I was having too much fun. I was doing people. I don’t know that you cultivate love and peace; they just happen. I don’t remember trying to cultivate anything. I think we carry certain inclinations with us, in our genes and in our upbringing, what we’re surrounded by. We see love. We adopt it. It just feels true to me.

I’m basically a peaceful person. I don’t like confrontation. I’ll take it on if I need to, but it’s not my way. One time somebody asked me, “What do you do?” And I said, “I do people; people do me.” I get to associate with these jewels who feed me all the time: friends, colleagues, neighbors. We’ve lived in the same house for fifty-eight years, and I’m still friends with my tennis pals, though I had to quit playing at eighty-five. I’m happy to be Aunt Lou to half the Salt Lake Valley.
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Let Me Be Sad

Now let me feel sad. Impulse, trained in gladness,
Do not try to whisk me away from grief
Like a child caught sulking in a corner
Immobilized by imagined hurt.

Instead, let me grow rich with my sadness.
Let it mellow and strengthen my joy,
Take bold hold of my will,
Give tears permission to water the parch of loss.

Let its music ripple my spine.
Let me give ardent ear
To what was, to what never will be.
Grief, be my companion in joy.

In the numberless calls acquainting me with the Night
Bring me to my senses, numberless too
In abandoning numbness and the faint iridescence
Of busyness, crowds, brief entertainments.

Like walking into a sea, only in depth can I float.
Depth, too often feared for its power
To raise me footloose and struggling
Is all that can gentle me back to shore:

Safe, breathing in the cosmos of the sweet unknown
Full of the Light of having been sad.

—Emma Lou Thayne
Debates on Mormonism’s status as a Christian religion generally revolve around dogmatic issues—what is, or what should be, Christianity’s minimum theological denominator, and does LDS doctrine fit within this particular requirement in order to be classified as Christian? For Stephen Webb, the author of *Mormon Christianity* and a former professor of philosophy and religion at Wabash College, that debate is settled: not only is Mormonism a legitimate branch of Christianity, but it is also a fountain of wisdom from which other Christians can draw, albeit critically. Indeed, Webb’s book is certainly one of the most flattering treatments of the Mormon faith to ever have been written by a scholar who is not a Latter-day Saint. It is also an excellent example of philosophical theology that will likely be appreciated by Mormons and non-Mormons alike for years to come.

Readers who are familiar with the author’s previous work in Mormon studies will not be surprised by the focus of this book. Indeed, *Mormon Christianity* further develops Webb’s February 2012 *First Things* essay “Mormonism Obsessed with Christ” and his 2012 Oxford monograph *Jesus Christ, Eternal God: Heavenly Flesh and the Metaphysics of Matter*, particularly its penultimate chapter entitled “Godbodied: The Matter of the Latter-day Saints.” The way in which these two publications are brought together and expanded is what gives *Mormon Christianity* its novelty. Webb takes the original, and perhaps questionable, approach of affirming Mormonism’s Christianity by highlighting one of its most distinctive characteristics vis-à-vis the classical theism of historical Christianity, namely the materialism of its metaphysics. This is what the author loves most about Mormonism. In fact, Mormon metaphysics is at the core of Webb’s claim that “other Christians can learn from the Latter-day Saints.”


Reviewed by Mauro Properzi
To be sure, the book is more than a thoughtful treatment of Mormon metaphysics. While not a comprehensive introduction to the religion of the Latter-day Saints (a difficult task for any writer to achieve), the book addresses a wide variety of topics, including the Book of Mormon, temple ordinances, priesthood, Sunday worship, LDS history, plural marriage, prophetic authority, and the First Vision. Yet Webb’s passion for Mormon metaphysics is evident because the topic reemerges in every successive chapter with additional nuances, connections, and articulations. It lies at the center of the whole endeavor, as the author himself admits: “I think that Mormon metaphysics provides the best gateway into the whole range of Mormon religious beliefs and practices” (9). Indeed, it is in his treatment of metaphysics, both Mormon and not, that Webb demonstrates an impressive breadth and depth of knowledge that extends beyond classical and Hellenistic philosophy into modern scientific developments in the realms of physics and astronomy. His understanding of nineteenth-century Mormonism and of the writings of Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, and the Pratt brothers is also notable.

The book is divided into an introduction, seven chapters, and three appendices. Each chapter could stand on its own as an individual essay; indeed, the articulation of the book’s core argument is not strictly linear. In the context of what he calls “the Mormon Ecumenical Moment,” Webb begins by analyzing Mormonism’s “institutional identity” in relation to its Catholic and Protestant counterparts. Comparative analyses of this kind surface at various other points throughout the book, and Mormonism generally emerges from them in a very positive light. To illustrate, the author states that “Mormonism cultivates a sense of belonging, purpose, and focus that is not easy to find in many churches today” (11) and that “Mormonism has a deeply Catholic sensibility . . . [combining] elements of Protestantism and Catholicism in a way that is more than something that simply adds them together” (15). He emphasizes Mormon “elasticity” and “expansiveness” of doctrine, stating that “Mormonism is more elastic than those liberal churches that strictly enforce their unwavering commitment to progressive politics” (22), and that “Catholicism . . . needs Mormonism’s exuberantly unrestrained imagination” (76).

With philosophical erudition, historical awareness, and a good dose of wit, Webb defends Mormonism and its founder against derogatory accusations of being “magical” and “cultish.” Yet his primary defense is articulated through an enthusiastic embrace of the Mormon view of matter, which he classifies as a Christian form of materialism that lies between atheistic materialism and Platonic immaterialism. “Take away
Plato from Christianity, and you will get . . . well, you will end up with something very much like the Mormon conception of the divine” (85)—such is Webb’s lament for the robust influence of Platonic philosophy over traditional Christianity. Indeed, the author sees the dominance of the immaterialist view as a contributor to modernity’s spiritual breakdown; he identifies in the severing of the supernatural from the natural “the single most important cultural revolution in the history of the world” (143–44). Conversely, for Mormons “nature is already thoroughly supernatural right down to the smallest atom, and the supernatural is nothing more than nature in its most intense and concentrated form.” Hence the whole point of Mormonism “is to affirm, celebrate, and seal the continuity between this world and the next” (148).

In addressing Mormon concepts of divine embodiment, gradation of matter, and “spiritual” materialism, Webb is not satisfied with simply highlighting the few doctrinal statements that exist on the subject. Instead, he turns to Orson Pratt “to find the true revolutionary potential of Smith’s metaphysics . . . [because] when it came to metaphysical speculation . . . Smith was the forerunner and Pratt was the real thing” (89–90). This is indeed one of the most interesting and dense sections of the book, exploring such topics as the nature of the Holy Spirit, intelligence, the idea of a world’s soul, and time-space dimensions. The author then surveys a few historical and theological aspects of Mormonism (with ample connections to metaphysics) before concluding with two questions, addressed to mainstream Christians and to Mormons, respectively. In asking Christians what they could learn from the Mormons, Webb detours somewhat into a critique of Calvinism, which he identifies as the main historical and theological opponent of Mormonism. The question for Mormons is different since it is focused on the future direction of the faith: will Mormonism be more metaphysical or evangelical? The author identifies David Paulsen as the best representative of the former direction and Robert Millet as the key exponent of the latter. Together, Webb concludes, “Paulsen and Millet make Mormonism look like a creedless Catholicism joined to a nonlit-eralist Protestantism” (169).

In the final analysis, Mormon Christianity is a fascinating book that is both intellectually stimulating and pragmatically relevant to the realm of interfaith dialogue. Its strengths include the author’s openness and appreciation of a doctrinal stance that lies outside his own religious tradition; his philosophical acuity, clarity, and breadth when dealing with Mormon metaphysics; and his capacity to demonstrate the centrality
of Mormon materialism within the broader framework of the Mormon doctrinal worldview. As a Mormon reader, I certainly obtained a renewed appreciation of the Christian materialism inherent in my own tradition. The book was also enjoyable in its personal autobiographical touch; I found that the author’s description of his own religious journey from Evangelicalism through the Disciples of Christ to Catholicism helped me to better comprehend his complex theological background and his unprejudiced approach to Mormonism.

At the same time, the book has some shortcomings that should not be overlooked. Weaknesses arise from the exaggeration of those elements that constitute its strengths. For example, Webb’s sympathetic view of Mormonism at times borders on the romantic, such as when he states that Mormons “do not manifest any trace of the religious guilt and self-reproach that are still inculcated in many traditional Christian churches. They seem too happy to be Christian!” (44). Moreover, his almost exclusive focus on Mormon metaphysics as the defining tenet of its Christianity risks obscuring the more multifaceted, complex, and paradoxical richness of the LDS faith. Perhaps, for a book entitled Mormon Christianity, the focus is too narrow. It follows that its ecumenical effectiveness can also be brought into question: readers may not as readily recognize Mormonism’s Christianity, as Webb does, from the primary focus on its distinctive metaphysics. Finally, the author’s critique of Calvinism in the latter section of the book appears to be a bit harsh and somewhat out of tune when compared to the conciliatory tone of the rest of the volume. These questionable elements aside, Mormon Christianity is a remarkable work of philosophical theology and a fresh, welcomed interpretation of the LDS faith and of its metaphysics, which will be well worth its readers’ time.

Mauro Properzi received his master of theological studies from Harvard Divinity School, an M.Phil in psychology and religion from Cambridge University, a PhD in Mormon studies from Durham University in the U.K., and a postdoctoral certificate in interfaith dialogue from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, Italy. Since 2011, he has been employed full time at Brigham Young University, where he teaches classes on world religions and Christianity. His main research interests include LDS-Catholic dialogue, the theology of religions, moral theology and ethics, and Mormon Studies. He has published in the Journal of Ecumenical Studies, the Journal of Mormon History, BYU Studies Quarterly, and in Issues in Religion and Psychotherapy. Properzi is a native of Gorizia, Italy.

Reviewed by Jay H. Buckley

Jacob Hamblin embodies one of the more colorful and interesting Mormon pioneers in Utah Territory during the second half of the nineteenth century. During his long and eventful life, he wore many hats—explorer, frontiersman, Indian agent, missionary, colonizer, community leader—and wore them well. Born on April 6, 1819, on the Ohio frontier, Hamblin left the family farm at age nineteen to strike out on his own. After nearly dying during a cave-in at a lead mine in Galena, Illinois, he collected his wages and traveled to Wisconsin to homestead. In 1839, he married Lucinda Taylor and began farming and raising a family.

Hamblin’s destiny changed after listening to Mormon elders preach the restored gospel. They baptized him into The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on March 3, 1842. Lucinda refused to travel west with the Saints and left her husband. Hamblin then married Rachel Judd, crossed the plains to the Great Basin, and settled in Tooele Valley southwest of the Great Salt Lake. When he was called out to fight Goshutes who were raiding cattle from the Mormon settlers, Hamblin had a remarkable experience that convinced him that if he never took the life of an Indian, he would never be killed by an Indian. Hamblin then learned their language, spent time with them, and adopted an Indian child into his family. These tendencies sometimes put him at odds with his ecclesiastical and “military” leaders, but his associations with native tribes often proved to be beneficial.

Brigham Young called Hamblin on a mission to the Southern Paiutes in 1854. Hamblin gained standing and influence among them because of his integrity, his friendship, and his spiritual gifts. His missionary efforts often revolved around his ability to prophesy and his gift as a faith healer. When President Young appointed him president of the Southern Utah Indian Mission, Hamblin moved his family to a home along the Santa Clara River.
Hamblin was in Salt Lake City to marry to his third plural wife, sixteen-year-old Sarah Priscilla Leavitt, on September 11, 1857, the date of the Mountain Meadows Massacre. That fateful event occurred just a few miles from one of Hamblin’s homes where family was staying. Some scholars believe the tragic incident may have been averted had he been present. Hamblin initially consulted with Governor Alfred Cumming to help bring to justice the Mormon perpetrators involved in the tragic murders. The governor refused to prosecute the case because all Mormons had been pardoned by President James Buchanan for their alleged crimes during the Utah War. Subsequent territorial governors and federal officials did not view the pardon the same way and sought to punish the Mormons. Under these threatening conditions, it seems apparent, though out of character, that Hamblin assisted other Church leaders in casting some of the blame for the attack upon the Southern Paiutes.

Some of Hamblin’s greatest accomplishments were his peaceful negotiation of the 1870 Treaty of Fort Defiance in New Mexico and his role in aiding the John Wesley Powell exploration of the Colorado River. Hamblin also served faithfully as a missionary to the southwestern tribes (Utes, Paiutes, Hopis, Navajos, Zunis, and many others), aided by his ability to speak Indian languages. He became intimately connected with the tribes, taking perhaps as many as three Paiute women as wives, although documentation for such unions is scarce.

Hamblin married his fourth (confirmed) wife, Louisa Boneli, and watched his posterity grow to at least twenty-four children, several step-children, and seven adopted Indian children. He helped establish the Cotton Mission in southern Utah, built several communities, and generally kept the peace. His two-story adobe, sandstone, and ponderosa pine home, completed in 1863, was a school and community gathering place and is one of the few pioneer-era homes still standing. Eventually, federal laws against polygamy forced him to move his families into Arizona, New Mexico, and Chihuahua, Mexico. Hamblin’s twilight years were spent as a fugitive, continually moving from one location to another in order to evade capture by federal officers. Hamblin died in Pleasanton, New Mexico, on August 31, 1886, and was buried in Alpine, Arizona.

Since his death, many biographers have attempted to dramatize portions of Hamblin’s life story. Authors approaching this larger-than-life figure have tended to either perpetuate frontiersman legends or focus on the mysteries surrounding the man. Paul D. Bailey’s *Jacob Hamblin, Buckskin Apostle* (1948) is among the first quasi novels emphasizing Hamblin’s role as a frontiersman. Pearson H. Corbett’s *Jacob Hamblin:
The Peacemaker (1952) represents a sympathetic and faithful Mormon perspective written largely for the Hamblin family and was the standard biography for several generations. The accomplished author Juanita Brooks, who wrote excellent works on the Mountain Meadows Massacre and John D. Lee, also wrote a short semifictional account, Jacob Hamblin: Mormon Apostle to the Indians (1980). Most of these works emphasized the religious and Indian missionary aspects of Hamblin’s life. More recently, Hartt Wixom’s Jacob Hamblin: A Modern Look at the Frontier Life and Legend of Jacob Hamblin (1996) set out to unravel some of the mysteries attached to Hamblin.

Although many authors have analyzed the life of Jacob Hamblin, none have succeeded to the degree that Todd M. Compton has. Compton is an independent Mormon historian, who has garnered both praise for his careful scholarship and criticism for his deconstructionist views of Church history, or a history of “tragic ambiguity,” as he calls it. He has published numerous articles and books, including In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith and Fire and Sword: A History of the Latter-day Saints in Northern Missouri (coauthored with Leland H. Gentry). While Compton’s sometimes rationalistic explanations of religious experience will not be edifying to all Latter-day Saint readers, from a historian’s perspective his biography of Hamblin is a tour de force.

Compton always gives special attention to detail, and his academic approach in analyzing primary and secondary sources to reconstruct Hamblin’s life enable him to effectively situate Hamblin within the broader context of Mormon, Utah, and western history. He portrays Hamblin as a mortal man, full of many virtues as well as some vices. In some ways, Hamblin represents the “Leatherstocking of Utah,” a reference to James Fenimore Cooper’s fictional but legendary character Natty Bumppo. Like Bumppo, Hamblin was a frontiersman who liked Indians but struggled with the cross-purposes of living among and learning Indian ways while aiding Indian displacement and Mormon settlement, an internal struggle that Compton calls “the great paradox of Hamblin’s life” (480). All that Hamblin could do was “help both Indians and white settlers adjust to the [colonizing] process in a humane and non-violent way” (482–83).

As with his previous works, Compton seeks to give a counterbalance to established narratives that have potential to give rise to myth. He provides insights when acknowledging that the earliest accounts of an incident do not always include the supernatural aspects and visionary perspectives of events that often are found in later accounts. When discussing a particular historical event, he does a good job of seeking balance when presenting the various points of view from Hamblin, Indians,
Mormons, and outsiders. He has done a masterful job of researching and documenting the totality of Hamblin’s experiences, examining and disentangling many legends and controversies and offering cogent, insightful interpretations of the key moments in his life. In sum, this work represents the most scholarly treatment of Jacob Hamblin to date.

Fortunately, Hamblin left the author numerous sources to work with. His journals, diaries, letters, account books, and other correspondence provided wonderful material. These records, combined with Hamblin’s autobiography that was ghostwritten by James A. Little and published as Jacob Hamblin: A Narrative of His Personal Experience (1881), aided Compton in his efforts to capture Hamblin’s thoughts and perspectives from many sources unavailable to or unused by previous biographers. It proved to be a daunting undertaking, one that resulted in a 642-page book with 100 pages of endnotes.

Compton successfully infuses Hamblin’s own words throughout the narrative, giving a personalizing touch that helps readers understand and relate to Hamblin’s thoughts and feelings. Compton is also willing to take previous interpretations of Hamblin to task, sometimes to set the record straight and sometimes to offer a different perspective on controversies. He gives a nuanced interpretation of Hamblin’s actions following the Mountain Meadows Massacre, which included burying the massacre victims and having his wives care temporarily for some of the surviving orphaned children. The event also created an irreparable rift between him and his friend John D. Lee, who eventually was executed for participating in the horrific affair while others probably as culpable as he were not prosecuted nor punished.

One of the downsides of this work is that the author often comingles historians with historical actors, which breaks the narrative flow and muddies the water for the casual reader, who may find the tome occasionally dry and too comprehensive or laborious to read. Those who do put forth the effort, however, will be taken on an exciting journey with one of the quintessential pioneers of southern Utah. Compton’s magnificent biography of Hamblin won the Juanita Brooks Prize in Mormon Studies, and it represents the best biography of Hamblin and one of the great biographies in Mormon and Utah history.

Jay H. Buckley is Associate Professor of History at Brigham Young University. His interests include western and American Indian history, and he is the author of William Clark: Indian Diplomat (University of Oklahoma Press) and coeditor and author of the 2012 book Zebulon Pike, Thomas Jefferson, and the Opening of the American West (University of Oklahoma Press).
THEATER REVIEW

Habeas Corpus and the Courts:
Individual Liberties from Joseph Smith
to Abraham Lincoln to Guantanamo.
By Jeffrey N. Walker and Dean Corrin.
Directed by Sandy Shinner.

Varsity Theater, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. March 26, 2014.

Reviewed by Jennifer Hurlbut

This production was created as one of a series of annual theatrical events presented by the Illinois Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission (ISCHPC) and the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum (ALPLM). Previous events dramatized a retrial of Mary Surratt for her role in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln and a retrial of Mary Todd Lincoln, who was tried for charges of insanity in 1875.1 In early 2013, Justice Anne Burke from the Illinois Supreme Court contacted Elder Dallin H. Oaks, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and a former Utah Supreme Court Justice, to ask if the Church could assist the ISCHPC in looking at Joseph Smith’s legal cases in Illinois.2

Elder Oaks contacted Richard Turley, Assistant Church Historian, who, with Jeffrey Walker, a contributor to the Joseph Smith Papers Project and an adjunct professor at the J. Reuben Clark Law School, met with the ISCHPC and the ALPLM to discuss the project. As Joseph Smith used the writ of habeas corpus on several occasions while in Illinois, the group decided to center its efforts on those cases. Walker, who has studied Joseph Smith’s use of habeas corpus,3 was asked to write the script, and Dean Corrin, associate dean of the theater school at DePaul University, became involved as the dramaturge. Walker and Corrin worked together to refine Walker’s script into the production.4

1. Information about these performances is available at Illinois Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission, “The Events of the Commission,” http://www.illinoiscourthistory.org/events.
4. Walker to author.
Habeas Corpus and the Courts focuses on three trials of Joseph Smith involving the writ of habeas corpus. Each trial dealt with extradition requisitions from Missouri for various alleged crimes. Habeas Corpus has now been performed four times, first in Springfield and Chicago (in conjunction with events in Nauvoo), and then in Salt Lake City and Provo, Utah, in 2014. The production is overtly educational and is being featured in high school and college curricula in Illinois. This play is like most theater in that it tells an audience about human experience, but its main goal is clearly didactic. The acting, set, and other aspects of performance were more than sufficient, but they were secondary to the primary purpose of teaching about this moment in Illinois legal history.5

For the first segment of the evening, four talented actors narrated and acted out three stories of Joseph Smith’s use of habeas corpus in Illinois. These three stories were told in about an hour. The stage set and costuming in this documentary production were intentionally spare, allowing the historical facts to speak prominently and starkly. Each actor played multiple parts, differentiating clearly between the roles with small costume changes and distinct acting styles. Sometimes one would break character to explain the scene directly to the audience. All parts were convincingly and energetically played. I expect that Mormons in the audience were pleased to see Joseph portrayed in a dignified manner, played most often by Clayton Stamper. Actor Nicholas Harazin introduced the three vignettes and explained the importance of these events in American history. The history was also given in the playbill, so that audience members could review the events afterward.6

Thanks to excellent direction by Sandy Shinner, the narration and stories moved quickly, presenting the essence of the history without getting bogged down in details. There was an unusual connection between the performers and the audience: I think most of us were fully aware that prominent judges, lawyers, and Church leaders of the past were being portrayed by actors on a stage while their present-day counterparts were in the audience.

The first of the three stories told is set in June 1841. Joseph was arrested outside of Quincy, Illinois, as he returned home from a trip to the East.

5. In keeping with the didactic purpose of the production, the play and panel discussion were recorded. It is anticipated that the production will be made available to the public in the near future.

6. The playbill and other resources are available at https://byustudies.byu.edu/showTitle.aspx?title=9416.
The arrest was based on a Missouri extradition requisition stating that Joseph Smith had outstanding indictments in Missouri. Joseph filed a writ of habeas corpus, which was reviewed by Judge Stephen A. Douglas (“Yes, that Stephen A. Douglas,” Harazin tells us). Judge Douglas ruled that the arrest from Missouri was faulty (because the warrant had been used before and a new warrant had not been properly re-issued) and released Joseph.

The second case arose in August 1842. This time, Missouri’s request for extradition from Illinois was based on Joseph’s alleged involvement in an assassination attempt on former Governor Lilburn Boggs in May 1842. The requisition stated that Joseph had “fled from justice,” but in fact Joseph was not in Missouri in May 1842 and, therefore, could not have fled from justice. Further, the requisition was based solely on an affidavit from Boggs that proved to be rooted in his beliefs, not on facts. So, again on a technicality, the requisition and arrest warrant were declared improper and Joseph was released.

This piece of history lends itself well to theater, since the original event was quite dramatic. People packed the courthouse in Springfield to see Joseph Smith. Some young ladies—including daughters of the judge, a daughter of the defense counsel, and Mary Todd Lincoln—were allowed to sit on the bench with federal judge Nathaniel Pope. Justin Butterfield, one of Joseph Smith’s attorneys and played by Clayton Stamper (who earlier played Joseph Smith), may have had the best line of the production. Admiring Judge Pope and the row of (invisible) young ladies, he said, “May it please the Court: I appear before you today under circumstances most novel and peculiar. I am to address the ‘Pope’ (bowing to the Judge) surrounded by angels (bowing still lower to the ladies), in the presence of the holy Apostles, in behalf of the Prophet of the Lord.” When this scene was performed, the actors used it as comic relief, just as Butterfield intended it for his audience in 1842.

The third event occurred in June 1843, when Missouri officials again sought extradition for Joseph’s alleged crimes in 1838. This time, a Nauvoo municipal court heard Joseph’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Finally, Mormons were allowed to tell their story in court: Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, Parley P. Pratt, Sidney Rigdon, and Brigham Young were

called upon to testify about persecutions in Missouri. The Nauvoo court ruled in Joseph's favor and ordered his release.

At the end of the play, the actors yielded the stage to a panel of five experts. In the BYU production, the panel consisted of Gery Chico, Dee Benson, John Lupton, Jeffrey Walker, and Patricia Bronte. Chico, a lawyer and chairman of the Illinois State Board of Education, chaired the discussion. Benson, a judge in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, compared 1840s habeas corpus law to today’s practice, saying that much of what was covered under writs of habeas corpus in the 1840s is now covered under more sophisticated and particular laws, and a writ of habeas corpus is rarely used in circumstances like those Joseph Smith faced. Lupton, of the ISCHPC, addressed questions regarding Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War, and how Lincoln suspended writs of habeas corpus during the war: it was an emergency action demanded by the needs of Northern troops moving to and from Washington, D.C., which was surrounded by Southern states. Walker addressed questions about Joseph Smith’s legal history and the powers of the Nauvoo City Charter. Bronte, a lawyer who has served as habeas corpus counsel for several men detained at Guantanamo Bay since 2005, brought the topic up to the present day. She explained the history of U.S. Congressional law and Supreme Court decisions regarding the status of these prisoners and the dilemma facing U.S. lawmakers and judges: that even though they respect the human rights of all prisoners, no one wants to be responsible for releasing a future terrorist hijacker.

To ascertain whether the production met its goal of teaching the need to understand habeas corpus law and its historic use, I interviewed several first-year BYU law students. All of them expressed that they knew nothing about habeas corpus beforehand and felt the production had successfully given them a good grasp of the law and how it had changed over time. One said she intended to study more on habeas corpus, especially regarding the status of prisoners at Guantanamo. All agreed that the experience taught them much, that law and history go hand in hand, and that all people need to understand history in order to understand the present.

Jennifer Hurlbut is a senior editor at BYU Studies. She earned a BA in international relations at Brigham Young University. She works primarily with the Church history editorial board.
Published for just one year, from May 1844 until May 1845, The Prophet is a key to understanding the Latter-day Saint experience in the East at that crucial time in LDS Church history. The pages are filled with news of Mormonism and the spread of the Latter-day Saint faith in New York, Pennsylvania, and other eastern states in the mid-1840s. Local news of interest to Latter-day Saint historians is presented against a backdrop of historical events, such as the United States presidential election of 1844, the Martyrdom of Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum, and the ongoing wrestle between Sidney Rigdon and the Apostles as they vied for converts in the East.

Editors of The Prophet printed an unrelenting defense of Mormonism to counteract exaggerated reports and slanderous claims stemming from Hancock County, Illinois, and printed in eastern newspapers. Editors George T. Leach, William Smith, Samuel Brannan, and Parley P. Pratt confronted politicians, newspaper columnists, and even the governor of Illinois on statements that misrepresented Mormon faith and vilified discipleship. In contrast, they wrote in glowing terms of Joseph Smith and thousands of Mormons gathered on the banks of the Mississippi. They wrote words of encouragement to fellow believers in the East who were planning to migrate to Nauvoo.

The accompanying searchable DVD contains scans of all fifty-two issues of The Prophet, as well as annotations about people, places, and terms mentioned in the newspaper.