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ABSTRACT
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On Monday, May 24, 1925, President Emeritus George H. Brimhall of the Brigham Young University read this original poem to pay tribute to President Charles W. Penrose who had passed away on May 16, 1925:

His voice is hushed, his pen is dry
His earth-life flag is furled;
But faith is strong and hopes are high -
  His words still move the world.

The songs that owe him their birth
  We sing as if our own;
In fields of thought that gird the earth,
  We reap where he has sown.

His valiant life, a beacon light
  Upon a mountain peak,
Shines, like a star in cloudless night
  For strong, and tired, and weak.

To worlds beyond, his spirit flies,
  Swift messenger of truth.
All heights, all depths before it lies,
  With it eternal youth.¹

Charles W. Penrose lived to be ninety-three years old and in those years he became a great missionary, a great journalist, a magnificent hymn writer, a poet, and a prolific pamphlet writer for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Andrew Jensen, Assistant Church Historian at that time stated: "His style of preaching and the plain comprehensive language used is always calculated to make a lasting

¹George H. Brimhall, "In Memory of President Charles W. Penrose," Improvement Era, July, 1925, p. 811.
impression upon all who come within the radiance of his voice."1

Statement of the Problem and the Importance of the Study

Since President Penrose was a journalist, a writer of pamphlets or tracts for his church, a writer of hymns, and a poet, he made a great impact on the members of the Church. Until a few years ago most Mormon Missionaries were familiar with some commonly used tracts written by Penrose called "Rays of Living Light," which explain the doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. President Penrose during his time, like James E. Talmage, John A. Widtsoe, and President Joseph Fielding Smith, was an acknowledged authority on Church doctrine. Therefore, he was called upon many times to speak on the doctrines of the Church. In General Conferences, he gave over thirty-seven speeches. He also lectured on such topics as Blood Atonement and the Mountain Meadow’s Massacre. After President Wilford Woodruff announced the ending of plural marriage with the Manifesto, Penrose traveled around the Church explaining the Church's position. During his political career, he spoke many times in the territorial legislature and in the Constitutional Convention for Utah Statehood. Because of his influence on the members of the Mormon Church, there is a need for an analysis of his speaking style, yet an examination of Knower's index in Speech Monographs2 does not show any theses written about his speaking ability.


It is the purpose of this thesis to examine three of his written speeches to determine his speaking style. President Penrose was an excellent journalist and a writer, but what type of an orator was he? This thesis will try to answer that question.

Scope of the Study

Before a critic can determine the speaking style of a person, the critic should be familiar with the times in which the speaker lived. With this knowledge, the critic can make a better analysis of the speech making of the speaker during his own time. Georges Louis Leclerc de Buffon is often quoted as stating that "style is the man."¹ It seems vital that a study be made on the life of a speaker, of the setting in which he spoke, of the speech itself and of the occasion.

The thesis will investigate the last thirty years of the life of President Penrose. Three speeches spanning those thirty years have been selected for study. Each of the speeches will be analyzed and evaluated using seven selected characteristics of style as a criteria. The first speech was an address dealing with unified voting given to a church audience at Ogden, Utah, on January 19, 1879. The second speech was on Woman's Suffrage given at Ogden, Utah, on June 3, 1889, and the last speech was given to an audience made up of the Penrose family and some friends just fifteen months before his death at the age of ninety-three.

Procedure to be Used

As far as possible the critic should know something about the

audience and the occasion so that he may reconstruct the total situation.

As Thonssen and Baird point out:

The last type of criticism may be called the judicial. It combines the aims of analytic and synthetic inquiry with the all-important element of evaluation and interpretation of results. Thus it reconstructs a speech situation with fidelity to fact; it examines this situation carefully in the light of the interaction of speaker, audience, subject, and occasion; it interpretes the data with an eye to determining the effect of the speech; it formulates a judgment in the light of the philosophical-historical-logical constituents of the inquiry; and it appraises the entire event by assigning it comparative rank in the total enterprise of speaking.

Chapter II of this thesis will consider the biography of Charles W. Penrose. This knowledge will give some insight into the character of the speaker. Chapter III will consider the definition of style, the method of analysis and evaluation, and the speeches of Penrose to be used in this thesis for analysis. Chapter IV will present the historical setting of each public address along with the analysis, the evaluation and the conclusions. Chapter V will deal with the overall review of the problem and method, the general conclusions, the specific conclusions about the speaking style of Charles W. Penrose, and the recommendations for further study.

This work will deal with the characteristics of style. Since there are many characteristics of style, the following books will be used to set the criteria for evaluation: Speech Criticism, Public

---


2Ibid., pp. 429-433.
Speaking as a Liberal Art, and Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry.

Since all three texts cover many of the elements of style, Wilson and Arnold's book will be used to form the basic nucleus with help from the other two. The following criteria will be used to evaluate the speaking style of Charles W. Penrose: Accuracy, Clarity, Propriety, Economy, Force, Striking Quality, and Liveliness. These will be defined in Chapter III. Also other books will help in synthesizing the above criteria; namely, an unpublished Master's thesis by Kenneth Mann entitled, "An Analysis of the Speech Style of Jefferson Davis," and a book by Arnold, Ehninger, and Gerber entitled The Speaker's Resource Book.

Review of Literature

An examination of Knower's Index also refers to several theses written on Mormon orators and types of speaking movements. Some of the studies include such men as George Q. Cannon, George A. Smith, Orson Pratt, Parley P. Pratt, B. H. Roberts, Brigham Young, and


6 Mormon is a name commonly used to refer to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Joseph Smith. Other studies include some later Mormon orators such as Matthew Cowley and Hugh B. Brown. The types of speaking movements include such studies in public addresses on behalf of the Welfare Plan, on the Mutual Improvement Association, on the Missionary System, at the General Conferences, of the L. D. S. Church.¹

The single most important work which has helped the writer to bring together his ideas for this study is Kenneth Mann's study² of the style of Jefferson Davis. This thesis proved very valuable because of its excellent treatment of the term style and its excellent analysis of the speech style of Jefferson Davis.

Other works, which proved helpful, were Robert Hatch's study³ of the Pratt-Newman Debate, Ray Gleave's study⁴ of the effect of the speaking of George A. Smith on the Iron Mission, and William Morgan's study⁵ of the speaking style of Hugh B. Brown. The writer studied these theses to stimulate thought in methods of procedure. Even though the writer did not use the formats of the above theses, they served as illustrations of different types of speech analysis.

¹See Bibliography, "Unpublished Theses and Dissertations."
²Mann, "Speech Style of Jefferson Davis," the complete thesis.
Other books and articles consulted by the author for a better understanding of the term style were *Contemporary American Speeches*\(^1\) by Linkugel, Allen and Johannesen, *On the Sublime*\(^2\) by Longinus, "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech,"\(^3\) by Irving Lee, and "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism,"\(^4\) by Albert Croft. *Contemporary American Speeches* has a good explanation on why we study speeches, one being to develop an appreciation of eminence in public address. Also the book lists many rhetorical devices, including stylistic devices. *On the Sublime* is an excellent treatment of style. It deals with bombast, eloquence, diction, figures of speech, and others. "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech," looks at a public address by the following ways:

- For the rhetorician—How did he get his effects?
- For the semanticist—What, in other words, did he say?
- For the logician—Is what he said a sufficient and consistent statement of the case.
- For the general semanticist—Does he make sense, properly evaluating what it is he talks about?\(^5\)

And "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism" brings out the following:

... this article will pursue three main lines of inquiry; (1) that of describing or defining the aims, materials, and methods


\(^5^\)Arnold, Ehinger, and Gerber, p. 18.
of the 'standard approach to rhetorical criticism; (2) that of analyzing some of the major inadequacies in the methods and objectives of this standard form; (3) that of proposing a revision of the aims of speech criticism.  

There are several good biographies about the life of Charles W. Penrose that give a keen insight into his life and accomplishments. One of the early colorful biographies is in Orson F. Whitney's History of Utah. Another biography giving an extensive look into the life of Penrose and his public speaking is found in Andrew Jensen's Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia. A third biography which has a lot on the early life and conversion of Penrose is the article "Charles W. Penrose: Builder of the West," by Annie Lynch. A fourth biography, one of the first written on Penrose, is in Tullidge's History of Salt Lake City. This biography includes a sample address on his political speaking. That address deals with the bill that Penrose and others had proposed to remove the political disabilities from the women of Utah. In connection with that bill, a tribute by Susa Gates gives a very stimulating account on his use of logic and argumentation. Another

1Schwartz and Rycenga, p. 403.


5Edward Tullidge, Tullidge's History of Salt Lake City, (Salt Lake City: Star Printing Co., 1886), p. 140.

tribute written by Gustave A. Iverson gives some insight into both the speaking ability and the character of Penrose. Finally, a short biographical work by Preston Nibley gives another view of Penrose, especially about his hymn writing.

Other sources which give good insight into Penrose and his works, are the "Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" and Penrose's unpublished "Personal Journal." The "Journal History" recorded many instances of his life and works, especially when Penrose was the Assistant Church Historian. As one does research in the "Journal History," he can see the hand of Penrose himself correcting and editing the work. Finally, Penrose's "Personal Journal" gives an added insight into his thinking. This personal journal is a day-by-day account of his activities. It is too bad that only a small portion of his journal exists today in the Church Historian's office archives.

There are other articles and biographies which have helped in this study, but the ones mentioned above form the bulk of the resource material used in this thesis. When one looks for sources which deal

---


3 Brigham Young, et al. "Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," (unpublished record of the activities of the Church, Salt Lake City, Church Historian's Office Archives, 1830 to present). Hence forth the footnote entry will read "Journal History."

4 Charles W. Penrose, "Personal Journal," (unpublished, Church Historian's Office Archives, Salt Lake City, December 16, 1895, to January 10, 1897).
with his public speaking, then the area of literature is very narrowed. There are many articles on his writing ability, but very little on his speaking.

The following works contain the bulk of Penrose's speeches:

The "Journal History of the Church,"¹ the Journal of Discourses,² the Improvement Era,³ and the L. D. S. Conference Reports.⁴ The speeches in these volumes were, of course, edited after having been recorded by such men as George F. Gibbs, John Irvine, and W. Theron Carruth. The writer hopes that he can ascertain the style of the speaker through these editions.

¹ "Journal History," November 29, 1879, pp. 1, 6; June 5, 1889, pp. 7-9; June 25, 1894, p. 3; December 4, 1897, p. 2; August 19, 1900, pp. 3-4; October 8, 1920, pp. 7-9; May 27, 1921, p. 3; August 27, 1922, pp. 1-6; and February 4, 1924, pp. 6-7.


CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAN

Charles William Penrose,

Synonymous with rapid thought, ready utterance and untiring activity is the name of the veteran editor of the 'Deseret News.' A scion of well known Cornish families, who were stockholders of tin mines, he was born in Camberwell, London, England, on the fourth day of February, 1832. Studious and inquiring, apt and quick to learn, he speedily mastered at school the common rudiments of education. He read the scriptures when only four years old, and was well versed in the doctrines, sayings and predictions of the Savior, the prophets and the apostles.1

Thus wrote Orson F. Whitney about the birth and early years of President Penrose--writer, poet, churchman, and speaker. For an adequate understanding of the speaking style of any orator, the critic must know and understand the man himself. Thonssen and Baird state, "It is a truism that speeches are meaningful only when examined in the social setting of which they are a part."2 They continue by saying:

The critic must, in effect, put on the garment of the past if he would understand fully the forces that shaped a speaker's thinking, the circumstances that prompted a particular speech, and the conditions that modified or determined the outcome of the address.3

Consequently, this author will try to study the man, the speech, and

---

1Whitney, IV, 333.
2Thonssen and Baird, p. 11.
3Ibid., p. 12.
the setting in which the speaker spoke and lived. Because no study has been found on Penrose's speech making, it is necessary to give sufficient background material to help the reader to understand what influenced Penrose to speak as he did. The following organization will be followed: His early years in England, his early and middle years in America, his later years as a Church official, and some background material on his speaking and oratory, as recorded by people living during his life.

The historical treatment of Penrose's life will be treated in chronological order to give a natural feeling and understanding of this great defender of the faith.

Early Years in England

As already stated, Charles W. Penrose was born in London, England, on February 4, 1832 to Richard and Matilda Sims Penrose. Charles was a precocious child, learning to read at an early age. Annie Lynch tells of his reading ability at age four which created a lot of interest. One time he was placed on a table in a tavern near his home where he read the newspaper to the delight of those present.1 This precociousness was due to the training that his mother gave him. Annie Lynch goes on to say, "Mr. Penrose was a very precocious child, a natural student, quick to learn, with a very retentive memory. At four, he could read the scriptures and newspapers. His mother, a cultured and highly educated woman, took great pride in teaching him. She was a Baptist, and he had a good religious training."2 In fact as

---

1Lynch, p. 35.
2Ibid.
a child he recited in dramatic style and was in demand at church socials. He also wrote poetry at an early age. At seventeen Charles read a book about the American Indians. In it the author, a Frenchman, described Joseph Smith preaching to the Indians about the history in the Book of Mormon. This book interested Penrose so much that he investigated and joined the Mormon Church. He was the only member of his family to do so. The authorities of the London conference soon noticed his scriptural attainments and spiritual inclinations. When Penrose was not yet nineteen, they ordained him an Elder. He was sent on a mission two months later to Maldon, in Essex, to "preach the gospel, 'break new ground,' and build up branches of the Church." Penrose left an opportunity for a life situation in a government office to go without purse or scrip to serve the Lord. He states in an address given to his friends and relatives just fifteen months before his death the following account of that first mission:

I was ordained an Elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and called to go out into the world without purse or scrip—without pay, without money, without price, with dependence upon nobody but the Lord, to preach the gospel. I was called and sent out for that purpose. And in the early part of March of that year, I started out. I was called upon to go to the county of Essex to preach the gospel. There were no Latter-day Saints there and no friends.

Another man by the name of Pursise was called to go to another part of the same county. We started out on foot to go to our fields of labor. On arriving in the town of Tensford, the capital town, which was his field of labor, we had no friends, no money and had no place to go, so we lay down by a straw stack

---

1Ibid.
2Ibid., p. 36.
3Jensen, I, 256.
and spent the night there. It was very cold night and we stayed there without supper, and in the morning had no breakfast and my companion became very discouraged.

'What are we going to do?' he asked, and I said, 'I am going on to my field of labor.'

'I have had enough,' he said, 'and I am going home.'

He went, and I do not know to this day what became of him. I went on to the town of Maldon in Essex. Before I started out the president of the branch gave me some good advice. He said: 'Now Brother Penrose, you are going out into the world and you will have to depend on the Lord. If you see somebody that looks well-to-do, and as if he would help you, go right up to that person and ask him to give you help, that you are a servant of the Lord.'

I remembered this advice and just before I got into the town of Maldon, being very tired and sleepy, I saw a gentleman coming across a field up to a stile—I don't know whether you know what that is—we called them stiles, so I walked up to him and after swallowing a few times, for I was not accustomed to begging, I said: 'I am a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, sent out into the world to preach the gospel.' And he said, 'Give him my compliments'—and walked off. You can imagine how I felt. I went on to the town and after distributing a few tracts—having no friends, no money, no change of apparel, no lodging, I came to one house and the woman seemed to be very kind and I asked her for a drink. She gave it to me. I sat down and broke into tears. That was my introduction to missionary work.1

And an excellent missionary he was, meeting with much opposition, yet he raised up many branches, including Maldon, Danbury, Chelmsford, Colchester and other places. It is interesting to note that he possessed the gift of healing to a remarkable degree.2 Penrose mentioned several instances that the Lord blessed those who received blessing under his hands.3 He labored on this first mission for

---

2 Whitney, IV, 333.
seven years walking between three and four thousand miles every year. During this time he married Miss Lucetta Stratford, of Maldon. Later he became the presiding officer of the London Conference and next the Cheltenham Pastorate where his brilliant pen was almost as busy as his ready tongue. Here he developed his ability as a journalist because he wrote many articles for the *Millennial Star*. His poetical mind created many songs used in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. As he was walking along a dusty road in Essex, he relates the following account about the composition of the song "Oh Ye Mountains High."

I had read about Zion and heard about the streets of Salt Lake City, with the clear streams of water on each side of the street; with shade trees and so on. I could see it in my mind's eye, and so I composed the song as I walked along the road....When I got to a place called Mundon, in Essex, I held a cottage meeting, and in that meeting I sang it for the first time it was ever sung. Of course the words were adapted to a person who had never been to Zion then, but it was afterwards changed a very slight respect or too, to fit people who had gathered with the Saints. It was inspirational and seemed to please President Brigham Young.¹

After ten years of missionary work, he, along with his family, emigrated to Utah, settling in Farmington where he labored at farming in the summer and at teaching in the winter. In 1864 he and his family moved to Logan where he had received an offer to teach school. His sojourn here was short lived because he was called on a second mission to England becoming the President of the London Conference. In his last two years he worked with Franklin D. Richards as Richard's assistant in the editorial department of the *Millennial Star*. Penrose wrote many articles, and in one of those articles he defended the Church against an attack of the *Manchester Courier*.

One of his principal ways of refutation was the use of humor. "Poor fellow! Just as he was about to throw up his hat with glee at the down fall of 'Mormonism' at last, he is paralyzed with the intelligence that it is stronger than ever. His hat drops from his trembling hand, and he doesn't know whether to pick it up again and laugh or let it alone and weep."¹

Even though he wrote very much, he went out on Sundays to preach to the people, baptizing many in Liverpool. At the end of the emigration season of 1868, he sailed for home arriving in Utah after three and a half years as a missionary.

Middle Years in America

This next period in his life found him engaged in a business venture with William H. Shearman, in Logan, Utah, under the name of Shearmen and Penrose. Later Shearman and Penrose turned the business over to a new business called the Logan Co-operative Institution, with Penrose becoming secretary and treasurer. So many years as a missionary left a burning desire to preach the gospel; therefore, he acted as a home missionary, traveling and preaching on Sundays, many times in the company of Apostle Ezra T. Benson. Since Penrose had worked with Franklin D. Richards in England, Penrose left Cache Valley upon the invitation of Elder Richards to go to Ogden there to start a long career as a journalist. He took subeditorial charge of the Ogden Junction which Richards and others had founded. After a year Penrose became the editor-in-chief of the semiweekly newspaper.²

¹"Journal History," 17 August, 1867, p. 2.
²Whitney, IV, 334.
Having received his American citizenship, he was elected to the Ogden City Council. He served for eight years on the council with his name being found on both party tickets whenever two parties were involved in the election. This period of time he was very much in the political area serving from Weber County in the Constitutional Convention for Statehood of 1872, helping to frame, not only the Constitution of the State of Deseret, but the memorial to congress, asking for admission into the Union. This same year he represented Weber County in the Democratic Territorial Convention, composed of both "Mormons" and Gentiles. During this convention, Penrose nominated George Q. Cannon as delegate to Congress, making a very pointed speech in Cannon's behalf. His speaking and committee work very much influenced the People's County Central Committee in which he was a member. In 1874 he was elected to the Territorial Legislature. He took an active part in all general measures, introduced a number of bills, drafted public documents, and rendered other valuable service for which his literary ability and native legal acumen well qualified him.

In June, 1877, President Brigham Young requested that he come to Salt Lake City to work for the newly formed newspaper the Deseret News under the general editorial management of Hons. George Q. Cannon and Brigham Young, Junior. In 1880 he became the editor-in-chief. During these years he filled the vacancy caused by the death of Albert P. Rockwood, member-elect of the legislature for Salt Lake County. In the session of 1880 he served on many important committees. While

\(^{1}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{2}\text{Jensen, I, 258.}\)
serving on one of these committees, he introduced a bill to take away the political disabilities from women. This bill created no end of discussion and debate with its author making very "able pithy speeches in its favor, and finally it passed both houses, but was vetoed by the Governor."¹ According to Susa Gates, the women of Utah appreciated very much Penrose and his advocacy of women's suffrage. She showed this appreciation by writing a fine tribute to him. In it she made the following statement about his speaking on that bill. "...Elder Penrose's attacks on the citadel of the conservative-defense-ramparts with his rapier thrusts of wit, and his broadside of shots and shells of logic and reason almost created a riot."² Penrose was re-elected and served in the legislature of 1882, during this time also serving in the Constitutional Convention of that year. During this convention, the committee in which he worked discussed a name for the new state. The committee entertained a motion "to substitute the word 'Deseret' for the words 'State of Utah,' whenever the latter appeared in the constitution." Penrose debated for the motion because he was not proud of the name Utah since it was "derived from a degraded band of Indians. Deseret was euphonious, signified a honeybee, and was redolent of blossoms and flowers."³

The years between 1882 and 1890 were very stormy ones for the Latter-day Saints in Utah, Idaho and Arizona. Penrose defended the people and their doctrines, both in writing and speaking with all his

¹Ibid., p. 259.
²Gates, p. 66.
³Whitney, III, 204.
brilliant ability. In 1884, he became a member of the presidency of the Salt Lake Stake, replacing David O. Calder, who had died. He now was acting as a home missionary, preaching in many places, his voice being heard in the Tabernacle and in other congregations of the Latter-day Saints. In the Fall of 1884, he delivered lectures in the Twelfth Ward assembly hall on "Blood Atonement," the "Mountain Meadows Massacre," and other themes, "refuting the common stories in relation to the same, and answering objections to and charges against the faith and practice of the Latter-day Saints. His continued defense of the Mormon cause, politically and religiously, by press discussions, public speeches and private interviews with strangers, caused him to be singled out, when the Edmunds law began to be enforced, as a conspicuous target by the anti-Mormon crusaders."¹ Some people tried to apprehend Penrose because he was suspected of being a polygamist. According to Whitney, Penrose had three wives.² At any rate, those people tried in vain in their search because he was not in the News building. They ransacked it, "from garret to basement in quest of the man whose keen and caustic pen had long been a ranking thorn in the side of anti-Mormonism."³ In 1885, after this incident, he was sent on another brief mission, this time to the States. Penrose was probably sent on this mission because of his polygamous background. During his absence, a grand jury questioned his legal wife and family. His wife refused to testify, but the children under duress gave the jury the desired evidence. Later on

¹Whitney, IV, 335.
²Ibid., p. 336.
³Whitney, III, 335.
in the year, the Church authorities sent him on to England to finish this mission.

During this mission, Penrose assisted editorially on the *Millennial Star*, wrote many articles for the London papers, and attended many conferences. He visited Ireland and during this visit spoke in the open air in the city of Belfast to three thousand people. This speech caused a great uproar causing even the papers in Belfast to carry on the discussions. While aboard, he continued to write for the *Deseret News* under the nom deplume of "Exile."¹

In the summer of 1887, Penrose returned to Utah and resumed the editorship of the *Deseret News*. He spent two winters in Washington, D. C., visiting personally nearly every member of Congress, and also President Cleveland and his cabinet in the interests of the Mormon question and Utah Statehood, explaining the situation in Utah. Since Penrose had been indicted under the Edmunds Act, a law forbidding plural marriage and "unlawful cohabitation," he sought help from President Cleveland, who, upon request from a few influential friends, issued a full amnesty to Penrose.

As an able expounder of Mormonism, Penrose was called to testify as an expert on Mormon theology before Judge Thomas J. Anderson in Third District Court as to the loyalty of Mormons and their doctrines. During this time some of the anti-Mormons tried to get refusal of naturalization against the Mormons because they belonged to a "treasonable organization." He refused to answer some questions dealing with his martial status, because the questions did not deal directly to the

¹Whitney, IV, 335.
issue at hand. After some deliberation Judge Anderson ordered him to answer the question. Since Penrose still refused, Judge Anderson ordered him taken to the Utah penitentiary until he did talk. The authorities released Penrose after five days in prison since no other evidence came to light. After the disbandment of the People's Party in 1891, he became a member of the Democratic Party, and in 1892 attended the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

When the Deseret News passed into the hands of the Cannons in the Fall of 1892, Penrose became the assistant editor of the Salt Lake Herald, later becoming editor-in-chief of that paper in 1893, continuing in that capacity until the Fall of 1895 when he became an assistant to the Church Historian, Franklin D. Richards. During this period, he wrote many pamphlets and published his series of tracts entitled, "Rays of Living Light." Annie Lynch told of this writing of the above-mentioned tracts,

While assistant church historian he wrote several pamphlets.... These have been translated into German, French, the Scandinavian Languages and Greek. Millions have been printed and distributed. No original copy was made of this but it was dictated to a stenographer. Mr. Penrose's ideas were so clear, his thoughts came so logically and rapidly that the words rolled out in a constant stream. Although dictating as fast as the stenographer could write, the work was never revised, not even a word altered.\footnote{Lynch, p. 38.}

Sometime between the years 1895 through 1899, he was professor of theology in the Brigham Young Academy at Provo, Utah, lecturing there for two and a half years, also discharging during this time his various other duties. Early in the year of 1899, he returned as editor-in-chief of the Deseret News.\footnote{Whitney, IV, 336.}
Later Years as a Church Official

Penrose served as assistant Church Historian until July, 1904, when in a meeting of the First Presidency and the Apostles held in Salt Lake City July 7, 1904, President Joseph F. Smith ordained Penrose to be an Apostle to the Twelve to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Abraham O. Woodruff. His natural ability and his great experience as a preacher helped him very much in this new calling; therefore, he became, as Andrew Jensen states, "a tower of strength in the midst of his brethren."¹ Because of his political leanings, he was called to Washington, D. C., in December, 1904 to appear as a witness in the Smoot case, to testify before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. That next year in December, he accompanied President Joseph F. Smith and other Church leaders to Vermont. He was one of the speakers at the dedication of the monument erected at Sharon in the honor of the Prophet Joseph Smith. In 1906 he was called to preside over the European Mission, with headquarters in Liverpool, England. Here he did a notable work, preaching the gospel, writing for the Millennial Star, influencing many people throughout the British Isles and Europe, traveling extensively, and dedicating many church buildings in that part of the world. In July, 1909, in company with President Anthon H. Lund and others, he, along with his wife, visited Scandinavia. They sailed up the Norwegian coast beyond the Arctic Circle. Penrose was the first Apostle of the Church whoever visited any point of the world north of the Arctic Circle. Later on Penrose visited and held meetings

¹Jensen, III, 769.
in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and other continental countries.

Since Rudger Clawson had succeeded Penrose as President of the European Mission, Penrose sailed for home on June 11, 1910, arriving in Salt Lake City early June 21. When John Henry Smith passed away, Joseph F. Smith chose Penrose to be his second counselor at the meeting of the First Presidency and Apostles held December 7, 1911. Penrose held this position until the death of President Smith in November, 1918. During this period Penrose accompanied President Smith on many tours throughout the Church. On one occasion they took a missionary tour through the Southern States, preaching in some of the leading cities and towns in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana. He also went to California. When President Smith died, in 1918, President Heber J. Grant selected Penrose to be his second counselor.\(^1\)

Charles W. Penrose died in Salt Lake City on May 16, 1925, at the age of ninety-three. At his death The Improvement Era said of him editorially:

> In summing up the life of President Penrose, we may say that his chief characteristic was his determination to do right at all times and live according to the precepts of his religion. He was persistent, determined, ever at work in the line of his duty. To one who knew him well he said recently, 'Mormonism is as much a part of me as my arm, my leg or my heart'; and again, 'Do right because it is right and not because anyone tells you to do it.'\(^2\)

As Orson F. Whitney stated, "His life, it is needless to say, has been a very busy and withal a very useful one, and it bids fair to abide so to the end. 'Better to wear out than rust out,' says the adage, and no

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 770.

\(^2\)As stated in Nibley, p. 128.
career exemplifies the proverb more strikingly than that of Charles W. Penrose.1 And finally as Andrew Jensen stated,

President Penrose is one of the ablest and best informed men among all the leaders of the Church. As an expounder of the principles of the gospel he has, perhaps, no equal, and as a writer his 'Rays of Living Light' and other productions from his pen have had a wider circulation and been translated in more foreign languages than any other literary production originated in the Church....His beautiful and inspiring poetical productions are known throughout Israel, and his hymns are sung in all the congregations of the saints, not only in the Anglo-Saxon world, but as translations in many other countries. Brother Penrose has, perhaps, spent more years in the ministry as a missionary and as presiding officer, both at home and abroad, than any other man in the Church, since the very beginning of its existence... True and faithful in all the many callings to which he has been called and the many positions he has filled, he is verily one of the pillars of the Church, whose faithfulness and incessant activity could well be emulated by any and all who desire to serve the Lord and keep His commandments.2

Speaking and Oratory

Even though Charles W. Penrose was an outstanding journalist and writer, research indicates that he was very much in demand as a public speaker. Like all Church authorities he spoke in many stake conferences, general conferences, and other public meetings. As the writer scanned the "Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" index, he noted that most of the entries referred to his speaking at some conference or rally. As early as 1861, one can find references of his speaking in the tabernacle. For example, on Sunday, November 24, 1861, "Elders Chas. W. Penrose and James A. Little preached in the forenoon and President Brigham Young spoke in

1Whitney, IV, 336.
2Jensen, III, 770-1.
the afternoon.\textsuperscript{1} This type of entry was very common. Also, some of the entries in the "Journal History" indicate something about his themes and supporting material in his speaking while he was on his second mission to Britain. The minutes of the Welch District Conference when Penrose was president of the London Conference May 12, 1867, show that he referred to the Kingdom of God, to his conversion, and to his reception of a testimony from living in England and Utah. He exhorted the Saints to be more energetic than the former day Saints, that the Church should become the dominant power in the world.\textsuperscript{2} In these missionary years he defended the doctrines of the Church every chance he had because the term "Mormonism" was a dominant term in his mission-speaking.\textsuperscript{3} When Penrose spoke in the London Conference gatherings, he preached sermons with the support of Bible references, talked about the first principles, bore his testimony to revelation and to Joseph Smith and Brigham Young as prophets, and pointed out how the gospel of Jesus Christ brought about peace and unity.\textsuperscript{4} Upon his return from this mission, Penrose's speaking was noted to be spicy and interesting in an oration at Logan, Cache County, on the celebration of the 24th of July, a date celebrating the entrance of the Saints into the Salt Lake Valley. He was "the orator of the day.\textsuperscript{5} Also on the 26th of September 1870, Josiah Rogerson reported in the Deseret Evening News a speech given by

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} "Journal History," 24 November, 1861, p. 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 2 May, 1867, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 6 October, 1867.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 5 April, 1868, p. 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Ibid., 24 July, 1869, p. 11.
\end{itemize}
Penrose on the 25th of September:

Ogden September 26. In the Tabernacle yesterday morning the meeting was addressed by Elder C. W. Penrose who delivered one of the most able, intellectual and interesting discourses, on the principles of Mormonism, we have been treated to for some time, touching upon the principles of truth, light, error, death, explaining in a manner, the personality of God and Satan, quoting from the revelations through Joseph Smith respecting the peopling of this earth, the rebellion in heaven and working of Satan's invisible hosts here in instigating the opposition and persecution that have followed this church since its organization, and so rife today. He occupied an hour and forty-five minutes, his words flowing like a stream of inspiration. The congregation was highly edified and attentive. If the voice of God could have any effect on the class who deny His personality, and who whittle up the devil into a nothing, save an evil principle in man, yesterday's discourse would certainly have cracked the shell which such have carved for their hearts and crawled into.¹

Annie Lynch also commented on Penrose's speaking, "As a speaker he is logical and forceful, never lacking the right word and seldom using an unnecessary word."² Another interesting note on Penrose's speaking came from the comments of one of the staff members of the Deseret News concerning a foreign translation of a discourse showing that he did have force and eloquence. "A pamphlet has been received containing a translation or rather a paraphrase into Swedish, of an address delivered by Elder Charles W. Penrose in the Tabernacle, on the occasion of the visit to this city of the Presbyterian ministers, May 15, 1892. The pamphlet is neatly gotten up, but the translator seems to have failed to a great extent to give the exact meaning of the speaker, besides losing much of the force and eloquence of the original address."³ One

¹Ibid., 25 September, 1870, p. 1.
²Lynch, p. 35.
last reference in the "Journal History" worthy of note shows Penrose's ability to stand on his feet whenever he was called. In one of his speeches Penrose mentioned that he had no expectation of speaking that day, stating, "I have no subject prepared, having nothing outlined in my mind to speak to you about,..." Then he proceeded giving an extensive discourse on the Sabbath Day including scriptural support for his ideas.\(^1\) On the next day a reporter for the *Deseret News* stated, "The discourse was supported by numerous citations from the Old and New Testament and was listened to attentively by a very large congregation."\(^2\) Consequently, according to the listeners of his day Penrose was an excellent speaker. Even in Penrose's only available journal dating from December 10, 1895, to January 10, 1897, he makes reference to twenty-six times that he had spoken at funerals, Church meetings, and in the times which he was called to explain the "Manefesto" to divergent groups.\(^3\)

Besides being a good speaker Penrose assisted others in preparation of their speeches, especially for publication. For example, he noted on page 40 of his journal, "Went over discourse of Elder F. D. Richards for publication," and "Revised discourse of President Joseph F. Smith for publication and took it to *Deseret News.*" Another entry stated that he had discussed President Smith's address, "At President's office with President Joseph F. Smith on the disturbance over his discourse at Provo last Saturday."\(^4\) Also, whenever he would publish his own addresses

\(^1\)Ibid., 25 June, 1893.

\(^2\)Ibid.


\(^4\)Ibid., p. 40.
he corrected them before submitting them for publication. "I finished correction of my discourse on Universal Salvation delivered at Nephi, for J. H. Parry to publish..."\(^1\)

With the above background, the writer is ready to evaluate the three speeches representing his early, middle and later years as a public speaker.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 25.
CHAPTER III

THE CRITERIA OF ANALYSIS

The main purpose of a speech critic is to analyze and evaluate the speech or speeches under question. To do this analysis, the critic must have in mind some authoritative standard or yardstick to evaluate the speeches correctly. In this thesis, style has been selected as the standard by which three speeches of Charles W. Penrose will be analyzed and evaluated.

In order to accomplish any meaningful analysis, the critic's first task is to collect some of the many divergent definitions of style so that he may come up with the definition that fits his purpose. The writer will first present some of these definitions, second, present some of the background to the characteristics of style, and last present the methods of analysis and evaluation including the actual criteria which he will use.

Definition of Style

What is style? One may ask. A. Craig Baird in his Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry brings together many definitions. He uses previous rhetoricians on which to support his definition. First, he cites Hugh Blair, "Style was 'the peculiar manner in which a man stresses his conceptions by means of language. It is different from mere language or

\[\text{Baird, Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 153-163.}\]
words.' To Blair, style has to do with a man's thinking and his emotional-imaginative reactions. It is a picture of the ideas that rise in his mind, and of the manner in which they rise there.'"¹ Baird also cites John Genung's definition, "'By style is meant, in general, manner of expressing thought in language; and more particularly of giving such skilled expression as invests the idea with fitting dignity and distinction.'" Baird goes on to develop Genung's idea by saying that "Style,... is the embodiment of thought. The speaker or writer's communication aims 'not so much at qualities of style in themselves as at the demands of the subject, in order to bring out in its fullness what is essentially there.' Style cannot be thought of as something added from the outside. It is the thought, 'freed from the crudeness, and incompleteness, and presented in its intrinsic power and beauty.'"² Baird goes on to state that also the style of a speaker is "influenced not only by the speech itself, but by the reader or listener-observer."³ Therefore, audience adaption is an essential principle of style. Thonssen and Baird added more light to the meaning by stating, "The expression which he (the speaker) then gives to his ideas, together with whatever rhetorical devices he uses to enhance effectiveness, may be called his style."⁴ The key word in that last quotation is effectiveness. Another critic, Porter G. Perrin, supports

³Baird, p. 154.
⁴Thonssen and Baird, p. 429.
the idea that style has much to do with the effectiveness of the speech.

Mr. Perrin defines style by distinguishing it from grammar:

But whatever style may mean to critics and philosophers, for a student or writer, it is most helpfully taken in a more concrete sense, to mean a speaker's or writer's use of language, the sources of the reader's or listener's impressions of his manner of thought and expression. The connotation of style is of the effectiveness of the expression (rather than of description of usage or questions of correctness). In contrast to grammar, the typical structure of the language, style refers especially to the words and expressions in which the speaker or writer has a choice among the resources his language offers. An analysis of a writer's style takes into account the qualities of words, phrases, idioms, sentences, and arrangement of material.¹

With the above ideas, Wilson and Arnold make the following definition of style: "Keeping in mind these definitions and what we have already said about style and its inseparable linkage to ideas, we would assert that style, as applied to the rhetoric of oral discourse, may be defined as the personal manner of utterance or expression giving ideas impact and movement."² Wilson and Arnold proceed to state what style is not. It is not decoration; consequently, it is not something that we step back and look at as if it were fine apparel or something to be exhibited. It is "inherent in, or at one with the thought. Rather than worry about what to do with the idea or how to exhibit it, we believe that one should think clearly in the first place so that the chosen words say accurately and clearly what one is thinking."³


²Wilson and Arnold, p. 279.

³Ibid., pp. 279-280.
Down through the ages the way to look at style is to consider its characteristics or traits. In ancient times style was regarded as the third part of rhetoric under its older title of elecutio. Also, the ad Herennium shows that there were a Grand, a Middle, and a Plain style, each having its distinctive characteristics. Cicero and later Quintilian continued these classifications with some differences. In the second half of the nineteen century, G. F. Quachenbos used the following divisions: The dry style, the plain style, the neat style, the elegant style, the florid style, the simple style, the labored style, the concise style, the diffuse style, the nervous style, and the feeble style. Each one of these types had its special characteristics. Recently, in the process of defining style, Arnold, Ehninger and Gerber bring out many of the characteristics of style:

Style - The distinctive manner of a speech or a speaker. Style is a loosely used word and very hard to define. The expression 'a speaker's style' may refer to his appearance, delivery, language, and voice; or it may refer to his language and delivery; or it may simply refer to his language. Whatever its scope, 'style' is usually employed to designate the special characteristics of manner, as apart from content, that distinguish one speaker from another. When applied to the use of language, style is employed most specifically to designate the selection and arrangement of words. While there are as many styles as speakers, style can roughly be divided into two groups: the simple (sometimes called the Attic) style, in which the speaker uses clear, simple words and uncomplicated sentence structure, and (2) the ornate (sometimes called the baroque or Hebric or Isocratic or Ciceronian, depending on

1 Thonssen and Baird, p. 406.
2 Ibid., p. 408.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., p. 409.
the nature of the ornateness), in which the speaker makes substantial use of parallel constructions, antitheses, long and frequent periodic sentences, figures of speech, alliteration, and other structural and sound devices. The only thing that can be said arbitrarily about style is that there is no such thing as a good style in any absolute sense. The best style for a speech is the one that permits the speaker to communicate his ideas to a particular audience in the most effective manner possible.¹

With these thoughts in mind, one must realize that style is the way a speaker casts his ideas into language, and as Harold D. Lasswell noted, "Style is an indispensable feature of every configuration of meaning in any process of communication."² Thonssen and Baird feel that an effective style... depends upon a speaker's having (1) an idea worth presenting, (2) an unmistakable clear conception of the idea, (3) a desire to communicate it, (4) a willingness to adapt it to a particular set of circumstances, and (5) a mastery of language adequate to express the idea in words."³

Methods of Analysis and Evaluation

In order to evaluate and analyze the speeches of Charles W. Penrose, the writer, with the assistance of Thonssen and Baird, will use the criteria set up by Wilson and Arnold in their book Public Speaking as a Liberal Art.⁴ The criteria will be as follows in outline form:

---


³Thonssen and Baird, p. 430.

I. Accuracy

A. Determined by the ability to choose the words which best express one's thought to a listening audience through

1. Vocabulary
2. Grammatical accuracy
3. The specific occasion

B. Determined by the

1. Speaker
2. Audience
3. Idea
4. Occasion

II. Clarity

A. The ability to express an idea completely.

B. The use of specific word types

1. Name words, nouns and adjectives, and verbs
2. Concrete rather than abstract terms
3. Good transitions
4. Simple, familiar sentence structure
5. Directness in what the speaker has to say—understandability

C. The use of sufficient amplification according to the audience requirements.

D. The avoidance of the following barriers to clearness

1. A defect in the expression
2. A faulty arrangement of words
3. The use of the same word in different senses
4. The use of a too artificial or complicated sentence structure
5. The use of uncertain references in pronoun and relatives
6. The unjudicious use of technical words and phrases, extremely long sentences.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Thoonsen and Baird, p. 413.
III. Propriety
   A. Fitted to the special conditions of the moment.¹
   B. Fitted to speaker, the audience, the occasion, and the subject matter.

IV. Economy
   A. The right choice of words in the right amount and the best order for instantaneous intelligibility
   B. The judicious use of figures of speech
   C. Sufficient amplification for ideas to be fully clear and understandable
   D. No down grading of vocabulary
   E. Avoidance of unnecessary adjectives and adverbs and unnecessarily inverted word order

V. Force
   A. Has drive, urgency, and excitement
   B. Compels the listeners to pay attention as it propels ideas forward

VI. Striking Quality
   A. Comes from words in euphonious combinations
   B. Gives poetic turns to wording, yet keeps them prose
   C. Paints word pictures which stir the listener's emotions
   D. Shows an uniqueness of expression

VII. Liveliness
   A. Shows force, economy, and striking quality
   B. Shows energy and "has a kind of movement that carries the idea forward to its most influential form."

¹Tbid., p. 414.
With the above criteria in mind, the writer will analyze the speeches of Charles W. Penrose to find the speaker's personal, distinctive style and the variations within it. The following speeches will be used in this analysis: "Remarks on Union," given on January 19, 1879; "Woman Suffrage," given on June 3, 1889; and "Graphic Glimpses of Pioneer Life," given on February 4, 1924.
CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF SPEAKING STYLE

Remarks on Union Speech

(Delivered January 19, 1879, at Ogden, Utah, to an audience of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints assembled to hear a member of the General Authorities and other speakers of the Church.)

Historical Setting

To fully understand the setting of this speech, one should understand the basic conflicts between the members of the Church of Jesus Christ and the non-members.

The discovery of gold in California in 1849 broke the isolation of the Mormons in Utah. Since Salt Lake City was the largest city on route west of Omaha, the national highway ran through the city. Because of the highway many non-Mormon merchants stopped off in Utah and made their homes. Also during the "Utah War" many freighters and camp followers made their home in Utah when Johnston's Army came into the territory. Also, when Johnston's Army left Utah on the advent of the Civil War, some of the soldiers, who had filled their terms, stayed on. Later on Colonel Patrick Connor with about three hundred California

---

1See appendix for complete texts of all addresses used in this thesis.
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company of volunteers established camp on the bench above Great Salt Lake City. Their reason for coming was to quell any revolt among the Mormons, but finding none, he granted long furloughs to his soldiers, whom he encouraged to mine the mountains in Utah. ¹

When Connors realized that the Mormons controlled the elections, he encouraged other non-Mormons to come to Utah. The mining boom took place in the seventies, and the finding of gold, silver, and copper resulted in attracting foreign capital and thousands of non-Mormons into the region. ²

Another event, that brought many non-Mormons into the area and especially to the Ogden area, was the coming of the railroad in 1869. Before the advent of the railroad, industries, which depended on the high cost of transportation by ox team such as cotton raising, iron manufacturing, and silk production, fluorished. But when the railroad came to Utah, many non-Mormon merchants started selling goods from the States, which competed with the locally made products forcing those Utah based operations out of business. Consequently, merchants, soldiers, and the coming of the railroad increased the non-Mormon population in Utah. ³

There had always been deep misunderstandings and mutual intolerance between the Mormons and the non-Mormons since the founding of the Mormon Church in 1830 until Utah became a state in 1896. Since the Mormons were always in the minority in the pre-Utah period, the non-

¹Ibid., pp. 443-4.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 445.
Mormons would settle the conflict by driving the Mormons out. Now when the Mormons settled in Utah, naturally they became the majority and maintained what they considered their natural rights. When the non-Mormons came, old conflicts started up anew. The basic conflicts playing a major role in the Utah history between these two groups were mainly three: "First the doctrine of plural marriage; second, the economic solidarity of the Mormons; and third, the political solidarity of the people who followed the leadership of the Church."¹ It was to the last point which Charles W. Penrose refers in the speech "Remarks on Union." The evaluation now follows of that speech.

**Evaluation of Characteristics of Style**

**Accuracy**—For the most part, Penrose's speech style is accurate. His thoughts on unity are directly stated in a grammatical way. First, Penrose shows that a problem exists with all the non-Latter-day Saint people moving into Ogden:

> The people of Ogden are peculiarly situated. A great many people have come here who are not of our faith, some good people and some not so good. But their sympathies and feelings both religious and political are dis-similar to ours; they are not of us, their interests are not identical with ours and although they may seem for the time to be friendly and to have an interest with us in our local affairs, yet our experience has demonstrated to us the truth of a certain saying of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.' ²

Penrose next alludes to those non-members who might be sympathetic with the Latter-day Saint people, but they will draw away from the Saints

¹Ibid., p. 448.

because "Some thing is sure to arise to draw the dividing line; some circumstance transpires which places them where they belong, and feelings and faith cannot be identified with ours." \(^1\)

After Penrose identifies the problem he asks the question, "What is needed?"

The great necessity for use as Saints of God is to become really and truly united, not only in thought, but in our faith and desires and sympathies one toward another, and in our fellowship as brethren and sisters in Christ. We must cherish an active, living faith, showing our faith by our works in our efforts to arrive at a perfect union.\(^2\)

Now he comes directly to the whole point of his address. "I see the necessity of this being united in our political affairs. When I look back at the last election, I am reminded of the few votes, comparatively, that were cast in this city."\(^3\) Penrose now calls this voting record as carelessness, giving a charge to those present, "We call the attention of our brethren and sisters to these matters, and say to every Latter-day Saint who has the right to franchise, it is your duty to vote. The franchise is not given to us as an ornament or plaything, but as a power to be used with our best judgment in the maintenance of truth and liberty."\(^4\) Then how is that power to be generated, one may ask? Penrose then directly gives the answer, "We must be Latter-day Saints all the time, in every act of our lives."\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 124.
and "We should be bound together by essential union--a union of heart and soul. How can this be brought about? By being true and honest one towards another, that there may be real confidence in our midst."\(^1\)

Along with the directness of the vocabulary, the sentence structure is fairly grammatical. Notice how Penrose is constantly putting two or more ideas in parallel. For example, in the very beginning of the address the parallelism is very evident, "I am more than pleased this morning to have the privilege of assembling with you, to see the faces of so many of my old friends, and to enjoy the blessings of the Spirit of God and the instructions of this Conference."\(^2\)

There are several areas where the critic might want to question Penrose's accuracy. For example, the critic might question the use of the pronoun this in several places in the speech. In most of the cases there is no direct antecedent for the word, but the idea is so directly stated that not many would miss his intent. Another area one might question is Penrose's choice of the words umbrage and phalanx; however, in the context of the speech, a listener can find the meaning of the word. For example, speaking about the necessity of being a brother to all, Penrose states, "We may even drop an innocent remark, which a person may take umbrage at and feel that we are his enemies when we are in reality his friends, and the same feelings are likely to result from joining, when really no offence is intended."\(^3\) Notice that he uses the word umbrage where the word offence might work just as well, yet it

\[^1\text{Ibid.}\]
\[^2\text{Ibid., p. 122.}\]
\[^3\text{Ibid., p. 126.}\]
seems as if Penrose did not want to overwork the term, using umbrage
first then offence second. Then, too, Penrose is a writer and his
writing background would have an affect on his speaking as well. The
other questionable word is phalanx. Notice his use of it, "God has
spoken to the chaotic particles of humanity; he has gathered us to­
gether to this place to make us one; and we should live together and
work together, and present a strong phalanx of power, as real brethren
and sisters in every deed, that the spirit of union may be in our hearts,
and in every deed and act, which should be made in each other's interest,
and not for individualism and self."¹ Yet when one knows the meaning of
the term, a body of troops in close array, the term becomes a very choice
one. With that meaning in mind, notice the effectiveness of the term in
the above context, especially with the idea of "spirit of union" quickly
following.

With the directness of appeal, the effective word choice, the
grammatical sentence structure, the speech is very accurate.

Clarity.---The main idea of this speech is to create a sense of
unity within the Latter-day Saint people, especially those living in
Ogden because of the influx of non-members. The speech is fairly long
one, but Penrose does not lose sight of his main goal. He knows, with
the influx of the non-Latter-day Saints, that if the people as a whole
will not vote as Latter-day Saints, then the major reason, that of
producing a society wherein the Lord may come and dwell, will be
hampered. Penrose amplifies this idea after he states that the Latter-
day Saints must not act separately:

¹Ibid., p. 128.
We did not come here for gold and silver, no matter how much of these precious metals there may be hid in the mountains around us. We did not come here for flocks and herds, for houses and lands, for orchards and vineyards, or for substance or earthly wealth of any kind. All these of course we desire to obtain, and it is a blessing to have them, for with them we can the better assist in rolling forth the kingdom of God; but the acquiring of such wealth was not the object we had in coming here; it was rather to build up a better system of society and establish upon the earth that divine order that exists where our Father dwells, a few of the principles of which have been revealed to us through the Prophet Joseph Smith. We come here, in other words, to find out the will of God, and then do it.¹

He goes on to state that the idea of unity must never be forgotten regardless whether the people are acting as members of the Church or members of society, "...we must keep the fact before us that the main object of our lives is to establish the kingdom of God upon the earth, that He whose right it is to reign may rule."² Penrose then makes a direct appeal to those who go to the polls, "...to be true to our covenants; we cannot say, religion, you stand aside, I am a politician today. We must be Latter-day Saints all the time, in every act of our lives."³ This appeal for unity is clearly stated throughout the whole of the speech, making the speech itself very clear.

Propriety.—This speech is very appropriate because it was designed for a specific audience, for a specific time, for a specific place, and for a specific reason. Since the address takes place in conference where an authority or a member of the stake presidency can and should give instructions to those present, Penrose

¹Ibid., p. 124.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
uses this time to call for unity in voting so that the Kingdom of God can be set up in this region and not be destroyed by outsiders. As already shown, the theme of unity is maintained throughout the whole of the speech. Penrose gears his remarks to the members of the audience so that they may know how to be unified. For example, "It is necessary that we be as one, in spirit and acts, and we must aim all day long for the accomplishment of the work entrusted to us....I have thought there is one thing that needs to be impressed upon us, and that is harmony of feeling and of thought between the heads and the body of the people." Therefore, one of the essential products of unity should be that of harmony between the First Presidency and the people. Another example that he gives is by "being true and honest one towards another, that there may be real confidence in our midst." Another virtue that he demonstrates is that one must have patience with another if that other person disagrees. By these means, then, Penrose exhorts the audience to be true Latter-day Saints so that they may be unified in heart and in action.

**Economy**—To illustrate what he means, Penrose amplifies his major ideas with illustrations. For example,

If we only appear to be united and bound together, and the bands should once be broken, separation would ensue, all would be confusion and the strength we possess would be wasted; but if we take such a course as will enable us to see alike and act alike, we will have veritable strength. Then let us try to establish such a union by being free and frank with and true to each other. To illustrate my idea: A lady gets a new bonnet, and she meets a lady friend and asks how she looks.

---

1 Ibid., pp. 124-125.
2 Ibid., p. 125.
'O how nice! says the latter, it suits you admirably; it becomes you so much.' She turns around when her friend is gone, and says to another lady, 'What a fright she looks in that poke of a bonnet!' So men will be friendly to each other's faces and false when their backs are turned.\(^1\)

Notice the above has sufficient amplification to be fully clear and understandable. Also the passage avoids unnecessary adjectives and adverbs and inverted word order. Penrose goes on to state that we must be frank and outspoken, but we must not be abrupt, always considering one's feelings.

Another way that Penrose shows economy is his directness of approach. After he exhorts the congregation to be free and outspoken yet being considerate of other's feelings, he launches into other reason for dis-unity.

But the greatest cause of dis-union is promise-breaking. One of the evils that is spoken of to be prevalent in the last days is that men should become 'truce-breakers!' this is, they should be guilty of making promises only to break them. I believe it can be truthfully said of some who call themselves Latter-day Saints, that they give their word to a brother, and almost before the breath is cold they falsify their promise; they make contracts in writing, and almost before the ink is dry they break them. If we make a promise to perform a piece of work, we should try to keep it, even if it appears to be to our injury.\(^2\)

Notice that Penrose comes right to the point for instantaneous intelligibility.

**Force:** It appears that the speech is very forceful because of the direct appeal to the audience. In each part of the speech, Penrose is showing that unity is very essential. Notice the direct call for


brotherhood in the quotation that follows:

Then shall we give up our strength to the minority who desire to take away our rights, and who have tried all the day long to destroy our best men? I think we will not; I think we will be more energetic and cling to one another, and, if we have differences we will try to settle them. Brethren, if you have hard feelings against a brother, go to him like a man, and tell him that he has done so and so, and that it is your desire to have the thing straightened out; and if you cannot make it right yourselves call to your aid the services of a teacher, and rather let us sacrifice our feeling than allow that genial spirit which belongs to true brother-hood to be crushed out of our hearts. Let every man and woman in this congregation to-day feel that any difficulties they may have had with their brethren or sisters shall be buried from to-day, and shall not be harbored any longer.  

Also, notice the directness of the imperative sentences in the above example, "... go to him like a man, and tell him that he has done so and so...." and, "...call to your aid the services of a teacher,..." All these types of sentence structures produce force. On the other hand, the use of "I think" has a tendency to lessen the force of the speech because it gives the speech an apologetic feeling. However on the whole, the speech is very forceful.

Striking Quality.--Penrose does not use extensively vivid language which creates word pictures in the minds of the audience or euphonious combinations, yet at times his use of specific examples make the speech very striking. The following example shows, it seems, a beauty of language that would stir any man's emotion.

We are children of the covenant, and should be bound together by the influence of the Holy Ghost, whose ties are stronger than those which exist between man and wife; that influence will make us one, even as the earth is one, though composed

---

 Ibid., p. 128.
of millions of atoms. In the beginning, we are told. God spake, chaos heard, and worlds came into order. The scattered particles came together and they were solidified, consolidated, and this little earth now rolling in space shows the effects of this real essential union of parts. God has spoken to the chaotic particles of humanity; he has gathered us together to this place to make us one; and we should live together and work together, and present a strong phalanx of power, as real brethren and sisters in very deed, that the spirit of union may be in our hearts, and in every deed and act,...¹

In reality the most striking quality of the whole speech is the appeal to the audience's sense of unity. Even though the example above has a quality of beauty, notice the appeal to unity. Every example in the speech is directly or indirectly used to call the audience to its duty to vote for those men who would better serve the cause of the Latter-day Saint.

**Liveliness.—** For the most part the speech lacks a lot of vivid language, as stated above; perhaps it lacks suspense and conflict, but it has specificity and proximity. It is specific by the way Penrose lists the ways the members in Ogden can become united in their beliefs and voting. It has proximity because the whole speech is directed to those present. In a sense the speech has an inward liveliness because of the energy of the speaker's personal testimony and knowledge of the principles of unity. Notice the power of the following example:

> I desire to see the church and kingdom of God alive in all its parts; I desire to see every member imbued with the spirit of God, and every man holding the holy priesthood feeling that spirit and power that belong to it, for I know there is virtue, and power and strength in it. I know that it is a reality. I know that when a man is ordained to the holy priesthood, if he seeks for the spirit of his calling, he can draw nearer to God than he could

¹Ibid., p. 128.
without it; I know he can do more good to humanity with it than he could possibly do without it. I know that the priesthood of God is effective; that there is life and vigor in it, and that through it a man has access to God the Eternal Father, and has power to help his fellowman.\footnote{Ibid., p. 127.}

Also, that energy comes from a metaphor running throughout the speech. This metaphor deals with the building of the kingdom or of God's world. First, Penrose states, "I have sometimes almost dreaded the consequences that may ensue, unless we become more united in our feelings and efforts to build up the Kingdom of God and to maintain the liberties that God has bestowed upon us."\footnote{Ibid., p. 123.} This quotation leads the audience into the metaphor.

Let us all be active members of the church and let us all be active members of the body politic—let us be real, live Latter-day Saints, and let the spirit of the Gospel flow to every part, that all may be invigorated, particle clinging to particle, for when each particle clings to the other particles this is the sign of life in a man, but when particles seem to have a desire to separate, that is indicative of dissolution, that mysterious change which we call death; when we pull apart that is a sign of spiritual death in the midst of the Latter-day Saints.\footnote{Ibid., p. 127.}

Notice the allusion to earth particles. Next, as already mentioned, Penrose brings in the creation of the world, "even as the earth is one though composed of million of atoms. In the beginning, we are told, God spake, chaos heard, and worlds came into order. The scattered particles came together..."\footnote{Ibid., p. 128.}

Penrose continues the metaphor by showing that God also called on the particles of humanity to unite. Besides, this metaphor is
closely knit with another metaphor about the body. The metaphor starts with the exhortation to be active members of the body politic, "We must try to establish real harmony, the head must be in harmony with the feet and the spirit that is in the head flow to the extremities of the body." In other words there must be harmony between "the heads and the body of the people." Taken together these two metaphors cling to each other to show that the members must be united with each other as the body is united and the earth is united.

The liveliness of this speech comes then in its clarity of purpose, its force, its striking quality, and above all its plea of unity.

Summary—An evaluation of the "Remarks on Union Speech" of Charles W. Penrose reveals the following about the characteristics of style.

Accuracy.—Penrose expressed himself directly to his audience. He used very effective word choice, and his sentence structure was grammatical. Since he did express himself directly to his audience, used effective word choice and grammatical sentence structure, there was little room for misunderstanding to what position he advocated.

Clarity.—Penrose was able to express himself with clarity. Even though the speech was a long one, he did not lose sight of his main goal. He used sufficient amplification to make sure that the audience knew what he was striving for.

---

1Ibid., p. 125.

2Ibid.
Propriety.—The speech was appropriate because it was designed for a specific audience, for a specific time, and for a specific reason.

Economy.—Penrose used economy in speaking because he used only the right amount of amplification and directness of approach. Even though the speech is a long speech, he comes right to the point for instantaneous intelligibility.

Force.—Penrose was forceful in the use of direct appeal and imperatives, but the use of "I think" has a tendency to lessen the forcefulness, giving the speech an apologetic feeling.

Striking Quality.—Penrose did not use extensively vivid language, yet his use of specific examples showed a beauty of language that would stir the emotions of most men. The appeal to unity was the paramount quality.

Liveliness.—The speech has liveliness because it has specificity and proximity. Also the metaphor which unifies the speech gives the speech an inward liveliness. Therefore, the speech has liveliness because it has clarity of purpose, force, and striking quality.
Woman Suffrage Speech

(Delivered June 3, 1889, at the regular monthly meeting of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Ogden City. Hon. Charles W. Penrose spoke on the privileges that should be accorded to women. There was a large audience in attendance.)

Historical Setting

During the Revolutionary period, women started to agitate for woman suffrage. The war inspired this liberal thought, yet the Continental Congress left decisions on suffrage to the states. New Jersey was the only state to give women the right to vote. It took away this right in 1807. In the 1830's the factory system created a labor force including women. Those men who championed temperance reforms, education, religious liberalism, and the abolition of slavery, needed the women activists to be heard on public issues. One of these women was Abby Kelly, an abolitionist, who used antislavery meetings to advocate woman suffrage. In 1848, a small gathering at Seneca Falls, New York, lead by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretis A. Mott, was called the first convention on woman suffrage in the United States. In 1850, Lucy Stone organized the Woman's Rights Convention attended by many national men and women reformers. In 1860 Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Stanton joined the reformers, and in May, 1869 founded the
radical Woman Suffrage Association. Later that year Wyoming gave the vote to women.¹

In the Utah Territory according to Milton R. Hunter, the Constitution gave to all white male residents of the State of Deseret over twenty-one years of age the right to vote. However, under the church government from July, 1847, until the establishment of Deseret in March, 1849, woman suffrage was also practiced in Utah.² When the Mormons practiced plural marriage, the non-Mormons tried many schemes to stop this practice. When the Mormons defied the anti-bigamy laws, Congress started new legislation in both houses where bills were introduced to give women the vote. Those members in Congress who introduced these bills thought that the women in Utah would soon do away with polygamy, but when Utah's delegate William H. Hooper gave enthusiastic support to those bills, the sponsors dropped the measures. Yet the territorial legislature did not forget about women's rights and passed a woman suffrage law, February 12, 1870.³ Later the Edmunds-Tucker bill of 1887 abolished woman suffrage.⁴ After the Manifesto was proclaimed by President Wilford Woodruff, Utah was granted the right to statehood. The Constitutional Convention worked sixty-six days working up the framework of the state government. The Utah State Constitution gave


⁴Ibid., p. 211.
the right to vote to women. "It accorded women equal suffrage with the men and it provided the polygamous marriages were forever prohibited."\textsuperscript{1}

Penrose, also an advocate of woman suffrage, submitted a bill to the Territorial Legislature in 1880 "to take away all political disabilities from women."\textsuperscript{2} This bill passed both houses, but the Governor vetoed it. With that type of advocacy, it is no wonder that the Woman's Suffrage Association of Ogden City asked him to speak to them.

\textbf{Evaluation of Characteristics of Style}

\textbf{Accuracy.--}In this speech, Penrose's style is fairly accurate in word choice, in grammar and in consideration of the audience. Mostly the word choice is quite accurate. For example, the following quotation shows this precision:

\begin{quote}
I do not believe that any person who is at all acquainted with the principles of the government will dispute that a woman is a citizen. Not only is she a citizen, but every woman who becomes the wife of a citizen becomes by virtue thereof, according to the law of the United States, a citizen herself.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

Notice the directness and the simplicity of the word choice also.

In regard to the grammar, again Penrose's style is grammatical in most respects. As in most of his speeches whenever he puts two or more ideas in juxtaposition, those ideas are balanced structurally; for example, "Voting is a privilege, and not a right and suffrage

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 232.

\textsuperscript{2}Jenson, I, 259. See also Tullidge's History of Salt Lake City, Bio., p. 140, for a sample of Penrose's speaking on that bill.

\textsuperscript{3}Speech by Charles W. Penrose, \textit{The Standard}, Ogden, Utah, June 5, 1889, p. 1.
comes by a grant from the legislature. Notice the balance of the noun subjects in the compound clauses, the predicate nominatives, and the verbs.

Penrose has geared the speech for this particular audience. His purpose is to persuade the ladies present to sell themselves on the idea of suffrage first and then to labor with the other women's groups around the country. His very first statement in the speech presents this idea,

I do not understand that the organizations of the ladies of Utah at the present time is to win back for themselves alone those political privileges of which they have been deprived; but to labor with all the rest of the women of the country who are interested in this question for the purpose of securing to women generally in the United States those political rights which they should enjoy as citizens of the United States.

Penrose finishes the speech in the same light, "... I tell you if you can only convert your own sex, you can secure the rights of suffrage." Most all of the arguments tend to support this purpose. Also he takes each of the counter-arguments, which the opponents of woman suffrage use, and refutes each one in turn.

Clarity—Most of the time Penrose is clear in his ideas. He uses the right amount of amplification for understanding. For example, after stating that women are citizens, he continues:

So women have in one respect a little advantage of the men. No matter how long she has resided here if she marries a

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
citizen she becomes a citizen. But although a woman is called a citizen, and is expected to perform the duties of a citizen as far as she can and is subject to the law, still she is deprived of any voice in the government. She has no right to vote for an officer of the government—unless, it may be, in some localities they are permitted to vote for school boards; and in one or two places for municipal officers.\(^1\)

He continues this line of reasoning throughout the speech showing that women have as much right as the men to vote, yet Penrose qualifies himself somewhat in the type of political jobs a lady could handle.

> I do not believe that women will be elected to be judges of the Supreme Court of the United States or commanding officers of militia or constables or anything of that kind. The good sense of the community will select the offices which they are the best qualified to fill. Don't you think a woman can be a treasurer as well as a man can?\(^2\)

On the other hand at times in the speech his ideas are not clear. For example, Penrose states that he is a believer in democratic principles and that through the Constitution of the United States the states have certain rights, and the Federal Government has certain rights. Since the constitution gives the right to the states to regulate suffrage, the ladies need not seek after an amendment to the constitution. But the idea is very difficult to grasp on first reading, let alone grasp when heard from the podium:

> This is a government in which certain things are delegated to the general government of the United States, and there are other powers which are retained by the respective states. This is the government for the government of the United States. A number of states, each of which is sovereignized in its own sphere are joined together in the general government, and have each given up a portion of their rights to this general government; and one of the rights which belong to them and which still

---

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid.
remains is the right to regulate the suffrage. The government of the United States derives its power from the Constitution, and it has no powers and can exercise no powers only as they are defined in that instrument; and under that it has no power to regulate the matter. And so when the women go to Congress and want the Constitution amended or the regulation for voting to be altered, they are working against the fundamental principles of the Constitution.¹

The problem probably comes as a result of the complicated sentence structure and the vague use of the word government in two senses. In another place Penrose makes some reference errors in which he shifts from plural to singular. For example, "So the women have in one respect a little advantage of the men. No matter how long she has resided here if she marries a citizen she becomes a citizen."² There are a few other places in which he makes this shift, but the shift seems to be quite natural. In all the speeches of Penrose that the writer read, he did not notice any errors of this nature. This fact might be that this particular speech was not as well edited as the others.

Other than the examples cited, the speech is clear because Penrose does express himself so the audience can understand the idea presented.

**Propriety**—Penrose designed this speech for a particular audience and for a particular time. Since the meeting is a gathering of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Ogden City, a speech on suffrage would be very much in order. It is quite appropriate for a state legislator to speak as he does since a few years previously he had

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
submitted bills in the legislature to give the right to vote to the women. Most all of the major ideas of the speech either point to the privilege of voting, refute objections to that privilege, or how to gain that privilege. Here are some examples of the major ideas which show the appropriateness.

1. Women are citizens.
2. In the Territory of Wyoming, women can sit on juries and serve as officers.
3. Women can hold property.
4. Women are just as qualified as men for some offices.
5. Analyze the objections made against women suffrage and find that there is no real basis for them.
6. We are all children of God.
7. Study principles of good government.
8. Women's power lies not in dominion but in domestic influence.

A final example is the closing remarks when Penrose makes his appeal to the Association.

If there is anything which you are deprived of, struggle for it. Ask for it, it is your privilege. Do not claim that you are so much better than the men; but contend for the principles of sound reason, contend for the privileges you ought to have as American citizens; and I tell you if you can only convert your own sex you can secure the rights of suffrage.

Economy.—For the most part, Penrose uses the right number of words and the best order for instantaneous intelligibility. In his refutation of the objections to women's suffrage he is very economical. Notice the effective use of the question in the following quotation.

Ibid.
But if we will analyze all the objections made against women suffrage, we will find that there is no real basis for them. They say that it will degrade a woman. How? They say she will have to mingle in the crowd and be jostled if she votes. Well does she not mingle with the crowd when she goes to the theatre, in the store, in places of business generally? Does she not travel up and down the same thorough fares and sometimes have to sleep in the same sleepers? Are they demoralized by that? Not a bit. They should have equal rights and privileges. At one time there was a great deal of ridicule when the woman tried to study for the profession of medicine. Now do women become doctors? Yes and no particular noise is made about it. And so with every profession—we find women lawyers. Why, women operate in Wall Street in New York. Some say it is unwomanly. Why should the woman not have a right to make money if she has the ability? There are many things that women are adapted to and so with men.¹

Another method Penrose uses to gain economy is somewhat antithetical. Notice the effective use of the co-relative not— but construction. "When you go to the ballot use it wisely—not as a little bit of paper of no worth, but as something of great importance." or "Women's power does not consist in rule and dominion; but in that quiet domestic influence which she exercises at home." Another effective antithetical sentence is "We want to build up this government, not tear it down."²

Probably the most effective economical device Penrose uses is the direct approach to his audience as the reader will realize by re-reading the above quotation which uses the question to refute the objections.

FORCE. — One of the constituents that helps to compel the audience to listen is the use of humor. The recorder of this speech

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
even lists the places in which the audience laughs. As Penrose states his reasons for having submitted the bill to the legislature to take away the disabilities from women, he clarifies his stand on the matter.

...I at one time attempted to get this word [male] erased, so that women might be placed on an equality with men—not that I believe that women are qualified to act as Presidents of the United States or judges or other executive offices. Perhaps some lady will disagree with me in that respect, but I am open to conviction if she wants to undertake to convince me. But I am a great deal like the Irish lady who said 'I am open to conviction but by my sowl [sic] I would like to see the man that could convict me.' (Laughter.)

Another place where Penrose uses humor in the speech is when he is refuting some of the objections.

I observed in reading some of the young ladies' journals discussing this matter, that they are going to be superior to the men. There is to be a perfect revolution all over the United States, the ballot box is to become purified, and the government is to be purified, and all movements which now actuate the people are going to be obliterated. Everything is going to be lovely and, I suppose, to use an old phrase, 'The goose is going to hang high' (laughter). I hope my friends in Ogden will not entertain such nonsense.

Another constituent that creates force in the speech is Penrose's idea of women's judicial capacity. This idea, it seems, would create some antagonism with the women members of the audience.

...but executive and judicial offices, if I had control of things, should be only occupied by men. The female mind is not judicial. Women generally jump at conclusions, and what would sometimes take a man an hour they observe in an instant. In judicial affairs it takes reasoning. You ask a woman any question and her answer is 'because.' They jump at conclusions. They don't count the steps—ix is hop, skip and jump; and often they light right on the mark.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
By in large, the humor, the precisness, and the economy create forcefulness in the speech.

Striking Quality—As in the first speech analyzed, the speech lacks a lot of vivid language, but it does have some striking qualities which appeal to the basic emotions of the audience. One of the first appeals is to the feeling of oneness of all peoples, "Ladies and sisters, gentlemen and brothers—we are all brothers and sisters, Jew and Gentile, all who dwell upon the earth are the children of the great Father. We are all brothers and sisters, for God created of one blood all nations that dwell upon the earth." Another appeal is the appeal to motherhood and its duties. After stating that women should study principles of government, he continues by stating,

You ladies should study these things. And another thing if they never understand these things how can the mother teach her boy the true principles of this government, if she does not understand them herself. Every boy has a political right to be President of the United States, and who knows but your boy may become president... We should teach our children to be obedient to the law. No community can have order without law--without law there is no peace, and without peace there is no happiness, and the foundation of happiness is laid in law.

Another striking quality of the speech is Penrose's voice of confidence in women.

I think they will try to understand what they are voting for, and I think they will vote for good and wise men. That they will find out the best men for the offices--find out the persons best fitted to fill them--and then vote for honest men, wise men and good men.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
And last the direct challenge to the ladies produces another striking quality.

Use your intelligence for good, virtue, order, peace and the maintenance of good order and the establishment of good government. Women have a good deal of power which is unseen. Woman's power does not consist in rule and dominion; but in that quiet domestic influence which she exercises at home.¹

**Liveliness.**—Regardless whether the speech lacks a lot of vivid language, it has an inward movement which propels it forward. The reason for this movement is Penrose's use of humor, of specific appeals, and of irony. One example of his use of irony is in his explanation of women as citizens.

Now if a woman should steal (of course women would not steal, they are such nice creatures) she is subject to punishment just the same as the man; and so if she became intoxicated (of course she would not). If a woman holds property she will have to pay taxes. You don't find any discrimination in that.²

The speech would probably be better if Penrose had used more vivid language, yet he selected use of antithesis and continued application of the basic purpose throughout gives the speech liveliness.

**Summary.**—The evaluation of the "Woman Suffrage" Speech illustrates the following concerning the seven characteristics of style.

**Accuracy.**—The speech is accurate for the most part in grammar, simplicity of word choice, and balance. Penrose also gears this speech

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.
for this particular audience, taking the arguments of the opponents to woman suffrage and refuting each one.

**Clarity.**—Most of the time Penrose is clear in this speech. He uses the right amount of amplification for understanding. At some points he is not clear, but these unclear parts might have suffered because of the inaccuracy on reporting.

**Propriety.**—Penrose designed this speech for this particular audience and for this particular time. All of the major ideas either point to the privilege of voting, refute objections to that privilege, or how to gain that privilege.

**Economy.**—For the most part, Penrose uses the right amount of words and the best order for instantaneous intelligibility. His use of questions, antithesis and the direct approach is very effective.

**Force.**—Penrose's use of humor helps to hold the attention of the audience, it would seem. Penrose's tongue in cheek pokes fun at woman's logical reasoning, but it does not offend.

**Striking Quality.**—The speech lacks a lot of vivid language, but the striking qualities which the speech has the appeal to basic emotions of oneness and motherhood with its duties, Penrose's voice of confidence in women, and the direct challenge to the ladies to use their intelligence for good, virtue, order, and the maintenance of good for the establishment of good government.
Liveliness.--The speech has movement. This movement comes from the humor, the specific appeals, the beauty of the ideas expressed, and the continued application of the basic purpose throughout the speech.
Graphic Glimpses of Pioneer Life Speech

( Delivered on February 4, 1924, to an audience of family and friends in the home of his daughter, Lulu and her husband, Walter A. Wallace.)

Historical Setting

Birthday celebrations usually are happy occasions, and this birthday seems to be one in which family and friends get together to celebrate the ninety-second birthday of Charles W. Penrose. The highlight of the celebration is the speech itself by Penrose. The editors of the Improvement Era, which published the speech two months after his passing, best summarize the historical setting.

It will be a delight to his thousands of friends who are readers of the Era to peruse these thrilling words of the late President and Pioneer Charles W. Penrose. They were spoken, a little more than fifteen months before his passing, to his family and friends who were assembled in his honor to commemorate the 92nd anniversary of his birth, February 4, 1924. How he came to write the hymn, 'Blow Gently, Ye Wild Winds,' is here told in his own way. The clearness, simplicity and earnestness of his testimony concerning faith in God as the Father of our spirits, the divinity of 'Mormonism,' eternal life and other doctrines of the Gospel, are characteristic of all his spoken and written utterances. All were exemplified in his life, and were a part of his very being.  

Evaluation of Characteristics of Style

Accuracy.--In this speech, Penrose is very accurate in all phases. He speaks directly to the friends and relatives. For example, because of all the children present, he speaks directly to them saying,  

1Headnote to Penrose, "Graphic Glimpses," p. 803.
"I don't know whether you children have seen oysters in the shell, but you know oysters grow in salt water and have a great rough shell on the outside." He proceeds by explaining how a lady's hand looked like the oyster. This example shows Penrose's way of expressing his ideas accurately. One knows exactly what he was intending, allowing for no misinterpretation. The grammar is accurate also. For instance, while describing a fierce storm his grammar is almost flawless:

The wind grew stronger until it was blowing terribly. I piled up two heavy boxes of clothing against the front door and helped to secure the door by using a pair of scissors. I then thought we were pretty safe. My wife lay there on the bed, with twins. Two little children three days old. I lay down on the floor and the wind began to screech and howl in a way you cannot imagine; it was a most horrible sound, rushing and screeching like whirlwinds. It blew everything loose on the house and made an awful noise. I was afraid something would happen and I was thinking what to do, the door blew right open, pushing the boxes of clothing before it and the snow blew in right over the bed.

Note the usage of the lie form in the above example. Few people today even know the right form to use in the past tense of lie. Penrose knew and used it correctly.

The speech is also effective because of the informal style that he uses for the type of audience addressed. He uses the pronoun "I" consistently because he knew that the audience was there to hear his life story. The address is filled with incidents from his interesting life. One such incident, which instilled in him the desire to write the hymn "Blow Gently, Ye Wild Winds," was the story dealing with the storm just cited. Therefore, the speech is accurate because it is

---

1 Ibid., p. 806.
2 Ibid., pp. 807-808.
precise; it is grammatically correct, and the style fits the audience addressed.

Clarity.--In this speech, Charles Penrose states his ideas so that his audience is able to understand exactly what idea he is giving. For example, he states,

I was blessed with the power of healing and many cases of healing were performed and it made quite a stir in the town. The mother of this young lady was sick with heart disease and had been given up by the doctors. One day she said she could exercise enough faith that the Lord could heal her. I had the same faith, and so we engaged a vehicle to take us down to the sea-side. I took her to a bath house and then we went into the water and when she came up she said, 'Praise the Lord; I am healed; I am well.' It was a very remarkable case and it attracted considerable attention.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 805-806.}

To continue the idea of the power of healing, Penrose gives another instance of a healing. He probably gives two examples to amplify the idea of healing. Then as he realizes that the time is short, he states, "I might tell you of similar instances of the same kind--many of them. They were great testimonies to me, but I must hurry along and cut the story short."\footnote{Ibid., p. 806.}

In the above example note the short uninvolved sentence structure--the directness of the approach. Even the use of the passive voice gives the emphasis to the Lord rather than to himself. Also note the example on page 65 the concrete wording. For example, "I lay down on the floor and the wind began to screech and howl in a way you cannot imagine; it was a most horrible sound, rushing and screeching
like whirlwinds." And last, note the above example of a good transition from the healing idea to the other areas of his mission.

Since clarity deals with the ability to express oneself completely, this speech is a good one because the listener or reader in this case knows exactly the ideas that Penrose is giving at all times.

**Propriety**—This speech is fitted for the audience addressed and for a particular period of time. Penrose always was trying to get people to live the good life. This speech is very appropriate for a counselor of the Church to give because of the time, and the many children and adults present. There are many examples which point out this appropriateness. For example, note the introduction: "My dear boys and girls, ladies and gentlemen, children and grandchildren of the Penrose family and their associates:" With this knowledge concerning the makeup of the audience, Penrose uses his personal experiences to maintain interest of the children and the adults. In another example where he alludes to the audience, he states, "Today I have had the pleasure of meeting a large number of my old friends, some of whom I met and knew abroad and some at home. Some I have been associated with intimately, particularly in connection with the great Latter-day work commonly called 'Mormonism.'" At this time he tells the Joseph Smith story so that he might show the comparison between himself and the


prophet. At the end of the speech he again alludes to the audience in his appeal for living the gospel:

You boys and girls attend Sunday School and your Religion Classes and your Primary. Do not do evil; don't associate with those who do evil, but keep close to the Lord and do right. Pray to him in your silent chambers. Pray to him if you are in trouble; pray to him in joy and thank him for his blessings, for every good thing is from him....

Penrose continues to exhort those present to live the gospel and to obey the commandments of the Lord. Last, he thanks his daughter and her husband for the use of their home and for the entertainment and again he asks God to bless those present.

Economy.—In this speech, Penrose comes directly to the point most of the time. One good example of his economy follows:

Now, when I went back to England I wrote that song which Frank has sung so prettily. The other numbers on the program have been so very splendid. I rejoice in your diversions—in your good times together. But I caution you not to do anything wrong. Avoid evil in your play. Cultivate the gift of music and the gift of singing. Learn all you can that is useful.

That last example comes directly to the point of living the gospel. Note the strong imperatives. Penrose continues this exhortation in the next paragraph first starting with an apology for keeping them so long:

I hope you will excuse me if I am taking up too much time here—but I want to say these things to you. Don't waste time on things that are only theoretical; learn things that will be of use and valuable to you. The great time to teach things of worth and truth is now at hand. This pedagogy called

\[1\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 810.\]
\[2\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 810.\]
science—a great deal of time is wasted in studying some things. A great deal of science is true but very much is false, worthless clap trap.¹

Also, Penrose uses a judicious number of figures of speech in this speech. Since a good simile allows the listener to get a better picture, Penrose occasionally used a simile to express his ideas. For instance, "Her hand looked like the outside of an oyster shell—,"² "One afternoon I noticed that the wind was blowing from the east to the west and the clouds had settled low like a pillow on the mountains."³ And, "I lay down on the floor and the wind began to screech and howl in a way you cannot imagine; it was a most horrible sound, rushing and screeching like whirlwinds."⁴ Notice that each simile comes right to the point that Penrose wanted. Also notice the use of sound words which gave the illusion of the wind. Now, Penrose did not use many—just the right amount.

Most of the time Penrose uses the right number of words for instant understanding, but at times because of the use of the passive voice, Penrose uses more words than necessary. For example, "All that night the wind howled and blew and tore and the next morning it subsided. Then we learned of the damage it had done. Cows and sheep were destroyed, barns blown away and great damage was done."⁵ Penrose

¹Ibid., p. 811.
²Ibid., p. 806.
³Ibid., p. 807.
⁴Ibid., pp. 807-808.
⁵Ibid., p. 808.
could have used the active voice for greater economy. For example, "Then we learned of the damage it had done," blowing away barns and destroying cows and sheep.

Force—This area is very difficult to analyze because there is little in the literature of the day which analyzes his delivery or the forcefulness of his words. Not referring to this particular speech but giving praise to the man on his ninety-second birthday, the editor of the Deseret News stated, "As editor of the Deseret News, President Penrose proved himself fearless and an able defender of the Church and its people during a period of violent opposition, and as an exponent of Gospel principles, perhaps he has not been excelled in all the history of the Church."¹

If the writer had been in attendance at this occasion, he is sure that the illustrations alone would have kept his attention. The comparison between the Joseph Smith story and Penrose's own conversion is an attention getter and a good device to introduce the listener to the life of a great man. Other personal stories throughout the whole of the speech were vital and lively. On the whole the speech was very forceful just to read it.

Striking Quality—The most striking quality of this speech is the personal experience that Penrose had while in Farmington. The description of the wind and the storm painted many word pictures. For example, Penrose states,

I lay down again on the floor and as soon as I began to go to sleep I could hear the wind screeching and howling and suddenly the window crashed and I had to get up again. I looked out and saw that the wind had blown the ground bare of snow and had actually blown rocks out of the ground and one had smashed the window and the snow was blowing in. I had to take up a Buffalo robe and nail it across the window to keep the snow from coming in--that was the pickle we were in. I had an old cow and no cow shed and the poor thing was out in the lot. I saw her standing out there like a cat perched on a fence, so I ran out and cut the rope loose and then tried to get back to the house. I dropped down on my hands and knees and pulled myself back by grabbing hold of weeds and grass. We were in that condition all day long.

Another striking quality is the general theme of the speech which is to appeal to the audience to do right. The paramount reason for giving the personal experiences is to show how the Lord could bless those present. Penrose states, "I am here tonight to testify to you that there is a God who made the heavens and the earth. He is the Father of that portion of us called spirits. The spirit of man is the son or daughter of God just as we are the sons and daughters of our mortal fathers in the flesh. God is almighty. He can be reached by prayer and faith. When we obey Him, He will hear our prayers." Because of Penrose's dedication, he believed the Lord had truly blessed him. Because of these blessings, Penrose could testify to the truthfulness of his convictions, stating, "I testify to you that 'Mormonism' is the work of God." With this testimony in mind, Penrose exhorts the children to seek the kingdom of God and to avoid evil, knowing that the Lord would be with them if the children lived the gospel the best that they could.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 809.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 809.
\(^3\)Ibid.
Liveliness—As one reads the speech, he feels the speech move toward its general purpose—to stimulate the audience to do right. The illustrations and personal experiences help to carry the listener along with them. The personal experience in Farmington creates suspense, also creating word pictures of the storm that had beset them. The sound words like rushing, screeching, and howling make the wind come alive. For the most part, Penrose uses the active voice in the speech. This use helps to give the speech realism and proximity. Since accuracy, clarity, propriety, economy, force and striking quality are constituents of liveliness—the ultimate virtue, the speech has liveliness also.

Summary

Accuracy.—Penrose is accurate. He speaks directly to the audience. One knows exactly what he is intending. Also, his grammar is almost flawless. Since this speech has been published, perhaps the grammar or the usage had been corrected. The speech is accurate because it is precise, it is grammatically correct, and its style fits the audience.

Clarity.—Penrose states his ideas so that the audience knows exactly what he is intending. He uses short uninvolved sentence structure and directness of approach.

Propriety.—This speech is fitted for the audience and for the period time. Penrose always tried to get his listeners to lead the good life. This speech is very appropriate for a counselor of the Church to give because of the time and the many children and adults present. He exhorted the audience to live as they should.
Economy.--Penrose comes to the point most of the time, by using the right number of figures of speech and strong imperatives. He could have been more economic by using the active voice instead of the passive, but whether the speech would have been any more effective is another matter.

Force.--Penrose was ninety-two years of age at the time of this speech. Yet his age did not lessen the forcefulness of this speech. There is nothing in the literature of the day which alludes to the forcefulness, but the illustrations, the comparisons, the stories all help to give force to the speech.

Striking Quality.--Perhaps the other speeches did not use a considerable number of figures of speech or other devices to produce vivid pictures in the minds of the listeners, but this speech does. The most striking quality of the speech is the use of personal experiences which produce the effect of being at the place that Penrose is speaking about. The appeal to do right also is striking.

Liveliness.--The speech moves toward its general purpose--to stimulate the audience to do right. Since accuracy, clarity, propriety, economy, force, and striking quality are constituents of liveliness--the ultimate virtue, the speech has liveliness as well.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Charles William Penrose was born in 1832. He was a very precocious child and learned to read at an early age. He became a convert to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints when only seventeen years of age. He later became a great missionary, a great journalist, a magnificent hymn writer, a poet, a prolific pamphlet writer for the Church, and an outstanding Church Leader. He was a man of big principles, and he always bore a strong testimony of the truthfulness of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Along with his other abilities, he was a skilled orator. His speeches showed his vast knowledge of the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Also, his style was truly the man. These were the traits of the character which stand out in the man, Charles W. Penrose.

Review of the Problem and Method Used

This study has been done to accomplish three things (1) to present a brief sketch of the life of Charles W. Penrose; (2) to evaluate and analyze three speeches by Penrose using a criterion of seven selected characteristics of style; and (3) to ascertain the effectiveness of Penrose as a speaker.

The speaking style of Charles Penrose has been analyzed and evaluated using speeches representing different types of audiences and
different periods of his life; namely, a church audience, a suffrage rally, and a group of friends and relatives. These speeches represent periods covering the last thirty years of his life. The first speech is a speech dealing with unified voting given at Ogden, Utah, on January 19, 1879; the second speech is on women's suffrage given also at Ogden, Utah, on June 3, 1889; and the last speech is a speech given to an audience made up of Penrose's family and friends given in Salt Lake City, Utah, on February 4, 1924.

Chapter II considered the biography of Penrose to give the reader a better insight into Penrose as a speaker. The characteristics of style, developed in Chapter III, were used to ascertain the effectiveness of the speaker and also to determine what made the speeches as much a part of the man, Charles Penrose, as they do. The characteristics used were: accuracy; clarity; propriety; economy; force; striking quality; and liveliness. Chapter IV considered the historical settings and the evaluation of the three speeches.

With this material in mind, the writer now can present the conclusions, which he has reached through the analysis and evaluations of the three speeches. The conclusions will be divided into two groups; first, those dealing with a general nature; and second, those dealing with the speaking style of Charles W. Penrose. The format of the second group will have the specific characteristic defined preceding the conclusions for that particular characteristic.
General Conclusions

1. The speaking style of Charles W. Penrose never seemed to weaken as he grew older. The last speech seemed powerful and audience appealing even more so than the others.

2. Penrose always, it seemed, could stand on his feet and bear witness to the truthfulness of the Church which he represented.

3. Since Penrose was a journalist, poet, historian, and missionary, he always had the necessary words at his command to expound Christian gospel principles.

4. Even when speaking to non-religious groups, Penrose showed those Christian ideals.

5. Most of the discourses by Penrose to religious audiences were filled with Mormon doctrine supported by scripture.

6. Penrose, it seemed, had an innate ability to inspire people. His prime purpose was to stimulate people to action, either in belief or in God, truthfulness, or in other religion centered themes. Also, his political speech making encouraged those present to act in some way. All three speeches used in this work showed that characteristic.

7. Penrose, it appears, always had his audience in mind and geared his remarks to it. He seemed to have great insight into the needs of the people.

Conclusions about the Characteristics of Style

Accurac y has been defined as the ability to choose the words that best express one's thoughts to a listening audience.
1. In all three speeches the style of Charles W. Penrose is fairly accurate in word choice and in sentence structure.

2. He uses direct statements to his audience to gain audience support.

3. The high-light of his style in regard to accuracy is his balanced structure. Always when two or more ideas were placed together, those ideas were placed in parallel sentences.

4. It seemed as if he always geared his speaking to that particular audience.

**Clarity** is the ability to express an idea completely.

1. For the most part, Penrose is clear in his speaking. If need be, he would use the necessary amplification to make sure that his listeners understood him.

2. At times he is not clear due to the complicated sentence structure that he would use on occasions. Also at times he would shift from plural to singular, especially when a subject pronoun was used.

3. He was more clear in the first and last speeches studied than he was in the second speech.

**Propriety** is the ability to fit the speech to any special condition of the moment. Also, the speech needs to fit the speaker himself, the audience, the occasion, and the subject matter.

1. Penrose seemed to excell in this area. Each speech was geared for that particular audience and occasion. He seemed to know what to say and how to say it. He always appealed to the audience to do the right thing.
2. He always alluded to the audience or occasion to set the stage for his ideas.

**Economy** is the ability to select the right words in the right amount and to put them in the best order for instantaneous intelligibility.

1. Since economy is not necessarily the least amount of words possible, but the right amount for intelligibility, Penrose is economical in his speech making because his use of amplification is very effective.

2. At times he uses the passive voice, which creates more words than necessary, but whether the speeches would be more effective is another matter.

3. He uses the direct approach to his audience for appeals and the bearing of his testimony.

**Force** has been explained to have the ability to give a speech, which has drive, urgency, and excitement. These elements compel the listeners to pay attention as the force propels ideas forward.

1. In each speech by Penrose, there is a forcefulness, which propels the ideas along. His use of humor, illustrations, and stories is very effective giving interest to the speeches.

2. At times he uses the term "I think" giving the speech an apologetic feeling.

**Striking Quality** in a speech comes from the use of words in euphonious combinations from poetic turns of wording, from pictures that stir the listener's emotions, and from an uniqueness of expression.
1. Penrose did not use vivid language extensively, yet the specific examples used showed a beauty of language, which would stir the emotions of most people.

2. In the last speech, he used many vivid examples, which painted word pictures compelling the audience to listen.

3. At times some of the expressions were almost poetic.

Liveliness in a public address shows force, economy, and striking quality. Liveliness also shows energy and has movement that carries the idea forward to its most influential form.

1. All three speeches showed an inward liveliness. This inward liveliness came from the use of an over-all metaphor in the first speech; from humor, specific appeals, and irony in the second; and from the creation of suspense and word pictures in the third.

2. Penrose mostly used the active voice, but at times he used the passive; however, the use of the passive voice did not detract from the inward liveliness of the speeches.

3. All the speeches studied were audience centered. Penrose always alluded to the audience; hence, he always was ready to bear his testimony of the truthfulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. His appeal to the audience was to live or to do as they should.

4. Even though he was advanced in age when these speeches were given, there was always a vitality in his speaking compelling those present to listen.
Recommendations for Further Study

When a critic starts to study the speaking of Mormon Church Leaders, he finds the field wide open. Even though many studies have been made, few have been done on style. Since there are volumes of speeches recorded in the Conference Reports and in other Church publications, a vast number of studies could be made on all five canons of rhetoric on conference speaking alone. On Penrose, one could study in the area of invention and arrangement. Another area on Penrose might be a comparative study between his speaking and his writing. A third area might be a study of his lines of arguments or ways of supporting his generalizations. A fourth area might be a statistical study of his types of sentences used.

Even on those studies that have already been made one could study the political speaking, conference speaking, or on the other elements of rhetoric. Volumes of materials are available for use in research in the Church Historian's Library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and in other church publications. The staff of the Church Historian's Library is always ready and willing to help anyone who desires the help. If the members of the Church do not do these types of studies, the work will not be done.
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APPENDIX I

Remarks On Union

In the Ogden Tabernacle, January 19, 1879

I am more than pleased this morning to have the privilege of assembling with you, to see the faces of so many of my old friends, and to enjoy the blessings of the Spirit of God and the instructions of this Conference. I believe we realize to a great extent the importance of the subject that has been presented to us this morning by Brother F. M. Lyman. I have thought upon it a great many times in reflecting upon the condition of the Latter-day Saints and the prospects that lie before them, and in viewing also the apathy and carelessness of a great many, and the influx of the people amongst us who are not of our faith. I have sometimes almost dreaded the consequences that may ensue, unless we become more united in our feelings and efforts to build up the Kingdom of God and to maintain the liberties that God has bestowed upon us. The people of Ogden are peculiarly situated. A great many people have come here who are not of our faith, some good people and some not so good. But their sympathies and feelings both religious and political are dissimilar to ours; they are not of us, their interests are not identical with ours, and although they may seem for the time to be friendly and to have an interest with us in our local affairs, yet our experience has demonstrated to us the truth of a certain saying of our Lord Jesus Christ, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." It would seem in our history that sometimes this was not the case, some people having come among us whose feelings appeared to be in consonance with ours and who were friendly disposed towards us, but their faith not being our faith, although their views to some extent were in harmony with ours, yet we have found in our experience that these words of the Savior held good even with them. Something is sure to arise to draw the dividing line; some circumstance transpires which places them where they belong, and they then occupy their true position. They are outside the covenant of the Gospel, and their sympathies and feelings and faith cannot be identified with ours. They are of the world, we are not; we have come out of the world. This may seem strange to some; but it is true as God is true. Christ laid this rule down, and we shall find that it is perfectly correct.

The great necessity for us as Saints of God is to become really and truly united, not only in thought, but in our faith and desires and sympathies one toward another, and in our fellowship as brethren and
sisters in Christ. We must cherish an active, living faith, showing our faith by our works in our efforts to arrive at a perfect union. I see the necessity of this in our political affairs. When I look back at the last election, I am reminded of the few votes, comparatively, that were cast in this city. This shows something wrong. What is it? There is a carelessness growing upon the people, and we perceive it to some extent in our religious affairs and public meetings, but we see it more clearly when it comes to voting, for many who have a right to vote stay away from the polls. We call the attention of our brethren and sisters to these matters, and say to every Latter-day Saint who has the right of franchise, it is your duty to vote. The franchise is not given to us as an ornament or plaything, but as a power to be used with our best judgment in the main tenance of truth and liberty. The spirit of the Gospel is the spirit of liberty, the Gospel itself is the perfect law of liberty; and every move that may be made, having for its object the maintenance of liberty, we ought to regard in the light of the Gospel, in the light of duty.

There is a great deal of talk, and has been for years past, of separating religion from politics. I believe that we need a little more religion in our politics than we already have, and I believe that if there were more true religion in politics throughout the world it would be better for humanity. I am certain that it is absolutely necessary for us who have come here, having separated ourselves from the world, for the purpose of building up the kingdom of God, in order to accomplish this to permit our religion to enter into our lives and govern us in all we do, whether it be secular or religious. We cannot act separately, singly and alone; the Spirit of the Lord, which is the spirit of the everlasting Gospel, should dictate us in all we do in a public as well as a private capacity, and when we are so influenced we will act with a due regard to the interests of our brethren and sisters. We did not come here for gold and silver, no matter how much of these precious metals there may be hid up in the mountains around us. We did not come here for flocks and herds, for houses and lands, for orchards and vineyards, or for substance or earthly wealth of any kind. All these of course we desire to obtain, and it is a blessing to have them, for with them we can the better assist in rolling forth the kingdom of God; but the acquiring of such wealth was not the object we had in coming here; it was rather to build up a better system of society and establish upon the earth that divine order that exists where our Father dwells, a few of the principles of which have been revealed to us through the Prophet Joseph Smith. We came here, in other words, to find out the will of God, and then do it. We must keep that object before us all the time, no matter in what capacity we act, whether as members of the Church or as members of society, whether we act in political or religious matters, we must keep the fact before us that the main object of our lives is to establish the kingdom of God upon the earth, that He whose right it is to reign may rule. And when we go to the polls, whether it be to vote for our municipal officers or otherwise, we must go there as Latter-day Saints, to be true to our religious covenants; we cannot say, religion, you stand aside, I am a
politician today. We must be Latter-day Saints all the time, in every act of our lives. And this carelessness in regard to voting we must get rid of; we must understand that the exercise of the franchise is required of us, and knowing this we should have the manhood to use it; and the sisters who enjoy the privilege of voting, should understand that the same obligation rests upon them as well as upon the men. This blessing is given to them to be used for the good of their brethren and sisters, for the benefit of the community of which they form a part.

It is necessary that we be as one, one in spirit and acts, and we must aim all the day long for the accomplishment of the work entrusted to us. Every member must be alive and continue to be alive. The sign of life is motion, but a great many of the brethren and sisters appear to be either dead or asleep in regard to these matters. We must do better if we would preserve ourselves from the burdens which the people of Tooele county have had to bear and are now bearing; if we would maintain our liberty and keep the balance of power, we must exercise the powers conferred upon us, and if we do not, we shall have to reap the consequences. This union we talk so much about, and which we say is essential to our strength, how shall be increase it? For we need an increase of union, particularly in some places. We will take Ogden, for instance, how shall we establish union and preserve it here? I have thought there is one thing that needs to be impressed upon us, and that is harmony of feeling and of thought between the heads and the body of the people. In order to establish that and continue it, there needs to be an identity of interests in our hearts. It will not do for our brethren, when they meet each other, to shake hands and enter into a formal conversation, and then, when they separate, have something evil to say of each other. We must try to establish real harmony; the head must be in harmony with the feet, and the spirit that is in the head should flow to the extremities of the body. We must try to establish an essential union. Not merely a grasp of hands and a tying together by rules, but the binding of heart to heart, that the spirit may have free course, run, and be diffused among the people. And in order to establish this, I have thought that we have need to be frank and free, and open one to another. I do not believe in that kind of discussion which produces contention, which comes from the devil; but I do believe in that free speech which establishes mutual understanding, tends to bind men together, and produces true affinity. We should be bound together by essential union—a union of heart and soul. How can this be brought about? By being true and honest one towards another, that there may be real confidence in our midst. Because one man may differ from another even though with one called to preside over him, is that to say that such a man is rebellious? I think not. There should be a distinction between honest difference and stubbornness and contention. We cannot all see alike yet, neither is it expected that we should in our present imperfect condition. As there is a difference in each other's countenances, so there is in each other's minds, and the only way to harmonize the difference of opinion that may exist among us, is to so live that the light of the Spirit of God can shine
in our hearts. Some men are quick to perceive a truth; others are slow. Some men will grasp at an idea and comprehend it in a moment, while it takes others a long time, simply because they are slower of intellect, or because they do not happen to see from the same standpoint as we do. We must be patient, and try to convince one another when we happen to disagree. How? By threats and denunciations? No; but by real forbearance, the same as God exercises towards us. Do we ourselves carry out His purposes as He has revealed them? I think not. I confess I do not. I can see the standard of righteousness, of nobility, and purity before me, but, alas! I know I have not reached it; yet I want to keep on striving until I get up to that standard, and I believe these desires are in your hearts. God exercises patience towards us, and this is the spirit we must exercise one towards another, until we can be brought to see eye to eye. There will be a time when the watchmen upon Mount Zion will sing together with perfect harmony. "Thy watchmen shall lift up their voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion." But the Lord will never bring Zion from above until Zion from beneath is prepared to meet it.

Then I would say, let us cherish forbearance and let us be frank and encourage frankness; I do not mean contention, that is a very different thing and comes from a different source. There is an essential union and there is an apparent union. I would not give a fig for the last, but the first is worth all we possess. If we only appear to be united and bound together and the bands should once be broken, separation would ensue, all would be confusion and the strength we possess would be wasted; but if we take such a course as will enable us to see alike and act alike, we will have veritable strength. Then let us try to establish such a union by being free and frank, and true to each other. To illustrate my idea; A lady gets a new bonnet, and she meets a lady friend and asks how she looks. "Oh how nice" says the latter, it suits you admirably; it becomes you so much." She turns around when her friend is gone, and says to another lady, "What a fright she looks in that poke of a bonnet!" So men will be friendly to each other's faces and false when their backs are turned. We should be free and frank and outspoken; but that is not to say we should be unwise and abrupt in our expressions, because we are very sensitive and easily get offended. We may even drop an innocent remark, which a person may take umbrage at and feel that we are his enemies when we are in reality his friends, and the same feelings are likely to result from joking, when really no offense is intended.

But the greatest cause of disunion is promise-breaking. One of the evils that is spoken of to be prevalent in the last days is that men should become "truce-breakers;" this is, they should be guilty of making promises only to break them. I believe it can be truthfully said of some who call themselves Latter-day Saints, that they give their word to a brother, and almost before the breath is cold they falsify their promise; they make contracts in writing, and almost before the ink is
dry they break them. If we make a promise to perform a piece of work, we should try to keep it, even if it appears to be to our injury. If we promise to pay a brother, we must do it or make it right with him, and not try to excuse ourselves by saying, "Oh, it is only a brother;" whereas, if it were a "gentile," we would very likely keep our promise. We must be true to our words under all circumstances and to all persons; if we borrow, we must pay our debt; if we cannot possibly do it, we must give our creditor the best satisfaction we can. When we meet with one another, and agree to carry out certain measures, let us do it, or not promise to do it. And when we meet together in our meetings, and any measures are brought forward in which the public are interested, or nominations are to be made for any of our public officers, and we feel that we cannot agree with the measures proposed, or have just cause to oppose the nominations, do not sit mum in the meeting, and as soon as it is over commence to kindle the spirit of opposition among our brethren. In all our political matters, if the elders and the people get together and come to a clear understanding with regard to the men who are to occupy certain positions, in the manner that I have alluded to, I cannot see how there can be any division, or how those who are not of us, who are in the minority, can expect to succeed in electing opposition candidates to fill our public offices. It cannot be done. We have the majority in numbers, and if we have a thorough union of power, our strength will be preserved. But our weakness is in our carelessness and apathy. We have the right to do good, the right to vote, but do not exercise it.

When we disapprove of any man put up to occupy any position, let us be sure in our minds that what causes that disapprobation is not any private pique against him. We have no right to vote against a man from our private feelings. If a man be put up for public position, and we have a private pique against him, that should not weigh a feather. A man is put up because he is considered fit for the position, and when the majority agree upon a certain person, we should fall into line, the minority should give way to the majority. And when we disagree with our brethren, it should not be because of any private feelings. One may say, "Oh, I do not want that man." Why? "Well, he said so and so against me, or he did not do so and so for me." It is not a matter whether you like a man personally or not. The question is, is he fit for the position. Is he the right man for the place? Do the majority of my brethren want such and such a man? If so, I will wave my differences and vote for him who is considered best fit for the position. These things are of far more importance than many of us think they are. In times past we have had the balance of power in our elections, and all things have gone on smoothly whether we have voted or not. But the time will come when the thing will be more evenly divided, and we must get in the habit of exercising every power that God has conferred upon us for the building up of his kingdom and for our mutual benefit. When a bishop of a ward calls upon a man to perform any public duty he should be willing to step forward to do his part; and every woman should feel that she would like to see her husband do quite as much as any other woman's husband, and not
only in religious matters but in all things for the welfare of the community of which we form a part. Let us all be active members of the church and let us all be active members of the body politic—let us be real, live Latter-day Saints, and let the spirit of the Gospel flow to every part, that all may be invigorated, particle clinging to particle, for when each particle clings to the other particles this is the sign of life in a man, but when particles seem to have a desire to separate, that is indicative of dissolution, that mysterious change which we call death; when we pull apart that is a sign of spiritual death in the midst of the Latter-day Saints.

I desire to see the church and kingdom of God alive in all its parts; I desire to see every member imbued with the spirit of God, and every man holding the holy priesthood feeling that spirit and power that belong to it, for I know there is virtue, and power and strength in it. I know that it is a reality. I know that when a man is ordained to the holy priesthood, if he seeks for the spirit of his calling, he can draw nearer to God than he could without it; I know he can do more good to humanity with it than he could possibly do without it. I know that the priesthood of God is effective; that there is life and vigor in it, and that through it a man has access to God the Eternal Father, and has power to help his fellowman. We should be a nation of kings and priests unto God, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people zealous of good works. This is what we should be, my brethren and sisters. And here, in Weber County particularly, where the outside element seems to be gathering, and which is naturally aggressive, always ready to try and wrest from us our vested rights, it behooves you to be earnest and sincere and united, and to be diligent in your efforts to hold for God and his kingdom those rights and liberties which he has given to us. God intended that his people whom he has gathered to this land should possess it, and that they should not be ruled over by their enemies, as long, at least, as they are in the majority. Then shall we give up our strength to the minority who desire to take away our rights, and who have tried all the day long to destroy our best men? I think we will not; I think we will be more energetic and cling to one another, and, if we have differences we will try to settle them. Brethren, if you have hard feelings against a brother, go to him like a man, and tell him that he had done so and so, and that it is your desire to have the thing straightened out; and if you cannot make it right yourselves call to your aid the services of a teacher, and rather let us sacrifice our feelings than allow that genial spirit which belongs to true brotherhood to be crushed out of our hearts. Let every man and woman in this congregation today feel that any difficulties they may have had with their brethren or sisters shall be buried from today, and shall not be harbored any longer. Say in your hearts, before I will have anything rankle or tarnish my feelings, I will go to my brother or to my sister and confess my weakness and thus get rid of it. And if we will be free and frank and honest, and say what is in our hearts, without fear or favor, there will be more union in our midst, and the Spirit of God will dwell with us, and we will see new beauties in our religion every day, and we will seek the society of our brethren
rather than shun them; but, on the other hand, if we harbor hard feel­ings in our hearts without divulging them or seeking relief, we may depend upon it that it will, if allowed to go unchecked, result in a separation from the very men for whom we today profess fellowship, and in our own overthrow and death. We are children of the covenant, and should be bound together by the influence of the Holy Ghost, whose ties are stronger than those which exist between man and wife; that influence will make us one, even as the earth is one, though composed of millions of atoms. In the beginning, we are told, God spake, chaos heard, and worlds came into order. The scattered particles came together and they were solidified, consolidated, and this little earth now rolling in space shows the effects of this real essential union of parts. God has spoken to the chaotic particles of humanity; he has gathered us together to this place to make us one; and we should live together and work to­gether, and present a strong phalanx of power, as real brethren and sisters in very deed, that the spirit of union may be in our hearts, and in every deed and act, which should be made in each other's interest, and not for individualism and self. The spirit of individualism is, every man for himself; the spirit of the Gospel is, every man for his brother; and it is this influence that prompts a man to say, "Let me love the Lord my God with all my heart, and with all my soul, and with all my strength, and let me love my neighbor as myself, and seek his interests as well as my own." This is the Spirit of God; it is the spirit of the everlasting Gospel; it is the spirit of peace, and joy, and consolation and comfort, and there is real, true happiness in it. What a miserable feeling it is not to be able to meet a man frankly and cordially. How different when friends and brethren meet. Their countenances at once brighten, and there is a glow and warmth which bespeak their feelings for each other; it is a feeling of joy and satisfaction, and those who possess it desire to bless and do good to their fellowmen.

I feel the importance of these simple truths; they are necessary to our growth as a community, and to our progress as individuals. God has revealed them for our guidance and salvation, both temporally and spiritually. Let us ponder upon them, and let nothing come between us and the Priesthood of God. Let us be united in all things, and when the time comes for us to vote for our municipal officers, let us have a clear understanding before hand, and then unite on it; and I will pro­mise you that if you will do your part, God will do his part, and we will come off more than conquerors. And the day will not be far distant when the Priesthood of God will have the balance of power, and the rule and dominion now in the hands of the wicked upon the face of all the earth will be taken away from the corrupt and the wicked, and given unto the hands of the Saints of the Most High God, and he will reign for ever and ever. Amen.
APPENDIX II

Woman Suffrage

In a women's suffrage meeting, June 3, 1889

I do not understand that the organizations of the ladies of Utah at the present time is to win back for themselves alone those political privileges of which they have been deprived; but to labor with all the rest of the women of the country who are interested in this question for the purpose of securing to women generally in the United States those political rights which they should enjoy as citizens of the United States. The Government in which we live is supposed to be a government of the people. It is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. There was a time when there was a dispute as to women having souls, but I think that day is passed.

I do not believe that any person who is at all acquainted with the principles of the government will dispute that a woman is a citizen. Not only is she a citizen, but every woman who becomes the wife of a citizen become by virtue thereof, according to the law of the United States, a citizen herself. So women have in one respect a little advantage of the men. No matter how long she has resided here if she marries a citizen she becomes a citizen. But although a woman is called a citizen, and is expected to perform the duties of a citizen as far as she can and is subject to the law, still she is deprived of any voice in the government. She has no right to vote for an officer of the government—unless, it may be, in some localities they are permitted to vote for school boards; and in one or two places for municipal officers.

In the Territory of Wyoming women can sit on juries and serve as officers if their fellow citizens feel inclined to elect them. In the Territory of Utah, ladies once held the right of suffrage, but not the right to hold office. Although women were entitled to vote, here they were not entitled to hold office as the word "male" is retained on the statute. While associating with other members of the legislature, I at one time attempted to get this word erased, so that women might be placed on an equality with men—not that I believe that women are qualified to act as Presidents of the United States or judges or other executive offices. Perhaps some lady will disagree with me in that respect, but I am open to conviction if she wants to undertake to convince me; but I am a good deal like the Irish lady who said "I am open to conviction but be my soul I would like to see the man that
could convict me." (Laughter.) It was not because I thought they were qualified to hold office that I desired to have the word erased; but I believed that there should be nothing on our statute books which discriminated against any portion of our community. And that it should be left to the good sense of the community to select what offices women should be elected to fill, if any. I think every woman should vote and have equal rights with the men at the polls; and for this reason; that every woman is a citizen, if she was born in the United States, or naturalized, or the wife of a citizen, and she is just as amenable to the laws.

Now if a woman should steal (of course women would not steal, they are such nice creatures) she is subject to punishment just the same as the man; and so if she became intoxicated (of course she would not). If a woman holds property she will have to pay taxes. You don't find any discrimination in that. Under our statutes women are permitted to hold property. A woman is an entity; she is a citizen and can hold property in her own right. Any woman can hold any property which she accumulated before marriage. It does not pass from her to her husband as under the old common law. As a woman can hold property in her own right and must pay taxes upon that property she ought to have some voice in the government as to the disposition of the revenue derived in part from her property. There are a great many arguments—no objections—against women voting; one is that women cannot be drafted into the army, and therefore should not vote. Well, have you not found some men who would not make good soldiers? They say a woman is not suitable for this, and that she is not suitable for that and so on. A great many of the arguments brought against the women can also be brought against the men. There are only a few men who are fit to be leaders.

There are certain leaders in the world that have a peculiar force of character and intellect. It will be so always in this world, and I believe in the other. There is one intelligence above another as there is one star above another, and the greater will lead the less. All of the objections which can be brought up about women can be brought against men. There is no reason, I think, why women in this country should not have a right to vote. There is another reason I have, and it is this: The laws of the United States have given the franchise to the colored people. I know a great many women who are more fit to exercise this franchise than the colored people. Go among the people of the south and mingle with them and see what a low order of intelligence exists and you will see thousands who have no idea of the principles of this government who have the suffrage, while thousands of intelligent women are denied it.

But if we will analyze all the objections made against women suffrage we will find that there is no real basis for them. They say that it will degrade a woman. How? They say she will have to mingle in the crowd and be jostled if she votes. Well does she not mingle with the crowd when she goes to the theatre, in the store, in places of business generally? Does she not travel up and down the same thoroughfares and sometimes have to sleep in the same sleepers? Are they demoralized by that? Not a bit. They should have equal rights
and privileges. At one time there was a great deal of ridicule when
the women tried to study for the profession of medicine. Now do women
become doctors? Yes, and no particular noise is made about it. And
so with every profession—we find women lawyers. Why, women operate
in Wall Street in New York. Some say it is unwomanly. Why should the
woman not have a right to make money if she has the ability? There
are many things that women are adapted to and so with men. Now let me
make a little explanation with regard to this matter in which there is
a great deal of misconception, that is that citizenship and suffrage
are the same thing. It is a great mistake. There are a great many
citizens who do not have the right of suffrage. No person can vote
except he be a citizen, though in some states persons who have declared
their intentions to become citizens can vote, but as a rule no person
can vote unless he is a citizen. Qualifications, however, are different
in different states and each state has a right to form its own local
laws regulating the right of suffrage and the qualifications of voters.
That shows that citizenship does not carry with it the right to vote.
Voting is a privilege, and not a right and suffrage comes by a grant
from the legislature.

I observed in reading some of the young ladies' journals dis-
cussing this matter, that they are going to be superior to the men.
There is to be a perfect revolution all over the United States, the
ballot box is to become purified, and the government is to be purified,
and all movements which now actuate the people are going to be ob-
literated. Everything is going to be lovely, and I suppose, to use an
old phrase, "The goose is going to hang high" (laughter). I hope my
friends in Ogden will not entertain such nonsense. I believe that
women will have a right to vote, and that when they do there will be
no perceptible change. The principles of government will remain the
same, and there will be the same kind of struggle for office, and the
same kind of motives to gain office as there is now. There is a
prejudice, and it is nothing but a prejudice in the United States
against woman suffrage, and it grows out of that old condition in
which we existed under the old common law, where the man was the head
and body of the house, and when woman married, she lost her identity.

I do not believe that women will be elected to be judges of
the Supreme Court of the United States or commanding officers of
militia or constables or anything of that kind. The good sense of the
community will select the offices which they are the best qualified to
fill. Don't you think a woman can be a treasurer as well as man can?
There are women who are fit to be treasurers, and I know of some who
handle the revenue of a city, county or other government better than
some men I have met. I think certainly that the good sense of the
community would select such an office for the women as they can fill
with honor and profit, but executive and judicial offices, if I had
control of things, should only be occupied by men. The female mind
is not judicial. Women generally jump at conclusions, and what
would sometimes take a man an hour they observe in an instant. In
judicial affairs it takes reasoning. You ask a woman any question
and her answer is "because." They jump at conclusions. They don't count the steps—it is hop, skip and jump; and often they light right on the mark. There are offices which women can fill and a good sensible community would determine what those would be; and therefore I think that the time will come in the United States that the people will have seen that as a government of the people all the people should have the right to vote.

I want you to understand me clearly, if I can make it plain to you: In your operations to obtain the right to vote or hold office, you should not make the claim as a right; it is not a right, it is a privilege granted by law.

I think there is another mistake made by the ladies in their efforts to obtain this privilege. That they are endeavoring to obtain an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I believe in Democratic principles. This is a government in which certain things are delegated to the general government of the United States, and there are other powers which are retained by the respective states. This is the government for the government of the United States. A number of states, each of which is sovereignized in its own sphere are joined together in the general government, and have each given up a portion of their rights to this general government; and one of the rights which belong to them and which still remains is the right to regulate the suffrage. The government of the United States derives its powers from the Constitution, and it has no powers and can exercise no powers only as they are defined in that instrument; and under that it has no power to regulate the matter. And so when the women go to Congress and want the Constitution amended or the regulation for voting to be altered, they are working against the fundamental principles of the Constitution.

Ladies and sisters, gentlemen and brothers—we are all brothers and sisters, Jew and Gentile, all who dwell upon the earth are the children of the great Father. We are all brothers and sisters, for God created of one blood all nations that dwell upon the earth. We are all children of the great Father. So I say ladies and sisters, gentlemen and brothers—in your efforts move upon a sensible line. Do not follow the multitude to delusion or folly. A great many things are being done and said. You who are organized need not follow the ladies of the United States into paths of folly and nonsense. You want to study principles of government—and that is one of the important things I think this association should enter into. I think you will get a greater interest in your meetings if they do this. Take up principles of government, municipal government, county government, state government, and then national government. You ladies should study these things. And another thing if they never understood these things how can the mother teach her boy the true principles of this government, if she does not understand them herself. Every boy has a political right to be President of the United States, and who knows but your boy may become president? You can't tell. Curious changes take place. You
want to understand these things so as to teach them to your children. We should teach our children to be obedient to the law. No community can have order without law--without law there is no peace, and without peace there is no happiness, and the foundation of happiness is laid in law.

The great difficulty with a great many parties is that they are not subject to restraint. They want to run wild. There is a spirit of independence we must not indulge in our children. The principles of law should be understood by the mother so that she may teach them to her son, and that they may have a disposition to understand what law is. When you come together let some ladies whose minds run in that direction take up some principle of self-government and explain it for the benefit of the others. We should study these principles, and if we find any weak places, find out how they can be shunned. We want to build up this government, not tear it down. We want to establish a good government.

When you go to the ballot use it wisely--not as a little bit of paper of no worth, but as something of great importance. Many of the men in the states go to the polls like cattle driven by men. I have heard of men being carried to the polls, a ticket thrust into their hands and held until they had given it to the judge and then hustled out. I do not think that women will do this, but I can't tell. I think they will try to understand what they are voting for, and I think they will vote for good and wise men. That they will find out the best men for the offices--find out the persons best fitted to fill them--and then vote for honest men, wise men and good men. By way of preparation for that, learn to understand principles of law and the principles of government of each little town, of localities, of the territories, of the states, of the nation, and then go on it you have time enough to learn inter-national law, the intercourse between one nation and another. Use your intelligence for good, virtue, order, peace and the maintenance of good order and the establishment of good government. Women have a good deal of power which is unseen. Woman's power does not consist in rules and dominion; but in that quiet domestic influence which she exercises at home. If you do not get the suffrage, your position is just as essential as the position of men. You can never be men if you try to be. There is no use trying. I have heard women say "O I wish I was a man only for a few minutes." There is as much chance to do good as you are. Neither can get along without the other, but the Lord has designed that they should go together. Nature has pointed out the path, and we see it in every form of creation, in the fruits, vegetables, trees, and everything there is male and female.

If there is anything which you are deprived of, struggle for it. Ask for it, it is your privilege. Do not claim that you are so much better than the men; but contend for the principles of sound reason, contend for the privileges you ought to have as American citizens; and I tell you if you can only convert your own sex you can secure the
rights of suffrage. How many ladies in Weber County are interested in this move? Convert your sex first. It is only the minority of women that are seeking to obtain the suffrage. I shall be pleased to see the day when you shall have this privilege granted you. May the day soon hasten, I shall hail it, and shall be very thankful to see women placed on an equality with men. So mote it be.
APPENDIX III

Graphic Glimpses of Pioneer Life

In a meeting of family and friends, February 4, 1924

My dear boys and girls, ladies and gentlemen, children and grandchildren of the Penrose family and their associates:

I heartily thank you this evening for this entertainment which you have furnished for my benefit and for your own entertainment and enjoyment. I regret that I am in such poor condition to speak to you. I am very much oppressed with the grip and for the last two or three days have not been in a fit condition to be in public at all. Yesterday I was intending to go to the Eleventh ward fast meeting to speak, but on account of this affliction, which has come on me a little every year for several years, I was unfit to go out. I should have been better today if I had gone to bed. I had made up my mind to be with you as you met to celebrate my ninety-second birthday.

Today I have had the pleasure of meeting a large number of my old friends, some of whom I met and knew abroad and some at home. Some I have been associated with intimately, particularly in connection with the great Latter-day work commonly called "Mormonism." I am a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and I have been closely associated with it ever since my boyhood. I have learned of the great fact that God Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, has in these latter times revealed himself and communicated with mankind through his prophet—a boy between fourteen and fifteen years of age, with a very common name, Joseph, and a very common surname, Smith. This young man, Joseph Smith was very anxious to find out which was the true religion. He was living among people mixed up in different sects and so he prayed to find which was the true religion. He retired to a grove of trees near his father's residence, a place which I have had the pleasure of visiting, and bowed down on his knees and prayed to the Father. There were many other churches—the Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Methodist—all different denominations, but he wanted to find out which was the right one, because he could see by good common sense that God would not invent a number of different religions, so he prayed, and in the course of his prayer, the Lord made himself manifest to him. God the Father and Jesus Christ, his Son, appeared to him in a pillar of light and conversed with him and told him to join none of the religions because all were gone out of the way and that the time was near at hand when the true religion should be revealed from heaven;
that the true gospel should be restored and that he should have authority to administer in its ordinances and to lead men in the truth.

I mention this because it has been my life. I learned about these things when I was a boy. I found myself in a similar condition in which Joseph Smith found himself. I prayed to the Father and he manifested to me the clearest way, that there was one true religion and that was the one which he revealed. Being convinced of the fact and knowing the gospel to be true, I was baptized on the 14th of May, 1850. If you will think for a minute or two you will see that was a long time ago. But the Lord gave me his Spirit, blessed me and led me in the path of righteousness. I bowed in obedience to the gospel, and although none of my friends or family could see as I did, yet I obeyed. I had to stand for myself. I embraced the Faith, received witness from God that this Church was the true one, and when the Lord called upon me, through his servants, to go and preach this faith, I answered the call and on the 6th day of January, 1851--how long ago that is! I was ordained an Elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and called to go out into the world without purse or scrip--without pay, without money, without price, with dependence upon nobody but the Lord, to preach the gospel. I was called and sent out for that purpose. And in the early part of March of that year, I started out. I was called upon to go to the county of Essex to preach the gospel. There were no Latter-day Saints there and no friends.

Another man by the name of Pursice was called to go to another part of the same county. We started out on foot to go to our fields of labor. On arriving in the town of Tennaford, the capital town, which was his field of labor, we had no friends, no money and had no place to go, so we lay down by a straw stack and spent the night there. It was a very cold night and we stayed there without supper, and in the morning had no breakfast and my companion became very discouraged.

"What are we going to do?" he asked, and I said, "I am going on to my field of labor."

"I have had enough," he said, "and I am going home."

He went, and I do not know to this day what became of him.

I went on to the town of Marldon in Essex. Before I started out the president of the branch gave me some good advice. He said: "Now, Brother Penrose, you are going out into the world and you will have to depend on the Lord. If you see somebody that looks well-to-do, and as if he would help you, go right up to that person and ask him to give you help, that you are a servant of the Lord."

I remembered this advice and just before I got into the town of Marldon, being very tired and sleepy, I saw a gentleman coming across a
field up to a stile—I don't know whether you know what that is—we called them stiles, so I walked up to him and after swallowing a few times, for I was not accustomed to begging, I said: "I am a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, sent out into the world to preach the gospel." And he said, "Give him my compliments"—and walked off. You can imagine how I felt. I went on to the town and after distributing a few tracts—having no friends, no money, no change of apparel, no lodging, I came to one house and the woman seemed to be very kind and I asked her for a drink of water. She gave it to me. I sat down and broke into tears. That was my introduction to missionary work.

It came to my mind that a man with whom I had conversed in London, William Taber, had some relatives there, so I inquired and was told, "Oh yes, her name is now Sayaart, I will find her and bring her to you." I found her brother and told of my sleeping out doors and she said, "You shan't sleep out of doors. I haven't got a place to keep you but I will find some place for you."

That was my beginning. I baptized a number of people, made many friends in the town, and one of the ladies I had baptized took up a colletion and hired a cottage where I could preach on Sunday. This was my introduction in the work. I mention these things so you will know what we had to face in those days. I succeeded in raising up a large branch there. I was blessed with health and rich spiritual blessings were poured out upon me. I was blessed with the power of healing and many cases of healing were performed and it made quite a stir in the town. The mother of this young lady was sick with heart disease and had been given up by the doctors. One day she said she could exercise enough faith that the Lord could heal her. I had the same faith, and so we engaged a vehicle to take us down to the seashore. I took her to a bath house and then we went into the water and when she came up she said, "Praise the Lord; I am healed; I am well." She was. It was a very remarkable case and it attracted considerable attention.

Another case which may be very interesting to you was that of a woman by the name of Colt, who had been baptized into the Church. This lady had been suffering from headaches—severe headaches, and by the laying on of hands she was healed and the pains left her and she got well as far as her head was concerned. One day while talking with her she held out her hand for me to see—which I easily could, because it was about as large as a shoulder of mutton—and there in each joint was a bleeding sore. Every joint was cracked. She said, "I have been suffering with this hand for years. I have been to hospitals, to doctors and they don't know what it is."

I don't know whether you children have seen oysters in the shell, but you know oysters grow in salt water and have a great rough shell on the outside. Her hand looked just like the outside of an oyster shell—it was an awful looking thing. I asked her if she had
any faith that her hand could be healed, and she said she had for she knew she had been healed of the headaches. I got some oil and she covered her hand up with a black glove, after administering to her. That night she went to bed and when she got up the next morning she found out she could close both her hands. She pulled off the glove and her hand was well--completely healed except one sore on the thumb and that was open for nearly a week. After that she had no trouble with it. Sometimes when I would go to the surrounding villages to preach she would hold up her hand and show it to the people and relate how she had been healed. These instances show the power of faith and the wonderful blessings of God.

I might tell you of similar instances of the same kind--many of them. They were great testimonies to me. But I must hurry along and cut the story short.

I labored in this way for ten years, in different parts of England, before coming to this country. I traveled from place to place. I raised up friends and baptized people and the Lord blessed me with strength of mind and body. I was only a young fellow--a little over nineteen. The Lord was with me in all my ministry. At that time I wrote a great many things for the Millennial Star, a publication in Liverpool. They are published in volumes to this day. A short time ago a man came to me and said he had read an old discourse of mine, written in 1859, published in the Millennial Star, in which I predicted a great many things, which he said had taken place. I got that copy of the Millennial Star, published on September 10, 1859, and these things that I wrote have come to pass, many of them word for word. These have been testimonies to me that the Lord was with me. During all of this time the power of God was with me and his Spirit led and directed me.

In 1861 I was released and came out here. I crossed the sea in a sailing vessel, a vessel which has to depend upon the wind for traveling power. Nobody knew about steam in those days. No one traveled by electricity; the wonderful powers of electricity were not then known and developed. Many wonderful things have come to pass since that time. We were thirty days before the winds and the waves from Liverpool to New York. I had passage in the steerage among the poorest of the poor and was there with them for thirty days. From New York to St. Joseph it took nine days of travel, then three days up the river on a boat, lying out on the deck at night, then eleven weeks on the plains from the Missouri River to Salt Lake City.

I have to talk rapidly and cut things short so that you may hear what I have to say without tiring you.

So we were thirty days on the ocean, sea sick, travel worn, at the mercy of the winds and waves. The Civil War had broken out and it took us nine days from New York to St. Joseph. Then three days on the Missouri River, followed by eleven weeks on the plains driving two yoke of oxen. I borrowed money and bought a cart and some oxen. After
I came here to Zion, I went to live in Farmington, and there I passed through the experience which caused me to write the song which my son, Frank, sang to you, called "Blow gently, ye wild winds." That song was written in England in 1865. I had been to Farmington, as I told you, and afterwards moved to Cache Valley. Just a few words about Farmington. There I had the experiences of my life. I had obtained a small log cabin which faced the east. At that time several severe wind storms had occurred which had blown things to pieces. One afternoon I noticed that the wind was blowing from the east to the west and the clouds had settled low like a pillow on the mountains. The wind was rising and I knew something was going to happen.

In order to protect my house I fastened my door. It has a little latch on it—no lock—if you know what a latch is.

The wind grew stronger until it was blowing terribly. I piled up two heavy boxes of clothing against the front door and helped to secure the door by using a pair of scissors. I then thought we were pretty safe. My wife lay there on the bed, with twins. Two little children three days old. I lay down on the floor and the wind began to screech and howl in a way you cannot imagine; it was a most horrible sound, rushing and screeching like whirlwinds. It blew everything loose on the house and made an awful noise. I was afraid something would happen and I was thinking what to do, the door blew right open, pushing the boxes of clothing before it and the snow blew in right over that bed. Well, I can't describe my feelings. I grabbed the door and tried to push it shut, putting my head against it. The snow poured in over my feet and ankles; I called out for Aunt Lizzie—we called her—who was living in corner room of the house and together we tried to push the door back but we couldn't succeed. I had learned that during the day some strangers passing through the town had stopped in the big house on the east side of the street. I found a big spike nail and I wrenched that out and got something to serve as a hammer and I drove that in the ground against the door and said, "Lizzie, hold on for dear life and I will get help. I ran out the back entrance and waited until the wind lulled a bit and then ran. I got these men and it took four of us three-quarters of an hour to nail the door up—all of that time to close and nail up the door, but at last we got it fastened up.

I lay down again on the floor and as soon as I began to go to sleep I could hear the wind screeching and howling and suddenly the window crashed and I had to get up again. I looked out and saw that the wind had blown the ground bare of snow and had actually blown rocks out of the ground and one had smashed the window and the snow was blowing in. I had to take up a Buffalo robe and nail it across the window to keep the snow from coming in—that was the pickle we were in. I had an old cow and no cow shed and the poor thing was out in the lot. I saw her standing out there like a cat perched on a fence, so I ran out and cut the rope loose and then tried to get back to the house. I dropped down on my hands and knees and pulled myself back by grabbing hold of weeds and grass. We were in that condition all day long.
We had no stove then, but we had a chimney built in the log house. I had borrowed a sheet iron stove and built a fire so we could get some hot water. The wind was still howling and screeching, the snow flying and it was terribly cold. I had laid down again and then I noticed that the chimney was red hot and was setting the logs on fire. I tried to put the fire out by packing snow on it but couldn't pack enough. I ran out to get help and by getting down and pulling myself along the fence I got to the nearest house and there I got Jacob Miller to help me and together we put out the fire. All that night the wind howled and blew and tore and the next morning it subsided. Then we learned of the damage it had done. Cows and sheep were destroyed, barns blown away and great damage was done. A man in the south part of town had built a new house and his wife was in the house during the storm, and the wind took the roof off the house. The woman ran with her baby across the street against the fence and there she and her baby were frozen to death.

About three and one-half years from that time I was called to go on another mission to England. I was called to be in the city on the first day of May. I was there; I learned that I was to leave immediately for my field of labor. We had no funds to help missionaries in those days and we had to get along the best we could. So I worked my way to New York and got on a shipping vessel, in the steerage, with a lot of wild Irish people. I was kept in England for three and one-half years. During that time my folks lived in a log cabin and got along as best they could. I have been back there three times. The last time I was gone three and one-half years. Money was very scarce and the missionaries had to get along as best they could, while the folks at home did the same. But the Lord blessed us. It was by his Spirit and power that I labored and through him I have maintained my reputation. I have met a number of good friends here today who have told me of the good work which the Lord gave me the power to do. I laid hands upon the sick, preached the gospel and baptized people. I can testify to you that the Lord has been with me, his Spirit is round about me, and it is by his power that I have been able to hold the position which I have in his Church. He has blessed me—I have the confidence of the people, and many who came here today told me of the work which I have done. It has been my life and my whole energy has been in the work of the Lord.

I am here tonight to testify to you that there is a God who made the heavens and the earth. He is the Father of that portion of us called our spirits. The spirit of man is the son or daughter of God just as we are the sons and daughters of our mortal fathers in the flesh. God is almighty. He can be reached by prayer and faith. When we obey him, he will hear our prayers. I exhort you boys and girls—grand-children—I exhort you to do right. Do what is right and stand by it under all circumstances and God will be with you and he will bring you off victorious at last. But if you disobey him, he will not be with you; but will leave you to yourselves and you will go down to darkness and despair. Believe in him, pray to him, keep his commandments and he will be with you to the end of your days as he has been.
with me. I hope he will be so until life is no more. I have faith that the spirit in my body is the son of God, and when the body has done its work that I shall live and shall be the same person then as I am now and I know that by continuing in faith to the end, I will be with him and the good and just and the pure in heart in his heavenly kingdom.

I testify to you that "Mormonism" is the work of God. He established it and has ever been with it; he is with it today and with all of his servants. He is with the priesthood in guiding and directing the affairs of his Church. You boys and girls attend Sunday School and your Religion Classes and your Primary. Do not do evil; don't associate with those who do evil, but keep close to the Lord and do right. Pray to him in your silent chambers. Pray to him if you are in trouble; pray to him in joy and thank him for his blessings, for every good thing is from him. He is the Author of all good and Satan is the author of that which is evil. Do right—avoid wrong; don't keep bad company. Do not join with the unrighteous but join with the Saints and God will be with you whether in joy or in pain, in every condition, on the land or on the sea, on the hill-top or wherever you may be. He is the God of all things in heaven and on earth and the Father of our spirits. I love you, my dear ones, with all my heart and the best thing I can say to you is to put your trust in the Lord and keep his commandments. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," so Jesus Christ taught, "and all other things will be added unto you." Be willing to keep his commandments. Obey your parents. Rejoice in the Truth; avoid evil as much as you possibly can and the Lord will be with you and in the end you will come together in the celestial kingdom of God and your joy will be eternal.

Now, when I went back to England I wrote that song which Frank has sung so prettily. The other numbers on the program have been so very splendid. I rejoice in your diversions—in your good times together. But I caution you not to do anything wrong. Avoid evil in your play. Cultivate the gift of music and the gift of singing. Learn all you can that is useful.

I hope you will excuse me if I am taking up too much time here—but I want to say these things to you. Don't waste time on things that are only theoretical; learn things that will be of use and valuable to you. The great time to teach things of worth and truth is now at hand. This pedagogy called science—a great deal of time is wasted in studying some things. A great deal of science is true but very much is false, worthless clap trap.

Learn what is right. Learn that which will make you useful, happy, kind, patient and charitable. All these things are from God.

God bless you and may his peace abide with you. I thank my daughter, Lulu and her husband, Brother Walter A. Wallace, for the use
of the house in which we have had this splendid entertainment. I thank my children. I thank you all. I pray God to bless you, my dear ones, that his peace will be with you always and his Spirit in your hearts; that you may be kept from want and from sickness; that you will do what is right; that we may finally unite in blessed happiness in the Kingdom of God, with all the good and upright of the earth. I pray peace to be with you all, through Jesus Christ. Amen.