THE KNIGHTS’ LOVE STORY AND WEDDING
LEGALITY SUSTAINED UNDER OHIO MARRIAGE LAWS
ESTABLISHING THE CHURCH SIMPLY
OLIVE CULTIVATION IN ANTIQUITY
JOSIAH QUINCY WITH JOSEPH SMITH
A JEWEL IN THE GARDENS OF PARADISE

ACQUISITIONS - SECTIONS

BY J. LEO FAIRBANKS

HAWAII TEMPLE, 1917

UNITED STATES & CANADA

V.F.

V. 39, NO. 4 2000
"The Great Wall," p. 88
TO OUR READERS:

BYU Studies is dedicated to the correlation of revealed and discovered truth and to the conviction that the spiritual and the intellectual can be complementary and fundamentally harmonious avenues of knowledge. This periodical strives to explore scholarly perspectives on LDS topics. It is committed to seeking truth “by study and also by faith” (D&C 88:118) and recognizes that all knowledge without charity is nothing (1 Cor. 13:2). It proceeds on the premise that faith and reason, revelation and scholarly learning, obedience and creativity are compatible; they are “many members, yet but one body” (1 Cor. 12:20).

Contributions from all fields of learning are invited. BYU Studies strives to publish articles that openly reflect a Latter-day Saint point of view and are obviously relevant to subjects of general interest to Latter-day Saints, while conforming to high scholarly standards. BYU Studies invites poetry and personal essays dealing with the life of the mind, reflections on personal and spiritual responses to academic experiences, intellectual choices, values, responsibilities, and methods. All personal essays received will be entered in our annual personal essay contest. Short studies and notes are also welcomed.

Opinions expressed in BYU Studies are the opinions of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University, the editors, the advisory board, or anyone else.

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS:

Guidelines for submitting manuscripts may be viewed on our website at http://humanities.byu.edu/BYUSTudies/homepage.htm

SUBSCRIBERS’ NOTICE:

Subscription is $5.00 for one issue (you may subscribe at this rate for as many future issues as you like); $20.00 for one year (four issues); and $45.00 for ten issues (tenth issue is free). Foreign subscriptions for Canadian residents are 1 yr., $28.00; other non-USA residents, 1 yr., $40.00 (airmail) or $32.00 (surface). A price list for back issues is available upon request. All subscriptions begin with the forthcoming issue, or additional postage is charged. Address all correspondence to BYU Studies, 403 CB, PO Box 24098, Provo, Utah 84602-4098. You may also contact us by email: "BYU_Studies@byu.edu"; phone: (801) 378-6691; or fax: (801) 378-5386. If you move, please notify us in writing four weeks before changing your address; otherwise you must pay for replacement issues and mailing costs.

BYU Studies is abstracted in Current Contents, Social and Behavioral Science; indexed in ATLA Religion Database (published by the American Theological Library Association, Chicago, email: atla@atlacom, website: http://www.atlacom) and Index to Book Reviews in Religion; and listed in Historical Abstracts; Arts and Humanities Citation Index; America, History, and Life; and MLA International Bibliography.

BYU Studies is published quarterly at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
©2000 Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. All rights reserved.
Printed in the U.S.A. on acid-free paper
4-90-46359-3-3M ISSN 0007-0106
BYU STUDIES

ADVISORY BOARD: Paul V. Johnson  Noel L. Owen
L. Gary Lambert  Stephen L. Tanner
Maren M. Mouritsen  Frederick G. Williams

EDITOR IN CHIEF: John W. Welch
EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Doris R. Dant
MANAGING EDITOR: Jennifer Hurlbut
PRODUCTION EDITOR: Robert E. M. Spencer

EDITORS: Michael J. Call, Humanities
Brian Q. Cannon, Historical Documents
Larry W. Draper, Book Reviews
Susan L. Fales, Book Reviews
Richard Neitzel Holzapfel, Photography
Casualene R. Meyer, Poetry
Larry C. Porter, Church History
Eric Samuelsen, Film & Drama
Steven C. Walker, Fiction & Personal Essays

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Kristen M. Allred  R. Adam Lindsay
Elizabeth Beus  Melanie Moore
Erick Carlson  Carrie Rash
Julianne Clegg  Katherine Rawson
Esther Clement  Kelli Ann Skinner
Karen Esplin  Elise Smith
Rachel Evans  Laura Summerhays
Hillary M. Gadd  Anastasia Sutherland
Kristina Hansen  Amber Tilley
Eileen Johnson  Lauren Watson
Elisabeth Lamb

STAFF: Glenda J. Egbert  Katy Worlton Pulham
Amber Lee Fawson  Annette Samuelsen
Marny K. Parkin  Jed Woodworth


TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES
Newel and Lydia Bailey Knight’s Kirtland Love Story and Historic Wedding 6
William G. Hartley
Joseph Smith’s Performance of Marriages in Ohio 23
M. Scott Bradshaw
Establishing the Church Simply 127
John P. Livingstone
Paul L. Anderson

SHORT STUDIES
Recent Notes about Olives in Antiquity 115
Wilford M. Hess
Twentieth-Century Temples 162
Julia Parkinson

PERSONAL ESSAY
The Great Wall 88
Carol Ottesen

DOCUMENTS
Josiah Quincy’s 1844 Visit with Joseph Smith 71
Jed Woodworth
New Photograph of the Granite Shaft for the Brigham Young Monument 98
Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and J. Michael Hunter
New Photographs of Joseph F. Smith’s Centennial Memorial Trip to Vermont, 1905 107
Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and Paul H. Peterson
POETRY

The Moon from Paysandú
Patrick Madden 70

Haiku Poet
Marilyn Nelson 183

Returning
George Handley 184

Palm Ridge
Norma S. Bowkett 207

BOOK REVIEWS

The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform
by Roger E. Olson
David L. Paulsen 185

Mahonri Young: His Life and Art
by Thomas E. Toone

A Song of Joys: The Biography of Mahonri Mackintosh Young—Sculptor, Painter, Etcher
by Norma S. Davis
Todd A. Britsch 195

Of Heaven and Earth: Reconciling Scientific Thought with LDS Theology
by David L. Clark
Noel L. Owen 199

A Descriptive Bibliography of the Mormon Church: Volume One, 1830–1847
by Peter Crawley

by James B. Allen, Ronald W. Walker, and David J. Whittaker
Larry W. Draper 202

BRIEF NOTICE

A City of Refuge: Quincy, Illinois 206

INDEX 208
Hyrum and Jerusha Smith’s home in Kirtland, Ohio, ca. 1900. This nonextant home is traditionally identified as the site of the Newel Knight and Lydia Bailey wedding. Courtesy Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints Library-Archives, Independence, Missouri (reference #D765.4).
Newel and Lydia Bailey Knight's Kirtland Love Story and Historic Wedding

William G. Hartley

In October 1835, Newel Knight and Lydia Bailey, two spouseless adults still in the prime of life, found themselves living in the same boardinghouse and eating at the same dining table. As lodgers with Hyrum and Jerusha Smith in Kirtland, Ohio, they had good reason to notice each other. Lydia's husband had deserted her more than three years earlier, and Newel's wife had died a year before. Romance developed quickly, and in a couple of months, Lydia accepted Newel's marriage proposal. Their pending wedding led Joseph Smith, who had personally converted both Lydia and Newel, to declare his right to perform marriages. Being a leader in a church that had published its beliefs concerning marriage, he could legally do so, and he also believed he had authority from God by virtue of the priesthood he held. Nevertheless, the wedding has given rise in recent times to historical controversy.

**Newel Knight**

Before Joseph Smith received the gold plates, he worked for a time for Joseph Knight Sr. in Colesville, New York, and became acquainted with the large Knight family, including married son Newel. Those in the Knight family network were among the first people to know about and believe in Joseph Smith's prophetic work.¹

Newel Knight was born September 13, 1800, in Marlborough, Vermont, and moved with his parents to New York when he was nine. In 1825, he married Sally Colburn, and they settled in Colesville, New York, near his parents. The next year, Joseph Smith came to work for the Knights, and when he knew he could trust them, he told some of the family about his visits from Moroni. After Joseph obtained the gold plates, the Knights provided him with paper and supplies while he translated. Newel was the recipient of the Church's first miraculous healing, when Joseph Smith cast a devil out of him. Newel was baptized soon after. Newel and Sally were with Joseph and Emma Smith in August 1830 when Joseph received a revelation regarding the sacrament.²

So many Knight relatives converted that Colesville became the Church's first organized branch. Hyrum Smith served briefly as its president, and Newel worked closely with him. When Hyrum left, Newel
became the Colesville Branch President. Newel helped direct the Colesville Saints’ move from New York to the Kirtland area early in 1831 and their move later that summer to Jackson County, Missouri. He was present at the dedication of the temple site in Independence and continued to preside over the Colesville Branch in Missouri. Joseph Smith blessed Newel and Sally’s infant son, Samuel, who was born on October 4, 1831.³

Newel, Sally, and Samuel were among the Saints forced from Jackson County in 1833. In 1834, when the Church’s first stakes were created, one in Missouri and another in Ohio, Newel was called to the high council in Missouri.⁴ He was chosen to be one of the Missouri elders to go to Kirtland to help build the temple and there receive “a great endowment and blessing.”⁵ While preparing to go, he and Sally became ill, probably with malaria. She was pregnant at the time and gave birth to a son in September 1834, but both she and the baby died soon afterward. After burying them, Newel, not fully healthy, left young Samuel with relatives and headed for Kirtland.

When Newel reached Kirtland, his good friends Hyrum and Jerusha Smith welcomed him and offered him board and room at their home. “Both he and his ever kind and amiable wife Jerusha,” Newel said, “did all they could to make me comfortable.”⁶

Newel visited the temple construction site, volunteered his labor, and was put to work. Records are silent regarding specific tasks this miller-by-trade performed. Newel considered this labor on the temple to be of “the greatest importance” because “it is a long time since the Lord had a house on the Earth.”⁷ For ten months his workdays revolved around lumber, plaster, glass, shingles, moldings, the sounds of hammers and saws, and the smell of wet plaster and new paint. Late in 1835, Newel noted in his journal, “The summer has passed very pleasantly with me, and I rejoice in my labors on the House of the Lord.”⁸

Lacking a wife, Newel paid close attention to the slender, fair-haired, soft-spoken, light-blue-eyed Lydia Bailey when she moved into Hyrum and Jerusha’s boardinghouse. The two saw each other at meals and while coming and going in the house but rarely spoke to each other. Gradually, as Newel learned about this attractive boarder, her sorrow-filled past, and her remarkable conversion story, he fell in love with her.⁹

**Lydia Goldthwaite Bailey**

A daughter of Jesse and Sally Burt Goldthwaite, Lydia was born in Sutton, Massachusetts, on June 9, 1812.¹⁰ Her Goldthwaite grandparents and their parents were Salem, Massachusetts, people. Her mother’s parents, David and Silence Jones Burt, were from Norton, Bristol County, Massachusetts. Lydia’s parents, Newel said, “were respectable, but not rich.”¹¹ Lydia’s mother was Presbyterian. Her father belonged to no denomination
“but was a moral & temperate man.”Lydia was the third of the twelve children born to Jesse and Sally in Massachusetts and New York. When Lydia was eight, Jesse moved the family to Villenova in western New York, some fifteen miles from Lake Erie and thirty miles southwest of Buffalo. Jesse was a farmer, one of the early settlers of the township. The family lived in a large, comfortable cabin in a wooded area. Lydia received a common-school education. When she was fifteen, her parents sent her to a local boarding school, because she was “studiously inclined” and had “a mind that was never satisfied.” Likely she attended the Fredonia Academy in nearby Pomfret. This Presbyterian-affiliated school was the main boarding school in Chautauqua County and drew students from western New York. She attended one year, returned home for the summer, and then, according to her history, went back to the school. Just how many terms she attended is not known.

At school, Lydia met a popular young man named Calvin Bailey. They married in the fall of 1828, when she was sixteen. For Lydia, the marriage turned tragic. Her own history, published for young readers, skims past her troubles with Calvin. But Newel recorded details based on what Lydia told him of some of the serious difficulties. For about three months, Newel wrote in his journal, all went well for new bride Lydia. But then she found that Calvin was a heavy drinker and an abusive man.

In 1830, Lydia and Calvin were living in Lodi, New York. At this point, Lydia’s life details become confusing. There is a Lodi, now called Gowanda, not twelve miles northeast of Villenova, which would seem to be the Lodi where Calvin and Lydia moved. But, there is another Lodi more than one hundred miles away—about twenty miles northwest of Ithaca in the Finger Lakes region—overlooking Seneca Lake. Apparently this distant Lodi was where Lydia and Calvin lived. The couple’s first child, Rosanna Bailey, was born there on November 3, 1830. Lydia loved her infant but felt sorrow, knowing the child would suffer “shame and wretchedness” from an intemperate father. Calvin, through heavy drinking and poor management, disposed of his farm and made his family destitute. He rented a small, uncomfortable home in Lodi and moved Lydia and Rosanna there.

In these dire circumstances, Lydia gave birth to a son, Edwin Bailey, on February 12, 1832. The baby lived but a day, and Lydia nearly died, too. Calvin sold the family’s furniture to pay for his drinking habit, and he often threatened Lydia, Newel wrote, and was cruel to the little daughter. About two weeks after newborn Edwin’s death, Calvin told Lydia they were to move about one hundred miles to New Albion, which is only about fifteen miles southeast of Villenova, where her parents lived. Lydia pleaded that she was too ill to move that far—she could not sit up for even a half hour at a time. “If you are so independan[t] you may Stay where you are,” Calvin
said harshly, “but I shall go where you will never see me again.” He deserted the family. Soon afterward, a man came and took away the family’s milk cow because Calvin had sold it to get money to move away.

Alone and almost friendless, Lydia returned to her parents’ home in Villenova, but when is not known. Newel records that Calvin, after being gone a “considerable time,” returned once, tried to take the child, and threatened Lydia’s life. Friends rescued Lydia and the little girl. Then, in January 1833, two-year-old Rosanna died. After recounting this history, Newel penned his own harsh judgments of Calvin Bailey:

Bail[e]y turned out to be a drunkard unworthy of a wife: letting her suffer and pine in sorrow, while he was carousing and spending even the avails of the last Cow. The trials of a Woman that has a drunken husband, are registered where such fiends never go; and the hellish deeds of the toper, with all his folly “thick upon him,” are reserved among the trials of the dam[n]ed.

Deserted by her husband and suffering from the loss of two children, Lydia was distraught. “Tears were often in her eyes, and a constant aching was at her heart,” her biographer said. To help Lydia mend, her parents agreed to let her move away from the scenes of her misfortunes. In February 1833, a family friend named Eleazer Freeman Nickerson took her to Canada by sled. They navigated a shortcut by leaving from a shoreline point below Buffalo and sledding about twenty miles across frozen Lake Erie to the Ontario side—breaking through the ice once. Ashore, they glided on to Mount Pleasant in Upper Canada, about sixty miles west of Niagara Falls. There, Nickerson and his wife made Lydia feel at home.

Lydia spent a pleasant spring, summer, and fall in Mount Pleasant and attended the local Methodist meetings. She wrote to her parents that she was glad to be where “I can feel safe from a wretch in humane [sic] shape.” She regretted that she could not be home to “enjoy the society of kind Parents Brothers and Sisters” and felt to return “if [only] I could and not be disturbed [by him] that I have reason to believe seeks [for] revenge on me.” Her 1833 letters home reveal her to be a believing Christian. Among bits of big-sister advice she sent to her younger brothers are these: “Be good Boys to read your Bibles and pray”; “Don’t forget Sunday S[c]hool, learn you[r] lessons well”; and “Rest when Sunday comes and go to me[e]ting.”

Conversion by Joseph Smith

In October 1833, Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon left Kirtland, Ohio, and traveled with Freeman Nickerson on a proselyting mission to visit Nickerson’s sons, Eleazer Freeman Nickerson and Moses Nickerson, in Upper Canada. These two sons were prosperous merchants and men of
standing in Mount Pleasant. Perhaps this is the only time in LDS Church history when a Church President has served a standard proselyting mission while holding that high office.28

The missionaries left Kirtland on October 5, 1833, and preached along the way. On October 14, the Prophet’s party passed through the neighborhood of Lydia’s parents, stopping in the township of Perrysburg, where Father Nickerson lived, and preaching in Lodi. While en route to Canada, Joseph and Sidney became concerned about their families and prayed for them. In response, Joseph received a revelation, now Doctrine and Covenants 100, which said that their families would be fine and that the two men must preach what the Lord would inspire them to say because he had “much people” in the area where they were going (D&C 100:3). Lydia was one of them. The Lord charged Joseph and Sidney to “lift up your voices unto this people” (D&C 100:5). In return, they were given a promise: “Inasmuch as ye do this the Holy Ghost shall be shed forth in bearing record unto all things whatsoever ye shall say” (D&C 100:8). Lydia would witness that outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The missionary party reached Eleazer Nickerson’s home on Friday, October 18. That evening or the next, the host asked Smith and Rigdon to explain their religion. Joseph Smith told about Moroni’s visits, the gold
plates, and the glorious message of the Book of Mormon. Lydia, "who was
listening and watching him intently, saw his face become white and a shin-
ing glow seemed to beam from every feature." Although Lydia had been a
member of the Methodist Episcopal Church for nearly seven years, this
witness of the Spirit converted her to the restored gospel. 29 Joseph Smith
bore testimony of the restoration of the priesthood and the need for bap-
tism by proper authority. Elder Rigdon spoke next. When both men
finished, those present asked many questions.

Notice was circulated that there would be a public preaching in the
Nickerson brothers’ new store. On Sunday, October 20, a "very large" and
attentive congregation heard the two Mormon leaders preach. "With
power," Lydia said, Joseph Smith exhorted those in attendance to seek for
the truth of what he had preached. After preaching elsewhere, Joseph and
Sidney returned to Mount Pleasant on Thursday, October 24, and "held
meeting at candle lighting to a large congregation." There, Eleazer Nicker-
son and his wife declared their full belief. 30 Another meeting was held at
Mount Pleasant on Saturday. The next day, Sunday, October 27th, "twelve
came forward and was baptized," including Eleazer Nickerson, his house-
hold, and "Lidia Baeley"—as Joseph Smith recorded her name in his
diary. 31 Perhaps employing poetic license, Lydia's biographer wrote that
Lydia was so thrilled when baptized that she cried out while standing in the
cold water, "Glory to God in the highest! Thanks be to His holy name that
I have lived to see this day." 32

The Saints met together the day Lydia was baptized. "Had a good
meeting," Joseph Smith recorded. "One of the sisters got the gift of
tongues which made the saints rejoice may God increase the gifts among
them for his sons sake." 33 That sister was Lydia. Her biography says of that
meeting that the Nickerson family were seated around "the wide, old-fash-
ioned fire-place in the parlor" listening to Joseph Smith teach. Moses Nick-
erson said he would feel glad if someone who had been baptized "could
receive the gift of tongues as the ancient Saints did and speak to us," to
which Joseph responded, "If one of you will rise up and open your mouth
it shall be filled, and you shall speak in tongues." 34 Everyone turned to
Lydia and urged her to be the one. Then, according to her history,

she was enveloped as with a flame, and, unable longer to retain her seat, she
arose and her mouth was filled with the praises of God and His glory. The
spirit of tongues was upon her, and she was clothed in a shining light, so
bright that all present saw it with great distinctness above the light of the fire
and the candles. 35

Two more converts were baptized and confirmed at the water's edge. The
missionaries ordained Eleazer Nickerson an elder and put him in charge of
the new congregation. 36
The next day, Monday, October 28, the believers met at candlelight, "broke bread," and the missionaries confirmed those who had been baptized the previous day. "The spirit was given in great power to some and the rest had great peace," Joseph Smith’s journal records.37

On October 29, the missionaries headed back to Kirtland. While their team was being hitched, Joseph Smith paced back and forth in the sitting room, deep in thought. Then, according to Lydia, he said to her and others present:

"I have been pondering on Sister Lydia's lonely condition, and wondering why it is that she has passed through so much sorrow and affliction and is thus separated from all her relatives. I now understand it. The Lord has suffered it even as He allowed Joseph of old to be afflicted, who was sold by his brethren as a slave into a far country, and through that became a savior to his father's house and country. Even so shall it be with her, the hand of the Lord will overrule it for good to her and her father's family."38

Speaking directly to Lydia, he pronounced a blessing that sounds very much like a patriarchal blessing. This was before formal patriarchal blessings were given in the Church.39

"Sister Lydia, great are your blessings. The Lord, your Savior, loves you, and will overrule all your past sorrows and afflictions for good unto you. Let your heart be comforted. You are of the blood of Israel descended through the loins of Ephraim. You shall yet be a savior to your father's house. Therefore be comforted, and let your heart rejoice, for the Lord has a great work for you to do. Be faithful and endure unto the end and all will be well."40

Lydia added another detail missing from Joseph’s diary account. Freeman Nickerson gave the Kirtland party money for them to return to Kirtland by crossing Lake Erie and thereby save some two hundred miles of land travel. Apparently, however, they instead went overland via Buffalo, New York, and reached Kirtland on November 4, 1833.41 Almost a year and a half would pass before Lydia would see Joseph Smith again.

Lydia stayed with the Nickersons until the next summer. She hitched a ride with someone heading towards New York and got as far as St. Catherine, Ontario, about eighty miles from her home. She stayed there for two months, then went by stagecoach to her family’s home in Villenova in September 1834. When she attempted to interest her parents in Mormonism, they "tried every method [to] turn her from what they termed delusion."42 When persuasion failed, they offered her property and money. "Her anxiety to be with the Saints increased [with] their Coldness," Newel related, so, "notwithstanding She dearly loved her friends She loved the cause of righteousness still better [and] bade her Fathers house farewell." About May 20, 1835, she started for Kirtland. Despite her parents’ objections to her going to the Mormon center, they gave her "ample means" to reach her destination and to start out "comfortable and respectable."43
In Kirtland, Lydia found lodging with the Vincent Knight family (no relation to Newel). Before she had even unpacked, Vincent asked her to help Joseph Smith pay off a debt. She emptied her purse, giving him, she estimated, fifty dollars. This meant she lacked means to buy even one meal. That evening, when Brother Knight told her that her money had kept Joseph from prison, she felt pleased she was able to help the prophet. Lydia lived with the Vincent Knight family until the fall.44

Newel and Lydia’s Courtship

About October 1835, Lydia accepted Hyrum Smith’s offer to move into his household and assist his wife, Jerusha, with running the boardinghouse. Lydia described Hyrum as being “tall, well-framed, with a fine, handsome countenance, and blue eyes, and his face was full of intelligence and spirit. His manner was dignified, but he was amiable and vivacious, and withal exceedingly courteous and fascinating” in all his interactions.45 In the Hyrum Smith home, Lydia met Newel Knight, who was one of the boarders. Newel described how he fell in love with her:

She had not been long in the family, when I found there was a growing attachment in my bosom to wards her, which I, in vain, strove to over come. She was very reserved in her manners, while prudence and wisdom seemed to mark her course in all her move ments; seldom did I hear her speak, unless it was to Sister Smith concerning the affairs she was engaged in; yet [I] Could now and then see the Crimson faint upon her Cheek; she would occasionally, as she supposed unperceive[ably] cast her eyes towards me, that [showed] Cupid’s dart had found its way to her heart: yet it appears she did not intend to let any one perceive it.46

Lydia’s history says Newel was “tall, had light brown hair, a keen blue eye and a very energetic and determined manner.” She learned Newel was a widower and had a three-year-old son in Missouri. Lydia “ached with sympathy for the desolate young man” because she knew all too well what sorrow was.47 Newel said he doubted he and she had exchanged a dozen words up to November 18, when he “came to the determination to make my feel ings known to her.” That evening he found her alone in an upper room. “I took her by the hand and after a few words with her I told her I thought her situation, as well as mine was rather lonely, and if it was agreeable to her perhaps we might be some company for each other.”48 She didn’t answer. Tears streamed from her eyes. Newel noted that when she was able to suppress her tears, she said:

The true feelings of my heart are known [by] none save the Lord. I suppose you are aware of [my] situation. I would rather sacrifice every feel[ing] of my own and even life rather than [st]ep aside from virtue, or offend my heavenly [fathe]r, or violate the law of God.49
By that she meant that however much she might like Newel, she believed it was improper for her to be courted while she was still legally married, even though her husband had deserted her more than three years before. Lydia’s history claims that Newel “endeavor[ed] to show her that according to the law she was a free woman, having been deserted for three years with nothing provided for her support,” an argument she did not accept. Newel’s version is different. “Bailey, of course, mean as he was, was not divorced from her,” he said, but he believed that the Lord nevertheless wanted them to marry. “I doubt not [the in]tegrity of your heart,” he told tearful Lydia, then suggested that “when you fully un[der-stand] the law of God you will know that you are free, [and I] would ask nothing at your hand Contrary [to that] law.” Lydia, overcome with emotion, could not reply. “She broke from my embrace & left the room.” Having put his heart on the line, Newel pondered what to do next. He had “half supposed” she would utterly reject his proposition, which would have ended his pursuit, “but in this to my great satisfaction,” he said, “I was wholly disappointed.”

He determined to find out God’s will in the matter, so for three days he pondered and prayed and fasted. Monday morning, November 22, 1835, he concluded he should talk over the matter with friend and landlord Hyrum Smith. Hyrum replied that “he knew it was all right, that the Lord never designed [that] a virtuous intelligent female as she was, should spend all her life single & in her present lonely situation, for God requires all, both male and female, to fill the measure of their Creation, & to multiply upon the earth as he hath Commanded.” Newel agreed, but he did not want to court Lydia if it caused people to speak evil of their relationship, so he told Hyrum he wished Joseph Smith would decide the matter, “for if the Lord gives her to me no man can say why do ye so?” Hyrum agreed to seek his brother’s approval for Newel and Lydia to court. Newel thanked Hyrum, then lifted his heart to God in a prayer of thanksgiving and supplication.

Newel spent that Monday morning working on the Kirtland Temple. Shortly after noon, Hyrum came to him and said he had explained the situation to Joseph Smith and now had an answer. As reported by Newel, Joseph Smith’s instructions read today much like some of the personal counsel recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants, although this information was only privately and verbally conveyed:

Bro[ther] Hiram Came to me, said he had laid the affair before Bro[ther] Joseph, who at the time was with his Council. Broth[er] Joseph after p[ray]or & reflecting a little or in other words enquiring [of the] Lord Said it is all right, She is his & the sooner they [are] married the better. Tell them no law shall hurt [them]. They need not fear either the law of God or man for [it] shall not touch them; & the Lord bless them. This [is the] will of the Lord concerning that matter.
As soon as he could, Newel went to the boardinghouse, found Lydia in the room where he had told her his feelings, and related to her what Joseph Smith had instructed. “We lifted our hearts with gratitude to our heavenly Father for his good ness to wards us & that we live in this momentous age, & as did the ancients so we have the privilege of enquireing through the prophet, & receiving the word of the Lord concerning us.”\textsuperscript{55} When she heard the prophet’s answer, Lydia fell to her knees and poured out her soul in thanksgiving to God. Then she agreed to marry Newel.\textsuperscript{56} Newel then went to the dining room and ate: “I had fasted & prayed three days & knights [sic], & did not desire food until after I had learned the will of the Lord, & Lydia & myself had made a Covenant to be for each other.”\textsuperscript{57}

This was Monday afternoon, November 23. Because of Joseph Smith’s instructions, Newel and Lydia decided to marry as soon as possible. Hyrum and Jerusha Smith offered to provide the wedding feast and advised that it be the next evening, “to which,” Newel confessed, “we readily Consented.” To “fulfil the gentile law,” Newel rode on horseback nine miles and obtained a marriage license from the county clerk, and was back by 3 P.M.\textsuperscript{58}

But who should perform the ceremony? Of the Saints, only Seymour Brunson had a license to legally perform marriages in Ohio—a judge in Geauga County had refused to let Mormon ministers obtain licenses to marry people. That evening, Newel and Lydia discussed how they both wished that Joseph Smith might “seal the bond of matrimony for us,” but had told only the Lord of their desire.\textsuperscript{59} Because Hyrum Smith was inviting the wedding guests, Newel requested that he ask Brother Brunson to perform the wedding. But while Hyrum was inviting Joseph and Emma Smith to be guests at the wedding, Hyrum mentioned to his brother his intent to invite Brunson to do the ceremony. Joseph objected. “Stop I will marry them my self,” he announced. This was good news to Newel and Lydia: “It seemed that the Lord had granted unto us the desires of our hearts.”\textsuperscript{60}

**Historic Wedding**

Tuesday evening, November 24, 1835,\textsuperscript{61} Newel and Lydia and about a dozen wedding guests and Joseph Smith gathered in the Hyrum Smith home for the wedding and the dinner. This event proved to be a milestone in the history of the early days of the LDS Church and has sparked recent legal controversy among some historians.

The newly published Doctrine and Covenants contained an “Article on Marriage,” which had been approved by a Church conference in August 1835, just a few months before the Knight wedding. The article, written by Oliver Cowdery, expressed the belief the Saints then held regarding marriage. It read, in part:

> We believe that all marriages in this Church of Christ of Latter-day Saints should be solemnized in a public meeting or feast prepared for that purpose,
and that the solemnization should be performed by a Presiding High Priest, High Priest, Bishop, Elder or Priest. 62

When he learned Newel and Lydia wanted to marry, Joseph Smith felt inspired that the time had come to assert his rights as a church leader, even if the local court refused to grant Mormon ministers a license to perform marriages. From then on, he decided, Saints could—and should—be married by priesthood authority. 63 According to Lydia’s memory years later, Joseph complained:

Our Elders have been wronged and prosecuted for marrying without a license. The Lord God of Israel has given me authority to unite the people in the holy bonds of matrimony. And from this time forth I shall use that privilege and marry whomsoever I see fit. And the enemies of the Church shall never have power to use the law against me. 64

Despite the snowy, freezing-cold evening, guests filled the room. Emma Smith accompanied Joseph, and they found that “the feast was prepared, the guests were ready.” 65 When Newel and Lydia sat down, the ceremony began. After singing and a prayer, Joseph asked the couple to stand and join hands. Joseph then made some remarks upon the subject of marriage, indicating “that it was an institution of heaven first solemnized in the garden of Eden by God himself, by the authority of everlasting priesthood.” Using a ceremony original to him but one closely following the Church’s newly published marriage regulations, Joseph called Newel and Lydia by name and asked the couple to “covenant to be each others companions during [their] lives, and discharge the duties of husband & wife in all respects.” They agreed. Joseph pronounced them husband and wife and blessed them that like Adam and Eve they would multiply and replenish the earth. He promised them a long life and prosperity. 66 The groom was thirty-five; the bride, twenty-three.

Because some of the company asked Joseph questions, he continued to speak on the principle of marriage, revealing “much that was entirely new.” While Joseph spoke, Lydia again saw “that strange, brilliant light shine though his features.” 67 For Newel, the evening was more than just a wedding ceremony and social occasion; it was a rich, spiritual experience:

The Prophet & his Council were there; we received much Instruction from the Prophet Concerning matrimony, & what the ancient order of God was, & what it must be again Concerning marriage. In the name of the Lord, & by the authority of the priesthood [sic] which he held, he joined us in the bond of matrimony. . . . The evening passed off well & all felt edified & glad of opportunity of enjoying instruction from the Lord through the beloved Prophet. Long, long has the world been shrowed in gentle ignorance & superstition, but the shackles are beginning to be blown away like the Summer threshing floor & light & intelligence to be given the Children of the kingdom.
Legal Controversies

Newel and Lydia’s wedding has sparked some controversy among historians. Did Joseph Smith break the law by performing a wedding he lacked a license to perform? And was Lydia legally eligible to remarry, or was she committing bigamy? Recent research summarized below shows that, according to Ohio statutes then in force, Joseph Smith was entitled to perform the wedding, even without a license. Ohio’s 1824 “Act Regulating Marriages” provided that a religious society (such as the Quakers, who had no ministers) could perform marriages without a license so long as the ceremony was done “agreeable to the rules and regulations of their respective churches.” With its “marriage” article published that September in the Doctrine and Covenants as section 101, the Church met the requirements of that law. Therefore, when Joseph Smith married Newel and Lydia, he performed a marriage that was legal, even though he lacked a court-issued license. (See the county clerk’s record of the marriage: fig. 1 in M. Scott Bradshaw’s article, this issue.)

But was Lydia legally entitled to remarry? Apparently Newel had heard that according to Ohio law, a person deserted by a spouse for three years could remarry. However, he must not have known that Ohio had changed the law just that year, requiring the desertion be for five years instead of three. No matter how many years were required, the law did specify that the person had to be an Ohio resident for two years, which disqualified Lydia, and the person had to apply to the Ohio Supreme Court for a divorce, which Lydia did not do. In that regard, Lydia technically broke the law. Conscientious, good person that she was, she agreed to marry only because Joseph Smith affirmed that the Lord approved of the union. Years later, trying to show the prophetic correctness of the decision, Lydia asserted that “a few days” after she agreed to marry Newel, news of her husband’s death reached her. Serious genealogy research has failed to locate Calvin’s death date or place, but he is missing from the 1840 census. Lydia wrote to her family and told them about marrying Newel. They wondered how she had managed to obtain a divorce but were extremely pleased she was free of and safe from Calvin.

Postscript

Newlyweds Newel and Lydia stayed in Kirtland until the Kirtland Temple was dedicated in April 1836. Before leaving Kirtland, Lydia received her patriarchal blessing from Joseph Smith Sr. Having lost both of her children, she took great comfort in his promise that she would have many children, teach them righteousness, and have power to “keep them from the power of the destroyer.” The couple reached Newel’s home in Clay County, Missouri, in mid-May 1836. During the next decade, Newel and
Lydia had six children while experiencing the Saints’ fortunes and misfortunes in Missouri and Nauvoo. The family participated in the exodus from Nauvoo, crossed the Missouri, and were part of George Miller’s advance company, which wintered at the Ponca Camp north of Winter Quarters. There, Newel was the senior high councilman until he died, apparently of pneumonia, in that isolated outpost on January 11, 1847. Lydia gave birth to the couple’s last child after Newel’s death. With her seven children, she managed to move west in 1850. As promised in her patriarchal blessing, all her children lived to adulthood. She later remarried and lived in Salt Lake City, Provo, Payson, and southern Utah. She spent her last years doing ordinance work in the St. George Temple and died on April 3, 1884.

Joseph Smith performed many more marriages in Kirtland after Newel and Lydia’s, and during the rest of the time he was subject to Ohio state law, no one challenged his right to do so.

William G. Hartley (william_hartley@byu.edu) is Associate Professor of History at Brigham Young University and Research Historian with BYU’s Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History. He currently serves as President of the Mormon History Association.
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Joseph Smith’s Performance of Marriages in Ohio

M. Scott Bradshaw

During the 1830s, ministers from a wide range of Christian denominations performed marriages in Ohio. Attempting to compile a comprehensive list of such churches would be a mammoth task, but a sampling of the court records from several Ohio counties shows that representatives from at least a dozen religious denominations were actively solemnizing marriages. These denominations included Anabaptists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, Episcopalians, Evangelicals, German Reformed, Mennonites, Methodists, Presbyterians, Unitarians, Universalists and, of particular interest to readers here, Latter-day Saints.¹

Most of these ceremonies were performed under a provision of Ohio law that prescribed procedures through which any ordained minister could be licensed to solemnize marriages. The county courts of common pleas issued licenses to perform marriages, and the granting of these licenses was a routine matter. According to law, a minister merely needed to appear before a county court and produce “credentials of his being a regular ordained minister of any religious society or congregation.”² The statute provided that, once granted, such licenses were to be valid for as long as the minister continued serving the same denomination.

A survey of Ohio county court records reveals only one denial of a request for a license. In March 1835, Sidney Rigdon made a motion for a license before the judge of his county court, Presiding Judge Matthew Birchard of the Geauga County Court of Common Pleas, which had jurisdiction over the Kirtland area. Even though Rigdon held the priesthood in the LDS Church and was a counselor to Joseph Smith in the presidency of the Church, the judge still refused Rigdon’s motion, holding that he was not a “regularly ordained minister of the gospel within the meaning of the Statute.”³ Whether intentionally or not, in denying Rigdon’s request, the judge appears to have signaled to other Mormon elders not to bother applying: Geauga County court records do not contain any evidence that other Saints either requested or were denied licenses to solemnize marriages.

The denial of Rigdon’s motion was not the only problem he had with the court over the marriage issue. Court records show that Rigdon was indicted in June 1835 and tried in October for illegally solemnizing the 1834 marriage of Orson Hyde and Marinda Johnson. Rigdon was discharged
only after it became evident that a license he received in 1826 as a Camp-
bellite minister was still technically valid, there being no record from his
previous church proving his dismissal.4

While Judge Birchard’s refusal of Rigdon’s motion may have dissuaded
LDS elders from making similar requests in Geauga County, at least one
elder was not deterred from performing marriages—even without a
license. County marriage records show that on November 24, 1835, Joseph
Smith solemnized the marriage of Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwaite
Bailey. These records also show that during the next two months, Joseph
performed an additional ten weddings (fig. 1). By June 1837, he had married
a total of nineteen couples in Kirtland.5

Joseph’s decision to perform marriages surprised some of the Saints.
This is particularly evident from the accounts of the Knight-Bailey wed-
ding. Lydia’s history states that Joseph’s brother Hyrum was “astonish[ed]”
when he learned that Joseph intended to personally marry her and Newel.
Probably referring to Sidney Rigdon’s legal troubles, Lydia’s history
explains that Ohio law “did not recognize the ‘Mormon’ Elders as minis-
ters” and that LDS elders had been arrested and fined for performing mar-
rriages.6 Newel was also amazed. He noted in his journal that Joseph did not
have a license to perform marriages and that without this the authorities
could impose a penalty.7

Joseph was not timid in announcing his intent to solemnize marriages.
During the Knight ceremony, he stated that LDS elders had been
“wronged” in connection with the marriage license issue and explained
that from this time forth he intended to marry couples whenever he saw fit.
Joseph also predicted that his enemies would never be able to use the law
against him.8

Nor was Joseph silent with respect to the uncertainty over his author-
ity to solemnize marriages. In comments made during a Sunday sermon,
just days after the Knight wedding, Joseph justified his action by explaining
that he had done as God commanded him. He further stated that it was his
right, or “religious privilege,” as he put it, to perform marriages. Not even
the U.S. Congress, he said, had “power to make a law that would abridge the
rights of [his] religion.”9

Not surprisingly, Newel’s and Lydia’s comments regarding Ohio law
and Mormon elders have led some historians to assume that Joseph acted
without legal authority when he married couples in Kirtland. These writ-
ers have used the term “illegal” quite freely in describing these weddings,
also noting that, in the case of the Knight wedding, Lydia had not obtained
a divorce from her previous spouse, Calvin Bailey, an abusive husband who
had abandoned Lydia several years earlier.
BE it Remembered, that on the Twenty fourth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty five, Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwaite of the County of Geauga, were legally joined in marriage, by competent authority, in conformity to the provisions of the Statutes of the State of Ohio in such cases made and provided; and a certificate of the said marriage, signed by Joseph Smith, who solemnized the same, has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas for said County of Geauga, this Twenty second day of February Anno Domini, one thousand eight hundred and thirty five.

ATTEST, 

D. Aiken, Clerk.

BE it Remembered, that on the Third day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty five, Warren Parrish and Martha H. Raymond of the County of Geauga, were legally joined in marriage, by competent authority, in conformity to the provisions of the Statutes of the State of Ohio in such cases made and provided; and a certificate of the said marriage, signed by Joseph Smith Jr. who solemnized the same, has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas for said County of Geauga, this Twenty second day of February Anno Domini, one thousand eight hundred and thirty five.

ATTEST, 

D. Aiken, Clerk.

Fig. 1. Geauga County records of marriages solemnized by Joseph Smith Jr. in Kirtland, Ohio, from November 1835 through January 1836. These and the records that follow were filed in Geauga County within the ninety-day term prescribed by law. The first two are for the marriages of Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwaite and of Warren Parrish and Martha H. Raymond. Typically, the county clerk, D. D. Aiken, recorded four marriages per page, but the pages are split here for ease of reading. Courtesy Judge Charles E. Henry, Geauga County Probate Court, Chardon, Ohio.
Marriage records of Thomas Carrico and Betsey Baker and of John Webb and Catharine Willcox. Courtesy Judge Charles E. Henry, Geauga County Probate Court, Chardon, Ohio.
Marriage records of John F. Boynton and Susan Lowell and of Joseph C. Kingsbury and Caroline Whitney. Courtesy Judge Charles E. Henry, Geauga County Probate Court, Chardon, Ohio.
Marriage records of Levi Loveland and Hanna Pierce, who were married by a justice of the peace, and of William F. Cahoon and Nancy M. Gibbs, who were married by Joseph Smith. Courtesy Judge Charles E. Henry, Geauga County Probate Court, Chardon, Ohio.
BE it Remembered, that on the Seventeenth day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and Thirty-six, Stanley and Dona Cahoon, of the County of Geauga, were legally joined in marriage, by competent authority, in conformity to the provisions of the Statutes of the State of Ohio in such cases made and provided; and a certificate of the said marriage, signed by J. Smith, who solemnized the same, has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas for said County of Geauga, this Twenty-second day of February, Anne Domini, one thousand eight hundred and Thirty-six.

ATTEST: J. R. A. Clerk.

BE it Remembered, that on the Seventeenth day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and Thirty-six, Tunis Rappleye and Louisa Cutler, of the County of Geauga, were legally joined in marriage, by competent authority, in conformity to the provisions of the Statutes of the State of Ohio in such cases made and provided; and a certificate of the said marriage, signed by J. Smith, who solemnized the same, has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas for said County of Geauga, this Twenty-second day of February, Anne Domini, one thousand eight hundred and Thirty-six.

ATTEST: J. R. A. Clerk.

Marriage records of Harvey Stanley and Lerona Cahoon and of Tunis Rappleye and Louisa Cutler. Courtesy Judge Charles E. Henry, Geauga County Probate Court, Chardon, Ohio.
No historian has been more direct in questioning the propriety of Joseph's performance of marriages than Michael Quinn:

[In November 1835 he [Joseph] announced a doctrine I call “theocratic ethics.” He used this theology to justify his violation of Ohio’s marriage laws by performing a marriage for Newel Knight and the undivorced Lydia Goldthwaite without legal authority to do so.]

Quoting Newel's surprise at Joseph's performance of the marriage, Quinn continues:

In addition to the bigamous character of this marriage, Smith had no license to perform marriages in Ohio. . . .

Two months later Smith performed marriage ceremonies for which neither he nor the couples had marriage licenses, and he issued marriage certificates “agreeable to the rules and regulations of the Church of Jesus Christ of Later-day Saints.” Theocratic ethics justified LDS leaders and (by extension) regular Mormons in actions which were contrary to conventional ethics and sometimes in violation of criminal laws.  

Historian John Brooke has made similar observations:

Specifically prohibited from performing the marriage ceremony by the local county court, Smith brushed aside a state-licensed church elder to perform the rites of marriage between Newell and Lydia himself. She was not divorced from her non-Mormon husband, so this technically bigamous marriage also challenged a broader moral code. . . . Over the next two months Joseph Smith performed five more illegal marriages.  

Richard Van Wagoner has likewise accused Joseph of disregarding the law:

Smith's performance of this marriage was one of his earliest efforts to apply heavenly guidelines on earth despite legal technicalities. Not only was Smith not a lawfully recognized minister, but Lydia Bailey, whose non-Mormon husband had deserted her, was never formally divorced.

Although these and other historians have concluded that Joseph was acting illegally in marrying the Knights, no writer to date has tested this assertion. In view of the negative spin that Quinn, Brooke, and Van Wagoner have put on Joseph's actions, it seems appropriate to study this issue and related circumstances in greater detail. The results of this research may surprise some readers. As it turns out, Joseph was indeed within his statutory rights in assuming the authority to solemnize marriages. Moreover, he was correct when he stated that performing marriages was his “religious privilege.” Ohio's marriage statute and the history and evolution of such laws in other states provided clear grounds for these conclusions.

The Knight-Bailey Marriage

As is evident from the main quotes above, much of the controversy surrounding Joseph's decision to solemnize marriages stems from his
performance of the Knight-Bailey wedding. While some of the primary sources do seem to cast doubt on the Prophet's legal authority, they also contain facts which attest to a general concern for legal compliance on the part of all parties involved. Newel in particular exhibited a grasp of legal issues which, though flawed, seems to have set the tone for events leading to his marriage.

According to Lydia's account, when Newel proposed, he attempted to persuade Lydia that her prior marriage to Calvin Bailey was not a legal impediment. Newel explained that "according to the law she was a free woman, having been deserted for three years with nothing provided for her support." Lydia seems to have been unimpressed with these arguments based on human law. She was more concerned with the "law of God," apparently fearing the moral implications of remarriage. Possibly Lydia had in mind the Savior's teaching that "if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Mark 10:12; see also Rom. 7:3).

None of the accounts clarify what exactly Newel meant when he assured Lydia that the law made her "free"; however, a review of Ohio statutes shows what he likely had in mind. According to a definition of the crime of bigamy adopted in Ohio in 1831, individuals previously married could legally remarry, without any necessity of obtaining a divorce, if the prior spouse had been "continually and willfully absent for the space of three years." Newel may also have had in mind a provision of state divorce law which allowed abandonment for three years to serve as grounds for divorce, though this alternative seems less likely. Divorces require time-consuming judicial action, a fact which would have been common knowledge even in the nineteenth century. Moreover, Lydia would not have met the residence requirements mandated in Ohio before she could file.

Judging by the terms of the 1831 bigamy statute, Newel's assessment of Lydia's rights was unquestionably correct. Lydia could indeed have remarried without fear of prosecution and without first obtaining a divorce. The exact date Bailey left her is unknown, but facts contained in her history and Newel's journal suggest that she had been abandoned for at least three years and possibly four. Nevertheless, Newel seems to have been unaware that earlier in 1835 the state legislature adopted a new bigamy statute. This law lengthened to five years the time required to constitute abandonment—a requirement which Lydia would not have met. Of course, the terms of that bigamy statute still required that, in order to be convicted, a married person had to have "a husband or wife living," which Lydia probably did not have, but she would have had no way of proving that in court at that time.
While Newel may have been mistaken in his understanding of the three-year-abandonment provision under the prevailing Ohio bigamy statute, his reference to Lydia being “free” under the law forms an important part of the context for subsequent events. After Lydia rebuffed Newel’s proposal, Newel turned to God in fasting and prayer and then decided to seek the advice of the Prophet Joseph.19 Lydia’s account describes what happened next:

Accordingly, Joseph presented his petition to the Lord, and the reply came that Lydia was free from that man. God did not wish any good woman to live a life of lonliness, and she was free to marry. Also that the union of Newel and Lydia would be pleasing in His sight.20

Joseph’s use of the precise word that Newel employed—free—would seem to tie his response to Newel’s initial legal argument. Joseph’s confident response also laid to rest the moral concerns which Lydia had. The Prophet assured her that she would not lose her salvation in remarrying; in fact, God would be pleased with her marriage to Newel.

Trusting in Joseph’s word, the two made immediate plans to marry. Lydia’s history reports that their confidence in the Prophet was soon vindicated. Shortly after their marriage on November 24, 1835, the couple learned of the death of Calvin Bailey, Lydia’s previous husband, a fact which they took as convincing proof of the inspiration in Joseph’s reply.21 Oddly, Quinn and Brooke characterized this union as “bigamous,” yet omitted Lydia’s highly significant mention of Bailey’s actual death. Because of the death of Lydia’s former husband prior to her remarriage, bigamy would have been a nonissue if it had been raised. Without evidence that his death occurred after the marriage, the state could not have borne its burden of proof in prosecuting Lydia for bigamy. Consequently, any liability which Joseph otherwise might have incurred for solemnizing such a marriage—if in fact it had been bigamous—thereby probably became a moot issue.22

Newel’s journal shows that he was concerned with another legal issue besides Lydia’s right to remarry, namely compliance with the Ohio marriage statute. Newel reports having gone by horse to the county clerk in order to obtain a marriage license (not to be confused with a license to solemnize marriages), returning by 3 p.m. on the day of the marriage.23 A search of county records confirms that Newel did indeed comply with sections 6 and 7 of the Ohio statute and received a license for his marriage to Lydia.24

Joseph Smith’s Compliance with the Ohio Marriage Statute

The accounts of marriages that Joseph later performed are not as detailed as those of the Knight-Bailey wedding. However, some of these later accounts contain important facts. For example, an entry in Joseph’s
journal contains a transcription of a marriage certificate he issued in January 1836 to William Cahoon and his bride, Nancy Miranda Gibbs. This is the same certificate that Quinn refers to (quoted above), seemingly suggesting that there was something improper in the issuance of these certificates. In reality, the wording of this certificate and of the Ohio marriage statute helps prove the legality of Joseph’s performance of this marriage. A brief examination of Ohio marriage law will demonstrate this point.

The Ohio marriage statute in force during Joseph Smith’s Ohio years was entitled “An Act Regulating Marriages.” Passed by the Ohio legislature on January 7, 1824, this act specified rules for marriage age, consanguinity, and licensing and specified who could solemnize marriages. It also prescribed when and how records of marriages were to be filed, and it stipulated penalties for various violations. Because of the importance of this law to this article, its provisions are reproduced in appendix 1. The crucial language in section 2 of the act provides:

> It shall be lawful for any ordained minister of any religious society or congregation, within this State, who has, or may hereafter, obtain a license for that purpose, as hereinafter provided, or for any justice of the peace in his county, or for the several religious societies, agreeably to the rules and regulations of their respective churches, to join together as husband and wife, all persons not prohibited by this act.

Accordingly, the language of this act specifies that “ordained ministers” could receive licenses to solemnize marriages from the local courts of common pleas. But even if Judge Birchard were not inclined to grant these licenses to Latter-day Saint elders, the Mormons still had other avenues open to them under this statute. According to this same section, a justice of the peace could also perform marriages and so could the “several religious societies, agreeably to the rules and regulations of their respective churches.” For those acting under the second half of section 2, there was no requirement for the person or religious society performing the marriage to hold a license from a county court. Ohio state law granted them the privilege.

An examination of entries in Joseph Smith’s journal suggests that he intended the marriages he performed to be valid under this latter category. The Cahoons’s marriage certificate, for example, shows that Joseph explicitly used the precise language of the Ohio statute. The Prophet stated that he married the Cahoons “agreeably to the rules and regulations of the Church of Christ of Latter-Day Saints on matrimony.” Likewise, a marriage Joseph performed in January 1836 included similar language: Joseph’s journal states that he married John Boynton and Susan Lowell “according to the rules and regulations of the church of the Latter-day Saints.” His use of statutory wording on these two occasions would not seem to have been coincidence. Rather, Joseph seems to have intended to show unequivocally that the marriage was valid under section 2 of the state of Ohio’s marriage statute.
While the case for the legality of these later marriage ceremonies may be clear, what of the Knight-Bailey marriage? The accounts contain no evidence that Joseph used the language of the statute on this occasion. Such language, however, was not necessary. No provision of the law required such a reference, and other denominations, such as the Quakers, performed marriages in Ohio under the “rules and regulations” clause without making explicit reference to the statute in their marriage certificates.\(^{33}\)

Thus, under the law, Joseph needed only to act according to the rules of the Church. If Joseph did this, then the Knight-Bailey marriage would have been legally performed, regardless of whether Joseph knew of his statutory authority or made any explicit reference to it.

The Church’s rules for marriage were included in the section entitled “Marriage” near the end of the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants\(^{34}\) (for the relevant portions of these rules, see appendix 2). These rules were drafted earlier in 1835 and adopted in August of that year at an assembly of Saints in Kirtland.\(^{35}\) The Church rules likely were the “rules . . . on matrimony,” that Joseph followed in marrying the Cahoons and may well have served as Joseph’s guide in marrying the Knights.\(^{36}\) This latter possibility is suggested by a comparison of the rules to the accounts of the Knight event. Such a process reveals many similarities, the most significant of which is that the substance of the actual ceremony, as recorded in Joseph’s accounts, has wording similar to that prescribed in the rules. For example, the rules and Joseph’s accounts all speak of the bride and groom agreeing to be each other’s “companion” and Joseph committing them to carry out their obligations as husband and wife. One account states that Joseph “p[r]onounced them husband & Wife in the name of God and also pronounced the blessings that the Lord conferred upon adam & Eve . . . with the addition of long life and prosperity.” In spirit and substance, this pronouncement also is similar to the form prescribed by the rules in the Doctrine and Covenants. These rules state that the officiator should unite the couple “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ” and invoke God’s blessings upon them.\(^{37}\)

Even if Joseph deviated from the rules found in the Doctrine and Covenants, his status as prophet of the Church would arguably have qualified his wording per se as “rules and regulations” under the statute. This follows from passages in the Doctrine and Covenants that established Joseph as a revelator and a “Moses” to his people and passages that instructed the people to be obedient to Joseph’s word (D&C 21:1; 28:2–3). Using this additional reasoning, the Knight wedding would again have been valid because Joseph, the recognized revelator for the Church, performed it under a claim of divine authority.

While it is evident that Joseph acted in accordance with Ohio’s marriage statute when he married the Knights, it is less clear whether he did so
knowingly. Joseph’s account is silent on the issue of legality of this particular action, and Newel and Lydia seem to have assumed that Joseph was knowingly acting contrary to state marriage law, even if he did believe that performing the marriage was his religious right. At the same time, Newel and Lydia’s accounts do not tell the whole story. Neither of them recorded the wording of the ceremony itself. Moreover, as lay persons not trained in the law, the Knights could easily have overlooked a simple comment or two—such as a reference to “rules and regulations of the Church”—that may have had legal significance.

If Joseph did not know his actual legal rights in November 1835, one wonders what the source of confusion over this issue was in the first place. Why did not Newel, Lydia, Joseph, and others know of the Church’s right to perform marriages under the “religious societies” clause? This question is particularly perplexing given that Newel exhibited an acquaintance with aspects of Ohio marriage and bigamy law.

One plausible explanation for this possible lack of understanding is suggested by the wording of printed marriage license forms used by the clerk of the court in Geauga County. These forms contained a blank for the names of the parties intending to marry and stipulated that the ceremony was to be performed either by a justice of the peace or a minister of the gospel holding a license to solemnize marriages issued by any Ohio county court (fig. 2). Once the names were filled in and the clerk signed and dated the form, the marriage license became valid. What these forms did not state is that “religious societies” also had authority to perform marriages. Possibly this omission was the source of some of the confusion in Kirtland.

Lest the mention of this omission raises doubts as to Joseph’s authority under the “religious societies” clause, it must be pointed out that these forms did not hold the force of law. The wording on the forms was not prescribed by Ohio statute. Rather, forms seem to have been printed locally, in the case of Geauga County, creating a time-saving convenience for county clerk D. D. Aiken.

Regardless of whether Joseph knew of his statutory rights at the time of the Knight-Bailey marriage, other facts attest to his knowledge of the legality of the marriages he performed. For example, he submitted the certificates for marriages he performed to the county clerk for recording. Section 8 of the Ohio marriage act required that a certificate be submitted, within three months of each wedding, signed by the minister or justice who had performed the ceremony. Joseph’s journal and county marriage records show that the Prophet complied with this requirement, submitting marriage records on numerous occasions (see fig. 1). The first of these was the certificate for the Knight-Bailey marriage, recorded by Aiken on February 22, 1835, two days prior to the deadline. That Joseph’s submission of
The State of Ohio, Geauga County, ss.

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GIVEN TO

Robert B. Thompson & Mercy R. Fielding

of the County of Geauga aforesaid, to be joined together in the bands of MATRIMONY, and any Minister of the Gospel, resident in the State of Ohio aforesaid, who has a license from any of the Courts of Common pleas within said State, in conformity to the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate Marriages," or any Justice of the Peace in said County, who has been duly commissioned and sworn, is hereby authorized to solemnize the Marriage contract between the parties aforesaid.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of my Office at the town of Chardon, in said County, the 21st day of August, 1831.

Anne Dominis, Clerk.

Fig. 2. Marriage license of Robert B. Thompson and Mercy R. Fielding, the last recorded couple Joseph Smith married in Kirtland. Courtesy Daughters of Utah Pioneers Museum, Salt Lake City, Utah.
this record was not an almost-belated afterthought is suggested by the fact that he transmitted several others at the same time and, furthermore, that these were the first marriage records that bear Joseph’s name.42

Evidence of scrupulous adherence to legal standards can also be seen in the case of at least one person whom Joseph married, William Cahoon. Unlike Newel Knight, who rode miles to obtain a marriage license for his wedding, Cahoon’s autobiography recounts that he found a legal way to avoid this trip.43 Section 6 of the Ohio marriage act specified that the parties did not need a marriage license if the event was properly announced in advance and if the ceremony was held in public. Cahoon’s autobiography states that these requirements were met.44

The propriety of Joseph Smith’s open performance of the Knight-Bailey and several later marriages is further seen in the fact that he was never prosecuted for these actions.45 The certificates for the marriages he performed were recorded by the county clerk without objection (see figure 1). With charges against Rigdon having been dropped only on a legal technicality just weeks prior to the Knight–Bailey marriage, Joseph could have expected to be prosecuted himself, if indeed he had acted in violation of the law. This assumption is buttressed when one considers that some citizens in the region advocated using the law as a way of challenging the influence of the Latter-day Saints. This polemic use of the law is seen in the autobiography of Eber D. Howe, an anti-Mormon newspaper editor who lived only a few miles from Kirtland:

All their vain babblings [those of the Mormons] and pretensions were pretty strongly set forth and noticed in the columns of the TELEGRAPH. In view of all their gaseous pretensions the surrounding country was becoming somewhat sensitive, and many of our citizens thought it advisable to take all the legal means within their reach to counteract the progress of so dangerous an enemy in their midst, and many law suits ensued.46

Howe and the citizens he referred to were not the first to suggest that the law be used against the Church. Joseph Smith had only recently arrived in Ohio when a person identified only as “L. E.” sent a letter to the editor of a leading Ohio religious newspaper, the Observer and Telegraph (Huron, Ohio), suggesting that the law be used against the new faith.47 This letter, published in February 1831,48 approvingly quoted a passage of the Book of Mormon which states that “false Christs” and “false prophets” were “punished according to their crimes” and that their “mouths had been shut.”49

Religious Privilege under Broader Ohio Law

As surprising as the foregoing conclusions may be to some historians, the fact is that Joseph actually did have legal authority to perform marriages in Ohio. He seems to have known this by January 1836, when his
journal records that he performed marriages according to the “rules and regulations of the Church.” However, he may not have known of these rights at the time of the Knight wedding in November 1835. If not, then the question arises: what was his rationale for asserting his authority to perform this marriage? When Joseph insisted during his Sunday sermon that marrying the Knights was his right, or “religious privilege,” was he correct, or was he just using a hyperbole to create a legal fig leaf to cover his actions? As with the case of his statutory rights under Ohio marriage law, a study of this question also provides clear vindication for Joseph. Though the issue of which ministers could solemnize marriages had been a contentious one in a number of states, by 1835 this controversy was a thing of the past. Previous legal restrictions had been lifted, and all Christian ministers enjoyed this right, even in former “establishment states,” where constitutional and statutory provisions had existed favoring particular denominations. (For a discussion of the history of the disestablishment of religion in America, see appendix 3.)

In Ohio, religious freedom had always been granted under state law. Ohio’s first constitution protected “rights of conscience” in matters of religion. This constitution also expressly rejected New England–style establishment of religion by prohibiting religious taxation, compulsory church attendance, and tax-support of clergy.

The official report of Ohio’s first constitutional convention, held in 1802, shows the broad support for measures providing for freedom of religion and related rights. For example, the state’s founding fathers expressed a determination to allow all citizens to hold public office, irrespective of their religious beliefs or lack thereof. A proposal to strike language prohibiting religious tests as “qualifications to any office of trust or profit” was soundly defeated, twenty-eight to six. A similar proposal that required belief in a supreme being was also defeated in an even more lopsided vote of thirty to three.

In this respect, Ohio chose a course different from her New England sister states, which had constitutions and laws that maintained an “establishment” of religion. In reality, Ohio founders probably had little choice but disestablishment. With settlers of different faiths streaming in from the various middle states and from New England, it would have been unthinkable for them to have done otherwise. The diversity of religious faith among Ohio’s citizenry virtually compelled her founders to provide broad constitutional guaranties of religious freedom.

Ohio’s marriage law always reflected these notions of religious freedom. Beginning with the state’s first marriage law in 1803 up until the passage of the 1824 marriage act (in force during the Church’s Ohio years), the provisions of Ohio marriage law allowed not just “ordained ministers” to
perform marriages but also religious groups according to their own rules.55 While the 1803 statute granted this latter right only to Mennonites and Quakers, later changes extended this right to all “religious societies.” This new wording effectively provided authority for all Christian faiths to solemnize their own matrimonial contracts without the necessity of obtaining licenses from the county courts. Accordingly, Joseph was well within his rights, as a citizen of the state of Ohio, to claim his “religious privilege” under these basic rubrics of Ohio jurisprudence. Indeed, no evidence has been found that his performance of marriages in Ohio was ever a subject of public concern during his lifetime.56

Sidney Rigdon and Marriages

In view of the abundant statutory and historical evidence supporting Joseph Smith’s performance of marriages, one wonders why Sidney Rigdon experienced difficulties in this regard. This issue is of more than passing interest. Previous scholarship has assumed that the Kirtland Saints generally received fair treatment at the hands of the county court. While in general this conclusion still seems valid, a number of facts related to the marriage issue invite us to take a deeper look at this assumed impartiality.57 Considerable evidence points towards discrimination against Rigdon.

A starting point in this discussion is found in the fact that LDS elders successfully obtained licenses outside Geauga County. Elder Seymour Brunson already held such a license at the time that Elder Rigdon’s motion for a license was denied. Brunson obtained his license in Jackson County, in southern Ohio (not to be confused with the Missouri county by the same name), a place where, according to Lydia Knight, “prejudice did not run so high.”58 Geauga marriage records show that between May 1834 and April 1836, Brunson actively used this license in Kirtland, joining eight couples in matrimony.59

Brunson was not the only LDS elder to receive a license to solemnize marriages in Ohio. A clue to this fact is found in Joseph’s journal under the date of March 21, 1836: “[P]repared, a number of Elders licences, to send by Elder [Ambrose] Palmer to the court [in] Medina County in order to obtain licenses to marry, as the court in this county will not grant us this privilege.”60 Even though Joseph had already been performing marriages under, as we suppose, the “rules and regulations” clause for several months, some LDS elders probably wanted the additional assurance of holding actual licenses to solemnize marriages. Court records from Medina County confirm that two elders received licenses, though not until the June 1836 term of court. These elders were Salmon Warner Jr. and Phineas Bronson Jr. (no relation to Brunson).61
Judge Birchard’s Interests. In light of counties outside Geauga granting licenses to Mormon elders, Geauga’s refusal of Rigdon’s motion seems problematic. If two other Ohio judges saw fit to grant licenses to LDS elders, why did Judge Birchard of Geauga County refuse? Birchard’s refusal cannot have been for any lack of assertiveness on Rigdon’s part. Court records show that Rigdon took the unusual step of using the services of an attorney in making his motion. Evidently, Elder Rigdon did not want to risk a refusal. Neither is it likely that Birchard relied on old New England judicial notions that prescribed which ministers could perform marriages. Although Birchard lived the first eight years of his life in Massachusetts, he was educated and received his legal training in Ohio. As judge he freely granted licenses to Methodists and Baptists, denominations whose ministers had at times been unable to legally perform marriages under the old system of religious laws in New England.

The most plausible explanation for Judge Birchard’s apparent discrimination can be found in political and religious differences that set the Saints apart from other Geauga County residents. Politically the Kirtland Saints typically voted for Democratic candidates, whereas the other residents of the county generally voted for Whig candidates. Birchard himself was a Democrat and was not a church-going man. One would not expect a judge to be prejudiced against any group; however, this judge may have reflected the political or religious biases of powerful local constituencies whom he would not have wanted to alienate. Presbyterian Whigs virtually dominated Geauga County politics at this time and were prominent in state politics. Birchard’s chances for reappointment by the Ohio General Assembly at the end of his seven-year term, or for appointment to the state supreme court bench, could have hinged to a considerable degree on the opinion local constituencies held of him.

Prosecutor Hitchcock’s Interests. Among the most prominent Whigs of Geauga were the county prosecutor, Reuben Hitchcock, and his father, Peter Hitchcock, an Ohio judge. Reuben Hitchcock was the prosecutor who brought charges against Rigdon in June 1835 for illegally solemnizing marriages. He also later served as a judge and distinguished himself in business endeavors. Peter Hitchcock served for twenty-eight years as a supreme court judge in Ohio (1819–33, 1835–42, and 1845–52), and twice served as the Speaker of the Ohio Senate (1815–16 and 1834–35). He also served two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives (1810–12 and 1816–18) and had once been a candidate for the judicial post to which Judge Birchard was appointed in 1833 (namely Presiding Judge of the third Judicial District, including Geauga and other nearby counties). At the time that Judge Birchard refused Rigdon’s motion for a license, Peter Hitchcock had just returned to the Ohio Supreme Court bench.
Peter and Reuben Hitchcock were both deeply religious men who cared about local church affairs. Like many in Geauga County, the Hitchcocks were Congregationalists who had voluntarily affiliated with the Presbyterian Church under a plan permitting the members and ministers of both churches to worship and function interchangeably. Peter Hitchcock's devotion to his faith can be shown through the records of his church in Burton, which consistently listed him as the leading financial contributor. Reuben served as the delegate from Painesville to the regional presbytery and, along with several other local attorneys, was one of the pillars of faith in his congregation.

The profiles of other Presbyterian Whigs were also impressive. Seabury Ford was elected as a representative from Geauga County to the Ohio General Assembly in 1835 and later as governor of Ohio. Ford was a cousin and close friend of Reuben Hitchcock and worshipped in the same congregation as Peter Hitchcock. He too was a generous donor to the church. Another prominent Presbyterian was William L. Perkins who also served as county prosecutor in Geauga during portions of the 1830s. Perkins and Reuben Hitchcock worshipped in the same Painesville congregation, and Perkins, too, served as a delegate to the regional presbytery.

**Antipathy toward Mormonism.** It is not known whether Judge Birchard denied Sidney Rigdon's application for a license in an attempt to court the favor of influential Presbyterian Whigs. Other than perhaps Perkins, who edited a local newspaper, it is not specifically known whether any of these individuals held strong views against Mormonism. However, one might infer that these Presbyterians in Geauga County held views similar to other Presbyterians in the region. The tone of articles printed in the local Presbyterian press may be an indicator. Typical of many papers, the *Hudson Observer and Telegraph*, located in Summit County about 30 miles south of Kirtland, ran articles expressing skepticism or even ridiculing the spiritual claims at the root of the LDS Church. For example, in 1834, this paper commented that some of the "good people" of the area had converted to Mormonism. The paper then suggested that a few good nights of sleep should be enough to straighten their thinking out. The editor also eagerly anticipated the publication of Eber Howe's *Mormonism Unvailed* and ran a series of unfavorable articles on the Church.

Similarly, at least some of the local Presbyterian clergy also seem to have taken a dim view of Mormonism. One minister in Painesville commented in a letter to his sponsoring organization that the Book of Mormon was a "mixture of fallacy & profaneness." He passed on second-hand reports of "alleged licentiousness" among Mormons and of their "annulling the marriage covenant." These attitudes likely formed the basis for later comments that Joseph Smith or his close associates made.
The *History of the Church* records that while living in Illinois, Joseph stated that he had been in a “Presbyterian smut machine” in Ohio.\(^4\)

As to the Hitchcocks, it seems possible that Reuben Hitchcock may have shared this antipathy for Latter-day Saints. He took early note of the presence of Mormons in Ohio, mentioning their activities in an 1831 letter to a friend in Connecticut. In this letter, Hitchcock commented on the “flourishing condition of Mormonism or Rigdonism.”\(^5\) Given the extremely negative image that both Sydney and the Church had in the Presbyterian press generally,\(^6\) Reuben’s conflation of Mormonism with Rigdonism can hardly be interpreted to carry a favorable connotation toward the Saints.

Reuben Hitchcock’s early feelings against Mormons may also be inferred from his later involvement in litigation brought against Joseph Smith. Hitchcock’s client was among the individuals that Eber Howe referred to when he stated that local citizens instituted many lawsuits against the Mormons, viewing the Church as a “dangerous enemy in their midst.”\(^7\) Reuben willingly served as plaintiff’s counsel in the most important of these suits—the 1837 case against Joseph and other Church leaders for allegedly breaking state banking laws. Although the plaintiff in this case was nominally one Samuel D. Rounds, evidence shows that the real party behind the suit may have been Grandison Newel, a notorious anti-Mormon.\(^8\)

Of course, additional explanations may also be identified for Reuben Hitchcock’s involvement in this case. He may have been attracted by the fees involved in such a high-profile case. Or he may have participated in the suit as a way to shut down the Kirtland Safety Society. Hitchcock and his father were involved in banking, and any financial instability in the county could have created a climate in which their own banking interests might have suffered.\(^9\)

**Rigdon’s Legal Rights.** Regardless of Judge Bichard’s motives for rejecting Sidney Rigdon’s motion for a marriage license, the judge’s decision is not justifiable from a legal point of view. The practice in Ohio courts was to freely grant requests for marriages licenses, provided the requester presented appropriate credentials. Examples can even be found where licenses were granted to representatives of groups whose members traditionally had solemnized marriages under their own rules without licenses. Such a case occurred in Wayne County, where a Mennonite minister was granted a license to perform marriages.\(^10\) This denomination had historically been categorized with Quakers and given special authority to solemnize marriages “agreeable” to its own rules.\(^11\)

In contrast to the improper refusal of Rigdon’s motion for a license, available evidence suggests at least two scenarios that might have served as a basis in law for the charges that were brought against Sidney Rigdon in June 1835. Unfortunately, no court records show which, if either, of these
legal theories the prosecutor rested his charges on. In the first of these scenarios, Rigdon may have assumed the 1826 license he acquired in Geauga County, as a Campbellite minister, was still valid even after he converted to Mormonism in 1830, and that assumption would be understandable. The entry in the court’s minutes does not note any limitation on Sidney Rigdon’s license, and the written license itself probably contained no such express limitations.\textsuperscript{92} Still, such reliance would not have been based on a sound assumption from a legal point of view. The Ohio marriage act provided that licenses were valid only so long as the holder remained a minister with the same religious society.\textsuperscript{93} As it was common knowledge that Rigdon had become a leader among the Latter-day Saints, the prosecutor, Reuben Hitchcock, may have thought he had an iron-clad case for conviction. Nevertheless, if this scenario is correct, Hitchcock evidently failed to consider the difficulty of actually proving that Rigdon had lost his status in his former church.

A second scenario is suggested in the records of marriages performed by Sidney Rigdon. County records show that Rigdon continued to perform marriages in Ohio after he converted to Mormonism in 1830. While the records for marriages he performed prior to his conversion almost invariably contain a reference to his 1826 license, records for marriages he performed after his conversion do not mention his previous license.\textsuperscript{94} This distinction would be consistent with Rigdon performing his marriages under the “rules and regulations” clause that Joseph evidently used. If so, Hitchcock may have indicted Rigdon on an assertion that the Church had no rules on marriage.

If indeed this latter scenario was prosecutor Reuben Hitchcock’s position, his ability to successfully make his case would have hinged on legal semantics. What is a church “rule” under the law? Must such rules be adopted by a vote of the church and published in order to be valid? Might oral instructions approved by church authorities be sufficient to constitute a rule? No published precedents on this issue appear to have existed, so Hitchcock would have been free to argue for whichever view suited his own thinking, provided the judge agreed with his interpretation of the law. Under the more restrictive of these two views, Hitchcock probably could have obtained a conviction. The LDS rules on marriage in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants were not adopted and published until after the marriage for which Rigdon was indicted. On the other hand, under a more lenient interpretation, Rigdon might possibly have been exonerated, particularly if he could have shown that in performing earlier ceremonies he was acting under Joseph’s direction or with the concurrence of the membership.\textsuperscript{95}

Regardless of which legal theory Reuben Hitchcock used to argue his 1835 case, one must still question the wisdom of prosecuting on such
charges. This type of prosecution appears to have been rare in the 1830s, perhaps even unheard of. Not only were other prosecutions for illegally solemnizing marriages not found in the records surveyed for this article, but national legal indexes for published cases of this era (generally containing state supreme court decisions) do not contain any listings for similar cases from other states. The only cases of illegally solemnized marriages listed up until 1835 are those charged under the older religious “establishment” marriage statutes of New England, the last of which was liberalized in 1834. Thus, the Sidney Rigdon case may have been unique. It appears to have been a deviation from the climate of toleration that prevailed in its day.

Persistence of Older New England Attitudes. The similarity of Sidney Rigdon’s case to older New England cases raises the interesting question of whether any parallels can be drawn between the two. Kirtland was located in a region of Ohio known historically as the “Western Reserve of Connecticut.” This region was settled largely by New Englanders who brought with them much of their native culture. Many of the most influential citizens of the Reserve still had strong ties to New England. Such citizens included the Hitchcock family. Reuben Hitchcock, for example, was educated in Connecticut at Yale only a few years after that state disestablished its churches. He was also an orthodore Congregationalist and had seriously considered studying theology and entering the ministry.

Not surprisingly, Reuben Hitchcock’s attitudes seem to have been consistent in some ways with old-style establishment views. A letter he wrote to a friend in Massachusetts in 1827 shows that he favored older judicial interpretations, allowing orthodox Congregationalists to retain control of church property and permitting them to appoint like-minded ministers, even when the majority of parishioners were Unitarians (liberal Congregationalists). This letter also shows that Hitchcock believed active measures should be taken to counteract the spread of what he deemed to be religious error. This is evident from a statement expressing favor for the use of “all justifiable measures” to prevent the extension of Unitarian theology. Although Hitchcock thought some orthodox Congregationalists exhibited an “unchristian spirit” towards the Unitarians, he still referred to these latter believers as “infatuated or self-deceived beings.”

In this light, it is hard not to wonder whether Reuben Hitchcock’s prosecution of Sidney Rigdon and Hitchcock’s later involvement in suits against Latter-day Saints were not rooted, at least in part, in his New England background. For several generations, the law had been employed in that region as the tool of choice in limiting the influence and spread of disfavored denominations. While New Englanders were among the most ardent supporters of democracy and of constitutional principles, their states were among the last to treat all Christian denominations equally before the law.
It would not be surprising if indeed Reuben Hitchcock's actions partially traced to his Puritan roots. Other members of the New England clergy seem to have held similar tendencies well into the 1830s and beyond. For example, Congregational missionaries in Hawaii acquired great influence with Hawaiian authorities and used this power to further a moral and political agenda with which Catholics and some foreigners disagreed at times. The New England missionaries supported, or at least concurred in, the expulsion of Catholic priests from Hawaii in 1831. The next year the missionaries' official Boston periodical ran a piece defending the expulsion. It stated that "removal of the Jesuits [Catholics] in the manner in which it was performed, was the violation of none of their natural or acquired rights, and therefore cannot properly be regarded as a persecution."

Latter-day Saint missionaries in Hawaii during the 1850s also had grounds to complain of the influence of Congregational missionaries. These ministers occasionally succeeded in using their considerable influence with the government to harass LDS missionaries and members. Numerous examples of such harassment can be found in the journals of these Mormon elders and in other sources. One such instance occurred when the Hawaiian government barred LDS elders from performing marriages, stating as rationale the fact that Mormons in Utah were practicing plural marriage. This incident took place at a time when former New England missionary Richard Armstrong was serving in a key Hawaiian government post and may be suspected of having had a hand in formulating the policy. The LDS missionaries repeatedly protested that they would marry couples only in accordance with Hawaiian law (in the 1850s, plural marriage was not against federal law in the United States), which then prohibited polygamy, but their protestations were of no avail.

Comparative Tolerance in Medina County

Given my tentative suggestion of a connection between the New England background of prominent Geauga County citizens, such as Reuben Hitchcock, and the problems that Sidney Rigdon encountered over the performance of marriages, some readers may be surprised to learn that LDS elders were able to obtain licenses to solemnize marriages in Medina County. Like Geauga, Medina was a part of the Western Reserve. Also settled largely by New Englanders, Medina holds many cultural similarities to Geauga. Nevertheless, a study of the social and religious climate of Medina County in the 1830s suggests that the two counties actually were different in significant ways. A few illustrations will serve to underscore this point.

One of the most striking differences between the two counties is that prosecutions for liquor and gaming violations in Medina County were virtually unheard of in the mid-1830s. For example, a review of Medina court
records for June 1835 through October 1837 shows that not a single indictment was brought for retailing liquor without a license or for related offenses. In contrast, such prosecutions were commonplace in Geauga County, where Reuben Hitchcock zealously enforced state liquor and gaming laws.

The lack of such prosecutions in Medina County may indicate that the Congregationalist-Presbyterianers had less influence there than in Geauga County. At this time, these denominations were fervent advocates of temperance, probably more so than any other churches on the Western Reserve. This is suggested by a perusal of the Huron, Ohio, Observer and Telegraph. This newspaper frequently carried testimonials of the ill effects of drinking and notices of temperance meetings. The minutes of presbytery meetings also attest to the emphasis being placed upon abstinence from alcohol. An additional confirmation of this fact is found in a letter from a minister serving in Medina. He complained that in his county the cause of temperance was “violently opposed, not only by the intemperate & the grossly immoral,” but also by Episcopalians and Methodists.

A related difference between the two counties may be seen by the presence of large numbers of so-called “infidels” in Medina. Reports from Congregationalist-Presbyterian missionaries in Medina contain several references to unbelievers with immoral habits. The tone of these comments is almost one of alarm and stands out markedly when compared to the reports coming out of other counties. One minister commented on the number of apostates from eastern churches in his vicinity, observing that the influence of even one of these “infidels” could do more damage to the cause “than a dozen scoffers who have never given any pretension to religion.” This minister also asserted that these unbelievers were given to “immoral habits” and were exerting a “deadly influence.” This same minister later wrote that “many who had left eastern churches on purpose to throw off all religious restraint, had made this a rallying point.” He further explained that he could name at least twenty locals who had once held letters of good standing from eastern churches but who were now among the ranks of the apostates. Another clergyman complained of the great wealth and influence in the hands of “Universalists & infidels”; he hoped to convert some so that their riches would be “on the side of truth & right.” Still another minister lamented that he had never seen “more open, decided, shameless infidelity” than in the Medina township where he was serving.

Mention of “infidels” is also found in a county history on Medina published in 1881. This history reports that during the early 1830s a group of unbelievers were quite prominent in Medina. These individuals reportedly “heralded their freedom from the thralldom of religious opinion” and even celebrated Thomas Paine’s birthday with a parade, complete with a cannon. A letter written to Peter Hitchcock during this era may refer to one
such citizen. In this letter, the writer complained that a candidate for a judgeship who had been supported by a petition—a certain Colonel Welton—was "decidedly opposed to religion and benevolent institutions" and was also a "Royal Arch Mason, adhering decidedly to that institution."112

What the Congregationalist-Presbyterians may have seen as infidelity, Latter-day Saints and others saw as tolerance. This point is seen in an article printed in the *Latter Day Saints Messenger and Advocate*, which reprinted a report that appeared in a Medina newspaper. This article reported that Mormon missionaries received a polite reception in Medina County and that county residents were cool to Eber D. Howe's book *Mormonism Unvailed.*113 Other reports indicate that these missionaries, over time, enjoyed modest success in at least some parts of the county.114

The tolerance shown Mormon elders seems consistent with other descriptions of early religious activity in Medina County. County histories from the nineteenth century describe a high degree of interdenominational cooperation among the early settlers.115 Geauga histories say less about early religious activity, so it is hard to conclude that this early tolerance was truly a distinguishing factor. Nevertheless, the descriptions given in Medina County accounts are striking enough that one wonders if they were the norm for all counties in the region. Possibly Medina County's religious tolerance was occasioned by isolation and a frontier spirit of cooperation; reportedly county settlements were carved out of a dense forest and did not even have their own post office for quite some time, the nearest being Cleveland, some thirty miles away.116

While the foregoing provides only a thumbnail sketch of conditions in Medina County during the 1830s, it strongly suggests that despite sharing a common New England cultural heritage, Medina and Geauga counties were very different places. In Geauga County, the dominance of the Presbyterians in local politics put the county under what their political opponents termed a "Church Government" that united church and state.117 Moral laws were strictly enforced, and while Latter-day Saints did not find themselves jailed on flimsy charges (as they later would in Missouri), they did find that the county judicial system seemed to be slanted against them on occasion. Thus, not surprisingly, LDS elders were able to obtain licenses to solemnize marriages in Medina but not in Geauga County.

**Conclusion**

Focus on the attitudes of Reuben Hitchcock and his coreligionists should not lead to undue criticism. Though Joseph Smith and other Saints experienced frustrations at times that may have been attributable to older New England attitudes, they also may have reaped a collateral benefit. Whatever the prejudices these transplanted New Englanders may have had,
many of these citizens were moral, orderly, level-headed, and committed to
democratic ideals. Unlike some agitators that the Saints encountered in
Missouri and Illinois, county officials in Ohio seem, on the whole, to have
confined their controversies with Joseph Smith and other Saints to the
courtrooms. While one does read of occasional mob activity against Saints
in Ohio, nowhere in LDS history does one read of an Ohio “extermination
order” or of a citizens’ wolf hunt directed at the Saints.

As frustrating as Joseph Smith may have found the court’s treatment of
Sidney Rigdon over the marriage license issue, the Prophet ultimately
suffered little inconvenience as a result. Consistent with his prediction,
Joseph was never arrested or prosecuted for performing the Knight-Bailey
marriage or any of the subsequent marriages he solemnized in Ohio. Ironi-
cally, the most serious outcome of his decision has been the unnecessary
damage to his reputation done by historians who have assumed that he
acted in violation of the law. In making this assumption, these writers not
only have made a mistake, but they have also missed some of the deeper
meaning in the event. Joseph’s performance of the Knight-Bailey marriage
was not the illegal act of an unethical man. Rather, this act was a bold
assertion of the rights that he believed his followers were entitled to as
American citizens.

Joseph Smith’s action invokes the memory of earlier “dissenting” min-
isters who also struggled against prejudices and whose efforts helped bring
about greater religious freedom in the United States. Just as he later would
personally seek redress for the Saints’ wrongs in Missouri, even pleading
their cause in Washington, Joseph insisted in Ohio that Latter-day Saints be
accorded their privileges and protections under state marriage law. Consis-
tent with his strong protection of individual religious liberties, Joseph
acted squarely in harmony with the prevailing legal attitudes and regula-
tions of the day in solemnizing marriages.
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Appendix 1

The 1824 Ohio Statute on Marriage

Summary

The Ohio statutory scheme provided the following:

§1 – minimum age and consent requirements for marriage;
§2 – three classifications in which people could perform legal marriages, namely as a licensed minister, as a justice of the peace, or under the rules of a religious society;
§3 – qualifications of ministers under the first classification;
§4 and §5 – and requirements for entering names of licensed ministers in county records in order to have good evidence of their authorization.
§6 – Prior to the marriage, notice needed to be given or a marriage license needed to be obtained by the couple,
§7 – and procedures were specified for obtaining such a license.
§8 and §9 – After the marriage, a certificate was to be filed with the county clerk, and penalties for failure to file or otherwise to comply with this law were stated.
§10 – Also, before proceeding, the minister or justice of the peace had the duty of seeing that the notices and consents required under sections 1 and 6 were in good order.

Full Text

The full text of the Ohio statute follows:

AN ACT regulating Marriages.

Sec. 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That male persons of the age of eighteen years, female persons of the age of fourteen years, not nearer of kin than first cousins, and not having a husband or wife living, may be joined in marriage: Provided, always, That male persons under the age of twenty-one years, female persons under the age of eighteen years, shall first obtain the consent of their fathers, respectively; or in the case of the death or incapacity of their fathers, then of their mothers or guardians.

Sec. 2. That it shall be lawful for any ordained minister of any religious society or congregation, within this State, who has, or may hereafter, obtain a license for that purpose, as hereinafter provided, or for any justice of the peace in his county, or for the several religious societies, agreeably to the rules and regulations of their respective churches, to join together as husband and wife, all persons not prohibited by this act.
Sec. 3. That any minister of the gospel, upon producing to the court of common pleas of any county within this State, in which he officiates, credentials of his being a regular ordained minister of any religious society or congregation, shall be entitled to receive, from said court, a license, authorizing him to solemnize marriages within this State, so long as he shall continue a regular minister in such society or congregation.

Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of every minister, who is now, or hereafter shall be, licensed to solemnize marriages, as aforesaid, to produce to the clerk of the court of common pleas in every county in which he shall solemnize any marriage, his license so obtained; and the said clerk shall thereupon enter the name of such minister upon record, as a minister of the gospel duly authorized to solemnize marriages within this State, and shall note the county from which said license issued; for which service no charge shall be made by such clerk.

Sec. 5. That when the name of any such minister is so entered upon the record, by the clerk aforesaid, such record, or the certificate thereof, by the said clerk, under the seal of his office, shall be good evidence that the said minister was duly authorized to solemnize marriages.

Sec. 6. That previous to persons being joined in marriage, notice thereof shall be published, (in the presence of the congregation,) on two different days of public worship, the first publication to be at least ten days previous to such marriage, within the county where the female resides; or a license shall be obtained for that purpose, from the clerk of the court of common pleas in the county where such female may reside.

Sec. 7. That the clerk of the court of common pleas, as aforesaid, may inquire of the party, applying for marriage license, as aforesaid, upon oath or affirmation, relative to the legality of such contemplated marriage; and if the clerk shall be satisfied that there is no legal impediment thereto, then he shall grant such marriage license: and if any of the persons intending to marry, shall be under age, and shall not have had a former wife or husband, the consent of the parents or guardians shall be personally given before the clerk, or certified under the hand of such parent or guardian, attested by two witnesses, one of which shall appear before said clerk, and make oath or affirmation that he saw the parent or guardian, whose name is annexed to such certificate, subscribe, or heard him or her acknowledge the same; and the clerk is hereby authorized to administer such oath or affirmation, and thereupon issue and sign such license, and affix thereto the seal of the county: the clerk shall be entitled to receive as his fee for administering the oath and granting license, with the seal affixed thereto, recording the certificate of marriage, and filing the necessary papers, the sum of seventy-five cents: and if any clerk shall in any other manner issue or sign any marriage license, he shall forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding one thousand dollars, to and for the use of the party aggrieved.

Sec. 8. That a certificate of every marriage hereafter solemnized, signed by the justice or minister solemnizing the same, shall be transmitted to the clerk of the county wherein the marriage was solemnized, within three months thereafter, and recorded by such clerk: every justice or minister, (as the case may be,) failing to transmit such certificate to the clerk of the county, in due time, shall forfeit and pay fifty dollars; and if the clerk shall neglect to make such record, he shall forfeit and pay fifty dollars, to and for the use of the county.
Sec. 9. That if any justice or minister, by this act authorized to join persons in marriage, shall solemnize the same contrary to the true intent and meaning of this act, the person so offending shall, upon conviction thereof, forfeit and pay any sum not exceeding one thousand dollars, to and for the use of the county, wherein such offence was committed: and if any person not legally authorized, shall attempt to solemnize the marriage contract, such person shall, upon conviction thereof, forfeit and pay five hundred dollars, to and for the use of the county wherein such offence was committed.

Sec. 10. That it shall be the duty of every minister or justice of the peace, before he shall solemnize any marriage between the parties, either of whom is required by the first section of this act, to obtain the consent of his or her parent or guardian, (except in cases where license shall have been obtained form the clerk of the court of common pleas,) to be satisfied that the intention of marriage between such parties has been duly published, and also that the consent of such parents or guardian has been obtained, either by acknowledgment in presence of such minister or justice of the peace, or by a certificate under the signature of such parent or guardian, and attested by one or more credible witnesses, who shall be present for the purpose of satisfying such minister or justice of the peace, that such certificate was actually signed by the parent or guardian for the purpose aforesaid.

Sec. 11. That any fine or forfeiture arising to the county in consequence of the breach of this act, shall be recovered by an action of debt, or by indictment, with costs of suit, in any court of record having cognizance of the same.

Sec. 12. That the law regulating marriages, passed February sixteenth, one thousand eight hundred and ten; and the act amending the said act, passed January eleventh, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-two; be, and the same are hereby repealed.

This act shall take effect and be in force from and after the first day of June next.

JOSEPH RICHARDSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ALLEN TRIMBLE,
Speaker of the Senate.

January 6th, 1824.
Appendix 2
Marriage, 1835 Doctrine & Covenants

At a General Assembly of the Church, held in Kirtland, Ohio, on August 17, 1835, pursuant to previous notice, the work of an appointed committee was approved. Its members had been assigned to “arrange the items of doctrine of Jesus Christ, for the government of his church.” The assembly approved the collected materials to be published as the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, which included the following provisions relevant to the performance of marriages, printed in section 101, page 251:

1. According to the custom of all civilized nations, marriage is regulated by laws and ceremonies: therefore we believe, that all marriages in this church of Christ of Latter Day Saints, should be solemnized in a public meeting, or feast, prepared for that purpose: and that the solemnization should be performed by a presiding high priest, high priest, bishop, elder, or priest, not even prohibiting those persons who are desirous to get married, of being married by other authority. . . .

2. Marriage should be celebrated with prayer and thanksgiving; and at the solemnization, the persons to be married, standing together, the man on the right, and the woman on the left, shall be addressed, by the person officiating, as he shall be directed by the holy Spirit; and if there be no legal objections, he shall say, calling each by their names: “You both mutually agree to be each other’s companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other, and from all others, during your lives.” And when they have answered “Yes,” he shall pronounce them “husband and wife” in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by virtue of the laws of the country and authority vested in him: “may God add his blessings and keep you to fulfill your covenants from henceforth and forever. Amen.”

3. The clerk of every church should keep a record of all marriages, solemnized in his branch.
Appendix 3
Disestablishment and the Right to Perform Marriages

Virginia

A discussion of established state churches in America begins well with Virginia, where perhaps the most famous struggle for religious freedom in any American state took place. Up until the War of Independence, the Anglican Church was the officially established religion in this state. Colonial Virginia was a place where restrictions on the activities of other faiths were "more strictly enforced" than elsewhere. After independence this situation engendered a spirited and prolonged public debate on the issue of religious liberty, a dispute that involved many well-known patriots, including Patrick Henry, James Madison, George Mason, and Thomas Jefferson. In the end, the Anglican Church was disestablished, and complete religious freedom was established by law in Virginia. An important part of this process was the passage in 1786 of the Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, a bill that had been introduced by Thomas Jefferson in 1779. Jefferson reportedly suggested that the final version of this bill was meant to protect not just every denomination of Christian but also "the Jew and Gentile, the Christian and Mahometan, the Hindoo, and infidel." For several years prior to the Revolution, dissenting religious groups, including the Baptists and Presbyterians, had protested against the favored status that the Anglican Church enjoyed in Virginia. These groups opposed restrictions limiting where their ministers could preach, demanded the right to preach to troops, and also sought the right to solemnize marriages—a right that had long been enjoyed only by Anglican ministers. Dissenting ministers eventually won this latter right, though not until 1780, when a law was passed allowing ministers "of any society or congregation of christians," including Quakers and Mennonites, to perform marriages. Language in the statute explicitly states that the law was intended to remove doubt "concerning the validity of marriages celebrated by ministers, other than the church of England."

Even after the adoption of the 1780 Virginia law, some groups still felt that legal refinements were needed to show more clearly that all denominations were on an equal footing with respect to the right to perform marriages. Another statute was adopted in 1784, further expanding this right. Among the changes in the new statute was wording allowing Christian societies—such as Quakers and Mennonites, who had sufficient regulations or traditions on the rules of marriages—to perform their own marriages "agreeable to the regulations that have heretofore been practiced in
the respective societies." This latter wording is similar to that found in Ohio's 1824 statute, under which Joseph Smith was able to validly perform marriages.

North Carolina

North Carolina was another state where the Anglican Church was officially established; however, the process of disestablishment in this state was not as protracted as in Virginia. The new state constitution of 1776 proclaimed that "there shall be no establishment of any one religious church or denomination in this State, in preference to any other." Whereas prior to 1776, only Anglican ministers had been able to perform marriages in North Carolina, under this new constitution and a new state statute, non-Anglicans also received this right. The statute provided that "all regular Ministers of the Gospel of every Denomination having the Care of Souls" could perform marriages, "according to the Rites and Ceremonies of their respective Churches." Developments in North Carolina's religious freedom continued in the nineteenth century, with eligibility to hold political office being extended to all Christians in 1835 and obstacles to office-holding by Jews being removed in 1868.

Establishment in New England

New England states also historically had an established church; however, rather than follow the lead of sister states like Virginia, these states retained aspects of their "establishments" after independence. Massachusetts, for example, adopted a new constitution in 1780, requiring that "suitable provision" be made, even at public expense, "for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily."

While the language of this mandate may appear neutral on its face, at least with regard to the various Protestant denominations of the day, this provision of the Massachusetts constitution actually served to establish the dominant denomination, the Congregationalists, and to confer upon them "peculiar legal facilities and privileges." For example, in the years following independence in Massachusetts, only "orthodox ministers" who were "learned" could become parish priests. These requirements may have had the effect of excluding dissenting denominations such as Baptists, whose clergy generally did not have formal theological training. Ministers not having official status as a parish priest were at times denied other important legal benefits, including tax exemptions and the right to perform marriages.

The legal benefits available to established churches in New England included the right to tax their parishioners and to compel church attendance.
Congregational ministers of this period of differing theological orientations are said to have "regarded a tax-supported church as essential to the preservation of morality and the regulation of society."16 The favored status of the Congregational Church helped perpetuate the social and political dominance of their ministers for years following independence.17 In contrast to the established churches, dissenting groups such as Baptists and Methodists were at times subject to annoyance that "amounted to persecution."18

Vermont

The first New England state to disestablish its churches was Vermont. In 1807 a law was passed that abolished "the system of compulsory religious taxation which generally favored the predominant denomination."19 This system of taxation is said to have empowered parishes, most of which were Congregational, "to levy a general tax for building meeting-houses and supporting their ministers."20 In 1814, Jesse Smith (the eldest brother of Joseph Smith Sr.) exercised his right to opt out of such a tax by lodging the required certificate of protest in the Tunbridge town records.21

Connecticut

Connecticut was the next state to disestablish its Congregational churches. Long dominant in this state, these churches, and particularly their ministers, wielded tremendous influence. The Congregational ministry, or "Standing Order," was a leading force in state government for decades following independence. These ministers reportedly were "men of character, ability, and public spirit, but opposed to yielding the inherited prerogatives of an Established Church."22

The narrow election of Oliver Wolcott in 1817 as governor heralded the end of establishment in Connecticut. Wolcott, a Congregationalist, and his Episcopalian running mate ran on a platform of religious toleration.23 Their victory was followed by other legal and constitutional changes in Connecticut, resulting in the end of establishment in Connecticut and in the promotion of greater religious freedom.24 Among the changes that followed was an emphatically liberalized marriage law. Previously, non-Congregational ministers did not have the right to perform marriages; the new law removed all discrimination in this regard.25 This statute stipulated that "ordained ministers" could perform marriages and emphatically added the following: "Provided nevertheless, That all marriages which shall be performed and solemnized, according to the forms and usages of any religious denomination, in this state, shall be good and valid." This statute also contained a provision validating prior marriages whose legality might previously have been called into question because they had been performed by ministers not authorized under state law.26
A review of Connecticut cases shows that prior to disestablishment under Governor Wolcott, non-Congregational ministers were prosecuted on occasion for performing marriages. An example is found in George Roberts v. The State Treasurer, a case reported from the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors in 1797. This case was an appeal to reverse a judgment against Roberts for solemnizing a marriage in 1793. The court upheld Roberts’s conviction for violating the state’s marriage laws, even though Roberts was a “duly appointed and ordained” Methodist deacon, authorized by the rules of his denomination to “perform divine service, administer the sacraments, and to celebrate marriages,” and had been appointed to minister to specific congregations. In sustaining the decision of the lower court, this court stated that it was clear that Rogers was not “an ordained minister, settled in the work of the ministry ... as the statute contemplates.”

Massachusetts

During the years when Connecticut was liberalizing its legal and constitutional structures with respect to religion, similar changes were being contemplated in Massachusetts. A constitutional convention held in 1820 offered voters the chance to extend “support benefits to non-Protestant religious teachers” and to terminate “compulsory attendance and public worship.” Viewed as an unsatisfactory proposal by parties on both sides of the establishment debate in Massachusetts, the voters soundly defeated this proposal, reportedly by a vote of 20,000 to 11,000, a significant margin. Soon after this vote, the state’s highest court handed down a decision making it harder for Orthodox Congregationalists to hold on to church property. This legal development set the stage for a decisive turn in public opinion, especially among the Orthodox Congregationalists. Thirteen years later, a popular vote swept away the legal provisions providing for the tax support of churches. By an overwhelming majority, voters approved a measure in November 1833 making religious groups “both self-governing and self-supporting.”

Typical of New England states with established churches, Massachusetts state law set limitations on which ministers could perform marriages. Following independence, the state allowed ministers to perform marriages only if they were ordained and “settled” over a particular congregation, with later modifications in the law allowing “stated ordained” ministers to do so. As with many other religious laws in New England, these standards were neutral on their face but in practical reality sometimes excluded non-Congregational ministers. Thus, not surprisingly, in Massachusetts, as elsewhere in New England, the issue of the performance of marriages by dissenting ministers was controversial and on occasion resulted in the arrest and prosecution of offending ministers. For example, Universalist
minister John Murray formed the Independent Church of Christ in 1779, and a body of members signed a statement agreeing to "receive him as [their] Minister." Evidently this group received Murray without ordaining him. Subsequently, the county sheriff arrested Murray for solemnizing marriages. After years of litigation, the courts finally resolved this issue against Murray, noting that "the forms of his ordination were not sufficiently notorious." Later, Murray "underwent a more 'notorious' ordination ceremony and thenceforth had no more troubles with the sheriff." Another example of such prosecution took place in 1800 when a Catholic priest was prosecuted for illegally performing marriages; however, this case was resolved in favor of the priest on the grounds that he was an ordained minister. This case and others set up a curious dichotomy in Massachusetts law: some groups were not permitted to collect religious taxes from adherents, yet they were permitted to perform marriages.

As in other states, the issue of who could validly solemnize marriage in Massachusetts was at times litigated in contexts other than as the result of prosecutions for violating marriage legislation. The Supreme Judicial Court decided a case in 1822 involving a woman who had been prosecuted for adultery because she was married by a minister thought not to have proper authority to perform marriages. The Court resolved the matter in the woman’s favor, holding that the minister’s particular situation was similar to a prior case involving a Methodist minister whose marriages were held valid. Interestingly, the published case cited authority in the footnotes, emphasizing that under different circumstances ministers might still be found to violate marriage legislation. This notation seemed to reaffirm that restrictions still existed as to which ministers could perform marriages and which could not.

New marriage legislation in Massachusetts promptly followed the 1833 vote. In fact, the need for such a change was on the agenda early in the next session of the legislature in Massachusetts, even before a comprehensive overhaul of religious laws was ordered. The new statute adopted by the legislature provided that "every minister of the gospel within the Commonwealth, who has been ordained according to the usage of his denomination," was authorized to solemnize marriages.

**New Hampshire**

As did her sister states in New England, New Hampshire also underwent a process of liberalization during the early nineteenth century. For example, the Toleration Act in 1819 gave all Protestant groups the same rights as Congregationalists to incorporate. In 1827 an act was passed which provided that "no person shall be compelled to join, or support, or be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious
society, without his express consent first had or obtained.” Despite these early changes, New Hampshire’s constitution retained elements that were typical of establishment states. Until 1852, only Protestants were eligible to serve in the state legislature. Even well into the twentieth century, the New Hampshire constitution contained provisions which originated in this earlier era of establishment, though these were not enforced.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite New Hampshire’s retention of some aspects of its establishment, the development of the state’s laws and judicial interpretations regarding the right to perform marriages was not out of harmony with the changing spirit of the times. A statute adopted in 1791 granted the right to solemnize marriages to “every ordained minister of the gospel in the county where he is settled, or hath his permanent residence.” The mention of “permanent residence” appears to have been intended to include denominations whose ministers were not necessarily “settled” over a congregation. This interpretation was taken by the state’s highest court in 1820 in the case of \textit{Town of Londonderry v. Town of Chester}.\textsuperscript{42} In this case, the court refused to read into the 1791 law a requirement that a minister be “settled.” Probably having in mind such groups as Methodists whose ministers often itinerated, the court stated that “the discipline of some sects had become inconsistent with permanent settlements [of ministers].” The court noted that “population had become so sparse, that settled ministers could not be maintained in every new town.”\textsuperscript{43}

New Hampshire continued this liberalization of its marriage law in 1832, when the state adopted a new statute. In contrast to the 1791 law, this new statute gave ministers statewide authority. It also eliminated the term “settled” and clearly extended the right to perform marriages to ministers of all denominations.\textsuperscript{44}

\textbf{Other States}

While the forgoing sketches focus on states that had established churches, readers should bear in mind that some of the original states never had such an establishment. States such as New York, Pennsylvania, and, particularly, Rhode Island did not have established churches.\textsuperscript{45} This last state, in fact, was founded as a haven of religious freedom where church and state always were separated.
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The Moon from Paysandú

The moon from Paysandú
Hasn’t got a man on it; it’s got
A woman and a donkey
Because you’re looking at it
From the other side

Try as you might, you cannot
Turn or squint or flip or lie on your back
And see
Anything else
Anything you’re used to

Just the Virgin Mary
Pregnant, riding to Bethlehem
Aware but not fully
Fathoming
The importance of what is soon to take place

—Patrick Madden

This poem won an honorable mention in the BYU Studies 1999 poetry contest.
Josiah Quincy's 1844 Visit with Joseph Smith

Jed Woodworth

A prophet's claims have always invited attention. The Prophet Joseph Smith took calls from an array of personalities who would not be satisfied without seeing this curiosity in the flesh. The visitors came from near and far and from every walk and station of life: politicians and priests, paupers and pundits, charlatans and seekers, and almost everything in between. Arriving first in a trickle and then in a stream, they found the Prophet wherever he had gathered the Saints. Some of the travelers left accounts of their visits, and from these sketches later generations came to know Joseph, too.¹

Few traveler accounts are better known to Latter-day Saints than Josiah Quincy's. Massachusetts legislator, son of a Harvard president, and later the mayor of Boston, Quincy had a pedigree to make ears perk. He and his cousin Charles Francis Adams,² son of former U.S. president John Quincy Adams, docked in Nauvoo in the spring of 1844 while sight-seeing along the Mississippi River.³ They spent a day with Joseph Smith. Quincy wrote up his experience and published it in a New York literary magazine nearly forty years later.⁴ That account was republished in 1883 in Quincy's posthumously published work, Figures of the Past, a potpourri of reminiscences based largely on his extensive journals.⁵ Many Latter-day Saints will recognize the oft-quoted passage from that work in which Quincy speculated on Joseph Smith's contribution to American history:

It is by no means improbable that some future textbook, for the use of generations yet unborn, will contain a question something like this: What historical American of the nineteenth century has exerted the most powerful influence upon the destinies of his countrymen? And it is by no means impossible that the answer to that interrogatory may be thus written: Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet. And the reply, absurd as it doubtless seems to most men now living, may be an obvious commonplace to their descendants.⁶

In his account, Quincy used language rarely seen in non-Mormon descriptions of Joseph Smith. He called Joseph "extraordinary," "remarkable," even "kingly"—all words Latter-day Saints would have used to describe their prophet. Quincy noted Joseph's wit, his handsome face, his personal charm. The "rugged power" Quincy saw in Joseph Smith resonated with the way the Saints liked to think about their leader.⁷
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Coming from a prominent and respected non-Mormon, these descriptions were too good to pass up. Excerpts from the Quincy account soon found their way into Latter-day Saint publications. From biographies to missionary tracts to general conference addresses to doctrinal treatises, Quincy was quoted with an ardor rarely seen. An authority to be believed, Josiah Quincy esteemed Joseph Smith at a time when few non-Mormons did.

Notwithstanding its important function for Latter-day Saints, Quincy’s published account raises a few questions. Should a forty-year-old reminiscence be trusted? Quincy expanded ten “closely written” journal pages into twenty pages of published text. The journals were never found, leaving historians to wonder how much of the account rested in contemporary observation and how much came of literary license or reconstructed memories then several decades old. How did the Church’s growing notoriety influence writing tone? Quincy no doubt read up on Mormonism after his visit to Nauvoo. And in truth, Quincy mixed compliments with descriptions that sounded very much like the anti-Mormon rhetoric of his day. For example, he did not discount the belief that Joseph was an “impostor” or a “fanatic.” The Prophet’s kingly abilities governed “feeble or confused souls who are looking for guidance,” not enlightened, rational minds such as Quincy’s. “Monstrous” was the word Quincy used to describe Joseph Smith’s religious claims. Quincy was obviously conflicted. His mixed review, together with Adams’s lukewarm journal entry, is enough to force this question: What did Quincy think of Joseph Smith at the time they visited?

A newly discovered letter penned by Quincy in 1844 (pages 83–87 below) helps us approach some answers. Housed in the Quincy-Howe family papers in the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts, the letter is among a dozen or so letters Quincy wrote to his wife, Mary, while on his tour of the western frontier. The letter, written from Davenport, Iowa, and dated May 16, 1844, the day after Quincy visited the Prophet, spares many details. The document does, however, provide a rare contemporaneous view of Joseph Smith, as well as introduce modern readers to Josiah Quincy. In this find, the differences between the two men become more striking than the similarities.

That differences might emerge should come as no surprise. In many respects, Josiah Quincy and Joseph Smith came from different worlds. Although they grew to maturity in New England at roughly the same time, their backgrounds show few similarities. The Smith family was ordinary, itinerant, and meager in formal education; the Quincy family, quite the opposite. Born in 1802, Josiah Quincy IV was raised on his family’s sprawling estate in Quincy (named after a distant ancestor), Massachusetts, a pastoral coastal town a few miles south of Boston. His father, Josiah III,
was a U.S. congressman, mayor of Boston, and university president; his mother, the daughter of a well-to-do New York City merchant. Parents of this cast expect large things out of their children. Accordingly, they gave Josiah, the eldest son, the best schooling money could buy, sending him to Philips Andover Academy and later to Harvard, where generations of his ancestors had attended.  

From the beginning, Josiah IV had “statesman” written all over him. While Joseph Smith entered politics free of family expectations, Quincy seems to have been groomed for elected office. The Quincys boasted that their ancestor Sieur de Quincy, an English baron, forced King John into granting the Magna Carta in 1215. Later generations formed an unbroken chain of elected office holders. Three Quincys—all named “Josiah”—would be Boston mayors. Josiah IV, expected to carry on tradition, spent his childhood on the laps of foreign diplomats and his youth sitting at the feet of former President John Adams, a relative and close family friend. He listened to and observed and modeled great leaders from an early age, adding insight to his opportunity. When Josiah was still in his early twenties, the governor of Massachusetts appointed him aide-de-camp, charged with escorting dignitaries around Boston. Such a post befit Josiah Quincy IV. While other prominent families traced their descent from sire to son, locals quipped that the Quincys traced theirs from “Siah to Siah.”

Josiah Quincy’s privilege did not outstrip his ability. After graduating from Harvard, he practiced law; married Mary Jane Miller, the daughter of a wealthy Boston merchant; and ran for public office. He served as president of the Boston city council (1834–37) and as president of the Massachusetts state senate (1842). He was three times elected mayor of Boston (1845–49). Witty and intelligent, he was known as a masterful orator. Unlike Joseph Smith, who was an able but not a polished public speaker, Quincy won prizes for his rhetoric. Even critics raved over his ability to quote Shakespeare just as well as the statute book.
This background of wealth and privilege could not help but color the way Quincy saw the world. Joseph Smith could no more measure up to the standard of refinement marked out in Josiah Quincy’s mind than could any other rural New Engander moving west with the frontier. Accordingly, nothing escaped the possibility of scrutiny. Everywhere he looked in Nauvoo, Quincy saw dirt. When he pulled up to the Nauvoo Mansion House, he saw a man dressed in a speckled coat and “dirty white pantaloons” emerge from a crowd of “dirty loafers.” That man was Joseph Smith. The Prophet invited him inside, but the mansion house was no better—“about as dirty as the prophet himself,” Quincy wrote. They later talked theology in what Quincy called a “close uncured room.”

The Mansion House was the best Nauvoo had to offer. The dirt thickened elsewhere in the city, an observation that could not have escaped anyone preoccupied with cleanliness and propriety. Nauvoo was a frontier town, a place at home in the elements, located, as William Mulder has observed, on the Mississippi, “both a dividing line and a mediator between wilderness and civilization.”21 To its inhabitants, Nauvoo would always be “the beautiful,” but to many outsiders the beauty lay more in the city’s natural surroundings than in any material creation.22 Urbane sensibilities such as Quincy’s could not measure progress in the thatched roofs and mud-packed dugouts that continued to dot the Nauvoo landscape in 1844. Even the perfectly geometrical plat, which caught his attention, failed to adequately structure the town. In the end, Quincy found the older, more progressive Quincy, Illinois (named after John Quincy Adams), and not the younger, unseasoned Nauvoo, “the most beautiful” Western city.23

Quincy, Illinois, was the exception to rule. If Nauvoo could not measure up, neither could any of the other towns on Josiah Quincy’s trip. He wrote home at every major stop, and each letter conveyed that nothing much impressed him. The lack of civilization he found down the Ohio River was reason for some disgust. During the entire one-thousand-mile boat ride, he saw only two homes of “either taste or refinement,” and these were just a notch above the small, ordinary log dwellings that predominated along the riverside. Even the finished homes were nothing but a “shabby row of brick houses, placed on a dirty street, along the muddy bank.”24 The sight might not have been so unseemly to Quincy had he not believed the dwellings reflected so much of their residents’ personalities. The people between Louisville and St. Louis, he said, resembled nothing so much as a crowd of “miserable looking wood choppers,” and the Louisville courthouse, without steps, windows, or finished floors reinforced his view.25 A watchdog for establishment culture, Quincy could not be content in the rough, uncut West. The same irritants he found in Nauvoo popped up elsewhere again and again. In Cincinnati, he stayed in a “very dirty chamber” and sighted another crowd of “dirty loafers.”26
Quincy was not alone in his preoccupation with gentility. By the early decades of the nineteenth century, an emerging American middle class was beginning to adopt the styles and mannerisms that a generation before would have thought solely the province of the gentry. Politeness, fashion, cleanliness, and good taste were all extolled as virtues to be cultivated.27 Elite classes in turn expected more of lower classes than ever before, and sneering such as Quincy’s became more and more commonplace. Easterners were especially concerned lest Westerners snub perceived culture centers on the coast.

Churches were not immune from refinement culture and in fact ambivalently sought to promote it. By the 1820s, the division between plain Christianity on the one hand and social propriety on the other had blurred in high churches such as the Congregational, Episcopalian, and Unitarian. Truth was beauty, and beauty, truth. Baptists and Methodists, many of whom composed the ranks of Mormon converts, lagged behind this trend, but by the 1840s, they too had begun to make the same move.28 In Nauvoo, Quincy saw dirt others did not, for he was a Unitarian, from an elite class, visiting religionists who had not made style a prerequisite to knowing God.29

Quincy’s religion, as did his elitism and his gentility, ordered his observations in Nauvoo. Unitarians, among the most anticlerical of all Christians, would have been skeptical of any claim to prophetic authority. And indeed Quincy was. He twice referred to Joseph Smith as “prophet, priest, and king,” wryly reporting titles to which no Unitarian would have ever laid claim. These offices were too reminiscent of the papal authority of Catholicism, which nativists like Quincy found both unconscionable to “reasoning men” and in subtle ways seditious to the American revolutionary spirit.30

The pan-Protestantism of antebellum America had little tolerance for faiths with strong claims to centralized leadership such as those found in Catholicism and in minority sects such as Mormonism. Protestantism (coded “Christianity”) was an unstated, unseen, yet powerfully influential assumption in American government. Joseph Smith’s overt claims to theocratic authority, running counter to this civic religion, would disturb even a man from Massachusetts, where the state church had been disestablished for only a decade.31 While Quincy’s exact views on disestablishment are unknown, his letter grouped the Prophet’s many duties en bloc as though together they were cause for concern. “The power he exercises both civilly & religiously is immense,” Quincy concluded, “& is a living proof of the insceptibility of human nature to imposition.” Nothing but absolute freedom of conscience would suffice. The enlightenment rationalism that informed Quincy’s Unitarianism demanded that conscience be pitted against obedience to authority and that conscience win.
Quincy’s politics made the same demand. Like many Massachusetts politicians of his day, Quincy belonged to the Whig party, which had formed in 1833 in opposition to President Andrew Jackson’s alleged Caeserism. “King” was a pejorative title the Whigs applied to Jackson. To objectors, Jackson’s supposed disregard of law and refusal to respect republican government’s separation of powers seemed all too reminiscent of the British crown. The Whigs, therefore, looked back to the Revolution for their name as well as their ideology. “A Whig in its pure signification,” proclaimed one party paper, “means one who prefers liberty to tyranny—who supports privilege against prerogative—the rights and immunities of the people, as ascertained by the equity of nature, the Constitution and the laws of the country, against the predominance of the Crown, or Executive power.” Some of this rhetoric may be dismissed as political bluster; Democrats did not like the Crown anymore than Whigs did. Nevertheless, diffuse state power did seem to be a Whig preoccupation into the 1840s. Whigs such as Quincy, already suspicious of powerful chief executives, would have likely found theocratic claims alarming.32

If Quincy was impressed by anything at Nauvoo, it was that curious anomaly looming above the horizon, the Nauvoo Temple. He thought he had Joseph Smith figured out until they rode up to the bluff that afternoon. A massive, two-story structure built of “hewn stone” set on a “majestic site” was hardly what one would expect from a dirty loafer.

Not even Quincy’s own town church compared to this Nauvoo site. The word “temple” resonated within him, for this was the name by which Quincy residents called the Congregational church they built in 1828. Touched by refinement culture, town members had torn down the church built of wood, the one Quincy attended as a boy, and replaced it with a $30,000 granite edifice (“the Stone Temple”) graced with a styled pediment front and four towering doric pillars.33

Quincy found nothing in his experience that resembled the Nauvoo Temple. All he could call it later in life was “a wonderful structure, altogether indescribable.”34 Most perplexing to him was why a people so apparently lacking in refinement would want to build a wonderful structure. The Nauvoo Temple was built of limestone, not brick or wood. It was three times as large as the Quincy temple and many times more expensive. The sun and moon carvings on the temple struck Quincy as strange, to be sure, but a man of his learning could not have missed the nature of its overall composition, which partook of the same Greek Revival style that Quincy, Massachusetts, residents admired.35 The dissonance Quincy found between the Nauvoo Temple and scenes elsewhere in the West must have been jarring. The builders and planners of the Nauvoo Temple simply could not be placed in the same category with those who had let the
courthouse in Louisville deteriorate. Quincy recognized a peculiar industriousness when he observed every member giving one day in ten toward the building's completion. Joseph, it appeared, commanded the devotion of his followers like no other. Subscriptions to the Quincy temple had come much more begrudgingly; although the building took just a year and a half to complete, residents required six years to pay it off.36

Josiah Quincy's interest in Joseph Smith no doubt grew over time. The Nauvoo Temple made Joseph's organizational genius obvious, but as Quincy aged, his respect for some of the Prophet's other gifts increased. He came to appreciate Joseph's charisma, which fascinated him all the more once he learned he could never match it. Sad experience was Quincy's teacher. He voluntarily resigned from the Boston mayorship in 1849 when his own party lashed out at him for passing prohibition legislation. Turning to railroads, he became treasurer of the Vermont Central. When the company went under, the directors blamed Quincy, demanded his resignation, and might have filed criminal charges against him had he not declared bankruptcy. His reputation ruined, Quincy lived out the final thirty years of his life farming and managing the family estate in Quincy.37

Thirty years provided plenty of time for reflection. By 1881, when he published the piece on Joseph Smith, Quincy had no desire to see the public excoriate any man. The Independent, where his article was published, had openly vilified Mormons over the last several months.38 Another approach seemed more proper, more rational, more fitting of a Quincy. "Such a rare human being," Quincy explained, "is not to be disposed of by pelting his memory with unsavory epithets." Joseph's rareness was now clearly apparent. The church he had founded, small and insignificant in Quincy's memory, now incited a national fury. A man whose followers then numbered in the "hundreds of thousands" was not to be glibbly dismissed.39

How did Joseph Smith acquire such a following? This was the question that puzzled Quincy, a question for which he had no answer. A man of common stock, Joseph Smith was now more powerful than the Quincy family had ever been.40 An explanation for Joseph's ascent in this "age of free debate" was unclear but not exactly opaque.41 Looking over the whole of American history, Quincy could see that Jacksonianism had largely replaced the aristocratic notions that had kept family dynasties such as the Adamses and Quincys in power. The Common Man had flourished; the aristocrat had withered. Neither Adams, nor Jefferson, nor any other elite, nor even that twice-elected representative of the masses, Jackson (whom Quincy had met), would hold the future history textbooks rapt. Rather, Joseph Smith, both the commonest and uncommonest Common Man, perpetually elected in the minds and hearts of his followers, would, Quincy hypothesized, command all the attention. This speculation would require forty years of hindsight and would not have been apparent to Quincy in 1844.
Far from a paean to Joseph Smith, Quincy’s letter shows just how easily the Prophet could be misunderstood. In this respect, the uncommon Quincy resembled other visitors. Like Quincy, visitors often held Joseph to an impossible standard. He was not biblical enough for some, not American enough for others, but rarely acceptable just as he was.

Within the context of a Bible-believing culture, such appraisals represent a curious phenomenon. In the Bible, refinement hardly seems necessary for a prophetic call. Unlearnedness is more a prerequisite than it is a liability. Prophets can also be both priests and kings, holding political power as God directs and speaking out on any matter of moral concern. Where the prophet leads, the people follow (even if the prophet wears dirty pantaloons or something akin to them).

But in Joseph Smith’s day, one in which American nationalism mixed with Biblicalism, ancient patterns alone seemed outmoded. The proof of America’s greatness lay in progress, not regress, and Biblical literalism, for many learned souls, represented regress. Without laying aside the assumptions they held dear, visitors like Josiah Quincy would always go away disappointed. Joseph Smith was restoring ancient religion, and only those who felt the power and promise of that quest could ever fully endorse him.

Jed Woodworth (jedwoodworth@hotmail.com) is an associate editor at BYU Studies. He has an M.A. degree in psychology from Duquesne University and an Ed.M. degree in education, emphasizing the history of education, from Harvard University.
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3. Quincy and Adams began their five-week trip from Boston on April 25, 1844. The major stops along their way included New York City; Philadelphia; Baltimore; Washington, D.C.; Cincinnati; Louisville; St. Louis; Chicago; Detroit; Cleveland; Buffalo; Rochester; Syracuse; and Albany. Quincy parted with Adams on May 29 at Buffalo, and both were in Boston by June 1. See Charles Francis Adams, Diary, April 25–June 1, 1844, quoted in Henry Adams, “Charles Francis Adams Visits the Mormons in 1844,” in reprint of Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society 68 (1944–47): 4–36.


10. George Q. Cannon, Journal of Discourses, 26 vols. (Liverpool: F. D. Richards, 1855–86), 24:257, August 19, 1883; Matthias F. Cowley, Sermon, in 72nd Semi-Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1901), 15 (hereafter cited as Conference Reports); and the following in Conference Reports: Charles H. Hart (April 4, 1909), 69–70; Seymour B. Young (October 6, 1918), 93; Heber J. Grant (April 3, 1921), 7; John M. Knight (April 3, 1921), 67–68; Joseph Quinney Jr. (October 5, 1924), 126–27; Heber J. Grant (October 3, 1926), 9–11; Heber J. Grant (April 13, 1930), 190–91; Richard R. Lyman (October 5, 1934), 14; Joseph F. Merrill (October 2, 1937), 76; Charles A. Callis (October 7, 1938), 24; Heber J. Grant (October 3, 1941), 8; Joseph L. Wirthlin (April 6, 1943), 122; Heber J. Grant (April 6, 1944), 8; Joseph F. Merrill (April 6, 1947), 134–35; Henry D. Moyle (April 8, 1962), 100; LeGrand Richards (October 2, 1965), 87.

12. Quincy, Figures of the Past, 318.

13. In the 1850s, Quincy once lectured in Boston on Thomas Ford’s History of Illinois, which has two chapters on Mormonism. Quincy’s Figures of the Past quotes a Joseph Smith statement made after Quincy’s Nauvoo visit (“I am going like a lamb to the slaughter”) and uses the phrase “the City of the Saints,” the title of Sir Richard Burton’s well-publicized book of the same name. [Josiah Quincy IV], Scrapbook [1841–1881], 211–12, Quincy-Howe Papers; and Quincy, Figures of the Past, 318–19. See also the articles cited in note 38.


15. “There is a mixture of shrewdness and extravagant self-conceit, of knowledge and ignorance, of wisdom and folly in this whole system of this man.” Charles Francis Adams, Diary, May 15, 1844, microfilm of holograph, Adams Papers, MHS. The entry was published in Charles Francis Adams, Diary, May 15, 1844, quoted in Adams, “Charles Francis Adams,” 20–23. The “imposture” Adams saw in Joseph Smith has been recently discussed in Truman G. Madsen, Joseph Smith the Prophet (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989), 100.

16. Josiah Quincy to My Very Darling Wife, May 16, 1844, Quincy-Howe Papers, MHS. This letter is 15¼ x 9¾ inches, folded in half to make four writing sides. According to MHS records, the letter was part of the original accession of Quincy-Howe papers donated to MHS in 1967 by Mrs. Mark Dewolfe Howe, a Quincy descendant.


18. Caleb H. Snow, A History of Boston, the Metropolis of Massachusetts, from Its Origin to the Present Period; with Some Account of the Environs (Boston: Abel Bowen, 1825), 94; Daniel Munro Wilson, Where Independence Began: Quincy, Its Famous Group of Patriots; Their Deeds, Homes, and Descendants (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1902), 183–84; Quincy, Figures of the Past, 58–73; Cameron, Public Service of Josiah Quincy, 6; Daniel Munro Wilson, Three Hundred Years of Quincy, 1625–1925: Historical Retrospect of Mount Wollaston, Braintree, and Quincy (Boston: Wright and Potrer, 1926), 45–82, quote on 71.
19. Mary Jane Miller (1866–74) and Josiah Quincy married in 1827. Their three children were Josiah (1829–1910), Samuel (1832–87), and Mary (1834–9). See “Quincy Family Genealogy”; and “Quincy-Howe Genealogy,” Quincy-Howe Papers.


25. Josiah Quincy to My Very Dear One [Mary Jane Miller Quincy], May 12, 1844, Quincy-Howe Papers; Josiah Quincy to My Very Dear One [Mary Jane Miller Quincy], May 9, 1844, Quincy-Howe Papers.

26. Quincy to [Quincy], May 6 and 9, 1844; Josiah Quincy to My Very Dear One [Mary Miller Quincy], 13, 1844. Quincy-Howe Papers. Similar observations are found in Charles Francis Adams, Diary, May 5, 7, 10, 17, 1844, as quoted in Adams, “Charles Francis Adams,” 13–18, 23.


29. Charles Francis Adams, who shared Quincy’s religion and social status, was similarly preoccupied with refinement. Adams slept in a “very indifferent room,” ate at a table that was “without order or delicacy,” and saw clothing that was “neither very choice nor neat.” Adams, Diary, May 15, 1844. For early Mormonism’s relationship to genteel culture, see Bushman, “Was Joseph Smith a Gentleman?” 27–43.

30. Josiah Quincy to My Very Dear Wife [Mary Miller Quincy], April 29, 1844, Quincy-Howe Papers; [Quincy], Scrapbook, 20–31; Teryl L. Givens, The Viper on the Hearth: Mormons, Myths, and the Construction of Heresy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 47–49. Quincy’s Figures of the Past spells out the seditious possibilities in Mormonism: “Here is a society [Mormonism] resting upon foundations which may at any moment be made subservive of every duty which we claim from the citizen” (318).
31. For more on religious disestablishment, see appendix 3 of M. Scott Bradshaw's article in this issue of BYU Studies.


34. Quincy, Figures of the Past, 328.


36. Lunt, Two Discourses, 125–27.

37. McCaughy, Josiah Quincy, 201; Cameron, Public Service of Josiah Quincy, Jr., 15–17; Wilson, Three Hundred Years, 68; Boston's Forty-Five Mayors, ed. Joseph J. Fahey (Boston: City of Boston, 1975), 11–12; [Quincy], Scrapbook, 32–142, 189; "Funeral Obsequies," Quincy Patriot Ledger, November 11, 1882, 2.


40. Although one more Quincy would yet be elected to the Boston mayorship, the family was clearly in decline. By 1880 the Quincy family had been reduced to just three male heirs, and within forty years, the family was largely without political influence. See Michelle Hilden, "The Mayors Josiah Quincy of Boston" (Ph.D. diss., Clark University, 1970); and "Last of the Quincys," in James H. Slade, comp., "Quincy Biography—Quincy Family," vertical file, Thomas Crane Public Library, Quincy, Massachusetts.

41. Quincy, Figures of the Past, 317.
Josiah Quincy’s May 16, 1844, Letter

Le Clare House, Davenport, Iowa. Ter.
Thursday M^3 May 16, 1844.

My very darling wife,¹

I closed my last letter at St Louis on Monday [May 13] and took passage in the Steamer Amaranth. We² passed rapidly that night and the next day through a beautiful and clean river³ nearly as wide as at St. Louis & studded with innumerable islands through which we passed sailed brushing the trees with the sides of our boat. during the day we reached Quincy, which being situated in the town of John & the County of Adams possessed a claim on our notice,⁴ we accordingly stopped the boat for half an hour & from the top of the Quincy house beheld for the first time a prairie. It appears more like a view out to sea than any thing else to which I can compare it. The perfect level stretching to the horizon & the living green almost amounting to blue with which it clothed giving it the appearance of water.⁵ But no description can convey any idea of the rich fertility of the soil, which requires & for years will require no manure to produce the most abundant harvests.⁶ The town of Quincy is acknowledged to be the most beautiful,

¹. Mary Jane Miller Quincy (1806–74). See also note 19 in the introduction above.
２. Quincy traveled with Charles Francis Adams (1807–1886). See also note 2 in the introduction above.
３. The Mississippi River.
４. Quincy, Adams County, Illinois, was named after John Quincy Adams (1767–1848), President of the United States from 1824 to 1828, who was the father of Charles Francis Adams, Josiah Quincy’s traveling companion. Located at city center was “John’s Square” (later Washington Park), the “town” to which Josiah Quincy refers. The play on John Quincy Adams’s name would have interested both these travelers, who were fourth cousins once removed. See also note 2 in the preceding introduction.
５. The Illinois terrain often astounded travelers from Eastern cities. Rebecca Burlend, who emigrated from England to Pike County, Illinois, in 1831, described Illinois as “thousands of acres with not a tree upon it, but covered with a sort of strong wild grass, growing sometimes three or four feet high.” Imagine for a moment, she said, “a rich meadow, or fine grass plain several miles in diameter, decked with myriads of flowers of a most gorgeous and varied description, and he will have before his mind a pretty correct representation of one of these prairies.” [Rebecca Burlend and Edward Burlend], A True Picture of Emigration (1848; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 84.
regular & New England like town in the west, & really seems to deserve the honor conferred upon it by its name. As we found we had a day to spare we determined to devote it to the service of the Mormon prophet Joe Smith, and accordingly landed at his city of [2] Nauvoo at midnight between Tuesday [May 14] & Wednesday [May 15]. As we were some distance from his residence we stopped at a poor tavern at the landing, under the guidance of a D^F Goforth, the most perfect personification of Don Quixote that was ever seen. He had been a surgeon in Genl Jackson’s army at the battle of New Orleans & seemed simple as a child with a strong inclination to


7. Quincy and Adams had not intended on stopping in Nauvoo. Learning about Mormons from passengers on the steamer, the two abruptly changed their plans. Adams said he was indifferent to visiting Joseph Smith but consented at Quincy’s urging. Josiah Quincy, *Figures of the Past*, new edition (1883; reprint, Boston: Little, Brown, 1926), 319; Charles Francis Adams, Diary, May 14, 1844, as quoted in Henry Adams, “Charles Francis Adams Visits the Mormons in 1844,” in Reprint of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 68 (1944–47): 20. See also note 11 below.

8. Joseph Smith’s residence, the Nauvoo Mansion House, located at the corner of Main and Water streets.

9. That is, an inn. See also note 16 below. This tavern, which Quincy said was located “at the landing” and “some distance” from the Nauvoo Mansion House, was more likely located on the west, not the south, bend of the Mississippi River.

10. William Gano Goforth (1795–1847), from Belleville, Saint Claire County, Illinois. Goforth was well acquainted with Mormonism. His wife, Martha Nelson Goforth, was baptized into the Church on April 7, 1844. A few days after Quincy and Adams visited Nauvoo, Mr. Goforth helped draft resolutions for Joseph Smith’s presidential candidacy. He joined the Church in 1845. See Joseph Smith Jr., *History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed., rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1973), 6:386–92; 7:394 (hereafter cited as *History of the Church*). Both Quincy and Adams credited Goforth, a fellow traveler on the *Amaranth*, with convincing them to stop in Nauvoo. What the two travelers knew about Mormons before their trip is unknown, but the stories they heard on the river could not have favorably disposed them to the faith. Adams said the passengers were “full of discouraging tales of the disposition of these Mormons.” A self-described non-Mormon “friend” of Joseph Smith’s, Goforth offset the negative accounts, piquing Quincy’s curiosity. “Had it not been for a certain Doctor Goforth,” said Adams, “I think Quincy would have been discouraged by the darkness and solitude which reigned on the shore. But [Goforth] urged our landing so much that we finally ordered our things on shore.” Adams, Diary, May 14, 1844; Quincy, *Figures of the Past*, 319.

11. General Andrew Jackson (1767–1845), president of the United States from 1828 to 1836, led the United States to victory over Great Britain in the Battle of New Orleans, January 8, 1815, an important battle in the War of 1812.
the Mormon faith. The City of Nauvoo is the promised land of the Mormons, is situated on a bend of the Mississippi, that commands a view for miles in both directions. Five years ago there were not fifty inhabitants on it, now they say there are twenty five thousand, & I should think there might be half that number.\textsuperscript{12} The town is laid out with perfect regularity & every house has attached to it an acre of land. Of course the prophet priest & king, who is the head of the sect & who numbers of 200,000 followers\textsuperscript{13} in his train could not but be an object of interest. Dr Goforth at early morning dispatched a messenger for “the chariot of the prophet” which soon appeared not like that Elisha saw, but on four good wheels with a substantial pair of sturdy horses.\textsuperscript{14} We entered & soon arrived at the seat of this [“]prophet, priest, king,\textsuperscript{15} Mayor, Lt General & tavern keeper”\textsuperscript{16} for as each

\textsuperscript{12} Some early sources estimate the population of Nauvoo in 1844 at 27,000. Later estimates are more conservative, placing the population at about 12,000, closer to Quincy’s estimate. Susan Easton Black, “How Large Was the Population at Nauvoo?” BYU Studies 35, no. 2 (1995): 91–94. The larger figure given to Quincy may have included Mormon settlements in Hancock County, Illinois, and Lee County, Iowa.

\textsuperscript{13} Adams confirmed this figure. Joseph Smith, he said, “boasts of having twenty-five thousand at Nauvoo and two hundred thousand in the Union.” Adams, Diary, May 15, 1844. It is unclear just who provided the figures. Joseph Smith is the likely candidate, but Quincy and Adams tend towards hyperbole. For example, Quincy said Joseph Smith took them to “his” temple, when it is doubtful Joseph would have laid claim to the work in such a way. Currently available evidence places the worldwide Church population in 1844 at 26,146 baptized. Deseret News 1997–98 Church Almanac (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1998), 529. But if 200,000 sounds too large, 26,000 sounds too small. Actual Church membership was probably somewhere in between these figures. Compare, for example, the existence of baptisms apparently not recorded on Church records but noted in The Journals of William E. McLellin: 1831–1836, ed. Jan Shipps and John W. Welch (Provo and Urbana: BYU Studies and University of Illinois Press, 1994), 413–14, with the disclaimer in Susan Easton Black, comp., Membership of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1848, 50 vols. (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1989), 11i–ii.

\textsuperscript{14} An allusion to 2 Kings 2:11, where Elisha sees a “chariot of fire, and horses of fire.”

\textsuperscript{15} The previous month, April 1844, the Council of Fifty ordained Joseph Smith “king” over the Kingdom of God. Soon thereafter Joseph applied the titles “prophet, priest [and] king” to himself publicly, titles he also gave to others. Joseph Smith, “The Globe,” Times and Seasons 5 (April 15, 1844): 508; and Andrew F. Ehat, “It Seems Like Heaven Began on Earth: Joseph Smith and the Constitution of the Kingdom of God,” BYU Studies 20 (Spring 1980): 253–79.

\textsuperscript{16} That is, an innkeeper. Technically, Quincy is incorrect. Joseph Smith was lately an innkeeper, but he gave up management of the Mansion House in January 1844 when he began leasing the house to Ebenezer Robinson. Note also that Quincy’s phrase “tavern keeper” does not refer to strong drink, for he refers to the Mansion House parlor as “a dry barroom.” Quincy, Figures of the Past, 322. Instead, he uses the secondary
& all of these is he inspired to act. The door was surrounded by dirty loafers, from among which our Quixotic guide selected a man, in a checked coat, dirty white pantaloons, a beard of some three days growth and introduced him as General Smith Your Prophet. He had the name but certainly but in few respects the look of [3] a prophet. He however blessed us\textsuperscript{17} & requested us into his mansion, which was about as dirty as the prophet himself. As the lower floor was crowded he invited us to ascend & throwing open a chamber door, we entered, a close uncured room on the bed of which lay one of the faithful, sound asleep, and we had the evidence of more than one sense that the Mormon saints were not freed from some of the necessities of humanity. This however was a small matter for a prophet. He covered his disciple as well as he could with the bed clothes and down we sat to theological conversation.\textsuperscript{18} Breakfast was soon announced & when it was finished we found "an upper chamber" properly prepared for our reception.\textsuperscript{19} We passed the whole day in his society, & had one of the most

meaning of tavern as "synonymous with inn or hotel." See Webster's \textit{American Dictionary of the English Language}, 1844 edition, s. v. "tavern."

\textsuperscript{17} "As Doctor Goforth introduced us to the prophet, he mentioned the parentage of my companion. 'God bless you, to begin with!' said Joseph Smith, raising his hands in the air and letting them descend upon the shoulders of Mr. Adams." Quincy, \textit{Figures of the Past}, 321. Adams said simply that Joseph "received us civilly." Adams, \textit{Diary}, May 15, 1844.

\textsuperscript{18} All the rooms in the inn were full. According to Quincy's published account, Joseph tried two rooms without success, until on the third attempt, exasperated, he "immediately proceeded to the bed, and drew the clothes well over the head of its occupant. He then called a man to make a fire, and begged us to sit down." Quincy, \textit{Figures of the Past}, 322. Adams adds further details. "At last we were ushered into one [room] where was a man in bed whom he [Joseph Smith] very abruptly slapped on the shoulder and notified to quit." Adams, \textit{Diary}, May 15, 1844.

Neither Adams nor Quincy said much about what was discussed in "theological conversation." Quincy's \textit{Figures of the Past} called Joseph's theology "monstrous"; Adams's contemporaneous record emphasized an agreement with his own faith. He concluded that Mormonism was "very nearly Christian Unitarianism—with the addition of the power of baptism by the priests of adults to remit sin, and of the new hierarchy of which Smith is the chief by divine appointment." Quincy, \textit{Figures of the Past}, 322; Adams, \textit{Diary}, May 15, 1844.

\textsuperscript{19} Here Quincy possibly alludes to the "prepared" "upper room" where Jesus and his disciples held the Last Supper (Mark 14:15). If, on the other hand, Joseph Smith used the phrase "upper chamber," Quincy may have used quotation marks sarcastically. The word "chamber" could be understood to mean specifically "a place where an assembly meets," a room specially designed as a "star-chamber" or an "imperial chamber." A politician who had undoubtedly been in many "chambers," Quincy perhaps felt the one in the Nauvoo Mansion House did not fit the bill. See Webster's \textit{American Dictionary of the English Language}, 1828 edition, s.v. "chamber."
extraordinary conversations I ever participated in, he preached for us, prophesied for us, interpreted hieroglyphics for us, exhibited his mum- mies\textsuperscript{20} and took us to his temple which he is now erecting on a most majes- tic site of hewn stone. Every inhabitant dedicates the labor of his tenth day to its structure, it will be finished within a year & whether Mormonism expires or not, must remain a massive memorial of its existence for cen- turies.\textsuperscript{21} I have neither time nor space to describe the faith or works of this most extraordinary man but reserve them for a future occasion. The power he exercises both civilly & religiously is immense, & is a living proof of the insceptibility of human nature to imposition. We left Nauvoo yesterday morning and reached this place at 12 last night. The scenery around is lovely beyond description & I & my companion have [4] just ordered “a barouche landau”, alias a two horse waggon for the purpose of making an exploration. I trust I shall yet have power to write to you again from this place for whether with priests or prophets I am ever most truly & devotedly your own Josiah Quincy Jr[.]

P.S. We shall probably go to the falls of St Anthony as it will only delay us five days, & is an opportunity we shall never have again. After we leave this [place] my opportunities of writing may not be frequent so if you do not hear [from me] you must not be anxious. Write me at Buffalo.—Good bye—God bless you.

[postmarked Davenport Iowa May 17]
Josiah Quincy
(for Mrs Quincy)
Boston
Mass\textsuperscript{ts}

\textsuperscript{20} For a fee of twenty-five cents, visitors at Nauvoo could view a half dozen or so Egyptian mummies Joseph had purchased in 1835 from Michael H. Chandler, a travel- ing merchant. The mummies contained the papyri from which the Book of Abraham was translated. The Prophet’s mother, Lucy Mack Smith, a widow, who functioned as curator over the relics, derived her support from the fees. Joseph participated by inter- preting the symbols on the papyri for tourists. See Donl Peterson, The Story of the Book of Abraham: Mummies, Manuscripts, and Mormonism (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995), 191–202. Surviving papyri fragments are reproduced with commentary in John Gee, A Guide to the Joseph Smith Papyri (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000).

\textsuperscript{21} The first story of the temple had been completed, and the windows for the sec- ond story had just been cut. Adams pronounced the temple “about half finished.” Smith, History of the Church, 6:355; Adams, Diary, May 15, 1844.
The participants in the BYU China Teachers Program visit the Great Wall, 1997. Two of the teachers, Don and Joyce Nuttall, take the long climb to the top. The Great Wall stands as a symbol of formidable yet breachable borders, like the cultural differences between the West and China.
The Great Wall

Carol Ottesen

As early as 1929, David O. McKay traveled to China to dedicate that land for the preaching of the gospel. Under an ancient tree in the Forbidden City, he supplicated the Lord to bless this people, who had suffered so much. He asked the Lord to “send to this land broad-minded and intelligent men and women, that upon them might rest the spirit of discernment and power to comprehend the Chinese nature.” In fall 1997, nearly seventy years later, I found myself in China teaching English for a year under the sponsorship of the BYU Kennedy Center for International Studies. We were told that we were on the Lord’s errand but that the boundaries of language, politics, and culture loomed like the ominous Great Wall we had visited the day after we arrived in Beijing. Nearly two thousand miles long, the Wall looms as a monument to Chinese tenacity and innovation as well as the tyranny and isolation they have suffered. After about three months in China, I found this quote from President McKay and only then began to see beyond the wall and realize that enlarging the borders of Zion (D&C 82:14) had mostly to do with crossing elusive personal borders.

But we had been warned. The first week we were taken to the office of Public Security and took an oath that we would not talk about religion or give any kind of literature about religion to any Chinese national. A monitor would be present in each class. We were there to teach English. We had already been told by our BYU sponsors that we should strictly adhere to this warning to avoid jeopardizing the Church’s position in China.

This venue seemed to fit me—no proselyting, no hours or baptisms to count. I was content because this subtle approach had the possibility of inspiring purer motives on my part and promoting some deep self-examination. And I was fairly comfortable in the role of giver but not quite ready to be a gracious receiver and meek learner.

The first day of teaching, I walked through the doorway to Building Eight, with its typical upturned Chinese cornices, and into the dark hallway. My shoes clicked on the cement floor as I looked for my classroom, heart racing, face flushing with some unnamed fear. Here I was in Jinan, China, at the Shandong Medical University to teach English, and I was about to open the door to face fifty Chinese medical students for the first time. I came with the usual apprehensions about Communism and the vague negative notions so prevalent in the media but had tried consciously to go with what I thought was an open mind. The door creaked loudly as I
Building 8, the foreign language building on the campus of Shandong Medical University, Jinan, China, where the Ottesens taught several classes. Dedicated teachers and students were not deterred by the broken windows, lack of heating and air conditioning, and lack of library facilities.

walked in the classroom. Immediately, the entire class arose and began to applaud. At the podium, under a large picture of Deng Xiaopeng, I stood as they continued to clap. I scanned their faces, unfamiliar, yet somehow very like the faces of my American Indian foster children. Perhaps it was
The Great Wall

this synapse or maybe the reality that I was so far away from home and such a warm reception was unexpected, but I could barely keep my composure. I had walked on the Great Wall of China just a few days before, and here I was in mainland China looking into the faces of folklore's "starving people in China" that had made me feel guilty about not eating my peas when I was a child. The wall began to fall down; a border was breached.

But other borders needed to be crossed. I kept thinking of President McKay's blessing. With these constraints and borders, what could I do? I figured my best bet was to begin by trying to comprehend the Chinese nature. Discussions in class were not successful at first because the Chinese students were unaccustomed to raising hands or asking questions and they were shy. So having them write was my first ploy to assess their language needs and to learn to "just love them," as was the admonition given us. The short essays poured in from my seven classes. My husband and I sat in the living room of our small apartment, reading essays (usually with our coats and gloves on) and occasionally shared a particularly touching or significant passage.

One graduate student in neurology wrote about his father, describing the paucity of his childhood in a family of seven. He was from a poor peasant home in the country, and the family slept huddled together on a kang, a brick bed. He related, "One of the cold nights my father said, 'I want you to know we will support you children in what you want to do. I want you to be men of light and knowledge.'" My student added, "How could he support us—all he had was love and five hungry children? But he gave us more than we imagined." This sensitive, bright student carried all my bags to the train and was the last face I saw as we pulled away from Jinan.

Another student wrote quite daringly:

Thomas Jefferson said to do what you believe is right and I would like to do that. Jefferson believed that conflicting ideas are a source of strength and it is conflict that keeps freedom alive. But many times I think it is no use to go to my classes because I cannot say what I think is true. I think a country can survive only if it allows men to have free ideas. I often dream in bed of these ideas, but my dream has no color. I believe in the "unlimitable freedom of the human mind."

I had a couple of private moments with this student and he asked me, "Do all Americans think all Chinese are communists?" I nodded that they probably do. He put his hand to his forehead with a small groan. Nothing else.

Song Wei* responded to an essay on education:

I have suffered so many unspeakable sorrows and embarrassments because I feel poverty terrible. But poverty of thought is more terrible than living in

---

*Names have been changed.
poverty. When I was accepted in this university and came from the country to the gate of Shandong Medical University, the guards would not let me in because they thought I was a beggar. So I had to show them proof. I knew I must get an education to rise in the world, to become thoughtful and find out how to eliminate the poverty and suffering of Mother China.

Many told of the famine of the Cultural Revolution—of grandparents who died because they gave all their food to the young, of boiling grass and tree bark for food. One student told a story about her little sister who became very sick. Her parents were sure that if she had some fresh fruit she would get well, so they took all the money they had from a tin cup high on the cupboard and bought three pears. My student, then just five years old, saw the pears sitting there and could not resist and ate one. She said, "When father came home he raged upon me and was about to beat me when he stopped suddenly, tears filling his eyes. When he did this he turned toward the wall. I don’t remember much about the cultural revolution, but I will always remember that pear."

A woman oncologist described receiving a dress for the Chinese New Year when she was six years old. The dress had to be taken up all over so it would fit. She wore it once a year on the holiday, each successive year letting out yet another seam until she wore it with material added for her high-school graduation.

One doctor was raised by his grandmother and described leaving her to come from the country to medical school: "I climbed into the wooden cart and she gave me some good advice and kissed me goodbye. Then she ran after the cart crying until she could run no longer on her little feet, which had been bound when she was a child. She called my name until I could hear her no more."

Essay after essay recorded similar stories. Issues of cultural differences began to fade with the discovery of a sensitive (almost sentimental) people who had suffered beyond the American imagination and yet remained, for the most part, amazingly hopeful and courageous.

My husband verbalized our feelings one morning as we walked past the playing field and saw the freshmen students in uniforms marching to commands from a loud speaker. They moved in perfect unity and discipline. They were not unhappy but instead seemed to emanate vigor and purpose. He said, "I hope we never have to go to war against these beautiful people."

Our students often visited our apartment, sometimes crowding in and sitting in overlapping layers on floor and couch. And we heard more stories, heard Meng Hui play the Chinese flute he taught himself, heard Li Tao play the violin. Liu Jun brought his girlfriend for our approval. Li Mei brought me a piece of cloth handmade by her grandmother. When I protested such a valuable gift, she nearly cried and said, "Please, take it to America and show them the beautiful things Chinese women do. With this
Some of the faculty and staff of Shandong Medical University studied English under Carol and Sterling Ottesen in 1997. At the end of the academic year, the Ottesens invited the class to their apartment. The Chinese made dumplings for the Ottesens, and the Ottesens made applesauce with cinnamon—a new treat—for their students.

gift they will know we are thinking of them.” We were overwhelmed with their generosity and quite unsure why they gave or what they expected. One student gave me his well-worn Mao pin that he said he had worn every day as a child “when Mao was my God. But now he is no longer, so I give you what I once loved as a souvenir of China.” We credited these gifts to our being teachers in a country where they are so revered or to being old and therefore respected or to being guests in their land. But whatever their motives, we began to know their natures, to cross the borders of cultural misunderstanding. Yes, we had come to love them.

Still I felt the presence of the wall. How could we help them in their lives? How could we give them the hope, the purpose, some had openly asked for? One morning I woke up with a bad cold. I was tired. A button flipped off my skirt, I felt unprepared for my class, and I was sick of hand washing clothes in the bathtub and drinking bad-tasting water out of a thermos. Besides, I was late. I grudgingly pulled everything together in my briefcase and marched off to class on a run, dabbing at my nose, wondering why I had ever decided to come to China and what good on earth I was
Carol Ottesen teaches English to a class of forty-eight second-year medical students at Shandong Medical University, Jinan, China, in 1996. Over the blackboard hangs a picture of the late Chinese premier Deng Xiaopeng.

doing anyway. As I approached the classroom, I knew I couldn't face the students in this frame of mind. So on the way down the hall, I uttered a quick, desperate prayer that I would be able to give this class what was needed. The class went all right, and I breathed a sigh of relief. Afterward, a group three or four female students approached me. "We've been talking, and we want to ask you a question. We don't understand something. What it is that happens when you walk into our room? It's kind of like a light or like the sun shining in and it happens every time and we want to know what it is." I nearly choked and was glad for the tissue in front of my face. How could this be? I fought a huge lump in my throat and managed to feebly express my thanks and gave them a hug. I so wanted to tell them where the light came from, that I had received a direct gift from Him, the "Father of Lights," to overcome my puny humanness.

Shortly after, the most stark revelation of all came as I read from the book of Ether one evening and saw in neon the most formidable border I needed to cross. Ether has just spoken about weaknesses being given to make us strong and says, "I prayed unto the Lord that he would give unto the Gentiles grace, that they might have charity" (Ether 12:36). Charity, true loving, is not possible for any human without His grace. The only way
I could overcome the pull of worldly tasks and personal pain was to cross the border of humanness into beauty and holiness by putting on the beautiful garment of His grace. The real borders are the walls of our own minds—the fears, the prejudice, the pull of daily concerns, the lack of acknowledgment to Him who can so enlarge us with grace that we have Zion minds, pure and holy. Only by putting myself in a position to receive that grace, only by enlarging my own borders, could I ever expect to be of any real use. But hadn’t I known that earlier? I was ashamed to think how often I must relearn, how often an unholy grumpiness gets in my way.

Yan Ling came to our apartment one night pleading, “I have no meaning in my life. I go to school to please my parents. When they die, who will I please? I must have meaning, and I know you have it. Please will you tell me life’s purpose?” She had been a frequent visitor, and we knew her well. I took her hands and heard myself say, “Yan Ling, someday you will know. Just remember I love you, and if you like, you may keep seeking.” Through tears she protested, “I don’t know how.” “Something will tell you,” I replied. “But that is all I can say.”

Often on Sundays we went to the central park of the university for what they call an English corner. The agenda is that we show up and, in a
matter of sixty seconds, a crowd gathers and begins to ask questions. Our last Sunday in China, a man spoke up aggressively about religion: "We understand that 80 percent of Americans believe in God. How can these smart people be so deceived and believe in something that is simply not true?" I replied that some of the people, including a number of great scientists deduced from the nature of the universe that there had to be a superior mind to create this kind of order—that even this great university had a master builder. He retorted, "But you can't prove these things!" I said that was true and that perhaps there are other ways of knowing. We were a little jittery about religious talk, and we were late for our Sunday meeting with our fellow teachers. So we gathered up our things and began to walk away. While my husband was detained by another student, the questioner ran after me and said quietly so others could not hear, "I want you to know, I don't necessarily believe that there is not a God; I just wanted to know how you know. How do you know?" We walked quickly toward the gate, where a taxi was waiting for us with the door open. I had no time. What could I say to him? I was torn, as I often was between expediency and attending to that which is most important. But something filled me. I put my hands on his shoulder. "Dear Brother, I sense your seeking heart and want you to know I love you." His eyes began to fill, and he couldn't speak. I was very sure of the consummate grace of that moment.

That day at our sacrament meeting of ten people, I felt the aptness of these words from the lesson: "For I will go before your face. I will be on your right hand and on your left, and my Spirit shall be in your hearts, and mine angels round about you, to bear you up" (D&C 84:88). The more I pushed at the borders of my human limitations, the more amazing were the ways opened to extend His influence.

Russell Schweickart, one of the astronauts on Apollo 7, tells of his feelings as he gazed down at the fragile earth:

You look down there and you can't imagine how many borders and boundaries you cross, again and again and again and you don't even see them . . . hundreds of people in the Mideast [are] killing each other over some imaginary line that you're not even aware of . . . And from where you see it, the thing is a whole, and it's so beautiful.²

Because of this new picture of a world with no boundaries, only a dark blue-and-white sphere circling serenely in its orbit, we know even more strongly that borders are of our own making and that if we are to truly become brothers and sisters, we must seek His grace to move into the realm of holiness. Only then may we understand how to enlarge the borders of our love to include not only 1.2 billion Chinese but all our relatives on this small planet.

Carol Ottesen (ottesenc@eastnet.com.cn) currently teaches in the English Department at Peking University as a participant in the China Teachers Program, Brigham Young University. She holds a B.A. in music from BYU and an M.A. in English from California State University. Carol Ottesen has taught at both California State University and BYU, and she has published several books.
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Fig. 1. A view of the ceremony just prior to the unveiling of the statue of Brigham Young, July 20, 1897. Detail of a photograph by Charles R. Savage.
New Photograph of the Granite Shaft for the Brigham Young Monument

Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and J. Michael Hunter

In July 1897, Latter-day Saints from throughout the Intermountain West gathered for a five-day celebration honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of Brigham Young to the Great Basin. On the first day of the celebration, a large crowd gathered at the intersection of Main and South Temple to dedicate an unfinished monument (fig. 1). A lone statue of Brigham Young stood upon a tall granite shaft taken from Little Cottonwood Canyon in June 1897, just weeks before. A rare photograph recorded the scene after the shaft was loaded onto a wagon for the first leg of its journey to the site of the Monument to Brigham Young and the Pioneers (fig. 2).

Historical Context of the Photograph

The Brigham Young Memorial Association, a quasi-Church organization, commissioned Cyrus E. Dallin to design and sculpt the monument. After Dallin completed the statue of Brigham Young some time in early 1893, the figure was cast by the Ames Manufacturing Company in Chicopee, Massachusetts. Eventually, it was placed on a temporary pedestal in front of the Utah Building at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago from May 1 to October 30, 1893 (fig. 3). Following the closing of the fair, the statue was shipped to Utah and placed on another temporary pedestal on Temple Block in the open area southeast of the temple. Several historic photographs show the statue in both locations.¹ The Brigham Young statue remained on Temple Block until 1897, awaiting the completion of the entire monument and the designation of its final location.

The association’s site committee went to work trying to locate a permanent site for the completed monument. Several locations were proposed, including a site in Brigham Young’s private cemetery, on Main Street in front of the temple, in front of the as-yet-unbuilt state capitol building,² and on the southeast corner of Temple Square. The association finally chose the latter, with a plan to take down the southeast corner of the square’s wall and incorporate stones from the wall into the monument’s foundation.³

Raising money to complete the monument had lagged, but the association thought it could revive interest by announcing plans to dedicate the monument in its unfinished state during the fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of the pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley, July 24, 1897. The Church
advanced $8,000 to the association for work on the granite pedestal. By this time the association had decided on a new location for the monument: the intersection of Main and South Temple Streets. Agreeing that a monument to the pioneers should be in this more public place, the Salt Lake City Council deeded to the association a plot of ground 25' x 25' at the intersection.

The association entered into an agreement with Watson Brothers to complete the granite pedestal on June 6, 1897. The monument was to be unveiled on the first day of the five-day Utah Pioneer Jubilee celebration,
Young monument pedestal had been successfully cut and loaded on the “specially provided” wagon that would carry it from Little Cottonwood Canyon to a train.

July 20, 1897\(^5\) (figs. 1, 4). A report of the transport of the granite base was published in the *Deseret Evening News* in June 1897:

[Accompanying] the above is an exact chalk plate reproduction of a photograph of the big rock hewn from the Livingston quarry in Little Cottonwood canyon, for the Pioneer Monument shaft. As shown here the block was being moved on rails by human strength to a wagon nearby. A vast amount of labor and considerable ingenuity have been expended in cutting the stone from the mountain and getting it ready for shipment to this city.
A large force of men have been steadily employed in the undertaking for several weeks and today they succeeded in loading it on a specially provided wagon on which it will be conveyed a distance of one mile from the quarry to the Rio Grande Western over which it will be transported to this city. When it is understood that its present weight exceeds twenty tons an idea of its size can be more easily formed. When it reaches the depot in this city it will again
Fig. 4. Brigham Young monument after it was unveiled at the intersection of Main and South Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, July 20, 1897. The Brigham Young statue stands upon its new granite pedestal. Charles R. Savage.
be transferred to a wagon and conveyed to the intersection of East and South Temple streets, where it will be made ready for placing in the shaft which is to commemorate the achievements of the Pioneers. It is estimated that it will require fifteen span of horses to draw it from the depot to the Monument site. The corner stone will be laid with proper ceremonies some day next week. Additional commemorative bronze figures and a plaque were added to the monument before its final dedication on July 24, 1900 (fig. 5).

Fig. 5. Brigham Young monument, ca. 1904, Underwood and Underwood. This view shows the monument after additional bronze plaques and details were added.
Provenance of the Photograph

The photograph of the granite stone used in *The Monument to Brigham Young and the Pioneers* was donated by Daphne Steele Despain (1902–present) in 1994 to the LDS Church Archives. She was the wife of Robert Earl Despain (1898–1986), from whom she obtained the photograph. Robert Earl obtained it from his father, Robert Henry Despain (1875–1967), who in turn received it from his father, William Joseph Despain (1843–1918). According to family tradition, William helped cut the granite from the Livingston quarry in Little Cottonwood Canyon. He also supposedly appears in the photograph (unidentified). Originally the family tradition provided a date of May 1893 for the photograph. However, the *Deseret Evening News* provides the date of the image as June 1897.

The image was damaged before being donated. Dale Heaps, LDS Church Archives conservator, repaired and remounted the image in December 1999. The photograph measures 15.3 x 33.3 cm and is mounted on card stock 17.3 x 36.2 cm. Since a drawing of a photograph taken just before the shaft was loaded on the wagon appeared in the *Deseret Evening News* on June 1897, we may assume that the same photographer was involved with this view. While the *Deseret Evening News* provides the name of A. W. Silver, the first initial may be a misprint. Primary sources, including the 1897 Salt Lake City Directory, do not mention any professional photographers with the name of A. W. Silver. However, there is a James W. Silver, an apprentice working at the Silver Brothers Iron Works, who could have been an amateur photographer and the person involved in preserving this historic event.

Conclusion

An amateur photograph captured a brief moment in LDS Church history in Little Cottonwood Canyon in June 1897. The decision to place the Brigham Young statue by Cyrus Dallin upon a granite pedestal was part of a lengthy effort to erect an appropriate monument to the early pioneers.
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New Photographs of Joseph F. Smith’s Centennial Memorial Trip to Vermont, 1905

Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and Paul H. Peterson

President Joseph F. Smith and a group of other Latter-day Saint Church leaders, accompanied by family and friends, left Salt Lake City on December 15, 1905, for Vermont to dedicate a memorial honoring the Prophet Joseph Smith, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth. During their trip, they visited Church historical sites in Ohio, New York, and Vermont and Smith family sites in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York. Photographs were taken during most of the trip, preserving a view of the places considered sacred to the ever growing number of members of the Church.

Historical Context of the Photographs

"I should like to see introduced among the Latter-day Saints, even at the risk of introducing another general holiday, the practice of celebrating or commemorating the birthday of the Prophet Joseph Smith," observed Joseph F. Smith, counselor in the First Presidency, at memorial services December 23, 1894, held in honor of his martyred uncle’s birthday. Speaking at the Salt Lake City Sixteenth Ward meetinghouse, President Smith noted that in the fifty years following Joseph’s martyrdom, only on random occasions and generally on a local basis, had Latter-day Saints come together on December 23 to honor the Prophet of the Restoration.¹

The birthday of Joseph Smith, of course, never did acquire official holiday status among Latter-day Saints. But interestingly, two months or so earlier in 1894 and two thousand or so miles distant, another admirer of the Prophet Joseph was setting into motion events that would satisfy President Smith’s yearning to memorialize the Church’s founder.

That admirer was YMMIA leader Junius F. Wells, son of Daniel H. Wells, who was a counselor to President Brigham Young. On a stunning autumn day in Sharon, Vermont, Junius, along with Spencer Clawson and Clara Clawson, Spencer’s daughter, were following their guide Harvey Smith, tromping through tall Vermont amber grass to a site that only Harvey was familiar with. After a short journey, Harvey Smith located the granite hearthstone that had once graced the modest cabin of Joseph Smith Sr. and Lucy Mack—the cabin where the Prophet Joseph was born. Junius thought at the time that a fitting memorial ought to be constructed there, but in the years following, he never aggressively pursued the notion.²
Ten years later, in the April 1904 general conference, First Counselor John R. Winder read a resolution proposing that “a suitable building or monument” be erected to the memory of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. Perhaps that announcement prompted Junius Wells to bring to fruition his earlier hope of erecting a memorial in Sharon. Learning that the Solomon Mack farm was possibly available for purchase, Wells, on behalf of the Church, consummated the sale on May 23, 1905. Wells suggested to the First Presidency that a monument be placed in the area, and in July he was given authority to use his considerable diplomatic and organizational skills to bring this suggestion about—in quick fashion. The goal was to have the monument in place by December 23, 1905—the 100th anniversary of the Prophet Joseph’s birth.5

Faced with the prospect of transporting one hundred tons of Vermont granite (in three sections—a forty-three-ton shaft and two bases) from the railroad site in South Royalton to the birth site in Sharon—a distance of six miles—Wells saw to it that special sections of railroad track were constructed and arranged for railroad cars that had superior strength. At his instigation, bridges were reinforced, and roads were improved.6 It was a Herculean task performed in the dead of a Vermont winter, a winter that Wells claimed the Lord moderated (at least until the time of dedication) in order that his task be completed.7 When the Centennial Memorial party arrived on December 22, they found the operation well under control. The imposing granite shaft monument was in place, and nearby a memorial cottage, which was just being finished, stood over the actual birthplace of Joseph.

The printed invitation issued by the First Presidency invited Church members to two different services held on successive days. The first portion of the invitation requested “the pleasure of your presence” at the actual dedicatory services on December 23 at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont. The second portion requested “Latter-day Saints throughout the world” to attend local memorial services to be held on Sunday, December 24. Following the signatures of the First Presidency, a concluding statement read as follows: “Owing to the Winter Season and limited accommodations, a personal response to this invitation is not expected by those living at a distance except in special cases.”8 Likely, this statement had the effect of limiting the number of dedicatory participants to those selected by President Joseph F. Smith, who, according to Elder George Albert Smith, chose twenty-nine of the thirty participants.9

As it turned out, most of the thirty people chosen to participate in this memorable journey were in some way connected to the Prophet Joseph by bloodline, by personal association, or by ancestral friendship
(see the sidebar). At least that is the rationale provided by Susa Young Gates, herself a participant, in her lively account of the journey printed in the Improvement Era in 1906. Gates also recorded that “representatives of other staunch and true men of the Church were invited, but were unable to go.” This list probably included such well-known figures as J. Golden Kimball; Bathsheba W. Smith, “the only living person who received her endowments from the Prophet [Joseph]”; and Emmeline B. Wells, one of the gifted and great women of the Church. Their reasons for declining the invitation are not given. Possibly some were unable to go because of advanced age or health considerations. Or possibly some were unable to raise sufficient funds to purchase a ticket. Both Gates, in her Improvement Era summary, and George Albert Smith, in his conference report of the journey, made it clear that participants paid their own way. Elder Smith chose to broach the matter because he was persuaded that a minority of church members “who do not pay tithing seem unduly anxious for fear someone else shall benefit by the tithes other people pay.”

The traveling group left Salt Lake City on December 18. George Albert Smith, the group’s business and financial manager, had arranged for them to travel on a well-equipped Pullman car, the

---

### Dedication Trip Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. Smith</td>
<td>President of the Church, “the living representative of the great family through which came the prophet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthon H. Lund</td>
<td>Second Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis M. Lyman</td>
<td>President of the Quorum of Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henry Smith</td>
<td>Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Penrose</td>
<td>Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum M. Smith</td>
<td>Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Albert Smith</td>
<td>Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. Smith Jr.</td>
<td>of the Historian’s office, son of President Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Smith</td>
<td>daughter of President Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Smith</td>
<td>wife of Elder Hyrum M. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members of the Seventy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriarchs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stake presidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wives of some of the stake presidents and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriarchs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorin C. Farr</td>
<td>who was baptized in 1832 and had lived with the Prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus M. Cannon</td>
<td>patriarch, representing the Cannon family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Y. Taylor</td>
<td>president of the Granite Stake, representing the family of President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>John Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susa Young Gates</td>
<td>representing the family of Brigham Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. Richards of the Tooele Stake</td>
<td>representing the families of both Willard and Franklin D. Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Richards</td>
<td>wife of George F. Richards, along with young son Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Smith</td>
<td>historian of the Smith family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McDonald</td>
<td>a friend of Joseph F. Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“Sofala” (figs. 1, 2). According to Elder John Henry Smith, the group spent the first day of travel in reading and playing games. Presumably, these activities, along with sightseeing and social discourse (and possibly occasional drowsing), were the main time fillers. President Smith’s group (fig. 3) arrived in South Royalton on the morning of December 22. Hours later, the Utah group was joined by twenty eastern Saints led by Eastern States Mission President John McQuarrie. All were treated splendidly by the South Royalton residents. Elder George Albert Smith observed that the people of the town “decorated, festooned, and seated a comfortable hall, where we held meetings and gatherings and became acquainted with the people.”

Dedicatorly services began at 11 A.M. the next day, December 23, 1905, the 100th anniversary of Joseph Smith’s birth. The group was filled with both expectancy and gratitude. Junius F. Wells, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, Hyrum M. Smith, Jesse M. Smith, and Charles W. Penrose presented remarks, all but Wells’s being brief ones. In addition to their main comments, most of the speakers heaped unstinting praise on the nonmember townspeople, whose acts of generosity and hospitality seemingly knew no bounds. Dr. Edgar J. Fish, of South Royalton, also gave brief remarks, greeting the visiting Saints “in that broad spirit of toleration, of Christian charity, of brotherly love, which unites men of every country, of every sect, and of every nation.” Fish’s comment was followed by hearty applause.
President Joseph F. Smith gave the dedicatory prayer. Not surprisingly, much of the prayer was given over to extolling the virtues and accomplishments of Joseph Smith. President Smith paid tribute to Joseph Smith as “a polished shaft in Thine hand, reflecting the light of heaven, even Thy glorious light, unto the children of men.”

Edith Smith, the oldest female representative of the Smith family in the traveling company and the “unpaid historian and temple recorder” for the Smiths, was granted the honor of unveiling the monument. As “her slender hand drew the rope which bound the Stars and Stripes about the polished base,” recorded Gates, “a shout at once arose, and men reverently lifted their hats, while women wept with joy and gratitude that such a man lived, had died, and now had been remembered.”

The next morning, Sunday, December 24, the Utah delegation left for Boston. After holding two meetings with the Saints and visiting Smith family ancestral sites, the memorial party left on Christmas night for Palmyra and Hill Cumorah country. On the trip home, they stopped at Kirtland to tour the Kirtland Temple and at Chicago to meet with the local Saints. They arrived in Salt Lake City on January 1, 1906, tired but fulfilled after a
Fig. 3. Joseph F. Smith and party standing in front of train, December 1905 (detail). Left to right: unknown man; possibly Lewis W. Shurtleff; possibly George F. Richards (holding his son, Oliver); possibly Alice Richards; Anthon H. Lund; possibly Joseph F. Smith Jr. (known today as Joseph Fielding Smith, tenth president of the LDS Church); possibly Ina Smith; unknown man; Joseph F. Smith; unknown man; John Henry Smith (uncovering his head with hat partially blocking his face); unknown man behind John Henry Smith; unknown woman; Charles W. Penrose; Francis M. Lyman; two unknown men; possibly Angus M. Cannon; and unknown man.
journey of two weeks that according to Elder George A. Smith was conducted "without sickness, accident or delay, with no unkind word, and with nothing but brotherly love from our Father's children wherever we met them, we were welcomed home by our families, and ate our New Year's dinner with them."\textsuperscript{22}

**Provenance of the Photographs**

A rather large collection of photographs taken during the trip is preserved in the LDS Church Archives in two separate collections. The first collection consists of twenty-five images, and the second collection, ninety-three. The collections are related (some images are in both) and appear to be the work of the same photographer as one collection has views taken just before or just after a view found in the other collection. In most cases, the photographs in both collections measure 15 x 15 cm or smaller. Daniel G. Shupe, of Ogden, Utah, donated the collection of twenty-five images to the Church in 1974. The provenance of the larger collection and the identity of the photographer of each collection are unknown at this time.

**Conclusion**

For most members of the Centennial Memorial party—if not all—the trip to Vermont and other significant historical sites constituted a defining moment in their individual lives. In his biographical sketches of important Church members, Assistant Church Historian Andrew Jenson (who, given his interest in Church history, would probably have given nearly anything to have taken the journey), always listed the dedicatory trip to Vermont as one of the significant happenings in the lives of the participants.\textsuperscript{23} "Out of the mists of memory," Susa Young Gates aptly wrote, "rises that exquisite shaft. It cleaves the sky, the flawless surface bearing a clear-toned, divine message to the darkened world of superstition and unbelief."\textsuperscript{24}

---
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Recent Notes about Olives in Antiquity

Wilford M. Hess

When a group of LDS scholars collaborated in 1994 under the auspices of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies to publish a book on the allegory of the olive tree in Jacob 5,1 few substantial works on olive production in the ancient world existed. Now, two new archaeological books add a wealth of information to our understanding of the importance of the olive in ancient life.2 Although expensive and technical, these new volumes offer further insights for anyone interested in olive culture as reflected in the scriptures, especially in the Book of Mormon.

The first mention of the olive in the Book of Mormon is found in Lehi’s prediction of the Babylonian captivity and the coming of the Lamb of God. Lehi compared the house of Israel to an olive tree whose branches would be broken off and scattered upon all the face of the earth (1 Ne. 10:12). After being scattered, the house of Israel would be gathered and the natural branches of the olive tree, or the remnants of the house of Israel, would be grafted in, or come to a knowledge of the true Messiah (1 Ne. 10:14). In this passage, Lehi probably drew upon Zenos’s allegory, found on the plates of brass. In incredible horticultural detail, that allegory compares the house of Israel to an olive tree. Yet that Old World information was apparently lost among Lehi’s descendants in the New World. After the fifth chapter of Jacob, the olive is not mentioned again in the Book of Mormon.

Although there are thirty to forty—some say up to four hundred—species of olive (Olea), the cultivated (tame) olive (Olea europaea L.) and the wild olive (Olea europaea var. oleaster) are the only ones of concern from a scriptural point of view. The cultivated, or tame, olive possibly originated in the Eastern Mediterranean and then spread westward. The cultivated olive has larger fruits with a smaller amount of the bitter glucoside, oleuropein. Cultivated olive species are developed by choosing the best olive trees among the wild species; the trees are selected for desirable growth patterns and fruit quality. This selective breeding has been going on throughout the ages and is still being done today. After centuries of domestication and selection, the differences between the domesticated (tame) and nondomesticated (wild) are normally very apparent, although there are obviously intermediate types.

Since these domesticated forms readily cross with the wild forms, resulting in a wide range of genetic variation, it is not desirable to grow new trees from seeds. Thus, the standard procedure used to propagate
This olive tree in Israel shows abundant evidence of grafting and pruning. The age of such trees cannot be determined because as olives regenerate, the inner portion of the stem decomposes, disrupting the continuity of tree rings.
desirable plants was, and still is, planting cuttings. The olive is one of the easiest trees to propagate by this means. Olive growers normally use wild olive grafts only to rejuvenate domesticated or tame trees; tame trees are also grafted onto the roots of wild trees to give the plants more vigor. For these reasons, it is not likely that Lehi’s group brought olive seeds with them to the New World. They may have attempted to bring cuttings, but even if they did so, the cuttings probably did not survive the long journey.

Another important point is that olives require a specific ecological setting to grow and reproduce. Olive trees thrive all around the Mediterranean. Low humidity, moderately cold winters, and long, hot summers are important. Temperatures cannot go below -11°C (12°F) or the plants will be killed. They grow well on moderately poor, rocky soil if they are given proper care. They prefer well-drained hillsides as they cannot survive if water stands around their roots. The trees grow between the latitudes of thirty to forty-five degrees and up to 550 meters above sea level, although some cultivars will grow at altitudes up to 600 meters or even higher on southern exposure slopes.

Of the many olive groves growing around the Mediterranean, the most memorable location that I have seen is near Delphi in Greece. There one can see what is perhaps the largest olive grove in the world. Tens of thousands of trees grow on the fertile plain below Delphi adjacent to the Mediterranean Sea, extending all the way up the hillside beyond Delphi, which is approximately 650 meters above sea level. Near Delphi, on the southern slopes of the hills, the wild and tame trees meet. Large trees with fat olives can be seen adjacent to small, bushy trees with small olives.

The relatively specific growing requirements for olives severely limit where they can grow. There are only a few areas in the New World that fit these specific growing conditions. They are mostly confined to limited areas in California, Arizona, Chile, and Argentina. Here is another reason why, even if Lehi and his followers had brought cuttings, the starts were not likely to have survived.

Many aspects of olive culture are relatively specific, and most are discussed in detail in earlier publications, where examples of botanical knowledge during biblical times are also described. The ancients knew how to nourish a vineyard, how to keep a vineyard from decaying, how to prune a tree in relation to fruit production, how to initiate young and tender branches, and how to keep the roots balanced with the foliage. The ancients also knew that there were wild (undesirable) and tame (domesticated or good) trees and that there were advantages and disadvantages of each. They knew that land could be poor (evil) or good, but that proper nourishment was necessary in either case. And they knew that, if the foliage of otherwise healthy trees was removed, the roots might perish. These details
add significantly to our understanding of how Zenos used various aspects of olive culture to convey his profound and well-known message about the history of the house of Israel. The allegory has received various interpretations; my own interpretations are discussed in an earlier publication and generally agree with the interpretations of Monte Nyman. I will focus here on contributions made to our knowledge by the information contained in the two new volumes.

Objectives and Conclusions in Olive Oil in Antiquity

The volume Olive Oil in Antiquity: Israel and Neighbouring Countries from the Neolithic to the Early Arab Period, edited by David Eitam and Michael Heltzer, contains twenty-nine articles written by thirty authors. The book is the result of a conference in Israel specifically about olive oil production and use. The subject gained interest in Israel after evidence of oil production was found at several archeological digs, especially at the ancient city of Ekron, which had a large-scale operation. The book points out the importance of olive oil for man's survival in ancient Israel, as "the fruit and its oil were major components in his diet." Oil was the "main source for [lamp] light and a basis for the manufacture of cosmetics and medication." Oil was also "used for oiling, ... for kindling the menorah, for offerings and for anointment of kings and priests." Eitam and Heltzer state that the research on olive oil in antiquity will broaden our understanding of "the ancient economy, ... social structure, [and] geopolitical relations" (1).

Production and Botany. One contributing scholar maintains that olives appeared in Israel "about 45,000 years ago" but "were most probably not cultivated until the Chalcolithic period," 4000–3000 B.C. Another contributor asserts that people "ate from the fruit of the olive tree even before [they] knew how to preserve it or to remove the bitter taste" of glycosides. Prehistoric dwellers in Mount Carmel and Galilee "knew of the olive and enjoyed its fruits" by 10,000 to 6,000 B.C. In fact, archeological evidence shows that "Israel may very well have been the birthplace of the cultivated olive" (7, 29).

The research presented in this book points out the importance of domestication: "Wild olives are allogamous [reproducing by cross-fertilization], reproduce entirely from seeds, and show a wide range of [genetic] variation. In contrast, domesticated olives are cultivated as clones," a practice that provides genetic uniformity. The two important characteristics that set domesticated olives "apart from their wild relatives are large fruit-size and higher oil-content. ... In the Mediterranean basin, olives constitute a complex of wild forms, weedy types, and cultivated varieties." The thousands of years of cultivation of the olive tree in the land of Israel and the Middle East created rules and rituals for tending olive orchards. The success
of the trees depends upon climatic conditions, precipitation, irrigation and cultivation methods, treatment of the seedlings, growing of the stock, and preparation for grafting and pruning. Many olive trees that are one thousand to two thousand years old still stand in Galilee, Judea, and Samaria (6, 8–9, 29–39).

**Area/Period Studies.** In *Olive Oil in Antiquity*, scholars report on the importance of olive oil in various geographical areas during ancient times.

**Israel.** Biblical writings imply the importance of the olive tree and its oil to the society located on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. The olive is also a common topic in other Jewish works and in Christian, Gnostic, and Islamic writings. Olive oil was “symbolic of dignity,” and an anointing with oil was symbolic of a change in status throughout the Near East. Oil was also “an item of charitable donation.” In addition to the use of olive oil for food and for light, oil was used in the manufacture of soap and, less commonly, in crafts including painting. In religious life, “olive oil was used for . . . purification ceremonies, [and] individual meal offerings.” Commonly, the meal offerings were “grain or flour mixed with oil to which frankincense was sometimes added.” These offerings “were intended to achieve a sweet odor before the divinity . . . and to ‘gladden the heart’ [Prov. 27:9].” The Bible contains “several examples of the ancient custom of pouring oil on sacred stones” (55, 56, 60–62, 125, 126).

According to the Mishnah, the oil press (and storehouse) were “an integral part of . . . an agricultural settlement.” Jewish sources from 200 B.C. to A.D. 500 also make it clear that olives were commonly spread on the roofs of homes “to expose [the olives] to the sun” for softening. In Israel during the Bronze and Iron Ages, a clay jug or a jar was used to store olive oil. To prevent the ceramic containers from “letting liquid out and allowing oxygen in,” the populace in some areas applied lime plaster or a “thick light-colored wash” to the jars. A decoration called combing was also used during firing to strengthen the jars. There is evidence that every seven years, “less sophisticated methods for the production of oil” were used because of a directive to “act during the Sabbatical year as the poor people act” (115, 116, 45–48, 118).

The economic impact of oil production was profound: “the oil produced was intended for sale or export outside the confines of the settlement and, most likely, outside the immediate region. . . . The production of oil provided profits amounting to almost twice the cost of living, [implying] a high standard of living” (123).

**Egypt.** The study on olive oil in Egypt focuses on the words used in ancient documents. “The Semitic loanword for olive, *zayit*, is known from Egyptian documents beginning in the Nineteenth Dynasty, from the reign of Merneptah.” Documents show that in the Twentieth Dynasty, Ramses III
planted olive groves, although “the hot, dry climate of Egypt does not favour the olive tree and its cultivation on a large scale” (41).

_Greece and Cyprus._ The study on Greece asserts that “for most areas of Greece olive cultivation was not practiced intensively until the end of the Bronze age.” In Cyprus “the earliest stratified evidence of olive oil extraction dates to . . . ca. 1300 B.C.” The Knossos Linear B tablets mention two kinds of olives; nonetheless, scholars believe that the oil was obtained from wild instead of domesticated olives—since “the olive was cultivated rather late in the Aegean, . . . the olive oil industry of the Minoans-Mycenaens relied heavily on the wild olive.” However, they used oil for perfume and unguents and seem to have been more interested in the industrial uses of oil than the nutritive (64, 49–52).

_Ugarit._ Ugaritic texts tell us that “the main source of oil in Ugarit was ‘olive oil.’” In Ugarit the olive stones were quite similar to those of modern domesticated olives, being “about one-third larger than the Greek stones.” Documents give evidence that “hired laborers and carpenters received oil from the stock of the royal household,” and taxes were paid in oil. During work, “oil was a component of the food rations.” One Ugaritic text hints at “the possibility of foreign trade in oil between Ugarit and other countries” (77, 79, 84, 89).

_Mesopotamia._ This study surveys the mentions of olives in cuneiform documents. Unfortunately, the evidence reveals only a few items I found interesting: “The name of the olive tree and its products occurs in a number of written forms, which seem to vary according to time and place.” “The earliest [written] occurrences of this tree and its products are in the Ebla texts. . . . In the third millennium [B.C.] sources from Mesopotamia proper[,] only scattered allusions to the products of this tree (wood and oil) are found.” “It is common knowledge that the olive tree was not native to Mesopotamia and was never cultivated there.” “Imported olive products may well have been expensive.” “Olive oil was an especially luxurious perfume used, only on a very special occasion,” and a small portion was destined to anoint the king. “There is no evidence for the use of olive oil for industrial purposes, . . . purification or illumination” (92, 94, 95, 97, 100).

_North Africa._ Olive culture may have begun in North Africa soon after the foundation of Carthage by Phoenicians. Most scholars agree that even though “the wild olive . . . is found in North Africa, . . . skills for cultivating the olive as well as the original olive scions . . . came from the East and were culturally transmitted by the Phoenicians or the Greeks.” By the fourth century B.C., Carthage produced enough olive oil to meet its own needs. Soon after the Romans established themselves in Africa, oleoculture was practiced intensively. The Roman scholar Pliny noted that “it is peculiar to Africa that it grafts them (olives) on a wild olive, in a sort of everlasting
sequence.” He was reporting on the Africans’ practice of grafting a new branch when an existing branch grew old. In this way, the same tree would grow for generations. Studies are still being conducted in attempts to determine the extent of the olive trade during the time of the Roman Empire (130, 131, 129, 134).

**Archaeological and Technological Studies.** Interesting new evidence has also come forth from various archaeological studies. For example, many “underground olive presses dating from the Hellenistic period onwards have been found in the Judean Shephelah.” One of them was found “in a large underground room . . . connected to the surface by a stepped passage that enabled easy access and operation.” Another press, found in the Plains of Sharon, was used from “the Late Roman and Byzantine periods, continuing into the Early Arabic period.” Presses were also found at Hirbet Sumaka, “a Jewish settlement from the Roman and Byzantine periods, and at Tel Batash, the biblical Timnah” (137, 149, 157, 243). One study compares oil presses excavated in Western Galilee to those in Judea (197–218). The book provides excellent figures and relates archaeological finds to cultural practices.

The Tel Miqne–Ekron oil industry in seventh-century-B.C. Israel is discussed at length. The 115 oil-press complexes found at ancient Ekron represent more than 30 percent of the total number of Iron Age oil-extraction installations discovered in Israel. Even though only about 2 percent of the site has been excavated, it is evident that the industrial zone took up at least 20 percent of the Stratum IB-C city, the largest olive oil production center found in the Near East (219–42).

Another impressive site is Maresha in Israel. The site has numerous underground caverns, and sixteen oil-pressing plants there have been studied. In its prime during the Hellenistic period, Maresha boasted sixteen olive-oil production facilities and 445 acres of olive groves. Maresha produced oil far in excess of its own needs; archeologists think that the city exported oil to Egypt. During the Roman–Byzantine periods, another famous high-capacity area was the Golan (257, 276, 277, 301).

In the hilly country of Manasseh, over a hundred sites with Iron Age I pottery have been studied to determine the olive economy during the Israelite Settlement period: “Assuming an average yearly crop of 25 kg of olives per tree, this producing 5–10 kg of oil, we arrive at 10–15 trees, on one dunam [1000 square meters, or about one-fourth acre], per household. This is the situation in the traditional Arab village today.” This figure suggests that “31 dunams of olive trees would have sufficed for [a village’s] own consumption.” However, the exchange of oil for other products probably “compelled hill-country villages to double or triple their . . . lands. If we [assume] 100 dunams of olives per village, we arrive at a total area of 3,000 dunams
of such groves in the 11th century B.C.” (308, 310, 311). This considerable amount is another indication that olive culture was very important in ancient Israel.

Conclusion. The evidence in Olive Oil in Antiquity shows that the center of activity for ancient olive culture and production was probably Israel. The findings discussed by the contributors of this book support the botanical references to the olive tree in Jacob 5. Since olive culture has been so important throughout the history of Israel, one can readily understand why some ancient prophets used the olive in their religious analogies.

Objectives and Conclusions of Wine and Oil Production in Antiquity

In Wine and Oil Production in Antiquity in Israel and Other Mediterranean Countries, Rafael Frankel draws his conclusions from “a geographic catalogue of over 3700 [agricultural] installations” for wine and oil production “from over 700 sites in Israel and from a similar number of sites from other countries. They date from the earliest times up to pre-industrial [times]” (back cover). The catalogue itself is provided on a compact disc supplied with the book. With a primary theme of regional diversity, Frankel argues that three aspects of his study are distinctive: “the wide chronological range examined”; “the wide geographical area covered” (which “includes the whole of the Mediterranean Basin and the surrounding countries”); and “the catalogue of installations on which the research is based [which] is not limited to those from clearly dated stratified contexts but includes many undated finds from surveys” (25).


Frankel provides many points of interest. For example, several scholars have indicated that it is “virtually impossible to distinguish between the wood, stones or pollen of the wild and the cultivated olive.” The amount of olive wood found in the archaeological record increased “sharply during the Early Bronze Age [which] suggests [the] beginning of olive cultivation at this period”; however, there is evidence that “olive cultivation almost certainly started before the Early Bronze Age” (36).

Linguistic evidence suggests that olive domestication may have originated in more than one geographical location. For wine, the terms used in the Semitic and Indo-European languages clearly derive from a common
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source. With olive and oil, this is not the case. The Semitic root for oil is similar in Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Akkadian. The same is true for olive. However, in Egyptian and Greek the roots are different from the Semitic and from each other. Frankel also shows evidence for independent olive domestication on Crete, based upon stone size, although some authors question the use of stone size as an indication of domestication (36).

Olives have been grafted since before recorded history. A method which is still practiced in Israel today is to use wild olive saplings taken from the forest as root stock and graft them with scions from a particular tree known to be fruitful. Interestingly, since olive trees live to a great age, the center of the tree trunk may decay and become hollow. Since tree rings cannot be counted, it is difficult to determine a tree’s exact age (37).

The size of ancient olive harvests was not very different from harvests today. “In Galilee today, olives are usually planted at 10 m intervals,” resulting in one hundred trees per hectare. In Greece the density “reaches 120 trees per hectare, in Spain 90, in Italy 85, and in Libya, in desert conditions, only 30. (See fig 3.) The yields of unirrigated olives in Israel today are 800 kg—3 tonnes per hectare or 8–30 kg per tree—although in exceptional cases a
FIG. 3. These olive trees stand on a hillside in the eastern Mediterranean region, a major olive-producing area for centuries. These trees have been planted with room for growth and cultivation. Olives flourish in rocky areas with ample light and adequate moisture. Regular pruning is required, and good orchards are kept free from weeds and trimmings.
tree will give as much as 50 kg.” Experts estimate that in ancient times the yields of olives were “7–30 kg per tree and between 700 kg and 3 tonnes per hectare” (37).

Although today olive oil is used for little other than cooking, the utility of olive oil in antiquity was seemingly endless. Frankel sheds additional light on those uses. In Mesopotamia, in the Hittite culture, and in the Mycenaean world, its main use was “as an unguent or as a basis for the production of perfumes and similar cosmetics.” Perfumed oils are also mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. Other practices involved men anointing “their heads and beards with oil” and women receiving beauty treatments of oil “enriched with myrrh.” Greeks cleansed themselves by applying olive oil to their bodies and then scraping “off the oil, sweat and dust with a special sickle-shaped instrument known as a strigil.” Industrial purposes included textile processing and tanning, the production of soap, and ritual (43, 44).

After oil was separated, a black fluid was left—the lees. Lees were used to fertilize olive trees, “to kill noxious weeds . . . to smear on vines to keep out insects . . . to make an infertile olive [tree] bear fruit,” and “to protect grain from insects and mice.” Lees were also used to soak firewood, to repel moths, to prevent the decay of wood and polish it, and to improve the health of cattle (45–46).

The triad of foods—corn (wheat or grain), wine, and oil—is mentioned eighteen times in the Bible, even though “there are few specific references [to the use of olive] oil as food” (45). One reference to oil as food is in Ezekiel 16:13. Reported miracles indicate oil’s use across socioeconomic classes:

Miracles both of Elijah (1 Kings 17:8–16) and Elishah (2 Kings 4:1–7) are connected to increasing a quantity of olive oil suggesting it to be a valuable product but also showing it to be expected that a simple family would have some oil for food in their home. . . . Limited data suggest that in Iron Age Judaea and Israel and Late Bronze Age Ugarit olive oil was a staple product of importance, although probably not available to the poorest part of the population. (45)

Summary

These two publications sustain many already known insights and also provide new insights into olive culture and use anciently. Much of their information confirms and elucidates details in Jacob 5 and stands behind the comparison of the olive tree to the history of the house of Israel. From such studies, modern readers may apprehend key meanings, especially when understanding such points as the great antiquity of the plant and the prominence of the olive in ancient times; the reference to two different kinds of olive (domesticated and wild) found anciently in different geographic
areas; the practice of domestication through the selection of desirable plants from wild populations of plants; the grafting of wild or nondomesticated plants to give vigor to the domesticated plants; the significance of grafting and pruning even before recorded history; the unlimited life span of the olive tree; the ancient ritual of anointing with olive oil; the widespread use of olive presses of various kinds in diverse geological settings throughout ancient history, indicating how the olive was valued throughout the Mediterranean basin; the suggestion that the center for olive culture and production ancienly was possibly Israel; the integration of olive and olive oil in the ancient cultures of the Mediterranean basin; and the use of olive oil for a variety of important purposes ancienly.
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Establishing the Church Simply

John P. Livingstone

The Church's concern for Native Americans led to the development of guidelines for simplifying curriculum and organization, thereby allowing indigenous priesthood leaders to move the Church forward more quickly and effectively where there are special language or cultural needs. The author, a former district and mission president, explores that development and shares his personal experience with the Church's simplified program.

Fragile ecosystems, such as the sparsely sown Arctic tundra or the delicate deserts of the southwestern United States, require special care and consideration. Visitors can cause significant environmental damage without being aware that their activities are having a long-term impact on the microbes, plants, and animals that have established a habitat over time and developed a calibrated use of scarce resources. Even minimal human activity may result in a significant disturbance to such a sensitive ecosystem. It can tip the balance of resources or cause other damage that requires multiple seasons for restoration.

In numerous areas of the world (including many places in the United States), units of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are human equivalents of such fragile ecosystems. Members of the Church in these areas may suffer from poverty, family separation, and displacement caused by war, racial tensions, or other difficult situations. Under these conditions, some branches have difficulty implementing all the programs of the Church.

Stake and mission leaders in these areas face a significant challenge in training faithful indigenous leaders who understand the delicate nature of their ecosystem and who can move the Church forward at an appropriate pace, offering challenges and setting goals that will best help local members "come unto Christ, and be perfected in him" (Moro. 10:32). Units in such sensitive areas may use a simplified program and curriculum instituted by the Church in the late 1970s. The program was created for use where conditions warrant an increased focus on basic gospel doctrines and on personal and family preparedness issues such as education, health, employment, home storage, resource management, and social, emotional, and spiritual strength.

Missionaries and longtime members need to be aware of this simplified program and curriculum. Otherwise, when visiting, moving into, or serving in small branches adapted to the ecology of the local culture, such
members may misunderstand the directives the local leaders are striving to follow. The gospel spirit in those units will be the same as elsewhere, but manuals and materials as well as a reduced organizational structure may feel strange and unfamiliar. Longtime members may inadvertently create anxiety in the local membership by commenting on the unfamiliar materials. When members from fully established areas wonder aloud why the “regular” priesthood and Relief Society manuals are not being used, they may unwittingly send a message that a local unit somehow does not measure up to what is “normal” in the Church. Newcomers sometimes succeed in supplanting the simplified curriculum in favor of more familiar materials. In some situations, curriculum alternates back and forth over several years as leadership changes.

This article is intended to familiarize Latter-day Saints with the history and background of the development of the Church’s basic program and curriculum and to share my positive experience with their use. As the Church expands—and growth outside the United States and Canada outpaces growth within—the need for basic materials becomes ever more evident.

**Challenges Faced in Fragile Cultures**

As a missionary and later as a mission president, I saw that the realities of life in some cultures create significant challenges for many new members, such as Native Americans and inner-city inhabitants who experience significant poverty due to difficulty integrating into the lifestyle of the majority. For various, and often complex, reasons, many people in these cultures have not experienced consistent school attendance; significant job opportunities, let alone planned career development; or even the practice of scheduling one’s activities with any regularity. Instead, life lurches from one personal challenge or crisis to another. Although problems related to money, education, sexuality, and physical and mental health affect all societies, in fragile cultures such problems are often handled on an emergency basis and in a fragmented way.

When the personal or family money supply dries up and there seems to be no prospect for more, some people are led to desperate acts to obtain the necessities of life. In these exigencies, individuals may lie, steal, or cheat simply to get by. Latter-day Saints living within such a culture understand the problems underlying the misbehaviors of their fellows and frequently are more sympathetic than are outsiders.

I have seen that many people in these trying circumstances have had only limited experience with complex institutions. They tend to see themselves as “little people” with no power or influence relative to businesses, government agencies, or even churches. When they must deal with an institution, they may feel threatened and foolish due to their ignorance of
the structure and function of large concerns and may mask their insecurity with aggression or, conversely, with a blasé demeanor. Bureaucrats often take that posture at face value and respond negatively, further compounding and reinforcing mutual negative impressions.

Family structure is often very loose, with few restrictions relative to sexuality. The paucity of family rules and poor enforcement of laws protecting young adolescents result in early sexual experimentation, exploitation by older teens and adults, and staggering numbers of children born out of wedlock to mothers as young as thirteen years of age. Children bearing children can mean that a mother’s mother assumes a major responsibility toward her grandchildren. Leaving their children in a grandmother’s care for extended periods, young mothers often attempt to escape or at least get a temporary vacation from the responsibilities of parenthood. The problems are compounded when, with some cleverness and swagger, older males prey on the loneliness of these young mothers, often sending them back home pregnant yet again. That individuals in these circumstances turn to drugs, alcohol, and sexual pleasures to try to “medicate” themselves out of despair is well understood by their peers.

Thirty-five-year-old grandmothers, buried in laundry and crying babies, are bewildered and discouraged by such burdensome family responsibilities. Nevertheless, grandmothers and great-grandmothers become the virtual leaders, mentors, and even sages within such societies, attesting to the pithy wisdom gained through hardship. The matriarchal nature of many crumbling societies is not surprising to those familiar with these kinds of conditions.

Men also feel the discouragement of growing up in such conditions and tend to take consolation in sexuality and in self-medicating with drugs and alcohol. Such behavior lowers their feelings of worth and spins the cycle of despair out of control. Rather than seeking safety and refuge within their families, where fathers may be absent and mothers emotionally overwhelmed, these young men frequently band together in gangs for protection and friendship, dreaming up elaborate rituals and extreme dares to prove loyalty to the gang. These groups, large and small, then begin a savage, desperate quest for money, power, and fame by plundering their fellow beings. As they age, some gang members begin to realize for themselves the wretched conditions fueled by their activities but feel trapped by the very bonds created by membership. The feeling of entrapment creates a powerful psychological dissonance and provokes reactions commonly seen in war zones.

These men’s relationships with women become as exploitive as they are medicinal. Incidents of rape are commonplace; it would be difficult, in such circumstances, to find a woman who has not been sexually abused. The resulting feelings of hopelessness and deflated self-worth among
women are undoubtedly telegraphed to offspring, further accelerating the spin of this dismal social cycle. People in these conditions often do not know whether to hang on tighter or simply let go.

Stories of Struggle

Missionaries and leaders from other cultures feel compassion for members caught in circumstances such as those detailed above but usually do not have the personal experience to help them relate to these members’ lives. Two of my sister missionaries learned this lesson at church one day. They were asked at the last moment to teach a Relief Society lesson in an inner-city branch. Trying to present the topic of the worth of souls, they asked the member sisters to offer their feelings regarding their own worth. Both missionaries reeled as the women recounted one story of abuse and struggle after another. “President,” one missionary reported, “I realized we were not at all on the same wavelength as these member sisters when it came to adversity and feelings of low self-esteem. Their life experiences were traumatic beyond anything I have ever been through. I just don’t know how they manage to still carry on in spite of what they have suffered!”

The cases of two individuals* illustrate the depth of need in certain cultures. In such situations, local Church leaders can ease the burdens these people face.

Carlene. Carlene, a sixteen-year-old in inner-city Detroit, argued with her mother over her hairdo before school one day. A “bad hair day” meant Carlene was late for school and very unhappy about her appearance. Her mother finally screamed at her to get out the door and go to school, late or not. Carlene still blames her mother’s unkind and impatient behavior for what happened next.

As Carlene walked down the sidewalk crying, a car full of young men pulled alongside. They “sweet-talked” her, as Carlene put it, into letting them give her a ride to school. She soon realized that these men were not taking her to the high school. In a strange neighborhood in a strange house, the young driver yanked her down bare wooden stairs to a lone mattress on the cement floor of the dank basement. There he raped her. Afterward, the young man said the plan was for all the other men to have her too, but because she was young and beautiful he would protect her from the others. Fearing further violence, Carlene believed that trusting this man was her only choice. He kept his word and became her first “boyfriend.” She felt obligated by his protection and trapped by his continuing threats.

*Names have been changed.
Carlene’s experience with this man was not the end of these kinds of problems. The shame, embarrassment, anger, and loss of self-worth simply compounded her troubles in ways that the young missionaries who knocked on her door years later could not understand. But caring, local priesthood leaders were in position to help with the effects of Carlene’s past. Understanding the context and culture in which Carlene lived greatly helped these leaders meet her needs and challenges; Carlene felt neither misunderstood nor unreasonably judged.

**Harley.** Harley joined the Church as a young father on a Canadian Indian reserve (Canadians prefer this term to *reservations*). Neighborhood friends teased Harley good-naturedly about his joining “a white man’s church,” but often the teasing turned sour, and a smoldering resentment was manifested by some. He also felt the pressure of the missionaries’ expectations that he would become the leader of the Mormons on his reserve. His wife, Anna, had not felt as strongly about the gospel as had Harley, but she was baptized anyway. Every weekend or two, she would go to town with her sisters and drink heavily at the only bar for twenty miles around. While he realized he could not make Anna stop drinking, Harley wished his children did not have to see their mother in such a condition. When she was drunk, Anna would mock him for his beliefs and say cruel things that were meant primarily to diminish the seriousness of her own behavior, but the words rankled. He started to wonder if just joining in with Anna at the bar would bring more peace between them. So Harley broke down and went drinking with Anna and her sisters. Not only did it not help, but Anna chided him for the inconsistency between his professed beliefs and actual behavior. Despite his pain at Anna’s reaction, the fact remained that when he was drinking he could forget the pressures of his new religion. Harley followed a pattern over the next few years of taking the teasing for only so long and then heading to the bar to have the alcohol ease his pain and stress. It would take over twenty years for Harley, with the help of priesthood leaders, to overcome his dependency on the self-medicating effects of alcohol.

Carlene and Harley are but two examples of members who live in fragile ecosystems. Their examples could be multiplied, and the list of member difficulties enlarged considerably. Working alone, these Saints often remain lost in darkness. But with the help of caring, culturally aware priesthood leaders, these members can become strong and steadfast.

**Challenges of Running the Church in a Fragile Environment**

Circumstances and spiritual promptings may dictate that priesthood leadership come from members outside of cultures such as those described above. In my experience, however, outside leadership has often resulted in
cross-cultural misunderstandings. A priesthood leader from a different setting may easily underestimate or misinterpret both the subtleties within a culture and the terrible troubles so familiar to branch members. A non-local leader might not be familiar with government contingencies for inner-city or reservation situations or local regulations and programs such as the one for distributing food stamps. He may also be unaware of scams relative to these programs that a branch president from the local culture would immediately recognize.

Being native to a culture can make a person more effective in counseling and advising other members in that setting. People in every culture have strengths and weaknesses that may not be readily apparent to outsiders. Locals understand the demands and challenges inherent in their own culture, speak the dialect, and understand the motivations of members whose actions would be considered outrageous in another context. Of particular value are those priesthood leaders, whether indigenous or not, who are sensitive to both the culture around them and the promptings of the Spirit.1

At times Church leaders and missionaries from other locales unintentionally offer their love and support in ways that lead to dependency. While people will always respond to unconditional love and acceptance, help that only meets a need rather than teaches a principle ultimately stifles growth. The risks are demonstrated by President Marion G. Romney’s analogy of the flock of seagulls that became dependent on a shrimp fleet and lost the ability to fish for themselves.2 Furthermore, displeasure and even animosities may arise when those who are dependent upon move on to other things. The situation is similar to one from the scriptures:

It was seen that the seemingly good feelings of both the [missionary] and the converts were more pretended than real; for a scene of great confusion and bad feeling ensued—[leader] contending against [leader], and convert against convert; so that all their good feelings one for another, if they ever had any, were entirely lost. (Joseph Smith—History 1:6)

Another challenge arises when leaders desire to implement as much of the full Church program as they can. Sometimes a few members will carry multiple assignments, juggling family, work, and Church activities in an amazing display of devotion and diligence. But such enthusiasm and skill may intimidate new members. Trying to impose the full program of the Church in such cultures before most of the members are ready can result in new members feeling inadequate and unable to meet what they perceive are the Lord’s expectations. The challenge especially affects both members converted from churches that require little or no participation and members who are not familiar with the kind of developed organization and structured interaction prevalent in mature Church units. These feelings of inadequacy may reinforce pressures from former friends who chide or tease converts about joining the Church. New members may begin to
regret the decision to convert. When individuals or families feel they cannot keep up or carry the Church load, the likelihood of inactivity and discouragement increases.

In these situations, the lack of confidence displayed by adult members can frustrate leaders and spur them into giving up on the adults in favor of trying to raise a new generation. It is not at all uncommon for a well-intentioned leader to be more concerned with establishing a Boy Scout troop than with developing an elders quorum.

Faced with these organizational challenges as well as a still-developing understanding of Latter-day Saint doctrine and its application, new members (especially those called to leadership positions) need a program suited to their needs. In response to these needs, the Church has outlined a plan that can be used in developing Church units.

**History of the Simplified Program**

The simplified program now used in many small Church units worldwide was pioneered in the 1970s in response to needs that had long concerned Church leaders. Beginning among native North Americans, this approach now serves the Church in many parts of the world.

Church leaders have always taken an interest in the American Indian peoples, an interest that clearly stems from belief in the Book of Mormon and from the early expansion of the Church into Native American territory. The Church’s first missionary efforts included missions to Natives. Then the westward movement of the Latter-day Saints placed them in close contact with the native peoples of the plains and the intermountain West. In Utah, President Brigham Young adopted a policy of conciliation and kindness toward the Natives.

In the twentieth century, a renewed awareness of the need to establish the Church among the Indians weighed heavily upon several Presidents of the Church. On September 13, 1946, President George Albert Smith asked Spencer W. Kimball (fig. 1), then an Apostle, to “look after the Indians—they are neglected. Take charge and watch after the Indians in all the world.” Elder Kimball organized and headed the Indian Relations Committee, and Golden Buchanan became the first coordinator of Indian affairs. Missionary work received new vigor in 1951, when young missionaries were called to serve among the Indians of the Southwest. (Until 1951 only older missionary couples served on Indian reservations.)

About 1949 the Indian Relations Committee conducted a survey that found that nearly half of the stakes in the Church had Native Americans living within their boundaries. Local committees were then organized to raise members’ awareness of the Indians’ struggles and to help determine how the stakes could best serve Indian people. This effort helped members and
leaders reach out to another culture with which they were generally unfamiliar and paved the way for more formal programs such as the Indian student placement services and Indian seminary.\textsuperscript{8}

Church leaders saw that the materials produced for the whole Church did not always meet the needs of Native American members, whether they lived on or off a reservation. In June 1975, Elder David B. Haight asked Stewart A. Durrant (fig. 2), then executive secretary of the committee over Indian affairs, to begin developing simplified materials for use in the Lamanite branches. In a letter, Elder Haight outlined the program’s priorities: “The Melchizedek Priesthood Handbook is one of the first projects we should tackle along with the Melchizedek Priesthood Study Guide and a companion course for the Relief Society to help strengthen the homes.”\textsuperscript{9}

On November 18, 1975, Elders Boyd K. Packer and David B. Haight called a special meeting to discuss the needs of Native American members. The minutes show leaders’ support of the simplified program and their intention to use it throughout the “developing areas of the world”:

Elder Packer then spoke to the group and said, “President Kimball is restless about the Indian program and does not think enough is being done.” Elder Packer said we need to push the program faster. He encouraged us to continue to refine and work on the overall simplified program for the developing areas of the world. This material can then be used in the struggling Lamanite branches. Elder Packer said [drawing an analogy to the Church’s practice of constructing buildings in five phases, or steps, to suit the size of the branch or ward], “We build a phase building, but we try to put new members in the full five phase program before they understand the first phase.”\textsuperscript{10}
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\caption{Elder Spencer W. Kimball, ca. 1945. Much of Elder Kimball’s Church service during his years as an Apostle centered on assisting Native peoples.}
\end{figure}
In February 1976, the initial draft of a simplified Church program was sent for review to the Church Correlation Committee, and in November the final draft was submitted. After reviewing the program, the committee concluded:

The basic idea is a good one. There seems to be an urgent need for simplified information, organization, and materials pertaining to the Church where there is no organized branch. This proposal is certainly a step in the right direction although it will undoubtedly need to be further refined by the Melchizedek Priesthood Executive Committee so that the documents finally approved could be implemented throughout the world and not only for groups of Lamanites.\textsuperscript{11}

One week later, in a meeting held November 18, 1976, the Council of the Twelve Apostles discussed the simplification program and recorded the following:

**EMERGING LANGUAGE REPORT:** as the Church moves into new lands, the council approved that:

(A) The organizational structure of the Church be simplified beginning with the family as the basic unit. The Church unit[s] should grow towards wards in a systematic process in identifiable stages. These stages could be family, group, small branch, and branch.

(B) Simplified curriculum materials based on the regular Church curriculum, administrative guidebooks, reports, and the **GENERAL HANDBOOK OF INSTRUCTIONS** should be prepared for these units to help new members assimilate gospel principles and practices. This would help them move forward until they are ready to accept the full Church program.

Care should be taken to see that these units do not continue to use the simplified program after they are organized into stakes. This proposal was referred to the First Presidency recommending approval.\textsuperscript{12}

In April 1977, the Council of the Twelve further discussed a simplified reporting system:

**Simplified Reporting System:** The Council approved Elder Boyd K. Packer’s presentation made in last week’s Wednesday Report Meeting concerning the organizational and reporting guidelines for the family, group, and small branches, known as the Simplified Reporting System, to be used by these small groups. The Council recommended that the Leadership and Priesthood Executive Committees work jointly to decide how to implement this new reporting system without further delay or study.\textsuperscript{13}

Then in June 1977, the Council of the Twelve approved a procedure for organizing small new units through appropriate priesthood leadership channels.\textsuperscript{14} What started as a program to help struggling Lamanite branches in the United States was now expanded to include developing areas throughout the world. The experience of working with Native Americans had increased Church leaders’ understanding of how to meet the needs
of unique cultures worldwide. Josiah W. Douglas, a curriculum writer for the simplified program, later reflected:

I'm convinced that when we began to meet the needs of the Lamanitish people and the handicapped people, then we began to meet the needs of the Church in the world. I think they were a catalyst that caused us to evaluate what we were doing. . . . We could only conceive of the Church with a huge primary, a full sized ward, hundreds of people, . . . And I think that working with Lamanite units began to pull us back and say, wait a minute. That's not working. It will not work in these places, it's too complicated. And so we began to try to address their needs, then immediately we began to address the needs in the Philippines and other developing countries.

During the last three decades, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has truly become a worldwide church. Statistics on the growth of the Church outside the United States and Canada between 1970 and 1980 give an idea of the increasing diversity of cultures within the Church during the mid-1970s, when the simplified program was in development. In 1970 there were only 42 stakes headquartered outside the United States and Canada. By the end of 1980, an additional 287 international stakes had been organized. This growing diversity made it necessary to prioritize what materials would be translated first and in what languages. As the Church expanded, it had become economically unfeasible for all the material being produced by the Church in English to be translated and distributed throughout the world.

To create the new, simplified materials, Durrant enlisted the help of Josiah Douglas and Ronald Knighton, who had lived and taught among Lamanite peoples for several years, as well as Wayne B. Lynn, a pioneer in the Indian seminary program. Douglas and Lynn supervised the production of Gospel Principles and the corresponding simplified priesthood and Relief Society manuals. Durrant, who had worked among the Canadian Aboriginal people, supervised the writing of the first guidebooks for family, branch, and priesthood leadership. Others who worked on the project contributed valuable insights from their experiences in the Indian seminary program. The experiences of
these leaders among various Lamanite cultures helped them understand the needs of other cultures within the Church.

The simplified program was ready for field testing by September 1977. The South Dakota Rapid City Mission and the Fargo North Dakota Stake were selected to test the simplified organizational and reporting systems and the simplified curriculum. By 1979 the simplified program was available for use in English-speaking areas; by 1980, in Spanish; and by 1985, in at least fifteen languages total.

The Simplified Program: Phase 1 and Phase 2

Today the simplified program includes a reduced organizational structure, a simplified reporting structure, a reduced curriculum, and simplified manuals. A 1982 pamphlet instructed that the basic unit program be used in the following conditions:

1. In an emerging area of the world.
2. In an area where people are scattered.
3. Where leadership is just beginning to develop.
4. Among minority and cultural groups.

Simplified Organization. The simplified program is designed to accommodate a group as small as a single family, which would meet together without being designated as a branch. A branch may be organized when there are two or more families in the area or in a cultural group (fig. 3).

In a small group, usually there are enough priesthood holders for only a branch president or presidency to be called. The branch presidency may initially be Aaronic Priesthood holders. When there are enough Melchizedek Priesthood holders for a complete branch presidency plus an elders quorum president, the unit may grow from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

Simplified Meeting Schedule. A Phase 1 unit holds a normal-length sacrament meeting (the branch president may bless the sacrament if he is the only priesthood holder). Sunday School is also full-length, but the members may meet in one group. The priesthood and Relief Society meetings last about fifteen minutes and do not include formal lessons. The branch president conducts priesthood meeting. He may simply review home teaching, discuss other branch business, and announce activities. Priesthood meeting is attended by all priesthood and potential priesthood holders. The Relief Society president meets with women, teenage girls, and Primary-age children; during the abbreviated meeting, she might review visiting teaching assignments and discuss business and activities.

In a Phase 2 unit, a full three-hour block of meetings is held. A larger number of Melchizedek Priesthood holders make it possible for the branch presidency to instruct the Aaronic Priesthood young men while the elders
THE FOUR PARTS OF
THE BASIC UNIT PROGRAM

1. Organization
The family is the basic unit of the Church.
Each family should be having individual and
family prayer, holding family home evening,
studying the scriptures, looking after their
temporal and spiritual welfare, and engaging in
missionary and genealogy work.

Prayer
Family home evening
Scripture study
Temporal welfare
Spiritual welfare
Missionary
Genealogy

The Family Guidebook (PBMP0087) has been
prepared to assist families to do these things.

Fig. 3. These pages from an early basic unit program
pamphlet (1982) demonstrate the simpleness of the pro-
gram. Copyright Intellectual Reserve, Inc.
In the Branch Guidebook (PBMP0076) we read: “When there are two or more member families and individuals in an area and at least one of the members is a worthy priest or Melchizedek Priesthood holder, a branch may be organized.”

The branch may begin very simply, with only a branch president who looks after his members using home teaching to encourage families and individuals in their duties.

---

In the beginning the branch may hold only a sacrament meeting.
quorum president instructs the adult men, or the adult men and young men may meet together. A full-length Relief Society meeting is held, and where possible, a Young Women meeting and a Primary meeting are also held. Significant priesthood leadership thus enables branch growth and auxiliary development.

**Simplified Reporting System.** In Phase 1, most reporting may be taken care of by district or stake clerks, or they may have the branch president do what he can. In some cases, the branch president may simply tally attendance and forward donations in their original envelopes to the stake or district president for processing. Leadership capability and experience determine which reports will be completed by branch leaders.

Phase 2 leaders will have more Melchizedek Priesthood holders and will be better able to handle reporting functions. Leaders may be able to take care of donations as well as some membership and activity reports. The availability of computers and men who can operate them determines reporting capacity.

**Simplified Manuals.** The best known of the simplified curriculum materials is the *Gospel Principles* manual being used throughout the Church today. The book was initially written as an elementary reference text to guide early curriculum development but is now used as a course book in Sunday School classes for new members and investigators. Soon after the inception of *Gospel Principles*, a simplified priesthood manual entitled *Duties and Blessings of the Priesthood*, printed in two parts, was produced. Part A is for use one year and Part B the next. The manual offers such straightforward lessons as “Effective Family Leadership” and “Having Fun Together as Families.” *The Latter-day Saint Woman*, Parts A and B, was produced for the Relief Society and Young Women. Lessons, such as “Caring for Our Homes,” “Developing Employment Skills,” and “Effective Family Leadership,” are practical and address the basic needs of members in developing cultures. *Walk in His Ways*, Parts A and B, was written and published for children in basic units. Lessons include “Taking Care of Our Bodies,” “Being Dependable,” and “Forgiving One Another.” These priesthood and auxiliary curriculum materials were prepared between March 1978 and March 1980.²³

**Guidebooks for Leaders.** Both Phase 1 and Phase 2 leaders are guided by a series of four handbooks. The *Family Guidebook* gives instructions for living the gospel within the family and also provides instructions on how to hold worship services as a family when authorized by area, mission, stake, or district priesthood leaders. The *Branch Guidebook* contains instructions on the organization and operation of a branch with only a few or with many members. The *Priesthood Leader’s Guidebook* explains the responsibilities of holders of the Aaronic and Melchizedek Priesthoods, including instructions for ordinances and blessings. The *Teaching Guidebook*
was not part of the original guidebooks but was added more recently (1994); it counsels on ways to be an effective teacher.24

**Rationale.** With the simplified program, local priesthood leaders can lead sooner, without having to spend time learning about and running the full Church program. The leaders are then in place to teach correct doctrine while administering to those in their charge. Building on the foundation of their leaders, new members feel more confident in playing a significant role sooner in their religious life than would be possible if they were dealing with the demands of the full program.

As simplified units grow in size, experience, and leadership, they prepare to step into Phase 3, the Church’s full program. This is the program that the majority of North American members experience in church nearly every Sunday. Bishops in Phase 3 wards usually have about two hundred leaders and teachers to carry out a majority of the programs and classes described in the *Church Handbook of Instructions.*25

**The Program Today.** While the simplified program does not receive special attention today, it is still important to the Church. When new Church curriculum programs went into effect in 1995 and 1998, special instructions were included for Phase 1 and Phase 2 units.26

**Scriptural Basis for Simplification**

The Church has based the simplified program on scripture; for each new principle, instructive scriptural passages are cited in the manuals. For example, the *Priesthood Leader’s Guidebook* cites twenty-three passages in its few pages. The *Branch Guidebook* begins with the Savior’s promise that “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matt. 18:20).

In addition to its educational uses, scripture also serves as the basis for the simplified program itself. In announcing the basic unit program, the Church issued a pamphlet in 1982 that begins with the following quotations:

> And thus did Alma and Amulek go forth, and also many more who had been chosen for the work, to preach the word throughout all the land. And the establishment of the church became general throughout the land, in all the region round about, among all the people of the Nephites. (Alma 16:15)

> And now, behold, I say unto you that you shall go unto the Lamanites and preach my gospel unto them; and inasmuch as they receive thy teachings thou shalt cause my church to be established among them. (D&C 28:8)

Establishing the Church in new areas requires priesthood leadership. Although in the passage below Joseph Smith does not directly address the issue of leadership, he does counsel missionaries to seek out adults:

> And first, it becomes an Elder when he is traveling through the world, warning the inhabitants of the earth to gather together, that they may be built up an holy city unto the Lord, instead of commencing with children, . . .
should commence their labors with parents, or guardians; and their teach-
ings should be such as are calculated to turn the hearts of the fathers to the
children, and the hearts of children to the fathers; and no influence should be
used with children, contrary to the consent of their parents or guardians; but
all such as can be persuaded in a lawful and righteous manner, and with com-
mon consent, we should feel it our duty to influence them to gather with the
people of God. But otherwise let the responsibility rest upon the heads of
parents or guardians.\textsuperscript{27}

The simplified program relies on the strength obtained from converting
people who can become leaders locally.

Building the Church and kingdom of God has been the main endeavor of
the Lord and his servants through the ages. But in the last days, the Lord seems
to follow a particular order that succors those in difficult circumstances:

And also that a feast of fat things might be prepared for the poor; yea, a feast
of fat things, of wine on the lees well refined, that the earth may know that the
mouths of the prophets shall not fail; Yea, a supper of the house of the Lord,
well prepared, unto which all nations shall be invited. First, the rich and the
learned, the wise and the noble; And after that cometh the day of my power;
then shall the poor, the lame, and the blind, and the deaf, come in unto the mar-
riage of the Lamb, and partake of the supper of the Lord, prepared for the great
day to come. Behold, I, the Lord, have spoken it. (D&C 58:8–12)

The phrase "after that cometh the day of my power" is significant
because of its promise concerning "the poor, the lame, and the blind, and
the deaf." A reaching out to the downtrodden and less fortunate was appar-
ently anticipated by the Lord. After the Church was established among
people who had the necessary resources, the gospel could be more easily
spread among those less fortunate. Finding the most efficient means of
teaching the gospel and establishing Church units among these people is
the essence of the simplified program.

Alma carefully organized his little church into branches of a particular
size, an early form of basic Church organization:

And after this manner he did baptize every one that went forth to the place of
Mormon; and they were in number about two hundred and four souls; yea,
and they were baptized in the waters of Mormon, and were filled with the
grace of God. And they were called the church of God, or the church of
Christ, from that time forward. And it came to pass that whosoever was bap-
tized by the power and authority of God was added to his church. And it
came to pass that Alma, having authority from God, ordained priests; even
one priest to every fifty of their number did he ordain to preach unto them,
and to teach them concerning the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.
(Mosiah 18:16–18)

The needs of Alma's people were unusual, so the Church organization in
his day was relatively simple. Alma kept the size of church units to about
fifty members. Leaders were priests. Each was commissioned to preach and
teach the gospel.
Alma also laid down some policies still applicable to small branches. For instance, a simple correlated curriculum effort is encouraged in Mosiah 18:19: “And he commanded them that they should teach nothing save it were the things which he had taught, and which had been spoken by the mouth of the holy prophets.” In other words, Alma wanted doctrines to be taught as they had been received, without adulteration.

In addition, Alma regulated which doctrines were to be taught initially: “Yea, even he commanded them that they should preach nothing save it were repentance and faith on the Lord, who had redeemed his people” (Mosiah 18:20). Paul and Joseph Smith both taught it was better to keep things simple at first: “I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able [to bear it], neither yet now are ye able” (1 Cor. 3:2). “For they cannot bear meat now, but milk they must receive; wherefore, they must not know these things, lest they perish” (D&C 19:22).

Sensitive to the potential difficulties of social proximity in small branches, Alma enjoined members to eliminate contention, be unified, teach each other, and keep the Sabbath day holy:

And he commanded them that there should be no contention one with another, but that they should look forward with one eye, having one faith and one baptism, having their hearts knit together in unity and in love one towards another. And thus he commanded them to preach. And thus they became the children of God. And he commanded them that they should observe the sabbath day, and keep it holy, and also every day they should give thanks to the Lord their God. (Mosiah 18:21–23)

The success of these little branches is shown in the last verse of chapter 18, where we are told the growth reached “in number about four hundred and fifty souls” (Mosiah 18:35).

Personal Experiences and Case Studies

The simplified program lies close to my heart, as I have seen it bless those over whom I have had stewardship. In my younger years, I longed for such a program. I served as a missionary in the Southwest Indian Mission from September 1969 to September 1971. I learned to love the Navajo people and the difficult Navajo language. The people’s gentle, humble ways and slower pace of life were new and interesting to me. Over time, I found that it was relatively easy for the people to understand the foundation principles of the gospel, but it was not so easy to establish the Church in their culture. Institutional complexity seemed to run counter to their ways. The investigators we brought to the baptismal font were sincere, repentant, and ready to make covenants with God. After a few weeks of attending church, however, many of these new Navajo-speaking converts would slowly drift
away and fall back into old habits. They went back to smoking and drinking, almost as if they had never joined the Church in the first place. I felt discouraged and frustrated to see this cycle of inactivity repeated time and again.

The Anglo educators and business people who made up the leadership of many reservation branches spoke only English. Of course, the language difference was a major concern, but an even greater concern was the dearth of Navajo priesthood leaders. We missionaries imagined that Native leaders could eliminate the cultural differences not only by conducting church meetings in their native tongue but also by leading their people and setting an example.

After returning to my home in Canada, I received permission to visit my younger brother in his mission, the Northern Indian Mission, which covered most of Montana as well as North and South Dakota. I wanted to see if he and his fellow missionaries wrestled with similar problems in establishing the Church on the Indian reservations of the northern United States. Though with them for only two days, I could see that they were struggling with many of the same organizational and leadership issues. I wondered if these challenges could ever be met and overcome.

A few months later, I was invited to join the Church Educational System and coordinate the Indian seminary program in Saskatchewan, the breadbasket province of the Canadian prairies. An up-close view of a significant endeavor to establish the Church among Native Canadians was at hand.

The Fort Qu'Appelle Saskatchewan District. I was twenty-seven years old when on March 12, 1978, the Fort Qu'Appelle Saskatchewan District was created in the Canada Winnipeg Mission. It included all of the Native Canadian Indian reserves in the southern part of the province. Only six branches had been organized on those reserves, all of which had previously been part of the South Saskatchewan District. I was called as district president, and two young Native men were called as counselors. I was frightened, as the calling seemed fraught with challenges. Alcoholism rates among Natives in Canada were very high at the time. The resulting personal and familial problems seemed insurmountable. The cross-cultural challenges inherent in efforts to establish the Church among Native people were, from my own experience, obvious.

Our district had few indigenous leaders. When I had first arrived in the Province of Saskatchewan, there were only two Native branches, both part of the South Saskatchewan District. The Carry the Kettle Branch and the Piapot Branch were located on the Indian reserves of the same names in the southern part of Saskatchewan. One Indian man, John Haywahe (fig. 4), served in the branch presidency of the Carry the Kettle Branch. He was the only
Native man serving in any leadership position at the time. In branches in the city of Regina, perhaps four or five Natives attended Church regularly.

Full-time missionaries taught seminary lessons to children in homes or in small, improvised church buildings on the Saskatchewan reserves (figs. 5, 6). Senior men on missions with their wives usually served as branch presidents. All the missionaries were new to what Canadians call “First Nations” culture and had a hard time understanding why people did things the way they did. Missionaries were caught off guard by certain customs, such as clasping instead of shaking hands and not looking people in the eye while talking with them. Missionaries were surprised to see women walk down a road several paces behind their husbands. More seriously, the social acceptance of wife beating was incomprehensible to the missionaries.
Although the missionaries truly loved the people, they had difficulty relating to the personal and familial problems of reserve members. Most Native members spoke English well, so in this case language was not an issue. But the lack of indigenous, local priesthood leaders was as serious a drawback as it had been among Natives in Arizona and Montana.

Faced with these circumstances, I wrestled during the days prior to our first presidency meeting with the problem of how we might make church meetings more attractive to Native people without compromising doctrine or principle. Could we get more men into leadership? I marveled that we had so many children involved in the Indian seminary and Indian placement programs and yet so few parents seemed interested in attending church. While these programs were significant for youth, they were not the priesthood quorums the Church needed, nor did they directly contribute to organizing Church units among Native Canadian people. How could we focus more on parents without neglecting the children? How could we help the senior missionary couples understand and assist the people better?

The first meeting with my new counselors was a freewheeling affair with wide-open discussion on how we might organize the district to maximize blessings to local members.

![Fig. 5. This converted gasoline station was purchased for the Native branch near the Cote Reserve in eastern Saskatchewan. Small buildings such as this one are often used when branches are just becoming established. Photographed 1978.](image)

![Fig. 6. Small trailer chapels such as this one near the File Hills Reserves in Saskatchewan give small branches their own building. Photographed 1978.](image)
My counselors expressed their mixed feelings about the Indian placement program and Indian seminary as well as the inferiority many Natives felt in their minority status. They commented on the need to provide specific training for various aspects of leadership for men and on how to use the people’s practical knowledge and ability to improve difficult situations. A feeling of unity evolved during the presidency meeting, and I felt that we were ready to serve although we were clearly in need of additional direction and guidance.

We planned our first district conference, unsure if many would come. We were touched and exhilarated when close to two hundred attended. Talks focused on strengthening the individual, the family, and the Church. We felt the strength of these Native people. Besides the missionaries and my family, only one other non-Native belonged to the district—the district clerk. (See fig. 7 for a photograph of one of the district conferences.)

Canada Winnipeg Mission President Howard L. Lund was concerned about having called us, young as we were, to the district presidency. He began to scout for materials and programs from Church headquarters that might be of value to the district. Only a few months passed before President Lund introduced us to Stewart A. Durrant, secretary to the Church Lamanite Committee. Durrant presented us with material and ideas that we felt were inspiringly revolutionary.
Durrant described a program that had been developed and approved by general Church leadership and was then called the basic unit program. Still in its infancy, the program was a simplified version of organization, manuals, and reports that would allow inexperienced priesthood leaders and members to function at a pace and level that were more comfortable and appropriate to their situation. He showed us a series of pamphlet-style guidebooks that outlined how a family, a group, or a small branch could administer the Church in a way that was reduced and streamlined compared to established wards and stakes. The guidebooks prescribed basics that were simple enough for a person with little or no Church experience to grasp. For example, the materials taught leaders how to conduct a meeting, how to prepare an agenda, and how to call someone to a Church position. The program was strikingly practical.

As a district presidency, we were thrilled. Each of us agreed that the basic unit program was an answer to our prayers and exactly what we needed. We could now establish the Church among these First Nations peoples. They would now have their own leaders holding priesthood keys to use on behalf of their own people.

A wonderful opportunity to put the program into place existed among Natives in Regina due to the presence of a faithful Native brother. Earl Stevenson (see fig. 4) was in his early sixties and worked as a custodian at the post office building in Regina. He had attended church regularly for many years, usually sitting by himself or with his son, whom he was raising alone. He was at that time quietly serving in the Sunday School superintendency of the Regina First Branch, where he carried out his duties with a singular dignity. Earl’s spiritual strength and love for his people qualified him to lead.

In our youthful enthusiasm, we recommended to the mission president that we immediately organize a Lamanite branch in Regina, the capital city of the Province of Saskatchewan. While only a handful of First Nations people actually came to church in Regina, we felt that if an indigenous branch president were called and a unit organized according to the basic unit program, the people themselves would see this as their branch run by their leaders. We were aware of the risk that such a move might foster a unit built solely upon social or cultural factors rather than testimony and priesthood keys, but the potential for growth through such ownership outweighed that risk. We hoped that our sensitivity to possible problems would enable us to minimize them.

We called Earl as president of the new Regina Lamanite Branch, a Phase 1 unit since a sole experienced priesthood holder cannot run a full-program ward by himself. A few more than a handful of Native people were there the first Sunday. Next time there were more. Within a year, over one
hundred people were seated in the Native branch each Sunday. While the communication of the Spirit knows no cultural barriers, the Natives' ability to participate comfortably in Church programs had sometimes been hindered by cultural obstacles. With President Stevenson and other Natives leading the branch, those obstacles seemed to be removed. The youthful counselors learned leadership skills by watching and listening to what he had to say in their branch presidency and other meetings.

President Stevenson could say things to the members that other, non-local leaders could not: "You people need to teach your children to be reverent at home. Then they will be reverent here!" I swallowed hard when I heard him being so direct, but he was right. Everyone knew he was right and loved him for his directness. When he asked members to serve in a calling or to perform some duty, they felt it was a request directly from God, not just from Earl Stevenson.

As attendance rose, tithing faithfulness climbed. In short order, this fledgling branch became the most effective Native Canadian or American Indian branch I had ever seen. The simplified program allowed President Earl Stevenson to serve his people as they had never before been served.

I was district president for only one year. In response to the Church's guidelines that minority units should have minority leadership, a Native man who was my first counselor, Christopher J. C. LaFontaine (see fig. 4), was then called as the district president. President LaFontaine understood the challenges of Church leadership and now had a foundation in Church government gained from the simplified manuals and guidebooks as well as his own leadership experience. Even though he had been a member only three years, he was fully able to handle all aspects of the district and was able to interact with neighboring stake leaders on all matters of business affecting the district.

By the time I was transferred from Saskatchewan, there were nine active Melchizedek Priesthood holders in the district and several others holding the lesser priesthood. Average attendance had risen to over 30 percent of the potential (fig. 8); the increase seemed
considerable to us, since the rate was less than 10 percent when we were called. Tithing faithfulness resulted in donations that were over ten times what they had been when the district was organized. The district has used the simplified program in its branches to this day. I was grateful for the opportunity to become acquainted with the program, for I would have another experience in its implementation years later.

The Detroit Michigan District. In 1995, I was called as president of the Michigan Detroit Mission. There were nine branches in inner-city Detroit, where the population is primarily African American. The Bloomfield Hills Michigan Stake had seven of these minority branches, and the Westland Michigan Stake had two. Here, as in Regina twenty years earlier, most of the leadership was not indigenous. Men from the suburbs served as branch presidents in several city branches, and stake high councilors were assigned to supervise and visit the branches on their regular monthly rotation. Stake priesthood and auxiliary leaders did their best to include branch members in stake programs and activities. From the Bloomfield Hills Stake, a “sister ward” was assigned to each branch. The sister wards helped with rides to church meetings, home teaching appointments, and branch activities.

Although stake leaders did all they could to be helpful, most were unfamiliar with inner-city life. They recognized that minority priesthood leaders would be better able to assist members and conduct Church affairs in a manner appropriate to local circumstances. We in the mission presidency concurred and implemented strategies to increase the number of men contacted and converted by missionaries. All missionary elders were encouraged to avoid teaching single women alone in their homes. The elders were instructed to ask these women if they knew of a man who would listen to the gospel message with them. Missionaries were also asked to seek out men who would listen to the discussions—especially those who were married and who had jobs and cars. We wanted them to find stable men who could be called as priesthood leaders, help with transportation to church, and portray good examples of family life.

As in Regina, the creation of a new district was instrumental in establishing the Church among a people. Elder Donald L. Staheli of the North America Northeast Area Presidency created the Detroit Michigan District on Saturday, August 23, 1997. This district covered all of the city of Detroit, pulling nine minority branches into one district. The boundaries of the new district, Eight Mile Road to the north and Telegraph Road to the west, are recognized as distinct racial borders as well.

Meeting with Elder Staheli, my counselors and I outlined our ideas regarding the use of indigenous priesthood leaders. We also indicated our
desire to have the new district implement the Phase 1 and Phase 2 program. Elder Staheli was receptive to these suggestions, and the resulting organization was a district presidency with a nonlocal district president and two counselors from the inner-city area. Elder Staheli felt impressed that the district needed the guidance that an experienced nonlocal district president could provide: this leader’s term could be shorter than normal but long enough to adequately train an indigenous successor.

The next day, Gordon Creer, a commercial real-estate salesman and member of the Bloomfield Hills Stake, was sustained as the first president of the Detroit district. Lamenais Louis, an auto worker originally from Haiti, and Solomon Bills, a Detroit City policeman and former branch president of the Belle Isle Branch on the east side of the city, were called as counselors.

Initially, some members of the new district were concerned that the district was created on a racial rather than geographical basis. But in time it became obvious to local members that the branches belonged together geographically, making it possible for local members to serve as leaders. Within five months, all branches but one were presided over by local members.

Some district members were apprehensive about breaking their ties with the outlying stakes. For example, leaders worried that, without the rides provided by the sister wards, some branch members would not make it to church meetings. However, such fears were short-lived. Members continued to attend because many members with automobiles began to pick up fellow branch members for church.

On May 28, 2000, less than three years after the district’s creation, President Creer was released, and President Lamienais Louis became the first Black district president in Detroit. Lamenais Louis did not join the Church until 1994, though his wife, Suzette, had listened to the missionaries and joined seven years earlier. He had been active in Solomon’s Temple, a large congregation of the Apostolic Church, but he finally followed his wife into the LDS Church. Not long after baptism, Lamenais began to receive callings, including one to serve in the branch presidency under M. W. Keil. As a counselor, Lamenais learned to conduct meetings and issue callings and releases. The Louises were sealed in the Toronto Temple a year after Lamenais’s baptism. Just two years later, Lamenais was called as a counselor to President Creer. Because of the simplified organization used in the district, President Louis was able to take on heavy responsibility early in his Church membership. In 1999 the Louises attended the dedication of the Detroit Michigan Temple with their son Gregoire W. Eugene-Louis (plate 1). Shortly afterward, Gregoire was one of the first three individuals (all of whom were preparing to leave for missions) to receive their endowments in the newly dedicated temple.
President Louis's story is not unique. I saw many local members (figs. 9, 10, 11) take control of their branches and serve as leaders and teachers. With a simplified organization and curriculum, these members did not have to spend much time learning to run the programs of the Church. Furthermore, the local leaders counseled about dealing with shootings, physical attacks, drug abuse, and other such topics. Teachers' lessons reflected the reality that a majority of Detroit households are headed by single mothers. Single mothers helped each other struggle to raise children in the Church without alienating the children from their fathers. Branch members understood the temptation a woman faced when a former lover returned and also understood the ramifications of inner-city poverty.

As these Saints taught the doctrines of the Church to each other, their attitudes about their circumstances changed. They learned they could follow a budget and pay their tithing. Aided by teachers and friends, they were no longer overwhelmed with teaching righteous values to their children.

One new convert I admired was particularly enthusiastic about her membership. But the first thing I noticed about Leticia* was her missing

---

*Name has been changed.
front teeth. She said that her abusive ex-husband knocked them out and that the missing teeth and extra weight she put on were useful deterrents to the sexual predators who were prevalent in her neighborhood. When the missionaries knocked on her door, Leticia was fixing up an abandoned house; she had been given a quit claim on the property. The water, power, and gas had been turned off and would not be restored until the house was brought up to city code. The missionaries were awed by this single mother who took hammer and crowbar to the walls of her house and replaced the plaster and lathe with new insulation and drywall.

Leticia had moved from Ohio (where she lost her teeth) into the Hamtramck area of Detroit. She had raised her five children to stay out of trouble, and four of them were doing just that. Her firm hand and stern voice did not have the desired effect on one of her sons, and his misbehavior had cost Leticia her home-based business in Ohio. Detroit had looked like greener pasture.

Leticia was captivated by the message delivered by the elders. She admired those young white men, who called themselves missionaries of the Lord and freely rode bikes in places even the Detroit police feared to tread. If they could take such effort, paying their own way, to come to her, surely she could come to the Lord with the same effort and faith. As she studied the scriptures and met with the missionaries, the truth of the gospel struck her with increasing force, and she enthusiastically received baptism. When she found the members struggling to sustain the branch, she wanted to help. The simpleness of the program made it easy for Leticia to contribute in significant ways, such as teaching Relief Society and Primary lessons. Soon she was serving in leadership positions in those organizations. The more she...
served, the better she felt, and before long, Leticia was one of the branch's stalwarts. Leticia's countenance changed; she now radiates a new softness and dignified confidence. She has a vision of where she is going and why. She wants more than the appearance of living the gospel; she wants to really live it. She wants her children to live it. One by one, they have begun to listen to their mother's encouraging words. Her older sons are still skeptical, but Leticia persists. "Three down, two to go," she says.

Membership in the Church brought Leticia unexpected benefits. A priesthood leader's referral resulted in new employment. A dentist in a neighboring stake was asked to help district members with their dental needs. He responded with enthusiasm and kindness, and Leticia has front teeth again. But she is still working on the house.

Conclusion

North American Church units are currently the leadership, finance, and missionary engines of the Church. Truly, the Book of Mormon
reminds us, North America has been a choice land, blessed by the Lord to
be a sort of neonatal incubator for his fledgling kingdom. However, in
many ways, the Church of Joseph Smith’s day or Brigham Young’s day or
even Heber J. Grant’s day was significantly different from the Phase 3 pro-
gram we enjoy today.30

Even so, it seems only natural that missionaries and expatriate mem-
ers from Phase 3 wards would try to organize Church units in challenging
cultures and developing countries by following the pattern with which
these members are so familiar. Perhaps they want to share the happiness
and success they have experienced. But rather than trying to customize the
Phase 3 organization and curriculum for special circumstances, seasoned
members can apply the approved, Church-correlated simplified program.
Members and missionaries familiar with the Phase 1 and Phase 2 pro-
gram are in a better position to assist in the establishment of the Church
both at home and abroad. And a new unit’s dependency upon missionary
couples, expatriates, or a lone experienced member can be greatly allevi-
ated by following the approved Phase 1 and Phase 2 program.

Starting simply and then building on that foundation can greatly
reduce the time required for new members and leaders to learn the system
and their place in it (fig. 12), for learning comes more naturally then than
it does through a premature imposition of a Phase 3 model. And under the
direction of area or mission leadership, new members and recently con-
verted priesthood leaders need not shoulder responsibilities greater than
those appropriate to local circumstances.

The success in the Detroit Michigan District offers dramatic evidence
of the wisdom and power of gradually growing toward ecclesiastical matu-


rity via the simplified program of the Church. In 1980, President Spencer W.
Kimball noted that “the basic unit program has been developed to assist
where there are special language or cultural needs. . . . Couples can be
trained in the basic unit program and can then assist in establishing the
Church among all people in all lands.” He urged “priesthood leaders to
become familiar with this program and use it to bless people.” His support
of the simplified Church organization and materials was based on the posi-
tive results of their use. “Where the program is being used as outlined,” he
reported, “we are meeting with great success.”31 Indeed, the Church pro-
gram of multiple phases seems to be a fulfillment of the Lord’s promise,
“Behold, I will hasten my work in its time” (D&C 88:73).
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2. Marion G. Romney, “The Celestial Nature of Self-Reliance,” *Ensign* 12 (November 1982): 91. Sometimes the situation is complicated. For example, an article on the Church in Ukraine quotes a mission president who felt that “the best thing that can happen is for the Americans to get out so it can be seen as a Ukrainian church.” But a Ukrainian woman quoted in the same article expressed her feeling that “when the [North American] missionaries are there, I feel the Holy Spirit. When they are not, I don’t. Church leadership should have been left in the hands of the missionaries—it was given away too soon!” Tania Rands, “Mormonism in a Post-Soviet Society: Notes from Ukraine,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 30 (spring 1997): 82, 85.


**Fig. 12.** In the simplified program, new members are able to quickly assume positions of leadership. Here Fred Spotted Bull, center, a member from the Blood band near Cardston, Alberta, makes a comment in a small-unit leadership meeting in 1980.
4. President Young advised:

I do not know that you have hitherto met with any difficulty from the Indians on your journey. You have heard of Indian hostilities against the whites on the western route, but you will have no trouble with them if you will do right. I have always told the travelling public that it is much cheaper to feed the Indians than to fight them. Give them a little bread and meat, a little sugar, a little tobacco, or a little of anything you have which will conciliate their feelings and make them your friends. It is better to do this than to make them your enemies. By pursuing this policy you may escape all trouble from that quarter, while you are journeying on the Pacific slope. (Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. [Liverpool: F. D. Richards, 1855–86], 10:231–32, July 8, 1863)


Then one morning in 1946, the Prophet of the Lord called me into his office and asked me to give leadership to a committee of the brethren to see that the gospel was carried to all the children of Lehi, not only to those close by but to those all over the world, including the islands of the sea. An hour or two later, as the Presidency and Council of the Twelve sat in regular session in the temple, the President of the Church referred to it again: “The church is so large now,” he said, “our missionary field is extending, too. It is not just Europe and the United States, but other parts of the world. . . . I was talking with one of the brethren this morning in regard to the Indians, and I feel that the work of disseminating the gospel among the Indians is one of the most important things we have to do—not only to the Indians close to us, but all over the world, in the islands of the sea, and elsewhere. That is going to take more time than it has taken before. We must find people who are willing to go and make the sacrifice.” (Excerpts from remarks of President George Albert Smith in meeting with Council of the Twelve and Presidency, September 13, 1946, in Spencer W. Kimball, “Lamanite Prophecies Fulfilled,” *Speeches of the Year* [Provo, Utah: Extension Publications, Brigham Young University, April 13, 1965], 4)

6. The committee was called by several other names, among them Indian Committee, Lamanite Committee, Lamanite and Minority Committee, and Minorities Committee. Several General Authorities served as coordinators until January 1962, when Dean L. Larsen became the secretary to the Indian Committee. He served until August 1, 1966, when Stewart A. Durrant was called. In 1968, Brother Durrant’s title was changed to Coordinator of Lamanites and Other Cultures. On February 2, 1971, the entire committee was released and coordination of efforts among Natives fell to LDS Social Services. In 1973 responsibility was shifted to the office of the Council of the Twelve; in July 1975, the Melchizedek Priesthood Department took responsibility for Lamanites and other minority cultures in America. Elders LeGrand Richards and Boyd K. Packer became advisers in May 1976. Stewart A. Durrant, James Moyle Oral History Program, interview conducted by Richard L. Jensen, June 8, 1983, 29, Church Archives, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.

7. Stewart A. Durrant, “Brief History of Indian Committee and Related Programs,” typescript, no date, copy in author’s possession.
8. Church leaders were concerned with the education and the development of more than American Indians:

Not only the southwest Indians, but Lamanites in general, are facing an open door to education, culture, refinement, progress, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. The Church has spent its millions in Hawaii and New Zealand and other islands to provide schools for the young Lehiites. Surely, no descendants need go now without an education, and schools in Mexico will be followed by schools in other nations. Surely the number of deprived ones is being reduced, and opportunity is knocking at their door. Hundreds of Lamanites are serving in mission fields in both Americas and in the islands of the sea. Lamanites are exercising their priesthood and rearing their families in righteousness. A new world is open to them, and they are grasping the opportunities. God bless the Lamanites and hasten the day of their total emancipation from the thralldom of their yesterday. (Spencer W. Kimball, The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball: Twelfth President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. Edward L. Kimball [Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982], 618–19)

For more on the Indian seminary program, the special curriculum developed for Native American students kindergarten through high school and designed as a supplement to their regular school day in public school, see William E. Berrett, A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Printing Center, 1988). For more on the Indian student placement services, which places Native students with Latter-day Saint host families during the school year, see Genevieve de Hoyos, “Indian Student Placement Services,” in Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 2:679–80.

10. Elder David B. Haight, Memorandum to Stewart A. Durrant, June 4, 1975; copy in author’s possession.
11. Stewart A. Durrant was given the minutes of this meeting and other meetings on this subject that followed, which he later shared in an interview. Durrant, oral history interview, 29.
12. As quoted in Durrant, oral history interview, 30.
14. On June 16, 1977, the Council of the Twelve determined the following organizational procedures:

PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING SMALL UNITS: The Minorities Committee presented the proposed procedure for establishing groups or small branches in stakes and/or missions which must be approved by the Area Supervisor and Regional Representative. This proposal has Correlation’s approval. This document will be presented to Zone Advisors and Area Supervisors in a special training meeting on June 25. (Council of the Twelve Minutes, as cited in Durrant, oral history interview, 31)

15. For example, President Kimball said, “‘Many challenges face all of us as we fellowship and teach the gospel to the cultural and minority groups living in our midst… When special attention of some kind is not provided for these people, we lose them.’” “Aid Minorities, Pres. Kimball Asks Leaders,” Church News, published by Deseret News, October 11, 1980, 4.


At this same time period (late 1970s through 1980s), the Church produced simplified hymn accompaniments, easing the burden of pianists and organists with limited musical experience. See Messages to Stake/Mission/District Presidents/Bishops and Branch Presidents from Church Headquarters, no. 34 (May 25, 1979), copy in Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah. Such modifications are evidence of the Church’s desire to make many aspects of the Church program accessible to more people.

21. Basic Unit Program (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1982), 1. Language and cultural differences are not necessarily determined by nationality or ethnicity. As Stewart A. Durrant pointed out, other factors can contribute to differences in culture: “I just last week returned from a deaf conference,” he said, “where probably 500 people were gathered together in Southern California, because that culture, the deaf culture[,] loves to be together. That is a separate, distinct culture, even though it’s not a nationality.” Durrant, oral history interview, 17.

22. Branch Guidebook (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1993), 1.

23. Gospel Principles (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979); Duties and Blessings of the Priesthood: Basic Manual for Priesthood Holders, Parts A and B (Salt Lake City: Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979); The Latter-day Saint Woman: Basic Manual for Women, Parts A and B (Salt Lake City: Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979); Walk in His Ways: Basic Children’s Manual, Parts A and B (Salt Lake City: Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979). For an example of matching curriculum to Native culture, see Jessie L. Embry, “Lamanite Relief Societies: The Relief Society and Its Relationship with Native Americans” (paper presented at the sesquicentennial Relief Society celebration, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1992).

24. Family Guidebook (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977); Branch Guidebook (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977); Priesthood Leader’s Guidebook (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977); Teaching Guidebook (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994).

25. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Church Handbook of Instructions (Salt Lake City: Intellectual Reserve, 1998). The Church Handbook of Instructions is printed in two parts: Book 1 is addressed to stake presidents and bishops; Book 2 is addressed to priesthood and auxiliary leaders.


28. In his article "Taking the Church Anywhere," Marvin K. Gardner reported that the First Presidency’s letter of October 10, 1980, was accompanied by these instructions: “Do not use Anglo leadership in minority units.” Ensign 11 (June 1981): 44.

29. This statement is attributed to Officer Knox, president of the Palmer Park Branch, Detroit Michigan District.


31. Spencer W. Kimball, “Ministering to the Needs of Members,” Ensign 10 (November 1980): 46; italics in original. The availability of Spanish-language basic unit curriculum materials was announced in a Church bulletin in November 1980. “Materials Management,” Bulletin, no. 5 (November 1980): [4], LDS Church Archives. For discussions on how the plan was implemented in Spanish and Asian-American cultures, see Jessie L. Embry, “In His Own Language”: Mormon Spanish Speaking Congregations (Provo, Utah: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, 1997), 63; and Jessie L. Embry, Asian American Mormons: Bridging Cultures (Provo, Utah: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, Brigham Young University, 1999), 68.
Twentieth-Century

Created by Julia Parkinson

Key

- Church Population
- Total Temples Announced & Operating
- Total Temples Operating

Operating Temples in:
- Canada, U.S.A.
- Mexico, Central & South America
- Europe
- Asia
- Islands
- Africa

Darker shades in 2000 indicate small temples

Number of Temples • Church Population (by 100,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (at January 1)</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Darker shades in 2000 indicate small temples.

A Jewel in the Gardens of Paradise

The Art and Architecture of the Hawai‘i Temple

Paul L. Anderson

For seventy years, the Hawai‘i Temple (now called the La‘ie Hawai‘i Temple) has stood like a timeless vision of paradise, white and gleaming between emerald mountains and a sapphire sea. Some visitors have seen in its noble form and lush gardens a resemblance to the Taj Mahal or some wonder of the ancient world. However, my own reaction upon approaching the temple for the first time was surprise. My lifelong familiarity with the building had come from handsome and exotic color photographs in Church magazines, and I was amazed to discover how much smaller the temple is than I had imagined.

This dismay at the diminutive size of the structure is completely appropriate. The temple is small. Before the additions of recent years, it was even smaller—a tiny pearl in a vast tropical setting. The building’s size makes its architectural presence all the more remarkable (fig. 1). The architects, builders, gardeners, and artists somehow managed to endow this structure with an aura of dignity and grandeur that transcends its modest dimensions to express its greater symbolic and spiritual importance. A comparison with the Provo Utah Temple illustrates the success of this building in appearing larger than life. Although the two buildings seem similar in size when seen from afar, the Hawai‘i Temple as originally constructed is only one-tenth as large.

For those of us interested in how sacred places are created—places with a feeling of holiness and significance—the Hawai‘i Temple has valuable lessons to teach. The story of the creation of this evocative building is fascinating and at times surprising. The characters in this story span virtually the whole sweep of Mormon history. When President Joseph F. Smith proposed its construction, he was approaching his eightieth birthday. Some of the designers and artists he called upon to realize his vision were young enough to be his great-grandchildren. The prophet—born in Missouri, raised in Nauvoo, orphaned by the martyrdom at Carthage, and matured on the trail to Utah—employed people on this project who would live through the 1980s.
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Although the Hawai‘i Temple had its beginnings in 1915, many of the basic concepts that would shape its form antedate it by several decades. When the temple was proposed to the membership of the Church in the October 1915 general conference, there were only four functioning temples in the Church. All were in Utah, and all had been initiated by Brigham Young. These structures were arguably the finest artistic achievements of Mormon pioneer times. Despite poverty, isolation, and persecution, the Latter-day Saints had built magnificent monuments of their faith and perseverance. The massive stone walls and graceful towers evoked both the strength of castles and the aspiration of cathedrals, two popular images in nineteenth-century European and American architecture. Their interiors gave literal form to the phrase “House of the Lord;” with rooms decorated like the great halls of a royal palace.

All of these buildings had been originally planned as “meetinghouse temples,” composed principally of large meeting rooms, one above the other. In the late 1870s, however, shortly after Brigham Young’s death, there was a major change in temple planning. Church leaders decided to replace the lower of the two assembly rooms with a series of impressive ordinance rooms for the presentation of the endowment. Worshipers would move through five rooms during the ceremony, some of which
were ornamented with murals providing appropriate settings for various parts of the sacred rituals. The exteriors of the buildings, which had already been designed when the new interior plan was adopted, did not reveal this more complicated arrangement. The rows of windows and moldings continued to imply that the temples were composed of two large rooms, much like the earliest temples at Kirtland and Nauvoo.

The Salt Lake Temple, the first of those four Utah temples to be started, was the last to be finished forty years later in 1893. Its completion coincided with the end of an era in Church history: the passing of the founding generation of pioneers and leaders, the virtual closing of the frontier, the official discontinuation of plural marriage, and the emergence of Utah from isolation to statehood. In the two decades that followed, as Utah and the Church entered the American cultural mainstream, Latter-day Saint architecture reflected an attempt to define an acceptable and progressive image for the Church in this very different world. Meetinghouses appeared with elements taken from a wide variety of styles, ranging from Gothic towers and Byzantine arches to Greek columns and Renaissance domes. On the block next to Temple Square, work began on a complex of administration buildings clothed in fashionable corporate classicism, as respectable as a government and solid as a bank.

A New Style of Architecture

In 1912, during this period of renewed confidence and prosperity, Church leaders announced plans to build a new temple, the first in thirty-five years, to stand in Alberta, Canada. For the design of the first temple in the new century, they held an architectural competition to seek the advice of the leading architects of the Church. Of the fourteen architectural firms originally involved, only seven actually turned in drawings in December 1912. These drawings, submitted anonymously to ensure fairness in judging, were put on public display in the new Bishop’s Building. The First Presidency and the Presiding Bishopric announced the winner in the Deseret Evening News of January 1, 1913. They passed over several pinnacled miniatures of the Salt Lake Temple to choose a daringly modern design by two young Salt Lake architects: Hyrum Pope, a thirty-two-year-old German immigrant, and Harold Burton, just twenty-five years old and a Salt Lake City–born son of English immigrants. The architects’ partnership was three years old at the time, and this was their first major commission.

Pope and Burton’s design for the Canadian temple was a new architectural concept. Church leaders, seeking to avoid needless expense, had recommended against large towers and spires. They also reiterated the decision that a large assembly room was no longer needed. As a result, the four major ordinance rooms and the celestial room became the largest spaces in
the building, and their arrangement could shape the temple's ultimate form. As designer Harold Burton pondered this situation, he arrived at a brilliant architectural composition that was perfectly logical and simple. The four ordinance rooms would be arranged around the center like the spokes of a wheel, each one a few steps higher than the one before, with the celestial room in the center at the very top of the building. The baptismal font would be in the center of the lower level, directly below the celestial room. Individuals participating in a temple session would pass through all four ordinance rooms in an ascending spiral. Finally, they would enter the central celestial room, a tall space with light coming down from high windows above the roofs of the other rooms. On the exterior, the four ordinance rooms would form four arms of a cross, each arm pointing in one of the cardinal directions, with the higher celestial room providing a suggestion of a tower in the center. Four minor wings, containing stairs and rest rooms, would project diagonally between the arms of the cross (fig. 2). The architectural style of the building was a blend of the influence of the modern American architect Frank Lloyd Wright and elements of ancient American ruins.4

A Temple in Hawai'i

When President Joseph F. Smith returned from Hawai'i in 1915 to announce his decision to build a temple there, he turned again to Pope and Burton to serve as architects. He asked them to design a smaller version of the Alberta Temple for the site on the Church's plantation at Lāʻie. Their design was ready for publication in 1916 (fig. 3).5

Although the general arrangement of the Hawai'i Temple was similar to the successful layout of the Alberta Temple, the architects did much more than create a miniature of their earlier design. For one thing, good building stone was not easily available in the islands, so they chose to build with exposed reinforced concrete. For aggregate in the concrete, they would use a local crushed volcanic rock. The exterior surface would be cleaned and tooled to a rather smooth texture with a creamy white color. The whole building would thus be monolithic in appearance, like an object carved from a single piece of stone. Ornamental cornices would be cast in place from molds in the structural framework, making even these details integral with the building's walls. This was a very progressive building technique for the time, particularly in such a remote location. Frank Lloyd Wright had pioneered this system for his Unitarian Church in Chicago just ten years earlier.

The plan of the temple was a simplified version of the Alberta design. The ordinance rooms, which accommodated fifty people each (about half the size of those at Alberta), remained the principal wings of a Greek cross
Fig. 2. Salt Lake City architects Hyrum Pope and Harold Burton proposed the daringly modern design of the Alberta Temple. A smaller, modified version of it was constructed in Lā‘ie, Hawai‘i. Photograph ca. 1973.

Fig. 3. Architects’ rendering of the Hawai‘i Temple, 1916.
(a cross with four equal arms). Where there had been diagonal minor wings in Alberta, the Hawai‘i plan replaced them with smaller square elements. This change gave the building a more traditional appearance, like a Greek or Roman temple with a flat facade. The Alberta Temple had been perfectly suited to a site in the midst of a prairie, looking the same from all directions. By contrast the Hawai‘i Temple site was better suited for a building with a definite front facing the sea and a back toward the mountains.

In its architectural style, the Hawai‘i Temple reflected many of the same influences as the Alberta design. It bore a strong resemblance to Wright’s Unitarian Church with its rectilinear form and flat roofs (fig. 4). More than the Alberta Temple, the Hawai‘i Temple also borrowed rather literally from elements of pre-Columbian American architecture. Perhaps traditional Book of Mormon connections with Polynesia reinforced the appropriateness of this borrowing. As in some of the handsome engravings in the architects’ reference book Incidents of Travel in Yucatan, the temple stood on an elevated platform that visitors approached directly on center. The decorative frieze at the top of the temple with three separate carved panels, as shown in the first published drawing, seems to have been taken directly from engravings picturing a building in ancient Mexico (fig. 5).

For its interior, the temple also borrowed ideas from antiquity to increase its feeling of monumentality. The concrete walls along the corridors connecting the ordinance rooms were scored to look as if they were made of huge blocks of stone. As a result, the rather small passageways and stairs suggest the feeling that, like tunnels through the great pyramids, they are part of a huge, solid structure.

**Sculptures for the Temple**

When the architectural designs were refined and plans were completed, construction began under the general direction of Samuel E. Woolley, Hawaiian Mission president and Lā‘ie Plantation manager, and under the direct supervision of his son Ralph. Several talented Utah artists were brought into the process to enrich and ornament the well-conceived architectural scheme. Two artists who made important contributions in this regard were J. Leo Fairbanks, age twenty-eight, already an established painter and sculptor, and his precocious younger brother, Avard Fairbanks, just eighteen years old. Both were sons of noted Utah painter J. B. Fairbanks. Leo had studied painting and sculpture at Columbia University, at the University of Chicago, and in Paris. Best known for the “crisp, bright style” of his paintings, he eventually became the head of the art department at Oregon State University. (See the front cover, this issue, for his painting of the Hawai‘i Temple.) Avard, the tenth child in the family, was recognized early as an artistic prodigy. He studied at the New York Art Students’ League at age thirteen, and a few years later, he became the youngest artist ever to
Fig. 4. The Hawai‘i Temple resembled Frank Lloyd Wright’s rendering of his Unity Temple, a Unitarian Church in Oak Park, Illinois, a Chicago suburb. Courtesy Rare Books Division, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah.
exhibit work at the prestigious Paris Salon. He had a long and distinguished career as one of Utah's most well-known realist sculptors and was head of the University of Utah's art department. The two brothers were assisted by a talented thirty-five-year-old sculptor from Norway, Torlief Knaphus, who worked under their direction and helped to carry out their designs. The Fairbanks brothers were commissioned to do sculpture work for the temple in fall 1916. By the following summer, they had worked out the designs for much of their work. Avard had already been in Hawai‘i several months working on the baptismal font when Leo joined him in July 1917, bringing his new wife with him on a working honeymoon. Avard's fiancée also came to Hawaiʻi to be married and assist her husband in his work.

For one so young, Avard's sculpture work is quite astonishing in its expressive quality. The oxen for the baptismal font appear dignified, strong, and lifelike in their movements, perhaps the best ever executed for a temple. Their harmonious integration with the architects' design for the font gives the whole composition a marvelously unified sense of religious solemnity. The relief panel at the head of the reflecting pools titled Maternity is another sensitive and mature work (fig. 6). It depicts a Polynesian mother surrounded by children and holding a shell that is the source of water, and
therefore life, for the temple gardens—a poetic and symbolically appropriate composition. The model for the mother was a faithful, local Hawaiian member.

The sculpture friezes on the upper portion of the temple’s exterior were the most ambitious of the brothers’ works. The original design for the temple had shown three small panels in this location on each side of the building, with their subjects to be taken from Church history. However, Leo and Avard made a different proposal, larger in size and theme. They received approval to create four long horizontal panels, one for each side of the building, composed of 123 figures from the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Book of Mormon, and early Mormon history. These figures were executed in high relief, in the style of Greek and Roman sculpture that had become popular for Victorian public buildings and monuments (fig. 7). This important change to the exterior design of the temple increased its classical feeling in contrast to the more geometrically modern Alberta Temple. The deep shadows from the tropical sun make the sculpture panels easy to distinguish even at a distance. The two brothers worked together with Knaphus through July and August on the full-sized models of these panels. Leo returned to Utah in September, leaving Avard to supervise their concrete casting and installation. The small design models for the friezes were placed in the temple chapel and later cast and displayed opposite the visitors’ center on the temple grounds.

![Fig. 6. This relief panel, at the head of the temple's reflecting pools, is titled Maternity. It depicts a Polynesian mother surrounded by children and holding a shell that is the source of water, and therefore life, for the temple gardens.](image-url)
Fig. 7. Old Testament Dispensation, on the west side

1. Joseph, telling his father to reverse his hands. Joseph, whose branches ran over the wall, stands nearest the Book of Mormon frieze
2. Jacob, blessing Ephraim and Manassah (3 and 4)
3. Benjamin
4. Judah
5. Abraham, hearing the voice of God
6. Isaac, carrying wood for his own sacrifice
7. Melchizedek
8. Noah, holding the dove
9. Enoch
10. Seth
11. Cain, turning away from God
12. Eve, at the altar of sacrifice
13. Adam, between the two trees
14. Moses, with the tablets
15. Aaron, in the robes of his office
16. Joshua
17. Samuel, anointing David (20)
18. Solomon
19. Elijah
20. Isaiah
21. Jeremiah
22. Daniel, in Babylonian captivity
23. Ezekiel
24. A woman symbolizing Israel looking forward to the Messiah, depicted on the adjacent frieze

Dispensation of Nephites, on the north side
Chronologically, this frieze must be read right to left.

1. Moroni, holding the record of his people. His figure stands nearest to the frieze depicting the latter days
2. Columbia—the United States—extending her hand to Hawai‘i
3. Mormon, writing his record
4, 5, and 6. A Hawaiian family looking to the Book of Mormon record
7. Hagoth, ship builder and explorer
8. A laborer, looking to Christ
9. A repentant person
10. Gadianton
11. Korihor
12. Kishkumen
13. A humble believer
14. Nephi₃, preaching
15. Christ appearing at the temple
16. Samuel the Lamanite, who prophesied of signs including the star
17, 18, and 19. Ammon teaching the mother and father of Lamoni
20. Captain Moroni, holding the title of liberty
21. Teancum
22. Amalekiah, slain by Teancum
23. Coriantumr, last of the Jaredites
24. King Noah
25. Alma₁
26. Laman
27. Nephi₁
28. Joseph, son of Lehi
29. Lehi, whose figure stands nearest the wall depicting the Old Testament story
Latter-day Dispensation, on the east side
1. The angel flying in the midst of heaven
2. A woman receiving the sacrament
3. A priesthood holder offering the sacrament
4. A priesthood holder
5, 6, and 7. Two priesthood holders laying hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost
8. A dove representing the Holy Ghost
9 and 10. A priesthood holder baptizing a woman
11. A kneeling woman representing repentance
12. Ángel Moroni with his record
13. Joseph Smith, praying
14. God, the Father, appearing to Joseph Smith
15. Christ appearing to Joseph Smith
16. A temple worker searching genealogical records
17, 18, 19, and 20. A family sealed in the spirit world through temple work
21, 22, and 23. Two elders blessing the sick
24. A Relief Society sister offering aid
25 and 26. A sister teaching a child
27. A man offering his tithing
28. A figure representing education
29. A figure representing industry
30. A missionary in the service of God
31, 32, and 33. A father, mother, and child sealed for eternity

Christian Dispensation, on the south side (no photo available)
This frieze shows Joseph of Nazareth; a shepherd of Bethlehem; Mary, mother of Jesus; a fisherman; a beggar; a fisherman leaving his net; the woman taken in sin; John the Baptist; a praying believer; mothers and children; a lame man seeking a blessing; John the Beloved; the blind; James; Christ, laying his hands on the people; Peter, ready to smite the Roman soldier; Roman soldier; Cornelius, the centurion; Saul, covering his eyes in the blinding light; Silas, an early Christian missionary; Augustine, an early Christian father; a converted pagan; a converted philosopher; Constantine; a purchaser of indulgences; a Catholic monk; a believing queen; a Catholic bishop usurping power; a reformer translating the Bible.
Murals for the Temple

The story of painting the temple murals is a rather complicated one mixed with elements of tragedy, frustration, and success. The commission for the murals in the three ordinance rooms was first given in 1916 to forty-four-year-old Fritzof E. Weberg. He was a convert to the Church, baptized in his native country of Norway in 1899 at age twenty-six. His artistic talents had come to the attention of Church leaders after his immigration to Utah. He had completed several mural paintings in Utah before being invited to work in Hawai‘i. His realistic and dramatic landscape style reflected his European training. Utah painter Lewis A. Ramsey was also commissioned by the Church to go to Hawai‘i to assist Weberg. Ramsey, forty-one years old, had studied in Paris along with J. Leo Fairbanks in 1902 and 1903 and had established himself in Utah as a skilled landscape and portrait painter. The contract he signed with the Church to assist Weberg reflected the likelihood that a collaboration with the older artist might not be easy. It stated that “it is absolutely imperative that [Ramsey] work in harmony with F. E. Weberg and that [his work] . . . be done under the immediate direction of and to the entire satisfaction of said F. E. Weberg.” En route to Hawai‘i with Weberg, Ramsey quickly discovered that working harmoniously would be difficult indeed. Weberg was irrational at times, subject to wide mood swings and uncontrolled outbursts of temper. While the two artists were visiting the volcano on the island of Hawai‘i, Weberg became enraged over sharing some of Ramsey’s sketching materials and seemed on the verge of violence.  

The situation was serious enough for the Hawaiian Mission leaders to cable the First Presidency on January 2, 1917, for instructions. They wrote that Weberg was “at times very disgruntled at Church” and “says [he] can’t work with Utah people” and that he was willing to complete the paintings “but not as a member of the Church.” The reply from Salt Lake City was short and clear: “Send Weberg home.” A follow-up letter authorized Ramsey to complete the contract “as though nothing had happened.” Some bitter feelings resulted from this unfortunate incident, with Weberg making accusations about Ramsey and Ramsey being obliged to defend himself. Three years later, an Ogden judge declared Weberg insane and committed him to the state mental hospital. Ironically, Ramsey felt that his association with Weberg resulted in his being passed over for future temple commissions, while Weberg, apparently fully recovered, received the commission for the creation room in the Arizona Temple a few years later.

In January and February 1917, Ramsey developed his sketches for the murals. He completed all three rooms before returning home in the early
summer. Some photographs of these murals have survived in Ramsey’s scrapbook. In the murals for the creation and garden rooms, the ocean and tropical foliage suggested local Hawaiian scenery. For the lone and dreary world, however, the scene shifted to the Rocky Mountains, complete with deer and bears. Sadly, the murals were as ill-fated as the artists’ relationship. Ramsey had recommended against mounting the canvas for the murals directly on the walls, fearing moisture problems, but was overruled. His fears proved to be justified. Not long after his departure in summer 1917, the newly completed murals began to deteriorate from moisture and mold.

Providentially, another talented artist appeared on the scene at the right moment. A twenty-four-year-old missionary named LeConte Stewart had recently arrived in the Hawaiian Mission. Already an accomplished painter, he had received excellent training at the New York Art Students’ League. During his ocean voyage and his spare moments in Hawai‘i, Stewart painted some charming views of the ocean and the islands. Stewart had met architect Harold Burton in Salt Lake City before his mission and had the chance to renew his acquaintance during Burton’s 1917 visit to Hawai‘i. According to Stewart, Burton watched him paint some children playing on the Lā‘ie beach and was impressed with his ability. The two talented young men spent hours talking about artistic philosophy and found that they thought much alike. Burton recommended that Stewart be placed in charge of the interior painting of the temple and other decorative work.

In collaboration with the architects, Stewart prepared miniature sketches for new creation room murals, a series of long narrow panels framed in moldings rather than filling the whole walls. This decorative approach integrated the paintings with the horizontal moldings around the room in a manner similar to interiors by Frank Lloyd Wright and some contemporary European architects. Stewart made a model of the creation room with these murals and sent it to the First Presidency for approval. Several weeks later, he received word to proceed. Eventually he completed the creation and garden rooms and assisted in selecting carpets, furniture, and paint colors for the temple’s interior. With his missionary status changed, he received permission for his fiancée to come to Hawai‘i to join him. The couple were married, and the new bride began teaching second grade at the Church school in Lā‘ie. In later years, Stewart also painted murals in the Alberta and Arizona Temples and pursued a distinguished career as a landscape painter and art teacher. He served for many years as chairman of the art department at the University of Utah, and when he died at age ninety-nine in 1990, he was widely considered the “dean” of Utah landscape painters.
The Interior of the Temple

Stewart’s murals were painted in a different style from Ramsey’s. Stewart had learned the impressionist technique, pioneered in France by such artists as Monet, Renoir, and Seurat. Like the French and American impressionist masters, Stewart sometimes used small brush strokes of unblended pure colors to build up his images, thus imparting to them a shimmering quality—a technique called pointillism. He used this technique particularly well in the creation murals where the unfocused, broken brush strokes in the early panels of the earth’s formation give way to more detailed and realistic depictions of the later events of the Creation. The larger and lusher paintings in the garden room depict a paradise that resembles the hardwood forests of the eastern states, where Stewart had studied landscape painting.

Meanwhile, Church leaders in Salt Lake City arranged for Alma B. Wright, professor of art at the LDS University, to go to Hawaii to assist with the mural work. Wright, at forty-one, was the same age as Ramsey. He had studied in Paris at the same time as Ramsey and Leo Fairbanks. During that time, Wright had been honored by having some of his work displayed in the Paris Salon. In Utah he had become well known for his portraits. In Hawaii, Wright painted in the world room and the baptistry. His murals of the lone and dreary world were done in a hard-lined style quite different from Stewart’s work. They depict broken, rocky mountains, storm-swept landscapes, gnarled trees, and wild beasts in combat. Some of the background areas have a softer, more impressionistic feeling, suggesting Stewart’s assistance or retouching of those places. Wright’s six paintings in the arches of the baptistry depict gospel principles and ordinances in a colorful illustration style.

The completed ordinance rooms were carpeted with heavy velvet-pile rugs. The windows were draped with Japanese silk. Unpolished oak moldings ornamented most of the major rooms. One of the sealing rooms was paneled in precious Hawaiian koa wood. The high windows in the celestial room were leaded in a geometric pattern in the style of Frank Lloyd Wright. The furniture for the temple was made by Fetzer Furniture in Salt Lake City to the architects’ specifications. In keeping with the temple’s architecture, the chairs and tables were straight and geometric, like the furniture of Frank Lloyd Wright and other modernists. The furniture was made of oak to match the architectural woodwork, with some contrasting wood inlays on more prominent pieces. This furniture must have complemented the architecture in a sophisticated harmony that has been lost in later years as the furniture has been replaced with more massive, elaborate, and colorful pieces, and the oak moldings have been painted.
A Paradise

It is easy to forget that Lā‘ie was not always covered with lush, tropical foliage. Photographs of the Church’s plantation show much of the land in cultivation, mostly in sugarcane, with the rest of the area rather barren. (See LeConte Stewart’s painting of Lā‘ie, this issue, back cover.) As the temple took shape in this open landscape, it must have looked small and lonely. The architects worked out a brilliant design for the temple grounds to remedy this impression. Their grand conception of the temple as the climax of an arrangement of terraces, reflecting pools, waterfalls, and tropical plants arranged along a formal axis was one of their most powerful ideas—a concept that would take many years of patient care to realize completely (fig. 8). From the driveway and gatehouses at the lower end of the site to the delicate fern houses and pergola behind the temple, everything was composed in a unified symmetrical scheme. In selecting the plants, the architects had the assistance of Joseph F. Rock, botanist of the College of Hawai‘i, who volunteered his services. Rock had traveled extensively, visiting the exotic gardens of India among other places, and contributed his expertise in tropical plant selection. Couple missionaries planted the lawns from small starts.

The enduring value of the temple builders’ work is evident in the temple’s ability to inspire awe and admiration through the decades. Its design achieved a sense of timelessness that has not gone out of fashion. As the gardens have matured and the outbuildings have expanded, the temple has continued to dominate its surroundings. Architect Harold Burton returned to Hawai‘i in the 1960s to design the expanded visitors’ center facilities, preserving the strict symmetry of the gardens through the extravagant device of balancing the portico of the large visitors’ center building with an equally large portico to an open courtyard on the opposite side. The great axis of the garden from the temple to the sea received its logical completion with the construction of Hale Lā‘a Boulevard down to Temple Beach. The basic idea of placing the temple at the climax of an axial composition proved to be flexible enough to allow for change and growth as the plantation buildings and fields disappeared and a town grew in their place.

The temple and its grounds demonstrate the spiritual power of an artistic vision. This small building could have become an insignificant structure lost in the development of later years. However, the quality of its design, the artistic success of its decorations, and the beauty and arrangement of its gardens have all combined to make it a memorable landmark for both the Church and Hawai‘i. It is a kind of artistic miracle that in this remote place, at a time when relatively few Latter-day Saints lived outside Utah, the builders were able to make this small temple into a fitting symbol of their grandest spiritual hopes and ideals—a vision of harmony and completeness in the gardens of paradise.
A Jewel in the Gardens of Paradise

Fig. 8. Hawaii Temple at night, ca. 1936.

LDS Church Archives
Paul L. Anderson (paul_anderson@byu.edu) is Head of Design at the Brigham Young University Museum of Art. He received a B.A. from Stanford University in 1968 and a M.Arch. (masters of architecture) at Princeton University in 1972. This article appears as a chapter in Voyages of Faith: Explorations in Mormon Pacific History, ed. Grant Underwood (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2000). For more information, see p. 228.

The Hawai‘i Temple is a subject that will be featured in an exhibition at the Brigham Young University Museum of Art: Mormon Moderne: New Directions in Latter-day Saint Architecture, 1910–55. Paul L. Anderson is the curator of the exhibit, which runs from March 1 to September 15, 2001.

7. Some of Frederick Catherwood’s illustrations of the interior of pre-Columbian temples show this effect with walls made of large stones. See Stephens, Incidents of Travel, 2:317.
8. Biographical information about these artists can be found in Robert S. Olpin, Dictionary of Utah Art (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Art Center, 1980).
10. Elizabeth Ramsey to David O. McKay, June 11, 1941, LDS Church Archives.
13. Lewis A. Ramsey Scrapbook, ca. 1897–1940, LDS Church Archives.
16. Although this reminiscence suggests that both Pope and Burton were in Hawai‘i in 1917, the L. A. Ramsey correspondence makes clear that only Burton and his wife were there at that time.
17. The koa wood paneling, mentioned in early descriptions of the temple, was apparently removed when this sealing room was combined with an adjacent room to make a single larger space. Koa wood is a very rare, red hardwood.
Haiku Poet

He said he wrote haiku like women sigh, 
like windows darken gentle with the night. 
He said he caught the rain of wings in flight—
he caught them quick and low and freed them high. 
All night he whispered: *Over the cool stones* 
*the stars pour their crystal tears; freezing the* 
*moonlight.* The words rang out inside his bones 
and sang his blood; his pulse an orchestra. 
No one could hear the song behind his eyes, 
although his breathing swayed beneath its weight, 
and then the breeze came lifting low and late 
through his lit window from the murmuring skies. 
He said, soft: *You know when death comes. A few* 
*poems stir like wind. They sing inside you.*

—Marilyn Nelson

This poem tied for second place in the BYU Studies 1999 poetry contest.
Returning

“We can always come here again,”
my six-year-old assures me, balanced
on the corpse of a fallen ponderosa
on its way to becoming black soil.

She peels back the bark and brushes away
the rotting wood digested, it seems, by mites.
A muscular hoar-haired grain is exposed.
I move my fingers along the resilient core.

No, I think, we can never come back to this.
Earth will embrace the tree and this girl
will shed her skin before I wake again.

—George Handley

This poem tied for second place in the BYU Studies
1999 poetry contest.
Book Reviews


Reviewed by David L. Paulsen

As The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints grows in influence and visibility throughout the world, interfaith conversations will no doubt increase. Unfortunately, too few Latter-day Saints have sufficient knowledge of traditional Christian theology to carry on any but the most superficial of conversations with adherents of other faiths. Roger E. Olson’s new book, The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform, can serve as a reliable resource for closing this knowledge gap.

The Story of Christian Theology is a very reader-friendly book. While the author, a professor of theology at Baylor University’s George W. Truett Theological Seminary, sees his book as a “refresher course” for Christian clergy, his audience is primarily the “untutored Christian layperson or student” (14). The author hopes to contribute to Christian discipleship by increasing theological understanding (11–12). To this end, Olson writes in a clear and engaging style. He recounts the history of Christian theology in story form, presenting over eighteen centuries of Christian thinkers who had in their theologizing (as they saw it) nothing less than humanity’s eternal salvation at stake.

Olson begins this epic history in the middle of the second century, continues it to the present, and even envisions how the story might unfold in the future. The book sacrifices depth for breadth but successfully holds the reader’s interest and gives a clear and comprehensive grasp of mainline Christian theology.

This book’s twenty-seven chapters divide into nine sections or parts. The titles of these parts help readers follow the narrative’s main plots and subplots, which Olson unfolds in a sweeping, dramatic style. “The Opening Act: Conflicting Christian Visions in the Second Century” presents the book’s central theme: conflict. Subsequent parts build on this theme, as can be seen in the following titles: “The Plot Thickens: Third-Century Tensions and Transformations”; “A Great Crises Rocks the Church: The Controversy about the Trinity”; “Another Crises Shakes the Church: The Conflict over the Person of Christ.” Conflict becomes permanently divisive in part five, “A Tale of Two Churches: The Great Tradition Divides between East and West.” Part six, “The Saga of the Queen of Sciences: Scholastics Revive
and Enthrone Theology,” shows how scholars and clerics attempted to eliminate sources of divisiveness. The futility of this attempt becomes clear in the book’s final three parts, “A New Twist in the Narrative: The Western Church Reforms and Divides”; “The Center of the Story Falls Apart: Protestants Follow Diverse Paths”; and “The Overall Plot Divides: Liberals and Conservatives Respond to Modernity.” Thus, as can be seen by these titles, a theme of theological tension pervades the book. This is a study of theologies that motivated dissension—dissension that Olson believes has peaked, rather than subsided, as Christianity begins a new millennium.

Five fundamental presuppositions, Olson says, drive his book. First is the assumption that beliefs matter. Olson argues that theology is inevitable insofar as a Christian (or anyone else) seeks to think coherently and intelligently about God. Indeed, he claims, “there can be no vital, dynamic, faithful Christian discipleship completely devoid of doctrinal understanding” (16). Second, sometimes beliefs matter too much, leading to needless divisions among Christians and inexcusable “burnings, drownings, and beheadings of people judged to be heretics.” Olson finds “no excuse” for such behavior and wants readers to believe similarly (17). Third, Christian beliefs are not all equally important, some being dogmas (such as the Incarnation and the Trinity), some doctrines (for example, the proper mode of baptism), and some merely theological opinions (the exact nature of angels). Olson concentrates his narrative on the important beliefs—primarily the dogmas, secondarily the doctrines (17–18). Fourth, the ideas of Christian thinkers who lived between New Testament times and today are very important. Olson sees his work as a foil to a revisionist movement of the 1980s that sought to “deny the existence of any kind of main line of influential thinkers” in Christian history (18). And fifth, God is providentially at work in establishing his people in truth and reforming theology when needed. The story of Christian theology, claims Olson, is much more than a mere human story, as critics have charged. He thus rejects historicism—the assumption that all ideas are reducible to cultural or historical contexts—in favor of faith in “God’s providential guidance (not necessarily control) of all events” (21). In Olson’s view, “God has never been absent from the Church, even in the dark eras when truth’s light shone dimly” (22). Thus the “hero” of the story “is not Constantine or Athanasius—as great and [as] influential as they were—but God himself” (22).

Throughout his telling of the story, Olson interjects his own metacommentary. The following points of this metacommentary are of particular interest to Latter-day Saints: (1) an explanation of the emergence of theology as a function of the loss of apostolic authority; (2) an acknowledgment of the profound influence of Greek philosophy in the shaping of that theology; (3) an admission that, in that particular theological development,
doctrines were formulated and accepted which lacked any explicit biblical basis; (4) a discussion of the perennial conflict between monergism (salvation is all God’s doing) and synergism (salvation requires human cooperation), and his identification of this conflict as the most important yet-to-be resolved issue in Christian theology; and, finally, (5) predictions as to how the story will continue to unfold. It is on these five points of metacommentary that I focus my attention.

The Passing of the Apostles and an Emergence of Theology

Interestingly, Olson openly recognizes that Christian theology in a strict sense did not begin until after the time of Christ: “The apostles were men and women of early Christianity with tremendous prestige and authority. They were eyewitnesses of Jesus or at least persons closely connected with his ministry or the ministries of his disciples. While they were alive, there was no need for theology in the same sense as afterward” (25). However, with the death of John the Beloved, “Christianity entered into a new era for which it was not entirely prepared. [For,] no longer would it be possible to settle doctrinal or other disputes by turning to an apostle” (25). In the middle of the second century, theological reflection arose in response to confusion caused by a “cacophony of [conflicting] voices” within the Christian church and to challenges of the church’s beliefs raised by outside critics (23). The need had arisen for orthodoxy, or “a definitive statement of Christian theological correctness” (23).

The Influence of Philosophy on the Formation of Christian Theology

Olson candidly acknowledges that “the story of Christian theology is deeply influenced by philosophy—especially Greek (Hellenistic) philosophy” (54; italics in original)—and explains how and why this philosophical-biblical synthesis came about. At the same time, Olson wonders (nay, worries) whether this Greek influence has not been altogether too great.  

Olson traces Greek influence on Christian theology back to Philo, a first-century Alexandrian Jew who “attempted to wed Judaism and Greek philosophy” (55). In particular, Philo attempted to explain the Old Testament idea of God in terms of “the highest levels of Greek theology,” which described God as “simple substance, completely free of body, parts or passions, immutable (unchangeable) and eternal (timeless)” (57).

According to Olson, Philo’s portrayal of the God of the Bible, applying within categories of both Greek philosophy and Christian theology, appealed to Jews, Christians, and Romans alike. Philo’s “approach to Jewish thought was already widely accepted (though not without controversy) among Jews of the diaspora, and Christian apologists of the second century
built on that foundation in order to show a similar consistency between the best of Hellenistic thought and their own fairly sophisticated versions of the Christian message” (55). These apologists sought to “defend the truth of Christianity on the basis of the philosophies of Platonism and Stoicism . . . that made up the common Greek philosophy of much of the Roman Empire in the second century” (56). The apologies were intended to convert educated Romans just as Philo’s philosophy was targeted at educated Jews. Philo’s work was thus “the Jewish precedent for the [second-century] Christian apologists’ task of persuasively communicating Christian ideas to educated and reflective Romans. They were simply standing on Philo’s shoulders and building a Hellenistic-Christian superstructure on his Hellenistic-Jewish foundation” (57).

While a few second-century apologists like Tertullian rejected formulating Christian beliefs within a Greek philosophical framework, most writers attempted just such a formulation. In order to “influence relatively humane Roman emperors such as Marcus Aurelius and Antoninus Pius to take Christianity seriously if not as true . . . most [Christian apologists] wrote open letters to these and other emperors and officials of the Roman Empire in which they attempted to explain the truth about Christian belief and behavior. . . . They thus created the basic method of traditional Christian theology” (58).

Olson believes that the second-century apologists’ reliance on Greek philosophical theology was, in many respects, for the worse. He instances this concern in his discussion of Athenagoras of Athens, the second-century Christian apologist who draws most explicitly on Greek philosophy. In A Plea for the Christians—an open letter to Emperor Marcus Aurelius—Athenagoras writes:

That we are not atheists, therefore, seeing that we acknowledge one God, uncreated, eternal, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, illimitable, who is apprehended by the understanding only and the reason who is encompassed by light and beauty, and spirit, and power ineffable, by whom the universe has been created through His Logos, and set in order, and is kept in being—I have sufficiently demonstrated. (Quoted in Olson, 62)

Olson comments:

Interesting to note is how Athenagoras described the God Christians believe in. While there is no debate about the biblical basis of such divine attributes as “uncreated” and “eternal” and few would question that God is “invisible” (apart from the incarnation in Jesus Christ), many Christian scholars have questioned whether Athenagoras was perhaps unduly influenced by Greek ideas of divinity when he characterized God as “impassible” (incapable of suffering or emotional feeling) and “incomprehensible” (beyond human understanding). Especially when he affirmed that the God Christians believe in is “apprehended by the understanding only and the reason,” doubts arise about the relative weight of Hebrew versus Greek thinking in his doctrine of God. (62)
Moreover, Olson suggests that such Christian notables as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas were likewise unduly influenced by Greek philosophical understanding. Of Clement, Olson writes:

More than any other early Christian writer, Clement of Alexandria valued the integration of Christian faith with the best learning of the day. His motto was “all truth is God’s truth wherever it may be found,” and he attempted to bring together those stray rays of divine light that he believed were diffused throughout the various philosophical and religious systems while submitting all to the overriding authority of the Hebrew Scriptures (allegorically interpreted, of course) and the apostolic tradition. (87)

Nevertheless, Clement’s theology tipped the scale in favor of Greek philosophy:

Clement’s God was like the God of Greek philosophy—a bare unity without parts or passions that cannot even be described except negatively and who can only relate to the world of nature and history through an intermediate being called the Logos. . . . Clement’s doctrine of God is a third-century echo and elaboration of second-century apologist Athenagoras’s teaching. Both belong to that line of Christian thought that subtly shaped the Christian idea of God to fit Greek philosophical speculation. (90)

Clement and other Christian Middle-Platonists, in turn, profoundly influenced Origen, perhaps the greatest of the earlier Christian speculative theologians. Olson asserts that

the place to begin any attempt to understand Origen’s doctrine of God and why it became a troubling legacy for the church is to examine his view of God’s nature and attributes. For him, God is Spirit and Mind, simple (uncompounded), incorporeal, immutable and incomprehensible. God is “simple substance” without body, parts or passions. (108–9)

When he turned to Scripture and its interpretation, Origen showed his true Alexandrian colors by emphasizing the spiritual meaning of much of it and the allegorical method of its interpretation. (106)

One of Origen’s purposes in allegorical interpretation was to relieve the unbearable pressure put on Christians by skeptics like the pagan writer Celsus, who ridiculed many Old Testament stories as absurd and improper to God. . . . Long before Origen or even Clement, of course, the Jewish scholar Philo had already set the trend in Alexandria for relieving this pressure. Such passages that seem to describe God in ways unworthy of divine being are not to be taken literally. They are, for example, anthropomorphisms in which God is being described in human images as having hands and feet. Or they are allegories in which God is being described in human images as having certain emotions that Greeks would consider absolutely contrary to divine apatheia (serenity and self-sufficiency). Origen joined Celsus in ridiculing the literal interpretations of many such passages as absurd and impossible. (106–7)

Olson concludes that, like Philo and the second-century Christian apologists, Origen “was unduly influenced by the Greek philosophical theism of the Platonic tradition” (107).
Thus, the pattern was set. Later theologians relied on the writings of theologians before them. Augustine was profoundly influenced by Christian Platonists such as Origen and Ambrose. Although Augustine rejected the impersonality of the god of Greek philosophical theology, he accepted (for worse, in Olson’s view) that strand of the Greek view that portrayed God as a timeless, impassible all-determining reality (342).

The merger of Christian theology and Greek philosophy culminated in the writings of Thomas Aquinas. By the late Middle Ages, Greek philosophical assumptions had become necessary conditions to Christian theology. Olson concludes that “Aquinas allowed his natural theology to determine his doctrine of God . . . [and that] the portrait of God that evolves out of it . . . seems quite foreign to the God of the scriptural narrative, who genuinely grieves and sorrows and even repents (relents) when people pray” (342).

The Formulation and Acceptance of Doctrines without Biblical Basis

According to Olson, Christian theologians’ heavy use of Greek philosophy in forming their conception of God “led to the standardization of certain beliefs that could not be explicitly found in Christian sources” (610). These beliefs included *creatio ex nihilo* (creation out of nothing), God’s triunity, and “the fully developed idea of the incarnation as a hypostatic union of two natures” (610). Nonetheless, Olson hastens to add his own view that the lack of a biblical base for these doctrines “does not take anything way from their truth. It is only to say that they represent the second-order language of the church. The first-order language is the language of revelation” (610).

Monergism versus Synergism: The Perennial Debate

Monergism and synergism name the two most fundamental theological responses to the cluster of questions about salvation. Origen adopted a synergistic position:

He emphasized the free participation of the human person and the absolute necessity of God’s grace apart from any predestination or determination of persons’ free choices.

... [S]alvation is seen as a lifelong process of gradual transformation in which human will and energy cooperates freely with divine grace in the hope that eventually the person will reflect God’s glory and participate in God’s immortal nature. (112)

On the other hand, Augustine emphasized God’s absolute sovereignty and man’s total depravity in his championing of a radical form of monergism:

Augustine ended up attempting to refute not only Pelagius’s alleged heresy of sinless perfection apart from assisting grace but also all forms of synergism. By the end of his life and career, Augustine would allow only his own monergism as the basis of an orthodox doctrine of salvation. (271)
Both Origen's synergism and Augustine's monergism have reverberated down through the centuries. Augustine's formulation profoundly impacted Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, John Calvin, and other magisterial reformers, while modes of Origen's synergism have been championed by scholastic reformers as well as by such notables as Jacobus Arminius and John Wesley.

According to Olson, the essence of Luther's contribution to Reformed theology was his consideration of salvation as a "free gift of divine mercy for which the human person can do nothing" (380). Luther regarded the belief in human free will as

just one more manifestation of human pride standing against the cross that proclaims human helplessness. . . . His theology of the cross also led him to a passionate defense of the doctrine of predestination—monergism of salvation—which he considered "very strong wine, and solid food for the strong." (382–83)

Zwingli also held to a strong version of predestination, emphatically rejecting the medieval Catholic view that God foreordains to heaven or hell on the basis of his foreknowledge of the free decisions of his creation. Rather, as Olson interprets Zwingli's view, "God knows because he predetermines. And Zwingli does not hesitate to affirm that those individuals who end up damned forever in hell are also eternally damned by God for that fate" (403).

Similarly, Calvin's monergism closely mirrored that of Augustine, Luther, and Zwingli (410). Calvin affirmed that God "ordained from eternity those whom he wills to embrace in love, and those upon whom he wills to vent his wrath" (as quoted in Olson, 411).

Monergism's monopoly on belief was not secure. Synergism was revived by the Dutch Reformed theologian Jacob (James) Arminius (1560–1609), whose teachings created a deep split within the Reformed community (see Olson, 454–72). He and his followers

vehemently denied that monergism is the only view of God's relationship with fallen, sinful human beings that does justice to salvation as a sheer gift. While rejecting unconditional election and irresistible grace, they upheld the central Protestant principles and affirmed that Christ's righteousness is imputed to sinners for their salvation on account of faith alone. (455)

In response to the Arminian controversy, Calvinists of the second half of the sixteenth century developed a system of thought consisting of five points which later became known by the acronym TULIP. These points were pronounced and made official doctrine of the Dutch Reformed churches at the Synod of Dort (1618–19). Olson summarizes the five points as follows:

• Total depravity—[H]umans are dead in trespasses and sins before God sovereignly regenerates them and gives them the gift of salvation. (This usually implies a denial of free will.)
• Unconditional election—God chooses some humans to save before and apart from anything they do on their own. (This leaves open the question of whether God actively predestines some to damnation or merely leaves them to their deserved damnation.)

• Limited atonement—Christ died only to save the elect, and his atoning death is not universal for all of humanity.

• Irresistible grace—God’s grace cannot be resisted. The elect will receive it and be saved by it. The damned never receive it.

• Perseverance—The elect will undoubtedly persevere unto final salvation (eternal security). (460)

With these five points officially endorsed, “Reformed Protestants everywhere,” Olson says, “tended to accept them,” though Arminians who rejected all five points were excommunicated and exiled from Holland (459). Nevertheless, as Olson points out, Arminianism survived and flourished elsewhere:

Though politically suppressed and later marginalized in the country of its birth, Arminianism took root and flourished on English soil in the late sixteenth century. Many leaders of the Church of England at first sympathized with it and then openly espoused it. Even though the Church of England’s Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion includes affirmation of predestination, Arminianism became a permanent option within the Anglican tradition. . . . The early Methodist movement founded by John and Charles Wesley and many early Baptists represented [an evangelical type] of Arminianism, while the Deists and liberal Protestant thinkers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries represented [a liberal or naturalistic type of Arminianism]. Through these movements Arminian theology gradually filtered into the mainstream of Protestant thought in England and the United States—much to the chagrin of more traditional Reformed Protestants. (472)

Distressingly for Olson, the ancient dispute between monergism and synergism is again threatening to further divide Protestants. Olson explains:

Just when evangelical Christians in Britain and North America think the great theological debate among them over monergism and synergism is passé, it breaks out again. As this book is being written, the old controversy between evangelical Arminians like Wesley and evangelical Calvinists like Edwards and Whitefield is threatening to break out anew as evidenced in the formation of Reformed renewal movements such as Christians United for Reformation (C.U.R.E.) and the Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals. Both groups of evangelical theologians, pastors and evangelists see Arminian theology as a bane on evangelicalism’s existence and seek to elevate monergism in the Augustinian-Calvinist-Puritan tradition as the norm for evangelical orthodox. (636 n. 21)²

Given the persistent and divisive debate between monergists and synergists, no wonder Olson identifies God’s relationship to human beings as one of the major “unresolved issues for theological reformers to work on” (612).
The Unfinished Story of Christian Theology

The existence of such major unresolved issues, coupled with the emergence in our time of a radical plurality of Christian movements and voices, leads Olson to acknowledge that “the story of Christian theology is not finished” and that “the contemporary age is a transitional one” (611). He argues:

For all the interest and “spice” that pluralism adds to the story, it cannot continue without some rediscovery of a central focus holding all the diverse theologies together as Christian. Many observers would argue quite rightly that the worldwide church of Jesus Christ is overdue for a new reformation. This time that reformation will need to be a reassertion of basic, or mere, Christian unity that strikes a healthy balance between experiencing God and knowing about God intellectually. A new reformer of the universal church is needed—a great spiritual thinker . . . must step forward to provide a new unifying vision of Christian theology that is solidly based on divine revelation, consistent with the Great Tradition of the church and spiritually reinvigorating. (611–12)

Olson is of the opinion that “the European and North American wells of spiritual and theological renewal have run dry and need to be refreshed from new sources” (612). The needed “theological prophet,” Olson suggests, may well arise from “the younger Christian churches of Asia, Africa, and Latin America” (612). “A vision of Christian theology unfettered by now-outmoded modern thought forms may have to arise from a non-Western Christian source if the story of Christian theology is to move on into the twenty-first century and third millennium with new vigor and vitality” (612).

Conclusion

As Christians move into a new millennium, they have seemingly come full circle. Indeed, the cacophony of contemporary Christian voices seems even more diverse than that which gave rise to Christian theology’s birth in the second century. (See chapter 35, “Contemporary Theology Struggles with Diversity.”) In *The Story of Christian Theology*, Roger E. Olson has poignantly chronicled what happened to Christian thought following the passing of the Apostles. His hope that a new theologian will arise to bring unity out of the present diversity seems more poignant still, for, as his own version of the story convincingly shows, no such Christian theologian, regardless of his intellectual gifts, has ever been able to unify Christianity. What seems, then, to be really needed—perhaps desperately so—is not for God to send more theologians, but for the world once again to look to revelation through Apostles and prophets who, like the Apostles of the first-century Church, can resolve doctrinal disputes not as the scribes but (as Olson himself points out) as ones having “authority” (25).
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3. This worry seems to contradict (or is at least in tension with) Olson’s claim that God closely superintended the Church’s development of doctrine.

4. Compare Roger E. Olson’s recent article, “Don’t Hate Me Because I’m Arminian,” Christianity Today 43 (September 6, 1999): 87–94. In the article, Olson identifies himself as an Arminian and pleads with Calvinists not to oust Arminians from Evangelical associations.


Reviewed by Todd A. Britsch

Suppose the moderator of a popular quiz show were to ask the identity of the following person: He visited the studios of both Rodin and Maillol and watched them work. He was hailed from across the lobby of the Cirque de Paris by Ernest Hemingway, joined a club that boasted Theodore Roosevelt as a member, and was driven to Jack Sharkey's training camp by Jack Dempsey. He often had lunch with Thornton Wilder and was a close friend of Leo Stein and his sister Gertrude. He was delighted when Charles Morgan II, president of Amherst, wrote that Robert Frost and Morgan were interested in exhibiting his work at the college. He taught a number of the nation's finest young art students, was well acquainted with most of The Eight (America's leading twentieth-century realist painters), and married the daughter of one of the best American impressionists. It is unlikely that these or additional equally impressive clues would lead many to the correct answer: Mahonri Mackintosh Young, the Salt Lake City–born sculptor and painter and grandson of Brigham Young.

Such is the fate of this artist, who, though hailed as one of America's leading sculptors during his lifetime, is known today primarily by a few specialists and by a small number of Utahns who recognize him as the sculptor of the Brigham Young statues at the nation's capitol and Brigham Young University or as the designer and sculptor of the This Is the Place monument in Salt Lake City. But things are changing for the reputation of Mahonri Young. After years of consignment to brief mention, footnotes, and unpublished academic papers, he has recently become the subject of two thoroughly illustrated books that are certain to make a much larger audience aware of his multiple artistic contributions. The earlier of these books (published in 1997) is by Thomas E. Toone, a professor of art history at Utah State University, and is based on his 1982 doctoral dissertation at Pennsylvania State University. Norma S. Davis, the author of the more recent volume (published in 1999), is an emeritus professor of humanities at Brigham Young University and the biographer of the American painter Florence Kate Upton.
Mahonri Young was born in 1877 to Mahonri Moriancumer and Agnes Mackintosh Young in Salt Lake City. He lived an apparently idyllic life at the factory of the Deseret Woollen Mills until his father died when Mahonri was seven. After he, his mother, and his two small brothers moved to the city, he received the first bit of his meager formal education in a home school and in the Twentieth Ward School. At seventeen he attended his one day of high school, after which he decided to directly pursue his ambition to become an artist (an ambition shared and realized by a surprising number of his boyhood friends). Newspaper illustration work and study with local artists—especially James T. Harwood, one of the early Utahns to study in Paris, France—led him to study at the Art Students’ League in New York City and ultimately to study and work for several years in Paris. There, Young became familiar with a variety of artistic styles, including the revolutionary movements led by Picasso and Matisse, but he rejected most of Modernism and held to what could be called American realism.

Even after extensive training, Young was slow in building a reputation and clientele. He and his family (he married Cecilia Sharp in 1907 and shortly thereafter had two children) lived on the edge of poverty for a number of years. The Youngs spent most of their married life in New York City and nearby Leonia, New Jersey, and Mahonri became well integrated into the New York art scene. But despite excellent connections and memberships in important artistic associations (he belonged to the Association of American Painters and Sculptors, which organized the famous Armory Show where he exhibited several works), Young struggled for commissions and was pleased with opportunities that artists of later times might disdain. He designed exhibits on the Hopi, Apache, and Navajo tribes for the Museum of Natural History and made medals for awards or decorations for schools.

Young’s reputation as a painter, engraver, and sculptor slowly grew, and sales of his works eventually brought in a good income. In fact, he had few financial difficulties after his marriage in 1931 to J. Alden Wier’s daughter Dorothy (Cecilia died of cancer in 1917). But despite his increasing fame, he had to compete vigorously for the two commissions that he desired the most, the monument commemorating the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Great Salt Lake Valley and the statue of Brigham Young that the State of Utah intended to place in the Capitol in Washington, D.C. He was successful in both instances. He was still trying to undertake additional projects when he died in 1957 at the age of eighty. In addition to his other numerous awards, he received the singular honor of being made a member of the American Academy of Arts, Music, and Literature in the years just prior to his death.
Both of the recent books tell Mahonri Young's story quite effectively, but Davis adds significant information that Toone's book lacks. With the exception of masters' theses, the beginnings of serious scholarship on Young go back to a dissertation that Wayne K. Hinton presented to the Brigham Young University History Department in 1974. While Hinton had access to some of the Young materials now housed in the Harold B. Lee Library, that collection was unfortunately quite disorganized, resulting in errors in chronology and detail in his work. Toone seems to have relied on much of the same material, but since the time of Toone's dissertation work, a great number of documents have been discovered, and librarians at BYU have organized the older material as well. Davis has taken full advantage of these rich resources, and she provides a great amount of this new information. In addition, she appears to have been an indefatigable researcher—checking sources, interviewing family members, running down names and newspaper interviews, identifying figures in photographs, in effect leaving little to guesswork. This thoroughness, combined with a very sympathetic writing style, makes for a convincing treatment of the biographical material. Readers will come away from the book feeling that they have a fuller sense of the artist, his aesthetic preferences, and the real challenges of his life.

The illustrative material in Toone's book is well selected and nicely reproduced. It is a pleasure to see the variety in Young's work and to be able to note his exceptional draftsmanship and his dynamic use of color. A quick glance at the book is enough to convince readers that Mahonri Young was an outstanding artist in several media. Toone also includes photographic documentation of Young's life and career.

Davis's Song of Joys is one of the most beautiful scholarly art books that I have seen. The design work of Adrian Pulfer and Matt Scherer is extraordinary. The page format (by my measurement 9½" x 12") allows for impressive reproductions. In addition to providing many images of the artist's work, Davis has supplied a valuable selection of newly discovered photographs of Young, his family, and his friends.

Because publishing art books is very expensive, authors often must forgo desirable features for financial reasons. But I wish that both books could have included at least a few more reproductions of works by other artists. Appropriately, both Toone and Davis compare Young's works with European or American artists by whom Mahonri was influenced or with whom they would like to draw a contrast. Unfortunately, the lack of reproductions illustrating these comparisons forces the reader to rely on an often faulty memory or to rush out for reference works.

I also had a little difficulty with the placement of the illustrations in both books. Each author (rightly, I believe) has chosen to include figure numbers to avoid interrupting the flow of the text. But occasionally a
photograph or reproduction is placed several pages before or after the page where it is discussed. I found myself looking around in the book to see if the illustration was included at all. Perhaps Toone and Davis could have employed some kind of parenthetical reference when it seemed important.

Toone’s editors did not always serve him well. A number of writing errors have slipped by, including dangling modifiers (56, 69, 120, 193, and others), the use of this as a pronoun with an unclear or abstract antecedent (53, 98, 107), and quite a few awkward and unclear statements. I was also troubled by some of Toone’s terminology. “Classical” and “Classic” seem to be used in varying senses—sometimes referring to Greek- or Roman-influenced works but elsewhere appearing as synonyms for “traditional” or “older.” More disturbing is the designation of Delacroix, Ingres, Corot, and Courbet as impressionists (104). This reference comes in a discussion of the Armory Show, but if that show used such a strange classification for these artists, Toone should surely have let the reader know.

The Davis text is considerably cleaner. It contains a few errors, including quotation marks used with indented quotations (18, 133, 182), a misspelling of Dorothy (190), and a use of “medium” when a plural is needed (153). However, the flow of the fine text is generally undisturbed by editing mistakes.

The adult Mahonri Young, despite his ancestry and upbringing, was never a participating member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He liked cigars and wine, and he found it humorous when he had to go to church twice in one day. Both Toone and Davis deal directly with Young’s relations with the Church, and each shows Young’s devotion to his Mormon heritage and friends. Davis is particularly strong in this respect.

A final note: both books would be stronger if they contained more aesthetic analysis of Young’s work. They make it clear that Young was a significant artist but only occasionally tell us what makes his work successful. Both authors are gifted in critiquing art—see, for example, Davis on the Seagull Monument (134) and Toone’s scattered comparative comments. I would like to have seen more full-scale analysis of the major works.

---
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Reviewed by Noel L. Owen

I joined the LDS Church about twenty-five years ago in a fairly rural part of Wales. As I was a new convert living in a remote area of the England Birmingham Mission, gaining access to authoritative Church books was as important to me as was going to church on Sunday. Such books were there to be “devoured.” In addition, as a scientist teaching at a university, I sought to correlate my scientific training and understanding with my newly acquired and burgeoning religious beliefs. When I obtained a copy of The Faith of a Scientist by Henry Eyring, father of the current Apostle Henry B. Eyring, I felt as excited as if I had discovered gold in the nearby hills. Had this new book, Of Heaven and Earth, been available then, I would have accepted and digested it eagerly. But now I am older in my Church membership and maybe a little more confident with the questions that commonly arise when science and religion are discussed. The result is that I am not quite as impressed as I probably would have been in the 1970s.

This edited text contains a remarkably heterogeneous collection of essays from a remarkably homogeneous group of authors (over half are, or have been, connected with Brigham Young University). The editor (and a contributor) is David L. Clark, a distinguished geologist at the University of Wisconsin. The other essay writers comprise six other geologists or Earth scientists, two physicists, one chemist, and one medical doctor. A more complete collection of authors might have included experts in several other scientific fields.

On the whole, the essays are well written and are not burdened with a plethora of scientific terminology and jargon or with an obvious personal bias. They contain some interesting facts and comparisons, and some represent very thoughtful presentations relating to science and religious belief. Fortunately, the classic contribution by Henry Eyring on the six worlds in which we live is included along with other more personal “how I overcame the difficulty of rationalizing my testimony with my science” types of contributions. The former introduces the reader to ideas and concepts that are exciting and mind stretching, whereas the main objective of the latter tends to be to comfort the reader with the knowledge that other scientists (some of them eminent in their fields) have struggled with serious doubts but have been able to overcome them and have developed strong testimonies of the restored gospel.
For example, Philip Low's essay, "Perspectives on Science and Religion," discusses the uncertainties that are an essential part of science and compares these with uncertainties that are inherent in the religious sphere. He also discusses the infinitesimally small probability of life originating from the accidental superposition of the appropriate small molecules, concluding that disciples of both science and religion require faith, experimentation, and tolerance.

Wilford Gardner's article, "Science as a Way to God," is partially a biographical account of the author's search for compatibility between his religious beliefs and his scientific inclination and partially his philosophy on the differences and similarities between two methods for obtaining truth: the scientific approach and the religious search. He concludes that "belief and understanding go hand in hand, both in the religious and the secular spheres of knowledge" (85).

Bart Kowallis, in his essay "Things of the Earth," describes some of the dating methods used by today's geologists and how these are used in assessing the age of rocks. He explains how Latter-day Saints need not be concerned if scientific data suggests that Earth may be over 4.5 billion years old.

The chapter by Henry Eyring is excerpted from two books written in the 1960s. He uses the classic analogy of a ticking watch found far from human habitation, comparing it to the universe: one "would ask not only 'Who made this watch?' but 'Who wound it up?'" (59). He describes the five different "worlds" of our physical existence ranging from the subatomic world to the world of the stars, but asserts that the sixth "world," the spiritual world, is necessary to fully understand the other five.

William Stokes's short essay, "If There Be Bounds," questions whether we have discovered all the boundaries of our physical universe and considers the revelation given to Joseph Smith in Liberty Jail (D&C 121:30–32). He concludes that we have indeed discovered many of the "bounds" of the universe and that others will be discovered in "this dispensation of the fullness of times." The most elusive of these is not necessarily discovering the limits of the universe but grasping with our finite minds that they may not exist at all. The confines of science itself may prevent explanation, and such answers may come only from divine revelation.

Geologist Raymond Ethington, in his article "Oh Say, What Is Truth," uses the analogy of a newspaper photograph, which has to be viewed from a certain distance because on closer inspection the image is actually composed of black dots; if viewed from a vantage point that is too close, the picture is lost. Similarly, with the scriptures and geologic evidence, we see the same picture (only an image of the real event) from imperfect vantage points.

In his essay "Atoms, Stars, and Us," Hollis Johnson provides a fascinating panorama ranging from the birth of the stars to the generation of the
elements that constitute matter as we know it. He concludes that despite the marvels of the universe, they pale when compared with the importance of improving our relationship with our Heavenly Father and learning the values that govern our lives.

In some ways the most unusual essay, Edwin Seegmiller’s “Expansion of Knowledge of Human Genetics: A Mormon Perspective” addresses the divinity within the human form. The author derives the discussion from his own extensive research as a physician on “gouty arthritis” and related maladies and concludes that our bodies are the result of our Father in Heaven’s creative genius. Although unlike the other essays in this volume because it is focused on a relatively narrow topic, this account of the discoveries that led to our present understanding of certain common ailments makes fascinating reading and is intelligible to nonmedical experts.

David Clark’s contribution concerns Earth and human history, and he asks if we would get the same result if we could “rewind” Earth’s history and record it again. He argues that evidence of progress in evolution strongly indicates the presence of a creator.

Kent Harrison’s essay, “Truth, the Sum of Existence,” discusses several topics such as the creation of the universe and the nature of time and space as well as matter and spirit. He points to the lack of common ground between religious and scientific truth and acknowledges that a full understanding of the universe may have to wait for the life beyond.

De Verle Harris’s essay refutes claims that mankind is a curse to the natural earth, depleting its resources. He concludes with optimistic confidence in Earth’s ability to sustain us, provided we realize we are its stewards.

What the authors in this volume have in common is a strong testimony of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ and of the doctrine that all truth and knowledge, whether from scientific discovery or from spiritual revelation, will eventually be in total harmony. This is a book that those interested in science will enjoy, whether dipping in a chapter at a time or reading it entirely in a single contemplative sitting.

---
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Reviewed by Larry W. Draper

Two new works of Mormon bibliography have made the world of Mormon studies a friendlier place.1 Completed after decades of painstaking compilation and analysis, these volumes bring to the public the expertise of several senior LDS scholars. While both books contain the words bibliography and Mormon in their titles, they are nevertheless very different publications indeed. The Crawley volume, in addition to being a bibliography, might also be described as a narrative history of LDS printing during the Church’s formative years. In contrast, the tome by Allen, Walker, Whittaker, Mauss, and Reynolds is a reference tool that directs students of Mormonism to thousands of secondary sources, most of which were produced during the twentieth century.

*A Descriptive Bibliography of the Mormon Church* is, to put it simply, the best available source on early Mormon printing and publishing. After nearly thirty-five years of collecting, researching, analyzing, and writing, Crawley, a recently retired BYU Professor of Mathematics, has produced a volume (the first of a projected three-volume set) unmatched in its historical details of early Mormon printing. For Crawley, this is not unfamiliar territory. Over the years, he has produced several smaller, more selective Mormon bibliographies.2

Readers do not ordinarily peruse bibliographies from cover to cover, but this book is written well enough that I willingly did just that. This finely produced volume is a list of the “incunabula” of Mormonism, the defining publications of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from the Church’s inception through 1847. But this exceptional book is far more than a simple list of early Mormon books, pamphlets, and broadsides. While other sources available in the past twenty years3 have provided the same bibliographic information, Crawley’s volume is set apart by its extensive nonbibliographic details that add meat to the dry bones of typical bibliographies. The book includes biographical sketches of authors,
editors, publishers, and printers as well as details on Mormon printing establish-
ments, presses, typefaces, size of print runs, bindings, printing costs, 
wholesale and retail prices, and much more.

A Descriptive Bibliography begins with an insightful historical intro-
duction to the first twenty-eight years of Mormonism with the Church's 
seminal publications in mind. Next is the bibliography proper, which is 
comprised of 345 numbered entries arranged chronologically, with each 
entry including an often lengthy exposition of the historical context in 
which the book was printed. The end of each entry gives the appropriate 
Flake number, a Dennis number when applicable, and a census of the col-
lecting repositories that hold an original of the item. The book concludes 
with endnotes, a list of library codes with their corresponding libraries, 
and three valuable indexes (author-title, biographical, and subject).

Occasional photographic reproductions of selected title pages (51 of 
the 345 entries) provide an important visual feel for these nineteenth-
century publications. One minor irritation is the method used to acknowl-
dege the sources of these illustrations. The citations do not appear on the 
page where the reproduction appears. Rather, they are found in a note 
buried at the end of the author-title index (456). The facsimiles are appro-
priately reproduced in actual size, yet nowhere is this stated to be the case.

Crawley is a tireless and meticulous student of the early Mormon 
book, and this bibliography reflects his tenacity. His book is a must for 
Mormon librarians, collectors, and serious students of early Mormon his-
ory. Unfortunately, this book may be difficult to acquire, as unusually 
rapid sales have made the work scarce.

The massive Studies in Mormon History (a huge volume printed in 
double column, 8½ by 11 inch format, with over 1,150 pages) is the compi-
lation of two independent Mormon bibliographies that enumerate pub-
lished sources primarily of the twentieth century. The larger bibliography, 
consisting of historical sources and comprising most of the book, was cre-
ated by three Mormon historians: James B. Allen, professor emeritus of 
history at BYU; Ronald W. Walker, professor of history at BYU and direc-
tor of research at the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for LDS Church His-

tory at BYU; and David J. Whittaker, curator of nineteenth-century 
Western and Mormon manuscripts in the L. Tom Perry Special Collections 
at BYU’s Harold B. Lee Library. The smaller bibliography, consisting of 
social science sources, was created by Armand L. Mauss, emeritus profes-
sor of sociology and religious studies from Washington State University, 
and his research assistant, Dynette Ivie Reynolds. This valuable reference 
book combines and indexes the vast historical and social science sources 
compiled from these two databases.
Studies in Mormon History begins with an introduction defining the authors’ scope and methodology. Next is the body of the bibliography, listing thousands of separate historical and social science sources dealing with Mormonism, including “more than 2,600 books, over 10,400 articles, more than 1,800 theses and dissertations and over 150 significant typescripts and task papers” (ix) arranged in bibliographic form alphabetically by author. This section, comprising 460 pages, contains both the historical entries from the Allen-Walker-Whittaker database plus the social science entries from the Mauss-Reynolds database to form a comprehensive bibliography of academic sources on Mormonism. Also included among the entries of books, articles, theses, and dissertations are entries for individual chapters taken from anthologies on Mormon subjects. Entries of this sort are particularly valuable because they are often missed by bibliographers and library catalogers as well.

The next section, 586 pages long, is a massive subject and name index of just the historical entries arranged into literally thousands of subject categories and formatted in abbreviated bibliographic form. The subject categories run the gamut from the obvious to the obscure, from “Abolitionism,” “Abortion,” and “Academic freedom” to “ZCMI,” “Zelph,” and “Zion’s Camp.”

The final section, a social science topical guide, is a subject index of just the social science entries arranged into twenty-one broad subject areas and further subdivided into a total of sixty-three social science subject categories. This is the smallest of the three sections (85 pages).

Because many scholarly works cover more than one topic or subtopic, the same abbreviated entry often appears in several subject categories. The resulting repetition of entries is of course what makes a subject index useful. Undoubtedly the index and topical guide will be the most utilized portions of Studies in Mormon History. Here one can begin a study of the secondary literature on nearly any imaginable subject or subtopic of Mormonism.

While all published bibliographies have their strengths and weaknesses, the strong point of this exhaustive compilation is its comprehensiveness. The compilers have attempted to be all inclusive of sources they classify as “‘serious scholarship’” (x). Additionally, they have included some sources deemed not as scholarly (such as biographical sketches) but nevertheless useful to Mormon studies. Also included are sources on Utah history that are not specifically Mormon but are not easily segregated from Mormon history. The compilers have excluded non-English publications, uncritically written family histories, the literature of Mormon schismatic groups, book reviews, and “‘faith-promoting literature’” (x). If anything, the compilers have consciously erred on the side of inclusiveness.
One flaw that cannot go unnoted is the way the compilers have sorted title entries (works without an explicitly noted author) in the bibliography portion of the book. These three hundred title entries are grouped together under the heading "Author unidentified." The compilers acknowledge this unusual arrangement in a footnote on page three, explaining that the computer program used to produce the bibliography did not allow for the proper sorting routine (known as an author-title/title sort). A better solution, although admittedly more time consuming, would have been to insert these entries manually in their correct alphabetical order. After so many years of work on this bibliography, the additional time to manually enter the title entries properly would have been insignificant.

Yet, as with *A Descriptive Bibliography of the Mormon Church*, the value of *Studies in Mormon History* is unarguable. No research library with Mormon collections can afford to be without these two references on its shelf, and no student of Mormonism will fail to benefit from consulting their pages.

Larry W. Draper is Curator of Americana and Mormonism in the Special Collections and Manuscripts Department of the Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University.

1. The Crawley book may be considered new even though it has a publication date of 1997: the book did not actually appear until late 1998, due to delays at Wind River Press of Austin, Texas.


4. This volume covers the first eighteen years of Church publishing; Crawley's second volume will cover from 1848 to 1852; volume three will cover from 1853 to 1857.

5. The Flake number refers to the listings in the two *Mormon Bibliography* volumes listed in note 3.

Brief Notice


Some books plow ground, other books break it. A City of Refuge: Quincy, Illinois, breaks ground and breaks it in a style uncommon in Latter-day Saint regional histories. Histories of the Church in early New York; Kirtland, Ohio; northern Missouri; and Nauvoo, Illinois, have long been available. These works were written by Latter-day Saints. Now comes a collection of symposium papers, written by LDS and non-LDS scholars, that chronicles the winter of 1838–39, when most of the Saints resided in Quincy, Illinois.

The papers were initially presented at a Quincy History Symposium held in Quincy, Illinois, November 5–6, 1999. The brainchild of Loren and Annette Burton, LDS public affairs missionaries in Nauvoo, this conference drew support from public and private nonprofit entities. It was designed to "honor the humanitarian efforts of the citizens of Quincy that saved the lives of thousands of Latter-day Saint refugees who were then in flight from their Missouri homes in the winter of 1839" (xii). Conference participants included Quincy-area conservatives, librarians, historians, and newspaper reporters; BYU historians; and Illinois government officials.

This collection's sixteen papers divide neatly into two camps. Mormon-related papers discuss the Missouri persecutions, Mormon demographics in Quincy, the Twelve in Quincy, apostasy and return, and Mormons in Quincy newspapers. Mormons are scarcely mentioned, however, in the papers on subjects such as the Quincy mounted riflemen, early Quincy architecture, Quincy-area riverboat stories, and folk culture.

The bulk of this work, of course, discusses the events of 1838–39. The book does well at narrating the Latter-day Saint side of that winter. The editors' contributions are particularly engaging. First-hand accounts help modern readers understand the difficulties of those days and appreciate the gratitude the Saints must have felt for the kindnesses of Quincy citizens. This is vital narration. But given the theme of the symposium, I was surprised this book did not say more of the Quincy citizens themselves. Nowhere do we find quoted any of the Quincy residents who lent a helping hand. A plat map or a map reconstructing the city of 1839 would have helped readers visualize the logistics of what one Quincy historian calls one of the "greatest humanitarian gestures in the United States" (67).

Given the focus on humanitarianism, sociological analysis would have improved this collection. Why did Quincy citizens lend a helping hand when most of the Saints' neighbors elsewhere did not? This, it seems to me, is the central question of the Quincy experience but one that remains unanswered. If the lesson of that winter can be located in "Christian service" (101), a demographic study of local religion would have been in order. Finally, since Democrats were apparently more eager than Whigs to assist the Saints, some exploration of this tension viz a viz political tensions in Missouri would have helped readers discriminate eager helpers from reluctant ones.

Despite these reservations, the book is a big step forward. Readers—Latter-day Saint or not, Quincy resident or not—will come away from the text inspired to go and do likewise, and little else can be more important than this.

—Jed L. Woodworth
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Palm Ridge

When Alaska was
Robert Serviced out of me
I flew south
to saguaro, to mesquite, to ironwood,
to man-made lakes and crumbling
granite trails.

Friends in the hot tub by the key-shaped pool
call this place God's waiting room.
I call it what it is, the Valley of the Sun,
and climb from the tub.

I walk past Humpty Dumpties
gossiping on a shelf inside the pool.
Pause by my husband in his shaded lawn chair
long enough to marinate my shoulders in sunscreen.
He fingers a brown spot on his forearm.
“Here's a new one,” he says.
“I'm like the bottom of a ship, barnacled.”

Everyone practices humor here.
My pharmacist asks if I played golf with Lincoln.
My physician labels me EKG Champion of Stress Tests.

I double-step down the wide steps and cast off.
Swim a pool length, jackknife and stretch out.
Hook my feet on the concrete edge
beneath the gushing artificial waterfall.

My body is parchment,
an antiquated palimpsest, partially erased by jests.
But in this warm light my veins syncopate the blues

—Norma S. Bowkett

This poem tied for second place in the BYU Studies 1999
poetry contest.
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Laie, Hawaii, 1919
by LeConte Stewart