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Nephi and Lehi drew upon the experiences of Moses and alluded to his exodus experience as a pattern of their own situation. Their knowledge of Hebraic literary traditions made it natural for them to introduce themselves as types of Moses. Moses Among Roman Ruins, by Lambert Suavius (Zutman). Engraving, 8" x 4", about 1550.
Nephi tells the story of the founding events of the Nephite people in such a way that his readers will see him as a second Moses. Although Nephi’s use of the Moses typology has been previously noted, what has not been noticed before is that his father, Lehi, also employs this same typology in his farewell address in 2 Nephi 1–4 in order to persuade his descendants of his own divine calling and of their new covenant relationship to the same God who had given the promised land to ancient Israel. The fact that Nephi and Lehi both saw themselves as Moses figures demonstrates their awareness of a recognizable feature of preexilic Israelite literature that has only recently been explicated by Bible scholars.

When Nephi wrote his second record (the small plates), portraying himself as a Moses figure, he followed the pattern set almost three decades earlier by his father Lehi. While there is no reason to think that Lehi or Nephi set out with an ambition to be a Moses type, the circumstances into which the Lord called them were very much like Moses’ transitional situation. And these connections were not lost on them. Further, the Hebraic literary tradition that we find in the Old Testament almost demanded that they presented themselves as antitypes for Moses. More than almost any of the Moses antitypes of the Old Testament, the lives of Lehi and Nephi naturally fit the Moses typology. It would make sense to criticize the Book of Mormon had it not made these kinds of strong, natural comparisons. Nephi wove into his record an essential literary feature of ancient Israelite texts, the necessity of which was not fully recognized until the late twentieth century. In fact, had Joseph Smith undertaken to develop Moses typologies on the basis of the scholarly understanding available in the 1820s, he probably would have gotten it wrong. Further, even though the Moses
Noel Reynolds, an astute student and longtime author of important studies on the Book of Mormon, has turned his energies and skills to asking why Lehi draws attention—openly and subtly—to Moses as a precursor of himself. Rather than an effort to inflate himself in the eyes of his family members, especially his unbelieving sons and their families, Lehi’s comparison follows a time-honored pattern of one prophet modeling his ministry on that of another, earlier prophet, thus gaining respect for his own work and demonstrating that he stands firmly within the stream of God’s sacred purposes.

In this carefully aimed study, Reynolds has uncovered one of the most important dimensions of Lehi’s last words to his family: Lehi shows that in his time and place he was the new Moses. Hence, his actions, his words, his efforts are to be seen by his children and their children as a continuation of the words and acts of Israel’s founding prophet, particularly as Moses’ mission is framed in the book of Deuteronomy.

Reynolds generously informs us about recent studies that solidify this sort of point about the influence of Moses on succeeding generations of prophets, most notably those of Dale C. Allison Jr. and Robert Alter. In addition to these studies, for a broad look at how Moses and the Exodus influenced the legal and social norms of later Israelites, a person could profitably examine David Daube’s *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible* (1963) wherein Daube makes dozens of points about the Bible that apply more or less directly to the Book of Mormon.

—S. Kent Brown, Brigham Young University

For further study on Moses typology that appears in the risen Savior’s visit, see S. Kent Brown, “Moses and Jesus: The Old Adorns the New,” in *The Book of Mormon: 3 Nephi 9-30, This Is My Gospel*, edited by M. S. Nyman and C. D. Tate, Jr. (Provo: Religious Studies Center, 1993), 89–100.
typologies employed in the Book of Mormon are sufficiently subtle to have evaded discovery until recently, they are in fact much more clearly and extensively developed than any of the comparable Old Testament precedents.

Nephi as Moses

Like Moses, Nephi fled into the wilderness after slaying an official of an oppressive regime, and he then led his people through that wilderness, over the water, and to the promised land. Like Moses, he constantly had to overcome the murmuring and faithlessness of his people. Like Moses, he secured divine assistance to feed his people in the wilderness. And like Moses, he was caught up into a mountain to receive the word of God. Further, on two occasions Nephi explicitly invoked the historical model of Moses laboring with the murmuring Israelites as a device to persuade his own murmuring brothers to help him in the tasks the Lord had given to him: obtaining the brass plates (1 Nephi 4:1–3) and building the ship (1 Nephi 17:23–32). By portraying himself as a Moses figure, Nephi was following a model invoked dramatically at least two decades earlier by his own father, when Lehi gave his final teachings and blessings to his family. Lehi, in turn, was following a pattern established earlier by a series of Old Testament authors.

The following chart demonstrates twenty-one points of comparison between Nephi and Moses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killing and fleeing</td>
<td>Ex. 2:11–15</td>
<td>Both Moses and Nephi fled into the wilderness after killing a repressive public figure; their flight prevented their being detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 4:18, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An exceedingly high</td>
<td>Moses 1:1</td>
<td>Both were caught up to a mountain where they received comprehensive revelation to ground and guide them as prophets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>1 Ne. 11:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattering and gathering</td>
<td>Deut. 4:26–31</td>
<td>Both saw and prophesied a future scattering and destruction of their people because of wickedness as well as a latter-day restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 12:19–23; 13:30, 34–42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with God</td>
<td>Ex. 33:11; Num. 12:8; Moses 1:2, 31</td>
<td>Both Moses and Nephi saw and spoke with the Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 11:1, 12, 21; 2 Ne. 11:2; 31:4–15; 33:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An unexpected calling</td>
<td>Moses 1:6, 26; Ex. 3:1</td>
<td>Neither Moses nor Nephi were of high birth, office, or other social or natural distinction at the time of their prophetic calling. Moses was a refugee from Egypt and a shepherd in Midian; Nephi was the fourth son of Lehi and a refugee from Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 2:19–24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision of nations</td>
<td>Moses 1:8, 27–30</td>
<td>Both were shown the future peoples of the world and the Lord's purposes for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 11–14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Ex. 3:10; 12:51</td>
<td>Both were major figures in leading people out of wicked places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 2; 17:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power over the elements</td>
<td>Ex. 14:13–22</td>
<td>Moses parted the Red Sea by the power of God; Nephi calmed the storm and made the Liahona to function “according to [his] desires.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 17–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promised land</td>
<td>Num. 13; Deut. 1</td>
<td>Both led their people safely to the promised land, though Moses was not permitted to enter his.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 2:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through the wilderness</td>
<td>Ex. 14:12</td>
<td>Both entailed years of difficult desert conditions, murmuring by the people, longing among the people for the lives they left behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 17:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion and plots</td>
<td>Ex. 17:4; Num. 14:5–10</td>
<td>Murmuring got to the point that there were attempts made on the lives of both Moses and Nephi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 16:37; 17:48; 2 Ne. 5:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td>Ex. 17:1–7; Num. 14–16; 20:1–13; 21:5–9; 23</td>
<td>Following divine manifestations of power, accounts of murmuring often ended in reconciliation between God and the murmurers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 3:28–31; 7:6–22; 17–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges of usurpation</td>
<td>Ex. 2:13–14; Num. 16:3, 13</td>
<td>Both Moses and Nephi were accused of usurping leadership and being driven by thoughts of self-promoted grandeur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 16:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine guidance in the</td>
<td>Ex. 13:21–22</td>
<td>For ancient Israel there was a cloud by day and pillar of light by night; for Lehi’s party it was the Liahona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wilderness</td>
<td>1 Ne. 16:10, 16, 28–31; 18:21–22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of starvation</td>
<td>Ex. 16:2–16</td>
<td>Both accounts tell how starvation was averted when food was provided through divine intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ne. 16:19, 30–31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled with the power of</td>
<td>Ex. 34:29–30</td>
<td>The people were afraid of Moses when he came down from Sinai; Nephi’s brothers at one point were afraid to touch him “for the space of many days.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>1 Ne. 17:48, 52–55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding texts</td>
<td>Genesis–Deuteronomy Large and</td>
<td>These texts provided religious and prophetic guidance for centuries and established a record-keeping tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small plates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building sanctuaries</td>
<td>Ex. 25–27; 36–9</td>
<td>Moses built the tabernacle, which was the pattern for Solomon’s temple, which was in turn the pattern for Nephi’s temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 5:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecrating priests</td>
<td>Ex. 28–29; Lev. 8; Num. 8</td>
<td>Moses and Nephi consecrated priests with authority to administer religious matters; in both cases, they were brothers to the prophet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 5:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious law</td>
<td>Ex. 20:2–17</td>
<td>Moses gave the Ten Commandments, Nephi the doctrine of Christ (though the Nephites also kept the law of Moses until it was fulfilled).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 5:10; 11:4; 25:24–27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of a successor</td>
<td>Deut. 34:9</td>
<td>Moses “laid his hands” on Joshua to be Israel’s leader; Nephi appointed a man to be king and ruler and his brothers Jacob and Joseph to carry on his spiritual role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob 1:9, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lehi as Moses

The following research shows that before Nephi composed the small plates account, Lehi also had used this literary device in an attempt to help his descendants understand their true situation, obligations, and opportunities. While we do not have Lehi’s account of the events reported in the small plates, we know that Nephi and Lehi shared leadership of their small clan. In the beginning, Lehi’s role was preeminent, but Nephi’s responsibility surfaced quickly in the brass plates episode and repeatedly thereafter at crucial junctures. As with Nephi, the actual sequence of historical events made it easy for Lehi to portray himself as a Moses figure. As with Moses, Lehi received commandments in visions from God, led his people out of a wicked land, through a wilderness, across a sea, and to a promised land. Then, after delivering a farewell address, he died, leaving it to younger leadership to establish a newly covenanted people in the promised land.

Historical evidence gives indication that Lehi was especially familiar with the book of Deuteronomy. Two decades before Lehi led his family into the wilderness, a manuscript now generally believed to have included all or part of the book of Deuteronomy had been discovered in the Temple in Jerusalem. In the eighteenth year of his reign (approximately 621 BC), King Josiah made this discovery and then went up to the Temple with all the people of Jerusalem, from the least to the greatest. There he stood by a pillar and read them the book, renewing the covenant contained therein, and all the people pledged themselves to the covenant (2 Kings 22–23, especially 23:1–3; see also 2 Chronicles 34–35). The book and this event then provided the basis for Josiah’s reforms by which he overthrew idol worship and then centralized worship of Jehovah at the Jerusalem Temple.

This version of Deuteronomy was without doubt the manuscript find of the century in ancient Israel.
before they left him behind and crossed over the Jordan River into their promised land. As the analysis below will show, Lehi’s own final address reflects an intimate knowledge of the text of Deuteronomy. Lehi alludes to it at every turn of his own discourse, without letting the references distort or detract in any way from his own message. He makes Deuteronomy a powerful—though unmentioned—foundation for his own message to all his readers, especially for those who might know that version of Moses’ last words.

It may be difficult for modern readers to understand why a prophet like Lehi would find it appropriate to compare himself to Israel’s great prophet-deliverer. But because Lehi and his people understood their own experience in terms of types and shadows of previous times (see Mosiah 3:15), the comparison was probably quite natural. By way of comparison, Lehi really had no better choice than Moses. If human history is, as Lehi and Nephi clearly understood it and as their own visions consistently reemphasized, a continuing and repeating revelation of God’s covenant with his people, then God’s leading of Lehi and his group out of Jerusalem and reinstating his covenant with them in a new promised land can well be understood in the terms of Israel’s previous exodus from Egypt. Thus, the roles of Lehi and Nephi fall into place as counterparts to the leadership of Moses.

Contextually, Lehi evidently saw himself in the same awkward position as Moses at the end of his life. After years of leading his family through a difficult wilderness journey beset with almost impossible obstacles that were overcome only through rather obvious divine interventions, Lehi’s two older sons still murmured and possessed a spirit of rebellion. Lehi knew from his visions that these sons would not have a lasting and sincere change of heart and that they would soon depart from the ways and covenants he had taught. But his time was over. Like Moses, he knew his mortal ministry was drawing to an end. All he could do now was leave a blessing and a set of teachings for future generations who would hopefully be more receptive to his true message and to the revelations on which it is based. Like Moses, he concluded his long sojourn on earth in a farewell address to his people, warning them of the dangers of disobedience to God and powerfully reminding them of the great blessings God has in store for those who remember their covenants and obey his commandments.

Lehi used Deuteronomy only as a parallel and not as a foundation for his teaching and blessing. He had experienced the same kinds of visions and revelations that Moses had received. In a vision, God showed Lehi the
mixed future of his people and the salvation of all mankind. He had beheld
the future birth and ministry of the Messiah, the Son of God. He had
seen the triumph of God and his people in the last days, and he had beheld
God himself on his throne. The last thing Lehi would have wanted to com-
municate was that Moses’ writings were the sole source of his understand-
ing. Lehi’s visions stood as the full and sufficient basis of his independent
witness and authority to prophesy to his children. If all his people had
been capable of recognizing the Spirit that bears witness of his revelations,
he would have had little need for a rhetorical appeal to Moses as a second
witness. But he knew that his rebellious older sons specifically rejected his
visions, calling him a visionary man (1 Nephi 2:11), and he therefore took
advantage of Moses as support. Thus Lehi phrased his message in terms
that should have repeatedly reminded his hearers of Moses’ similar mes-
sage delivered on a similar occasion.\textsuperscript{9}

The following chart summarizes fourteen themes Lehi invoked that
are also found in Deuteronomy. Though his farewell address has no
explicit reference to Moses, the themes provide ample evidence that Lehi
consciously saw Moses as his prototype.\textsuperscript{10}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal of blessings</td>
<td>Deut. 4:9–13, 32–38, 2 Ne. 1:1, 3, 10</td>
<td>Both Moses and Lehi wanted their people to remember what good the Lord had done for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of a successor</td>
<td>Deut. 1:38; 3:28; 31:3, 7, 14, 23, 34:9, 2 Ne. 1:28</td>
<td>Moses appointed Joshua explicitly, Lehi appointed Nephi indirectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A prophet’s last words</td>
<td>Deut. 4:21–22, 2 Ne. 1:13–15</td>
<td>Both Lehi and Moses knew that they would soon be gone; they both wanted to issue a final warning that their people must obey the commandments or suffer both temporally and spiritually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostates will be cursed, scattered, and smitten</td>
<td>Deut. 4:25–27; 7:4; 8:19–20; 11:16–17, 26–28; 28:15–20; 30:18, 2 Ne. 1:10–11, 17–18, 21–22</td>
<td>Both the Israelites and the Lehites were led to lands of promise by the Lord on the condition that once there they would keep the commandments or be swept off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember the statutes and judgments</td>
<td>Deut. 4:1, 5, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1</td>
<td>Here is Lehi’s most direct and obvious invocation of a dominant theme of Deuteronomy. The need of both peoples to keep the statutes and judgments of the Lord in order to avoid disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the commandments and prosper in the land</td>
<td>Deut. 28:15; 29:9</td>
<td>If obedient, each people would be blessed and prospered in their land of promise. Lehi goes beyond Moses to provide a succinct statement of the promise that is repeated nearly twenty times in the Book of Mormon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:20; 4:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A rebellious people</td>
<td>Deut. 9:6–8, 13</td>
<td>Both Lehi and Moses were dealing with a gainsaying and rebellious people, and they pointed this out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:2, 24–26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A choice land</td>
<td>Deut. 5:16; 8:1, 7–10</td>
<td>The lands of promise were specifically chosen and prepared by the Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:5–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The covenant people and their land</td>
<td>Deut. 4:13, 31; 5:3; 7:9; 29:24–28</td>
<td>Connected with the land is a promise that it will be an eternal inheritance to righteous posterity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A choice and favored people</td>
<td>Deut. 4:20, 37; 7:6, 14; 26:18–19; 28:1, 9</td>
<td>Notwithstanding their rebellions, both people were choice and favored of the Lord because of the covenant with their fathers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goodness and mercy of the Lord</td>
<td>Deut. 7:9, 12</td>
<td>In addition to setting forth the more immediate blessings of land and substance, Lehi and Moses expound on the plan of salvation and the goodness of God manifested therein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:3, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing between good and evil, life and death</td>
<td>Deut. 30:15, 19</td>
<td>Moses as well as Lehi explicitly place a choice before their people by explaining the commandments and consequences for disobedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 2:18, 26, 27, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Typology in Ancient Israelite Literature

We need not view these comparisons by the first Nephite prophets as either original or audacious. The Nephites were familiar with the notion of types and shadows in the workings of God among his people (see Mosiah 3:15). But what was the source of this Nephite perception? Recent scholarly analyses of the Old Testament show that ancient Israelites expected true prophets to draw such comparisons, at least implicitly. Beginning with the book of Joshua, Old Testament texts consciously portrayed great prophets and heroes in ways that would highlight their similarities with Moses, the prophetic predecessor whose divine calling and powers were not questioned. Ironically, after he was safely out of the way and unable to interfere with any sinner’s life, Moses was revered by the rebellious and the obedient alike, making him a powerful icon that successive prophets could invoke in their attempts to influence their own contemporaries to be obedient and faithful.

Although his history of typological interpretations focuses principally on the New Testament, Dale C. Allison has recently demonstrated persuasively that the Moses typology was originally an Old Testament tradition, and that it is pervasive in its many books and in the later rabbinic literature. As Moses led Israel out of Egypt, through the Red Sea on dry ground, and eventually to the promised land, so Joshua led the people out of the wilderness, across the River Jordan on dry ground, and into the promised land. On that day the Lord exalted Joshua in the sight of all Israel; they stood in awe of him, as they had previously stood in awe of Moses (Joshua 4:14). Allison collects from the scholarly and interpretive literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquittal before God</td>
<td>Deut. 4:14–15</td>
<td>They absolve themselves of responsibility for their people’s future transgressions by declaring that they have taught correct principles and that it would now be up to their people to govern themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:15–17, 21–22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address to future generations</td>
<td>Deut. 4:9–10; 7:9</td>
<td>The promises and counsel applied to many generations, not just to those to whom the discourses were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Ne. 1:7, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
impressive examples of well-developed Moses typologies in the biblical accounts of Gideon, Samuel, David, Elijah, Josiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Ezra, Baruch, the Messiah, the suffering servant, and even in the rabbinic tradition of Hillel. More generally, these typologies are only one manifestation of what Robert Alter has called a “general biblical predisposition to see history as a chain of duplicating [or replicating] patterns.”

Three assumptions seem to guide Old Testament authors in their use of typologies. First, the repeating chain of duplicated patterns in history testifies that the one true God is behind it all. Second, written accounts of recent events and people are best filled with religious meaning through silent allusions to earlier events and people. And third, because recent events parallel the events of holy history, they are extensions of that same history.

Many kinds of typologies can be constructed from a variety of materials. From his study, Allison extracted a list of six ways in which the account of one person or event (the antitype) can be constructed to allude to a prior person or event as a type. No two historical figures are identical, nor do they live identical lives. For any two such figures, the story of their lives could be told in such a way as to avoid any suggestion of similarity. Alternatively, selected facts can also be used to emphasize common features. By constructing the account of a second figure to evoke the readers’ memories of a prominent earlier figure, a writer can suggest strongly to the readers that the later person plays a similar role in God’s theater, as did the first. Robert Alter may only be pointing to the obvious when he notes that readers in traditional societies with a fixed literary canon were in a much stronger position to identify literary allusions because “the whole system of signaling depends . . . on a high degree of cultural literacy.”

The ways in which a writer can make this suggestion include (1) explicit statement or reference, (2) silent borrowing of textual elements, (3) silent pointing to a similarity of circumstances, (4) borrowing of key words and phrases, (5) following a similar narrative structure, and (6) imitating patterns of words and syllables. Lehi’s farewell address appears to use all but the first and the last of these six methods in signaling to his auditors that he has been called and directed of God, as was Moses of old, to lead a branch of Israel into a new land and a new dispensation.

Because of the long history of exaggeration or abuse of typological methods of interpretation, Allison has also assembled several guidelines abstracted from Old Testament usage that will help interpreters be...
objective and restrained in identifying and defending solid and substantial typologies of the kind we might reasonably infer were intended by their authors. He advises that (1) the text must allude to another that already existed at the time it was written (Lehi alluded to texts from Deuteronomy), (2) the type and its textual source must have been important to the author of the text which makes the allusion (Lehi valued and embraced his predecessor Moses), (3) combinations of different devices of allusion make it much less likely the similarities are accidental (Lehi combined four of these devices), (4) the type alluded to must be sufficiently prominent so that the allusions will be evident to most qualified readers (Moses is the most prominent type available to Lehi and his people), (5) typologies that are known and appreciated are more convincing when invoked anew (Moses was well known to Lehi and his family), and (6) “two texts are more plausibly related if what they share is out of the ordinary” (the experience of Lehi’s people was certainly extraordinary, as had been Israel’s deliverance from Egypt). The typology of Lehi’s farewell address, which positions Lehi as antitype and the Moses of Deuteronomy as type, is exceptionally strong and adheres to all six of these guidelines.

In their analyses of the Moses typology in the Old Testament, both Michael A. Fishbane and Allison are perfectly clear that the principal engine driving the typologies is simple literary allusion, which is helpfully explained by Robert Alter as “the evocation—through a wide spectrum of formal means—in one text of an antecedent literary text.”

“Allusion occurs when a writer, recognizing the general necessity of making a literary work by building on the foundations of antecedent literature, deliberately exploits this predicament in explicitly activating an earlier text as part of the new system of meaning and aesthetic value of his own text.”

Typologies work by describing one set of persons and events in a way that alludes to some previous and well-known set. The allusion calls on readers to be alert to the similarities between the two and to the possible religious meaning of such similarities.

Robert Alter analyzes literary allusions in terms of three important variables: form, function, and relation to previous text. The formal elements of the Moses typology in Lehi’s farewell address include embedded text where Lehi uses phrases or paraphrases of Deuteronomic themes and situational similarity, as described above. The function of the Moses typology is, in Alter’s terms, to “provide the whole ground plan” of the composition, as Lehi borrows fourteen prominent themes from Deuteronomy in his much shorter address. WhileAlter identifies subtle intertextual allusions where the relation between texts may be part-to-part or part-to-whole, 2 Nephi 1 clearly constitutes a case of whole-to-whole allusion,
in which the author wants readers to see both the contexts and the full texts as similar in an obvious and forceful way that will provide compelling reason for readers to reach strong religious conclusions that would motivate lifelong changes. Alter calls this kind of allusion metonymic “because there is extensive contiguity between the worlds of the alluding text and the evoked one, in contradistinction to other kinds of allusion, where the two texts are linked by some perception of similarity between them, the connection thus being ‘metaphoric.’” Alter goes on to argue that such large scale, whole-to-whole allusions have a strong relationship to rabbinic midrash. In a concluding insight, Alter uses an example from English poetry to demonstrate how “the articulation of a strong individual voice, resonant with the writer’s unique experience and temper, is achieved at least in part by the evocation and transformation of a voice, or voices, from the literary past.” Both Nephi in the small plates and Lehi in his farewell address appear to accomplish this evocation through their use of the Moses typology.

Allison has noted further that the Moses typology was used most effectively in the Bible with transitional figures like Samuel, who had been “raised up at a decisive time in Israel’s history” to close “one era and usher in another.” Samuel “broke the Egyptian bondage,” oversaw “the transition from a theocracy with judges to a kingdom with monarchs,” and “inaugurated the age of Torah.” The transition under Moses became “paradigmatic: it was the prime example of history changing course, of one dispensation giving way to another. So just as it was natural to comprehend any great historical transition as another exodus,” it was also natural to see a Moses figure in men who “altered the seasons and straddled epochs.” With this insight, it becomes almost a requirement that Lehi and Nephi be seen by their descendants as antitypes for Moses. The exemplary transitional roles played by Joshua and Samuel are still less dramatic than those of Lehi or Nephi as described in 1 Nephi.

The most direct evidence that Lehi compared himself to Moses comes in the first chapter of Lehi’s final speech to his people, reported in 2 Nephi 1. Lehi needed to bolster his case, for, as his rebellious older sons clearly saw, their father had led them out of Jerusalem, not Egypt. The analogy between a thriving and prosperous Jerusalem and an oppressive Egypt was not easy for them to accept (1 Nephi 17:21–22). It was hard for them to believe that the kingdom of Judah was wicked and soon to be destroyed as their father described from his visions. So, in his final words to them, Lehi invoked the very phrases and themes emphasized by Moses in his farewell address to the Israelites as recorded in Deuteronomy. In so doing, Lehi cast himself in a role similar to that of Moses in an eloquent attempt to bring
his murmuring sons into obedience and acceptance of the successor the Lord had chosen. It was a noble, although futile, attempt, and its inevitable failure may have been presaged in what some have called the awkward logic of the blessings Lehi gave to his sons.22 Even so, recorded and perpetuated forever in the family records, Lehi’s words stand for all time, like Deuteronomy for the Israelites, as a witness to his descendants of what the Lord expected them to do.23

Moses Typology in the New Testament

The word type comes from the New Testament Greek typos, meaning “a blow” or “a mark left by a blow,” as a die is used to imprint a pattern on a hard surface. With Moses as the type or pattern, Christ becomes the antitype, that in this case fulfills the earlier type which foreshadowed him and his mission. Scholarly discussion of the Moses typology has been dominated largely by the New Testament allusions to Moses as the precursor of Christ, or to Christ as a “new Moses.” Indeed, the problem scholars have always had with interpretive emphases on typologies is that these emphases have generally been used to prove the truth of the New Testament claims to the divinity of Christ. The logic would follow that if an ancient biblical type is reproduced in a later antitype, one should conclude that this is evidence of the same God working through history, and that the salvation brought about by Christ on behalf of all men is therefore intentionally prefigured in the Old Testament types.

Paul, Matthew, and John all find types in the Old Testament that, like prophecies, are fulfilled in Christ and the new covenant. The Flood is a type for the antitype baptism (1 Peter 3:20–21), and Adam, along with Moses, is a type of Christ (Romans 5:12–21). Interpreting the Old Testament typologically assumes that the same God brought forth both Moses and Jesus, and that he is in charge of history. In general, the types of the Old Testament were understood to prefigure the antitypes of the New Testament. This approach “presupposes the unity of the Old Testament and New Testament and that the active involvement of God to save and deliver people in history is consistent. It presupposes, therefore, that the meaning of the Old Testament is finally unclear without the New Testament, as is that of the New Testament without the Old Testament.”24

Typological interpretations have been faddish at different times in Christian history, and, being merged with unconstrained allegory by

\[\text{In general, the types of the Old Testament were understood to prefigure the antitypes of the New Testament.}\]
patristic writers, persisted in a distorted form up to the time of the Reformation, when literal interpretation of scriptural texts returned to fashion, and typologies were again assumed to report historical fact. The damage was done, however, and the excess of analogical interpretation became confused with and brought disrepute on the typological method, becoming especially repugnant to nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars, who were not uniformly committed to the underlying religious assumptions. However, within the last decade it has become very clear that typological interpretations were incorporated almost routinely throughout the text of the Old Testament itself, and that the New Testament authors who used these mostly implicit typologies were only trying to depict their prophet-heroes as proper successors to Moses—and, therefore, spokesmen and instruments of Moses’ God. What this also suggests is that Israelites steeped in the Old Testament would have actually expected the prophetic claims of new prophets to be bolstered by adaptations of the Moses typology to their particular circumstances. Such similarities might even have been understood as one demonstration of genuine prophetic calling. The Book of Mormon merely caters to this literary expectation of its original, culturally-Jewish audience.

Conclusions

Both in Nephi’s small plates generally and in Lehi’s farewell address specifically, implicit allusions are made to Moses as a type for both Nephi and Lehi as antitypes. Like Moses, both are important transitional prophet figures. They have seen the future of their own people in vision, and they know in advance that these people will look back on them as founders of their branch of Israel with a new covenant in a new promised land, just as old Israel looked back to Moses. But as on the numerous occasions in the Old Testament where such typologies are drawn, neither Nephi nor Lehi make many of these comparisons with Moses explicit. Dale Allison laments the difficulty that modern readers, like “bad readers with poor memories,” have in detecting these silent allusions to important earlier writings and in appreciating the wealth of additional meaning that such references bring. The Jewish writers tended “to assume a far-reaching knowledge of Scripture or tradition and so leave it to us to descry the implicit:” the Jewish writers rarely give “exhibition of the obvious.”25 As another commentator has observed, Isaiah in particular seems to take for granted that his hearers know the traditions as well as he did.26 And so it is that, in “ancient Jewish narratives typology consists, as a general rule, of references that are almost always implicit.”27 Nephi’s incorporation of this
Hebrew literary device may partially illustrate what he had in mind when he referred to his own training in “the learning of [his] father” and “the manner of prophesying among the Jews.”

Lehi’s last address to his people appears to invoke at least fourteen important themes and verbal formulations from the final addresses of Moses as recorded in Deuteronomy, a text that was well known to and revered by his people. When these are added to the numerous similarities of historical circumstance, Lehi’s intention to invoke Moses as a type for himself is placed beyond doubt. As with the presentation of Elijah as an antitype of Moses, so does Lehi’s farewell address argue that Lehi was in the line of prophets-like-Moses. In so doing, Lehi adds the weight of Moses’ testimony and all the successive prophets to his own. This is especially important because, as is often the case with the living prophet, his people were fully accepting of the teachings of the long-dead Moses and his successors, but were rebelling continuously against Lehi and his chosen successor, Nephi. Though Lehi’s appeal is successful with only part of the people in the short run, it provides a beacon and a witness to his descendants for centuries, giving them clear guidance whenever they were disposed to conduct themselves according to the will of the Lord.
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In the drafting of this paper I was generously assisted by Drew Briney, who gave me access to his comprehensive analysis of Deuteronomic terminology that shows up anywhere in the Book of Mormon. His lists demonstrate that later Book of Mormon prophets used Deuteronomy frequently as well.
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Harry Anderson, *The Second Coming*. Although Church members will likely recognize this painting and other works of art discussed in this article, they may not be familiar with the artists who created them.
Setting a Standard in LDS Art
Four Illustrators of the Mid-Twentieth Century

Robert T. Barrett and Susan Easton Black

Prints of paintings of Christ and other people from the scriptures and Church history are displayed in Latter-day Saint meetinghouses, visitors’ centers, and temples throughout the world and are used in Church magazines and manuals. Many of these artworks were created in the 1950s and 1960s by American illustrators Arnold Friberg, Harry Anderson, Tom Lovell, and Ken Riley. While the religious works of these illustrators are familiar, less known are the career paths these artists took and the other works of art they created. This article aims to acquaint the reader with the lives of these illustrators and the circumstances surrounding their artwork commissioned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley earned their reputations in the heyday of the national magazines Saturday Evening Post, Collier’s, McCall’s, Liberty, Good Housekeeping, and Ladies’ Home Journal. These artists are a product of the golden age of illustration, a period from the 1880s to the 1930s which saw unprecedented growth in commercial art. Many talented artists in America were attracted to the field of illustration, and they competed for the chance to paint a page or cover for nationally distributed magazines.

Whether the magazines featured factual articles, romantic stories, adventurous yarns, or murder mysteries, the illustrator was expected to interpret the text and work within limitations and deadlines. The variety and sheer volume of paintings in these magazines advanced the artists’ careers. “If you are doing representational paintings, like I am today, I can’t think of a better training ground than illustration,” says Ken Riley. “Illustration is a stepping stone for a lot of artists who have gone on to gallery work.” Indeed, Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley...
Serving on BYU’s Faculty Council on Rank and Status brought not only weighty decisions to Robert Barrett, Associate Dean of the College of Fine Arts and Communications, and to Susan Easton Black, Professor of Church History and Doctrine, but a collegial friendship. As their friendship grew, these veteran faculty members shared their interest in the famous illustrators of the past whose replicated artwork still adorns LDS meetinghouses and temples throughout the world.

With an opportunity extended to them by Doris R. Dant to write an article for BYU Studies celebrating the lives of the great illustrators, Barrett and Black were intrigued and determined to combine their talents. Barrett brought his expertise in illustration, and Black shared her ability to write biographies. It proved a learning experience for both. Black developed a greater appreciation for the artistic talents of these pictorial storytellers, and Barrett gained a greater understanding of the artists’ lives and the circumstances that brought them to the attention of Church-connected entities responsible for their specific commissions.

Robert Barrett feels a deep appreciation for these artists. As a boy growing up in rural Utah, he saw in Life magazine a series on the Civil War created by Tom Lovell. Inspired, Barrett practiced his art by copying Lovell’s work. Barrett also admired Ken Riley’s work in magazines and learned to recognize it. It was a special pleasure for Barrett to talk with Riley and also with Arnold Friberg for this article, as the artists have great mutual respect for each other’s work. Barrett and Black both express appreciation for assistance from David Lovell, son of the late Tom Lovell, and Kristin Geddes, daughter of the late Harry Anderson.
did move on to portrait, mural, and gallery work. As the gap between art and illustration has recently narrowed, appreciation for the contribution of these artists has increased.

**The Golden Age of Illustration**

As late as the nineteenth century, fine art could be seen only by the wealthy or those who frequented museums. In the United States, because travel to the museums and galleries of Europe was too often financially prohibitive, an increasing audience clamored for reproductions of fine art. Although European owners were usually amenable to prints being made of their private collections, poor printing processes made such willingness a moot point. Replicating an accurate, printed version of an original drawing or painting without blurry lines and muddied colors was impossible. In the nineteenth century, the invention of high-speed rotary-plate presses and a high-quality halftone engraving process soon changed the impossible to the conceivable.4

European corporate executives saw potential revenue in reproducing art for a rising middle-class society; their counterparts in America saw that potential and more. The Americans envisioned great profit in nationally distributed books and magazines that combined art with narratives and short stories. These entrepreneurs believed that by sending illustrated magazines through the mail, it would not be long before housewives, breadwinners, and children were scurrying to be the first to read monthly or weekly publications.

Many American artists were invited to submit portfolios to the emerging American art patron, the magazine editor. Some artists scoffed at the invitation to illuminate a short story with a painting, refusing to pollute their talent by associating with a literary product of questionable worth. The thought of subjecting the creativity of their paintbrushes to the dictates of an editor seemed unrewarding. These artists could not imagine that becoming a pictorial storyteller would be anything but a step down, a prostitution of God-given talents.

Not all artists, however, held this view. Howard Pyle, often referred to as the “Father of American Illustration,” embraced the book and magazine world. Pyle pioneered new ways to depict the dramatic, the heroic, the adventurous, and the American. Pyle later opened American art schools dedicated to building a contingent of American illustrators that was unrivaled by European counterparts.5 Among his highly talented students, none was more impressive or teachable than Harvey Thomas Dunn (1884–1952).6
Dunn illustrated stories for the Saturday Evening Post. During World War I, he worked as a graphic reporter on the front lines. At the war’s end, Dunn began teaching at the Grand Central School of Art in New York City. Only students whose portfolios passed his critical review were invited to enroll in his class. Arnold Friberg and Ken Riley were among the chosen.

Under Dunn’s demanding tutelage, America’s new artists learned to set the stage for a reader to imagine a story. They were told again and again that an illustrator had the potential to shape America’s self-image, and, in order to shape the American Dream, they had to be very good—very good. “Paint the epic; not the incidental,” Dunn admonished. “Any picture that needs a caption is a weak picture. . . . In making a picture, you should excite interest, not educate. Let the colleges do that.”

Although not all teachers at the Grand Central School of Art agreed with Dunn’s philosophy, gifted students caught the vision. To them, Dunn was the catalyst for igniting their aspirations. Under his guidance, this hand-picked cohort of students illustrated American icons. They became the pictorial storytellers that sustained the vision established in the Golden Age of Illustration through the 1940s and 1950s. To their readership, magazine covers revealed the ideal life: the soda fountain, the doctor’s office, and the classroom. Norman Rockwell, a student of Dunn, created vignettes of daily life that made images of sleigh rides to Grandma’s house and stockings hung for Santa Claus into American icons. Such illustrations became more popular in America than so-called fine art. This popularity led artists to vie for opportunities to illustrate even poorly written short stories in a nationally distributed magazine. But meeting deadlines, satisfying editors, and discarding originals for the published form was difficult. Illustrator Paul Calle recalled the difficulty of working for a magazine: “One week you were doing the great moments in surgery, the next it was people of the Bible. Our job was not merely to take the script and follow it exactly; it was...
to create interest in the scene, to go beyond the written word.”

Ken Riley felt that illustration brought the best artists in America together. “We prided ourselves on being able to make a good picture of anything,” he said. For the men and women who succeeded, it was a wonderful time, a golden age in which the American artist was born.

But, as with any era, this golden age passed. Photography eventually replaced much illustration, and television viewing pushed aside magazines. During this transitional time, illustrators scurried to find alternative markets, including those more closely associated with fine arts. Those who perpetuated the standard came to the attention of Latter-day Saint leaders.

Arnold Friberg

Arnold Friberg, the son of Sven Peter Friberg of Sweden and Ingeborg Solberg of Norway, was born on December 12, 1913, at Winnetka, Illinois, a suburb of Chicago. Due to his father’s deteriorating health, the family moved to warmer climes when Friberg was three years old. They settled in Phoenix, where his father was employed as a blue-collar worker. When Friberg was seven years old, his father was introduced to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints by a fellow carpenter. Friberg’s parents were baptized, and one year later so was Arnold.

Art captured Friberg’s young fancy. “I knew from the age of four what I was going to do,” he mused. His father encouraged his budding talent. “Every day I would draw an original cartoon. They were crude, but . . . they weren’t copied,” Friberg recalled. He became so proficient at cartooning that, on his eighth birthday, his father took him to meet “Uncle Billy” Spear, editor of the Arizona Republican, where Mr. Friberg worked. Spear told young Arnold to come back the next Saturday. Dwight B. Heard, owner and publisher of the newspaper, also took an interest in the young artist.
By age ten, Friberg was convinced that he needed to enroll in an art course. He enrolled in a cartooning correspondence course offered through the Washington School of Cartooning. “Every penny counted” to the Friberg family, and neighbors told Arnold’s parents, “You’re wasting your money. A boy 10 years old isn’t ready to study on a professional level!” Friberg’s parents ignored the comments.

By age thirteen, Arnold had “turned pro” and was working for a sign painter. At fourteen, he enrolled in the Federal Schools of Minneapolis, a correspondence school for commercial artists. Before the year ended, he was self-employed, painting signs and displays for theaters, real-estate entrepreneurs, and the manager of the local wrestling arena. By age fifteen, he had been hired by Safeway grocery store to paint signs, and a local vaudeville production had employed him to do “chalk talk” acts on stage. Friberg liked “chalk talk.” On stage he drew legendary characters to the delight of cheering crowds.

Crowds also cheered Arnold’s athletic prowess on the football field and in the boxing arena, but their plaudits did not turn his artistic bent toward self-portraits. “I’m not keen on painting things of my own life and times,” he said, preferring “things of great antiquity.” In recognition of his talent, Friberg received three national art awards before high school graduation.

After graduation, Friberg received unusual advice from his bishop, who generally counseled young men to serve missions: “Forego the mission. Go to art school instead, for you will do more good through developing your talent than you could do in two years of door-to-door tracting.” Following that advice “with alacrity,” Friberg entered the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts. After an intensive year of training in which he worked part time for printers, he returned to Arizona and touted himself as a commercial artist. Although the grim years of the Great Depression gripped Phoenix, Friberg never looked to the government for “make work” projects. Yet he gave up his lucrative business in 1934 for a chance to enroll once again in design, lettering, fashion drawing, and illustration at the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts. He then remained in Chicago, doing a variety of commercial art. Of these options, it was illustration that captured his fancy. “I learned more from the great illustrators than from any painter,” he claimed.

In spite of the rigorous training, it was not until 1937 that Friberg received his first “big break.” The Northwest Paper Company, a manufacturer of fine printing paper, commissioned him to create a pictorial symbol for the Northwest Mounted Police. From his first illustration of the “Mounties” to his last, his depictions of athletic uniformed men became
collector’s items and helped make Friberg the only American invited to be an honorary member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. His series of three hundred paintings over a thirty-eight-year commission is recognized as the longest-running series of illustrations in advertising history.26

With this ongoing art commission in his portfolio, Friberg was numbered among the young illustrators who could approach the major national magazines. It was no surprise that an invitation came in 1940 for him to attend the Grand Central School of Art and study under the tutelage of Harvey Dunn. Friberg did not hesitate to accept the invitation.

Although class work was demanding and Dunn uncompromising, Friberg excelled until World War II. He had not anticipated that anything could divert him from Dunn’s tutoring, but the war dampened his aspirations and ended the honeymoon period of his education. For a time, he considered serving in the air corps, which was actively seeking illustrators to depict young men looking skyward—the ultimate symbol of patriotism. He was offered a captain’s commission if he would paint recruiting posters, but he refused the commission because he “couldn’t rationalize wearing a uniform in a cushy desk job in the states” when his peers were fighting in deadly combat.27

Friberg saw war action in the Philippines and in Europe with the U.S. Army’s 86th Infantry Division. For three and a half years, he scouted and patrolled along enemy lines. When not seeking out the enemy, he drew maps and training aids for his division. The work was intense, dangerous, and demanding, and in 1946, when his troop ship docked in the San Francisco harbor, Friberg was ready for discharge. He longed to return to illustration to depict the good, the wholesome, and the American Dream. But he soon realized that the war had altered his artistic style. Before the war, Friberg explained, “to me a mountain was a shape and a tone . . . [but] through the army training and the actual combat, earth started to become a real thing. . . . It became a physical thing—something that would stop a bullet.”28 The epic power and physical substance of his new illustrations landed him work and the necessary funds to set up a studio in San Francisco.

Although designing packages, fashion illustrations, and a calendar series featuring the American West kept him busy, a young woman named Hedve Baxter captured his attention. In 1946 they were married in San Francisco. Two years later, the young couple visited Salt Lake City, where Friberg formed an acquaintance with Avard Fairbanks, then dean of the newly created College of Fine Arts at the University of Utah. Their acquaintance grew to friendship when doctors recommended that Hedve’s health would improve in drier climes, and Fairbanks expressed excitement over having Friberg, a national “big-league” illustrator, consider Salt Lake City home. Fairbanks invited Friberg, who had never completed an
academic degree, to teach practical courses in commercial art and illustration at the University of Utah.29

Although Friberg accepted the invitation, he believed his real reason for coming to Salt Lake City in 1950 was to be commissioned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to do epic religious paintings. He viewed himself as spending a lifetime painting Bible scenes, the pioneer trek, and sacred moments in Church history. He imagined “a good forty paintings of the life of Joseph Smith. How I could bring that guy to life! Through strong pictures, I could build Joseph into an American hero,” he said.30 But Friberg was disappointed to discover that illustration was not a high priority to Church leaders.

His first Church commission was a commemorative painting for the hundredth anniversary of Richard Ballantyne’s first Sunday School in the Salt Lake Valley. Neighborhood children dressed in nineteenth-century costumes were photographed, sketches were made, and oil studies were completed before he painted the scene on canvas.31

Additional opportunities to create book dust jackets and billboards did little to forward his career, and these jobs were time consuming. Hoping to steer his career toward religious themes, Friberg sought divine help. He felt that God answered him and provided the gifts necessary to advance his career and his art: “The first vision of a picture always comes—‘Boom!’ I never have but one concept of a picture, but I have to do research because I don’t see it all in clarity,” said Friberg. “The idea selects the artist it wants.” As to why he has been so blessed, he unequivocally stated, “What I do I am driven to do. I follow the dictates of a looming and unseen force. . . . I try to become like a musical instrument, intruding no sound of its own but bringing forth such tones as are played upon it by a master’s hand.”32

Arnold Friberg, Our First Rocky Mountain Sunday School.
Among those who recognized the powerful spirit and vision of Friberg’s art was Adele Cannon Howells (1902–1951), general president of the Primary from 1943 to 1951. On her deathbed, she arranged for the sale of personal property to pay Friberg twelve thousand dollars for twelve illustrations depicting Book of Mormon scenes to appear in the *Children’s Friend*. Friberg recalls, “It was a startling task to undertake, for the Book of Mormon had never been illustrated before, at least on any professional level. There were no precedents as there are for the Bible. Imagine illustrating the Bible or the Book of Mormon in twelve pictures!”

Sister Howells anticipated that children seeing the Friberg reprinted paintings would find in them scriptural heroes. Friberg shared her vision but also added his own. He believed that children were drawn to paintings of fully developed characters, not the “Dick and Jane” of art or what he called a “kiddie” style. He was convinced that children deserved to see the “power and majesty of the word of God.”

Although the contractual arrangement was between Sister Howells and Friberg only, a misconception persists that the Book of Mormon paintings were commissioned by Church priesthood leaders. Sister Howells not only conceived of the idea, she had the tenacity to face murmured opposition and sell personal property to pay for the paintings. Unfortunately, she did not live long enough to see one sketch drawn.

Friberg turned to Church leaders for historical and doctrinal suggestions. He had questions about antiquity and archeological findings as well as about hair length and clothing but was surprised to find that opinions varied from leader to leader. And with that variation grew a personal frustration in attempting to paint another’s visual interpretation of scripture when he had thoughts of his own. Adding to the dilemma was a strong suggestion that he paint great sermons, such as those given by Alma and King Benjamin. Realizing that the Book of Mormon is much more than a record of sermons, Friberg countered the suggestion with a conviction that a sermon, although inspiring to listeners, does not provide the drama needed to create an intriguing scene.

He wanted to paint heroes that appeared legendary in stature. “This idea that mankind is wretched and little is wrong,” he stated. “The muscularity in my paintings is only an expression of the spirit within. When I paint Nephi, I’m painting the interior, the greatness, the largeness of spirit. Who knows what he looked like? I’m painting a man who looks like he could actually do what Nephi did.” This artistic philosophy too often left him feeling ostracized. “It sounds egotistical to say I’m the only guy that can do a particular type of picture. But it’s true, and I feel a burden that separates me from people,” Friberg said.
Although he failed to meet the deadline for the *Children's Friend* fiftieth anniversary, his paintings proved worth the wait. After eight of his paintings had appeared in the *Friend*, they were recognized for their artistic value by the National Lithographic Society. That recognition led Herman Stolpe, a Swedish art publisher on a tour of the United States, to alter his plans and come to Salt Lake City to meet Friberg in the mid-1950s. “He spoke good English and I spoke a little bad Swedish,” recalled Friberg. But it was obvious that Stolpe was interested in Friberg’s art. Stolpe graciously accepted eight prints of the Book of Mormon illustrations. At the same time, Paramount Pictures producer and director Cecil B. DeMille was searching for an artist to create biblical characters, costume designs, and scenes for his upcoming motion picture *The Ten Commandments*. He had written to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art inquiring about a Bible artist in America. Museum personnel responded with one name, Arnold Friberg, but did not know where he was living. Frustrated with not finding an American, DeMille called on his friend Stolpe: “Perhaps you could help me by looking around Europe for such an artist.” Stolpe assured him that he would. But after an unfruitful European search, he sent DeMille the eight Book of Mormon illustrations with a handwritten note: “The man you’re looking for is in Salt Lake City.”

DeMille readily grasped the relationship between the Book of Mormon and Old Testament scenes and saw in the eight reprints the power and majesty of Friberg’s artistic talent. He was especially drawn to the painting

---

This article adds a biographical dimension to the four LDS perspectives on images of Christ published in *BYU Studies* 39, no. 3 (2000), pages 7–106, now available at byustudies.byu.edu. Articles by James C. Christensen, Noel A. Carmack, Richard G. Oman, and Richard Neitzel Holzapfel, introduced by Doris R. Dant, offer personal perspectives of artists as well as analyses of form and content of images of Jesus Christ used by Latter-day Saints in the twentieth century. Literalism, imagery, spiritual intimacy, open-endedness, idealism, and many other artistic, cultural, and religious elements are discussed in relation to the complex phenomenon of trying to express infinite subjects and feelings on two-dimensional canvases.

—John W. Welch
The Brother of Jared Sees the Finger of God. The surprise captured on the face of the brother of Jared was riveting to DeMille. He sent an immediate offer to Friberg to come to Hollywood and be the artist for The Ten Commandments. Surprisingly, Friberg did not receive the offer well. He had not met the deadlines for completing the Book of Mormon illustrations and felt inadequate to meet future demands. His inclination was to reject the offer, but President David O. McKay’s advice changed his mind: “The Ten Commandments [project] can’t wait. They’re making it. The Book of Mormon can wait. Do the Ten Commandments.”

In 1953, Friberg moved to Hollywood. As the chief artist-designer of The Ten Commandments, he readily conceived of biblical characters and scenes as well as costumes for actors Charlton Heston, Yul Brynner, Yvonne De Carlo, and Vincent Price. His designs were so innovative that he was nominated for an Academy Award. Although the award went to another, his fame was not diminished. Fifteen monumental paintings of scenes from the motion picture were exhibited on every inhabited continent and seen by rich and poor alike. DeMille estimated that more people...
saw the Friberg paintings than “most of the great masterpieces of ages past.” DeMille called Friberg “an inspiration” for “his profound reverence and knowledge, as well as his superb artistry.” He went on to say that, among the living creators of religious art, “one stands out for his virility and warmth, dramatic understanding, and truth. That man is Arnold Friberg.” Norman Rockwell agreed, calling Friberg the “Phidias of Religious Art!” The Royal Society of Arts in London named Friberg a lifetime fellow.

Friberg returned to Salt Lake City in 1957 to complete the last four Book of Mormon paintings—*Samuel the Lamanite on the Wall, Captain Moroni and the Title of Liberty, Christ Appearing to the Nephites, and Moroni Bids Farewell to a Nation*—all of which were duly published in the *Children’s Friend.* In 1963 he painted *Christ Appearing to the Nephites* (renamed *The Risen Lord*). This painting, depicting a bare-chested Christ, was not well received by Church leaders and led to such conflicting discussions that Friberg began to look elsewhere to contribute in the world of art. He accepted a 1969 commission from General Motors to paint a series of college football highlights spanning one hundred years. In the bicentennial year 1975, to honor General George Washington, he painted what many consider his masterpiece, *The Prayer at Valley Forge.* Of that painting, one gallery owner said, “I saw grown men standing in front of it with tears in their eyes. I was glad to have the darn thing out of the gallery. I was
going broke! Nobody came and looked at anything else.”

For thirty years, Friberg was also a preeminent painter of Western subjects.

In his later years, Friberg became discouraged. He fought to save his house and studio from a highway expansion and lost. Then came Hedve’s debilitating illness that forced her into a nursing home; she died in 1986. “A darkness came into the pictures,” Friberg admits. It took time to recover his artistic vision. *The Night When Christ Was Born* and *The Prayer in the Grove* attest to his victory over discouragement.

Happier times came with his marriage to Heidi Wales. The couple had a formal Mounted Police wedding in Canada. At their wedding banquet, a letter from the Queen’s palace in London was read announcing that Her Majesty “would be pleased to pose for a large equestrian portrait to be painted by A. Friberg.” Friberg spent several weeks working at Buckingham Palace and at Windsor Castle on the royal equestrian portrait.

Commenting on his body of work, Friberg said, “I feel good about my pictures, for they speak directly to people’s hearts. . . . That’s why I’ve been stubborn, and work longer than I should have. Because all that is left is your work. Nobody’s ever going to know what you could have done if you’d had a little more time.” Regarding the future, Friberg has a “driving wish to paint many more pictures, especially of a religious nature, and trusts that the Lord will grant him the strength and the years on earth to do them.”

Arnold Friberg, *Liahona*. 
Arnold Friberg, *The Brother of Jared Sees the Finger of God.*

Arnold Friberg, *Lehi and His People Arrive in the Promised Land.*

Arnold Friberg, *Abinadi Appearing before King Noah.*
Arnold Friberg, *Alma Baptizing in the Waters of Mormon.*

Arnold Friberg, *Nephi Rebuking His Rebel- lious Brothers.*

Arnold Friberg, *Ammon Defends the Flocks of King Lamoni.*
Arnold Friberg, *Captain Moroni and the Title of Liberty.*

Arnold Friberg, *Two Thousand Stripling Warriors.*  
Arnold Friberg, *Samuel the Lamanite Prophecies.*
Arnold Friberg, *Christ Appearing in the Western Hemisphere.*

Arnold Friberg, *The Ship Brooklyn.*

Arnold Friberg, *Mormon Bids Farewell to a Once Great Nation.*
Harry Anderson

Harry Anderson was born in 1906 in Chicago. Although his mother was a Lutheran, he attended a Congregational church in his youth. By the time he enrolled as a math major at the University of Illinois, he had stopped attending religious meetings. His interest was academics, and he worked washing dishes, waiting tables, mowing lawns, and selling hosiery to support his studies.

During his sophomore year, Anderson enrolled in a still-life painting class, hoping to complete his curriculum with an elective course. To his surprise, Anderson discovered that he had a talent for drawing. In contrast, few accolades were coming his way in calculus.57

Anderson entered the freshman class at the Syracuse School of Art in 1927.58 Like most artists, he studied anatomy and the works of masters such as Rodin and Michelangelo. In his junior and senior years, color theory and painting were emphasized. He loved color theory and honed his talent with colors to such precision that he surpassed the ability of his university instructors. Fellow students were calling him “artist.” Tom Lovell, who shared his private studio in the dormitory attic, claimed he “learned more from
Anderson than from his teachers. Lovell urged Anderson to quit school and work in New York with him, but Anderson was determined to graduate; he earned a bachelor of fine arts with distinction in 1931. After graduation, he and Lovell went to New York and set up a studio near other hopeful and gifted illustrators in McDougall’s Alley.

Un fortunately, Anderson’s big plans of commissions from the “slick” magazines waned as the Great Depression hit the print industry. Unable to secure commissions, he sought employment with the Mirror Candy Company on Times Square, selling candy from seven in the evening to the wee hours of the morning. His earnings of ten dollars a week did not meet his expenses. Promotion to night manager and an increase of two dollars a week did little to alleviate his precarious circumstances. Scrounging through trash cans for pop bottles that would bring a few pennies helped somewhat.

In April 1932, Anderson received his big break. An editor at Collier’s magazine offered him a commission to illustrate a short story of a French soldier returning to his girlfriend. With that two-tone commission in his portfolio, he confidently ventured toward other publishers. “Nothing succeeds like success” became his philosophy. Magazine art directors William Cheesman (art director at Collier’s) and Frank Eltonhead (editor at Ladies’ Home Journal) became his mentors. These men showed him the tricks of the trade—matching a picture to a story, tilting the head to intrigue a reader, and using a brush stroke to suggest that excitement awaited the reader on the next page.

But after two years of working for New York–based magazines, Anderson left the Big Apple. Chicago beckoned with offers from Montgomery Ward for farm produce illustrations for their spring and summer catalogs. With fresh confidence, he joined an art agency in Chicago’s Palmolive Building and began illustrating everything from seed envelopes to Cream of Wheat boxes.

A commission from the Woman’s Home Companion propelled Anderson in a new direction. The Companion wanted illustrations for a story that featured a beautiful young woman. Perhaps not by chance, Harry saw a receptionist working on the thirty-sixth floor of the Palmolive Building who fit the description. He arranged for Ruth Huebel, an employee of Esquire magazine, to pose for the painting. They were married a year later, in 1940.

The following year, Anderson accepted a position with the famed art studio of Haddon Sundblom. With this position came more work than he had imagined. Major corporations wanted him to illustrate billboard ads and full-page color images for magazine stories. Anderson’s illustrations
and covers became regular features of Collier’s, Saturday Evening Post, Woman’s Home Companion, Ladies’ Home Journal, and Good Housekeeping.

With his talent in such high demand, he felt the need to optimize his painting technique to ensure quality and yet preserve time, so he developed a strict artistic routine.

From the concept of an illustration to its completion, every step in his routine was meticulously followed. It began with doodles and moved to a few sketches in casein. Next came the “squaring” of the sketch to facilitate proportional reproduction onto canvas. He then placed the old sketches aside and cleared “a place for himself before his easel.” Next he reached for a brand-new brush and began. Ruth seldom came into his studio because Anderson was convinced that he could not focus on the easel when his wife was looking over his shoulder. From the commencement of the painting to the end, Anderson stood. His routine was followed day after day and year after year. “The test of one’s courage often may be the way he faces the grind of daily routine,” said Ruth. “I have seen Harry endure a sometimes brutally monotonous existence. I have marveled at his dedication and faithfulness to his work in a lonely studio, year after year.”

However lonely Anderson may have been, the routine paid big dividends. Within a year of their marriage, the Andersons were living the illustrator’s American Dream. Although Anderson was deluged with art commissions, stomach cramps interfered with the completion of his illustrations. Doctors were consulted but were unable to diagnose the problem. For two years, he ate only strained baby food while waiting for a diagnosis.
At long last came the answer: an allergic reaction to the turpentine in his oil-based paints.66

Wanting to remain competitive in the illustrative world, Anderson switched to water-based paints and looked to heaven for answers. The Seventh-day Adventist Church provided some spiritual answers. He accepted their theological doctrines and made a firm resolve to face life anew. This resolve was difficult, especially since he was a habitual smoker and a social drinker, and the Adventists shunned smoking and drinking. And then there were his lucrative beer illustrations. To Ruth, it was one thing to change personal habits and quite another to threaten their livelihood.67

While the Andersons were contemplating their options, Dr. Glenn Millard, a local Seventh-day Adventist pastor, suggested the possibility of Anderson’s working for the church. Anderson agreed.

In 1945, Anderson painted What Happened to Your Hand? for an Adventist children’s book. Although editors viewed his illustration of Christ in a modern-day setting as nearly blasphemous, its broad appeal directly led to his 1946 move to the headquarters of the Adventist publications in the Takoma Park–Washington, D.C., area. His illustrations soon appeared in many religious textbooks, storybooks, and periodicals but were not limited to these outlets.

Anderson felt free to seek outside commissions, and he split his career between commercial illustrations at premium wages and paintings for the Seventh-day Adventists at prices well below their value.68 Anderson favored opportunities to paint Jesus Christ. “I paint Christ the way I like Him, not to please other people,” said Anderson: “The Bible says He would not stand out in a crowd, but it also suggests He was not ugly. I know He

Harry Anderson, Gangway! an advertisement for Cream of Wheat. Cream of Wheat®, a registered trademark of KF Holdings and is used with permission.
Harry Anderson, illustration for *Collier’s* magazine. In this early work, one can see the way Anderson dutifully followed the directive to tilt his subjects’ heads. The subjects seem artificially posed.

was a carpenter, that He did a lot of walking, so I see Him as strong, both physically and emotionally. I try to show that. He later added that he also liked to represent Christ as loving. He was successful in visualizing a strong but loving Jesus for a rising generation.

But through it all he was frustrated. His working environment was stifling because he worked on the top floor of a non-air-conditioned office building. Perspiration dripped down his arms, spoiling his work. When he complained, fans were installed. But the fans blew his sketches around. Failing to find a solution, Anderson began spending more time away from the office. In so doing, he developed a research interest and a passion for “do-it-yourself” projects. From cutting leather to sewing costumes to making furniture, he was becoming versatile but losing focus. After seven years in Washington, Anderson realized that he was slipping backwards in his art. Just as he was beginning to voice his concern, he received a telephone call from his college roommate, Tom Lovell, who suggested that Anderson return to work in New York and live near him in Danberry, Connecticut. The idea intrigued Anderson, especially when he learned that many artists, including Ken Riley and John Scott, were Lovell’s neighbors.

In August 1951, the Andersons moved into a home on a five-acre lot in Connecticut. The Andersons were enthusiastically welcomed to the neighborhood. Although he was offered hospitality and rounds of golf, Anderson was true to his artistic routine and remained slightly aloof. In the 1960s, he was commissioned by Esso Oil Company to paint images for the series “Great Moments in American History” and “Great Moments in
Early American Motoring.” In 1962, after being awarded the Adolph and Clara Obrig prize in watercolors by the National Academy of Design in New York City, an opportunity came that he had not expected.

Anderson received a visit from his friend Wendell Ashton, director of LDS Church public communications, along with J. Willard Marriott, head of a multimillion-dollar business, and Hobart Lewis, editor-in-chief of Reader’s Digest. They offered him the opportunity to paint “key points in [Christ’s] work for man, climaxing in His second coming” for the Mormon Pavilion at the 1964 New York World’s Fair.

Anderson accepted the commission to paint with oils even though he had not painted with that medium since the early 1940s. Stomach cramps or not, he agreed to paint a 5’ x 12’ mural of Jesus Christ ordaining his Apostles. Ruth noticed something unusual in his rigid artistic routine during this painting: he was “very moved” and would “get up at night to work on it.”

Church leaders and millions of visitors to the Mormon Pavilion were also moved by this painting.

Latter-day Saint leaders liked the artistic style, and they liked the artist. Anderson saw in Latter-day Saint tenets similarities with his own Seventh-day Adventist creed—a belief in the second coming of Jesus Christ, the importance of good family living, and an abhorrence for alcohol and tobacco. Thus he was not opposed to accepting additional Latter-day Saint commissions. Among his commissioned paintings for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints were Christ Ordains His Apostles, The Ascension of Christ, Nathan Eldon Tanner, The Second Coming, Isaiah
Harry Anderson, illustration for “The Gossamer World,” a Collier’s magazine story by Faith Baldwin. Harry’s son, Tim, posed in different costumes as the main character and as all the lilliputian characters in the scene. This was Tim’s favorite picture of himself. Woolsey and Anderson, Harry Anderson, 40–41, 78.
Prophesying, Christ Giving Commission to Disciples, Christ in Gethsemane, The Sermon on the Mount, The Resurrected Christ Appearing to Mary, Christ with Children, Triumphal Entry, Joseph Smith, The Crucifixion, and The Resurrected Christ Appearing to the Disciples. Anderson painted fourteen scenes from the life of Jesus Christ and six from the Old Testament for the LDS Church. The Church also acquired nineteen additional paintings from the Seventh-day Adventist Church, all with biblical themes.78

However, when Church leaders desired paintings of the Restoration and the Book of Mormon, Anderson refused the Latter-day Saint commission. “He was a very committed, true, and honorable Seventh Day Adventist,” said Jay Todd, former managing editor of the Ensign. “He had his own sense of commitment and declined to paint Book of Mormon and Restoration scenes. As long as the Church commissioned biblical work, something that he deeply believed in, he accepted the commissions and was willing to acquiesce to Church leaders on visual interpretation.”79 For example, when Anderson was counseled to paint angels with no wings, he complied but never missed an occasion to attempt to convert Church leaders to the correctness of his personal biblical interpretation. Artist Bill Whittaker remembers being amused at the doctrinal bantering Anderson enjoyed with Gordon B. Hinckley.80 Artist Walter Rane explains, “Anderson was not just doing work as a job. He had to believe in it.”81

When Anderson turned down Latter-day Saint Restoration commissions, Church leaders asked him for names of artists who could paint the desired scenes. Anderson suggested only one man: his neighbor Tom Lovell.

Harry Anderson became recognized as one of the country’s leading artists. “How did you get to be famous?” young artists asked. “[By]
concentrating on my job, applying the principles of art as I know them, and keeping on until the job is finished,” said Anderson. “I’ve always tried to do my best. In my paintings I am giving of myself. It all boils down to simple, hard work.”

Anderson had no favorite paintings in his portfolio. He believed that artistic images more than five years old did not represent his advancing talent. With that conviction came an uneasiness about past paintings: “Almost every job I’ve sent out I’ve wished I had it back, for it was not as I wanted it—but I ran out of time in meeting a deadline,” recalled Anderson. The painting that always intrigued him the most was the one on his easel.

Anderson never became caught up in the fame that surrounded his work. He chose to live a quiet, modest life in New England and rarely traveled. He and Ruth had to be coaxed to visit Salt Lake City to see how his paintings were displayed, which they finally did in 1975. Although they were pleased with the display and grateful for the kind words of President Spencer W. Kimball, they were equally grateful to return home. News of his paintings being reproduced and sent around the globe was nice to hear but did not divert him from the easel. When Anderson learned of chapels
Harry Anderson, *The Crucifixion.*

Harry Anderson, *Christ’s Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem.*

Harry Anderson, *Go Ye Therefore, and Teach All Nations.*
Harry Anderson, *Christ in Gethsemane.*

Harry Anderson, *Noah’s Preaching Scorned.*

Harry Anderson, *Christ with the Children*.

Harry Anderson, *The Sermon on the Mount*. 
and temples displaying reproductions of his work, he was pleased but not unduly proud. Likewise, he was self-conscious about being inducted into the Society of Illustrators’ Hall of Fame and the New York Art Directors Club in 1994. Soon after the induction, he suffered a debilitating stroke. He died two years later at age ninety.

Tom Lovell

Tom Lovell was born in New York City in 1909. Soon after his birth, his family moved to the countryside of Nutley, New Jersey. In that quiet setting, his childhood was described as “a happy time,” especially in the woods just past his father’s barn.84

When Tom was nine, he expressed an interest in Native Americans. His mother, wanting to encourage his interest, took him to the New York Museum of Natural History. In the museum, he drew sketches of weapons and artifacts, a first glimmer of his artistic bent. Although he was initially pleased with his sketches, they were easily replaced with an interest in athletics by age ten. He imagined personal athletic prowess, if not fame, on the ballfield, but an acute case of polio at age thirteen changed his dream.85 He turned to reading and once again discovered a compelling interest in Native Americans. So empathetic did he become with the mistreatment of the American Indians by government officials that he spoke on the topic as valedictorian at his high school graduation in 1926.86

After graduation, Lovell was employed as a deck hand for the U.S. Shipping Board on the flagship U.S.S. Leviathan. He was next employed as a timekeeper at the W. J. D. Lynch Construction Company. Finding only a modicum of happiness in these positions, Lovell entered the College of Fine Arts at Syracuse University in 1927.

Feeling confident about his artistic renderings, he contacted magazine editors during his freshman year seeking potential patrons. Although rejections came all too fast, editors at Hersey Publication were encouraging. They hired Lovell to draw dramatic illustrations for “shoot-em-up” westerns, unsolved mysteries, and horror stories of menacing gangsters. By his junior year, he was illustrating for the “pulp” magazines Shadow and Wild West Weekly and earning sixty dollars for a cover and six dollars for a drawing.87 By his senior year, Good Story Publications had hired him on a regular basis and expected ten drawings each month. University faculty, knowing that Lovell was the only senior doing professional work, gave him permission to work on his jobs during studio sessions.

Lovell had his eye on the slick magazines. Although the blood and thunder action of the “pulps” had intrigued him in college, illustrating
short stories in the slicks was a greater challenge. While most starting illustrators feared the task of illustrating a sedate story, the challenge of creating a picture for a story of no consequence intrigued Lovell. Although he hoped to illustrate manuscripts written by noted authors such as Edna Ferber, Paul Gallico, Sinclair Lewis, or Louis Bromfield, any manuscript would do.

His first appointment with editors of This Week magazine earned him a commission. His appointment with editors at Redbook had the same result. In time, editors from American, Colliers, Ladies’ Home Journal, McCall’s, and National Geographic were competing for his talents.\(^{88}\) He drew and painted everything from beautiful women to sailing ships and, unlike most beginning illustrators, made good money during the Depression.

With money in his pocket and prospects for future work, Lovell asked former classmate Gloyd “Pinkie” Simmons to marry him. They were married in 1934 and settled into a small apartment in Montclair, New Jersey, near his parents.\(^{89}\) They remodeled his father’s barn into an art studio and weathered the Depression.

During the recovery years, Tom and Pinkie developed an “art/manuscript system.” Pinkie read the manuscripts and noted highlights in the stories that warranted an illustration. Tom often agreed with her intuitive reading. He believed that illustration, “like all great art, . . . can have mood, design and artistic brushwork. Turn them upside down: figures, animals and trees are no longer evident as such. Instead you see excellence of design and placement. Upside down the painting becomes design, pure and simple, or, to put it another way, rhythm and opposition.” As for modern art, he minced few words: “In that land of make believe, every man is a king.”\(^{90}\)

Meanwhile, the kings of illustration were banding together in an artists’ colony at Westport, Connecticut. In 1940 the Lovells joined Harold Von Schmidt, J. C. Leyendecker, Norman Rockwell, Bob Harris, John Falter, Dick Lyon, Graves Gladney, and Emery Clarke in Connecticut. The professional and social stimulus of these respected peers advanced Lovell’s own reputation and opportunities. But World War II brought a halt to the camaraderie in his neighborhood.

Although Lovell was older than the recommended draft age, he wanted to join the Marine Corps as a combat artist. A less-than-perfect left eye and a slightly bent back, a remnant of the polio of his youth, nearly prevented his enlistment. But after assuring the enlistment board that he would paint good pictures as a Marine, he was accepted and commissioned a staff sergeant in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. He was assigned to be an artist for Leatherneck Magazine and Marine Corps Gazette at the Marine
barracks in Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{91} He painted magazine illustrations, Marine recruiting posters, and a series of large paintings on Marine Corps history.

When the war ended, Lovell returned to civilian status and assumed that he could easily resume his career. However, illustrating for magazines had become more competitive, and younger illustrators had captured the market. “Each time a new player enters the field, the game gets tougher,” said Lovell. In his early days, everything Lovell and his peers created was novel. He joked, “The first time a cavalcade of Indians was painted going left to right, it was virgin territory.”\textsuperscript{92} But after the war he walked the streets of New York City as if he were unknown.

In the process of looking for work, he learned much about rejection, but, more importantly, he developed a strong determination to succeed and created a painting routine to ensure his success. To meet the competition head-on, he determined that “to get a painting going, I’ll act it out and get the feel of it.”\textsuperscript{93} He visited libraries and museums to research clothing, weapons, lifestyle, and artifacts. He soon found that few details in research were worth discarding and that he wanted his illustrations to vividly leap from the canvas to reveal epics of legendary proportion.

To do so, he honed his talents. He began by rendering small thumbnail charcoal drawings. He then progressed to miniature oils or pastel sketches and then to larger charcoal drawings. Before anything was drawn on canvas, he made a full-sized drawing that lacked only the details of the
principal figures. He next looked for models. Family members, friends, and even passersby were recruited to pose. If models could not be found, Lovell would improvise. Using the mirror in his studio, he would roll up a pant leg, flex a muscle, make a fist or a grimacing face to complete an illustration.

His first drawings of characters on canvas often were of an undraped figure. He was a firm believer that “clothing covers too much,” that the bend of a joint, the bulge of a muscle, or the curvature of the back made all the difference in a really good painting. Then came the clothing and details.

Just as Lovell’s artistic style was reaching maturity, the Joseph Dixon Crucible Company offered him his first career break since the war. The president of the company had seen one of his Marine posters and wanted him to paint Colonel Henry Knox and his Revolutionary patriots moving artillery from Fort Ticonderoga to the Atlantic seaboard. The painting was well received. With that painting in his portfolio, he once again established himself as a top illustrator.

National Geographic and Life magazines were beginning to ask for his talents, but amid their tugs came a most unusual commission. Friend, fellow classmate, and neighbor Harry Anderson needed a hand with art for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Confident in Anderson’s recommendation, Church leaders invited Lovell to paint scenes of the Restoration.

Lovell was uncomfortable with the proffered commission. Through the years, he had listened to anti-Mormon sentiment and had formed a
negative opinion of the Church. However, he was in need of work. Magazine work was not steady. Slick magazines’ dismissal of the illustrator in favor of the photographer had more than dented his pocketbook. Acceptance of the commission would provide him with needed funds, but how would such acceptance weigh on his conscience? Finally, he was swayed to accept the commission by the assurance of Latter-day Saint leaders that his acceptance would not suggest that he embraced Latter-day Saint tenets.97

Throughout his commission, Lovell was guarded in his personal expressions of faith and friendship.98 He insisted on a strictly professional relationship with Church leaders. Although he assured leaders that he would do his best to paint several Restoration and Book of Mormon scenes, he was not interested in doctrinal discussions. To him the commissioned art was a means to an end, not an occasion to discuss his belief system. Therefore, it was not surprising that, when other opportunities for work were presented to Lovell, he negotiated to end his professional relationship with the Church. An amicable conclusion was reached. It was Lovell who suggested that artist Ken Riley paint the remaining commissions.99

Tom Lovell’s path turned in 1968 to the Southwest. A commission from the Abell-Hanger Foundation of Midland, Texas, to paint the historic Permian Basin brought a major shift to his art.100 He had come full circle by returning to his childhood fascination with the Native Americans. Although he was applauded for his depictions of clothing, weapons, and events that shaped the American West, it was his characters leaping from historical epochs that won him plaudits. As artist Bob Lougheed exclaimed, “Tom Lovell handles figures better than anyone else who has ever painted the West.”101

Lovell became a regular exhibitor at the annual shows of western artists held in Arizona, Texas, and Oklahoma. In the 1970s he was elected to the National Cowboy Hall of Fame, was awarded the Prix de West Gold Medal, and garnered the silver medal in the Cowboy Artists of America. With so many accolades coming

Tom Lovell, *The Angel Moroni Appears to Joseph Smith.*

Tom Lovell, *John the Baptist Ordains Joseph and Oliver,* as seen on the cover of *Der Stern,* November 1970.

Tom Lovell, *Mormon Abridging the Plates.*

Tom Lovell, *Moroni Burying the Plates.*
from the West, Tom and Pinkie moved to Santa Fe, New Mexico, in 1977. Of his western residency, he said, “I am simply a tenant of the land and for me the place is richer for the recollection of former times. I hope some of that richness is transmitted in my work.” All agreed it was. When some encouraged him to stretch farther, he countered, “I’m not the kind of guy who wants to make the world over.” He insisted at age seventy-two, “I am painting for Tom Lovell. I’ve never thought of giving it up.” When asked how he would like to be remembered, he said, “I would like my grandson just to remember me as a man who painted a lot of good pictures.” Lovell and his daughter, Deborah, died in an automobile accident on June 29, 1997, in Santa Fe.

**Ken Riley**

Kenneth P. Riley, the only child of Elwin A. and Marie Pauling Riley, was born on September 21, 1919, in rural Waverly, Missouri. By 1926 he and his parents were living in the railroad community of Parsons, Kansas, where his father sold cars at a local Chevrolet dealership. Although his father worked long hours, there was never much money for extras. The weekly edition of the *Saturday Evening Post* was one of the family’s few extravagances.

However, such extravagance ended during the Great Depression when bank credit for purchasing automobiles dried up and so did his father’s job. To ease the family’s economic struggle, Ken found employment with sign painter Ray Scroggins and with Eddie Lain and His Orchestra. Playing the drums at high school dances was fun, but drumming at sleazy bars soon left him tired of alcohol and distraught over drug-broken friends. Yet it seemed that his life would follow this unfortunate path.

However, an art teacher named Olive Rees recognized Riley’s artistic talent and encouraged him to try watercolors. She even suggested that he apply for a show card painter position at the town’s Orpheum Theater. His application led to a lofty seat behind the movie screen, where he copied romantic love scenes as they showed on screen. His charismatic paintings of Claudette Colbert and Clark Gable were placed on a tripod in front of the Orpheum. They were so true to life that the Tri-State Fair hired Riley to draw bucking broncos on storefront windows to advertise their forthcoming events.

Eventually, Riley discarded his romantic scenes and drawings of rodeo broncos for a pre-med program at Parsons Junior College. Olive Rees again turned him to art. In fall semester 1938, she paid his tuition to the Kansas City Art Institute of Missouri. He accepted her generous gift and
his parents’ small stipend and entered the three-year art program. While serving as class president at the institute, Riley met freshman MarCyne Johnson of Topeka, Kansas. Although romance blossomed, a scholarship to the Art Students League propelled him to New York City in 1941. Under the tutelage of Frank Vincent DuMond (1866–1951) at the League and Harvey Dunn at the Grand Central School of Art, Riley learned divergent approaches and emotional philosophies to art. Overwhelmed by criticism and conflicting theories, Riley left art school after just one year, later saying, “I couldn’t have painted a picture even if I tried.”

Although Ken and MarCyne discussed postponing their marriage because of the war, they dismissed their worries and were married on December 12, 1941. They made their home in a small flat in Greenwich Village. MarCyne worked as a bank secretary to earn money for household expenses so that Ken could continue his study of art. Although he sold a few action drawings to pulp magazines, it did not appear that an art career would be his. In May 1942, Riley left New York and shortly thereafter enlisted in the United States Coast Guard. To his surprise, it was in the Guard that he honed his artistic skills, remembering Dunn’s admonition, “Choose a picture and think of it from all angles, then choose the most barren, most brutal way of saying it. Say it strongly and simply.” When he had perfected his images, he was transferred to the Coast Guard Public Relations office in Seattle. In Seattle reporters from the United and Associated Presses selected his drawings to illustrate their commentaries on the war. They saw in his work a gamut of emotions that portrayed thanksgiving for life and the brutality of death.

Due to the popularity of his sketches, Riley assumed that he would sit out the war in Seattle. But this was not to be. He was assigned to be a combat artist aboard the invasion transport U.S.S. Arthur Middleton, bound for the South Pacific. His drawings depicting boredom aboard ship and fatigue in the battlefield captured the interest of leaders in the Coast Guard Headquarters at Washington, D.C. His works were exhibited at the National Gallery of Art. His scenes of human vulnerability, convulsing waves, and sinking ships captured the realism of war and the prestigious opportunity to design a commemorative stamp for the Coast Guard.

The climactic moment for Specialist Second Class Riley was winning the grand award at the Seventh Annual Outdoor Air Fair sponsored by the Washington Times Herald for his painting For Thine Is the Kingdom. “Gosh!” was his response to the notoriety. The headline of his hometown newspaper, Parsons’ (Kansas) Sun, expressed it better: “Ken Riley Now Famed Painter.” Among those who took special interest in his art was David Finlay, director of the National Gallery. He
commissioned Riley to sketch seven drawings to accompany *The War Letters of Morton Eustis*.

After the war, Riley returned to civilian life with confidence that he could make a living with his art. He and MarCyne moved to the quiet countryside of Ridge-way, Connecticut. To support his family, he drew explosive adventure comics for publisher Joe Simon at night. During the daylight hours, he worked on his portfolio, painting American life—a mother and child, a boy and a girl, a son returning from the war.

Riley’s first commission from Bantam Books moved him from pulp artist to respected illustrator. Confident that additional opportunities would be forthcoming from major magazines, he and MarCyne moved closer to the New York publishing houses. After settling in a flat in a high-rise apartment house in Peter Cooper Village, Riley made an appointment with Frank Kilker, art editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*. “I vividly recall walking down this long, tunnel-like hallway and meeting Kilker, who asked me to spread my work out on a big round table. He scrutinized it for what seemed like an eternity . . . then looked up and said, ‘Well, I like this. You’ll be hearing from me.’”

Within a month, the first story came in the mail. This assignment was followed by other stories that arrived regularly for the next decade. He attributes his success to the art editors at the *Post*, who taught him how to stop the reader from aimlessly thumbing through a magazine. Although he pleased the editors, not everyone liked his work. For example, Riley recalled an angry reader who wrote of Riley’s illustration of tree stumps in Oregon. “Not a beaver, nor saw, nor ax would result in the projections . . . pictured. . . . It really made no difference, since the stumps were on a par with the picture . . . and it stunk too!” Although depressed by the comment, Riley determined to “do his best to get the details correct but he would not be subservient to them.”

To him, all of the so-called “facts” were an interpretation that would eventually be reinterpreted by the viewer. He refused to give up creating...
what he called “viable works of art.” He said, “I don’t tie myself to an 
object. I want to be able to enlarge or diminish—to play with the colors 
and shapes on my own terms. I do a lot of reading and looking in muse-
ums with the goal of absorbing what is there. Then I let it come out, not as 
ethnological re-creation but as an aesthetic statement.”

By the early 1950s, Riley had received a commission from Life maga-
zine to do a historical series on the presidents of the United States and the Civil War. Attempting to meet their scholarly standard forced him to reconcile his desire to make a work aesthetically pleasing and the com-
mission to be historically honest. The same confrontation occurred when he accepted a commission with National Geographic. The Geographic 
required submission of meticulous line drawings before a painting could 
be rendered. While Riley waited for the go-ahead, art critics at the British 
Museum checked his drawings for accuracy. Although he was initially 
miffed by the overbearing scrutiny, such careful review awakened in him 
an interest in historical painting that proved central to his later paintings 
of the American West.

Secure in his trade by 1953, he and his family moved to the artist 
colony of Westport, Connecticut. In the small suburb of Danberry, they built a home and designed a studio. Riley found that he had little need 
to go into the city unless he was delivering a painting, but he did not feel isolated from the world of illustration with neighbors such as Tom Lovell
and Harry Anderson.

He felt so at home with these friends that he shared with them his 
mounting frustration over the contrast between his vibrant original paint-
ings and poor reproductions. Color, light, and values faded; subtle accents appeared muddied in the reproductions. He knew his color palette was wrong and asked for their advice. Anderson and Lovell were quick to encourage and slow to criticize.

It was not a surprise that Anderson and Lovell suggested Ken Riley be 
the one to complete the ever-growing opportunities presented by Latter-
day Saint Church leaders in the 1960s. Initially, “Riley refused the com-
mission. It was not until he experienced a life-changing event that he was 
willing to work for the Church,” recalls Evelyn Marshall. Riley did not say just what that event was. Riley painted the life of Joseph Smith—The First Vision, Joseph Smith Receiving the Plates from the Angel Moroni, Restoration of the Melchizedek Priesthood, and Joseph Smith Commanded to Lay Out the City of Zion.

According to Vern Swanson, Director of the Springville [Utah] Museum of Art, “Riley sensed the importance of this commission for the Church, and wanted to do his best. He found that he liked working with
the Latter-day Saints and appreciated doing something important for the religion. Using the term advisedly, he was a professional, a hireling—not one seeking to learn the truthfulness of Joseph’s prophetic calling.”

After completing his work for the Church, Riley accepted an invitation to teach advanced art students illustration and painting at Brigham Young University in an eight-week seminar during summer 1968. Of this teaching experience, he recalled, “I spent the summer at Brigham Young University and enjoyed the atmosphere of the campus. I have great memories of the students and faculty there.”

Student Gary Kapp recalled, “I took a summer class from him. He was a great guy and gave me lots of time—instruction really.” Riley and his wife so enjoyed their stay in the West that they “decided, well, this is ridiculous, to be living in the East.”

In 1972, Riley moved his family to Tombstone, Arizona. The daily life of the Plains Indians and the Apache Wars consumed his interest. He meticulously copied Apache etchings found on nearby canyon walls. After three years of copying etchings and living the life of an “artist cowboy” in Tombstone, Riley viewed his transition into western painting complete.

But residing in the small, remote town had lost its appeal, so he and his wife moved to Tucson. To his amazement, his career soared in Tucson. In 1976 he exhibited at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame; in 1983 he was awarded the Silver Medal at the Cowboy Artists of America for his artistic rendition *Visit of Lewis and Clark*; in 1984 the National Western and Wildlife Society selected him as the Artist of the Year; and in 1993 he was honored with the Eiteljorg Museum Award. His paintings are on permanent exhibition in the Phoenix Art Museum, the West Print Museum, the Eiteljorg Museum, the White House, and the Custer Museum. In 2003...
he was the “featured artist at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame. Over a hundred paintings from his current work to the magazine days, and military renderings” were displayed.\textsuperscript{124} Ken Riley continues to work in Tucson, Arizona.

**Art Critics Question the Value of Illustration**

We have found that Latter-day Saints express little interest in the success these illustrators experienced outside of their Church commissions. About the artwork, members’ comments are generally positive, but it is not unusual to hear statements such as, “I have seen that painting in three chapels in Mesa alone. It must have passed through Church Correlation.” Although the momentary humor in such expression suggests Church members are ready for something new, it also suggests that these artists continue to shape the Latter-day Saint visual image of holy prophets and the Savior.\textsuperscript{125} Artist Bill Whittaker says that Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley “set and maintained the standard.”\textsuperscript{126} David Erickson, a gallery owner in Salt Lake City, believes, “They set such a tone there is no room for the new guys.”\textsuperscript{127} Several struggling Latter-day Saint artists agree.

Art critics, however, are cautious in praise of the religious paintings of these four artists. While their work is subject to the criticism heaped on illustration generally, its religious nature attracts additional derision. The artists are given due credit as skillful illustrators, competent in color, line, and composition. Yet, critics will claim, these ends were met by producing works that are superficial, inauthentic, and unsophisticated. They say the works lack depth, artistic individuality, and style, sacrificed in the attempt to create art that is widely accessible.\textsuperscript{128} In one academic slide library, Anderson’s religious works and those of his contemporary
Kenneth Riley, *Joseph Smith Receiving the Plates from the Angel Moroni.*


Kenneth Riley, *Joseph Smith Commanded to Lay Out the City of Zion.*
Warner Sallman are even filed under the label “Kitsch”—the ultimate artistic insult.129

“The painter who illustrates is suspect,” explains art educator Marshall Arisman. “All painters know that the word ‘illustration’ is the kiss of death.”130 Such an attitude toward illustrators would be amusing if it had not taken root in the art community. Twentieth-century fine artists snubbed illustrators by claiming illustrators gave more allegiance to commercialism than to the higher principles of art. Such statements as “The illustrator is no more than a hireling—a hired gun of the marketplace” were commonplace. Critics believed that illustrators had flooded the market with marginal work that was sloppy in execution and failed in design. “Where is their contribution to the world of art?” critics asked.131 Barry Moser, a well-known artist and academician at Rhode Island School of Design, Princeton University, and Vassar College, recalls, “Like most fine art students in the 1960s, my beginnings were overshadowed by the powerful figures of the then-dominant and fashionable Academy, Abstract Expressionism—Frank Kline, Mark Rothko, Adolph Gottlieb, Jackson Pollack. But not Norman Rockwell; his work was not worthy of my serious attention. He was merely an ‘illustrator.’”132

Rockwell and other illustrators are derided by most art critics, and so it was a shock when the Guggenheim, one of the premier art museums in the United States, featured an exhibition of Rockwell’s work in 2001. The resulting barrage of stinging criticism included this from Corcoran Gallery director David Levy: “I have great problems with Rockwell. There are aspects of his work that are wonderful and aspects that are off-putting. There are aspects of Rockwell legitimately worth disliking, but I could say that about [other significant artists] as well.”133 Surprisingly, Ned Rifkin, director of the High Museum of Art in Atlanta, took a neutral stance upon seeing illustrations on the walls of the Guggenheim: “Whether Norman Rockwell is an artist or a great artist is immaterial to me. He is a Force.” Critics were jolted to near silence by the words of New Yorker art critic Peter Schjeldahl: “Rockwell is terrific. It’s become too tedious to pretend he isn’t.” Rockwell would have been pleased with Schjeldahl’s praise. Rockwell’s son, Peter, observed, “People were always saying to him, ‘I don’t know anything about art, but I like your work.’” Rockwell often lamented, “I wish sometime someone would come up to me and say, ‘I know a lot about art and I like your work.’”134

“It is time to call a truce in the cultural war between high art and popular art,” stated an article about the reawakening interest in Rockwell. Guggenheim curator Robert Rosenblum concurred: “There are no battles to be fought anymore.”135 His call to resolve the conflict between fine artist
and illustrator seemed reasonable to some. After all, the critics’ distinction between the two disciplines was becoming a blurred issue. The day when hierarchical nonsense elevated the painter to a position of moral superiority was waning. Heated discussions that centered on the value of art for the printed page or the gallery wall were few. Alice Carter, professor at San Jose State University, said, “I’m pretty tired of the illustration/fine art debate. . . . I think that it’s good to remember that the division between painting and illustration is a late nineteenth century construct, a result of an explosion in print media that required so many images that artists had to devote themselves to either gallery painting or illustration work and couldn’t handle a dual career.”

When illustrators and artists began to mend past wounds, the art critics scrambled to find a controversy that would capture the interest of both disciplines. The moral high road that dominated yesterday’s art and the lack of such a road today has captured the critics’ fancy for the present. To grasp “how contemporary art is packaged for the marketplace . . . is also to grasp the sorry moral condition of art today and how this is shriveling art, making it less and less a meaningful endeavor.” Critics now write longingly of the era when art was under the banner of beauty and order: “Art was a rich and meaningful embellishment of life, embracing—not desecrating—its ideals, its aspirations and its values.” They lament that few embellishments on churches, public buildings, fountains, or plazas by today’s artists remind us of religious longings, values, or aspirations.

As this new controversy about the value of modern art takes hold, some critics look to artists in the twentieth century who painted the memorable, the moral, and the sacred—those who were ignored since they were mere illustrators. Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley, illustrators who knew all too well the sting of the critics’ pen, are enjoying an enviable place in art criticism today.

Conclusion

In the 1950s and 1960s, while art critics were panning the religious illustrations of Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley, budding young Latter-day Saint artists were appreciating that art. James Christensen, Robert Barrett, and Gary Kapp seemed to intuitively grasp the impact, devotion, and greatness of the work of those four. “I was around thirteen or fourteen years old when Friberg’s Book of Mormon paintings came out in the Children’s Friend,” recalls Gary Kapp. “I remember spending hours looking at them. Arnold Friberg is the reason I became an artist.”

Kapp and others of today’s Church artists have paid the price to become successful artists, “to expand their vision of what can be done” to teach
Many North American Latter-day Saints will agree with Barrett and Black in valuing illustration in the debate between high versus low art, pictorial versus conceptual, representational versus formalist. Herman DuToit of the BYU Museum of Art and I recently concluded a two-year study aimed at unearthing BYU students’ predilections in the art-viewing experience. Our study revealed that a large majority of BYU students approach works of art with the expectation that art is supposed to look like something, to be representational. The students also have a large preference for the instrumental: they expect an emotive, spiritual, and/or mnemonic response to the artwork. Abstract, conceptual works of art are largely disfavored. Thus, Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, Riley, and those who have followed their lead continue to have a loyal consumer base.

As Barrett and Black show, the ubiquitously reproduced artwork of Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley shaped much of the religious visual culture of twentieth-century Mormonism. This shaping, particularly in images of Jesus, accompanied similar iconographic trends of American Protestant Christianity. The authors argue that these artists “set a standard” for LDS art. Certainly the artists set a cultural precedent for LDS illustration. Many have followed in their wake, but significant changes have occurred in the work of these artistic descendents when compared to the artists discussed. These differences include the increased personability and visual intimacy of Jesus; the abandonment of epic scenes with heroic, hypermasculine characters; and the exchange of the vivid for the soft lens. These developments raise important questions for future discussion by Latter-day Saints in regards to cultural binding, expectations of religious art, and the materiality of personal and communal piety.

—Josh Probert,
Yale Divinity School Program in Religion and the Arts
“things to the heart that the eyes and ears can never understand.” Yet today’s artists remain in the shadow of Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley. “It’s hard to throw the ghost of Friberg off, especially when I paint the same scenes,” said Walter Rane. Artist Perry Stewart said Anderson “was the greatest realistic artist of the century. Even to this day, his is the most credible work that we see.” Gary Kapp added, “I thought Anderson’s face of Christ was very compelling. It is still the best face of Christ I have ever seen.” Ralph Barksdale, a graduate from the Art Center in Pasadena and a prominent artist in the West, said, “I don’t think that there is, or was ever any greater illustrator than Anderson. . . . As for Lovell, his work was solid ‘Chicago-ish,’ no nonsense painting . . . [and] Riley [had] competent composition.” To artist Del Parson, these painters were “fantastic artists.”

Perhaps Murray Tinkelman, professor and senior adviser of the Master of Arts program at Syracuse University, said it best: “They [Friberg, Anderson, Lovell, and Riley] remain the giants. Many people have ‘poo-pooed’ religious art, especially in the twentieth century. These men were passionate artists! It was never just a job to them.” The contributions of Arnold Friberg, Harry Anderson, Tom Lovell, and Ken Riley to the visual art of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints remain unsurpassed.

Robert T. Barrett (robert_barrett@byu.edu) is Associate Dean and Professor of Fine Arts and Communications at Brigham Young University. He received an MFA and an MA from the University of Iowa.

Susan Easton Black (susan_black@byu.edu) is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University. She received an EdD from BYU and an MA from California State College, San Bernardino.
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115. Ken Riley enjoyed playing a game of golf with Harry Anderson and said that neighbor Tom Lovell “was a gentle man—highly talented.” Riley, interview.

116. Whittaker, interviews.

117. Evelyn Marshall, interviews.

118. Joseph Smith Commanded to Lay Out the City of Zion (also known as Joseph Smith and the City of Zion) was commissioned for use in the Visitors’ Center in Independence, Missouri. “On the Cover,” Improvement Era 72 (December 1969): 1. Riley was also commissioned to paint illustrations featuring early reformers John Wesley and Martin Luther.

119. Swanson, interviews.

120. Riley, interview.

121. Gary Kapp, phone interviews by Robert T. Barrett, August 7 and 9, 2003, transcript in authors’ possession.


123. McGarry, West of Camelot, 89, 92.


126. Whittaker, interviews.

127. David Erickson (owner of David Erickson Gallery in Salt Lake City), interview by Susan Easton Black, August 7, 2003, transcript in authors’ possession.

128. Comments from numerous art historians and curators, Latter-day Saint and non–Latter-day Saint alike, notes in possession of the authors.

129. This information comes from Josh Probert, a student in the Yale Divinity School program in religion and the arts.


132. Barry Moser, In the Face of Presumptions (Boston: David R. Godine, 2000), 110–11. In addition to his academic accomplishments, Moser is a well-known artist, print maker, illustrator, lecturer, and writer.


136. See Milton Glaser, Keynote address (Society of Illustrators, October 27, 2000).
140. Kapp, interviews. Kapp’s work has been featured in a number of professional galleries. Many of his religious illustrations and paintings have been featured in Latter-day Saint publications.
142. Rane, interviews.
143. Perry Stewart (Assistant Professor of Art at Utah Valley State College), interview by Robert T. Barrett, August 10, 2003, typed transcript in authors’ possession.
144. Kapp, interviews.
145. Ralph Barksdale, interview by Robert T. Barrett, August 11, 2003, transcript in authors’ possession.
146. Del Parson, interview by Robert T. Barrett, August 19, 2003, transcript in authors’ possession.
147. Murray Tinkelman (Professor/Senior Advisor of the Master of Arts program, Syracuse University), interview by Robert T. Barrett, August 7, 2003, typed transcript in authors’ possession. Tinkelman also serves as director of the Hall of Fame at the Society of Illustrators and was largely responsible for having Harry Anderson elected a member.
Arnold Friberg, *The Prayer at Valley Forge*. This monumental painting was completed for the bicentennial of American independence in 1976, conceived “not only to honor Washington, but to symbolize the divine source of human liberty.” Schwarz, *Arnold Friberg*, 109.
Arnold Friberg, *Springtime in the North*. Part of Friberg’s Royal Canadian Mounted Police series, this painting portrays a Mountie watering his horse in a thawing stream. The series was commissioned by the Northwest Paper Company for use in its advertisements and calendars.
Arnold Friberg, *In the Waters of Manitou*. One of many Friberg western paintings, this work captures the Indians’ sacred relationship with their God, Manitou. Friberg studied the workmanship and grain of an actual Indian birchbark canoe and saw how it could reflect “God’s golden light . . . on clear pure waters.” Schwarz, *Arnold Friberg*, 163.
Arnold Friberg, *Mormon Preachers*. This work portrays missionaries in Scandinavia, where Friberg’s parents were born. A dedicated member of the LDS Church, Friberg has eagerly used his talent to portray the Restoration.
Harry Anderson, *Jewelry Store Window*. Anderson illustrated for advertisements and for magazines stories. Several authors wrote Harry, saying “they thought he did a better job telling their story with his picture than they had done” with words. Woolsey and Anderson, *Harry Anderson*, 29.
Harry Anderson, Jacob Blessing, Joseph. Anderson attended a Congregationalist church as a child but later joined the Seventh-day Adventist church with his wife, Ruth. He enjoyed painting Bible scenes for the Seventh-day Adventists and later for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Harry Anderson, *Moses Calls Aaron to the Ministry*. As a conscientious Seventh-Day Adventist, Anderson willingly painted Bible scenes for the LDS Church but declined the invitation to paint scenes of the Restoration.
Tom Lovell, *The Handwarmer*. Here two Sioux hunters warm up in the heat from a white homesteader’s stovepipe. Inside the sod house, the homesteader must hear the sounds on his roof but does not come out. Hedgpeth and Reed, *Art of Tom Lovell*, 68.
In 1867, the resourceful US Army Captain Murie turned to the Pawnees to help rout a group of Cheyenne raiders. The Pawnees “disguised themselves in Army coats and hats, leading the Cheyenne to believe that this was an inferior force of ill-prepared white soldiers.” Hedgpeth and Reed, *Art of Tom Lovell*, 89.
Tom Lovell, *The Thaw*. Both the Indian warrior and the white trapper are armed, but the Indian’s gesture indicates that there will be no fight today. Here Lovell displays his characteristic concern for historical accuracy as well as his mastery of form and composition. Hedgpeth and Reed, *Art of Tom Lovell*, 158.
Kenneth Riley, *Visit of Lewis and Clark*. Riley is interested in capturing important historical moments. Here Mandan warriors, dressed in regalia to display their status, prepare to meet Lewis and Clark in 1804.
Kenneth Riley, *First Breath of Spring*. Riley’s renowned art of the American West portrays emotion as well as historical accuracy. This piece shows a stage on the Butterfield route during a muddy spring thaw.
Kenneth Riley, *Absaroka*. Riley was concerned with portraying the spiritual aspects of Native Americans. Through his interplay of light and shape, Riley captures “the covenant of Indian, animal, and earth.” McGarry, *West of Camelot*, 148.
Kenneth Riley, *The First Vision*. While Latter-day Saints are familiar with this painting, the image is usually used cropped. Seeing it whole, one notes the rays of divine light through the cathedral-like trees.
Fig. 1. Brigham Young, ca. 1852–1854, attributed to Marsena Cannon. This daguerreotype measures 2¾ x 3¾ inches and is preserved in its original 1850s velvet case with a folding clasp lock. Because Cannon did not use a corrective prism, the image is laterally reversed, giving us a mirror image.
In July 2005, the Deseret Morning News in Salt Lake City published a story with the punning headline “Old Young Photo donated to BYU.”

Even though Mark and Suzanne Richards had donated the rare 1850s daguerreotype of Brigham Young to BYU in December 2004, the donation did not draw media attention until just days before the July 24 pioneer holiday in Utah. For historians, especially photographic historians, the story was compelling—one of those rare moments when something thought to have vanished suddenly reappears. It was known that this particular precious daguerreotype had been created because a later photographic copy of it existed and had been printed in 1936. However, researchers feared that the original had been lost—a victim of the ravages of time. The numerous news stories provided the public, the large extended Young family, and historians a sense of satisfaction that this priceless treasure from the past had found its way into an institutional repository where professional preservation methods could ensure its longevity.

What Mark and Suzanne Richards donated to Brigham Young University in December 2004 was an original 1850s daguerreotype (fig. 1)—an image captured through the medium of a thin, shiny, silver-coated copper metal plate and a camera. As it was exposed, the sitter attempted to sit or stand still for what must have seemed a very long time. Daguerreotypes, introduced to the world by Frenchman Louis Jacques Mandé Daguerre in 1839, are crisp and detailed and do not easily fade. Early sitters were often shocked by the stark realism of the image. Their bright, mirrored surfaces seem to accentuate and hold each subtle detail and nuance of light when the images are positioned properly by the viewer. Daguerreotypes were amazingly accurate and were inexpensive when compared to other forms.
of art, most costing between one and five dollars, including a leather or gutta-percha case. The process took Europe and North America by storm.

**Daguerreotypes among the Early Saints**

At this time, most Latter-day Saints found themselves on the fringes of the young country’s frontier—far away from the camera’s eye. But in August 1844, a Daguerrean artist brought his knowledge, talent, and equipment to Nauvoo. Lucian Foster, a Latter-day Saint convert from New York, began advertising in the *Nauvoo Neighbor* that he could make “an image of the person, as exact as that formed by the mirror, that is transferred to, and permanently fixed upon a highly polished silver plate, through the agency of an optical instrument.” A few of Foster’s images capturing the Nauvoo Temple and some Saints have been preserved, either in the original format or in photographic copies of daguerreotypes. Foster disappears from Church records after the Nauvoo era, and today we lack any daguerreotypes of the epic movement west.

In the fall of 1850, another Daguerrean artist, Marsena Cannon, a native of Rochester, New York, arrived in Salt Lake and set up shop. Brigham Young’s first visit to his studio was on December 12, 1850. The studio experience in the early days was always staged. Candid images were unknown; photographers produced only formal portraits in a very controlled environment.

Sometime before June 1854, Brigham once again sat before Marsena Cannon’s camera in Salt Lake City. Remarkably, two precious small treasures have survived from that day—two daguerreotypes in their original cases. One of the images is housed in the National Portrait Gallery in Washington, D.C., and was gifted to the United States by the J. Willard Marriott Jr. Charitable Annuity Trust several years ago. The other image, donated by Mark and Suzanne Richards, is now housed in the L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (see fig. 1). Viewers can notice the slight shift in hand position in relation to the jacket when they compare the two images. Daguerreotypes in the very early years were colorless, but by the time this image was taken, some artists added...
gilding after exposure. As can be seen in figure 1, Brigham’s watch chain, rings, and masonic pin have been gilded. The daguerreotype bears the hallmark of a French plate maker who produced plates from 1850 to 1858. The image is housed in a beautifully crafted blue velvet case, a much finer type of case than the usual leather or gutta-percha (fig. 2).

Provenance

At some point after Brigham purchased this daguerreotype from Cannon, it came into the possession of Clarissa Young Spencer, one of Brigham’s daughters. In the 1930s, when Preston Nibley began working on a biography of Brigham, Clarissa gave Nibley several items belonging to Brigham including a handkerchief, a spoon, and this daguerreotype. Nibley, who worked at the Church Historian’s Office in Salt Lake City, first published a series of articles on the life of Brigham Young in the Church Section of the Deseret News. These articles were then collected and published in book form in 1936 as Brigham Young: The Man and His Work. The volume included seven images of Brigham that were printed on polished paper and inserted at specific points throughout the book. Three of them were based on copies of daguerreotypes. Nibley writes for the caption of the one recently donated to Brigham Young University, “President Young about 1858 or 1859 [sic; it was prior to June 1854]. This photograph is from a daguerreotype in possession of the author.” The Young family treasures remained in Nibley’s possession until his death in 1966 and were then held by his widow, Ann Parkinson Nibley. She held onto the collection until her own death in 1980, when it was passed to her grandson Mark Richards, who at the age of sixteen already had a reputation in the family for being interested in history and antiques.

Years later, when Mark began thinking about the “old photograph” of Brigham in his possession, he approached William W. Slaughter, the Church photographic archivist at the Church Archives in Salt Lake City. Slaughter was naturally delighted to see the original and showed Mark the photographic copy of it made by Nibley before the publication of his book. He also informed Mark that historians thought the original image had been lost. A series of visits to Mormon Americana dealers in Salt Lake City to determine the value of the daguerreotype eventually brought him in contact with Richard Nietzel Holzapfel. Holzapfel arrived at Benchmark Books in Salt Lake City at the behest of Curt Bench. Holzapfel has often been disappointed by items people have brought to him, thinking they had an original image of Brigham or some other famous Latter-day Saint. But this time, when Mark Richards carefully unwrapped the original though damaged case, Holzapfel saw that it was
indeed a precious treasure (fig. 3). Something remarkable happens when we hold in our hands or first see with our eyes the original of a piece of beloved artwork. Holzapfel felt he was coming face to face with Brigham.

**Dating the Daguerreotype**

In dating the image, Nibley was off by five or six years. This sitting was copied in the form of a woodcut and published in *Gleason’s Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion* on June 3, 1854.² By comparing the two images, one can see that the woodcut was clearly copied from the Cannon daguerreotype. Obviously, the image was taken before June 3, 1854. It is unknown whether this daguerreotype, its companion, or another possible daguerreotype taken at the same sitting was the basis for the woodcut.

*Gleason’s Pictorial* was a popular illustrated newspaper printed in Boston. It is likely that its publisher contacted Brigham Young and asked for the use of a daguerreotype and that the daguerreotype was sent with a missionary going east. Taking into account the time that correspondence and travel took, we can assume that the image was taken in 1852 or 1853.

To further substantiate the latest likely date, we can take a look at the text of an advertisement which appeared in the *Deseret Weekly News* on August 3, 1854. Chaffin and Cannon advertised, “We have a new stock
of plates, cases and other materials pertaining to the business; all of best quality; three German cameras that can’t be beat, with speculum attached for taking views without reversing. Everything we have is new except the workmen, and they are far better than new.” Daguerreotypes made by Cannon before he procured his new German cameras “with speculum attached” would all appear as the reverse of real life. Writing would be backwards, hair would be parted on the wrong side. Everything would appear as it does when you look into a mirror. In this daguerreotype, Brigham Young’s hair is indeed parted on the wrong side, indicating that the photograph was taken prior to August 1854.

We can say with some certainty that the daguerreotype was taken in the winter because Brigham wears a dark vest. It was the fashion to wear a dark vest in the winter and light in the summer.

**Earlier Daguerreotypes of Brigham Young**

Six known images of Brigham Young predate these two daguerreotypes, only two of which survive in their original form as daguerreotypes. The others survive only as photographic copies of the nonextant daguerreotypes. The daguerreotype recently donated to BYU is one among four known original daguerreotypes of Brother Brigham in existence today. The six known images that predate are as follows:

1. A 1934 paper print copy of an 1846 daguerreotype, attributed to Lucian Foster. This image shows Brigham standing in a doorway in Nauvoo holding a cane and a top hat—most likely the earliest known daguerreotype of Brigham.

2. An original daguerreotype taken on December 12, 1850, by Marsena Cannon in Salt Lake City now preserved in the Church Archives in Salt Lake City. This wonderful image shows Brigham wearing a black vest and a Masonic pin.

3. Paper print copies of two daguerreotypes taken in 1851–52 found in the Church Archives, other institutional collections, and private collections. In these prints, Brigham is wearing a white vest. At least two views were taken, most likely on the same day.

4. A paper copy from an unknown source (possibly a copy of a copy of a daguerreotype) found in the Widtsoe Family Photograph Collection at the Utah State Historical Society.

5. An original daguerreotype of Brigham and Margaret Peirce Young, about 1852–53, in the private possession of Richard M. Young of Logan, Utah. It is possibly the only extant portrait of Brigham with a wife.

6. A copy print of a photograph of a daguerreotype, about 1850–54, of Brigham Young and an unidentified wife. In this mysterious image, a large smear or scratch obliterates the wife’s face. The existence of this image was
rumored but uncertain until it was found in the collections of the *Deseret News* in 2002.\textsuperscript{11}

**A Well-Preserved Treasure**

The media attention this donation received will hopefully spur others to consider donating their treasures to institutional repositories. Professional preservation methods ensure the artifacts will be seen by generations to come. Today, institutions often provide copies for the donators’ personal enjoyment. Donations also provide access for family members who may not have even known that such an item existed. Thoughtful individuals are making sure that their family treasures will survive for future generations by donating artifacts to responsible institutions. It is an immense pleasure that Brigham Young University finally has within its important collection a beautiful and fine daguerreotype of its namesake.

Richard Nietzel Holzapfel (holzapfel@byu.edu) is a photograph editor of *BYU Studies* and Associate Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University.

Thomas R. Wells (tom_wells@byu.edu) is a photograph editor of *BYU Studies* and is Curator of Photographic Archives at the L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University.

7. The engraver who created the woodcut was Frank Leslie, an important contributor to the development of photojournalism in the nineteenth century. Leslie’s name on the lower left edge, just under Brigham’s right hand, indicates that Leslie engraved this particular block for the *Pictorial*.
9. For a full discussion of the photographic record of Brigham Young, see Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and R. Q. Shupe, *Brigham Young: Images of a Mormon Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Eagle Gate; Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2000).
Hugh Nibley’s Articles of Faith

John W. Welch

So, Hugh Nibley has two lawyers speaking at his funeral. Good thing he appreciated irony! I have laughed and wept as I have written this final examination.

Speaking on behalf of all who have taken a Nibley class, attended a Nibley fireside, source-checked a footnote, or have been changed by reading his gifted prose, I say, simply, thank you, Hugh, with special mention also to Phyllis.

If we were to “render all the thanks and praise that our whole souls have power to possess” (Mosiah 2:20), yet would our thanks be inadequate. He was a true friend, a model mentor, generous and inspirational in the extreme. He never did anything part way.

To paraphrase Brigham Young, I feel like shouting hallelujah all the time when I think that I was so fortunate to ever know Hugh Nibley.

Robert K. Thomas once said, “Few students can talk coherently about their first class from Brother Nibley.”¹ That was the case for me when I entered his honors Book of Mormon class as a freshman forty years ago, or thirty-six years ago when I had my first three-hour, one-on-one session with him. And it is still the case today. Who can speak coherently of the life-changing experience of encountering Nibley’s expansive curiosity and grasp of everything from “before Adam”² to the continuous “breakthroughs” he always hoped to see?³

Lots of words are used to describe Hugh Nibley: brilliant, eclectic, iconoclast, critic, genius. But what was it, I got wondering, that held it all together for Hugh? What were Hugh Nibley’s “articles of faith”? In the middle of the night, two days after his passing, it suddenly dawned on me what his articles of faith were. And as my mind ran through the colorful
titles of his many books and publications, through which most people will have access to him, the following thirteen-point insight fell into place:

First, Hugh believed in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost (A of F 1). He rejected Augustine’s speculative creation of trinitarian theology, commenting wryly, “Here certainly is a place where revelation would [have been] helpful.”

Second, Hugh believed that we will be accountable for our own sins and not for Adam’s transgressions (A of F 2). He saw to the depths of the plan of salvation and wrestled to the ground the “terrible questions” of where we came from, why we are here, and where we are going. He reen-throned human agency through the ancient “doctrine of the two ways” and the primordial dichotomy of good and evil.

He zealously claimed the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience (A of F 11). He spoke out against intolerance or judging others. He wanted you “to understand men and women as they are, and not . . . as you are.” Tolerance, he wrote, is a crucial ingredient in “exemplary manhood.”

He also spoke keenly on political topics, realizing the necessity of being subject to kings, rulers, and magistrates (A of F 12), yet hoping that people in power would not seek for glory or to get gain, and that we would have “leaders,” not “managers.” He wrote of being “in the party but not of the party,” on statecraft, ancient and modern, on “the uses and abuses of patriotism,” and much about the problems of war and the ideals of peace.

Hugh Nibley’s first principle was clearly faith in the Lord Jesus Christ (A of F 4). Hugh believed that, through the Atonement of Jesus Christ, all mankind shall be resurrected (A of F 3). At Don Decker’s funeral, Hugh declared: “A physical resurrection does exist. We believe in it. We will need it. We came here to get a body for a definite purpose. The body plays a definite role in the mind and the spirit.” Hugh testified that Jesus Christ “paid the ransom price, he redeemed us when we could not redeem ourselves.” It was, he said, “a suffering of which we cannot conceive, but
which is perfectly believable.”19 We are saved by grace after all we can do, or as he unforgettably said, “Work we must, but the lunch is free.”20

He spoke extensively of obedience to the ordinances of the gospel (A of F 3). In “How Firm a Foundation,”21 what made it so was the priesthood, ordinances performed by those in authority (A of F 5), which extend the gospel beyond this “ignorant present.”22 The ordinances are everything behind his books The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri23 and Temple and Cosmos.24 The ordinances have allowed him and will allow us to pass into the spirit world, out of the reach of the power of Satan.

Of the first principles of the gospel (A of F 4), Hugh said, “We must keep our eye on the principles of the gospel that have been given us.”25 Of repentance, he spoke of perpetual, voluntary repentance as the very definition of righteousness.26 He exemplified humility and unpretentiousness.

He wrote passionately about the nature of spiritual gifts (A of F 7), and exhorted us to “deny not the gifts of God.”27 He clearly had the gift of tongues. From his own thin-veil experiences, he knew of and defended trenchantly the realities of the visions of Joseph Smith.28 He rejoiced in the gift of prophecy.29 He truly believed and unfolded all that God has revealed, from “Enoch the prophet”30 and “Abraham in Egypt”31 to the instructions revealed during Christ’s forty-day ministry.32

Eagerly he believed all that God does now reveal, and shall yet reveal (A of F 9). He drove a wedge between the sophic world and the prophets.33 He wrote incisively against “criticizing the Brethren,”34 ending that presentation with a story of Elder Spencer W. Kimball wiping off Hugh’s dusty shoes, and with the testimony, “I truly believe they are chosen servants of God.”35

Because Hugh had a command of primary sources, a major segment of his widely published work successfully compares the organization that existed in the Primitive Church with features of the Restored Church (A of F 6), covering such subjects as Apostles and bishops,36 prayer circles,37 baptism for the dead in ancient times,38 and when and why “the lights went out.”39

Without doubt, he believed the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly40 (A of F 8). Without correct translation we have only “zeal without knowledge.”41 Nibley taught us to read the Greek New Testament with our LDS eyes wide open. According to the King James Version, John 17:11, in the great high priestly prayer, simply reads, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me”; but to Hugh Nibley, who rightly sees this as a temple text, it is better translated instrumentally, “Holy Father, test them on the name with which you
endowed me,” a much different reading, for those who wish to enter into the presence of God.

It goes without saying that he believed the Book of Mormon to be the word of God. We could multiply dozens of titles, from *Lehi in the Desert* to his last retrospective “Forty Years After.” He has consistently taught us to look at this book more carefully, that it holds up under the closest scrutiny as an ancient testament of Jesus Christ, with deep spiritual relevance today and at the judgment bar of God.

No theme was stronger for Hugh Nibley than our “approaching Zion,” which is the thrust of the tenth Article of Faith. When invited to speak in a Last Lecture Series at BYU in 1971, without hesitation he took Article of Faith 10 as his ultimate topic in the lecture he challengingly entitled “Our Glory or Our Condemnation.” He wrote often about the millennial goals of a consecrated Zion, if only from “a distant view.” He saw Zion as needing to be perfectly pure in a perfectly pure environment, to be holy enough to receive the coming Lord himself, “for the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation” (Ps. 132:13).

In the tenth Article of Faith is located Nibley’s concern about the renewal of the earth to its paradisiacal glory, of “man’s dominion,” our “stewardship of the air” and the obligations that accompany all “promised lands.”

In “Goods of First and Second Intent,” he spoke of seeking after things that are ends in themselves, things that are honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and so forth (A of F 13). Throughout his life he was occupied with this quest, in an effort to educate the Saints, from college students down to the most humble amateurs. On the phrase “in doing good to all men,” this is precisely what his speech “How to Get Rich” is all about. And how do we get rich? By giving it all away, in doing good to all men. And, for Nibley, these were not just words.

Thus, several new conclusions dawned on me as I suddenly appreciated more fully than ever before Hugh Nibley’s brilliance as the quintessential gospel-scholar. As eccentric as he was in some ways, Hugh Nibley swam in the main streams of Mormonism. It is hard to find the title of a single Nibley book or article that does not pertain directly to one of the Articles of Faith.

In extraordinary ways, he addressed ordinary topics. His subtexts were none other than the primary truths of the Articles of Faith, all thirteen of them.

His framework was completely congruent with Joseph Smith’s.

He did not ride any particular pet hobby horses, but sought to circum- scribe all truth into “one eternal round.”
He preached the gospel, in its fullness, and with an eye single to the glory of God.

Nibley was loved and trusted precisely because he put first principles first.

At his sixty-fifth birthday celebration, it was said, “A great scholar . . . is not one who depends simply on an infinite memory, but also on an infinite . . . power of combination; bringing together from the four winds, like the Angel of the Resurrection, what else were dust from dead men’s bones, into the unity of breathing life.”

We will be everlastingly grateful to Hugh Nibley for bringing it all together, for taking dusty books and forgotten scrolls, and breathing into and out of their words the eternal truths of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. For all this, and much, much more, thank you, Hugh.

In his memory, let us live our religion. We have a work to do to prepare for that exalted sphere where Hugh now moves, and talks, and expounds with endless joy. I testify that the gospel of Jesus Christ is true, that we shall have life, and have it abundantly.

Hugh W. Nibley was a frequent contributor of valuable articles to BYU Studies. The full text of over a dozen of his titles can be found on the web at byustudies.byu.edu.

John W. Welch is the Editor-in-Chief of BYU Studies, the Robert K. Thomas Professor of Law at Brigham Young University, and founder of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS). This speech was delivered at Hugh Nibley’s funeral on March 2, 2005.
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One of my priorities as document editor for *BYU Studies* is publishing documents by and about lesser-known Latter-day Saints, especially women. Only documents judged to have lasting historical significance are featured in *BYU Studies*, so the challenge is to discover rich, unpublished sources that allow readers to hear otherwise silent historical voices. Sally Bradford Parker’s letter to her brother-in-law John Kempton on August 26, 1838, fills the role perfectly. I learned about the letter from Brenda McConkie, a relative of Sally Parker, who showed me a transcript of it while we were on a tour of LDS history sites in Ohio. Steve Sorenson at the LDS Church Archives brought Sally Parker’s letters to Janiece Johnson’s attention. Her research and writing on early LDS women made her the right choice to work with these letters and to write an introduction for the one featured here.

Sally’s letter is published with the permission of the Delaware County Historical Society, where the original reposes safely in the Doris Whittier Pierce File in Delaware, Ohio, near Columbus. Pierce donated this and other family letters to the Historical Society, where family historian W. Edward Kempton painstakingly transcribed them. Kempton’s transcription and genealogical research underpin this edition of Sally’s letter. The letter is also available through the LDS Family History Library.

This document is more challenging to present than most of those *BYU Studies* has featured. As Kempton wrote to Brenda McConkie on October 15, 1997, Sally is a “powerful and moving writer,” but her literacy, like Joseph Smith’s, was limited. Her lack of capitalization, punctuation, standardized spelling and appropriate verb tenses is not much poorer than that of some undergraduates, but it makes deciphering her vocabulary and syntax difficult. Document editors today believe that the anthropology of a document—its humanness—is historically significant. We want to mediate only minimally between the author and the reader, the way a museum curator might present an artifact. But we also seek to provide access to the meanings of the document captured in the words. How does one capture the power and beauty of Sally’s prose in modern language without damaging it and marring her in the process?

We decided to bring readers into the document editing process by featuring the text twice. The original transcription leaves usage, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation as Sally rendered it. Editorial insertions in brackets [like this] are minimal. Inserts <like this> show words Sally inserted. Strikeouts like this show words Sally struck out. The edited transcription strives to maintain the integrity of Sally’s intent while increasing readability. Her verbs remain but tenses have been changed and punctuation, capitalization, and spelling have been standardized.

—Steven C. Harper, BYU Studies
Sally Bradford Parker is not a name most LDS Church members recognize, but her faith, exemplified through the letter featured below, weaves an important fabric distinctive to early Latter-day Saint women. The limited number of known early Mormon women’s voices, especially prior to the organization of the Relief Society in 1842, makes this document particularly valuable. As Sally shares her experience, she augments and supports the testimony of Hyrum Smith as a Book of Mormon witness and particularly the witness of another woman—the Prophet’s mother, Lucy Mack Smith. When Sally arrived in Kirtland she was in awe of the many Latter-day Saints who focused their lives in faith and prayer. Lucy Mack was one of those exemplary individuals. Lucy’s sincerity deeply impressed Sally, who seems to have shared a motherly kinship with her.

Sally’s letters portray her as a powerful chronicler of her personal and family experience in a small branch on the periphery of the Church. Through her writing, Sally demonstrates that, like the saintly examples she found in Kirtland, her membership in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was the dominant thread of her life—even though most of her life she was not gathered with the general body of the Saints. Sally’s letters intricately wove that dominant thread with the price of produce, weather conditions, and familial inquiries of health.

Sally Bradford’s parents were early settlers on the Maine frontier. At the age of twenty she married Peter Parker in newly settled Farmington, Maine, in 1799. Sally bore three daughters and three sons, beginning in 1800 with her namesake, Sally, and ending with Julia Ann two decades later. She and Peter also raised their granddaughter Sarah after her mother died in 1826. The Parkers and many of their relatives embraced the
restored gospel in Maine beginning in 1834. Sally and Peter optimistically migrated to Kirtland in June 1837 to gather with the Saints, but a national economic crisis that year devastated Kirtland’s speculative base. Sally described with enthusiasm the events of her first week in Kirtland in a July 1837 letter. She attended meetings in the temple with hundreds of people, and after Sunday meetings she marveled as she witnessed the baptism of a 108-year-old man. Her son John worked with Joseph Smith and claimed that he “never saw a [more] clever man in his life.” As the Parkers were able to gather with the Saints and participate in meetings, the fellowship they enjoyed with the Saints was contrasted by confrontations with the fruits of apostasy.

Joseph Smith left Ohio for Missouri in January 1838. The Parkers left Kirtland soon after, following their non-Mormon son John to Sunbury, Ohio, a promising location near the National Road in central Ohio settled largely by other families from Farmington, Maine. The Parkers arrived in Sunbury early in March 1838. That summer, Kirtland Camp, the largest contingent of Latter-day Saints immigrating from Ohio to Missouri, passed near Sunbury under the direction of Hyrum Smith, and Sally eagerly awaited an opportunity to see the Saints. Though Sally missed the fellowship of the main body of the Saints, the Parkers’ small branch in Sunbury would grow. In April 1840 Julia Ann Parker recorded that the Latter-day Saints were “increasing very fast in this town and about here there has three of the most respectable men in town been baptized and joined their church besides a good many others.” In the same letter, Sally commented that four individuals had been baptized during the week to add to their branch of twenty. She added, “It is a grate comfort to us to see the work of the Lord a spredding so fast for it never spread so fast before as it has for a year past.”

A deeply moving letter written by Sally to her mother in September 1842 documents the death of her husband, Peter, in Sunbury. She wrote seeking sympathy in her “lonsom hours;” she mourned, “my hous is lonsom my tabel is lonsom my bed is lonsom was lonsom when I got out and when i comin and how lonsom the place whear he sat.” As she expressed the great void she felt after Peter’s death, she also shared his unfailing faith and the spiritual peace he felt at the time of his passing. After Peter’s death Sally thought she would be in lonely Sunbury for the rest of her life, yet she sold her property in December and was living in the “promis land” of Nauvoo by summer 1843. She enthusiastically declared that “the way was opened for me to com and now I am in the middle of Nauvoo.” After 1845 she moved frequently. For several years after the death of her husband, Sally’s sons Asa and John attempted to get their mother to return to Sunbury,
yet she was determined to “take up her abode in the wilderness.” Though their initial attempts were “all to no purpus,” at some point Sally did return to Sunbury and was living there with Asa by 1850. Sally’s declining health limited her ability to be actively involved in the Sunbury branch, though she remained firm in her faith. She professed, “I feele som times if I had a thousands toungs I could use them all in praising my Lord and Master for what he has don for me and what sees I have passed. . . . I had a feast of fat things to my soul that I never shall ever forget.” Though Pierce claimed that Sally died in 1852 in Iowa, it seems unlikely that she made it back to Iowa by that date, and her death and burial remain undocumented.

For Sally Parker, religion was central to her experience. As she boarded a ship for Kirtland, she wondered if among the two hundred “out landish

“His Discourse was Beautiful”

Having done research on Hyrum Smith’s sermons and writings for the Joseph F. Smith family organization quite a few years back, I found the reference to Hyrum in Sally Parker’s letter quite enlightening. First, I believe this is the only reference that we have that indicates that Hyrum passed through Sunbury, Ohio. Second, Sally’s description of his sermon confirms my opinion that Hyrum had considerable eloquence as an orator. Overall, it is difficult to get a strong sense for Hyrum’s personality and speaking prowess because so few of his sermons were recorded. However, after my research, I came to know Hyrum as more than only the mild and meek supporter of his brother Joseph. At times his tongue was on fire. He could rise up in great denouncements of evil using the salty language of frontier times; he could reason carefully with investigators late into the night; his writing about the eventual destiny of Kirtland stands as one of the most prophetic documents of Church history; his Word of Wisdom discourse, in my mind, is the most visionary and doctrinally compelling on the subject.

True, when compared to Joseph (a man overflowing with charisma), Hyrum was described as being more demure. But in looking at the documents, we see that Hyrum, standing alone, was a dynamic leader and an unyielding witness for the Book of Mormon.

—James T. Summerhays, BYU Studies
peopl” there was “a nuf religion aboard the ship to save it.”15 If the group was as “out landish” as Sally thought, it is likely that she was not the only woman aboard with similar thoughts, for religion has always been of central import to the experience of American women. Women’s presence in churches has been a consistent feature of American religious history.16 Likewise, Sally’s letters share similar themes of witness and exhortation with the letters of other early Mormon women.17 Her baptism into the LDS Church brought her divine assurance and support. In an 1838 letter Sally shared with her daughter, “I feel the same confidence in god as I did when I was Baptised about four years ago . . . that religion has stood by me ever since and ever will I put my trust in god.”18 She exhorted family members of other faiths to “read the Book of Mormon” for “there never was no truer book than for the emerica land” and if they read it for themselves they would “find it so.”19 Though Sally often found her “eyes failing,” pens “wore out,” and “paper scarce,” for her these messages were critical and worth the trouble.20 For us, her woven words give us a “window into [her] soul.”21

In the letter featured below, Sally writes in the aftermath of a devastating wave of bankruptcy and apostasy in Kirtland, updating her sister’s family on the community of saints. Sally describes her intimate relationship with Lucy Mack Smith, her experience listening to Hyrum Smith, what she knows about the antagonism of dissenters Warren Parrish and John Boynton, and the latest report from Orson Hyde on the success of the British mission. She weaves in the prices of potatoes and wheat as seamlessly as she wove the eighty yards of homespun cloth she reports in passing: Sally can be discovered in the way she weaves.22

Sally’s weaving pattern altered with her baptism into the LDS Church. Reflecting both geographical and spiritual migration, she expressed, “I niver have wish my self back.”23 Building upon her biblical foundation, the Book of Mormon and the new revelations added much more scripture to be “a fulfilling” and more to meld into her weave.

Her faith in the Restoration became her main pattern interwoven with daily life. This letter is Sally’s response to a wide variety of changing conditions: soil, crop prices, children, grandchildren, grandparents, the Kirtland economy, dissent, and an increasingly international church. In each instance Sally chooses to exercise faith. Indeed, faith in God, faith in the witnesses of the Restoration, and faith in the Book of Mormon become Sally’s most prominent thread. Her weave is a seamless, unpunctuated stream of consciousness flowing from one topic to another, resulting in the fabric of which Sally Parker and some other early Mormon converts were made.
[Sunbury, Delaware Co., OH]
De August the 26, 1838
Mr. John Kempton
Farmington, Maine

Dear and beloved Brother and sister in the Lord,

With pleasure I now write you a few lines but I know not where to begin. But I pray the Lord to direct me. We heard the letter read that you sent to Isaiah or Peter Parker. And you said if we could send you something to comfort you, which I don’t know as I can. For I have not heard but one sermon since we have been in the place and that by Hyrum Smith. As he was moving to Missouri he tarried with us a little while. His discourse was beautiful. We were talking about the Book of Mormon, which he is one of the witnesses. He said he had but two hands and two eyes. He said he had seen the plates with his eyes and handled them with his hands and he saw a breast plate and he told how it was made. It was fixed for the breast of a man with a hole in the stomach and two pieces upon each side with a hole through them to put in a string to tie it on, but that was not so good gold as the plates for that was pure. Why I write this is because they dispute the Book so much. I lived by his Mother and she

I lived by his Mother [Lucy Mack Smith, in Kirtland] and she
was one of the finest of women, always helping those that stood in need. She told me the whole story. The plates were in the house and sometimes in the woods for eight months on account of people trying to get them. They had to hide them once. They hid them under the hearth. They took up the brick and put them in and put the brick back. The old lady told me this herself with tears in her eyes and they run down her cheeks too. She put her hand upon her stomach and said, “O the peace of God that rested upon us all that time.” She said it was a heaven below. I asked her if she saw the plates. She said no, it was not for her to see them, but she hefted and handled them and I believed all she said for I lived by her eight months and she was one of the best of women.

I suppose there are some that are departed from the faith. They will hold on to the Book of Mormon, but if they deny that, farewell to all religion. Without doubt you have heard from John Boynton and Warren Parrish. I lived a lone neighbor to Parrish. You remember the piece he put into the paper to send to his parents. He appeared to be a man of God and now he is turned like a dog to his vommit and so forth. He and Boynton they lost their religion and they came out from the Mormons and drew away about thirty and now some have seen their error and gone back but the others have
denied the Bible and the Book of Mormon and the whole. Parrish is a lawyer and Boynton is up to all rigs and they are working against the Mormons. But now they are writing against the heads of the Church.

I heard they have sent letters that they were sorry that they deceived the people. I believed that they were praying people. Now they will curse and swear and call upon God to damn anything that does not suit them and they have their debating meetings that there is no religion.

Let us begin and hold fast lest at any time we let them slip. The older I grow and the more I see the stronger I feel in my mind. O brother, stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made you free. Preach the preaching as one said anciently: that I do not become discouraged, the prize is ahead. I mean to hold on to that faith which is like a grain of mustard seed, which will remove Mountains yes and heal sickness too. Bless the Lord for I feel the power of it in my heart now. I am as strong in the faith as I was when we were baptized and my mind is the same. I mean to hold on by the gospel till death.

I suppose you will want to hear something about the times. The spring [was] very wet and cold and the summer very hot and dry. The people think there will not be half a crop of corn but if you had as much you would call it a whole crop. Potatoes [are] very poor, wheat very good. Some say it will not be
more than fifty cents, others seventy-five, but if it is a dollar we had not ought to find fault. I will write a little more about the Mormons. Brother Hyde has got home from England with good news. They have baptized two or three thousand in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales. They have ordained elders, priests, and deacons and the work is very rapid. They got license from the queen to ordain churches. He has gone up to Fair West with his family and he is a going back soon with others. There is a gathering from the east and west, north and south. There are a moving daily the camp west—about three weeks ago six or seven hundred. They did not pass through this place. For this I was sorry, for I expected to see many of my neighbors in Kirtland. I expect Josiah Butterfield, Samuel Parker, Benjamin Butterfield are gone. I believe Benjamin means to be saved and family. Hannah Parker and Samuel were baptized. The work is a going on. Sometimes when they are a moving they stop and baptize on the road. They are scattered from Kirtland to the Missouri. All the Parrishites say, it does not stop the work. They baptize by day and by night and so the scriptures is a fulfilling. If I could see you and sister two hours I could tell you a long story. Don’t be discouraged. I see nothing to discourage me although I have no privilege of meetings with the Brethren. Yet I
believe the time is not far off when I shall enjoy the privilege with brothers and sisters again. O how I wish that you were here to dig them out of the holes of rocks. Most all professors, but no religion.

I wrote this to you on account of your letter, but I don’t know as it will bring satisfaction. I should have written to John Parker, but for fear he would start before this reached you I wrote to you. If he has not started I want you should send word to him get a cradle, without fail, for his children. [page 4] Peter and Mary I suppose will think hard if they know I write to you. I want you and sister should go and see them and tell them I think of [them] daily and hourly with all the rest of the relatives and acquaintances. Be sure and see Grandmother Woods, for I send my best wishes to her. I don’t know as you can read this, for I am in a great hurry about weaving. I have now eighty yards now on hand. I want you should all send letters by John. Tell Rosilla and Cynthia I have not forgotten them. When you go to your meetings tell the brothers and sisters I have not forgotten them, and I want they should pray for me, for I often think of the blessed seasons we have had. We have not heard from Brother Pinkham’s folks since they went away. We have not found Brother Moses. Yet we are as well as common. Farewell. Pray for us.

Sally Parker
Brother and Sister Kempton
Janiece L. Johnson (janiecejohnson@hotmail.com) has a Masters in American History from Brigham Young University and a Masters of Theological Studies from the Divinity School at Vanderbilt University. She is currently teaching, researching, and writing while on hiatus from graduate studies.


2. Sarah Hiscock was also called Sally after her mother and grandmother.

3. Sally Parker to Mr. Francis Tufts, July 24, [1837?], Kirtland Mills, Ohio, Doris Whittier Pierce File.

4. Sally commented that those that have “departed from the faith” are the “gratest oposers.” Parker to Tufts, July 24, [1837??].

5. W. Edward Kempton, “When the Mormons Came to Sunbury,” unpublished manuscript used by permission.

6. Julia and Sally Parker to Mr. Francis Tufts, April 18, 1840, Sunbury, Ohio, Doris Whittier Pierce File.

7. Parker to Tufts, April 18, 1840.


9. Asa Parker to Mr. Francis Tufts, [August 1843??], Sunbury, Ohio, Doris Whittier Pierce File.

10. Sally Parker to Mrs. Francis Tufts, August 28, 1843, Doris Whittier Pierce File. Mrs. Francis Tufts is Sally’s daughter Mary, who married Mr. Francis Tufts.


12. John W. Parker to Mr. Francis Tufts Jr., June 16, [1848], Aurora, Indiana, Doris Whittier Pierce File.

13. A. L. and Sally Parker to Brother and Sister, [Late Summer? 1851], Sunbury, Ohio, Doris Whittier Pierce File.

14. The 1850 census for Delaware County, Ohio, records Sally as living with her son Asa in Sunbury. Though it is possible that Sally again returned to the Saints as Pierce claims, it is improbable that Sally’s health would have permitted the 740-mile journey.

15. Parker to Tufts, July 24, [1837??].


19. Sarah Condit and Sally Parker to Mr. Leonard Hescock, March 9, 1847, Keosaugua, Iowa, Doris Whittier Pierce File.
20. Julia, John, and Sally Parker to Mr. Francis Tufts, November 11, 1838, Sunbury, Ohio; and Sally Parker to [Mr. Francis Tufts?], April [1842?], Sunbury, Ohio, Doris Whittier Pierce File.


22. Sally was a prodigious “weever.” In Parker’s first two months in Sunbury she wove three hundred yards of cloth. This is a classic example of home production common in the latter part of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century. Sally contributed to the family economy by selling the cloth for anywhere from eight to sixteen cents a yard. Parker to Tufts, May 31, 1838; and Parker to Tufts, November 11, 1838. See Christopher Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780–1860* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 181–190.

23. Parker to Tufts, May 31, 1838.

24. John Kempton married Hannah Bradford, sister of Sally Bradford Parker, in 1818 in Farmington, Maine. John and Hannah Kempton moved to Sunbury, Ohio, in November 1838, apparently in response to this letter. The letter was postmarked “Sunbury August 28.”

25. Isaiah Kempton was the son of John and Hannah Bradford Kempton. Peter Parker III, Isaiah’s cousin, was the son of Peter and Sally Bradford Parker.

26. Shortly after their arrival in Sunbury Sally attended a Baptist meeting because of its proximity, yet she longed for fellowship with the Saints. Echoing Elijah’s biblical encounter with the priests of Baal (2 Kings 16) she opined, “I often thought their god wass asleep or gon a journey.” It seems Hyrum Smith’s discourse was the only one she would classify as a sermon. Parker to Tufts, November 11, 1838.


29. John Boynton had been an Apostle since 1835, and the Parkers interacted with him and his family in Kirtland. Sally’s daughter Julia Ann worked for Boynton. Boynton’s mother impressed Sally as a woman as “free harted as ever I saw” (Parker to Tufts, July 24, [1837?]) who lived by faith and prayer. This likely added to her disdain of Boynton, who had rejected the Church. Warren Parrish was Joseph Smith’s scribe since 1835. Both were outspoken members of the dissident faction that arose in Kirtland with the failure of a joint stock company in which many Church leaders invested (the Kirtland Safety Society Anti-Banking Company).


31. Far West, Caldwell County, Missouri, was the central gathering place of Missouri Mormons from 1836 to 1838.

32. The camp to which Sally refers was Kirtland Camp, the largest group of LDS immigrants from Ohio to Missouri in 1838. They traveled southwest out of Kirtland, turning westward near Mansfield, Ohio, and passing just north of Sunbury.

33. Josiah Butterfield was an early Mormon missionary in Maine instrumental in converting many in the Farmington area. In 1837 he was living in Kirtland. Benjamin Butterfield and Samuel Parker were related to Sally Parker and John Kempton.

34. The Parkers were the only Mormon family in Sunbury, Ohio, in August 1838.

35. After joining Mormonism in 1834, John Kempton actively proselytized neighbors and friends in the Farmington, Maine, area. Here Sally refers to his missionary work, wishing he were ministering in Ohio. Sally’s desire was soon realized when the Kempton family moved to Sunbury in November 1838. In her April 18, 1840, letter to Francis Tufts, Sally reported successful missionary work near Sunbury led by John Kempton. “Now our Church is about twenty and many very Believing and wee think it is a few drop[s] before a more plent[iful] shower. When we com in March [1838] there wass no Brethern of our sect til Brother Kempton cam and now wee have a go[o]dly number of loving Brothren and sisters.” Parker to Tufts, April 18, 1840.

36. Sally’s eldest son John Parker had returned to Maine from Ohio to move his young family or perhaps their belongings. Sally hoped to get him this message before he began the return trip to Ohio.

37. Peter was Sally and Peter Parker’s eldest son. Mary Butterfield Parker is their daughter.

38. Cynthia and Rosilla Cowan were daughters of David Cowan Jr. and his wife, Joanna, who was a sister of John Kempton and thus a sister-in-law of Sally Parker. The Cowans were active Mormons in Farmington, Maine.

39. Nathan Pinkham was married to Betsey Bradford, Sally’s sister. The Pinkhams lived in Kirtland when Sally and Peter Parker arrived there in the summer of 1837. Apparently the Pinkhams left for Missouri prior to the departure of the Parkers to Sunbury, Ohio.

40. Moses Bradford was Sally’s oldest brother. He left Maine in 1818 with his family and settled in Star Township, Hocking County, Ohio.
Nineteenth-century migrants traveling across America suffered from many diseases as they journeyed to new homes in the West. The disease that was most common and caused the highest rate of illness and death was cholera. Historian Robert Carter notes, “It was a disease with which people were . . . familiar, yet it was little understood. It would strike suddenly, with no warning, often killing the victim within hours of the first symptoms. It was so uncontrollable that often entire families, even whole emigrating companies, would be wiped out.” While cholera was not always fatal, it brought fear and suffering into the lives of nineteenth-century travelers.

The purpose of this article is to report the history and pathology of cholera, the factors influencing the transmission of the disease, and the occurrence of epidemics, and to assess the impact cholera had on the overland migration trails of North America during the 1800s, particularly the impact on Mormon migration from 1847 to 1869.

The Nature of the Disease

Cholera was first referred to in the writings of Hippocrates and Galen but was not formally recognized as a severe, infectious diarrheal disease until 1817, during the first recorded pandemic, which began in India and spread through Asia and the Middle East. The second recorded pandemic occurred in 1829, introducing cholera to Europe and the Americas along trade and shipping lines. Additional pandemics occurred in 1832, 1849, 1866, 1911, and 1961, with cases continually being reported in many third-world countries. Cases reported as recently as the 1990s in the United States.
My work on the impact of cholera on Mormon migration was begun as an assignment in a Church history class on Mormon migration taught by Dr. Fred Woods. I became interested in the topic because it became apparent that many members of the Church in the process of coming to the Great Basin died of cholera. Even more apparent was the fact that many of those who died were children. I felt I wanted to know more about this disease, which we see here in the United States so infrequently today but which rages in third-world nations during times of both natural and man-made disasters.

Learning about cholera was so interesting. There is a fair amount of current medical literature on cholera and, surprising to me, there were many historical accounts of the disease from early American pioneers and native Americans. It was fascinating to mesh the observations of those who had experience with the disease during American and Mormon migrations across the American continent and the observations of current health care providers. The observations of early Americans were so descriptive and detailed that writing the article for a nonmedical audience was greatly facilitated. It has been exciting to use the knowledge gained in the process of writing this article in both my nursing classes and the Doctrine and Covenants classes that I teach.

Writing the article for a nonscientific periodical was a new experience for me. I had never written in the historical format, and the scientific format is much different. I am very grateful to Dr. Richard Bennett in the Department of Church History and Doctrine and the reviewers and staff at BYU Studies for their continual help and support in producing this work. I am also very grateful to Elaine Marshall, Dean of the BYU College of Nursing for her critique of the article and encouragement to continue with the work.
Areas affected by cholera from 1842 to 1862. This map shows that cholera spread around the world along trade routes. Cholera followed travelers, including Mormon pioneers, from the Mississippi Basin on trails to the western edge of the continent. Information from Geographical Review 41, no. 2, Atlas of Distribution of Diseases, plate 2, American Geographical Society, 1951. Used by permission.

States are attributed to food products imported from affected countries. Natural disasters such as the 2004 tsunami and Hurricane Katrina and social upheaval caused by military actions still cause concern about the occurrence of cholera.

Before scientists understood bacterial transmission of disease, there was little understanding of the cause of any disease, including cholera:

Misconceptions of the disease’s cause were evident from the entries recorded in emigrant diaries and journals along the trail. Many thought the cause was drinking from “holes dug in the river bank and marshes” and “shallow wells . . . impregnated with alkali.” . . . Some emigrants even believed that beans were the cause, so much so that beans were banned from many overland companies. . . . Other common theories of causation of the disease held by the emigrants, besides poor water quality, included diet, climate, night air, evening mists, and over-indulgence in alcohol.

A major breakthrough transpired in 1849 when John Snow, Queen Victoria’s physician, observed that cholera was likely to develop when water and sewage were mixed and then ingested. He hypothesized that
cholera was a localized disease affecting the gastrointestinal tract and its symptoms were caused by fluid loss. Snow further reasoned that the causal agent, once ingested, multiplied in the intestine and then passed from person to person. He saw that cholera transmission could occur as a result of touching contaminated bedclothes, but transmission over long distances had to take place through drinking water contaminated with the specific cholera agent.6

During the 1853–54 London cholera epidemic, Snow tested his hypothesis by tracking the agent from those infected to their water source—a water pump on Broad Street. Once he shut down the pump by removing its handle, new occurrences of cholera stopped. John Snow, the first scholar in epidemiology (the study of the cause of disease), did not understand the microbiological cause of the disease because he lacked the technology required to examine a sample. Yet he did understand the conditions necessary to cause and transmit the disease.7 Other epidemiologists confirmed that the cholera organism is transmitted by contact with contaminated water, food, or clothing that has been exposed to the organism; by flies or other insects that carry the bacteria from a contaminated source to another source; or by contact with human feces or vomitus.8

The actual bacterial cause of cholera was discovered shortly thereafter, in 1854, when Filippo Pacini described the organism, Vibrio cholera, although the organism was not isolated and cultured until the 1880s by Robert Koch.9 Koch proved that the bacteria colonize and multiply in the small intestine in as little as six hours or as long as five days. The bacteria produce a toxic substance that interferes with the ability of the gut to absorb water, electrolytes, and other nutrients, resulting in a severe dehydrating diarrhea, vomiting, and intestinal cramping. The rapid dehydration and electrolyte shifts are most malignant in those who can tolerate such losses the least, such as the very young, the elderly, or those with chronic diseases. In many cases, victims die within a few hours of the onset of the disease.

The first symptom in the clinical course of the disease is voluminous, odorless, clear diarrhea. The diarrhea is similar in chemical makeup to normal human body fluid, and the fluid lost can “exceed 1000 milliliters (1 quart) per hour in adults and 10 milliliters per kilogram per hour in small children.”10 At this rate, victims may lose over 10 percent of their body weight in a matter of hours, causing severe dehydration.11 Secondary to electrolyte loss from the diarrhea, vomiting and intestinal cramping follow but often with no initial fever and resulting in severe muscle cramping, especially in the calf muscles. Severe cases of cholera will exhibit
One of my first suggestions to students taking a Family History class is to create a timeline for each ancestor. This timeline should focus on religious, secular, cultural, social, or locality histories of specific events which occurred during the life of their subject. I quickly learned that one event which affected virtually all of my students’ early-twentieth-century ancestors was the Spanish flu epidemic of 1918. After reading Patricia Rushton’s article, I realize that the cholera epidemics she describes were as challenging as the flu epidemic. I appreciate the light her article sheds on the lives of my ancestors who dealt with cholera.

My ancestors William and Hannah Watkins of Islington, a district of London, had ten children during their first sixteen years of marriage. Eight of them died of cholera and were buried side by side in New Bunhill Fields cemetery. They were unaware that city officials were concerned that the Islington water supply might be contaminated by drainage from nearby cemeteries. In 1840, William and Hannah were converted by Mormon missionaries in St. Luke’s Parish; they traveled to Nauvoo with Parley P. Pratt in 1842. Grief over the deaths of their babies probably led to conversion and a willingness to migrate.

Another ancestor, Laura Peters of Ffestiniog, Wales, was not sure that the time had come for her family to go to Zion but received an assurance from three heavenly messengers that it was indeed time for her family to leave and that she would arrive safely. She and her husband, David, and their two daughters took the seven-week journey from Liverpool to New Orleans on the vessel Hartley. After they secured clearance papers, they set off up the Mississippi for St. Louis in an American steamboat. On that riverboat, passengers were attacked by cholera. Many bodies were left buried along the riverbanks. Laura was very busy on the trip caring for the sick and preparing the dead for burial until she too became infected with the dread disease. Because of that heavenly assurance, she never lost faith and knew she would be healed by the power of the Lord. She kept walking, with help, to prevent herself from going to sleep; she had seen others die in their sleep. Elder Lucius N. Scovil said in his journal, speaking of Laura Peters’s condition, that “through administration she was immediately healed. The promise given to her by heavenly messengers was fulfilled.” (From family history records by John David Peters and Konda Atkisson, in my possession.)

Learning about the trials our forebears faced gives us not only knowledge and understanding but also empathy and gratitude.

—Lynne Watkins Jorgensen, Accredited Genealogist
the following symptoms after the initial symptoms have taken their toll: extreme thirst, rapid heartbeat, weakness, and postural hypotension (dizziness and fainting). The kidneys stop producing urine and the heartbeat becomes irregular. Victims then may develop rapid breathing; “sunken eyes; irregular, weak or absent pulses; . . . cool and clammy skin; and a decreased level of consciousness.” The final symptom and the one that heralds impending death is an elevated fever (sepsis), probably secondary to the inflammatory response to the bacterial infection and the overwhelming dehydration.

In the nineteenth century, there was little treatment available for victims of cholera, but those who could swallow fluids were encouraged to do so. Common treatments also consisted of some combination of calomel, camphor, opium, cayenne pepper, peppermint, musk, ammonia, or mustard plasters. The treatments did not address the cause of the disease but rather were an effort to control the major symptoms of vomiting, diarrhea, and muscle cramping.

Ironically, the spread of cholera may also have been influenced by resistance to the disease. There are several types of cholera, each referred to as a serotype. Only two serotypes affect human beings. Exposure to these serotypes produce antibodies in the person exposed, which may increase resistance to reinfection.

The rapid spread of microbes, and the rapid course of symptoms, means that everybody in a local human population is quickly infected and soon thereafter is either dead or else recovered and immune. No one is left alive who could still be infected. But since the microbe can’t survive except in the bodies of living people, the disease dies out, until a new crop of babies reaches the susceptible age—and until an infectious person arrives from the outside to start a new epidemic.

The very fact of resistance among the world population in general may account for the cholera epidemics only during certain years.

Today, cholera can be treated successfully with aggressive rehydration and electrolyte replacement, either orally or intravenously. Antibiotics, such as tetracycline or doxycycline, reduce the duration and amount of fluid and electrolyte loss. In areas of the world where cholera has developed a resistance to these antibiotics, newer antibiotics known as fluoroquinolones are an effective alternative.

**Causes of Cholera Epidemics in America**

The occurrence of cholera on the American continent followed the incidence of cholera on the other side of the Atlantic. “The simple reason that the United States was spared recurring bouts of cholera between 1835
and 1848 was that those nations with whom America engaged in commercial intercourse were temporarily free of the scourge.”

When an epidemic did strike, specific factors probably had to be present: poor sanitation, significant population movement, flooding, and certain weather conditions.

**Poor sanitation.** While on board ships traveling to America, migrants, Mormons and non-Mormons alike, lived in terribly crowded conditions. Refitted cargo ships used for these transatlantic journeys often had temporary deck flooring that allowed rats and bilge water into passenger areas. Even though the American packet ships or passenger ships used in the mid-1840s had a bit more head and cargo room than other cargo ships prior to refitting, the lower deck held as many as five to six hundred passengers, while the main deck could accommodate another three hundred passengers. Four to six persons were assigned to the same six-foot-square berth, arranged in double and triple tiers. Between the berths, passengers had to store their few belongings, food stuffs, and cooking utensils, and needed to find space to do what little cooking they could. During rough or stormy weather, the hatches were closed to prevent water from filling the passenger spaces, yet even with the hatches closed, sea water got into the spaces. Human excrement resulting from sea sickness and other diseases was certainly present. Such periods of travel were truly miserable for those aboard, and the crowded conditions undoubtedly fostered the spread of diseases like cholera.

Sanitation conditions were not much better on the overland trail than they were crossing the Atlantic: “Maintaining cleanliness and hygiene during the trail era was difficult, but especially so under the dirty, dusty conditions of overland travel. . . . Food cooked over an open fire of buffalo dung, prepared with dirty hands and utensils and tainted with contaminated water, was continually a potential risk.” Emigrants boiled their water, “not to kill the cholera bacteria, which was still unknown to [them], but to distill the water to remove the alkali and saline or to kill the insects often living in the water (‘wiggles’, as they were commonly referred to). One emigrant found so many organisms in his cup that he noted that his ‘drinking water is living.’” Emigrants often used rags to clean up personal waste—rags that were washed in the same streams from which they drank.

Cholera seemed very unpredictable to people of the 1800s. “It ravaged some towns in a progressive sweep yet entirely skipped or inflicted only a few in others.” We now understand the logic of the erratic spread of the disease: if a town or location was situated so that human and animal waste ran away from the town, if the inhabitants of the site attempted to remove
waste, or if the area was not one of high traffic volume, the town might be spared the ravages of the disease.

**Population movement.** Infectious disease was spread by the major migrations of the nineteenth century. Such movement led to “vast and rapid urbanization in many areas of the world,” increasing the risks of poor sanitation and transmission of disease from close human contact; “increased travel, allowing more rapid spread of diseases from isolated areas;” and “human encroachment into wilderness areas, resulting in contact with previously sequestered infectious” disease. These conditions certainly existed during pioneer migrations, especially when vast numbers of people arrived from Europe into such cities as New Orleans, Boston, Philadelphia, and New York, swelling these cities’ populations and overtaxing what were probably minimal systems of sanitation. During the California Gold Rush, large numbers of travelers crossed the continent. These travelers increased the population in outfitting centers and camps along the trails and often carried the cholera bacteria from one site to another. While human advancement into wilderness areas generally spread infectious disease, in the case of overland travelers entering the Rocky Mountains, the rate of cholera decreased. This decrease was probably due to better drainage of water in the mountains.

**Flooding.** A third factor that may have influenced the high rate of cholera on the plains, specifically in river valleys, was flooding. The report of one assistant surgeon at Fort Harker, Kansas, in 1867, gives additional insight to the information of one historian:

> Smoky Hill river had overflowed its banks “to an unusual extent” a few weeks before the cholera outbreak, and the “lowlands near it were extensively flooded” from April through July. There was also . . . “a great deal of rain for this section of the country.” Decomposition of animal and vegetable matter “has taken place with unusual rapidity.” . . . There had been “an unusual number of flies and mosquitoes,” and houses in and near the post had been infested with “a large fly which differs from the common house fly.”

The waters of the flooding rivers, which contained soil nutrients, probably acted like the medium in a giant petri dish, since bacteria need moisture and nutrients to multiply. The wider the flood, the more moisture available, and the more nutrition provided for the cholera organism. In the mountains, the rivers did not flood as much, resulting in fewer media for the bacteria.

**Weather.** Another factor that may have influenced the high rate of cholera during some years and its absence in others was the weather. Many bacteria cannot live in cold conditions and are killed by the cycle of
each winter freeze. Freezing winters may have killed the bacteria, resulting in some years and some seasons when the rate of disease was low or nonexistent. Cold mountain winters may therefore account for the lack of cholera once migrants reached higher western elevations. There is no way to specifically correlate weather patterns with cholera epidemics in the West in the nineteenth century since official weather records are as lacking as specific numbers of cholera deaths. However, some literature does refer to the decrease in the incidence of cholera during the winter and its increase again as warm weather occurred:

The bitter cold of January brought the city [New York in 1849] a momentary reprieve, and there were no more new cases. For most New Yorkers, gold fever quickly replaced fears of cholera. But the more thoughtful realized that their city enjoyed only a respite. The warmth of the coming spring would certainly quicken the dormant seeds of the disease.

**Estimating Cholera’s Death Toll among Mormon Migrants**

Cholera epidemics occurred on the overland trails of the North American continent in the years 1833, 1849, and 1866. These American epidemics have been examined in some detail by several scholars. While it is clear that thousands died of the disease, most references and discussions do not provide numbers but only describe the situation of suffering and how that suffering impacted the journal writer.

There may be other reasons why accurate statistics about the number of cholera deaths are not available today; undoubtedly, many were not recorded. Statistics may not have been reported out of fear of panic or economic damage. Many personal journal accounts note the number of graves or make reference to the numbers of deaths that occurred from cholera—sometimes in single digits, sometimes in the thousands—but they are frequently only estimates rather than hard numbers. However, some historians do provide figures: Roger P. Blair provides an estimated death toll of one hundred fifty thousand in the 1832 and 1849 epidemics combined and fifty thousand in the 1866 epidemic. He notes, “The number of deaths from cholera on the overland trek West can never be accurately known; estimating losses from diary accounts or reminiscences is inherently difficult. But from an historical perspective, the number that died during the 1849–1854 epidemic is less important than recognizing that the number was great and that the risk faced by the embarking emigrants was immense.”

The pattern of inaccurate record keeping of cholera deaths among Mormon travelers was consistent with that of other travelers. Though
there are 136 references to cholera in the personal accounts found in the Mormon Immigration Index, probably less than a quarter of these describe separate incidents, and only a few state actual numbers of deaths. In one account, for example, John Martin wrote that cholera caused the death of two-fifths of all Saints traveling upriver from New Orleans to St. Louis in 1849. He found work burying the dead and noted that often they buried twenty-four persons a day. General voyage notes from the September 1849 voyage of the Berlin noted that forty-nine persons aboard ship died from cholera, twenty-six to twenty-eight of whom were Latter-day Saints.33

Several factors may explain the incomplete mortality records among Latter-day Saints in post-Nauvoo migrant communities. First, no established hospitals or clinics maintained records of diseases or deaths. Second, many Saints buried loved ones privately without notifying their leaders. Third, very poor families could not afford the burial fees or the cost of a coffin and so did not report deaths. Fourth, the dead were sometimes buried between or on top of existing grave sites or at any site convenient to the persons digging the grave. Finally, there may have been hesitancy on the part of Church leadership to admit that disease and death were a constant presence for LDS migrant companies lest Saints be deterred from gathering.34 Therefore, most of the comments about the numbers of deaths from cholera in the Mormon Immigration Index employ the use of such terms as “many,” “some,” “a few,” or “an unusual number.”

Cholera among Soldiers, Non-Mormon Migrants, and Native Americans

Elisha P. Langworthy, an assistant surgeon with U.S. Army troops at Fort Leavenworth in 1850, described the situation at that site. “Cholera raging to an awful extent among us. Men at active pursuits one day . . . the next day they are a loathsome mass, thrown coffinless into a yawning pit. We wrap 4 to 5 daily in their blankets, and throw their remains in the ground with a blessing or a prayer. No stone marks their last resting place . . . desertions [have] continued in gangs from 3 to 8 [a day].”35

Historian John D. Unruh comments on the few survivors left after a cholera outbreak in several companies of migrants:

[On] one 1850 turn-around [round trip], the only surviving member of his entire company, prudently decided to tempt fate no further. The three survivors of a cholera-ravaged seventeen-man group who retraced their steps in 1852 concurred. Ezra Meeker later recalled meeting a train of eleven returning wagons in 1852, all driven by women. Not a single male remained alive in the entire train. Another 1852 company, initially numbering seventy-two men, began to backtrack after more than a third
of their number died, but had barely enough men physically capable of driving their teams.\(^{36}\)

Accounts of the course of cholera among the Plains Indians add to the picture of the disease’s rapid course. “A famous warrior, known as Little Old Man, mounted his horse and rode through camp shouting, ‘If I could see this thing [cholera], if I knew where it was, I would go there and kill it.’ Minutes later, he succumbed to cramps, slumped from his horse, and collapsed dead on the ground.”\(^{37}\)

The record of a frontier doctor shows the helplessness felt by Indians faced with a disease they could not treat:

They dug two holes in the ground, about twenty inches apart. The patient lay stretched over the two,—vomit in one hole and purge in the other, and died stretch(ed) over the two, thus prepared, with a blanket thrown over him. Here I witnessed cramps which go with cholera dislocate hips and turn legs out from the body. I sometimes had to force the hips back to get the corpse in the coffin.\(^{38}\)

Huge numbers of Plains Indians died of the disease, significantly reducing their populations. The Kiowa Indian tribe remembered their exposure to cholera as “‘the most terrible experience in their history.’”\(^{39}\) The Western Sioux “talked constantly of all the people who had died.”\(^{40}\) Exposure to or fear of the disease caused tribes to migrate, sometimes decreasing the incidence of illness, sometimes only spreading the disease. In fact, drastic reduction of tribal numbers due to cholera caused decreased numbers of potential marriage partners, and, consequently, a decrease in birth rates, and resulted in the effective extinction of some tribes. Additionally, since the elderly were particularly vulnerable to cholera, many wise tribal elders died, and tribes lost experienced leadership. Younger, less-experienced members were forced to lead, sometimes making angry, unwise decisions.\(^{41}\)

**Cholera among Latter-day Saints**

The first reference to cholera among a Latter-day Saint community was during Zion’s Camp of 1834, when over two hundred men marched from Kirtland, Ohio, westward to Jackson County, Missouri:

As the march proceeded, exhaustion resulted, patience became short, and tempers flared. Finally, the dreaded cholera hit with its terrifying cramping and sudden death. Two years before this time America had experienced a major epidemic of cholera, and its symptoms were well known—diarrhea, spasmodic vomiting, and painful cramps, followed
by dehydration that left the face blue and pinched, the extremities cold and dark, and the skin on the hands and feet puckered.42

Thirteen members of Zion’s Camp were buried near Independence, Missouri, and many participants suffered but survived.

Later, after the Saints had settled and then abandoned Nauvoo, disease and death stalked the Mormon Trail. There is some discussion about whether there is evidence of any deaths from cholera during the early years of the exodus at Winter Quarters. One author states that “cholera did not affect the Mormons until 1849.”43 However, the situation of Winter Quarters matches many of the risk factors previously mentioned: poor sanitation, population movement, and high risk for flooding. For example, James Linn described the bed of the Missouri River in the summer of 1846 as “‘a quagmire of black dirt, half-buried carrion and yellow pools of what the children called frog’s spawn,’”44 conditions that would have been ripe for malaria as well as cholera. Deaths from cholera mentioned in other LDS Church history sources from that period may refer to occurrence of the disease in the smaller communities surrounding Winter Quarters or to occurrence later, in the epidemic in 1849. “Life in these settlements was almost as challenging as it had been on the trail [from Nauvoo]. In the summer they suffered from malarial fever. When winter came and fresh food was no longer available, they suffered from cholera epidemics, scurvy, toothaches, night blindness, and severe diarrhea.”45

Cholera’s devastation was clearly evident in the accounts of ships bringing Saints from Europe. For example, in 1849, sixty-seven of the 249 passengers on the Buena Vista and forty-three passengers on the Berlin died of cholera.46 In 1854, the deaths of twenty-four passengers on the Germanicus47 and most of the two hundred deaths of the 678 total passengers on the ships Jesse Munn and Benjamin Adams were due to cholera.48

James Moyle, a Mormon immigrant on board the John M. Wood in January 1851, described the awful course of the disease as follows: “They would be taken first with cramps in the stomach and vomiting, then they would begin to look a dark black color in the face then their limbs would cramp up and in a short time they would be dead. I have seen people eating breakfast apparently quite healthy, and we would have them buried before night.”49

In 1866, the Cavour was struck by cholera while crossing the Atlantic. Passengers were afflicted again after they began their travel across the country in a Church wagon train:

Already, on board the Cavour cholera had broken out among the migrants. It made its first appearance in Brother L. Larsen’s family,
of whom most of the members later died. But on the travel by railway that terrible malady raged fiercely among the emigrants, claiming its victims one by one. The rough treatment the emigrants received was in part responsible for the heavy death rate. Just before the train arrived at St. Joseph, Missouri, one of the passenger cars took fire, and it was with great exertion that the sick were removed from it to escape from being burned to death. At St. Joseph a number of sick and dying had to be left in the hands of wicked people. . . . On the voyage by steamer up the Missouri River nine of the emigrants died, four of them being buried one night and five of them the next. . . . Consequently, this cholera infested company had to get ready in the greatest haste for the long and wearisome journey, and on August 13th the emigrants left Wyoming with sixty ox teams in the charge of Captain Abner Lowry.

Historian William Mulder writes that the joy the Cavour company felt as they were met by a Church wagon train at the Missouri River “was turned to grief when cholera, which had already taken a toll of the emigrants aboard ship and en route from New York, broke out again, leaving hardly a family intact and not abating till they reached the mountains. The deaths, John Nielsen remembered, ran ‘far past the hundred mark, and in history it [the Cavour company] has gone down as the cholera train.’”

From 1840 to 1855, most of the ships carrying Saints from Europe docked at New Orleans. Saints traveling upriver to an outfitting site had to travel through St. Louis, where cholera was often reported. In 1849, the Missouri Daily Republic, a newspaper printed in St. Louis, noted that ships docking in that city either brought news of the spread of the disease or had passengers who were sick or had died of cholera. One such example was the riverboat Highland Mary. The newspaper reported that twenty-seven people on board had died from cholera, and another thirteen were ill.

Sarah Jeremy, a British convert traveling up the Mississippi River in 1849 in the company of 249 Saints, was among the sixty or more who were stricken by cholera. She wrote, “Men and women were lying on the deck, unable to help themselves and no one able to do anything for them. Their tongues and mouths were parched with thirst and they felt as if they were being consumed with fire.”

As noted earlier, convert John Martin found work burying the dead. He had been a passenger on the Ashland in 1849. He commented about his stay in St. Louis:

I accepted the offer to run one of the city hospital vans and stayed until the cholera had died out. The death rate was very great for three months. Three of us were kept busy running light wagons and we took two loads a day each and four dead bodies on each wagon at a time. As we took only such people known as paupers, this compared with the
others filling more respected graves would make the numbers somewhat alarming. The average paupers we buried daily was 24. The other two drivers were stricken down with the cholera and one died with it, but I did not get it.\textsuperscript{55}

Cholera struck people at the ports and outfitting stations used by LDS immigrants in their travels from the East Coast to the Great Basin. For example, more than two thousand European Mormon converts spent two months at Mormon Grove, Kansas, in 1855,\textsuperscript{56} chosen for “its desirable location on a bend of the Missouri River farther west than any other outfitting point, fine grazing grounds, abundant good water, and a healthy situation.”\textsuperscript{57} Yet in 1855, cholera attacked Mormon Grove:

[Cholera] afflicted the Mormon emigrants—not only at Mormon Grove but also at various other places along their journey west. Some even died along the four and a half-mile stretch between Atchison and Mormon Grove. One local observer wrote, “I saw several of the Mormons die of the cholera in their wagon beds before they got started for the Grove.” Cholera decimated the Mormon immigrants in 1855. It was said, “[I]n that season, as many as sixteen persons were buried in one grave at this same Mormon Grove.”\textsuperscript{58}

Converts from Texas traveling to the Great Salt Lake Valley in 1855 detailed the loss of about thirty-three Saints out of a company of one hundred to cholera. One family lost five of their children.\textsuperscript{59}

Ira Nathaniel Hinckley, great-grandfather of President Gordon B. Hinckley, crossed the Missouri River at Council Bluffs in April 1850. They traveled up the Platte River to the Sweetwater, where cholera broke out in camp and Eliza [Ira’s wife] became violently ill. Stunned by how quickly the disease struck, Ira watched helplessly as his young wife died. The day of her passing—June 27, 1850—he lost his half-brother Joel as well. Grief stricken, he split logs for coffins and buried his wife and brother in unmarked graves on the open prairie. Not yet twenty-two years old, he had lost both parents and was now a widower with an eleven-month-old daughter, with whom he arrived in the Salt Lake Valley on September 15, 1850.\textsuperscript{60}

Cholera affected the handcart companies of 1856 as well:

The McArthur company [1856] was only a few days behind the Ellsworth company. Among those in the McArthur company was the Hans Heinrich Elliker family of Zurich, Switzerland, consisting of the parents and seven children ages 5 to 26. While camped at Florence, Nebraska, two of the daughters died of cholera and were buried there. Once on the trail, the father became ill and the mother and three sons took turns pulling him in the poorly constructed handcart.
One day as they crossed a small stream, the 21-year-old son, Konrad, asked if he could stop and rest awhile, saying he would catch up with them. "As they looked back they saw him wetting his white handkerchief in the stream. That was the last they saw of him." Though others went back and searched for him, no trace was ever found and the company had to move on. Adding to the heartache of this family, the father died a few days later and was "laid to rest on the plains with only a pile of stones to mark the hallowed spot."

Cholera caused Mormon leaders to revise the converts’ travel routes. In 1854 Brigham Young directed Franklin D. Richards, the Church agent in Liverpool, to begin sending Church ships to the eastern ports of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York City to avoid the effects of cholera in New Orleans and along the Mississippi. Until then there was no efficient way to get the Saints from Eastern cities to outfitting posts for the westward cross-country trek. In 1855 the Mormons "shifted their port of debarkation from New Orleans to New York and other eastern ports, to take advantage of the service which resulted from the rapid expansion of the railroads westward." Brigham wrote the following to his son-in-law in England:

If we can have our emigration come to the eastern cities and the northern rout, it will be much relieve [to] our Brethren from sickness and deth which I am very ancious to due. There is a raleway from new Yourk City to Iowa City and will cost onley about 8 dollars for the pasedge. Then take hancarts and there little luggedge with a fue good milk cowes and com on till they are met with teams from this place, with provisions &c.

This travel plan provided a more rapid, efficient, and less expensive means of getting the Saints started on their transcontinental journey.

A related effect of cholera on Mormon migration was a change in trails used to traverse the country. The Overland Trail, rather than the Mormon Trail, was used for 20 to 25 percent of the Saints who traveled west between 1849 and 1868 (see map below). Though there were a number of reasons Latter-day Saint migrants used the Overland Trail instead of the Mormon Trail, one goal was to avoid cholera along the North Platte River. The change in trails also shortened the journey, and after 1867, the change in trails allowed the Saints to take advantage of the railroad, built along the route of the Overland Trail.

The threat of cholera in St. Louis or other outfitting stations caused many converts to hasten their journey to the Salt Lake Valley. For example, Welsh convert Priscilla Merriman Evans records that despite an offer of a profitable job in Iowa, she and her husband decided to cross the plains rather than remain in Iowa a season. She recorded that "money was
no inducement to us . . . Many who stayed apostatized or died of cholera.”
Other journals expressed the same urgency to be moving west toward Zion. It was common practice for those who could leave to escape those cities where cholera was present and keep from being attacked by the disease. Conversely, victims who survived and were recuperating from the disease needed time, causing migrating companies to delay their journey.

It is important to note that although cholera produced changes in Mormon migration, the disease did not stop or slow the migration. Members barely interrupted the accounts of their westward journeys to report occurrence of the disease or the deaths it caused. Few Saints of the time ventured to describe their feelings about their losses in their journals; they seemed to preoccupy themselves with the continuing trials of their journey to the Salt Lake Valley. The accounts that do discuss cholera use terms such as “suffering,” “awful scourge,” “raging,” and “sad terrible times.” For example, Charles Sansom, a passenger on Erin’s Queen and a resident of St. Louis in 1849 while earning money to travel west, stated, “During the raging of the cholera many of our folks, the Latter-day Saints were called to lay their bodies down. I was many times called on to assist in waiting on the sick and assisted in preparing for burial the bodies of those who were called away, but escaped myself from any attack of that fearful scourge.”
James Thomas Wilson wrote in his autobiography, “This affair just ended as the cholera broke out in our camp, and many of our brethren and sisters

Mormon and Overland Trails. The Mormon Trail, following along the North Platte River, was the trail used by the 1847 companies and afterward. By 1868, 20 to 25 percent of LDS companies had used the Overland Trail instead. One reason was that cholera occurred less frequently along the Overland Trail. Kimball, “Another Route to Zion,” 34–36.
fell victim to this awful scourge. Whole families were entirely swept away, parents losing most of their dear ones, and children losing their parents, and if ever I was in a situation requiring all the faith I had, it was then.”

It seems reasonable that a high proportion of deaths from any condition would be seen in children and the elderly. One of the distinguishing characteristics of Mormon immigrant companies was that they were predominantly made up of families, which would include a high proportion of the very young and very old, thus Mormon companies were at higher risk than others for disease. The loss of children due to cholera was especially hard for parents. “Infant mortality was high. Six out of seven [Mormon British immigrant] women experienced the death of a child” from all causes, including cholera.

**Cholera as a Punishment and a Trial of Faith**

In the case of Zion’s Camp, Joseph Smith made it clear that the Saints were struck with cholera as a punishment from the Lord:

> This night the cholera burst forth among us, and about midnight it was manifested in its most virulent form. Our ears were saluted with cries and moanings, and lamentations on every hand; even those on guard fell to the earth with their guns in their hands, so sudden and powerful was the attack of this terrible disease. At the commencement, I attempted to lay on hands for their recovery, but I quickly learned by painful experience, that when the great Jehovah decrees destruction upon any people, and makes known His determination, man must not attempt to stay His hand. The moment I attempted to rebuke the disease I was attacked, and had I not desisted in my attempt to save the life of a brother, I would have sacrificed my own. The disease seized upon me like the talons of a hawk, and I said to the brethren: “If my work were done, you would have to put me in the ground without a coffin.”

“At this scene my feelings were beyond expression,” wrote Heber C. Kimball. “Those only who witnessed it, can realize anything of the nature of our sufferings.” One effect of this severe trial was that those who had endured Zion’s Camp were later called to lead the Church. Brigham Young stated that after their return to Kirtland, Joseph Smith received a revelation that the Quorums of the Twelve and the Seventy would be made up of Zion’s Camp members.

Early Latter-day Saints saw cholera as a pestilence or the “wrath of God” upon humanity, a “sign of the times heralding the last days.” While in Zion’s Camp cholera was considered a consequence of sin or punishment for lack of commitment to responsibilities in the Church, by the late 1840s cholera was seen as a trial to be endured and not as a punishment. Albert
Dickson, who came across the plains as a child, wrote about the disease in his company: “At the first camp on the Platte River, cholera broke out and two of our number succumbed to the dread disease which did not leave our company until we reached Loup Fork.” Albert’s great-granddaughter wrote about the effect of this trial on him:

Disease was one of the first challenges faced by both children and adults. . . . Pioneers are generally thought of as adults, but the majority of the western pioneers were actually children like young Albert Dickson, who trekked the westward trails and settled in the valleys of the mountain west. As they grew older, they became the leaders of many thriving communities that were literally carved out of a barren and hostile land. . . .

Albert Dickson eventually moved to Morgan county [Utah] and became the first bishop of the Richville Ward. He served in that position for thirty-seven years. His strength and leadership qualities, along with those of other early Church leaders, were undoubtedly developed by his experiences on the journey west.

Cholera was and is a terrible disease. It has taken the lives of millions worldwide, including many members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as they traveled from the eastern United States, Great Britain, and Scandinavia, across the ocean and plains, to gather in the valley of the Great Salt Lake. These Saints came in obedience to the command to gather to the tops of the mountains. They realized the possibility that some would never arrive at their destination, yet they came anyway. Cholera did not stop or slow the migration. Although migrants were afraid of the disease, the pull to gather to Zion was stronger than their fear.

The Saints suffered as a result of the loss of family members to cholera. When a child died, parents could be comforted by the Church doctrine of eternal life, which addresses the salvation of children who die before the age of accountability, but the loss of a child was heartbreaking for nineteenth-century Saints, as it is today.

Cholera was a severe trial to many of the Saints who traveled the oceans, rivers, and plains in the nineteenth century. They have left us a legacy of endurance and faith in the face of hardship and loss.

Patricia Rushton (patricia_rushton@byu.edu) is Associate Professor in the College of Nursing at Brigham Young University. She is a Registered Nurse, an Adult Nurse Practitioner, and an Advanced Oncology Certified Nurse. She earned a BS at the University of Utah and an MS and PhD at Brigham Young University.
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I feel as if I am looking back at my own life in the Church when I try to trace the history of the Relief Society in Japan. The two are closely intertwined. In August 1949, I traveled nine hours from Nagoya to the mission headquarters in Tokyo to be baptized by Elder Ted Price in the presence of my father who lived in Urawa, Saitama. Mission President Edward L. Clissold confirmed me. I returned to Nagoya by myself on the same day. There were no Latter-day Saint meetings held in Nagoya at that time. The closest area that had meetings was Narumi, a suburb of Nagoya, and I made the two-hour trek there every week. So I wrote a letter to Mission President Vinal G. Mauss, who filled the position in September 1949, asking permission to begin holding regular meetings in Nagoya. A Sunday School was then started there. Toward the end of April 1950, a new missionary came to the area, and he served as branch president. A couple of sister missionaries also arrived at about the same time. In those days, the congregation of the Nagoya Branch consisted of my husband, Tohkichi (who was baptized September 30, 1950), me, and another young single sister, in addition to the missionaries.

The women of the branch, including any visitors, began to meet in the sister missionaries’ apartment on Tuesday nights on the initiative of newly arrived Sister Philomena Andrade. She shared her ideas of tidying houses, arranging cupboards, cooking simple dishes, and answering questions...
about the gospel. Elder Wayne R. Harlane, the branch president, said, “Let’s call it a women’s meeting as we cannot organize anything officially.” Thanks to Sister Andrade’s attractive personality, five to six women, including high school students, gathered regularly. Cooking classes were

---

**Yanagida Toshiko**

Yanagida Toshiko is a Latter-day Saint who was baptized long ago. She is a daughter of Takagi Tomigoro, who was baptized in 1915 and was an important Church member in Japan before the mission closed in 1924. Her uncle Takahashi Nikichi joined the Church in 1908 and later brought his brother Tomigoro into the Church. Sister Yanagida was a Japanese pioneer in the post–World War II era, was called as the first Relief Society president in Japan, and served in that office for many years. She has been a very modern woman, and her character is marked by a studious and flexible mind. She enjoys composing *tanka* (a form of Japanese poetry). She also wrote an autobiography entitled *Ashiato* (My footsteps) and was the editor and chief writer of *Seiki wo koete—Matsujitsu-Seito-Iesu-Kirisuto-Kyokai Dendo 100-nen no Ayumi* (Beyond the century—a story of 100 years of the LDS Church in Japan). The following article is my translation of her memoirs, written in commemoration of the Relief Society’s sesquicentennial in 1991, that tell the story of the organization’s development and her contributions to it.

—Numano Jiro
the main attraction. Because missionaries were often transferred, this women’s gathering was sometimes held at night and other times during the day to accommodate the missionaries’ schedules. Since there were no chapels then, we sat in the missionaries’ tatami (straw mat) room and cooked inexpensive beefsteaks, pancakes, cookies, cakes, and so forth using an oven I had brought from my home and placed on a portable stove. On rainy days though, I sometimes found only myself and two sister missionaries there. The food we cooked together was a blessing to my home in those days when Japan had not yet made an economic recovery from the war.

Once, canned food and used clothes were sent to us from the U.S. Relief Society as welfare supplies. We walked with the sister missionaries on a hot summer day to deliver the goods to families whose children were attending Sunday School. In those days, my children were the only children of Latter-day Saint parents, so my family was both very surprised and thrilled to receive the goods. Another time when goods were sent to us, we delivered an especially great number of supplies to a very poor family, but the father of the family sold the goods to buy more sake (alcohol). The missionaries and I keenly realized how challenging welfare work can be at times. The experience, I think, helped me understand the gospel very much. As I was a new member then, the conversation I had with Sister Andrade strengthened my testimony of the gospel and taught me about brotherly love.

The members and those interested in the Church met together often. The missionaries’ residence or a member’s house typically became a meeting place, since there were no chapels in those days. On cold days, we wore an overcoat to meetings; on hot summer days, we burned a mosquito-repellant stick. We had no air conditioning. Although the room we typically met in was narrow and inconvenient, it was a good environment to nurture love among those who came.

Bazaars held a very important position in Relief Society work in Japan. We asked a Church member in the occupation army to purchase chocolate, chewing gum, and so forth from the PX (post exchange) at a low price, and then we sold the items at the busiest quarters in Sakae-machi, Nagoya, holding a bazaar at the square where a TV tower now stands. We sold chocolates, in a box hung from our necks, at an important intersection for three days in 1950 and 1951. Shops nearby complained to us that the prices were too low, so we got their permission to continue selling by limiting the activity to only three days. At that time, one U.S. dollar corresponded to 360 yen. Japan was destitute of commodities, and so U.S. members of the
Church and missionaries, who gave us much assistance, all looked rich in the eyes of the Japanese.

Missionaries served for three years then, and their clothes often wore out before they went home. Patching trousers, washing bedclothes, and beating cotton mattresses to soften them all became tasks of the Relief Society. When members were few, the Relief Society president took this responsibility, but sometimes I did, too.

**Called as Relief Society President**

Edward L. Clissold presided over the mission in Japan from 1948 to 1949, and Vinal G. Mauss presided from 1949 to 1953. A very modest branch Relief Society first saw the light of day in Nagoya as early as 1951 with me, Sister Yanagida, as president, and Sister Adachi Yoshie and Sister Fumie Swenson as counselors (fig. 1). (There was no secretary at that time.)

Hilton A. Robertson served as the next mission president (1953–55). Following Robertson was Paul C. Andrus, who presided over the Northern Far East Mission for two terms or six years (1955–62). On February 26, 1961, during President Andrus’s term, I was called to be Relief Society district president of the West Central District. Sister Suzuki Toshi was called as

---

**Fig. 1.** Branch Relief Society presidency in 1951 pictured with Relief Society sisters. Front row, second from left, Adachi Yoshie; third from left, Yanagida Toshiko; fourth from left, Fumie Swenson.
president of the Central District (1962), Sister Matsushita Shoko as president of the Hokkaido District (1963), and Sister Miyara of the Okinawa District (1963). I was responsible for eleven branches—Nagoya, Kanazawa, Kyoto, Okamachi, Abeno, Nishinomiya, Sannomiya, Okayama, Hiroshima, Yanai, and Fukuoka—and was to attend each branch conference. In order for me to attend remote branches in Hiroshima, Yanai, and Fukuoka, I took a night train with the district president, then Suzuki Shozo. There was no Shinkansen (bullet train) at that time.

Three years later, on June 21, 1964, Mission President Dwane N. Andersen (1962–65) called me to be the Relief Society president of the Northern Far East Mission. Sister Uenoyama Emiko was called to the Relief Society presidency of the West Central district. I called Sister Yaginuma Setsuko to be my counselor (the only one at that time), and Sister Tange to be secretary. These sisters resided in Nagoya, making it convenient to conduct regular business. Before this time, the mission president’s wife served as the president of the Relief Society in the international missions, but the responsibility was being transferred to local members. I am not sure whether this shift occurred all over the world or just in Japan. With her duty of overseeing Relief Society, Sister Peggy Andersen had put a message in Seito-No-Michi, the Church’s monthly magazine in Japan (fig. 2), but she turned over this task to me. My main responsibilities, however, were to attend district conferences of the four districts, to assist Relief Societies in the districts, and to make an annual financial report to the Relief Society General Presidency in Salt Lake City.

During this era, Relief Society had a separate budget from the mission budget. Expenses for Relief Society—such as transportation fees, correspondence, and so forth—had to be borne by the organization itself. Revenue came from female Church members eighteen years and older, who, in

**FIG. 2. Seito-No-Michi (Way of the Saints), the Church magazine in Japan in 1962.**
principle, automatically became members of Relief Society. Each member paid thirty yen a year and was given a membership card. Of the thirty yen, twenty went to mission headquarters, five to the district, and five to the branch Relief Society fund. Branch Relief Societies raised additional money by holding bazaars, dinner parties, and other activities; the district Relief Society occasionally held bazaars, too. Because our budget was separate from that of the priesthood leadership, we saved money by using night trains and ferryboats to go to Hokkaidō and Okinawa when attending district conferences. At midnight, I would travel on a ferryboat from Aomori to Hokkaidō; when going to Okinawa, the train trip took twenty-seven hours from Nagoya to Kagoshima, then I had to wait for the ship and it took another twenty-five hours on a smaller ship to Naha, Okinawa. In those days, Okinawa was under U.S. occupation, so I carried my passport with me and had to get the required vaccinations before boarding the ship there. When I first visited Okinawa in 1964, I found cars driving on the right-hand side of the road and discovered that money was in dollars and cents—I remember the bus fare was 3 cents.

When I traveled to these district conferences, members of the local Relief Societies were kind enough to let me stay at their homes. Visiting remote districts offered opportunities to become familiar with local leaders such as Sisters Hachimine Yoshiko, Miyara Toyoko, and Tohma Misao, who took me to see the remains of the war in Okinawa. Sister Andersen advised me to visit four branches—there were only four at that time—in Hokkaidō when I was there to attend district conference in late September 1964. I stayed at the Matsushitas’ in Sapporo, at a Sister Takahashi’s in Otaru, at the Ohkawaras’ in Asahikawa, and at the Kawasakis’ in Muroran, where I saw the sole Latter-day Saint chapel made of wood in Japan. Those homes were all heated, but I saw large electric fans that helped cool the temperature in the chapel’s hall where district conference was held in Okinawa in November of the same year. There were two branches in Okinawa, Naha, and Futenma. In Futenma, a half-cylindrical barrack disposed of by the U.S. Army was used as a meetinghouse and as the missionary quarters. Experiencing the reverse sequence of seasons during the trip to Okinawa that fall, I realized how long Japan is, even though it is a small country.

In addition to visiting district conferences and the various district Relief Societies, I also had to oversee the organization’s finances. Because Relief Society had its own budget, I had to send an annual financial report to the general board. This was a perplexing job because it was difficult for many branches to understand how to complete the forms. I often had to correct some parts before totaling up reports from the
districts. It took Sister Yaginuma and me a few days to check the reports with an abacus, then we filled in the mission form, took it to mission headquarters, checked it again with Sister Andersen, and finally submitted it to the general board. It took a lot of time to calculate and fill in the form, so I had to stay the night at the mission home. Although my children were all boys and my husband was busy with his work, I managed to leave home because my mother, who had joined the Church, was in good health and was willing to fill in for me at home. Still, leaving home for days (it took a week just to go to Okinawa) burdened family members, which bothered me a lot; this was the period of my life when I was worried about my home affairs.

Manuals

When the Church was experiencing a boom of international growth in the mid-twentieth century, there was a long gap before the Relief Society lessons were translated into other languages. Thus, we did not have any manuals and we depended wholly on sister missionaries for materials. Separate, mimeographed booklets were sent to us, subject by subject, during the era of President Andrus. There were five subjects: visiting teaching messages, theology, social science, literature, and work meeting. One year for the subject of social science we read a small book about Japanese history that had been written after the war. For the first time I learned of historical figures like Himiko, a famous queen of ancient Japan. I found a striking difference between the contents of this book, based on real historical material, and that of the history books written before the war, which had been built around legends surrounding the Japanese Imperial House. I became fascinated with history even though I had had little interest in it when I was young. Reading this small book awakened me to the wonders of history. So I appreciate very much the Church’s program that offered various stimuli for progress.

From 1965 to 1966, teaching materials for Relief Society lessons began to appear in the Seito-No-Michi. This was very convenient for us. But occasionally they did not appear in the magazine, and we had to prepare the materials ourselves. The Relief Society’s study year lasted eight months from October through May, which meant we had no materials to teach from during the remaining four months. We spent those four months doing what was called “work meeting.”

In preparing the manual for work meeting, we had to translate it into English and submit it to the general board for their approval. So I selected and edited portions of old mimeographed manuals that many sisters had
shown lots of interest in. For the visiting teaching messages, we picked up those used during 1957–58; for theology, Signs of the Times by Joseph Fielding Smith; for social science, First Presidency, which was used from 1957 to 1958. For literature we selected the topic of Japanese poetry and learned its genres and history, reading from classical poetry collections such as 
Man-jo-shu and Kokin-shu, along with Haiku and modern poetry. We also studied some Japanese literature. We created a curriculum for work meeting by selecting subject matter from Mochimono to Kurashikata (Possessions and Life), published by a commercial press, Fujin-no-tomo. Thus, we needed the understanding and approval of the general board for preparing our own textbooks of literature and work meeting. We asked Sister Takahashi Motoko, a graduate of Brigham Young University, for help. She was one of the members on the mission Relief Society board.

After getting approval from the general presidency, we arranged to print the manuals in time for the start of Relief Society lessons in October. During a hot summer in 1965 in Nagoya, Sister Yaginuma and I managed to find a printing shop that would produce our job at a low price. We asked them to print it quickly, and we proofread the text ourselves. The book was finished on schedule. We used the same manual again in 1972. It was a humble thing with cheap paper and binding, but it was a memorable item for us.

Rapid Growth

In 1968 when he was leaving Japan, Mission President Adney Y. Komatsu said, “To have sufficient growth, we need to divide the mission so that we can have more branches.” Exactly as he said, the mission was divided into two with the arrival of Mission President Edward Y. Okazaki in Osaka one month after Mission President Walter R. Bills took President Komatsu’s post in Tokyo. Residing in Nagoya, I was assigned to serve in Relief Society under President Okazaki and his wife, Chieko, in the Japan-Okinawa Mission. Since we were separated from the Relief Society of the Japan Mission, and having no part in their work, I do not know how they progressed after that. I do know, however, that Church leaders decided to sponsor a Mormon Pavilion at Expo ’70 to be held in Osaka in 1970. We all worked hard in the local units and hoped the Church would experience growth. President Okazaki oversaw our work on the project. Just as we expected, missionary work advanced extensively after Expo ’70. I feel dazzled to see the growth of the Church as missions increased successively to reach ten in 1992, and stakes multiplied to twenty-two by that same year. I sense the rush of the latter days as I witness the rapid increase in the number of temples in the world.
Unrealized Volunteer Work Plan

When the Tokyo Temple was completed in 1980, I was the Relief Society president of the Tokyo North Stake. The construction of the temple proceeded steadily, and the Relief Society was to do the final cleaning, behind the construction crew, before the building was to be opened to the public. Representing seven stake Relief Societies in Tokyo, I was given the responsibility to prepare for the cleaning from Tanaka Kenji, a Regional Representative (fig 3). This involved mobilizing four hundred sisters in five days, dividing them into morning and afternoon groups. While doing the scheduling, we were touched when sisters in remote areas, busy with raising children, willingly volunteered service despite the sacrifice involved.

On the day before the operation, we had a meeting in the temple for preliminary arrangements with Elder McFee from Salt Lake City, the staff of Kajima Construction Co., Regional Representative Tanaka, and the several ward Relief Society presidents. Elder McFee wanted the cleaning done according to the plan, just as the last cleaning of the previous ten temples in other countries had been done. However, the gentlemen from Kajima Construction said that such a cleaning was unnecessary, or rather would bring in dirt with so many people coming in and out. The Kajima representatives assured us they would deliver the temple only after a thorough cleaning. The discussion went on until evening, and finally the plan of volunteer clean up was dropped after Church leaders were satisfied with their inspections. We had to tell the sisters in various districts who were to come the next morning that the plan was cancelled. After 9:30 that night, we used what telephones we could find and quickly communicated this news to ward organizations. It was a night to be remembered because of the fuss. This incident impressed me with how Japanese construction companies handled things compared to those in other countries. At the
same time, I privately felt the will of God behind it, supposing that sisters who offered service at any cost showed their testimony but were exempted from the sacrifice, just as Abraham of old was commanded to stop the sacrifice of Isaac.

**Reminiscences**

When I was traveling in America in 1991, I visited the Okazakis; the Andersens; former Mission President Mauss, then ninety-one years old, and his daughter Peggy; and the Andruses. All were in their declining years. Looking back upon the past, I remember how they were once young and energetic, so I worked in good spirit, even though I sometimes worried about problems. I am filled with a strong feeling of gratitude for the Lord’s guidance as I remember those dear mission presidents and missionaries who taught us inexperienced members.

I am a witness to the current progress of the Church in Japan, and I am grateful for this. In this year of commemorating the Relief Society’s sesquicentennial (1991), I cannot refrain from feeling happy and grateful for the present circumstances of the Relief Society in Japan after forty years of its history. Past events seem vast and obscure, as if in dreams. Now I feel obliged to the next generation for their unceasing service. I should say that we as women are responsible for fulfilling the Relief Society’s motto “Charity Never Faileth,” and our faith in the Lord leads us to his glory without fail.

Author Yanagida Toshiko lives in Yokohama, Japan, with her husband, Tokichi. She is the mother of two married sons and has seven grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren. This article, along with many others, will be published in *Taking the Gospel to the Japanese, 1901–2001*, eds. Reid Nielson and Van C. Gessel (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2005).

Translator Numano Jiro teaches English at Hiroshima Kokusai Gakuin University in Hiroshima, Japan, where he lives with his wife, Mitsuko.

1. In 1990, I happened to attend a reunion of missionaries from 1948 to 1954 in Salt Lake City. We were all very delighted to see each other. Sister Andrade (now Sister Clowson), who started the women’s meeting, now white-haired, was actively engaged in running the reunion.

Although I was raised in the Church, I observed many cultural ceremonies and festivals originating in Buddhism as I grew up in Japan. One of those was what the Japanese call *ohaka mairi*, a visit to our ancestors’ graveyard. It usually took place on a holiday in Japan, which used to be called *Senzo o Uyamau Hi*, Honor Your Ancestors Day.

I recall on one such holiday in my early teens, I had to accompany my mother, her father, and her sister to visit their ancestors’ graveyard in Tama, outside of Tokyo. I learned then that this holiday now referred to as *Shūbun no Hi*, Autumnal Equinox Day, was a special day for the deceased because the sun rises from the East and goes down to the West, where our ancestors lived. We were to go to the graveyard to clean their graves with water and leave flowers, usually white. I also learned that the tablets and the boxes of ashes we kept in the mausoleum did not have the names of those I could recognize. They are identified with titles or rankings in Buddhism and new names are given to them to be used in the next world. In order to find out the names by which they were known in this world, I would have to go to their Buddhist temples and go through their registry. As we removed the fallen leaves of autumn and washed the tombstones with water, my grandfather made sure the lock in the back of the mausoleum was tightly closed, saying he did not want to be invited in by his ancestors yet.

I did not realize the significance of the Autumnal Equinox Day, which often is referred to as the Buddhist holiday *Hīgan*, until I became a more serious student of the scriptures. It was September 21, 1823, when the angel Moroni visited a boy Joseph Smith to tell him about the buried record of Christ on the American continent and also to announce the visit of
Elijah, who will plant in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers, and the hearts of the children shall turn to their fathers.\(^1\) This announcement has such close resemblance with the holiday in Japan that I could not excuse it as a mere coincidence. But first let me explain more about Higan.

According to *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*, the Japanese Language Dictionary, Higan 彼岸 (the other shore) is a short form of *Tō-Higan* 到彼岸 (arriving at the other shore), which is a translation of a Sanskrit word *paramita*.\(^2\) This life on this earth is called *Shigan* 此岸 (this shore), the worldly desires and passions are the river or the ocean in between, and when we die we reach the other side, the world of *paramita* (absolute perfection).

The Buddhist ceremony celebrating this event is called *Higan-e* 彼岸会, which lasts seven days in the fall and spring. The exact middle day of the seven days is called Higan and is the autumnal equinox in the fall and the vernal equinox in the spring. One of the Buddhist sects, *Myōkōji*, has a website which explains the Higan-e as the following:

> The Higan-e Ceremony, Memorial Service During the Equinox

Nichiren Shōshū performs the Higan-e Ceremony as a Buddhist practice for accumulating benefits and amassing virtue in the lives of the believer and the deceased. The daylight and the nighttime hours of the vernal and autumnal equinox are equal, signifying the inseparability of darkness (yin) and light (yang), as well as the oneness of good and evil. As the sutra expounds, “the Buddha desires the Middle Way.” For this reason, the benefits of performing positive deeds on these days are superior to those practiced at other times. These days of the equinox present exceptional opportunities for us to arrive at the other shore (higan). Moreover, Buddhism expounds the four debts of gratitude, one of which is to one’s parents and ancestors. Thus, during the Higan-e Ceremony, we make offerings to the *Gohonzon*, establish memorial tablets for our ancestors and perform memorial services for them. This small good deed becomes the great positive act enabling us to reach the other shore. This is the true significance of the Higan-e Ceremony.\(^3\)

The first documented occurrence of Higan-e in Japan was in 806 AD and was held to console the deceased spirit of Emperor Sūdō 崇道天皇. Higan or Higan-e has been mentioned in works of Japanese literature, folk songs, folk tales, diaries, and poems including *The Tale of Genji* and haiku, indicating that it has been part of Japanese culture for over one thousand years.

The actual visit of Elijah did not take place until the temple in Kirtland was completed. On April 3, 1836, Elijah, Moses, Elias, and Christ himself appeared to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery and returned the keys to do the work for the dead in this dispensation.\(^4\) What is so interesting and
It was, I am informed, on the third day of April, 1836, that the Jews, in their homes at the Paschal feast, opened their doors for Elijah to enter. On that very day Elijah did enter—not in the home of the Jews to partake of the Passover with them, but he appeared in the House of the Lord.\textsuperscript{5}

It is interesting that the actual coming of Elijah took place on the Jewish holy day, a day celebrated by the Jews, who intimately knew of his mission and his returning to this earth. Conversely, the announcement of Elijah’s coming took place on a day special to Buddhists, non-Christians who were unfamiliar with his work and role; nevertheless, they have observed the spirit of Elijah especially on this day for a long period of time.

The gospel in its fullness has made provisions for people who have died without any contact with the gospel of Jesus Christ on this earth. This is particularly important for the Asians, who, though not exposed to Christianity, yet were taught to revere their deceased parents and ancestors. In fact, President David O. McKay told of an intelligent Chinese student who rejected a Christian minister’s urge to accept Jesus on this very point. The Chinese student asked the minister:

“Then what about my ancestors who never had an opportunity to hear the name of Jesus?” The minister answered: “They are lost.” Said the student: “I will have nothing to do with a religion so unjust as to condemn to eternal punishment men and women who are just as noble as we, perhaps nobler, but who never had an opportunity to hear the name of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{6}

In other words, the ordinances for the people who will receive the gospel on the other shore was to commence in this final dispensation, and Moroni brought this announcement to the boy Joseph on the night of the Autumnal Equinox Day in 1823.\textsuperscript{7} This announcement is extremely important for the Asian people.

Would it be just a mere coincidence that this important historical event took place on the twenty-first of September? Would an unlearned teenage boy, Joseph Smith, have had a chance to learn about the significance of Higan in upstate New York in 1823 just to fabricate a date? I tend to think that it was neither a mere coincidence nor a fabrication by Joseph Smith.

The Lord designates certain days for us and sets them aside as holy days so that we can remember some important spiritual events relating to our eternal salvation.\textsuperscript{8} One of the most important holy days of all is the Sabbath. The Lord ended his work of creation on the seventh day
and blessed it and sanctified it (Gen. 2:2–3). Through Moses he commanded the Israelites to keep the Sabbath day holy to remind them that he had freed them from bondage (Ex. 20:8–11; Deut. 5:15). Just as the Lord had freed the Israelites from the bondage of the Egyptians, he has freed us from the bondage of both physical and spiritual death through his atoning sacrifice. He rose between the end of the Sabbath and the first day of the week (Matt. 28:1–8; Mark 16:1–9; Luke 24:1–7; John 20:1), which is now designated as the Sabbath, and we have been told in this dispensation to pay devotions to him on this day (D&C 59:9–17). The word sacrifice comes from Latin sacr- meaning “sacred” and the suffix -facare meaning “to make;” it is related to such words as sacrament. In fact, some Latter-day apostles such as James E. Talmage and Melvin J. Ballard suggest that Heavenly Father’s sacred sacrament was giving his son Jesus Christ as an atoning sacrifice for us.

Another important holy day for members of the Church is April 6. According to the Latter-day revelations, this date marks the actual birthday of our Savior and the restoration of his Church upon the earth. Members meet every year for general conference in commemoration of the organization of the restored Church, just as the Israelites must have been taught to remember these and other important days designated by the Lord. I can think of other days designated as their holy days: Pesach, The Feast of Passover; Shavuot or Pentecost, The Feast of Weeks; Yom Kippur, The Day of Atonement; Succoth, The Feast of Tabernacles.

Is the announcement of the coming of Elijah on the Autumnal Equinox Day coincidence? It may well be. However, when I think of the many Asians who have accepted the gospel, and I believe there will be many more when they realize what the gospel of Jesus Christ in its fullness offers, I cannot help but suspect that this is part of Heavenly Father’s intricate plan and one of the special holy days he designates. My own father, the first convert to the Church in the city of Sendai after World War II, was overjoyed when, after studying both Catholicism and Protestant teachings, he heard about the fact that temple work could be done for his relatives and friends that he lost in the war.

As I think of the visit to the family graveyard in Japan with my mother, her sister, and my grandfather, all of whom have already gone on to the spirit world, I am filled with joy from the knowledge of the restored gospel, and I have become more grateful to the Lord for sending heavenly messengers to Joseph Smith to restore the gospel of Jesus Christ in its fullness. At least for me, and, I am sure, for many Asians and others who honor and revere their parents and ancestors, the visit of Moroni on the night of the autumnal equinox in 1823 was an extremely significant event.
As was announced, Elijah did come and the promises made to the fathers are being planted in the hearts of the children, and the hearts of the children are turning to their fathers all over the world.
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David and Emma Ray Riggs at Zurich Lake, Switzerland, 1922, while he was presiding over the European Mission.
“Twenty Years Ago Today”
David O. McKay’s Heart Petals Revisited

Mary Jane Woodger

David Oman McKay and Emma Ray Riggs were married January 2, 1901, making them, as David noted, the first couple sealed in the Salt Lake Temple in the twentieth century. As David’s public profile rose with his call as Apostle in 1906 and then as President of the Church in 1951, the McKays became known popularly as the Church’s happiest couple. During their marriage, President McKay wrote poems and other expressions of endearment for Emma Ray. He delivered these “heart petals,” as he called them, from the Tabernacle pulpit and in the Deseret News Church Section on their anniversary, her birthday, holidays, and other occasions. He publicly wooed his wife and intermittently even said to his audience, “May I give you what I call a ‘heart petal’ as we sit in sacred communion?” Latter-day Saints identified with their prophet’s charm. Emma Ray McKay valued her husband’s efforts. She expressed her appreciation and affection:

In marriage, a woman’s happiness is committed to a husband’s tender care. David has given me that care always, trying to make everything as easy as possible in the home. He is neat in his habits, always desirous of getting help when needed, especially concerned with my state of health, never reproaching me for my personal or mental defects, ever making me feel that I am of the greatest importance to him. “A man never appears to greater advantage than in proving to the world his affection and preference for his wife.” It is a joy to have my birthday and Christmas roll around, not so much for a material gift from my sweetheart as for the “heart-petals in rhyme” with which he continues to woo me and which always thrill me. . . . Charm . . . is as natural to him as life.”

During his sixty-three-year tenure as a General Authority, the effect of David O. McKay’s “heart petals” to his wife, and the resulting example to
the Church at large, is immeasurable. These letters have been published for the first time in a collection entitled *Heart Petals: The Personal Correspondence of David O. McKay to Emma Ray Riggs.* The greatest explanation for President McKay’s successful marriage is found within his words, which share his desire to bless his wife’s life. The letters chart the evolution of the relationship between Emma Ray Riggs and David O. McKay. The devotion of these loyal companions is exemplified in the development of qualities and attitudes that made their marriage an ideal pattern for courtship and marriage. Moreover, the letters evoke President McKay’s voice, revealing a “great and greatly loving man.”

Carefully examining the inward sentiments of a future prophet during his courtship, through the lens of his own written words, can bring precious insights. In these early letters, most of them written as he served a mission in Great Britain, David emerges as an insecure young man enamored with a young woman back home. As he describes his endeavors, it is clear the letters are focused on seeking her approval. His correspondence includes the vivid memoirs of a young man at the brink of courtship, the central theme being the developing story of a relationship in the years before, during, and after falling in love.

The bond between the McKays was initiated, developed, and solidified to a large degree through the medium of pen and paper. David O. McKay did not keep Emma Ray’s letters written to him; fortunately, Emma Ray treasured the correspondence even from their earliest days. These letters, covering decades of correspondence, demonstrate the affection of a young man for his sweetheart and, later, the remarkable devotion of a husband for his wife. The McKays are revealed not only as partners in rearing a family, managing a household, and fulfilling church and civic responsibilities, but as romantic lovers as well.
Though many have previously called the McKays college sweethearts, the published collection, *Heart Petals*, begins with President McKay’s first invitation to Emma Ray Riggs on July 1, 1897—after his university graduation. The collection concludes with a letter he wrote in 1932 as an Apostle and father of seven. David and Emma Ray McKay were dedicated in their correspondence to each other, and readers will delight in David’s descriptions of personal experiences. The letters provide opportunities for historians, researchers, teachers, church leaders, Latter-day Saints, and others to better understand the personal nature of President McKay within the spiritual, cultural, and sociological framework of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In a time when postal services were used more extensively and overseas telephone usage was rare, McKay’s correspondence also represents a slice of American history and culture—letter writing as a crucial means of communication.

McKay’s innermost feelings, joys, heartaches, and determinations pervade the letters, imparting a wealth of insights into his personality and thought. One of the most significant contributions of the personal notes is the documentation of McKay’s growth from a young man into a mature husband and leader. Such growth through personal experience developed and matured immensely through the years as McKay was called to be a General Authority at the age of thirty-two. His visits to the far corners of the earth are recorded, reflecting his hesitancy to be away from his home and family, yet his quiet resolve to do the work he was called to do. Firsthand experiences written to Emma Ray, his confidante, show the character of a truly thoughtful, loving man and his dedication to church service.

The letters McKay wrote during 1921–22 are of particular interest. In 1919, McKay became the first LDS Church Commissioner of Education. Part of his responsibilities in this calling included a worldwide tour of all LDS Church missions and schools to “become personally acquainted with conditions in all parts of the world.” McKay
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copied some of his journal entries in his letters home to Emma Ray, which include information and impressions he received while traveling. These experiences became significant in McKay’s recommendations for LDS Church policy as an Apostle and in his administration as prophet, seer, and revelator. These letters trace McKay’s evolving attitudes that correspond largely with the development of the Church from a small regional entity into a global religion. For instance, in a letter to a friend, McKay disclosed that the more he traveled the more he became convinced that those of European descent had “no monopoly on the fundamental truths that contribute to real manhood and true womanhood.” Similar attitudes are found in his letters to Emma Ray. McKay’s travels were essential for the establishment and development of the LDS Church in foreign lands and in the lives of those with whom he personally interacted.

As a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, the insights David O. McKay shared with his wife are valuable both institutionally and biographically. Few such letters have ever been published, and, outside of Joseph Smith’s letters to Emma, no published collection like David O. McKay’s letters exists. The following letter, written by President McKay to Emma Ray on their twentieth wedding anniversary and, coincidentally, during his world tour, represents the richness of his correspondence. David O. McKay often underscored single letters, words, or segments of words for emphasis, and this has been maintained. However, at times he used a double or triple underline, and this has been standardized with a single underscore mark.

Tokyo, Japan

2 January 1921

My Sweetheart:

You were my sweetheart twenty years ago this day; you are twenty times twenty times my sweetheart now!
It doesn’t seem possible that a score of years have passed since you and I covenanted to walk side by side and heart in heart along the Pathway of life through Eternity; yet the reckoning of Old Father Time says such is the fact!

There are three great epochs in a man’s earthly life, upon which his happiness here and in eternity may depend, viz., his birth—his marriage, and his choice of vocation. With the first he has little to do, so far as we know; but he is fortunate indeed who can look back upon his birth as a truly regal one. Not in the sense of tinsel show, or the veneer of the false standard of so-called society; but the birth that inherits the true wealth of nature—pure, untainted blood, a strong body, and nobility of soul—a birth that furnishes the environment in which these gifts may grow in development. Such a birth was yours, Dear; and such was mine.

It is generally conceded that American men and women, unlike the Japanese, have the right to make their own marriages, the right or privilege of choosing a mate being almost inviolate. With this thought in mind, I pride myself in having manifested for once in my life perfect wisdom. But when I analyze the conditions I find that very little credit is due to me, for it required no superior or discriminating judgment on my part to choose any life’s partner when once I had met her. No other girl—and you know my girl acquaintances were not a few—possessed every virtue with which I thought a sweetheart and wife should be endowed. All these you seemed to have. I thought so, even when I met you for the first time, in the doorway of your old home, when a country lad, I paid you our first month’s rent, and half acknowledged as much when I returned to our rooms, but was told by Jeanette that “There was no chance.” Later, one afternoon, after Thomas E. and I had greeted you and Bill on the porch of one of the little cottages, I remarked to him as we drove away, that you were my ideal, possessing every grace and virtue. So, after all, it was not any judgment, but your superior endowment to which I am indebted for my first interest and choice.

But I give credit this Twentieth anniversary to even a higher source. When I think of the varied circumstances that brought us together; of the nearness with which we both came several times of making a mistake; of the hundred and one little experiences that combined to draw us together rather than to separate us, I am willing to acknowledge the guiding influence of a Divine Power.

As long as Memory and Feeling shall endure, I shall alway[s] hold in sacred remembrance the absolute Trust and Confidence that hallowed my
love for you—even before we were engaged to be married. It became in Courtship the foundation stone of our future happiness.

It gives me such joy even to recall those happy young days that I wish I could write all day; but it is nearing Priesthood meeting time.

Twenty years ago today! Never before have I placed such value upon my choice of a profession. Happy thought when I decided to become a teacher; for that decision was a factor in directing my footsteps to you. That third important epoch has been made fruitful and happy because of your inspiration, unselfish devotion, and love.

January Second Nineteen One marked the beginning of a new year, the beginning of a new century, the beginning of a new and happy life!

I loved you that morning with the love and fire of youth—It was pure and sincere. You were my heart’s treasure [indiscernible word] bride more sweet, and pure, and beautiful! But this morning, which I see you with these virtues and your many others crowned with the glory of perfect motherhood, when I see our seven precious boys and girls shining like heavenly jewels in the precious [indiscernible word] that crowns these twenty happy fruitful years of your life, I think I didn’t know what love was when I took you as my bride. It was but as the light of a star compared with glorious sunlight of Love that fills my soul to-day. The only cloud that occasionally dims it is the realization that I haven’t been able to give you the comforts you deserved for the untiring thoughtful devotion to your Loved Ones!

May twenty years hence find our love for each other and our children to-day twenty-times twenty-times sweeter and more precious!

Your Devoted Sweetheart,

David O.

Mary Jane Woodger (mjw5@byu.edu) is Associate Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University, and in 1998 she was honored by Kappa Omicron Nu for her dissertation research, entitled “The Educational Ideals of David O. McKay.” Dr. Woodger has authored and co-authored numerous articles that have appeared in various academic journals, as well as venues for the LDS audience including the Journal of Book of Mormon Studies, Deseret News Church News, and The Religious Educator. Her recent publications include David O. McKay: Beloved Prophet, The Teachings of David O. McKay, and Heart Petals: The Personal Correspondence of David Oman McKay to Emma Ray McKay.
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As Fire

When I live
let me live as fire
let my movement be heat
let burning fill my bones
live coals sear my words
tongues of flame halo my head

When I die
let not my body turn utterly cold
let ashes smolder
embers wait for stirring
let oil cover me as a blanket
and holy fire devour me

When the Lord God calls the four winds
let my dry bones rattle
let them shake bone into bone
let flesh clothe them
skin lay upon me fresh as newborn
and winds breathe fire into me

When I stand
let the cords of death melt as in a furnace
let even the earth beneath my feet
become glass let sun and moon
burn overhead let all people cry out
Holy holy holy Lord God Almighty
and let the whole earth
inhale light

—Richard Tice

This poem won first place in the BYU Studies 2004 poetry contest.
Behold I

Kent P. Jackson

On two occasions while he worked on his New Translation of Genesis in 1830, the Prophet Joseph Smith dictated to his scribe Oliver Cowdery a word combination that in English is awkward and ungrammatical, though in the Hebrew it is not: “Behold I.” The first occurrence reads, “Behold I I am the Lord God Almighty.”1 The second reads, “Behold I send me.”2 Both passages are in the Book of Moses in the Pearl of Great Price, but “Behold I” is not found in either of those passages today because, after the time of Joseph Smith, each was edited out of the text.3

“Behold, I am the Lord God Almighty” (Moses 1:3; from 1867 to present)
“Behold, here am I, send me” (Moses 4:1; from 1902 to present)

I propose that both occurrences of “Behold I” were once found in the Hebrew text of Genesis. I have argued elsewhere that we need not view all of the Joseph Smith Translation changes as restorations of original text, because many changes probably were made for other reasons.4 But in this case, I must conclude that the only reasonable explanation for the two occurrences of “Behold I” is that they were at one time part of a Hebrew narrative from which the early chapters of today’s text of Genesis derive, a narrative that was restored (at least in part) in 1830 by the Prophet Joseph Smith through divine revelation.

The first occurrence appears in Moses chapter 1, an extended passage that does not have a counterpart in the Bible. Ironically, that same chapter includes an important prophecy in which the Lord foretells a time when people would reject and remove some of Moses’ words, which would subsequently be restored by a later prophet (Moses 1:40–41). The second
“Behold I” is also found in a Joseph Smith Translation addition that has no biblical counterpart, Moses 4:1–4. Both Moses 1 and Moses 4:1–4 are critically important for understanding the biblical material that follows them, and thus both were probably among those parts of an original text that were taken from Moses’ record, as had been prophesied.

In my judgment, the best explanation for “Behold I” is found in the grammar of the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew construction hinēni is found in about 180 locations in the Old Testament. It means “Behold I.” The construction contains the word hinnēh, “behold,” to which is affixed the suffix –ni, which is a first-person-singular pronoun. The word hinnēh does not translate easily into today’s English. It is not a verb and thus does not mean

Many ancient poetic forms found in LDS scriptures support the belief that Joseph Smith received power from God to translate ancient texts. Notwithstanding this, some people propose explanations as to how he somehow knew about those forms and through extraordinary genius could mimic Hebraic literary stylistic elements. This short study by Kent P. Jackson demonstrates for the first time another type of Hebrew word combination, found in Moses (“Behold I”), that is so tiny and obscure in its detail that it becomes all the more compelling. One might argue that a genius imposter could invent sweeping poetic forms that, in a general way, mimic the great Israelite prophets of the past, but to include a Hebraism so unknown in the English translations confirms, in my mind at least, that Joseph was working in an inspired medium that brought to light the pure and original meaning and, in this case, the original wording of an ancient text.

—James T. Summerhays, BYU Studies
“behold” in the sense of “to look” or “to see.” It can be described best as an exclamatory particle that has the purpose of drawing the attention of the hearer to the speaker. In some places in the King James Version, it is translated with the English word *lo*, a nonverbal exclamatory that reproduces better the intent of the Hebrew, as in “Lo, I die” (Gen. 50:5).

In most instances in the Hebrew Bible, *hinēnî*, “Behold I,” is found preceding a participle. Whereas finite verbs in Hebrew identify the subject in the conjugation itself and do not need pronouns to be understood (for example ‘āmar = “he said”), participles need pronouns, nouns, or names to identify the subject of the sentence. Thus the pronoun suffix -nî is added to *hinnēh*, “behold,” to identify the first-person speaker, yielding *hinēnî*, “Behold I.” The following passages are my translations from the Hebrew:

*hinēnî* [Behold I] *mēbî’* [bringing] *rā’ā* [evil]
“Behold, I am bringing evil” (2 Kgs. 21:12)

*hinēnî* [Behold I] *bōrē’* [creating] *šāmayim* [heaven] *hādāšīm* [new]
“Behold, I am creating a new heaven” (Isa. 65:17)

Much less frequently, *hinēnî* is used with finite verbs:

*hinēnî* [Behold I] *āmūt* [I will die]
“Behold, I will die” (1 Sam. 14:43; KJV, “Lo”)

*hinēnî* [Behold I] *nišba’tî* [I have sworn]
“Behold, I have sworn” (Jer. 44:26)

In over twenty instances, *hinēnî* stands alone as a statement of response or identification. The King James translation renders it in the following ways, listed in order of frequency:

- “Here *am* I” (2 Sam. 1:7)
- “Behold, *here am* I” (Gen. 27:1)
- “Here I *am*” (1 Sam. 22:12)
- “Behold me” (Isa. 65:1)
- “Behold, *here I am*” (Gen. 22:1)
- “Behold, *it is* I” (Isa. 52:6)
- “Behold, *here I am*” (1 Sam. 12:3)

The only reasonable explanation I know of for the two occurrences of “Behold I” is that they were at one time part of a Hebrew narrative.
Sometimes hinēnî precedes a prepositional phrase:

 hinēnî [Behold I] ‘imkâ [with you]
 “Behold, I am with you” (1 Sam. 14:7)

 hinēnî [Behold I] ‘ālayik [against you]
 “Behold, I am against you” (Ezek. 26:3)

In fewer cases it is used in conjunction with the independent pronoun I, placing emphasis on the identity of the speaker:

 wa’ānî [And I] hinēnî [behold I] mēkîm [establishing]
 “And I, behold, I am establishing” (Gen. 9:9)

The first example of “Behold I” in the Joseph Smith Translation also emphasizes the identity of the speaker. It is at the very start of God’s words to Moses, in which God introduces himself to begin his discourse: “Behold I, I am the Lord God Almighty.” The repetition of the first-person pronoun serves to highlight the speaker and introduce him with clarity and force. In the Old Testament, there are numerous examples of God prefacing or finishing his words with a self-identification, as in these two examples from the King James translation: “I, even I, am the Lord” (Isa. 43:11), and “Behold, I am the Lord, the God of all flesh” (Jer. 32:27).

John Whitmer, one of the scribes for the Joseph Smith Translation, received an assignment to transcribe for the Prophet, that is, to make copies of manuscripts (see D&C 47:1). When he made a copy of the dictated Genesis manuscript in March 1831, he copied the passage in Moses 1:3 precisely as written: “Behold I I am the Lord God Almighty.” But some time later, a different hand lined out the first I with hatch marks in pencil. It is impossible to know when and by whom the text was changed. The same wording is found in the 1878 Pearl of Great Price, which took its Book of Moses text from the 1867 Inspired Version. All later editions of the Pearl of Great Price have had identical wording in this passage, and thus the I of “Behold I” is no longer in the Book of Moses.

In all of the occurrences of hinēnî cited above, and indeed in the vast majority of occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, the first-person pronoun
suffix anticipates the *subject* of the sentence. But in some instances, as in the following examples, it anticipates or reenforces the *object* of the sentence:

\[
\text{hinēnî [Behold I/Behold me] } \text{ya’āšeh [let him do] } \text{lī [to me]}
\]

“Behold, let him do to me” (2 Sam. 15:26)

\[
\text{hinēnî [Behold I/Behold me] } \text{šĕlāhēnî [send me]}
\]

“Behold, send me” (Isa. 6:8)

The second occurrence of “Behold I” in the Joseph Smith Translation is of this type: “Behold I send me” (Moses 4:1). It draws the listener’s attention to the speaker, yet at the same time it anticipates the speaker’s role as the direct object of the sentence that follows (“send me”). When John Whitmer copied the dictated manuscript, he preserved the words intact and added punctuation: “Behold I, send me.” It appeared as “behold me; send me” in Franklin D. Richards’s 1851 Liverpool *Pearl of Great Price*, printed from a manuscript copy derived from the dictated text, obviously edited. And it appeared as “Behold I, send me” in the 1878 Salt Lake City edition of the *Pearl of Great Price*, copied accurately from the RLDS *Inspired Version*. In his preparation of the 1902 edition, Professor James E. Talmage made the text more grammatically coherent in English by inserting the words “here am,” yielding, “Behold, here am I, send me.”

This wording was followed in the 1921 edition and in the current (1981) edition.

That the unexpected combination “Behold I” appears in two places in the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis suggests strongly that neither occurrence was a scribal error or an inadvertent misstatement by Joseph Smith. The Prophet is not recorded elsewhere as ever using “Behold I,” and thus it is unlikely that the Moses text represents his own speech pattern. Moreover, it is not a construction that is found in the Book of Mormon or in the King James Version of the Bible. Consistent with English usage, “Behold I” was translated out of the English Bible, just as it was edited out of the Book of Moses. Whereas the King James translation was a significant model for the language of the Prophet’s revelations and translations, it clearly was not the model for “Behold I.” I suggest that both occurrences of “Behold I” in the New Translation were once in the Hebrew text of Genesis—in passages that were lost since antiquity but were restored anew through the Prophet Joseph Smith.
Kent P. Jackson (kent_jackson@byu.edu) is Professor of Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University. He received his PhD in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Studies from the University of Michigan. He is the recent author of The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2005), and various articles in BYU Studies, including “The Process of Inspired Translation: Two Passages Translated Twice in the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible,” BYU Studies 42, no. 2 (2003): 35.


2. Old Testament Manuscript 1, page 6, line 23; Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews, Joseph Smith’s New Translation, 90.

3. The Book of Moses is Genesis 1:1–6:13 of the Joseph Smith Translation, including Moses’ introductory vision (Moses 1).

4. See Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews, Joseph Smith’s New Translation, 8–11.

5. The word hinnēh appears over one thousand times in the Hebrew Bible. In about 90 percent of the cases, the King James translators used behold, and in about 10 percent they used lo. Words like hey and yo, sometimes used in modern American street vernacular, have somewhat equivalent meanings. For the uses and translation of hinnēh, see Francis I. Andersen, “Lo and Behold! Taxonomy and Translation of Biblical Hebrew hinnēh,” in Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday, ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 25–56.

6. The italics shown are as in the current LDS edition of the King James translation. In the 1611 first edition, only the examples in 1 Samuel 12:3 and Isaiah are as shown; the other examples had no italics.


8. Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews, Joseph Smith’s New Translation, 83, punctuation added. See also Moses 1:3.

9. The original writing was apparently intact when the Prophet made additional corrections to the page with Sidney Rigdon as scribe. That work was done in ink. Verse numbers were added to the page, also in ink, probably by one of the Prophet’s Kirtland or Nauvoo clerks. Pencil was used on the page for the later insertion of some punctuation, as well as for some small line numbers written down the left margin. Perhaps someone, thinking that there was an error, lined out the I during one of those processes, or perhaps it was lined out for the same reason during the preparation of the 1867 Inspired Version. Moses 1 was first printed as “A Revelation to Joseph Smith, jun. given June, 1830” in “History of Joseph Smith,” Times and Seasons 4 (January 16, 1843): 71–73, which is the source for the text in the 1851 Liverpool Pearl of Great Price. The Times and Seasons text differs from the original manuscripts in several places, and thus it is impossible to tell from it how the text read at the time.


12. Because the original intent likely was to anticipate the object of the sentence, rather than the subject, “Behold, send me” would be both accurate and sufficient in this instance.

13. It is not found in the Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon, for which see Royal Skousen, ed., *The Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon: Typographical Facsimile of the Extant Text* (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2001). 2 Nephi 28:3 repeats the pronoun I in two consecutive sentences with the phrase “I, I am the Lord’s.” The first example follows the word *behold*, but its absence in the second suggests to me that the phrase simply repeats independent pronouns for emphasis.
Sheep

The night was not still;
even at dusk none of us
were easy; even in the moonlight
no one was calm. It was nearly
quiet. Instead, there was rustling.
The sound of crowded
air, of things just-above and just-
beneath. Of waiting. And then

we heard the daybreak,
noise like sunshine, gold
as meadow flowers.
We shifted closer, wondering,
and watched the dark sky light
with sound. *Birds,*
we whispered, but above us
the trees too were watching.
When the familiar night fell
we breathed again, bent
our heads to the grass,
gulped the comfortable air.
And yes, we are content

to graze, sleep, spend
our deliberate hours,
feel ourselves heavy with young.
Still, some nights we look up
without knowing why, hoping
for a signal none of us can quite
remember, a direction that has somehow
escaped us, although there was a moment
we understood it; a moment
that held more than trees, grass, sky.

—Marilyn Nielson

This poem won second place
in the 2004 BYU Studies poetry contest.
As a fifth-generation Latter-day Saint from the dusty lands southwest of Salt Lake City, anthropologist Janet Bennion, who has written extensively about women’s roles in contemporary polygynous societies, begins this study of the Chihuahua fundamentalist colonies by explaining that she, too, is “a desert rat.” As such, she relates to the subjects of her book *Desert Patriarchy* as both an insider and an outsider. Referencing Clifford Geertz’s Balinese cockfight, she explains that her methodology is to operate “as the interpreter of the culture” by “vividly representing the natives’ voices and the creative images and symbols of their lifestyle and perspectives” (xi-xiii). Her thesis contends that while a desert environment does not absolutely create patriarchal, fundamentalist, separatist cultures, its geographic realities do strongly support them. “The roots of this process lie in the teleological relationship of environment and culture: the desert facilitates religious patriarchy and female networking, which in turn create a social structure conducive to isolation and separateness” (3). She says “the desert has always drawn religious fanatics” who set up societies that are “dominated by patriarchy and informal female support networks,” and that this system of “desert patriarchy is obviously the driving force behind the adaptive longevity of the white colonists in Chihuahua, northern Mexico” (4).

The study begins with a historical overview of the colonies. Bennion’s descriptions of the Colonia Juárez and Colonia LeBaron are vivid and astute, deftly placing the movements into the historical context of the Mormon experience in America and tracing its roots back to Loren C. Woolley’s split from the mainstream church and establishment of the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Drawing

---


Reviewed by Mark Metzler Sawin
from extensive interviews with family members from different factions of the LeBaron family, Bennion constructs a thorough and sympathetic history of the volatile and at times violent LeBaron colony. This unapologetic, first-hand history may prove irksome to some as Bennion’s concern is to describe the group through its own eyes and thus does little to show its alienation from the mainstream church. She uses this same descriptive technique with the Mennonite colony, but with even less historical rooting. Bennion is primarily a scholar in Mormon studies, and her contextualization of the Chihuahua Mennonites is painted in broad strokes, relying heavily on outdated sources instead of the many recent and thorough studies available—the four-part *Mennonite Experience in America* series and Kimberly D. Schmidt’s scholarship on the lives and work of conservative Mennonite women are obvious omissions.¹

Bennion explains “desert patriarchy” by dividing it into six components that are present in the Chihuahua groups.

**Male supremacy.** This is a “unique form of Anglo *machismo*” where men control production, reproduction, financial resources, and the group’s spiritual salvation. This salvation is built on a “patrilineal pathway to heaven that runs through him, his father, his grandfathers, and so on, to God.” This results in communities that have “a large pool of female mates/laborers, and strict male-male competition for women, resources, and priestly authority” (5).

**Female networking.** This system formally “sustains male privilege” but informally, and more importantly, “is the socioeconomic foundation of society that maintains social life on a daily basis.” Women form networks of “emotional, economic, and spiritual ties among co-wives, female friends, and relatives” which supplement, and at times oppose, patriarchal power. Formed in the context of strict male authority, these networks promote a form of women’s solidarity that is stronger than that which exists in “a more liberated female-dominated social setting where women bicker with each other rather than unite against male authority” (6–7).

**Nonsecular education.** Each group runs its own schools that stress practical skills and forbid or largely ignore anything that does not pertain to their daily lives or theological understandings. Education is highly gendered and usually stops before or during high school, especially for women.

**Imbalanced sex ratios.** There are far more women than men of reproductive age due to men’s dangerous work conditions and greater exposure to the outside world (8–9).

**Alternative sex and marriage forms.** In the break-away communities with Mormon roots, the “prestigious males” (those with land and
authority) marry the majority of the young women, forcing all other men to “either leave the colony or look elsewhere for mates” (9). In the Mennonite colony, endogamy (marrying within the group) is the norm. In both groups, men are usually 5 to 10 years older at marriage and women have their first child while still in their teens.

**Circumscription.** This “occurs when the emigration of dissatisfied factions is blocked by features of the physical or social environment.” The tight-knit social structures of these communities, combined with the “heat, drought, predators, poor soil, and imposing sierras” of the desert make it very difficult for members (especially women) to leave. Most “prefer to stay in Chihuahua, in spite of its difficulties, rather than face ostracism and rejection in the larger society” (10–11).

The driving point of *Desert Patriarchy* is the importance of geographical circumscription. Bennion argues that patriarchal societies in metropolitan, tropical, or fertile farming environments are unable “to achieve the same longevity and maintenance of cultural traditions” as those located in deserts. The desert’s harsh physical realities reinforce the other characteristics of patriarchal societies and thus, she contends, “the desert . . . is the mechanism by which patriarchal fundamentalism best flourishes” (11–12).

The bulk of this work consists of first-person narratives describing the experiences of Bennion and her three student assistants in the colonies. These are well-written, hands-on descriptions that follow the new ethnographic models that use “more literary, first-person forms to ‘show’ rather than ‘tell’ the reader about the culture—making the reader a participant in the unfolding of the process” (xiii). Bennion succeeds in this format, providing sharp descriptions that allow the reader to feel the heat, dust, and rhythm of the communities, but at times the story comes without enough analysis to explain why these things are significant and not merely interesting.

The narrative drive and provocative descriptions of these unique communities make this work both important and enjoyable. The descriptions of the polygamous colonies, especially the LeBaron group, are strong and will surely promote further study. The descriptions of the Mennonite colony are also solid, but do not always fit well with Bennion’s central arguments. The primary contribution of this book is its further explication of Bennion’s work on women’s roles in fundamentalist, polygynous societies. It convincingly demonstrates that the polygynous colonies’ patriarchal structures promote a female network that allows for surprising amounts of female autonomy and power. This is a significant contribution to gender and religious studies and will surely spark further scholarship. Less successful is Bennion’s argument for the importance of geographic circum-
scription. The desert does provide an environment that pulls communities together in an effort to survive, but the ethnographies of the colonies often belie her argument for geographical circumscription, suggesting instead that communal pressure, fear of the outside world, and familial ties provide far more convincing explanations of how and why these communities remain cohesive. In the end, Bennion’s geographical circumscription argument seems stretched and overstated. Hutterites in the fertile farm-lands of Canada and Orthodox Jews in the heart of New York City maintain strong, patriarchal communities without the benefit of a desert. Many desert-dwelling communities (such as the Hopi and Zuni) do not. The significance of the desert to the maintenance of patriarchal societies is provocative but not well proved in this otherwise valuable work.

Mark Metzler Sawin (mark.sawin@emu.edu) is Associate Professor of American History at Eastern Mennonite University in Harrisonburg, Virginia, and has authored articles on both Mormon and Mennonite history, including “Moving Stubbornly Toward the Kingdom of God: Mennonite Identity in the Twenty-First Century,” Mennonite Quarterly Review 75, no. 1 (January 2001): 89–98; and “A Sentinel for the Saints: Thomas Leiper Kane and the Mormon Migration,” Nauvoo Journal 10, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 17–27.

Reverence: Renewing a Forgotten Virtue—the title is straightforward, the subtitle a lament easily understood and therefore not much elaborated. This book by Paul Woodruff (Professor of Humanities at the University of Texas in Austin) is a delight, in part from the beauty and pertinence of the poetry that Woodruff brings in to illuminate his discussion, and from the charm added by his explications. Woodruff is an experienced and widely published translator of Plato, Thucydides, and other classic works, and his prose is a joy as he illustrates the various facets of reverence with brief scenarios and as well as longer stories.

Woodruff begins with a definition of reverence and continues to refine it until the book ends:

Reverence begins in a deep understanding of human limitations; from this grows the capacity to be in awe of whatever we believe lies outside our control—God, truth, justice, nature, even death. The capacity for awe, as it grows, brings with it the capacity for respecting fellow human beings, flaws and all. This in turn fosters the ability to be ashamed when we show moral flaws exceeding the normal human allotment. (3)

This notion of understanding our own human limitations is emphasized throughout the book in many contexts, and is not to be confused with an unwillingness to strive with might and mien nor as a denial that proper motivation can result in amazing accomplishments.

Woodruff presents reverence mainly in social and political settings. In fact, he is at some pains to demonstrate that it is a virtue not necessarily connected to religion. “Reverence has more to do with politics than with religion” (4). “It is a natural mistake to think that reverence belongs to religion. It belongs, rather, to community . . . [and] lies behind civility
and all of the graces that make life in society bearable and pleasant” (5). But it stands to reason that religion often promotes reverence. After all, isn’t the function of organized religion to guide us in our daily lives?

Two friends of mine commented separately upon this book, the first saying that he did not think Woodruff religious; the second saying that not many books change many people. As to the second, that sounds more like an indictment of “many readers” than of “many books.” As to the first, if we recall the New Testament definition: “Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction” (James 1:27), we are pretty well obliged to see Woodruff as genuinely religious. We may just as easily ask in what way is God religious? Well, in nothing more than in his concern for the helpless and the poor, and in his requirement that we make that our business also.

Though Woodruff’s concern with reverence is pointed at humanity in general, not just the helpless and the poor, it necessarily includes them. In chapter six, “Ancient China: The Way of Power,” we are told that Confucian Li, respect and reverence of every day life, helps keep people from descending into animal behavior on the one hand and on the other from assuming to themselves the prerogatives of heaven. “The ethical consequences are similar; both virtues [dignity and humility] act as restraints on human power, and both work indirectly to protect the weak” (104). “When Zi-you asked about filial piety, the Master said: ‘Nowadays filial piety merely means being able to feed one’s parents. Even dogs and horses are being fed. Without deference, how can you tell the difference?’” (104, quoting Analects 2.7).

Ancient China’s example is very important to Woodruff. He asserts that reverential behavior moves down as well as up social hierarchies and that it is fostered by ritual or ceremony. He notes that filial piety provides a structure for the natural affection of the child for his parents and at the same time gives him practice in behavior beyond the family he will use as an adult. The emperor also, through observance of the ceremonies of courtesy, develops moral sensitivities that enable him to be reverent of his ministers and also of ordinary citizens, in much the same way a father develops respect for his son.

Touching these points, chapter two, “Without Reverence,” contains a vignette titled “Feeding Time.” Family members are scattered to various activities—Dad is with pals, David is at a friend’s house, Mom has brought Sarah home from soccer but has gone to a meeting. Sarah has her algebra on her bed, a bag of chips in easy reach. She has dutifully put food out for the dog, a pet not hungry right now. There will be human food on the table later which may not be eaten by more than one or two people at a time,
just when they are hungry. Remind you of Analects 2.7 above? Ceremonies attendant on a family eating together can generate reverence.

Present societal understanding of irreverence is not exactly within the scope of Woodruff’s present concern, but early on he gives it a half-page nod. Americans, and probably everyone else with the latitude to do so, carry on a love affair with some form of irreverence. Referring to the media, Woodruff says,

> We hear more praise of irreverence than we do of reverence. . . . That is because we naturally delight in mockery and we love making fun of solemn things. . . . In my view the media are using the word “irreverent” for qualities that are not irreverent at all. A better way to say what they have in mind would be “bold, boisterous, unrefined, unimpressed by pretension”—all good things. (5)

He adds that Nietzsche is the “one great western philosopher who praises reverence” and he “is also the most given to mockery” (5). Semantics may get in our way here. I don’t like ‘mockery’ (to me ugly and destructive) subsumed under ‘reverence,’ but I am fine with ‘unimpressed by pretension.’ The case for irreverence probably should go something like this: Alert, self-respecting people have always been quick to treat people, ideas, and institutions irreverently that to them appear foolish. This irreverence is especially so in people whose lives confront them with hard realities of some sort, and who therefore develop a realism that is impatient, if not disgusted, with triviality, falseness, or smokescreens of whatever variety. Maurice Hilleman, the microbiologist who defeated mumps, measles, and many other diseases, was such a man. It was said of him that he was helpful and pleasant with his students and co-workers, but that “he had zero tolerance for fools.” Most of us love that kind of attitude. If it strikes you that disallowing fools their sway is too much like rudeness, Woodruff would likely say reverence is the capacity to approve or disapprove appropriately. It does not require one to praise or even allow foolishness. Many teachers have delighted in the occasional student whose honesty and whose confidence in his own perceptions have equipped him to detect sham in any of its guises. Such a student acknowledges authority and tradition only when they prove out. This kind of irreverence is often associated with inventiveness, creativity, and exploration. It tends to make society better. Woodruff calls this a part of reverence on the basis that reverence is a virtue that enables people to respond sensitively to bad as well as good situations. The student revolt of the 1960s may have started with something like that—objection to what those students saw as false values in their parents’ generation. But as Woodruff points out, irreverence is seductive. The delight
it gives us should be a red flag. Its too easy and too frequent use can be the start of arrogance and hubris (4, 91).

Other plausible scenes presented in chapter two help show the chaos that can flow from groups operating without reverence. The point of one example, titled “God Votes in a City Election,” is clearer when we learn that one party has posted signs all over town, “God voted against Proposition Two.” Woodruff is showing the chasm between misdirected faith and reverence. Another, “Dad Slugs the Umpire,” is also parlayed into the continuing refinement of Woodruff’s definition. A girl in a children’s league is called out on strikes. She is devastated, her furious father commits the crime, and the newscasters with a good story are the big winners. “Learn to control your emotions,” counsels a psychologist (29). But Woodruff uses this story to hone a point: “Virtue, after all, is supposed to be the capacity to have the right emotions from the start. If you have emotions that need to be controlled, you are already in trouble. . . . Even when self-control is called for, it is painful and prone to failure because it runs against our grain. But reverence runs with the grain—or, rather, as you cultivate reverence, you are changing the way your grain runs” (29–30).

One of the longer illustrations occurs in chapter five, “Ancient Greece: The Way of Being Human.” Woodruff mentions two particular concerns of the ancient Greeks that are, naturally, like those of the ancient Chinese: one, the danger of descending into animal behavior, and two, the danger of losing sight of their human limitations. Woodruff reminds us that, in the Iliad, Hector thinks that because he has driven the Greeks back against their ships, he is a greater general than he really is, ignoring the fact that his success is partly due to Achilles’ having withdrawn from the fighting. Blinded thus by false self-esteem, he launches an all-out thrust, strips Achilles’ armor from the careless Patroclus, and vaunts over him as though he had killed Achilles himself. It costs him everything.

Achilles also loses perspective. Grief and anger at the death of Patroclus take his wits away, turn him animal, cause him to refuse suppliants, and stir him to indecent speech. As his death approaches, Hector wants agreement that whoever wins will allow the body of the fallen to be buried. Achilles snarls, “‘Don’t try to cut any deals with me, Hector. / Do lions make peace treaties with men? / Do wolves and lambs agree to get along?’” (87, quoting Iliad 22.261–63). Later, Hector makes a dying request:

“I beg you, Achilles, by your own soul
And by your parents, do not
Allow the dogs to mutilate my body.”
And Achilles, fixing him with a stare,
“Don’t whine to me about my parents,
You dog! I wish my stomach would let me
Cut off your flesh in strips and eat it raw
For what you’ve done to me. There is no one
And no way to keep the dogs off your head.”

In Woodruff’s view, Achilles has utterly failed himself. He argues that even in war we can be reverent, that we are in danger of brutalizing ourselves if we lose sight of our basic humanity, the humanity, in fact, that we share with our enemies and prisoners.

Odysseus seems to have had similar perceptions. After his violent overthrow of the Suitors, he summons his old nurse Euryclea, who has, for the past ten years, endured the violence and threats of the Suitors; she stood as a buffer between them and her mistress, Penelope. When she arrives and surveys the carnage, which until that day had been caused by the Suitors, she sinks to her knees in profound relief and commences an eerie, minor-key cry of triumph, exulting over the vanquished like the tailor-bird Darzee in Kipling’s “Rikki Tikki Tavi.” Odysseus stops her, saying, “Old Woman, it is not meet to exult over the dead” (*Odyssey* 22.407–16). He sees that, not only in their death but also in their having disgraced their parents, shamed their places of origin, and offended the gods, they have lost enough, and that gloating now would serve no purpose but to debase her and him.

Woodruff’s point brought harshly to mind something I witnessed toward the end of WWII. In northern Luzon, I had walked a few miles up a mountain road to visit a buddy at Division Artillery Headquarters. It happened that while my friend and I were “cooling it” in the shade of some shrubbery, a great cry went up. A starving and unarmed Japanese straggler, cut off from his unit, had risked sneaking into the camp. He was spotted searching the garbage cans for anything he could eat. Many GIs ran howling for their weapons, carbines in that instance, and the pathetic enemy scurried up one of the tall trees nearby. Those trees had no branches for a hundred or hundred fifty feet and then a lot of foliage at the top. In no time, the GI’s were firing at him or at least at the top of the tree. His fall was greeted with gleeful shouts, but when the game ended, something sobered them.

In chapters ten and eleven, “The Reverent Leader” and “The Silent Teacher,” Woodruff endeavors to show how reverence can produce societies large and small that operate under mutual respect, without force or violence. However, he notes that we may never see a purely reverent
leader—“one man’s leader is another man’s tyrant” (163)—and warns that it is difficult to practice reverence in an irreverent group. He uses the disastrous affair between Athens and Melos for illustration. Athens was leader of a league of city-states formed to repulse Persia, but over decades had become tyrannical in that role. She sent a force to Melos demanding submission, but the Melians, wanting autonomy, demanded justice. The Athenians put it brutally: Justice can be discussed when both parties are strong, but when only one is strong, it will take all it can and the weak have to accept that. The Melians thought submission would be outright slavery, and resisted. All the Melian men were killed, the women and children enslaved. So we easily see Athens as tyrant, but Woodruff observes that both parties were tyrannical—the Athenians obviously, but the Melian leaders as well because they did not allow their citizens to take part in their deliberations for fear the citizens would accept slavery rather than fight. Leaders, he tells us, must start respect by showing it first, honestly, to their followers—in classrooms or in larger societies. He warns against teachers or leaders acting as though they were infallible (assuming divine attributes), and against anything that would isolate them from their followers. Good leaders listen to their followers, a defense against bad judgment, and they are not offended if followers see flaws in their orders and, on that basis, even disobey.

On the notion that ceremony can support the development of reverence, Woodruff reports that when Oliver North joined a combat unit in Vietnam, his company commander wore a red bandana and allowed his men to call him Organ Grinder. Woodruff’s comment on that: “If you carry guns and dress the part of a bandit, you may find it easier to play the part of a bandit as well” (179). The next commander would not let his lieutenants speak to him until they cut their long hair and otherwise resumed standard appearance. Woodruff ends this section by noting that those who are given weapons for our defense do not hold them in their own service, but in the service of the whole society, thus the greater emphasis on the ceremonies that attempt to guarantee disciplined behavior in those who hold weapons. This principle, he assures us, applies to nonmilitary societies also.

This book is readable—its language plain, its content home fare, its illustrative material charming. But for me the primary values are (1) I was unobtrusively challenged for having forgotten reverence; (2) I was provoked—especially by the ideal of a Chinese emperor learning, through ceremonial behavior, to revere his subjects, like his European counterpart with the ideal of noblesse oblige. Such an ideal does not always take, of course, but what is the alternative? The provocation was this: Is God
reverent? Of what could the Great Creator stand in awe? After showing Moses something of his creations, he said, “This is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man” (Moses 1:39). The size and scope of that divine undertaking argues more than a passing interest. He must see something in us to have made such a huge investment. That something must have to do with our intellect, its potential at least, for he seems willing, against profound regret, to let us slip slowly or plunge precipitately down to hell, but only because he holds that something he sees in us inviolate. Considering the costs to him in labor, compassion, and all the rest, that is an awe-inspiring instance of reverence.

This book is capable of changing some people.

George Bennion (benniong@juno.com) is Professor Emeritus of English, Brigham Young University. He studied Greek literature at Arizona State University in the mid-seventies.
Historia de los Mormones en Argentina: Relatos de Pioneros, by Néstor Curbelo (Munro, Buenos Aires: Gráfica Integral S.A., 2000)

Historia de los Santos de los Últimos Días en Uruguay: Relatos de Pioneros, by Néstor Curbelo (Montevideo: Imprimimex S.A., 2002)

Compared to virtually any other region in the world, Latin America has witnessed exponential LDS growth in the last three decades. And yet, scholarship for this area has lagged behind. Within the general sphere of Latin American studies, there has been much work done on religious movements beginning in the early sixties with liberation theology and continuing through the eighties and nineties with the growth of Protestantism and evangelicalism. To a small degree, the Latter-day Saints have received some attention in the latter works. However, more often than not these have tended towards oversimplifications or incorrect assessments of how Church members see themselves. For example, see David Stoll’s Is Latin America Turning Protestant? The Politics of Evangelical Growth (University of California Press, 1990), 103–106. Dr. Mark Grover of Brigham Young University has pointed out that Mormon scholars have not done much to clarify these misnomers. In fact, there is a paucity of literature on the subject.

Most recently, Néstor Curbelo has published two books in Spanish that deal with the Church in the Southern Cone: Historia de los Mormones en Argentina and Historia de los Santos de los Últimos Días en Uruguay. These two short histories provide a quick glimpse into the Church’s beginnings and growth in Argentina and Uruguay.

Curbelo, a Church member from Buenos Aires, has worked for the Church’s magazine division, and this has availed him the opportunity to meet the veritable who’s who of Argentine and Uruguayan LDS Church membership. His research for these two works was compiled by videotaping oral history interviews of Church members whenever he had the opportunity. The interviews should prove an important resource to future researchers. These works fall into what Leonard Arrington and James Allen have called the “polemical” approach to Church history. These narratives are apologetic in its purest form.

In Historia de los Mormones en Argentina, Curbelo begins by recounting Parley P. Pratt’s celebrated arrival in Chile late in 1851 (1–11). He then moves chronologically and relates other important events such as establishing the Mexican colonies, the 1876 Book of Mormon translation by Melitón González Trejo and James Z. Stewart, and the 1948 translation of the Doctrine and Covenants (17, 22–25).

Curbelo then discusses the role of the Church in the modern era with the opening of missionary work following the arrival of Elder Melvin J. Ballard, Rey L. Pratt, and Rulon S. Wells in Buenos Aires in December of 1925 after a boat voyage of seven thousand miles. These men then dedicated the land for the preaching of the gospel on Christmas Day of 1925 (32–37).

For the most part, the book is a chronological narrative and does not provide much in the form of analysis. Curbelo provides excerpts from the many oral history interviews that he has conducted to carry the reader along. One interesting point that he fleshes out is the early missionaries’ proselytizing failures to the Lamanites in the Argentine interior. Curbelo clearly explains that the early Church
in Argentina and Uruguay was in fact a Church of immigrants, most notably German members.

Noticeably lacking is any real linkage to life outside the Church. How did young LDS university students juggle their beliefs with the anti-government rhetoric of the 1970–1980s? How do Latter-day Saints today deal with the mounting economic problems facing these countries? How does their faith carry them through the lean times? Perhaps a better-trained historian might have ferreted more information from the subjects who were interviewed. Argentina’s flamboyant and controversial leader Juan Perón is mentioned only in reference to an interview he had with President David O. McKay. In fact, while Argentina was embroiled in a bitter guerrilla war (“The Dirty War”) during the 1970s, Curbelo ignores the political turmoil and loss of life and calls this period a wonderful time for the “great missions in South America.” Certainly, more research is needed in this area. Still, this work makes an important contribution, and his second work *Historia de los Santos de los Últimos Días en Uruguay* shows an improvement in writing over his first.

In all, Curbelo has provided us with more than one hundred oral history interviews. Undoubtedly, many of these members kept journals that would probably fill in any gaps in the oral histories. One aspect of the oral histories that deserves special note is Curbelo’s attention to the role of sister missionaries. It is sometimes too easy to lose sight of the role of women in the Church when writing history, and Curbelo does an admirable job of at least mentioning those early stalwart sisters even if he underestimates the roles they played as missionaries. Curbelo is also thorough in his narrative of places, including when and where branches were created, thus providing resources for future research.

So where do these works leave future researchers? In this author’s opinion, there is sense of urgency. We cannot be satisfied with only oral history. Mr. Curbelo has performed a great service and should be congratulated for his work, but there is always more that can be done. Those initial pioneers are in their waning years. It is important to maintain ties with them and verify what other resources they might be able to share with us such as journals or further interviews.

Then the researcher needs to delve deeper into the lives of those Saints in Argentina and Uruguay to find how they participate as members of the Church in countries that are often in political turmoil and a state of flux. The Saints in Latin America do not live in a spiritual vacuum, and it is time for researchers to tell their story using Arrington and Allen’s pluralistic approach. It is time to bring their history in from the edges.

—Allan S. R. Sumnall

*Historia de los Santos de los Últimos Días en Paraguay: Relatos de Pioneros*, by Néstor Curbelo (published by the author, 2003)

This is the third volume tracing the history of the LDS Church in southern South America by Néstor Curbelo, Institute Director in the city of Buenos Aires, Argentina. The volume briefly outlines the history of the Church in Paraguay beginning with the introduction of missionaries in 1949 when it became part of the Uruguay Mission, through the organization of the Paraguay Asunción Mission in 1977, and ending with the
dedication of the Asunción, Paraguay Temple in 2002. It has an informative examination of missionary work among the indigenous population including the intriguing story of the village of Mistolar, where most of the inhabitants joined the Church.

As in Curbelo’s previous volumes on Argentina and Uruguay, the book is not a strictly chronological history but a construction of the story of the Church using primarily quotes from oral interviews of missionaries and members conducted by the author. Copies of the oral interviews have been deposited in the BYU Library and the LDS Church Archives. There is limited commentary or analysis and the focus of the book is on people not events. There is a valuable chronology of the history of the Church in Paraguay and good charts and maps. Of significant interest is the large number of photographs (160 of them) that provide a delightful visual history of the Church.

This is a volume for the member and missionary that may be weak on analysis but strong on spirit and faith. The Church and scholarly community is indebted to the sacrificing work of Néstor as he strives to preserve in these volumes the history of the LDS Church in South America.

—Mark L. Grover

THE KEY AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF BYU STUDIES

The mission of this publication is to be faithful and scholarly throughout, harmonizing wherever possible the intellectual and the spiritual on subjects of interest to Latter-day Saints and to scholars studying the Latter-day Saint experience. To achieve this goal, BYU Studies strives to be

**Accurate**  
To ensure that information is well grounded

**Selective**  
To choose articles of lasting value

**Interesting**  
To present new discoveries and insights

**Respectful**  
To respect reasonable points of view

**Expansive**  
To pursue a wide range of academic inquiries

**Clear**  
To make ideas readily understandable
Celebrate the bicentennial of Joseph Smith’s birth with *Opening the Heavens*, one of the most persuasive books on Joseph’s prophetic calling ever compiled. It is a perfect gift to give to family or friends on the eve of Christmas Eve—Joseph’s birthday 200 years ago. Read accounts of those who were there and witnessed the outpouring of divine manifestations, from Joseph’s many accounts of the First Vision to the hundreds of recorded accounts of the time the mantle of Joseph fell on Brigham.

“*Opening the Heavens* allows readers to decide for themselves about certain key events of the Restoration, such as the First Vision and the translation of the Book of Mormon. All the crucial documents are laid open for inspection with enough commentary to put them in context. For serious students of Latter-day Saint history, nothing could be more helpful—and inspiring.”

—Richard Lyman Bushman

Gouverneur Morris Professor of History Emeritus,
Columbia University
Latter-day Saints often worry about psychotherapy negatively affecting their souls—for good reason. Even religious therapists may promote anti-gospel principles. This hazard is particularly extreme when therapists are unaware of their practicing assumptions. Now counselors—and their clients—can go to *Turning Freud Upside Down* for a gospel corrective to that problem.

No mere Freud basher, this book indicts basic concepts riddling much of traditional psychotherapy.

“If you want to think about psychotherapy in dramatically new ways, read *Turning Freud Upside Down*. As its title suggests, this book upends traditional psychological dogma. Far more important, it also advances alternative, gospel-based views of human behavior and personality. LDS and other Christian clinicians who feel lost in the trenches will find this book an indispensable map for moving further away from secular assumptions and techniques to a more spiritual base. I eagerly await the forthcoming volumes in this series.”

Godfrey J. Ellis, Ph.D.
Director of the Master’s Program in Counseling Psychology
St. Martin’s University