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The Boggs Shooting and Attempted Extradition
Joseph Smith’s Most Famous Case

Morris A. Thurston

When the Mormons were driven out of Missouri during the winter of 1838–39, they found the people of Illinois to have sympathetic hearts and welcoming arms. The Quincy Whig noted that the Mormons “appear, so far as we have seen, to be a mild, inoffensive people, who could not have given a cause for the persecution they have met with.” The Alton Telegraph declared that in Missouri’s treatment of the Mormons “every principle of law, justice, and humanity, [had] been grossly outraged.” Over the next six years, however, feelings toward the Mormons gradually deteriorated, newspaper sentiment outside Nauvoo turned stridently negative, and in June 1844 their prophet was murdered by an enraged mob.

What propelled this downward spiral of public opinion? The exploitation of political and economic power by the Mormons, the private practice (but public disavowal) of polygamy, the outspokenness of apostates like John C. Bennett, and religious bigotry all played roles, to be sure. A sometimes overlooked factor, however, was the widespread view that Joseph Smith took advantage of legal technicalities to avoid punishment for crimes he had allegedly committed. A heretofore understudied, but critical, element in turning public opinion against Smith and the Mormons was the successful repulsion of three well-publicized bids by Missouri to extradite the Mormon prophet. This is the story of the second of these three legal proceedings, the attempt to forcibly return Joseph to Jackson

1. Quincy (Ill.) Whig, February 23, 1839, 1; “The Mormon War,” Alton (Ill.) Telegraph, November 17, 1838, 2.
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After graduating from law school, I began what became a thirty-five-year career as a litigation partner in a global law firm. Even while practicing law, however, my passion was LDS history. Following my retirement as an active lawyer, I began serving with the Joseph Smith Papers Project (Legal Series), which enabled me to combine my legal expertise with my love of Church history. I have also enjoyed team teaching a course on Joseph Smith and the law at BYU’s J. Reuben Clark Law School.

I find the attempts of the state of Missouri to extradite Joseph Smith to be particularly fascinating; this article focuses on the second of the three extradition attempts. Here we read about Joseph’s trip to Springfield and his hearing before federal district judge Nathaniel Pope, where he was prosecuted by the Illinois attorney general and defended by the United States attorney for Illinois. It was a proceeding of enormous interest throughout the land; the courtroom was packed, ladies of society flanked the judge (including the recently married Mary Todd Lincoln), and newspapers in Illinois and beyond gave the case headline status. Judge Pope’s decision was formally published and became one of the leading American authorities on habeas corpus and extradition for decades to come.

I am currently working on articles that will tell the stories of the equally gripping first and third attempts by Missouri to extradite Joseph. Among my other interests is the trial of the accused murderers of Joseph Smith. I have reviewed the notes of the trial taken by various recorders and, using recreated condensed versions of the testimony of the key witnesses in that case, have structured a mock trial that I have presented at a variety of venues.

I am also interested in the art of life story writing; my wife, Dawn, and I lecture (and have coauthored a book) on the subject. I enjoy researching the lives of historical figures such as Joseph Smith and trying to make their experiences accessible as stories. This article covers only eight months of the Prophet’s life and focuses on just one of his many legal battles, but the events make an engrossing story as well as a revealing legal study.
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County, Missouri, to stand trial for his alleged participation in a plot to murder Lilburn W. Boggs, the former governor.2

A Shot from the Dark

On the evening of May 6, 1842, Lilburn Boggs was relaxing in the private family room of his Independence home, reading a newspaper. His six-year-old daughter rocked her infant sister in a cradle nearby. His wife and other members of his large family were in the dining room finishing their evening meal. Without warning, the tranquility of this domestic scene was broken by the crash of a pistol shot fired through a window. Boggs slumped back, blood gushing from wounds in his neck and head. The screams of his wife brought neighbors and then doctors, who found that two balls had penetrated Boggs’s skull and one or two others his neck, causing profuse bleeding. He was not expected to survive.3

2. To my knowledge, this is the first scholarly article to focus on the second extradition attempt from a legal perspective, although most general histories of the Mormon experience in Nauvoo give it passing mention. Many of the facts surrounding the extradition attempts are noted in the History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, compiled by various LDS scribes and historians, published in serial form in several newspapers, finally edited by Brigham H. Roberts, and published by the Church as a six-volume work in 1902 (hereafter referred to as History of the Church). A concise legal discussion of the extradition attempts can be found in Edwin Brown Firmage and Richard Collin Mangrum, Zion in the Courts: A Legal History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1900 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 95–101. Monte B. McLaws, in “The Attempted Assassination of Missouri’s Ex-Governor, Lilburn W. Boggs,” Missouri Historical Review 60 (October 1965): 50–62, provides detail on the Boggs shooting and its aftermath, focusing on allegations that O. Porter Rockwell was the assailant. I am currently working on articles dealing with the first and third extradition attempts, which relate to treason charges brought by Missouri against Joseph Smith and others in connection with the 1838 Mormon War in Missouri.

3. Contemporaneous newspaper accounts disagree on whether Boggs was hit by three or four balls. “A Foul Deed,” St. Louis Daily Missouri Republican, May 12, 1842; “Governor Boggs,” Jefferson City (Mo.) Jeffersonian Republican, May 14, 1842. Further details concerning the shooting can be found in two pieces written decades later, both apparently based on the recollections of Boggs’s son. See F. A. Sampson, ed., “A Short Biographical Sketch of Lilburn W. Boggs by His Son,”
On the night Boggs was shot, twenty-eight-year-old Orrin Porter Rockwell was also in Independence. He had brought his wife, Luana, there in February so she could be with her parents when she gave birth to their fourth child. Rockwell left for Illinois shortly after the Boggs assault, arriving back in Nauvoo in due course. Nine days later, on May 15, 1842, the Boggs shooting was mentioned from the stand in Nauvoo at a general meeting. Apostle Wilford Woodruff recorded in his diary that Boggs had “just Been assassinated in his own house & fallen in his own Blood. . . . Thus this ungodly wretch has fallen in the midst of his iniquity & the vengeance of God has overtaken [Boggs] at last & he has met his Just deserts though by an unknown hand.” A letter to the Nauvoo Wasp, a Mormon newspaper edited by the prophet’s brother William, exulted, “Boggs is undoubtedly killed, according to report; but Who did the Noble Deed remains to be found out.”

---


4. During his stay in Missouri, Rockwell reportedly had been using the alias name of “Brown.” William F. Switzler, Illustrated History of Missouri, from 1541 to 1877 (St. Louis: C. R. Barns, 1879), 251. This was perhaps an understandable precaution in a state from which the Mormons had been expelled a few years earlier by executive order.

5. John C. Bennett claimed that Rockwell arrived the day before the report of the Boggs assault. John C. Bennett, The History of the Saints; or, an Exposé of Joe Smith and Mormonism (Boston: Leland and Whiting, 1842), 282.


8. Nauvoo (Ill.) Wasp, May 28, 1842, 2. This letter was written anonymously by an individual who used the pseudonym “Vortex” and was in response to a Burlington Hawkeye article, reprinted in the Wasp, reporting that a Mormon was suspected in the shooting. A Wasp editor commented on the Vortex letter as follows: “We admit the foregoing communication to please our correspondent, not that we have any faith that any one has killed Governor Boggs. The last account we have received is that he is still living and likely to live.” History of the Church, 5:xxii.
The reports of Boggs’s demise proved to be premature. Although he lingered on the verge of death for two weeks, eventually he recovered fully. Determining who committed the crime, however, proved difficult. A “very fine” pistol was found outside the window of Boggs’s home, apparently dropped when the perpetrator hastily departed the scene. Other clues, if any existed, were not made public.9

It appears that a silversmith named Tompkins (a man “about 38 or 40 years of age”) was the main initial suspect, but a citizens committee, headed by the notorious anti-Mormon militia leader Samuel D. Lucas, investigated and cleared the man of responsibility.10 The committee reported to Governor Thomas Reynolds that there were no other suspects.11 Nevertheless, it was not long before some began speculating that the Mormons might be involved.12 On May 14, 1842, about the same time that news of the shooting reached Nauvoo, David W. Kilbourne, postmaster of nearby Montrose, Iowa, and a persistent anti-Mormon agitator, wrote a letter to Governor Reynolds opining that he “should not entertain a doubt that it was done by some of Joe’s minions at his instigation.”13 Joseph Smith, for his part,

9. *Daily Missouri Republican*, May 12, 1842. The newspaper reported that “a man was suspected” but also quoted the governor’s brother-in-law as saying that “suspicion does not seem to rest on any person.”

10. *Jeffersonian Republican*, May 21, 1842. Lucas had been major general of the Missouri Militia during the Missouri Mormon War and had ordered Joseph Smith to be summarily executed after the latter voluntarily surrendered on November 1, 1838. Lucas’s order was disregarded by Alexander Doniphan, who regarded it as patently illegal. Alexander L. Baugh, *A Call to Arms: The 1838 Mormon Defense of Northern Missouri* (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 2000), 149–51.


denied any involvement. Still under the impression that Boggs was dead, he wrote to the *Quincy Whig* on May 22, “He died not through my instrumentality. My hands are clean, and my heart pure from the blood of all men.”

That the Mormons would come under suspicion was not surprising. Boggs symbolized Mormon persecution in Missouri, having issued the infamous Extermination Order, the official document by which the followers of Joseph Smith had been driven from the state. Rockwell was Smith’s personal bodyguard, a fiercely loyal acolyte who was capable of using a gun when the situation demanded it. The fires of blame were stoked by John C. Bennett, whose spectacular rise to the top rungs of responsibility in the Church had been followed by a precipitous fall that Smith had “sworn Vengeance publickly against Gov Boggs ever since he settled in this neighborhood.”

14. “Assassination of Ex-Governor Boggs of Missouri,” *Whig*, June 4, 1842, 2. Smith’s letter bore the date of May 22, 1842, and was also published in several other Illinois newspapers. The relevant portion of the letter reads as follows: “In your paper . . . of the 21st inst., you have done me manifest injustice, in ascribing to me a prediction of the demise of Lilburn W. Boggs, ex-governor of Missouri, by violent hands. Boggs was a candidate for the State Senate, and I presume, fell by the hand of a political opponent, with his ‘hands and face yet dripping with the blood of murder;’ but he died not through my instrumentality. My hands are clean, and my heart is pure from the blood of all men. I am tired of the misrepresentation, calumny, and detraction heaped upon me by wicked men.”

15. For example, on September 16, 1845, Rockwell shot and killed Frank Worrell. The shooting was done on the order of Hancock County Sheriff Jacob Backenstos, who had deputized Rockwell. Worrell was leading a mob apparently bent on harming Backenstos. *History of the Church*, 7:446. Coincidentally or not, Worrell had been in charge of the Carthage Greys unit assigned to guard the jail on the day Joseph and Hyrum Smith were murdered and had refused to answer some questions about the incident on the ground that his answers might incriminate him. See George D. Watt, Minutes of Trial, *People v. Levi Williams, et al.*, manuscript copy in Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City. Rockwell was eventually arrested for the Worrell shooting but, after receiving a change of venue, was released. Schindler, *Orrin Porter Rockwell*, 146–49, quoting *Whig*, May 6 and 13, 1846.
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and excommunication on grounds of immoral behavior. Not content to slink off in obscurity, Bennett had maintained a high profile by publishing and speaking on the alleged licentiousness of Smith and his followers. The Boggs assault presented an appealing opportunity for Bennett to strike further blows against Mormonism. According to Bennett, Smith had prophesied in a public meeting in 1841 that Boggs would die by violent means. When Rockwell left “for parts unknown” not long before the assault, Bennett claimed he asked Smith about it and that Smith replied Rockwell had “gone to fulfill prophecy.”

Concern that Missouri might initiate some sort of extradition proceeding against Joseph Smith may have prompted the Nauvoo City Council to pass its first habeas corpus ordinance on July 5, 1842, which provided that no Nauvoo citizen “shall be taken out of the city by any writs without the privilege of investigation before the municipal court, and the benefit of a writ of habeas corpus.” The ordinance was enacted “for the protection of the citizens of this city [Nauvoo], that they may in all cases have the right of trial in this city, and not be subjected to illegal process by their enemies.”

16. On June 24, 1842, Smith wrote to Governor Thomas Carlin about the inappropriate behavior of Bennett, stating, “I have been credibly informed that he is colleagueing with some of our former cruel persecutors, the Missourians, and that he is threatening destruction upon us; and under these circumstance I consider it my duty to give you information on the subject, that a knowledge of his proceedings may be before you in due season.

“It can be proven by hundreds of witnesses that he is one of the basest of liars, and that his whole routine of proceedings, while among us, has been of the basest kind.” Joseph Smith to Thomas Carlin, June 24, 1842, Joseph Smith Letterbook 2:233–35, Church History Library; History of the Church, 5:42–44.

17. “Nauvoo,” Warsaw Signal, July 9, 1842, 2; “Bennett’s Second and Third Letters,” Springfield (Ill.) Sangamo Journal, July 15, 1842, quoting from a letter by John C. Bennett to the editor of the newspaper dated July 2, 1842.

18. Nauvoo City Council Proceedings, 1841–45, July 5, 1842, Church History Library (hereafter “Nauvoo City Council Minutes”); History of the Church, 5:57. “A writ of habeas corpus is an order in writing, signed by the judge . . . directed to any one having a person in his custody or under his restraint, commanding him to produce, such person at a certain time and place, and to state the reasons why he is held in custody, or under restraint.” John Bouvier, A Law Dictionary Adapted to the Constitution and Laws of the United States of America, etc., rev. 6th ed. (1856), s.v. habeas corpus, online at http://www.constitution.org/bouv/bouvier_h.htm. The Nauvoo Charter provided that “the municipal court shall have power to grant writs of habeas corpus in all cases arising under the ordinances of the city council.” Section 17 of “An Act to Incorporate the City of Nauvoo,” Laws of the State of Illinois passed by the Twelfth General Assembly (Springfield, Ill.: Wm. Walters, 1841), 55.
On July 12, 1842, Postmaster Kilbourne wrote another letter to Governor Reynolds reporting on a conversation with Bennett in which the latter claimed he had strong evidence that Rockwell was the triggerman in the Boggs assault and was acting as the agent of Joseph Smith. According to Kilbourne’s thirdhand report, just before the news of the attempted assassination reached Nauvoo, Smith said God had told him that “Boggs would not die in his bed.” Also in July, Bennett wrote several letters to various newspapers, expounding on his theory that Smith was involved in the matter.

In early July 1842, Rockwell paid a visit to Bennett. According to Bennett, Rockwell said he had been wrongly accused of wishing to assassinate Boggs or of being ordered by Smith to do so. “If you say that Joe Smith gave me fifty dollars and a wagon to shoot Boggs, I can whip you, and will do it in a crowd.” Rockwell also maintained, “I never done an act in my life that I was ashamed of.” Bennett’s self-reported reply: “I know nothing of what you did, as I was not there, I only know the circumstances, and from them I draw my own inferences.”

Unless further evidence is uncovered in some musty archive or attic, historians will never agree on whether Rockwell was the Boggs assailant.

---


21. Bennett’s affidavit detailing his version of the meeting with Rockwell on July 5, 1842, was printed in the St. Louis American Bulletin, July 14, 1842, and reprinted in “Disclosures—the Attempted Murder of Boggs!” Sangamo Journal, July 22, 1842.

22. Rockwell, who was illiterate, never left a written journal or memoir in which he might have addressed the question directly, although he told the story of his incarceration in Missouri, and it was printed in the Millennial Star 22, no. 33 (August 18, 1860): 518–20 and no. 34 (August 25, 1860): 535–36. See also History of the Church, 6:134–42. Joseph Smith, dictating in “The Book of the Law of the Lord” during the period Rockwell was exiled in the East, said, “But there is one man I would mention namely Porter Rockwell, who is now a fellow-wanderer with myself—an exile from his home because of the murderous deeds and infernal fiendish disposition of the indefatigable and unrelenting hand of the Missourians. He is an innocent and a noble boy; may God Almighty deliver him from the hands of his pursuers. He was an innocent and a noble child, and my soul loves him; Let this be recorded for ever and ever. Let the blessings of Salvation and honor be his portion.” Joseph Smith, Journal, August 23, 1842, as published in Dean C. Jessee, ed., The Papers of Joseph Smith, 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989–92), 2:439. As this paper went to press, the second volume of The Joseph Smith Papers:
Evidently, however, Lilburn Boggs thought the Mormons were involved. On July 20, 1842, Boggs signed an affidavit (fig. 1) stating that “he believe[d], and ha[d] good reason to believe from Evidence and information [then] in his possession, that Joseph Smith commonly called the Mormon Prophet was accessory [sic] before the fact of the intended murder.” As we shall see, the wording of that affidavit became critical in the legal proceedings that followed.

**Requisition and Arrest**

Based on Boggs’s affidavit, Governor Reynolds issued a requisition for the extradition of Smith and Rockwell and sent it to Illinois governor Thomas Carlin. The requisition went beyond the information in the Boggs affidavit by claiming that Joseph Smith was a “fugitive from Justice” who had fled to the state of Illinois and by naming “O. P. Rockwell” as the assailant. No evidence was cited to support these additional claims.

The Boggs affidavit and Reynolds requisition were prepared in accordance with Article IV of the United States Constitution and a 1793 federal statute covering interstate extradition. These authorized the governor of
Fig. 1. Lilburn W. Boggs affidavit, July 20, 1842.
a state to requisition a fugitive from the governor of the state to which the fugitive had fled. In addition, the Illinois legislature had passed a law requiring the Illinois governor to comply when a proper demand was made by the governor of another state.

In due course, warrants were issued by Governor Carlin for Joseph Smith and Porter Rockwell, and on August 8, 1842, lawmen led by Adams County undersheriff Thomas King arrived in Nauvoo to make the arrests. King was no stranger to Smith, having been the officer in charge of a posse that had taken him into custody the previous year when Missouri was attempting to bring him back to stand trial for charges of treason. This earlier extradition attempt was foiled when circuit court judge Stephen A. Douglas released Smith on a legal technicality following a habeas corpus hearing. Now, finding himself once again under arrest by King, Joseph again applied for a writ of habeas corpus. This time, however, instead of appearing before an Illinois circuit court judge, Smith applied to the Nauvoo Municipal Court, which granted the writ. This home court maneuver apparently caught Sheriff King by surprise, so he left Smith and Rockwell in the custody of Nauvoo marshal Dimick B. Huntington and returned to Quincy for further

25. The Constitutional provision and the enabling statute also applied to runaway slaves. U.S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2; An Act Respecting Fugitives from Justice, and Persons Escaping from the Service of their Masters (February 12, 1793), 2d Cong., 1st sess., ch. 152, sec. 1, Laws of the United States of America, from the 4th of March, 1789, to the 4th of March, 1815, Including the Constitution of the United States, the Old Act of Confederation, Treaties, and Many Other Valuable Ordinances and Documents; with Copious Notes and References (Philadelphia: Bioren and Duane, 1815), 2:331.


28. The earlier arrest of Smith by King occurred just outside Quincy on June 5, 1841, shortly after Smith had left a meeting with Governor Carlin. “The Late Proceedings,” Times and Seasons 2 (June 15, 1841): 447. See also History of the Church, 4:364–71.
instructions, taking the arrest warrants with him. 29 There, an incensed Carlin told King that the Nauvoo Municipal Court did not have authority to override a warrant issued by the governor. 30

The habeas corpus obtained by Joseph Smith and Porter Rockwell was issued pursuant to the July 5 city council ordinance mentioned above. The council believed they were acting under the authority of the Nauvoo Charter, which gave the municipal court “power to grant writs of habeas corpus in all cases arising under the ordinances of the City Council.” 31 An addendum to the charter provided that the city council could pass ordinances that were “necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers specified in [the charter],” so long as they were neither “repugnant to, nor inconsistent with, the constitution of the United States or of this State.” 32 Carlin (as became clear from his subsequent correspondence) felt strongly that his arrest warrant did not fall within the ambit of the habeas

29. Petition of Joseph Smith, August 8, 1842, Joseph Smith Collection, Church History Library; History of the Church, 5:86. Eliza R. Snow’s journal for August 14, 1842, records: “King, the deputy sheriff, and Pitman from Quincy, with the Sheriff and his associate from Mo.; are yet watching about the City for Prest. S[mith] who had absented himself while they were on their return to Quincy.” Maureen Ursenbach [Beecher], ed., “Eliza R. Snow’s Nauvoo Journal,” BYU Studies 15, no. 4 (1975): 396.

30. “When Governor [sic] Carlin was informed of the proceedings of the Municipal Court, his anger got the master of his judgement and he disregarded our Charter and would not pay any attention to it. Thereby impeaching the proceedings of Congress and proving himself to be not a whit better than his Colleague Boggs of Missouri. He dispatched the Sheriff, back with orders to take me at all hazards and pay no regard to our charter.” Joseph Smith to Dr. J. M. Bernhisel, September 7, 1842, Joseph Smith Collection, Church History Library.


corpus right granted under the charter because Smith’s alleged crime did not arise under an ordinance of the city council. Taking a contrary view, Smith and his lawyers reasoned that the city ordinance granting any citizen arrested in Nauvoo the right to apply to the municipal court for habeas corpus was a proper extension of power under the charter addendum because it was not inconsistent with either the Illinois or the United States constitution.\(^{33}\)

It is unclear whether the Nauvoo Municipal Court merely granted Smith’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus or held a hearing on the return at the same time.\(^{34}\) In any event, Carlin was exasperated by the municipal court’s assumption of habeas corpus power in connection with a warrant issued by the governor for a crime that had nothing to do with a Nauvoo ordinance.

As soon as King left Nauvoo for Quincy on August 8, the Nauvoo City Council got busy. Before the end of the day, they had already passed another ordinance concerning writs of habeas corpus, an even broader extension of the municipal court’s power. This ordinance provided that even if the court were to determine that the writ had been properly issued, it could hear testimony on the merits of the underlying action and dismiss the defendant if it found that the action had been brought through “private pique, malicious intent, or religious or other persecution, falsehood or misrepresentation.”\(^{35}\)

---


34. It may be useful to briefly review habeas corpus procedure. A person who was arrested could challenge the circumstances of his detention by having his attorney prepare a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. This petition could be presented to a low-level local judicial magistrate, such as a justice of the peace or a master in chancery. If it appeared to the magistrate that there was merit in the petition on its face, he could command the officer having custody to bring the defendant before a court. The command and the original warrant were called a “return.” If the court was not ready to hear the return on the writ, or if the attorneys for either side requested a continuance to prepare their arguments, the prisoner could petition to be released on bail. At the hearing on the return, evidence and arguments would be made by the attorney for the prisoner, as well as an attorney for the state, concerning the propriety of the arrest. See Timothy Walker, *Introduction to American Law*, 9th ed. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1887), 631–32.

35. Nauvoo City Council Minutes, August 8, 1842; *History of the Church*, 5:87–88. This ordinance further expanded the reach of the municipal court’s habeas corpus power by providing that not only citizens of Nauvoo but any persons arrested in Nauvoo could have their habeas corpus petitions heard by the municipal court.
This expanded habeas corpus inquiry—permitting a court to hear testimony on the merits of the case—went well beyond what had been allowed under the common law, which viewed the purpose of habeas corpus as permitting the prisoner to challenge whether the arresting documents had been properly issued. Indeed, even the Mormon press understood that “a writ of habeas corpus [could] only test the validity, not the virtue of a process, (as testimony to prove the guilt or innocence of a person—under an investigation by habeas corpus, is inadmissible).”

An argument can be made that in Illinois the statutory habeas corpus power was more expansive than it had been at common law. An Illinois rule permitted a petitioner for habeas corpus to “allege any facts to shew, either that the imprisonment or detention is unlawful, or that he is then entitled to his discharge” and gave the judge authority to “proceed in a summary way to settle the said facts, by hearing the testimony . . . and dispose of the prisoners as the case may require.”

How does one interpret the key words “any facts” in this statute? Do they mean that a court hearing a return of habeas corpus on an arrest pursuant to an extradition request was entitled to inquire into the facts of the underlying substantive allegations against the petitioner? If those facts

36. “Persecution,” 888–89; History of the Church, 5:102–3 (parentheses and italics in original). As if to emphasize the common understanding of the scope of inquiry on a habeas corpus hearing, the Times and Seasons article went on to explain why Smith and Rockwell had not presented themselves to the district court in order to clear themselves: “If they appealed to the district court it might have availed them nothing, . . . as their dismission would rest upon some technicalities of law, rather than upon the merits of the case; as testimony to prove the guilt, or innocence of the [persons] charged, could not be admitted on the investigation on a writ of habeas corpus, the question, not being, whether the persons are guilty or not guilty; but merely to test the validity of the writ; which if proved to be issued in due form of law, however innocent the parties might be, would subject them to be transported to Missouri” (brackets in original, italics added).

It should be noted that during this time, Joseph Smith was the editor of Times and Seasons. Terence A. Tanner, “The Mormon Press in Nauvoo,” in Roger D. Launius and John E. Hallwas, Kingdom on the Mississippi Revisited (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 94, 103–6.

37. Illinois Revised Statutes, sec. 3 at 324 (1833), emphasis added.

38. At least one commentator has suggested they may have. See Dallin H. Oaks, “The Suppression of the Nauvoo Expositor,” Utah Law Review 9 (Winter 1965): 883–84. Oaks acknowledges that “at common law and under the law of most states it would have been an abuse of the writ of habeas corpus to use it to consider questions of guilt or innocence, for the historical role of habeas corpus was simply to determine whether the arrest warrant was free from any formal defects and perhaps whether the warrant had been based on sufficient written
concerned actions that had taken place in another state, such an inquiry would seem to place an unusually heavy burden on the arresting authority. Should Missouri be expected to produce witnesses and elicit testimony in an Illinois court about a crime allegedly committed in Missouri? Or do the words “any facts” simply mean that the court hearing the habeas corpus could delve into any facts that had a bearing on whether proper procedures had been followed to obtain the Illinois arrest warrant?

The non-Mormon press had a field day with the new habeas corpus ordinance. The Warsaw Signal printed the ordinance in full, expressing its outrage:

We copy the above ordinances in order to show our readers the barefaced affrontery with which the holy brotherhood at Nauvoo set at defiance the civil authorities of the State. No man having claims to even an ordinary

evidence.” But he explains that while “the Nauvoo Municipal Court may have erred in its application of these principles . . . the power that the court exercised was clearly authorized by law, not in defiance of it.” Oaks, “The Suppression of the Nauvoo Expositor,” 883–84. There is no evidence, however, that Smith or his attorneys raised the cited statute at the habeas corpus hearing, and it is fair to say that most people felt it was improper (or, at least of questionable propriety) to try the facts of the underlying case at a habeas corpus hearing. Although evidence as to the underlying merits had been presented to Illinois Supreme Court Justice Stephen A. Douglas when Smith appeared before him on a writ of habeas corpus in connection with Missouri’s first extradition attempt, Douglas declined to base his ruling on such evidence. Likewise, United States District Judge Nathaniel Pope (as will be discussed below in connection with his decision in this case) disregarded submitted evidence that Joseph was not a fugitive from Missouri. Governor Thomas Carlin, as noted above, strongly believed the municipal court had overstepped its bounds in freeing Joseph. Carlin’s successor, Thomas Ford, also felt that a court might not properly consider evidence of whether an alleged fugitive had fled from justice (as will be further discussed in the postscript section of this article). Finally, both Mormon and anti-Mormon newspapers accepted that a court could not, on a habeas corpus hearing, inquire into the underlying merits of the case. These were important factors in creating a widely held belief outside Nauvoo that Smith stood above the law.

39. The Alabama case of Ex parte Mahone, 30 Ala. 49 (1857), which is cited in footnote 128 of Oaks, “The Suppression of the Nauvoo Expositor,” 883, holds that a prisoner who is in custody can “claim as a matter of right that such officer shall hear and pass on all legal evidence which he offers, touching the question of his guilt. If, on such examination, ‘it appear that no offense has been committed, or that there is no probable cause for charging the defendant therewith,’ the prisoner must be discharged.” It should be noted, however, that this case was specifically decided under applicable Alabama statutory law and Oaks points out that it is an “unusual opinion.” Dallin H. Oaks, “Habeas Corpus in the States—1776–1865,” 32 University of Chicago Law Review 243 (1965–66) at 259 (footnote 71).
share of common sense, can ever believe that there is the least shadow of authority in the City Council of Nauvoo, to pass such an ordinance. . . . [T]his Mormon ordinance, not only extends to all cases of arrest; but sets the laws of the United States at defiance, by giving authority to the Municipal Court to enquire into the causes of the arrest; a power which even the legislature of this State cannot confer.

. . . The guilt or innocence of the accused must be determined by the Courts of the State from whence the requisition issued. 40

While Sheriff King was in Quincy consulting with Governor Carlin, the Nauvoo marshal released Joseph Smith and Porter Rockwell. The prisoners had challenged their detention on the grounds that the marshal had no authority to continue holding them, since King had taken the warrants for their arrest with him. The attorneys for the accused men considered petitioning the local master in chancery for a writ of habeas corpus, which would have avoided the jurisdiction issue; however, such a writ likely would have required a hearing on the return before a circuit court outside Nauvoo, and so they decided against pursuing that course. Joseph and his advisors were concerned that applying for a writ from the master in chancery would have amounted to a tacit admission that the Nauvoo Municipal Court lacked jurisdiction, and they knew that a court outside Nauvoo would decline to rule on the merits of the underlying action. 41

“When They Returned, I Was Away”

Joseph Smith did not linger in Nauvoo. As he put it, when the lawmen returned to Quincy, “a report went abroad that the matter would end there, but we did not expect it and consequently I kept out of their way, and when they returned I was away.” 42 This, of course, outraged his enemies. “No termination of the affair could be less satisfactory than the one which has taken place. If [Smith] had resisted, we should have had the sport of


41. “Persecution,” Times and Seasons, 889; see also History of the Church, 5:102–3.

42. Smith to Bernhisel, September 7, 1842. Porter Rockwell first went to Philadelphia and then to New Jersey. He sought to find employment in both places, but with little success, and seemed to be suffering from depression. Orrin Porter Rockwell per S. Armstrong to Joseph Smith, December 1, 1842, in History of the Church, 5:198.
driving him and his worthy clan out of the State *en masse*, but as it is we are mortified that there is no efficacy in the law to bring such a scamp to justice.”

During the next three months, Joseph Smith was seldom seen in public, hiding out in various safe houses in Nauvoo and surrounding Mormon communities in Illinois and Iowa. On August 11, he called an unusual council meeting after nightfall on a small island in the Mississippi River between Nauvoo and Montrose, Illinois. His wife Emma, his brother Hyrum, and other Church leaders and Mormon lawmen, including Newell K. Whitney, George Miller, William Law, William Clayton, and Dimick Huntington, set off from the Nauvoo shore in a skiff. Shortly after they arrived on the island, Joseph Smith and Erastus H. Derby arrived in a skiff from the Iowa side. There in the darkness they discussed the state of affairs and what to do about them. Judge James H. Ralston of Quincy, Illinois, and lawyer Stephen W. Powers of Keokuk, Iowa, were nearby, having promised to stay vigilant and to provide legal assistance on both sides of the river as needed by the Mormon prophet.

During the time he was in hiding, Joseph continued to maintain that he was innocent in the Boggs affair, but the forced exile undoubtedly weighed heavily on a man who thrived on interactions with his family and his people. His frustrations showed in his correspondence, in which he characterized the proceedings against him as a “farce . . . gotten up, unlawfully and unconstitutionally, . . . by a mob spirit.”

In an open letter to the members of the Church in Nauvoo, he stated that his enemies pursued him “without cause, and have not the least shadow, or coloring of justice, or right on their side.” In a letter to Emma, he considered the possibility of escaping with her and “20 or 30 of the best men we can find” to the Wisconsin pine country. “Then we will bid defiance to the world, to Carlin, Boggs, Bennett, and all their whorish whores, and motly [sic] clan, that follow in their wake.”

In the same letter to Emma, Joseph discussed the advisability of her visiting Governor Carlin to try to convince him to rescind the arrest warrant. Emma had a personal relationship with Carlin based on previous visits, both with and without her husband, to the governor’s home in Quincy.\textsuperscript{48} Joseph, however, did not think highly of Carlin, writing that “on the whole, he is a fool,” that a visit by Emma would be of no use, and that “the more we notice him, and flatter him, the more eager he will be for our destruction. You may write to him, whatever you see proper, but to go and see him, I do not give my consent at present.”\textsuperscript{49}

Responding immediately to her husband’s suggestion, Emma wrote Carlin a letter of supplication dated August 16, 1842. “I find myself almost destitute of that confidence, necessary to address a person holding the authority of your dignified, and respectable office,” she wrote, “and I would now offer, as an excuse for intruding upon your time and attention, the justice of my cause.” Emma then stated what seemed obvious to her—that her husband was not guilty of the crime alleged against him. “Indeed it does seem entirely superfluous for me, or any one of his friends in this place, to testify his innocence of that crime; when so many of the citizens of [Illinois] . . . do know positively that the statement of Governor Boggs is without the least shadow of truth.”\textsuperscript{50}
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\textsuperscript{48} In late July, before Carlin had received the requisition from Reynolds, Emma had traveled to Quincy with Eliza R. Snow and Amanda Barns Smith to visit the governor. The women presented a petition to him seeking executive protection in the event mobs from Missouri came to attack or arrest Joseph unlawfully. Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, \textit{Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith} (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 121. Eliza R. Snow wrote in her journal of this visit, “He [Governor Carlin] manifested much friendship, and it remains for time and circumstance to prove the sincerity of his professions.” However, in a life sketch written much later, she commented, “But alas! soon after our return, we learned that at the time of our visit, and while making protestations of friendship, the wily Governor was secretly conniving with the basest of men to destroy our leaders.” Ursenbach [Beecher], “Eliza R. Snow’s Nauvoo Journal,” 395, 395 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{49} Joseph Smith to Emma Smith, in Jessee, \textit{Papers of Joseph Smith}, 2:430.

\textsuperscript{50} Emma Smith to Thomas Carlin, August 16, 1842, in Jessee, \textit{Papers of Joseph Smith}, 2:433–34. The letter was written on August 17 and was personally delivered.
Emma reiterated the persecutions the Saints had endured in Missouri and then closed with a personal entreaty. “And now I appeal to your excellency as I would unto a father, who is not only able but willing to shield me and mine from every unjust prosecution. I appeal to your sympathies and beg you to spare me, and my helpless children. I beg you to spare . . . our aged mother,—the only surviving parent we have left,—the unsupportable affliction of seeing her son, who she knows to be innocent of the crimes laid to his charge, thrown again into the hands of his enemies.”

Governor Carlin replied on August 24, 1842. Writing in a formal and verbose style, he apologized for his delay in responding, citing press of business. He was firm, however, in rejecting Emma’s plea to intervene in her husband’s behalf. Carlin viewed his duty as “entirely of an executive, and not a judicial character,” leaving him no discretion in the matter. He explained that the Illinois extradition statute required “that when ever the Executive of any other State . . . shall demand of the executive of this State, any person as a fugitive from justice, and shall have complied with the requisitions of the act of congress . . . , it shall be the duty of the executive of this State to issue his warrants . . . to apprehend the said fugitive.” Carlin concluded, “With the Constitution and laws before me, my duty is so plainly marked out, that it would be impossible to err, so long as I abstain from usurping the right of adjudication.”

Emma was far from satisfied by Carlin’s response and promptly replied. Sensing that the governor was unlikely to be swayed by further

by William Clayton to Carlin in Quincy on August 19. After reading it in Clayton’s presence, Carlin “expressed astonishment at the judgement [sic] and talent manifest in the manner of her address.” Smith, Journal, August 21, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:437.


52. Thomas Carlin to Emma Smith, August 24, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:451. Contrast Carlin’s view of gubernatorial discretion with that of his successor, Thomas Ford, as discussed in the “Postscript” section below.

53. Carlin to Smith, August 24, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:451. The Illinois law to which Carlin referred was An Act Concerning Fugitives from Justice (January 6, 1827), sec. 1, The Revised Code of Laws of Illinois. The “act of congress” to which Carlin referred was An Act Respecting Fugitives from Justice, and Persons Escaping from the Service of their Masters (February 12, 1793), sec. 1–2, which contained three “requisitions” or prerequisites to a governor’s duty to deliver up a fugitive from justice to the governor of another state: (1) a demand had to be made to the governor of the state to which he fled; (2) an indictment or an affidavit charging the fugitive with a crime had to be given; and (3) the governor of the demanding state had to certify that the charges were true. Laws of the United States of America, 2:331.
appeals for mercy, her second letter, dated August 27, 1842, focused on the legal issues involved in the Missouri requisition. She assured Carlin that neither she nor her husband wanted the governor to abrogate his executive duty. There was, however, legal justification for Carlin’s leaving Smith in peace. The Nauvoo City Council had passed a habeas corpus ordinance giving the Nauvoo Municipal Court the right “to try the question of identity,” and her husband could prove that “the Mr. Smith referr’d to in the demand from Missouri, is not the Joseph Smith of Nauvoo, for he was not in Missouri . . . [and] is not a fugitive from justice.” She asked, “Why then, be so strenuous to have my husband taken, when you know him to be innocent of an attempt on the life of Governor Boggs, and that he is not a fugitive from justice?”

Carlin responded to Emma’s second letter on September 7, 1842. Again his air was formal, but his undertone betrayed irritation, and his decision was unchanged. With regard to the Nauvoo City Charter, he expressed his “surprise at the extraordinary assumption of power by the board of Aldermen as contained in said ordinance.” In Carlin’s view, any claim that the municipal court had the power “to release persons held in custody under the authority of writs issued by the courts, or the executive of the State of [Illinois], is most absurd & ridiculous, and an attempt to exercise [the writ of habeas corpus in this manner], is a gross usurpation of power, that cannot be tolerated.”

Emma might have known that Carlin would be unsympathetic to any claim that the Nauvoo charter provided a basis to challenge a warrant issued by the governor pertaining to a matter that had nothing to do with a Nauvoo ordinance. Her more persuasive argument was that Joseph manifestly had not fled from Missouri justice. The extradition demand was based on Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that “a Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State,

54. Emma Smith to Thomas Carlin, August 27, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:452–54. Emma’s letter also explained that it was not the fear of a just decision against him that had deterred Smith from going to Missouri, but his knowledge that it was never intended he should have a fair trial. She claimed she had evidence that twelve men from Jackson County, Missouri, had lain in wait between Nauvoo and Warsaw with the intent to take Smith from the hands of the lawmen who had come to Nauvoo to arrest him. Emma railed at some length against the “tyranny, treachery and knavery of a great portion of the leading characters of the State of Missouri.”

55. Thomas Carlin to Emma Smith, September 7, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:476.
shall on demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.”

To Emma, it stood to reason that her husband could not have “fled” from Missouri justice if he had not been in Missouri at the time the crime was perpetrated.

Carlin did not respond directly to that argument, but his letter contained the suggestion that Smith “of course . . . would be entitled to a writ of Habeas Corpus issued by the circuit court, and entitled to a hearing before said court.” Nevertheless, Carlin was vehement in his opinion that “to claim the right of a hearing before the municipal court of the city of Nauvoo is a burlesque upon the charter itself.”

That Carlin had become testy concerning the Smith affair is perhaps understandable. Newspapers were critical of his unwillingness to use force to apprehend the Mormon prophet. The Sangamo Journal complained that the “State authorities have quietly acquiesced and submitted to be bullied, and see the laws set at open defiance by the Mormon Prophet!” Carlin, it was said, “never seriously intended to deliver Joe Smith over to Missouri. . . . The Governor could have commanded force enough to take him; it was his duty to do so; but he did not do it—because the clique, by whom he is controlled, determined otherwise.”

The Nauvoo City Council, for its part, disregarded the criticisms that it was overstepping its bounds and continued to refine the Nauvoo habeas corpus law. Its September 9, 1842, ordinance provided that the municipal court could make writs of habeas corpus “returnable forthwith,” meaning that the court could issue the writ and proceed immediately to adjudicate it. Its November 14 ordinance explained the circumstances under which the court could hear testimony and outlined procedures and fines for dealing with noncompliance with the ordinance. The latter ordinance provided a heavy penalty for anyone seeking to arrest a person in Nauvoo knowing that the writ was illegal—a fine of up to one thousand dollars and up to a year’s imprisonment.

56. U.S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2.
57. Carlin to Smith, September 7, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:476–77. The four-letter exchange between Smith and Carlin has recently been published, with commentary, by Joseph Smith Papers coeditors Andrew H. Hedges and Alex D. Smith in “The Lady and the Governor: Emma Hale Smith’s and Thomas Carlin’s 1842 Correspondence,” Mormon Historical Studies 9, no. 2 (Fall 2008): 139–52.
On September 20, 1842, Governor Carlin, no doubt frustrated by the inability of his state law enforcement officers to capture Joseph Smith, issued a “proclamation” setting forth the legal basis for issuing the arrest warrants for Smith and Rockwell, reciting that they had “resisted the laws, by refusing to go with the officers who had them in custody” and offering a reward of two hundred dollars “for the apprehension and delivery of . . . either of the above named fugitives from justice.”

Exploring Legal Options

As these events were unfolding, Smith and his advisors were exploring legal avenues for avoiding extradition to Missouri. Sidney Rigdon inquired of Justin Butterfield (a prominent Illinois attorney, who, in addition to his private legal practice, served as the United States attorney for the district of Illinois) and received an encouraging response. Butterfield explained that the United States Constitution provided for extradition of fugitives from justice but that Smith did not fit that definition because it could not be shown that he had fled from Missouri justice—essentially the same argument Emma Smith had made in her letters to Governor Carlin. Butterfield maintained that in this case the governor of Illinois “has no jurisdiction over [Smith’s] person and cannot deliver him up.”

In early December 1842, Thomas Ford assumed the governorship of Illinois, his election due in part to the overwhelming support of Mormon voters in Illinois. No doubt hoping that Ford would not be emotionally


61. Justin Butterfield to Sidney Rigdon, October 20, 1842, Sidney Rigdon Collection, Church History Library. This letter later became a point of contention between Smith and Rigdon. At a conference on October 6, 1843, Smith accused Rigdon (who was postmaster of Nauvoo) of negligently or deliberately delaying delivery of the Butterfield letter for four weeks. Rigdon replied that the letter was in response to his own inquiries of Butterfield, “that he [Rigdon] received it at a time when he was sick, and unable to examine it, did not know that it was designed for the perusal and benefit of . . . Smith; that he had, consequently, ordered it to be laid aside, where it remained until inquired for by Joseph Smith.” History of the Church 6:47–48.
invested in an order that had been promulgated by Carlin, a delegation of Mormon leaders, including Hyrum Smith, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards, and William Clayton, traveled from Nauvoo to Springfield in early December. Their purpose was to appear in connection with the bankruptcy petitions of Joseph and Hyrum, as well as to canvass state leaders concerning what might be done to resolve the extradition stalemate.\textsuperscript{62}

After arriving in Springfield, the delegation met with Stephen A. Douglas, “who appeared very friendly and offered to assist us in our business as much as possible.” Douglas, who years later would become the Democratic candidate for president of the United States, was at this time judge of the Illinois circuit that included Hancock County. He was well acquainted with Joseph Smith, having presided at the 1841 hearing in Monmouth involving Missouri’s initial attempt to extradite Smith on charges of treason arising out of the Mormon conflict of 1839. Douglas had visited Smith at Nauvoo the day after Boggs was shot, though, of course, neither man knew of the assault at that time. Now Douglas recommended that the delegation petition Governor Ford to revoke the writ and the proclamation for Smith’s arrest.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{62} The delegation departed Nauvoo on December 9, 1842, and also included Henry Sherwood, Benjamin Covey, Peter Haws, Reynolds Cahoon, and Alpheus Cutler. Hyrum Smith and Benjamin Covey went to attend to Hyrum’s petition in bankruptcy; the others went in Joseph’s behalf. Jessee, \textit{Papers of Joseph Smith}, 2:497–501.

Next, the delegation met with United States attorney Justin Butterfield, formally requesting his legal assistance. Butterfield drafted a petition to Governor Ford as well as affidavits to be signed by various members of the party averring their firsthand knowledge of Smith’s being in Illinois at the time of the assault on Boggs. They also made a copy of the Boggs affidavit, and, armed with these papers, they accompanied Butterfield to meet with Ford at 4:00 PM the same day.\textsuperscript{64}

Butterfield told Ford that, having reviewed the facts, he found “the arrest was based upon far weaker premises than he had previously supposed.” It said nothing about Joseph having fled from justice, and the constitution authorizes only the extradition of a “fugitive from Justice . . . of the State from which he fled.” Ford replied that he was sure the writ of Governor Carlin was illegal, but he doubted his authority to interfere with the acts of his predecessor. He did promise, however, to “state the case” to the judges of the supreme court at their meeting the next day and would do whatever they recommended.\textsuperscript{65}

The supreme court judges polled by Ford agreed that the Missouri requisition was illegal, but they were split on the propriety of Ford’s simply rescinding the actions of Carlin without judicial intervention. Ford was unwilling to take a step that was of doubtful legality; however, convinced that Smith would prevail in a court hearing, he summarized his conclusions in a letter dated December 17, 1842, to be delivered to Smith when the delegation returned to Nauvoo.\textsuperscript{66}

Today it would be inappropriate for a sitting governor to be granted an \textit{ex parte} consultation with justices of a state supreme court in order

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{66} “I submitted your case and all the papers relating thereto, to the judges of the Supreme Court; or at least to six of them who happened to be present. They were unanimous in the opinion that the requisition from Missouri was illegal and insufficient to cause your arrest, but were equally divided as to the propriety and Justice of my interference with the acts of Governor Carlin. It being therefore a case of great doubt as to my power, and I not wishing ever in an official station to assume the exercise of doubtful powers; and in as much as you have a sure and effectual remedy in the courts, I have decided to decline interfering. I can only advise that you submit to the laws and have a Judicial investigation of your rights.” Thomas Ford to Joseph Smith, December 17, 1842, in Jessee, \textit{Papers of Joseph Smith}, 2:504–5. At this time there were nine justices of the Illinois Supreme Court: Thomas C. Browne, William Wilson, Samuel D. Lockwood, Theophilus W. Smith, Samuel H. Treat, Sidney Breese, Walter B. Scates, Stephen A. Douglas, and John D. Caton. Jessee White, ed., \textit{Illinois Blue Book, 2007–2008} (Springfield: Secretary of State, 2007), 413.
\end{footnotes}
to obtain an opinion on a legal dispute involving a private citizen in an impending case. In 1840s Illinois, however, ethical rules were less evolved. Before becoming governor, Ford had been a justice on the Illinois Supreme Court and would likely have developed a collegial relationship with many of the judges. Such a relationship would have made it easy for him to sound them out on various legal issues.

Justin Butterfield also wrote a letter addressed to Joseph Smith, confirming that he had read Governor Ford’s letter and agreed with Ford’s characterization of the supreme court justices’ opinion. He then encouraged Smith to “come here without delay and you do not run the least risk of [not] being protected while here and of [not] being dis-charged by the Sup. Court by Habeas Corpus.” Butterfield further explained, “I have also a right to bring the case before the U.S. [District] Court now in Session here, and there you are certain of obtaining your discharge—I will stand by you and see you safely delivered from your arrest.”

While they were in Springfield, the delegation also consulted with James Adams, a Springfield judge who had joined the LDS Church in 1836. When they returned, they carried also a short note from Judge Adams advising Smith to come to Springfield. Bearing the three letters, the Mormon delegation arrived back in Nauvoo on December 20, 1842.

---

67. Rule 63, Canon 3A(4) of the current Illinois Code of Judicial Conduct provides that “a judge shall not initiate, permit, or consider ex parte communications, or consider other communications made to the judge outside the presence of the parties concerning a pending or impending proceeding.”

68. Justin Butterfield to Joseph Smith, December 17, 1842, in Jessee, Papers of Joseph Smith, 2:505–6. That Butterfield should be the attorney Joseph Smith turned to for representation in his habeas corpus matter is somewhat curious in view of the fact that Butterfield, in his role as United States attorney (at the specific behest of United States Treasury Solicitor Charles B. Penrose), had opposed the bankruptcy filings of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. The opposition to the Smiths’ bankruptcy petitions was unusual (less than one percent of bankruptcy petitions filed under the Bankruptcy Act of 1841 in Illinois were opposed) and was based primarily on John C. Bennett’s claims that the Smiths had fraudulently transferred property just prior to their filings. In fact, Butterfield cited Bennett’s claims in his letters to Penrose and even made a trip to Nauvoo in September 1842 to examine land records. Joseph I. Bentley, “In the Wake of the Steamboat Nauvoo: Prelude to Joseph Smith’s Financial Disasters,” Journal of Mormon History 35 (Winter 2009): 23, 35–38.

69. His note read, “My Son:—It is useless for me to detail facts that the bearer can tell. But I will say that it appears to my judgment that you had best make no delay in coming before the court at this place for a discharge under a habeas corpus.” James Adams to Joseph Smith, December 17, 1842, in History of the Church, 5:206.
After considering the assurances contained in these letters, Joseph Smith determined to venture to Springfield to have his case heard on its merits. Accordingly, on Monday, December 26, 1842, he took several steps to claim his legal rights. After presiding as chief judge of the Nauvoo Municipal Court in the morning, he formally surrendered to Wilson Law, who was general of the Nauvoo Legion, on the charges that had been proffered against him under the proclamation of Governor Carlin. Then, apparently concerned that he might be waylaid by marshals en route to the state capital, Joseph sent Henry Sherwood and William Clayton to Carthage to obtain a writ of habeas corpus. When he returned home, he found Emma sick with chills and consulted with Dr. Willard Richards, his personal secretary, concerning her condition.

**Joseph Smith Goes to Springfield**

The following morning at 9:00 AM, Joseph Smith and his entourage started for Springfield. Accompanying him were his brother Hyrum, Apostles John Taylor and Orson Hyde, Nauvoo stake president William Marks, Willard Richards, Wilson Law, Levi Moffet, Peter Haws, and Loren Walker. They were joined on the way to Carthage by Henry Sherwood and William Clayton, who reported that although the Master in Chancery had been willing to issue an order for habeas corpus, they had been unable to obtain an official writ because the court clerk had been out of town. The group arrived at Plymouth and the home of the Prophet’s brother Samuel about sunset. There were joined by Edward Hunter, Theodore Turley, Shadrach Roundy, and Dr. Harvey Tate.

On Wednesday the party traveled from Plymouth to Rushville, and on Thursday from Rushville to an inn kept by Captain Ebenezer Dutch. The weather during this trip had been bitterly cold, and as the party gathered round the fire that evening, Joseph told of a similar frigid night several years earlier when he and Sidney Rigdon and their families had been making their way from Ohio to Missouri. They had tried to obtain lodging at

---

70. Smith, Journal, December 26, 1842, in Scott H. Faulring, ed., *An American Prophet’s Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 258. *History of the Church*, 5:209, states, “On my return home, I found my wife Emma sick. She was delivered of a son, which did not survive its birth.” This is a misreading of the original document. This entry actually says: “Sister Emma sick, had another chill. Had a consultation concerning her with Secretary.” Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 258. “Secretary” refers to Joseph’s secretary, Willard Richards, who was a physician.

“all the taverns,” only to be turned away by the proprietors because they were Mormons. Fearing for the families, Smith confronted one landlord, saying that he had “men enough to take the town & if we must freeze we will freeze by the burning of there [their] houses.” This had the desired effect of opening the inn to them, and in the morning the inhabitants apologized.72

The Mormon traveling party arrived in Springfield on Friday, December 30, proceeding to the home of Judge Adams, where Joseph Smith would stay during his sojourn in the state capital. The conversation turned to slavery, and Orson Hyde asked Smith what advice he would give to a man who came into the Church having a hundred slaves. Smith replied, “I have always advised such to bring their slaves into a free country, set them free, educate them & give them their equal rights.”73

While at Judge Adams’s house, Smith was introduced to his legal counsel, Justin Butterfield. Others who were present at times during the afternoon discussion included Joseph’s brother William, who was a member of the Illinois State Legislature, and Illinois Secretary of State Lyman Trumbull. Butterfield had already decided it would be best to bring Smith’s case before the United States District Court for Illinois, to be heard by Judge Nathaniel Pope, and the assembled group discussed procedural issues.74

Why did Butterfield decide to bring the case before the federal court, rather than the Illinois State Supreme Court? Butterfield knew, of course, of the opinion given by a majority of the judges of the supreme court to Governor Ford that Smith should prevail in the matter. Nevertheless, Butterfield was the United States attorney for Illinois and, as such, was accustomed to handling cases in the federal court system. More significantly, he was of the opinion that the federal court had *exclusive* jurisdiction of extradition matters because the right to demand extradition was provided by the United States Constitution, and federal law established the procedures to be followed in extradition cases. He likely also knew his opponent would be Josiah Lamborn, the Illinois State attorney general, whose “home court” was the Illinois Supreme Court. Lamborn was prepared to argue

72. Smith, Journal, December 28, 1842; in Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 259–60; *History of the Church*, 5:210–11. In Rushville, measurements were taken of several of the men in attendance and Joseph and Hyrum were both found to be six feet tall.


that the state court system had jurisdiction over such matters because an Illinois statute specifically required the governor to honor requests for interstate extradition made by executives of sister states.75

Before Joseph Smith’s case could be heard by Judge Pope, there were preliminary matters to be seen to. The original writ for Smith’s arrest, one of the foundational documents for the habeas corpus petition, was still in the possession of Sheriff King of Hancock County. On Saturday, December 31, 1842, Butterfield petitioned Governor Ford on Smith’s behalf for a new arrest warrant to avoid undue delay waiting for King to bring the original warrant to Springfield. This new warrant was to be issued by the Sangamon County76 sheriff and would enable Butterfield to obtain a new writ of habeas corpus immediately.77

Ford complied with Butterfield’s request,78 Joseph was surrendered to the custody of Sangamon County sheriff William F. Elkin, and the company made its way to the federal court that was then located on the second floor of the Tinsley Building, across the street from the state capitol. There Butterfield presented Judge Pope with a petition for a writ of habeas corpus to release Smith from custody.79 Pope granted the requested writ, setting Monday for a full hearing on the case and ordering that notice be given to Governor Ford and Attorney General Lamborn. Butterfield asked that Smith be released on bail, and Pope granted the request, setting the amount at four thousand dollars. Judge Adams and Wilson Law each pledged two thousand dollars, and Smith was released.80 That afternoon,

76. The correct spelling of the county is, and was at the time, “Sangamon.” Nevertheless, a commonly used spelling in the 1840s was “Sangamo,” and the county’s newspaper was called the Sangamo Journal.
77. Smith, Journal, December 31, 1842, in Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 262–64. According to Smith’s journal entry, Ford commented that from the reports he had heard, the Mormons were a “peculiar” people, but he found that “they look like other people” and that Smith was “a very good looking man.”
Joseph Smith’s Most Famous Case

Smith and Butterfield dined at the American House, Springfield’s finest hotel, visiting with an ill Governor Ford in his room both before and after the meal.  

There was an unfortunate incident at the court that day. Catching sight of the Mormon party, someone observed, “There goes Smith the Prophet and a great looking man he is.” Someone else added, “[and] as damned a rascal as ever lived!” Hyrum Smith took exception to this and fired off a sharp retort, to which the man responded, “God Damn you and any one that takes his part is as damned a rascal as he is.” Wilson Law shot back, “I am the man and I take his part.” The name-calling continued—“You are a damned rascal to[o],” and “You are a [lying scoundrel],” and so forth. The troublemaker began to take off his shirt and went out into the street, urging the Mormons to come out and fight. At this point, William Prentice, a genial marshal, appeared and was able to quiet the crowd and restore peace.

It is difficult to overstate the commotion the arrival of Joseph Smith and his entourage caused in Springfield. At that time, the Illinois capital was considerably smaller than Nauvoo, and the Mormon city was gaining population rapidly. Smith was leader of a sizeable and controversial religious minority in the state, having considerable political power in Hancock County. It was common knowledge that he had been avoiding arrest for several months, and now he was coming to stand in a court of law. The Alton Telegraph noted that “quite a sensation was created in [Springfield], by the appearance of Joe Smith, the Mormon prophet, in our midst.”

Illustrating how charged the atmosphere was, when a team of horses ran away from its owner and past the state house, the cry was raised, “Joe Smith is running away!” which produced “a sudden adjournment of the House of Representativ[e]s.” Even Joseph’s followers created a memorable impression. The editor of the Alton Telegraph observed:

[Smith] was attended by a retinue of some fifteen or twenty of as fine looking men as my eyes ever beheld. My great astonishment is, how men possessing the intellectual faculties, refinement of education, and cultivated minds, that most of his body guard apparently do, can be so outrageously blinded, and led captive by imposition, as they are by Joe

83. “From the Editor,” Alton (Ill.) Telegraph and Democratic Review, January 7, 1843, 2.
84. Smith, Journal, December 31, 1842, in Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 265.
Smith. As for Joe Smith, his demeanor as far as I could observe, was by no means censurable, and he apparently was as unconcerned as to what was passing around him, as though he was a perfect stranger to the whole proceedings.\(^8^5\)

The Speaker of the House offered the Representatives Hall to the Mormons for preaching on the following day, Sunday, January 1, 1843. Joseph designated Apostles Orson Hyde and John Taylor for that assignment. Before the speakers began, the assembled Saints sang a rousing hymn, “The Spirit of God like a Fire Is Burning.” Hyde spoke in the morning meeting, giving a history of the gospel from Old Testament to modern times. Taylor spoke in the afternoon about repentance, baptism, the laying on of hands, and the need for acceptance of the restored gospel.\(^8^6\)

The following day Joseph arose in good spirits, predicting that he should not go to Missouri, dead or alive. Judge Pope convened court at 10:00 AM, entering the courtroom with seven ladies, who took their seats beside the judge.\(^8^7\) Nathaniel Pope was then fifty-eight years old and one of the most distinguished men in Illinois. He had served as the first territorial secretary of Illinois and had been a territorial delegate to Congress. He was “rather above than below the medium height and rather corpulent,” possessing a fine legal mind and considerable intellectual power. “His native judgment was strong and profound and his intellect quick and far-reaching, while both were thoroughly trained and disciplined by study.” He was a dignified man, yet courteous to those in his courtroom.\(^8^8\)

Because of the great publicity attending Smith’s case, the courtroom was packed on each day of the hearing. The

\(^8^5\) “From the Editor,” Alton (Ill.) Telegraph and Democratic Review, January 7, 1843, 2.


\(^8^7\) Smith, Journal, January 1, 1843, in Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 267–68.

ladies in attendance included Judge Pope’s daughters, attorney Butterfield’s daughter, and also Mary Todd Lincoln, who just two months earlier had married the future president of the United States. Rather than force them to find a place among the jostling courtroom spectators, the gallant Pope furnished seats at the front of the courtroom, near the bench.\(^{89}\)

Apparently, the presence of ladies at a federal court proceeding was unusual; undoubtedly they were there to see the famous Mormon prophet—tall, striking in appearance, and only thirty-seven years old.\(^ {90}\) One anti-Mormon correspondent, the anonymous “Alpha,” observed sarcastically:

> During Smith’s trial Judge Pope sat upon the bench with three ladies upon each side of him.—The smiles of these associate judges added very much to the solemnity of the proceedings. . . . Their attendance . . . was a compliment, I suppose, paid to the virtue of the Holy Prophet. And as they gazed upon his manly form, probably the power of imagination brought around them the fancie scenery of Nauvoo . . . there was Jo and his Mormon virgins, of which rumor, with her thousand tongues; has said so much—and there was his gilded apartments—in which the midnight orgies of barbarous incantations were never heard—and there the prophet perhaps humbly kneeling and praying as prayed the prophets of old, “mine enemies reproach me all the day long, and they are mad against me, swore against me.” . . . Terror is depicted in the countenance of the prophet—his virgins in alarm rush to him, and alternately cast their white arms around his neck, and exclam, “thou are all that this poor heart can cling to.”\(^ {91}\)

---

89. Isaac Newton Arnold, *Reminiscences of the Illinois Bar Forty Years Ago* (1881), 5–7; *Wasp*, January 14, 1843, 1. Abraham Lincoln’s law office was nearby, but there is no evidence he attended the hearing, nor is there any definitive proof that he ever met Joseph Smith, although he may have.


91. Letter to the Quincy (Ill.) Herald, quoted in *Sangamo Journal*, January 26, 1842. Alpha’s letter was sharply criticized in the *Sangamo Journal*, not because of its criticism of Smith, but because of its disrespectful tone in referring to
The state of Illinois was represented by Attorney General Josiah Lamborn, a “remarkable man . . . of the tersest logic.” Only thirty-four years old, Lamborn presented an unforgettable physical appearance—tall and imposing, yet crippled by a congenitally defective foot. Despite his relative youth, he was an experienced and able lawyer, having frequently appeared before the Illinois Supreme Court. Ironically, although he opposed Joseph Smith in this case, he was appointed by Governor Ford two years later to serve as prosecuting attorney at the trial of Smith’s accused murderers.92

Lamborn promptly requested a continuance of the hearing to enable him to prepare his case more fully. Judge Pope granted the request, putting the hearing over to Wednesday. Butterfield asked for and received permission to file objections to the facts set forth in the Boggs affidavit and the Reynolds requisition.93

On the eve of the Wednesday hearing, Smith prophesied that “no very formidable opposition would be raised.”94 He was not to be the only one predicting acquittal. The editor of the Alton Telegraph reported that “from a candid examination of the law I am satisfied the impostor, Joe Smith, will be discharged. He is clearly not a fugitive from justice within the intent and meaning of both the act of Congress and the constitution of the United States.”95

Butterfield, Pope, and the ladies. “Rarely has an article appeared in any of our State papers which has produced a deeper and more general feelings of indignation, than that under notice. It is manifestly the production of an individual, rendered rabid by the fact, that he has no longer control over the person of Joe Smith, or, what is probably quite as important to him, his money,—and who seeks to visit his wrath upon Mr. Butterfield, Judge Pope, and some of the more intelligent and amiable ladies of which our State can boast.” “Case of Joe Smith,” Sangamo Journal, January 26, 1843.

92. Oaks and Hill, Carthage Conspiracy, 84–85. One of Lamborn’s contemporaries remarked, “He could see the point in a case as clear as any lawyer I ever knew, and could elucidate it as ably, never using a word too much or one too few.” Usher F. Linder, Reminiscences of the Early Bench and Bar of Illinois, 2d ed. (Chicago: Chicago Legal News, 1879), 258; Bateman and Selby, Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois, 327.


95. “From the Editor,” Alton (Ill.) Telegraph and Democratic Review, January 7, 1843, 2. Although the editorial was published after Judge Pope rendered his decision, the wording suggests it was written sometime prior.
The Return of Habeas Corpus

On Wednesday, when Judge Pope entered the courtroom, a number of ladies again took their place at either side of the bench. Josiah Lamborn rose and moved to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction. He meant no disrespect to Judge Pope, he said, but this case belonged in state court. In honoring the requisition of Governor Reynolds, Governor Carlin had been acting pursuant to an Illinois statute requiring him to do so. Pope said he would take Lamborn’s motion under submission but would hear the matter in full before making a decision.96

Lamborn then insisted that even if Pope assumed jurisdiction over the case, he could not go behind the extradition papers. To do so would be to try the case on its merits, which was not the proper function of a habeas corpus hearing. Pope suggested that the question was not one of guilt or innocence, but of whether Smith was a fugitive. Lamborn replied that it was not the function of the governor of Illinois, or the court, to determine such an issue, since it would require an inquiry into facts outside the record, and this was improper. Lamborn also argued that whether Smith was in Missouri or Illinois on the day Boggs was shot was irrelevant. “If he prophesied that Boggs should be shot, where should he be tried?” To Lamborn, Missouri was the obvious answer.97

Two attorneys argued on behalf of Joseph Smith—Justin Butterfield and his associate, Benjamin S. Edwards. Going first, Edwards addressed the jurisdictional issues. He said he did not understand why Lamborn, the state attorney general, should prosecute this case. Lamborn was, of course,
permitted in federal court as a courtesy, but Article IV of the United States Constitution provided the basis for the return of fugitives from justice, and federal jurisdiction extended to all cases arising under United States laws. Edwards then went into a discourse on the history of extradition and why it was covered in the Constitution, noting that one of the reasons the Revolutionary War was fought was to put a halt to improper extradition from the colonies to Great Britain.98

Justin Butterfield, of course, was the star of the defense show. When he rose to speak, he was dressed “a la Webster” in a blue dress coat with metal buttons and a buff vest.99 All eyes were on him, and he rose to the occasion, making a memorable opening statement to the court. As recalled later by an Illinois lawyer who was present at the hearing:

Mr. Butterfield . . . rose with dignity, and amidst the most profound silence. Pausing, and running his eyes admiringly from the central figure of Judge Pope, along the rows of lovely women on each side of him, he said: “May it please the Court, I appear before you to-day under circumstances most novel and peculiar. I am to address the ‘Pope’ (bowing to the Judge) surrounded by angels (bowing still lower to the ladies), in the presence of the holy Apostles, in behalf of the Prophet of the Lord.”100

Butterfield also addressed the jurisdiction issue. Lamborn had argued it was “the general opinion of the bar” that this matter should be heard by the state court. Butterfield said he had great respect for the bar, but only contempt for “barroom” opinion.101 Legal precedent should control. He pointed out that the requisition and warrant purported to be based on the Constitution and federal statutes.102 In issuing these documents, the

98. Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 273–74.
99. Daniel Webster was one of the most famous lawyers, orators, and statesmen of the day. Webster had argued many famous cases before the United States Supreme Court, was later elected to the United States Senate, and became secretary of state. See, for example, Robert V. Remini, Daniel Webster: The Man and His Time (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997). Butterfield was “a personal friend and warm admirer” of Daniel Webster. Bateman and Selby, Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois, 69.
100. Arnold, Reminiscences of the Illinois Bar, 6. A more contemporaneous, though abbreviated, account of Butterfield’s opening statement can be found in “Opening in Joe Smith’s Case,” The New Orleans Daily Picayune, February 24, 1843: “I rise under the most extraordinary circumstances in this age and country, religious as it is: I appear before the Pope, supported on either hand by Angels, to defend the Prophet of the Lord!” (Italics in original.)
101. Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 274.
102. U.S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2; An Act Respecting Fugitives from Justice, and Persons Escaping from the Service of Their Masters (February 12, 1793), sec. 1, Laws of the United States of America, 2:331.
governors of Missouri and Illinois were acting as appointees of the United States, and both were bound to support the Constitution. When a person’s rights are invaded under a law of the United States, Butterfield argued, he has no remedy except in the courts of the United States. The state legislature had no right to interfere with federal laws, and if they purported to do so, their acts would be void. Indeed, as Butterfield interpreted the law, not only did the federal court have the right to assume jurisdiction, it had the exclusive right to do so.

Next, Butterfield discussed the insufficiency of the Boggs affidavit, which formed the basis for Governor Reynolds’s requisition. The affidavit did not recite any facts demonstrating that Joseph Smith had committed a crime in Missouri or that he was a fugitive from justice. The governor of Illinois had no legal right to transfer Smith to Missouri unless he had fled from that state. Emphasizing this point, Butterfield repeated the key words of the Constitutional mandate: Only a person, charged with a crime, who “Shall Flee” from justice, should be delivered up to the governor of another state.

Finally, Butterfield argued that his client had a right to prove facts “not repugnant to the return”—in other words, Smith could seek to prove facts that did not contradict the evidence upon which the arrest warrant was based (in this case, the Boggs affidavit). To this end, Butterfield submitted several evidentiary documents for consideration of the court. In one of them (see fig. 2), Joseph Smith stated under oath that he was not in Missouri “at the time of the commission of the alleged crime set forth in the [Boggs] affidavit.” In a second document, a number of leading Mormons averred to facts that accounted for the presence of Smith in Nauvoo from February 10 to July 1, 1842. In a third sworn statement, several prominent

103. Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 274–75.
104. Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 275–76; U.S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2.
106. Affidavit of Wilson Law, et al., State of Missouri vs. Joseph Smith, Illinois Circuit Court, January 4, 1843, in History of the Church, 5:242–43. Hyrum Smith, Willard Richards, and William Marks said that they had been with Smith in his home on the evening of May 5. Hyrum Smith, Willard Richards, Henry G. Sherwood, John Gaylon, and William Clayton said that they attended an officers’ drill in Nauvoo on May 6 from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM, and that Smith had been present during the whole of that time. Willard Richards, William Clayton, Hyrum Smith, and Lorin Walker said that they had seen and conversed with Smith in Nauvoo daily from February 10 to July 1, 1842, and knew that he had never been absent
Fig. 2. Joseph Smith’s denial, January 2, 1843.
non-Mormons, including Stephen A. Douglas, stated that they were in Nauvoo the day after the shooting and that they had seen Smith reviewing the Nauvoo Legion on that day (which proved that he could not have been in Independence, Missouri, on the previous day).\(^{107}\)

These sworn statements, Butterfield argued, demonstrated that Joseph Smith had not fled from Missouri justice. To the contrary, his client had been dining with a judge of the highest court of Illinois, three hundred miles away from Jackson County, Missouri. Permitting Smith to prove he was in Illinois at the time of the shooting was not “repugnant to the return” because Boggs had not alleged otherwise.\(^{108}\)

To Justin Butterfield, sending a man to Missouri who had never been outside Illinois at the time the crime was allegedly committed constituted an attack on the basic liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. Joseph Smith’s fate this day might be ours tomorrow, he argued. It was a matter of history that Smith and his people had been murdered and driven from Missouri. It was better he be sent to the gallows than back to Missouri. He was an innocent and unoffending man. The only difference between his people and others was that his people believed in prophecy and most others did not.\(^{109}\)

Willard Richards, Joseph’s personal secretary who had taken extensive notes throughout the trial, wrote that it proceeded with the utmost decorum, even though the courtroom had been crowded. Judge Pope was highly respected by all, and the lawyers, Butterfield, Edwards, and Lamborn, had conducted themselves with dignity. He praised Lamborn for avoiding the sort of inflammatory statements that had been common in


other legal proceedings against the Mormons. After Butterfield concluded his arguments, the court called a recess and Smith and Butterfield retired to the judges’ room. There the Mormon prophet was introduced to an unnamed senator and the ladies who had been present for the argument, including Governor Ford’s wife.  

Following Lamborn’s rebuttal, Judge Pope adjourned court until the following day so he could prepare his opinion. Smith retired to Judge Adams’s house where he visited with Hyrum Smith, Orson Hyde, and Theodore Turley. In the evening, Smith, Hyde, and Wilson Law left in a carriage sent by Marshal William Prentice to dine and spend the evening with Prentice, his family, and others. Both Justin Butterfield and Josiah Lamborn were among the guests in attendance that evening, as well as Judge Douglas and William Pope, Judge Pope’s son. Smith reported to Richards that he “had a Most splendid Supper with many interesting anecdotes and every thing to render the visit agreeable.”

**Judge Pope Delivers His Decision**

On Thursday morning, January 5, the courtroom was again packed, “mostly . . . [with] a very respectable class in Society anxious to hear the decision although the public expression was decidedly in favor of an acquittal.” Again, a number of ladies took their places at both sides of the bench. Judge Pope began by thanking the lawyers for their able arguments that had “been of great assistance in the examination of the important question arising in this cause.” The consequences that might flow from an erroneous decision had “impelled [him] to bestow upon it the most anxious consideration.”

The important constitutional question, as seen by the judge, was “whether a citizen of the state of Illinois . . . can be transported to Missouri, as a fugitive from justice, when he has never fled from that State.” First, however, it was necessary to address the motion to dismiss made by Lamborn on jurisdictional grounds. This was an important question of the

---

111. Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 278. William Prentice, the marshal, was very friendly toward the Mormon party during their stay in Springfield, spending time to socialize and exchange stories and jokes.
day, as federal courts were still defining the degree of their supremacy over state courts. In this instance, the state of Illinois had passed an extradition act authorizing the governor of Illinois to return a fugitive to another state when the executive of the other state demanded it. Lamborn had argued that this was the statute that should govern the Smith case, and therefore state court was the appropriate forum. Pope disagreed. Since Congress had conferred the power of extradition on the governor of Illinois, no act of Illinois could supersede that power. The Constitution and laws of the United States were the supreme law of the land. If the legislature of Illinois had merely intended to make it the duty of the governor to exercise a power granted by Congress, and no more, the executive would be acting by authority of the United States. “If it intended more, the law [was] unconstitutional and void.”

Therefore, Judge Pope concluded, he had jurisdiction over the case at bar and Lamborn’s motion to dismiss must be denied. The judge sidestepped the question of whether the federal courts had exclusive jurisdiction to hear such matters, as urged by Butterfield. That question was one that “this court is not called upon to decide.”

Judge Pope then turned his attention to the merits of the case. The Boggs affidavit, which he recited, “furnished the only evidence on which the governor of Illinois could act.” Butterfield had introduced affidavits proving that Joseph Smith could not have been in Missouri on the day Boggs was shot, but Lamborn had objected to consideration of those affidavits “on the ground that the court could not look behind the return.” Pope deemed it unnecessary to decide that point because, in his view, the Boggs affidavit was fatally defective on its face.

To justify sending Smith to Missouri to stand trial, Boggs should have distinctly stated, first, that Smith had committed a crime and, second, that he had committed it in Missouri. Regarding the first point, Boggs had averred “from evidence and information now in his possession” that Smith was an “accessory before the fact” of the intended murder. If Boggs truly had evidence and information that a crime had been committed, he should have enumerated them under oath in his affidavit.

Boggs was shot on the 6th of May. The affidavit was made on the 20th of July following. Here was time for inquiry, which would confirm into certainty or dissipate his suspicions. He had time to collect facts to be laid before a grand jury, or be incorporated in his affidavit. The court is bound to assume that this would have been the course of Mr. Boggs, but that his suspicions were light and unsatisfactory.

Moreover, in claiming that Smith was accessory before the fact of the intended murder, Boggs was stating a legal conclusion. Such conclusions
were the province of the judge. “What acts constitute a man an accessory is a question of law, and not always of easy solution. Mr. Boggs’ opinion, then, is not authority. He should have given the facts.”

As to the second point, the affidavit never actually said that Joseph Smith had fled from Missouri justice. In order to show that the accused was a fugitive from justice, the affidavit should have set forth facts demonstrating that he had committed a crime in Missouri. Pope noted that the Reynolds requisition went significantly beyond the matters set forth in the Boggs affidavit:

The governor of Missouri, in his demand, calls Smith a fugitive from justice, charged with being accessory before the fact to an assault with intent to kill, made by one O.P. Rockwell, on Lilburn W. Boggs, in this state (Missouri). This governor expressly refers to the affidavit as his authority for that statement. Boggs, in his affidavit, does not call Smith a fugitive from justice, nor does he state a fact from which the governor had a right to infer it. Neither does the name of O. P. Rockwell appear in the affidavit, nor does Boggs say Smith fled.

Judge Pope could consider only the facts contained in the affidavit of Boggs as “having any legal existence.” The misstatements and overstatements in the requisition and warrant were not supported by oath and could not be received as evidence “to deprive a citizen of his liberty, and transport him to a foreign state for trial.”

Pope explained that the state of Illinois had a duty to pass laws making it criminal for one of its citizens “to aid, abet, counsel, or advise, any person to commit a crime in her sister state.” A person violating such a law “would be amenable to the laws of Illinois, executed by its own tribunals.” Lamborn had argued “with a zeal indicating sincerity” that Missouri was entitled to entertain jurisdiction of crimes committed in other states having an effect in Missouri. “But no adjudged case or dictum was adduced in support of it. The court conceives that none can be.”

A matter brought to the court on habeas corpus was to be “most strictly construed in favor of liberty.” The 1793 Act of Congress provided that a requisition had to be based on an indictment or an affidavit supporting the charges. Since the foundational evidence supporting extradition was insufficient in this case, Smith must be discharged.

One can imagine the jubilation that Pope’s decision produced in Joseph Smith and his followers in the courtroom. The Mormon prophet stood, bowed to the judge, and thanked him. Then Pope invited Smith and Butterfield to his chambers where they spent an hour in conversation together. The astounding growth of Nauvoo came up in conversation and Butterfield asked Smith to prophesy how large the city might become.
Smith refused to be pinned down to precise numbers but said he would tell them what he had told people when he first came to Commerce. The old inhabitants had said, “We’ll be dammed if you can” build up a city in this place; Smith prophesied that he could. To Pope and Butterfield, he said, “We have now about 12,000 inhabitants.” The Mormons would build a great city, he said, for they had the stakes, and now they had only to “fill up the interstices.”

Judge Pope, having noticed the diligent note taking of Willard Richards, asked Smith if Richards could transform Pope’s oral opinion into a written one that could be given to the newspapers. Richards worked on that project for the remainder of the day.

On the following day, January 6, Smith and Richards met Butterfield at the federal court. Richards delivered the opinion he had prepared for Judge Pope. Smith handed over two promissory notes of $230 each to Butterfield for his attorney fees, which, together with $40 that had already been paid, made a total fee of $500 for Butterfield’s work on the case. (Apparently Butterfield had sufficient confidence in Joseph Smith

114. History of the Church, 5:231–32; Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 284–85. Smith’s estimate of the population of Nauvoo at that time was likely a little high, but probably not by much if the Mormon population in the nearby towns was counted. The Nauvoo population in 1842 has been estimated at four thousand, rising to twelve thousand in 1844, making it nearly as large as, if not larger than, Chicago. Susan Easton Black, “How Large Was the Population of Nauvoo?” BYU Studies 35, no. 2 (1995): 91–95.


116. History of the Church, 5:232; Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 285. It appears that Judge Pope used Richards’s write-up as the basis for his published opinion but with some modifications. See United States, Decision of Nathaniel Pope, Richards Draft, Springfield, Illinois, January 5, 1843, Ex Parte JS for Accessory to Boggs Assault, Church History Library; History of the Church, 5:223–32, 244.

117. The notes were signed by Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, and “Moffat & Hunter” (probably Levi Moffat and Edward Hunter). Faulring, American Prophet’s Record, 285–86.

118. It will be recalled that Governor Carlin had offered a reward of $200 for the capture of Joseph Smith. An anti-Mormon letter, published anonymously in the Quincy Herald and republished in the Sangamo Journal, claimed that
to be willing to accept his promissory notes, even though he had opposed Joseph’s petition for bankruptcy on grounds of alleged fraud.)

Smith asked Pope if he could have an exclusive copy of the judge’s final decision for publication in the Nauvoo newspaper, the *Wasp*. He wanted to print the decision before Springfield’s *Sangamo Journal*, edited by Simeon Francis, could print it. Smith explained that Francis had published “much against the Church,” and “we have a little pride in being the first.”119 Predictably, Judge Pope declined this request but said he would give James Adams a chance to copy it as soon as it was finished.120 As it turned out, Pope’s decision was published in the *Sangamo Journal* on January 19, 1843, and in the *Wasp* on January 28, 1843.

William Clayton had been busy copying key documents from the court file, and the Mormon contingent took certified copies of them to Governor Ford’s office, along with a prepared order for Ford to sign.121 The executive order, dated January 6, 1843, stated that “there is now no further cause for arresting or detaining Joseph Smith . . . by virtue of any proclamation or executive warrant heretofore issued by the governor of this state.”122

“Gen. Law of the Nauvoo Legion brought Smith [to Springfield] and intended to claim the reward of Smith’s attorney fee, (a glorious state of things) but was shamed out of it.” “Case of Joe Smith,” *Sangamo Journal*, January 26, 1843.

119. The *Sangamo Journal* had published John C. Bennett’s salacious charges against Joseph Smith and was generally critical of the Mormon prophet.


121. William Clayton, Journal, January 6, 1843, depository. The documents copied by Clayton were Boggs’s affidavit, Reynolds’s requisition, Carlin’s arrest warrant as reissued by Ford, Carlin’s proclamation, Smith’s petition for habeas corpus, the writ of habeas corpus, the order of the court, Smith’s affidavit, and the affidavits of the eleven others that had been submitted by Butterfield. Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 285–86; *History of the Church*, 5:233–44.

Thus, Joseph Smith “had scored another victory over his old enemies in Missouri,” but from an objective standpoint, the victory was a hollow one. Smith had wanted a victory “on the merits” and understood from his lawyer that Judge Pope would not rule on a “technicality.” Nevertheless, Pope did not rule on the merits of the underlying charge. He did not express any opinion on the question of whether Smith had ordered the assassination of Boggs. Indeed, Pope did not even make a finding on whether or not the Mormon prophet had fled from justice. Instead, Pope ruled that the Boggs declaration was insufficient to support the claim that Joseph had fled from justice. This could be considered a ruling “on the merits” only if a narrow view of the merits was taken.

Return to Nauvoo

The Mormon contingent departed from Springfield on Saturday, January 7, 1843. Although the “travelling [was] very bad” and the weather so cold “as to turn the horses white with frost,” there was an air of jubilation as they rode along. Their prophet once again was free. The party sang a jubilee hymn that Wilson Law had composed to commemorate the occasion. Later, when the party reached Captain Dutch’s where they were to spend the first night, more verses were added and it was sung over again.

Mormon Jubilee

And are you sure the news is true?
And are you sure he’s free?
Then let us join with one accord,
And have a jubilee.


125. “The Mormon Jubilee,” *Wasp*, January 14, 1843, 1. An earlier, less-polished version was entered in Joseph Smith’s journal; see Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 287–89. The hymn came to be known as the “Mormon Jubilee.” It was to be sung to the tune of “Auld Lang Syne” or William Mickle’s “There’s Nae Luck about the House.” Apparently, the piece was composed by Law and Willard Richards as the group was riding toward Captain Dutch’s. *History of the Church*, 5:246. I have included the chorus twice because of a slight variation, although it is repeated several times in the original.
We’ll have a jubilee, my friends,
We’ll have a jubilee;
With heart and voice we’ll all rejoice
In that our Prophet’s free.

Success unto the Fed’ral Court.
Judge Pope presiding there,
And also his associates true,
So lovely and so fair.

We’ll have a jubilee, my friends,
We’ll have a jubilee;
With heart and voice we’ll all rejoice,
In that our Gen’ral’s free.

And to our learned counsellors
We owe our gratitude,
Because that they in freedom’s cause
Like valiant men have stood.

Chorus

In the defence of innocence,
They made the truth to bear;
Reynold’s and Carlin’s baseness both
Did fearlessly declare.

Chorus

Edwards and Butterfield and Pope,
We’ll mention with applause,
Because that they like champions bold
Support the Federal laws.

Chorus

Th’ Attorney Gen’ral of the State,
His duty nobly did,
And ably brought those errors forth,
From which we now are freed.

Chorus

One word in praise of Thomas Ford,
Our Governor so true;
He understands the people’s rights,
And will protect them too.

Chorus

There is one more we wish enroll’d
Upon the book of fame;
That master spirit in all jokes,
And ‘Prentice’ but in name.

Chorus
The Sucker State we'll praise in song,
She's succour'd us indeed,
And we will succor her in turn,
In every time of need.

Chorus

Our charter'd rights she has maintain'd
Through opposition great;
Long may her charter champions live,
Still to protect the State.

Chorus

We'll stand by her thro sun and shade
Through calm and tempest, too;
And when she needs our Legion's aid,
'Tis ready at Nauvoo.

Chorus

With warmest hearts we bid farewell,
To those we leave behind;
The citizens of Springfield all
So courteous and so kind.

Chorus

But Captain Dutch we cannot pass,
Without a word of praise;
For he's the king of comic songs
As well as comic ways.

Chorus

And the fair ladies of his house,
The flow'rs of Morgan's plains,
Who from the soft Piano bring
Such soul-enchanting strains.

Chorus

And now we're bound for home, my friends,
A band of brothers true,
To cheer the hearts of those we love,
In beautiful Nauvoo.

We'll have a jubilee, my friends,
We'll have a jubilee;
With heart and voice we'll all rejoice,
In that our Mayor's free.

At Captain Dutch's, the party retired late after an evening of song and good humor. The next morning, they arose early and continued their journey to Nauvoo. Along the way, the horses pulling one of their carriages bolted, causing the carriage to slip off a bridge and suffer damage.
Not letting this dampen their spirits, all agreed they should send the bill to Governor Boggs. At every stop along the way they sang the jubilee to raise their spirits, arriving in Nauvoo on Tuesday, January 10, 1843, to welcoming throngs. Joseph Smith was especially touched when his elderly mother, Lucy, came in and grasped his arm, “overjoyed to behold her son free once more.”126 Eight days later the Smiths hosted a celebratory dinner party at the Mansion House for some fifty people. The occasion coincided with the Smiths’ fifteenth wedding anniversary, and the jubilee was again sung, along with a second jubilee composed for the occasion by Eliza R. Snow.127

**Postscript**

For the most part, the non-Mormon press was complimentary of Joseph Smith’s Springfield lawyers and of Judge Pope’s ruling.128 The *Sangamo Journal* reported, “The arguments presented by the counsel for Smith were conclusive. . . . In our next paper we shall publish that Opinion of Judge Pope—which will be found to be a most able one—presenting all the facts and law, so clearly that all who examine it will unite in those commendations which were bestowed upon it when delivered from the bench.”129 According to the *Alton Telegraph*, “The decision of Judge Pope was uncommonly clear and lucid, and gave universal satisfaction, so far as I have heard any opinion expressed.”130 A correspondent for the *St. Louis Republican* was even more enthusiastic: “The decision was one of the most chaste and beautiful things I ever listened to, and the correctness of the

126. Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 290–91; *History of the Church*, 5:247. A proclamation was issued under Brigham Young’s name setting aside January 17 as “a day of humiliation, fasting, praise, prayer, and thanksgiving.” The bishops of the several wards were instructed to schedule meetings where one of the brethren who had been in Springfield could attend and give a history of the legal proceedings. *History of the Church*, 5:248–49.
128. “While some of JOE SMITH’S former counsel . . . were advising him to ‘secrete himself on swamps,’ and avoid an arrest under the requisition of the Governor, Mr. Butterfield, on consultation, advised him to the manly course of trying the legality of the writs for his arrest before the competent tribunal—the U.S. Circuit Court of Illinois.” “Case of Joe Smith,” *Sangamo Journal*, January 26, 1843.
conclusions to which his Honor arrived, has, so far as my observation extends, been universally acquiesced in.”

Newspapers were far less charitable, however, toward Joseph Smith. The *Louisville Daily Journal* “suppose[d]” the opinion was correct, but opined that Smith “ought to be punished for the crime under the laws of Illinois.”  The *Alton Telegraph* was more blunt: “Joe Smith, for the time being, has escaped that punishment he so richly merits, but a righteous retribution will yet be visited upon him. No man, whose hands are stained with the blood of a fellow mortal can successfully elude the punishment. The day of its visitation upon him may be far distant, but arrive it certainly will.”

Judge Pope’s decision was destined to become an important one throughout the land on issues of extradition, habeas corpus, and federal jurisdiction and was cited in many of the leading treatises on the subject long after all the participants were dead. Both in terms of its impact on the law, as well as the notoriety it received in its day, this was the most famous of the more than one hundred legal cases in which Joseph Smith was involved during his lifetime. Had Smith’s case come up in our day, however, a different standard would apply, as an Illinois citizen may now be extradited under state law if he commits an act, even though in Illinois, that “intentionally result[s] in a crime” in the demanding state.

131. The Springfield correspondent of the *St. Louis (Mo.) Republican*, writing under the date of January 5, 1843, is quoted in “Joe Smith Discharged,” *Louisville (Ky.) Daily Journal*, January 13, 1843.
135. “The Governor of this State may also surrender, on demand of the Executive Authority of any other state, any person in this State charged in such other state . . . with committing an act in this State . . . intentionally resulting in a crime in the state whose Executive Authority is making the demand.” Illinois Criminal Extradition Act, 725 Illinois Criminal Statutes 225, Section 6 (emphasis added). The Illinois statute, enacted in 1955, is based on the Uniform Criminal
Not long after the Smith case was decided, Governor Ford was faced with a strikingly similar situation involving a requisition by Missouri for the extradition of an Illinois citizen alleged to be a fugitive from justice. This matter involved a man named Richard Eels, apparently an abolitionist, who had been charged with stealing slaves from a citizen of Missouri. Upon investigating the incident, Ford concluded that Eels had not been in Missouri at the time of the incident and therefore could not be a fugitive from Missouri justice. Exercising his gubernatorial discretion, Ford declined to issue a warrant for Eels’s arrest. After Missouri Governor Reynolds complained, Ford responded with a lengthy letter, dated April 13, 1843, explaining his decision. Ford said that he had not made any determination as to the facts of the underlying crime (which he acknowledged to be the province of the Missouri courts) but merely whether Eels had fled from Missouri. He noted Reynolds had not furnished any evidence that Eels was a fugitive. Indeed, should Reynolds provide Ford with “respectable testimony, that Eels was a fugitive from justice” and if it were to be sufficient to “make the evidence already furnished on the other side of the question at all doubtful,” Ford stood “ready to issue another warrant.” This suggests that if Ford (rather than Carlin) had been Illinois governor when the requisition for Joseph Smith relating to the Boggs assault was received, he might have been persuaded to exercise his discretion not to issue an arrest warrant in the first place.  

Ford recognized, however, that the judiciary might not be as free as the executive to consider the underlying merits on a return of habeas corpus: “But the question may be asked why not suffer the arrest to be made, and then leave the matter to be decided by the courts of Justice on a writ of habeas Corpus? The obvious answer to this, seems to be, that every executive warrant of arrest contains a recital, that the individual sought to be apprehended is a fugitive, the truth of which allegation the courts might have no authority to enquire into.”

Let us return briefly to Porter Rockwell, whose presence in Missouri at the time of the Boggs assault was the genesis of the allegations against

---

Extradition Act, adopted by most states. The change from the prior law was regarded as an important step in aiding the fight against organized crime. See Albert J. Hamo, “Some Needed Changes in Illinois Criminal Procedure,” 1953 University of Illinois Law Forum, 425. Of course, Judge Pope might still have ruled that the Missouri requisition was inadequately supported by factual allegations in the Boggs affidavit.

136. Thomas Ford to Thomas Reynolds, April 13, 1843, copy in Church History Library.

137. Ford to Reynolds, April 13, 1843.
Smith. Apparently he found life on the lam depressing in Pennsylvania and New Jersey (whence he had fled after being released by habeas corpus in Nauvoo), and after the favorable decision by Judge Pope on Smith’s extradition case, decided to risk a return to Nauvoo. Unfortunately for him, on March 4, 1843, he was spotted by a bounty hunter in St. Louis as he was changing boats to go up river to Nauvoo. He was unceremoniously taken under guard to Independence, where he languished in jail for nine months. Twice he made unsuccessful attempts to escape, which resulted only in his being more isolated in his imprisonment. His captors promised him that if he would testify against Smith, a deal could be made that would give him freedom, but he refused to do so. When his case was finally brought before a grand jury, it determined there was insufficient evidence even to indict him, much less convict him of the crime.

Rockwell was released from his imprisonment and made his way to Nauvoo, where he appeared unannounced at Joseph and Emma Smith’s Mansion House in the midst of a party on Christmas Day 1843. As recounted in Joseph’s journal, “a man apparently drunk, with his hair long and falling over his shoulders come in and acted like a Missourian. I commanded the Capt[ain] of the police to put him out of doors. In the scuffle, I looked him full in the face and to my great suprize and Joy untold I discovered it was Orrin Porter Rockwell, just arrivd from a years imprisonment in Mo [Missouri].” According to some accounts, Smith promised that Rockwell’s enemies

138. This was risky for Rockwell, since he was undeniably in Missouri at the time of the Boggs shooting and therefore could not avail himself of the argument that he had not fled from the state.

139. “Orin Porter Rockwell, the Mormon confined in our county jail some time since for the attempted assassination of ex-governor Boggs, was indicted by our last grand jury for escaping from the county jail some weeks since. . . . There was not sufficient proof adduced against him to justify an indictment for shooting at ex-governor Boggs; and the grand jury, therefore, did not indict him for that offence.” Independent Expositor; Niles' Register, September 30, 1843, as quoted in Hubert Howe Bancroft, History of Utah 1540–1886 (San Francisco: The History Company, 1890), 156.

would have no power over him so long as he remained loyal and true and did not cut his hair. Despite many dangerous and violent encounters throughout his adventure-filled life, Rockwell (with his distinctively long hair) remained alive and well until 1878, when he died of a heart attack in Salt Lake City at the age of sixty-five.\textsuperscript{141}

**Conclusion**

If we reflect back to that triumphal return to Nauvoo from Springfield in January 1843, when a jubilee composed in Joseph Smith’s honor was sung at every stop, we sense the exhilaration he must have felt. He had been received in the state capital by some of the highest-ranking officials in Illinois. He had watched two of his Apostles deliver sermons to a full house in Springfield’s Representatives Hall. Ladies of the highest society had been drawn to court to see him. A non-Mormon newspaper had noted what fine-looking figures he and his men cut. The United States attorney for the district of Illinois had stood as his lawyer. A preeminent federal judge had delivered a widely praised opinion assuring he would not be sent to Missouri to stand trial in connection with the Boggs assault.

Yet the same events, seen from the outside in, paint a more ominous picture. In response to the threat of extradition, the Nauvoo City Council had passed ordinances giving its municipal court (with Smith as chief justice) habeas corpus powers well beyond what was generally considered proper. While he was received by leading politicians in Springfield, it is clear in hindsight that Mormon votes were being courted. Governor Ford tried to warn the Prophet about exerting too much political influence, but Smith brushed him aside.\textsuperscript{142} It is true that ladies had been drawn to see him, but at least part of the draw was no doubt curiosity about his rumored polygynous lifestyle. While Judge Pope’s opinion was praised as legally

\textsuperscript{141} “Death of Porter Rockwell,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, June 11, 1878, 2; “Porter Rockwell,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, June 12, 1878, 2; Schindler, *Orrin Porter Rockwell*, 366. Joseph F. Smith, then an Apostle, later to become Church President, delivered Rockwell’s eulogy. “He had his little faults, but Porter’s life on earth, taken altogether, was one worthy of example, and reflected honor upon the church.” The anti-Mormon *Salt Lake Tribune* dismissed this as a “fitting tribute of one outlaw to the memory of another.” “Rockwell’s Funeral,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, June 13, 1878, 4; Schindler, *Orrin Porter Rockwell*, 368.

\textsuperscript{142} Ford advised Smith to refrain from all “political electioneering,” but Smith replied that he always “acted on principle” and that the Mormons were driven to unify their vote because of being persecuted and not because of the influence of Smith. Smith, Journal, January 6, 1843, in Faulring, *American Prophet’s Record*, 286.
sound, the feeling persisted that Joseph had once again ducked through legal loopholes, and this rankled his enemies. Less than eighteen months later, the Mormon prophet would be assassinated by an enraged mob.

The tide of public opinion had already begun to turn against Smith and the Mormons when Missouri’s first extradition attempt ended with a ruling by Judge Douglas on a legal technicality. Some even suggested that Carlin and Douglas had conspired to stage a sham trial. When this second extradition attempt ended in a similar dismissal without addressing the underlying charge, even newspapers that supported the verdict on technical grounds believed that Smith should somehow be tried and punished for his crime. When a new requisition was issued by Missouri several months later on the old treason charges, and when the Nauvoo Municipal Court purported to hear the merits of the case on a writ of habeas corpus and released Smith forthwith, it only served to strengthen conviction of the anti-Mormon element that Smith was dangerously above the law.

The murder of Joseph Smith in Carthage Jail the following year was the result of a widely felt indignation against the Mormons in general and Smith in particular. The officially ordered destruction on public nuisance grounds of the Nauvoo Expositor, a newspaper Smith believed had slanderously attacked him and whose editorial content he believed was likely to provoke violence, is generally credited as being the spark that ignited the flame. Nevertheless, the Mormon prophet’s successful repulsion of the three attempts by Missouri to extradite him was an important contributing factor in the anti-Mormon frenzy.

143. Warsaw Signal, July 14, 1841, 2.

144. As a further example, the Alton Telegraph proclaimed, “We believe [Smith] combines in his composition all the elements of a base, wicked, dangerous and corrupt man. And that he has openly violated the laws of God and man for which he should be severely punished.” “The Quincy Herald, Judge Pope, the Discharge of Joe Smith,” Alton Telegraph and Democratic Review, January 28, 1843, 2.

145. As the Alton Telegraph sarcastically put it, “He [Joe] . . . was taken before that very impartial and disinterested legal tribunal, the Municipal Court of Nauvoo. The officers of this misnamed court of justice are composed of the most blinded, infatuated and unprincipled of Joe’s deluded followers, and the result was precisely what every man of common sense might have known it would be—a discharge of their Prophet from the legal custody of the officers of the law.” “Joe Smith,” Alton Telegraph and Democratic Review, July 15, 1843, 2; emphasis in original. I plan to deal with the interesting facts and law of Missouri’s third extradition request in a subsequent paper.
The endeavors of Missouri to bring Joseph Smith back for trial were splashed across the pages of the newspapers of the day. It mattered not to the critics that Smith turned to the law to avoid extradition; they saw him as having taken advantage of legal technicalities and raw political power. Believing their elected officials and judges lacked the power and the will to bring the Mormon prophet to justice, the mob in Carthage became judge and executioner, shoving the law aside like a troublesome boulder in the road.

Morris A. Thurston (morris@morristthurston.com) has done extensive legal research for the Joseph Smith Papers Project (especially regarding the Nauvoo period) and is an assistant lecturer at Brigham Young University’s J. Reuben Clark Law School. He recently retired as a senior litigation partner in the global law firm Latham & Watkins. Thurston received a BA from Brigham Young University and a JD from Harvard Law School. Among his publications is a book on memoir writing titled *Breathe Life into Your Life Story*, which he coauthored with his wife, Dawn. He is currently working on articles about other Joseph Smith legal cases, along with biographies of several of his pioneer ancestors.
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Singing the Word of God
Five Hymns by President Frederick G. Williams

Frederick G. Williams

Although largely overlooked today, Frederick G. Williams (1787–1842) wore many hats and played an important role in the early days of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He was Second Counselor in the First Presidency (1833–37); a personal scribe to the Prophet Joseph Smith (1832–36); the principal doctor for the Saints in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois (1830–42); military commander, spy, scout, historian, doctor, and paymaster for Zion’s Camp (1834); trustee of the Church-sponsored Kirtland School (1835); publisher of the first LDS hymnal and Doctrine and Covenants (1835); artist for the plans of the Independence Temple and the Kirtland Town Plat (1835–36); editor of the Church’s Northern Times newspaper (1835–36); an officer of the Kirtland Safety Society “bank” (1836–37); a justice of the peace in Geauga County Ohio (1836–37); and a landowner in Kirtland who retained his farm so that the Lord would have a “strong hold” in the city for five years (D&C 64:21). Thanks to a recently catalogued document found in the LDS Archives in Salt Lake City, we can now add hymn writer to the list of Williams’s accomplishments.

It will be the purpose of this article to establish Frederick G. Williams as the author of five restoration hymns—originally published in The Evening and the Morning Star, later in the first hymnal and in subsequent LDS hymnals—using a series of important evidentiary steps. Perhaps even more importantly, a close-reading comparison will show that the hymns were inspired by a personal gift of tongues experience that was recorded by President Williams in the Kirtland Revelation Book in 1833; hymn texts deriving their language from a miraculous gift of tongues experience is a singular occurrence in Church history. This article will also trace the provenance of the recently catalogued document from Emma Smith through
It has been a desire of mine for many years to see a comprehensive biography on Frederick G. Williams, my progenitor and namesake, come to fruition. The first significant step toward this goal began when my wife, Carol, and I moved from South Gate, California, to Provo, Utah, to attend Brigham Young University in 1965. We determined to do research in the Church Historian’s Office of the LDS Church and to visit with as many relatives as we could find. The Church archives had a file containing President Williams’s papers, and they also had his portrait and his 1837 medical ledger. We were permitted to copy the file and portions of the ledger. The most fruitful contact among President Williams’s descendants was my Aunt Elizabeth Williams Rogers, who turned over to me assorted papers, letters, and journals that her mother, Nancy Abigail Clement Williams, had used in writing her book, After 100 Years (1951), the first biography on Frederick G. Williams.

The second significant step came when Carol and I moved to Madison to attend the University of Wisconsin for my MA and PhD degrees in Luso-Brazilian literature. During the five years we lived there (1966–1971), we took advantage of the relative proximity to Nauvoo, Illinois, and Kirtland, Ohio, and traveled to those and other Church history locations, searching for documents. We copied President Williams’s probate file in Quincy, Illinois; portions of the Quincy Whig newspaper; civil records in Kirtland and Chardon, Ohio, that touched on his career as a doctor and as a justice of the peace; and records of deeds and taxes. From the stories that had been handed down and collected by Frederick G. Williams’s descendants in Utah and from the civil records we copied in the Midwest, I was able to write “Frederick Granger Williams of the First Presidency of the Church” (BYU Studies 12, no. 3 [1972], 243–61). Over the years, while teaching and publishing in Portuguese studies, I would also take short vacations to Utah to do additional research on President Williams in the Church History Library, and would occasionally
publish my findings, such as the 1988 article “Did Lehi Land in Chile? An Assessment of the Frederick G. Williams Statement,” a sixteen-page paper published by the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies at Brigham Young University.

The third significant step was taken in 1999 when I accepted the invitation to join the faculty of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at BYU, after twenty-seven years teaching at the University of California (first at UCLA and then at UCSB). The move to Utah was providential, for it allowed Carol to sing with the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, and it gave me an opportunity to be near the Church History Library and near professional historians to aid me in my quest. At the family reunion of the descendants of Frederick G. and Rebecca S. Williams, held in Salt Lake City in August of 2006, the Church History Library and Museum of Church History and Art were asked to join together to mount an exhibit on our progenitor. On display in one of the cases was a sheet containing songs written by Frederick G. Williams. I had never seen this document before. I soon learned that it had only recently been catalogued with the other papers belonging to Frederick G. Williams. I immediately began investigating the document’s provenance and sought to learn whether any of the songs had ever been published.

the son of her second husband, Major Lewis Bidamon, until it was donated, along with a cache of some eighty-five other Joseph Smith-related papers, to the LDS Archives in 1937 by Mormon documents collector Wilford C. Woods. The following pages will also highlight the subject of the songs and their significance as the first hymns to focus on the vision of Enoch, revealed to Joseph Smith in November and December of 1830, regarding the Second Coming of Christ, the establishment of Zion, and the return of the city of Enoch at the beginning of the Lord’s millennial reign.

The First LDS Hymnal

In July 1830, three years after Joseph Smith’s marriage to Emma Hale and three months after the Church was organized, the Prophet received a revelation (today’s D&C 25) at Harmony, Pennsylvania, for Emma, then twenty-six years old. Among other things, she was told by the Lord “to make a selection of sacred hymns” (v. 11). Due to a number
of stressful events in her personal life—which included moves from Pennsylvania to New York and from New York to Ohio in the dead of winter, ill health, her husband’s tarring and feathering episode, multiple pregnancies, and the deaths of several children, plus the 1833 destruction of the press in Missouri that had been slated to publish the hymnal—Emma was unable to comply fully with the Lord’s charge until five years later when the first LDS hymnal, *A Collection of Sacred Hymns, for the Church of the Latter Day Saints*, was finally published by F. G. Williams & Co. in Kirtland, dated 1835.

It is likely that soon after the revelation in Pennsylvania, word spread among the members that a hymnal was being considered. However, it was not until the experienced hymn writer and newspaper editor William W. Phelps, then thirty-nine years old, joined the Church in June 1831 and settled in Missouri that same year, that the hymn project started to move toward publication. On April 30, 1832, the original six-member Literary Firm of the Church met in Independence, Missouri, to discuss several items, including the printing of the Book of Commandments, a Church almanac, and a hymnal. The decision reached regarding the latter reads as follows: “Fifthly: Ordered by the Council that the Hymns selected by sister Emma be corrected by br. William W. Phelps.”¹ A month later, on May 29, 1832, the printing office of W. W. Phelps & Co. was dedicated in Independence, Missouri.² In addition to the three scheduled printing projects mentioned above, Phelps began to publish (in June 1832) the first LDS newspaper, *The Evening and the Morning Star*.

The *Star* provided a publication outlet for the hymns being considered for the hymnal, and indeed a total of twenty-eight hymns, songs, and poems were printed (but without author attribution) on the back pages of the first fourteen issues of the *Star* before the press was destroyed in July

---

¹ Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., *Far West Record: Minutes of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1844* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983), 46.
² Cannon and Cook, *Far West Record*, 49–50.
of 1833. Today we know that some of those hymns were borrowings from popular Protestant hymns and adapted with new words that were more consistent with the restored gospel. The destruction of the press delayed the publication of the hymnal and of the Book of Commandments (which was later published as the Doctrine and Covenants) for another two and a half years and moved the site of their eventual publication from Independence, Missouri, to Kirtland, Ohio. The Star, likewise, moved its operation to Kirtland and began publishing again in December of 1833. The Doctrine and Covenants, the hymnal, and the Kirtland-based Star were all published by F. G. Williams and Co.

Of those original twenty-eight poems printed in the Independence-based Star, twenty-one were included in the original LDS hymnal of 1835. Since there were a total of ninety hymns published in the first hymnal, an additional sixty-nine were selected over the next two and a half years. We may speculate, therefore, that besides the destruction of the press and the busy schedules kept by Emma Smith and W. W. Phelps, the delay in publication of the hymnal might have also been a conscious decision on the part of Emma or the Prophet to allow time for the composition of new hymns that conformed to the restored gospel.

Awaiting the composition of new Restoration hymns may have been a factor, but there is no doubt that the major impetus for completing the work on the hymnal was the nearing dedication services for the Kirtland

3. Although anti-Mormon sentiment undoubtedly included the soon-to-be-published Book of Commandments, the immediate focus of the press’s destruction was an angry response to the editorial “Free People of Color” in The Evening and the Morning Star, which the Missourians interpreted as a Mormon ploy to encourage and aid blacks into the slave state of Missouri and thereby tip the voting balance away from slavery. The Evening and the Morning Star 2 (July 1833): 109; hereafter cited as Star.


5. Technically speaking, the Book of Commandments was never published because the printed sheets, along with parts of the press, were thrown out into the street before they could be collected and bound together as a book. It is only due to the bravery and resourcefulness of two young girls, the Rollins sisters (Mary Elizabeth, age 15, and Caroline, age 12), who risked their lives to retrieve and hide some of the strewn folios, that we have sample editions of the book. See Mary’s autobiographical writings in “Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner,” Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine 17 (July 1926): 196.
Temple. On September 14, 1835, an important decision was made by the Kirtland high council to move the work forward; the wording of the decision is similar to the one taken by the Literary Firm in Missouri three years earlier. “It was further decided that Sister Emma Smith proceed to make a selection of sacred hymns according to the revelation, and that President W. W. Phelps be appointed to revise and arrange them for printing.”

Hence, the first LDS hymnal was finally published, most probably in early 1836 (although the date on the title page is 1835), in time to be used at the dedication of the Kirtland Temple on March 27, 1836.

The Five Songs of Zion

The focus of this study is a grouping of five of the original twenty-eight poems that appeared in the pages of the fourteen issues of the Missouri Star. These five stand apart not only because they appear together in the last three issues, but also because of their unique designation as “Songs of Zion” rather than hymns or poems for the Church of Christ. Two appeared in May 1833 (“Age after age has roll’d away” and “Ere long the vail will rend in twain”),7 two in June 1833 (“My soul is full of peace and love” and “The happy day has rolled on”), and one in July 1833 (“The great and glorious gospel light”).

The designation “Songs of Zion” is an important title, which in the Star distinguished them from the rest that were designated as either hymns or poems. In the first three issues of the Star (June, July, and August 1832), the poems that were printed were introduced with the following designation: “Hymns, Selected and prepared for the Church of Christ, in these last days.” The fourth issue (September 1832) introduced two poems with the designation “Select Poetry.” Issues five and six of the Star (October

6. Fred C. Collier and William S. Harwell, eds., Kirtland Council Minute Book, 2d ed. (Salt Lake City: Collier’s Publishing, 2002), 131. Helen Hanks Macaré, in her 1961 doctoral dissertation on LDS hymnals, used the traditional convention that poems are not considered hymns or songs until they are set to music. “‘Hymn’ means any set of words included in any Mormon hymnal while ‘poem’ is defined as any set of words not so included.” Helen Hanks Macaré, “The Singing Saints: A Study of the Mormon Hymnal, 1835–1950” (PhD diss., University of California–Los Angeles, 1961), 96. The authors of the poems, however, often wrote words to fit known hymn tunes and thus designated their poems as “hymns” or “songs.” The most common poems for the most common of hymns are stanzas of four lines of iambic tetrameter rhyming abab.

7. In the Star, as well as in the 1835 hymnal (and in many subsequent hymnals also), “vail” is spelled with an “a” instead of an “e.” For consistency, the word will appear as “veil” hereafter.
and November 1832) introduced poems with the designation “Selected Hymns.” Issue seven (December 1832) printed Isaac Watts’s beloved hymn “Joy to the World” under the title “The Second Coming of the Savior,” but without author attribution and without a designation. No poems were published in the Star number 8 (January 1833), and the two poems printed in number 9 (February 1833) carried the designation “New Hymns.” The next two issues of the Star (March and April 1833) published one poem apiece but without any designation. The final three issues of the Missouri Star—numbers 12, 13, and 14 (May, June, and July 1833)—published the five poems under consideration, each introduced with the singular designation “Songs of Zion,” again without author attribution. The “Songs of Zion” designation evidences their origins as songs and as part of a group.

Provenance of the Document Containing the Five Songs

In July and August 1937, Wilford C. Wood, an LDS businessman from Utah and a dedicated collector of Mormon Americana, purchased two sizeable caches of documents connected to Joseph Smith and the early history of the Church from Charles E. Bidamon of Wilmette, Illinois, son of Major Lewis Bidamon, second husband of Emma Smith. Contemporary reports indicate that the number of documents acquired from Bidamon was over eighty-five. Of the documents identified in the news reports, perhaps the most significant is the so-called Joseph Smith “Egyptian Alphabet and Grammar,” which was listed as the manuscript of the Book of Abraham. The Deseret News reported the acquisition of the first group of documents under the title “Documents Obtained by Wilford Wood: Papers in Writing of Prophet Joseph Included.”

8. The designation in the November 1832 issue was actually “Selected Hymn,” even though two poems were published.
9. The July 1833 issue uses the designation “Song of Zion” because only one song was published.
10. In addition to the many documents he purchased and turned over to the Church, Wood also purchased many properties of historical importance, such as the Newel K. Whitney store and John Johnson home in Ohio, the Adam-ondi-Ahman property and Liberty Jail in Missouri, and the Nauvoo Temple lot and Carthage Jail in Illinois. A comprehensive listing of the documents retained in the Wilford C. Wood Museum in Bountiful was prepared by LaMar C. Berrett, The Wilford C. Wood Collection, Volume 1: An Annotated Catalog of Documentary-Type Materials in The Wilford C. Wood Collection (Provo, Utah: Wilford C. Wood Foundation and Brigham Young University, 1972).
The number of documents obtained in July 1937 is listed at forty by Wood himself in a letter dated December 24, 1937, which he wrote to President Heber J. Grant.12 The second cache of forty-five documents obtained from Bidamon by Wood and turned over to the Church was reported two months later, also in the Deseret News under the title “Book of Abraham Manuscript Is Found: Wilford C. Wood Gets Rare Documents on Recent Tour.”13

Form of the Williams Songs

Among the eighty-five documents obtained from Charles E. Bidamon and turned over to the Church Historian’s Office by Wilford C. Wood in 1937 is one containing all five “Songs of Zion” in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams, which I believe were also authored by him. It consists of two sheets with the five songs that had been published in the Star.14 Each song is written in numbered quatrains (or four-line stanzas), and each verse is in iambic tetrameter rhyming aabb, but not always consistently. The songs vary in length from four to twenty-three stanzas.

Only recently, on May 7, 2003, was this document catalogued under the author’s name.15 But as early as 1981, historian and handwriting expert Dean Jessee had identified the handwriting as that of Frederick G. Williams and had posited that Williams had authored the songs in 1831. The cataloguing information also mentions the provenance of the documents: it had been in the Wilford C. Wood collection and had likely been received

14. The first sheet has three songs; the front side contains the first sixteen stanzas of Song 1, whose first line is “Age after age has rolled away.” On the back side of the first sheet are the remaining seven stanzas of Song 1 (for a total of twenty-three four-line stanzas). Also on the reverse of the first sheet are all four stanzas of Song 2 (“The happy day has rolled on”) and all five stanzas of Song 3 (“The great and glorious gospel light”). The second sheet, written on only one side, contains two songs: the four stanzas of Song 4 (“My soul is full of peace and love”) and the nine stanzas of Song 5 (“Ere long the veil will rend in twain”).
15. A second recent document in Frederick G. Williams’s handwriting was also catalogued on May 7, 2003, and is titled “Route and between Kirtland, Ohio, and Liberty, Missouri [ca. 1837]” (written on both sides). The cataloguing notes for this document state, “Item was among papers in ‘Pre-Nauvoo’ portion of Nauvoo subject file. Handwriting recently identified as Williams, indicating it was possibly received in Historian’s Office with other Williams papers in nineteenth century or was possibly in Williams account book, as two financial entries on document’s reverse match entries in that record.”
Fig. 1. This three-page document, obtained from Charles E. Bidamon in 1937 by LDS businessman and collector Wilford C. Wood, contains five “Songs of Zion” in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams.
Fig. 2. Page 2 of the “Songs of Zion” document.
Song 4

1. By soul a full of peace and love,
   I saw shall see Christ from above,
   And angels to the blessed Trinity
   Shall join with me in holy song.
2. The earth's sweet peace has rest my keen,
   And fill my soul with heavenly grace,
   Sun and moon, with peace and love
   I am waiting for the kingdom come.

3. I prepare my heart to sing your song,
   To join this glorious heavenly song,
   To hail the reign of heaven henceforward,
   And join the kingdom song of joy.

4. Let all my powers of mind combine,
   To hail my Saviour and his throne,
   In him my voice united shall be,
   And adore him King, and Lord of all.

Song 5

1. Cry long the word shall reign in heaven
   The king ascend with all his train,
   The earth shall shake with awful might,
   And all creation feel his might.
2. The trump of God it long shall sound,
   And with the sound under heaven,
   The earth and sea shall adore the throne
   Whereon the voice of hoary heaven.
3. The voice of God the earth is given
   To bless your hands and your presence,
   The heavens appear for your return,
   The day of your return is present.
4. I shall then know it was on high,
   I shall see the king without the sky,
   The king in cloud of fire,
   And all the earth to his command.
in the Historian’s Office along with other Joseph Smith documents Wood had obtained.16

**Direct Inspiration for the Songs**

Dean Jessee, according to the cataloguing notes, posited that Frederick G. Williams might have received the inspiration for his songs from the Enoch revelation with which he may have become acquainted as early as 1831 while in Missouri. This may in fact be when President Williams first learned of the revelation, but there is a closer, more direct inspiration for the songs, which is recorded in the Kirtland Revelation Book. This bound volume contains fifty entries of revelations and prophecies, forty-four of which were included in the D&C, thirty-six of which are in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams.17

Recorded on pages 48 and 49 of the Kirtland Revelation Book is an interesting entry titled “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated,” dated February 27, 1833. The entry that immediately precedes it (pages 47–48), today’s D&C 88, was received on January 3, 1833, and ends with these words: “Given by Joseph the seer, and written by F. G. Williams assistant scribe and counselor.” The entry that immediately follows it (pages 49–51) is today’s D&C 89, the Word of Wisdom, also dated February 27, 1833, and also in Frederick G. Williams’s handwriting.

The Prophet makes no mention of a gift of tongues experience on February 27, 1833, in his writings, although the *History of the Church* does record the Word of Wisdom revelation received on that same day.18 Had there been a spiritual outpouring given to the Prophet and those in his company, the “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” entry would likely have stated as much. Virtually every other spiritual manifestation,

16. Frederick G. Williams, Songs [about 1831], cataloguing notes, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as Church History Library). A notarized bill of sale listed the documents that were purchased by Wilford C. Wood, among which was “Two pages of poems.” See Richard L. Evans, “Illinois Yields Church Documents,” *Improvement Era* 40, no. 9 (1937): 565.

17. The Kirtland Revelation Book is found at the Church History Library. H. Michael Marquardt, through Modern Microfilm, published a Xerox copy of the volume in 1979, and then published a more definitive, expanded edition as *The Joseph Smith Revelations: Text and Commentary* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1999).

revelation, and prophecy found in the Kirtland Revelation Book indicates that it came through Joseph the Prophet, except this entry.

It would appear, therefore, that President Williams received his own personal gift of tongues and translation experience and, as one of the presidents, prophets, and seers entitled to revelation, recorded it among the spiritual manifestations in the Kirtland Revelation Book. By his own volition or perhaps at the suggestion of his wife, Rebecca, or the Prophet, Frederick G. Williams decided to render the spiritual outpouring in verse form, or as songs, perhaps with a view to having them form part of the LDS hymnal and thus be sung by the Saints. In any case, it was not long before Williams transformed the spiritual “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” experience into five “Songs of Zion” and sent all five off to Missouri for publication in the Star where, as previously noted, they began to appear two months later, starting with the May issue of 1833.

**Songs Published in First Hymnal and Sung at Temple Dedication**

Besides being printed in the Star, four of the five songs by President Williams also appeared as a group, with minimal changes (mostly punctuation and capitalization), in the original 1835 LDS hymnal as hymns 19–22 (pages 25–29), but again without author attribution. It may not be a coincidence that Song 5, “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” was sung by the choir at the Kirtland Temple dedication just before President Rigdon delivered the opening prayer. It was during the dedicatory prayer that President Williams saw a heavenly messenger “rend the veil” and take a seat beside him. The visit by the heavenly messenger was recorded, and the words of the song were published (again without attribution) in the dedication proceedings published in Kirtland by Oliver Cowdery.

The four songs by Frederick G. Williams included in Emma Smith’s original hymnal of 1835 were also included in most of the subsequent LDS hymnals.

---

19. For example, at the dedication of the Kirtland Temple the Prophet presented, for a sustaining vote, the members of the Presidency as Prophets and Seers: “I then made a short address, and called upon the several quorums, and all the congregation of Saints, to acknowledge the Presidency as Prophets and Seers, and uphold them by their prayers.” *History of the Church*, 2:417.

20. A comparison of the Kirtland Revelation Book entry “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” with the five “Songs of Zion,” discloses that the same ideas and phrasings (sometimes the exact words) are common to both. See comparison later in this article.


22. See Macaré, “Singing Saints,” addendum, which lists all hymn titles found in LDS hymnals from 1835 to 1950.
Song 2, “The happy day has rolled on,” appeared in the first five published hymnals (1835, 1838, 1839, 1840, as well as Emma Smith’s second hymnal of 1841) but not in C. Merkley’s 1841 hymnal (which only printed nineteen hymns), nor in the J. C. Little and G. B. Gardner hymnal of 1844. Thereafter it appeared in each of the subsequent hymnals published throughout the nineteenth century, including 1844 (Liverpool), 1849, 1851, 1854, 1856, 1863, 1869, 1871 (Salt Lake), 1871 (Liverpool), 1877, 1881, 1883, 1884, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1894, 1897, and 1899. It has also appeared in every twentieth-century hymnal including the one currently in use (1905, 1912, 1927, 1948, 1950, and 1985).

Song 3, “The great and glorious gospel light,” appeared in all nineteenth-century LDS hymnals except C. Merkley’s (1841). And although it appeared in the first three hymnals of the twentieth century (1905, 1912, 1927), it has been dropped from the last three (1948, 1950, and 1985).

Song 4, “My soul is full of peace and love,” appeared in nearly all of the nineteenth-century hymnals (except C. Merkley’s 1841 hymnal, and the 1843 and 1844 publications); it also appeared in the first two of the twentieth century (1905 and 1912), but it was dropped from the 1927, 1948, 1950, and 1985 hymnals.

Song 5, “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” appeared in all the nineteenth-century LDS hymnals (except 1843) and in all except the last three hymnals of the twentieth century (1948, 1950, 1985).

Misattributions of Authors in LDS Hymnals

There have been plenty of missed and incorrect attributions regarding the authors of the early hymns of Zion. Helen Hanks Macaré points out, for example, that the hymn “Earth with her ten thousand flowers,” which appeared in the 1835 LDS hymnal, was incorrectly attributed to William W. Phelps for many years but was in fact written by Thomas Rawson Taylor.23 The change in author attribution from W. W. Phelps to Thomas R. Taylor was not made, however, until the current 1985 hymnal. Another example Macaré lists of inaccurate author attribution of the hymns in the 1835 hymnal is “The day is past and gone” which was credited to Parley P. Pratt in 1869, many years after his death. The Pratt attribution continued until 1905 when John Leland was finally listed as the correct author.24

In 1903, the Deseret Evening News published an appeal for information on the authors of hymns in the then-used LDS hymnal. The Church

23. Macaré, “Singing Saints,” 126. She further reports that “in 1905, Junius F. Wells, an assistant Church historian, ascertained by writing to John Julian that the poem had appeared in the ‘select remains’ of Thomas Rawson Taylor.”

was preparing a new hymnal, to be published in Liverpool, England, and desired to list the full names of the authors of the hymns.\(^{25}\) In another section of the *News* of the same evening, a list was published of fifty-seven titles or first lines of hymns whose authors were unknown. Two of President Williams’s songs were listed without attribution: “My soul is full of peace and love” and “The great and glorious Gospel light.”\(^{26}\)

**Considerations on Author Attribution of the Five Williams Songs**

For our discussion on the authorship of the songs (especially for Songs 2 and 5, which were attributed to other people many years after Frederick G. Williams’s death in 1842), it is important to note that the first LDS hymnal to include author attribution was the 11th edition (1856) of *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs: for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, first published in 1840 by Brigham Young, Parley P. Pratt, and John Taylor in Manchester, England.\(^{27}\) It is also significant to point out that in that 11th edition, none of the four hymns under consideration were listed with an author. In the next edition, however, which was the 12th of *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, published in 1863 in Liverpool, England, Song 5, “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” was attributed to Parley P. Pratt, who had been assassinated in 1857. Sometime between 1856 (the 11th edition) and 1863 (the 12th edition) someone, perhaps George Q. Cannon, who is listed as the 1863 publisher, attributed the hymn to Pratt. For the remainder of the editions in the nineteenth century, the 13th (1869) through the 23rd (1899), Pratt was listed as the author. No authors were ever listed for the remaining three songs until the 24th edition, published in December 1905, where Song 2, “The happy day has rolled on,” was attributed to Philo Dibble.

**Song 1**, “Age after age has rolled away,” attributed to W. W. Phelps in 1889. This song was never included in any LDS hymnal, but the name of W. W. Phelps as author was linked to it in the late twentieth century.\(^{28}\)

---

27. The first edition was published in 1840 under the title *A Collection of Sacred Hymns: for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in Europe*.
28. Michael Hicks, in *Mormonism and Music*, 36, noted the similarities between the content and even the phrases used in “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” and the first Song of Zion (“Age after age has roll’d away”), published in the *Star*. He compares portions of the two and, without any explanation, attributes the latter to W. W. Phelps, assuming no doubt that since Phelps was the editor of the *Star* and had published some of his own hymns in earlier numbers,
Could this poetic writing possibly be an expression by W. W. Phelps? He was, of course, a gifted poet and editor, so he could have done the versifying. Phelps was in Missouri and not in Kirtland on February 27, 1833, but all he would have needed to versify “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” was a copy of the transcript taken from pages 48 and 49 of the Kirtland Revelation Book, which Frederick G. Williams could have easily provided him. However, that raises an important question about the other four hymns, which are also derived from the “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated.” If these poetic writings are indeed the versified expression by W. W. Phelps, they most likely would have been attributed to him (along with the many other hymns he wrote) beginning in 1856, when author attribution first appeared in the 11th edition of the hymnal, *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs: for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. But they never were, and one of the five was even misattributed to P. P. Pratt while Phelps was still living. Phelps moved to Utah in 1849, was a member of the Legislature in 1851, and published Utah’s first almanac; he died in Salt Lake in 1872.

Could Joseph Smith be the one who rendered the gift of tongues experience into verse? Yes, of course; and to support this view he would later versify today’s D&C 76. The Prophet could also be the author of “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated.” He was in Kirtland on February 27, 1833, where he received the Word of Wisdom (D&C 89). However, as we have noted, there is no mention of a gift of tongues experience in any of Smith’s writings on that date, and there is no written indication that “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” was received by the Prophet, which is the usual introduction to all the Kirtland Revelation Book entries, copied by Frederick G. Williams.

**Song 2, “The happy day has rolled on,”** attributed to Philo Dibble in 1905. The most likely source for the misattribution is Philo Dibble’s son.

---


30. Philo Dibble (1806–1895) was born in Berkshire, Massachusetts. Cannon and Cook, *Far West Record*, 257. In 1830, when twenty-four years old, Dibble was baptized a member of the Church in Kirtland, Ohio, where he spent the night of his baptism at the home of Frederick G. and Rebecca Williams and received a spiritual confirmation of the truthfulness of the gospel. Karl Ricks Anderson, *Joseph Smith’s Kirtland: Eyewitness Accounts* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), 7.
Spurred by the above appeal published in the *Deseret Evening News*, Philo Dibble Jr. (his father had died in 1895) of Layton, Davis County, Utah, went to the Church Historian’s Office on April 3, 1903 and made the following statement:

The hymn on page 266 of the 15th edition of the Latter-day Saints hymn book, published in Salt Lake City, 1883, commencing

“The happy day has rolled on
“The truth restored is now made known, etc. etc.”

was composed by my father, the late Elder Philo Dibble, Sen., as far back as the days of Missouri, 1831–1838. The authorship was a matter of frequent reference between my father and myself, and I urged him on several occasions to make it known that he was the author of this hymn.

In compliance with the request of the First Presidency that those having information relative to the authorship of hymns, I have hereby made this statement.\(^{31}\)

We may never resolve who the author of Song 2 is to everyone’s satisfaction. Although we do not have Philo Dibble’s own words, we can surely accept the son’s testimony as sincere and accurate. Furthermore, what possible reason would there be for the son to misrepresent the facts? On the other hand, it could be that Philo Dibble’s memory regarding the authorship of the hymn was faulty when he spoke to his son; after all, the hymn was published in 1833, sixty-two years before Philo’s death in 1895, and seventy years before the son’s statement.\(^ {32}\) The fact that Williams penned all five

---

31. Ron Watt, email message to author, February 22, 2007. Statement found among the fourteen written responses to the *Deseret News* appears in a folder entitled “Hymns 1903” at the Church History Library. Philo Dibble Jr., the fourth child of Philo Dibble Sr., was born October 17, 1835, in Clay County, Missouri, and died December 7, 1915, at age eighty, twelve years after making this statement.

A letter containing a similar statement is found in the same file from Edwin C. Dibble (a grandson) addressed to the Church Historian dated April 22, 1903.

32. It may be that Philo Dibble wrote a poem with a similar first line or title, which he or his son confused with “The happy day has rolled on.” Hymn titles with similar words (which appeared in the early LDS hymnals of 1835, 1838, 1839, 1840, and 1843) whose authors are still unknown, according to Helen H. Macaré,
Songs as a unit soon after a spiritual manifestation he had recorded as “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” in the Kirtland Revelation book on February 27, 1833, is likewise compelling evidence of Williams’s authorship. Also significant is the fact that the five songs were found as a unit among the papers of Emma Smith, the compiler of the 1835 hymnal.

**Song 3,** “The great and glorious gospel light,” never attributed until now.33

**Song 4,** “My soul is full of peace and love,” never attributed until now.

**Song 5,** “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” attributed to P. P. Pratt in 1863. The listing of Parley P. Pratt as the author of Song 5, “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” as noted above, first appeared in 1863 in the 12th edition of *Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs,* six years after Pratt’s death. While he lived, however, Pratt never included the song among his own compositions. The first edition of Pratt’s collected works is titled *The Millennium, A Poem, to Which Is Added Hymns and Songs* and was published by Parley P. Pratt in Boston in 1835. The hymn in question is not found among the seventeen poems that make up the volume. Of course Song 5 was published in May of 1833 in the *Star,* if Pratt had in fact written it, he probably would have included it in his collected works in 1835. Pratt’s second edition of his collected poems is titled *The Millennium, and Other Poems* and was published in 1840.34 Song 5, “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” is likewise not found among the poems and one essay that make up that volume. Since Song 5 had by then been published in the 1833 *Star,* the 1835 LDS hymnal, and the 1836 *Messenger and Advocate,* and had been sung at the dedication of the Kirtland Temple, it is not likely that Parley P. Pratt would have purposely left out this beloved poem from his second edition.

33. Mack Wilberg, now director of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, composed music for this hymn and three others published in the 1835 LDS hymnal. The piece was performed at the Joseph Smith Bicentennial Concert held on November 18, 2005, at Brigham Young University. Wilberg wrote in the program notes: “Then it just hit me that there were lots of great texts that are no longer known or used in the Church but yet have a valuable message, particularly concerning the Restoration. So what I have written are completely new musical settings of old texts. . . . The last movement is entitled ‘The Great and Glorious Gospel Light.’ It has a little nobility about it and I hope brings the piece to a close.” Transcription of Mack Wilberg’s Introduction, in author’s possession.

edition of collected hymns, unless, of course, the hymn had not been written by him in the first place.

In the 1913 edition of Parley P. Pratt’s collected works, *The Millennial Hymns of Parley Parker Pratt*, which contained fifty hymns, hymn no. 17 of the collection is “Ere long the veil will rend in twain,” and at the bottom of stanza 9, the last stanza, appears “Parley Parker Pratt, 1840.” Where did 1840 come from? The answer perhaps is found in the first edition of *A Collection of Sacred Hymns*, compiled by Brigham Young, Parley P. Pratt, and John Taylor in Manchester, England in 1840. That hymnal contained a total of 271 hymns, including the four songs by President Williams, but there are no attributions for the texts. Hymn no. 12 is “Ere long the veil will rend in twain.” In Parley P. Pratt’s autobiography, he states that the 1840 hymnal contains “nearly fifty of my original hymns and songs, composed expressly for the book, and most of them written during the press of duties which then crowded upon me.”

**The Enoch Revelations**

One of the most significant doctrinal and historical contributions made by Joseph Smith is the restored knowledge of the life and ministry of the prophet Enoch. Beginning in June 1830, Joseph Smith received a series of revelations (now part of the Book of Moses found in the Pearl of Great Price) on the creation of the earth and the first generations of man. From November 1830 to February 1831, the revelations focused on Enoch: Moses 6:21–68, Moses 7:1–69; and Moses 8:1–2. Through his great faith, Enoch received a vision of the history of the world that gives us insights into the plan of salvation, the Fall of Adam, the central role of Christ in the redemption of mankind, and the events leading up to the Lord’s triumphant Second Coming. We also learn that Enoch, although faced with


37. The Bible references to Enoch are scanty: Genesis 5:18-24; Luke 3:37; Hebrews 11:5; and Jude 1:14. These verses mention Enoch’s translation but do not detail his ministry, teachings, and prophecies, or of the establishment of the city of Zion and of his vision of the history of the world. It is interesting to point out that there are at least three apocalyptic books of Enoch; “these are included in the category usually called ‘pseudepigrapha,’ meaning writings under assumed names, compiled long after the time of the supposed author. On the basis of latter-day revelation it appears there are some truths contained in the apocalyptic Enoch books.” Bible Dictionary, “Enoch,” 665.
great opposition and wickedness in his day, was successful in converting many souls to the gospel. He founded a city called “City of Holiness, even Zion” (Moses 7:19), which, in the process of time, was taken up into heaven (Moses 7:21). The Lord promised, however, that the city of Enoch would return to the earth at the Lord’s Second Coming (Moses 7:63–64). We also learn that on that joyous occasion the heavenly hosts will join in song with the earth’s inhabitants when Zion is again restored to the earth to usher in Christ’s millennial reign (Moses 7:53, 63).

In addition to the revelation on Enoch found in the Book of Moses cited above, Joseph Smith received other revelations, now in the Doctrine and Covenants, that referenced Enoch. 38 Joseph Smith also received new information on Enoch when translating Genesis 9:21–23, which was recorded between March 8 and April 5, 1831. 39 The Lord, addressing Noah after the flood, speaks of the covenant he had made with his great-grandfather, Enoch:

> And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant, which I made unto thy father Enoch; that, when men should keep all my commandments, Zion should again come on the earth, the city of Enoch which I have caught up unto myself.

> And this is mine everlasting covenant, that when thy posterity shall embrace the truth, and look upward, then shall Zion look downward, and all the heavens shall shake with gladness, and the earth shall tremble with joy;

> And the general assembly of the church of the first-born shall come down out of heaven, and possess the earth, and shall have place until the end come. And this is mine everlasting covenant which I made with thy father Enoch. 40

It is safe to assume that the newly revealed information on Enoch and his prophecies regarding the return of the city of Zion to the earth excited the imagination of the early members of the Church. W. W. Phelps, editor of the Church’s monthly newspaper The Evening and the Morning Star in Missouri, aided in keeping the subject uppermost in their minds.

---

by publishing excerpts of the Enoch revelations and by referencing them in his editorials. Between June 1832 and July 1833, Phelps published nine revelations about Enoch, mentioned the ancient prophet fourteen times in editorials, and printed six hymns that referred to Enoch. From the Star we see that the very first hymns composed and published in this dispensation on Enoch’s visions, prophecies, and the return of the city of Zion to the earth were the five written by Frederick G. Williams.

**Internal Evidence: The Texts Compared**

It is an important fact that Frederick G. Williams would decide to turn his spiritual experience of singing in tongues into hymn texts. Usually these experiences were shared privately among groups of devout Saints, but Williams obviously wanted everyone to sing what he sang. So he did what so many of the early Church leaders did—he wrote hymn texts. He made sure that his singing in tongues was not only interpreted and recorded, but was versified and printed.

One intriguing aspect of this topic, for which there are no ready answers, is the subject of the gift of tongues. Speaking and singing in tongues, together with the translations thereof, were well known among the early members of the Church. The Kirtland Council Minute Book, for instance, contains the following entry for January 22, 1833, concerning one of the earliest manifestations of this gift, after the Church was restored.

After prayer the president [Joseph Smith] spake in an unknown tongue. He was followed by Br. Zebedee Coltrin and he by Bro William Smith. After this the gift was poured out in a miraculous manner until all the Elders obtained the gift together with several of the members of the Church both male & female. Great and glorious were the divine manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Praises were sang to God & the Lamb besides much speaking & praying, all in tongues.

41. One of the important gifts of the Spirit since New Testament times, speaking in tongues is often referred to as “glossalalia” from the Greek word for tongue.


43. Collier and Harwell, *Kirtland Council Minute Book*, 6. See also *History of the Church*, 1:323. Frederick G. Williams was the assistant scribe for this
Because President Williams was present at the meeting where the gift of tongues was manifested, he too probably experienced the gift. A month later, on February 27, 1833, we find Frederick G. Williams again receiving the gift of tongues, this time as a song or hymn, together with its translation. He subsequently rendered the whole into verse form, a first in Mormon hymnody. Since there are no records to guide us, we can only speculate about the procedure, somewhat akin to the Book of Mormon translation by the gift and power of God. The complete text is in table 1.

The above text can be analyzed as containing a preamble (verses 1–2), followed by four sections: Enoch’s vision, from the beginning until the restoration just prior to Christ’s return (verses 3–8); Frederick G. Williams’s personal testimony of the gospel (verses 9–11); the restoration of the gospel with an admonition to repent and prepare for the Bridegroom (verses 12–14); the final scene: the coming of Christ, the City of Enoch, and the Saints’ celestial reward (verses 15–17). This same progression is found sequentially in the five “Songs of Zion,” to wit:

Song 1: Age after age has rolled away
   Section 1: Enoch’s vision, from the beginning until just prior to Christ’s return
Song 2: The happy day has rolled on
   Section 1: Enoch’s vision continued; the restoration by angels
Song 3: The great and glorious gospel light
   Section 2: Williams’s personal testimony of the gospel he has accepted
Song 4: My soul is full of peace and love
   Section 2: Williams’s personal testimony of the gospel

conference, which continued the next day, January 23, 1833, with more manifestations of the gift of tongues and other spiritual manifestations. “At the close of which scene Br F G. Williams being moved upon by the Holy Ghost, washed the feet of the president [Joseph Smith] as a token of his fixed determination to be with him in suffering or in rejoicing, in life or in death and to be continually on his right hand, in which thing he was accepted.” See Collier and Harwell, Kirtland Council Minute Book, 5–6. See also History of the Church 1:323.

44. It may be useful to note that Philo Dibble, Parley P. Pratt, William W. Phelps, Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, Peter Whitmer, John Whitmer, and many others, were a thousand miles away in Missouri at the time of the Kirtland “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” episode of February 27, 1833. See entry of February 26, 1833, in Cannon and Cook, Far West Record, 60; and Pratt, Autobiography, 99–101. See also Philo Dibble, 1806–1895. Autobiography (1806–c. 1843), “Early Scenes in Church History,” in Four Faith Promoting Classics (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1968), 74–96; also accessible online at http://www.boap.org/LDS/Early-Saints/PDibble.html.
Table 1

Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated.  
February 27, 1833, Kirtland Revelation Book, 48–49

| 1. Age after age has rolled away, according to the sad fate of man—countless millions forever gone. |
| 2. At length the period of time has come that oft was seen by a prophetic eye and written, too, by all holy men inspired of the Lord, a time which was seen by Enoch of Old, |
| 3. At a time when he stood upon the mount which was called the Mountain of God as he gazed upon nature and the corruption of man, and mourned their sad fate and wept and cried with a loud voice, and heaved forth his sighs, “Omnipotence, Omnipotence! O, may I see thee!” |
| 4. And with his finger he touched his eyes and he saw heaven, he gazed on eternity and sang an angelic song and mingled his voice with the heavenly throng, “Hosanna! Hosanna! The sound of the trump!” around the throne of God echoed and echoed again, and rang and reechoed until eternity was filled with his voice. |
| 5. He saw, yea, he saw and he glorified God, the salvation of his people, his city caught up through the gospel of Christ. |
| 6. He saw the beginning, the ending of men; he saw the time when Adam his father was made, and he saw that he was in eternity before a grain of dust in the balance was weighed. |
| 7. He saw that he emanated and came down from God. He saw what had passed and then was and is present and to come. |
| 8. Therefore, he saw the last days, the Angel that came down to John, and the angel that is now flying, having the everlasting gospel to commit unto men— |
| 9. Which in my soul I have received, and from death and bondage from the Devil I’m freed, and am free in the gospel of Christ. |
| 10. And I’m waiting, and with patience I’ll wait on the Lord. Hosanna! Loud sound the trump! Come Eternity, to ring Hosanna forever. |
| 11. I’m waiting the coming of Christ, a mansion on high, a celestial abode, a seat on the right hand of God. |
| 12. Angels are coming, the Holy Ghost is falling upon the saints and will continue to fall. |
| 13. The Saviour is coming—yea, the Bridegroom—prepare ye, prepare! Yea the cry has gone forth, “go, wait on the Lord!” |
| 14. The Angels in glory will soon be descending to join you in singing the praises of God. The trump loud shall sound—the dark veil soon shall rend—heaven shall shake, the earth shall tremble, and all nature shall feel the power of God. |
| 15. Gaze ye saints, gaze ye upon him—gaze upon Jesus—Hosanna!—loud sound the trump!—His Church is caught up! |
| 16. Hosanna! Praise Him ye saints. They stand at His feet—behold they are weeping—they strike hands with Enoch of Old. |
| 17. They inherit a city as it is written, the City of God. Loud sound the trump! They receive a Celestial crown. Hosanna! Hosanna! The Heaven of Heavens! And the heavens are filled with the praises of God. Amen. |

Section 3: Admonition to the Saints to prepare for the Bridegroom.  
Williams personalizes the injunction, applying it to himself.  

Song 5: Ere long the veil shall rend in twain  
Section 4: The final scene: the coming of Christ, the city of Enoch, and the Saints’ celestial reward.

“Songs of Zion” Compared with
“Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated”

A close comparative reading of the two texts (see table 2) discloses the similarities in the order and progression of the ideas, as well as in the choices of the phrases and words used. The limit imposed by the number of feet he could use in each verse (four feet of iambic tetrameter), plus the need for an end rhyme (aaBB), necessarily affected and changed the word selection Williams used. Nevertheless, some are exact duplicates. The number in parentheses in the right column refers to the verse in which the phrase appears.

New Details Added to the Enoch Vision

President Williams’s 1833 spiritual experience “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated,” which he recorded in the Kirtland Revelation Book, adds several details to the Enoch story not found elsewhere. To begin with, the narrator (who, in this case, may be considered the Spirit of the Lord) announces that, whereas all the holy prophets, not just Enoch, beheld in vision the time leading up to the Second Coming of the Lord (and wrote about it), that glorious period has now come; the time foretold has arrived (table 1, verse 2).

Among other insights, we learn from “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” that Enoch was not simply given the privilege of seeing God (compare with Moses 7:3–4). Rather, the glorious opportunity to see God came to Enoch because he asked to see God (table 1, verse 3).

We learn further that Enoch’s ability to see the Divine was conveyed when God touched Enoch’s eyes with his finger (table 1, verse 4). The ambiguity present in the pronoun “he” is avoided in the hymn version by naming God as the initiator of the action. “With finger end God touch’d his eyes.”

The name of the mountain where Enoch saw the Lord and beheld the vision of eternity is called “the mount Simeon” in the Pearl of Great Price (Moses 7:2). In “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” we learn that it was also referred to as the Mountain of God (table 1, verse 3).

When the vision of eternity is unfolded to Enoch in the Pearl of Great Price, the Lord tells Enoch “Look, and I will show unto thee the world for the space of many generations” (Moses 7:4). In that vision, Enoch is shown “all the nations of the earth” (Moses 7:23) and, beginning with his own,

46. In a previous encounter with God, Enoch was told “Anoint thine eyes with clay, and wash them, and thou shalt see” (Moses 6:35).
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song 1: Age after age has rolled away</th>
<th>Kirtland Revelation Book, pages 48–49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Age after age has roll’d away,</td>
<td>Age after age has rolled away (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since man first dwelt in mortal clay;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And countless millions slept in death,</td>
<td>countless millions forever gone (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That once supplied a place on earth:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> According to the fate of man,</td>
<td>according to the sad fate of man (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which God had fix’d in his own plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So age must come, and age must go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till work complete is here below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Which had been seen by saints of old,</td>
<td>that oft was seen by a prophetic eye (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And by the prophets were foretold;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which wondrous things are drawing near:</td>
<td>a time which was seen by Enoch of Old (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Enoch saw, and saints did cheer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Enoch who did converse with God:</td>
<td>[Enoch] stood upon the mount (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stood on the mount and stretch’d abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His soul wide as eternity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He rent the vail and wonders see.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> With mighty faith he did expand</td>
<td>he saw heaven, he gazed on eternity (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’er earth and heaven, o’er sea and land,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till things above and things below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He did behold; yea, did them know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> His heart he tun’d to notes above,</td>
<td>and sang an angelic song (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His soul o’erwhelm’d with boundless love,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sang a song in heav’nly lays,</td>
<td>mingled his voice with the heavenly throng (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While angels’ tongues joint’d him in praise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> With finger end God touch’d his eyes,</td>
<td>And with his finger he touched his eyes (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That he might gaze within the skies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His voice he rais’d to God on high,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He heard his groans and drew him nigh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> With joy and wonder, all amaz’d,</td>
<td>with the heavenly throng (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amid the heav’nly throng, he gaz’d!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While heav’nly music charm’d his ear,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And angels’ notes, remov’d all fear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Hosanna, he aloud did cry,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To God who dwells above the sky:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, Hosanna did resound,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among the heav’nly hosts around.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> His voice he raised in higher strains;</td>
<td>echoed and echoed again (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoed and reechoed again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till heaven and earth his voice did hear:</td>
<td>until eternity was filled with his voice (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eternity did record bear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> The trump of God around the throne</td>
<td>“The sound of the trump!” around the throne of God (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proclaim’d the power of God anon,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And sounded loud what should take place,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From age to age, from race to race.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Among the heavenly hosts he sang</td>
<td>the salvation of his people (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s scheme of life for sinful man,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And for the gospel’s saving grace,</td>
<td>He saw, yea, he saw and he glorified God (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He prais’d the Father face to face.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song 1 (continued): Age after age...</td>
<td>Kirtland Revelation Book, pages 48–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The end of all his labors here,</td>
<td>Were all unfolded to him there:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His city rais’d to dwell on high,</td>
<td>his city caught up through the gospel of Christ (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With all the saints above the sky.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. He saw before him all things past,</td>
<td>He saw what had passed and then was (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From end to end, from first to last;</td>
<td>He saw the beginning, the ending of men (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yea, things before the world began,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or dust was fashion’d into man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The place of Adam’s first abode</td>
<td>the time when Adam his father was made (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While in the presence of his God,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the mountains raised their heads,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or the small dust of balance weighed,</td>
<td>before a grain of dust in the balance was weighed (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. With God he saw his race began,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And from him emanated man,</td>
<td>he emanated and came down from God (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And with him did in glory dwell,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before there was an earth or hell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. From age to age, whate’er took place,</td>
<td>He saw what had passed and then was (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was present then before his face;</td>
<td>and is present and to come (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And to the latest years of man,</td>
<td>Therefore, he saw the last days (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was plain before him, hea’ns’ plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. His eyes with wonder did behold,</td>
<td>Eternal glories yet untold:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And glorious things of latter time,</td>
<td>the angel that is now flying (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which angels have to tell to men.</td>
<td>gospel to commit unto men (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He then did hear, in days of old,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message that to John was told;</td>
<td>the Angel that came down to John (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angel which the news did bring,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He heard him talk and heard him sing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. And knew before the days of John,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What glories were on him to dawn,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message which he did receive,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He heard and saw, and did believe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He knew full well what John should hear,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning times and latter years,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When God again should set his hand,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gather Israel to their lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The gospel then from darkest shades,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should rise and go with rapid strides,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till nations distant, far and near,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The glorious proclamation hear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The angel that this news proclaims,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should come and visit earth again,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit the gospel, long since lost,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To man, with power, as at the first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Song 2: The happy day has rolled on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Lyrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The happy day has rolled on,</td>
<td>The glorious period now has come: At length the period of time has come (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The angel sure has come again: the angel that is now flying (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To introduce Messiah's reign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The gospel trump again is heard,</td>
<td>Loud sound the trump (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The truth from darkness has appear'd;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The lands which long in darkness lay,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have now beheld a glorious day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The day by prophets long foretold;</td>
<td>that oft was seen by a prophetic eye (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The day which Abra'm did behold; by all holy men inspired of the Lord (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The day that saints desired long,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When God his strange work would perform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The day when saints again should hear</td>
<td>Angels are coming, the Holy Ghost is falling (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Come down to converse hold with men. upon the saints and will continue to fall (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Song 3: The great and glorious gospel light

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Lyrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The great and glorious gospel light,</td>
<td>Has usher'd forth into my sight,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which in my soul I have receiv'd; Which in my soul I have received (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From death and bondage being freed. from death and bondage from the Devil I'm freed (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With saints below and saints above</td>
<td>Hosanna! Praise Him ye saints (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'll join to praise the God I love;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Enoch too, I will proclaim, they strike hands with Enoch of Old (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A loud Hosanna to his name. Hosanna! Loud sound the trump (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hosanna, let the echo fly</td>
<td>Hosanna! The sound of the trump … echoed (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From pole to pole, from sky to sky,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And saints and angels, join to sing. The Angels in glory will … join you in singing (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Till all eternity shall ring. Eternity to ring Hosanna forever (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hosanna, let the voice extend</td>
<td>Till time shall cease, and have an end;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Till all the throngs of heav'n above, with the heavenly throng, “Hosanna!” (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall join the saints in songs of love. and sang an angelic song and mingled his voice (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hosanna, let the trump of God,</td>
<td>Hosanna! The sound of the trump … of God (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proclaim his wonders far abroad,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And earth, and air, and skies, and seas, And the heavens are filled (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conspire to sound aloud his praise. with the praises of God (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Song 4: My soul is full of peace and love**

1. My soul is full of peace and love,  
   I soon shall see Christ from above;  
   And angels too, the hallowed throng,  
   The Angels in glory will soon be descending (14)  
   Shall join with me in holy song.  
   to join you in singing the praises of God (14)

2. The Spirit’s power has sealed my peace,  
   And fill’d my soul with heav’nly grace;  
   Transported I, with peace and love,  
   Which in my soul I have received (9)  
   Am waiting for the throngs above.  
   I’m waiting the coming of Christ, a mansion (11)

3. Prepare my heart, prepare my tongue,  
   prepare ye, prepare! (13)  
   To join this glorious, heav’nly throng:  
   his voice with the heavenly throng (4)  
   To hail the Bridegroom from above,  
   The Saviour is coming—yea, the Bridegroom (13)  
   And join the band in songs of love.

4. Let all my pow’rs of mind combine  
   To hail my Savior all divine;  
   To hear his voice, attend his call,  
   Hosanna! Praise Him ye saints (16)  
   And crown him King, and Lord of all.

**Song 5: Ere long the veil will rend in twain**

1. Ere long the veil will rend in twain,  
   the dark veil soon shall rend (14)  
   The King descend with all his train;  
   heaven shall shake, the earth shall tremble (14)  
   The earth shall shake with awful fright,  
   and all creation feel his might.

2. The trump of God, it long shall sound,  
   The trump loud shall sound (14)  
   And raise the nations under ground;  
   The voice echoes, the sound is given.

3. Lift up your heads ye saints in peace,  
   The Savior comes for your release;  
   The Saviour is coming (13)  
   The day of the redeem’d has come,  
   The saints shall all be welcom’d home.

4. Behold the church, it soars on high,  
   His Church is caught up (15)  
   To meet the saints amid the sky;  
   To hail the King in clouds of fire,  
   And strike and tune th’ immortal lyre.

5. Hosanna now the trump shall sound,  
   Hosanna! The sound of the trump (4)  
   Proclaim the joys of heav’n around,  
   In songs of love, and all divine.

6. With Enoch here we all shall meet,  
   they strike hands with Enoch (16)  
   And worship at Messiah’s feet,  
   Unite our hands and hearts in love,  
   And reign on thrones with Christ above.

7. The city that was seen of old  
   a city as it is written (17)  
   Whose walls were jasper, and streets gold,  
   They inherit (17)  
   We’ll now inherit thron’d in might:  
   The Father and the Son’s delight.

8. Celestial crowns we shall receive,  
   They receive a Celestial crown (17)  
   And glories great our God shall give,  
   While loud hosannas we’ll proclaim,  
   And sound aloud our Savior’s name.

9. Our hearts and tongues all join’d in one,  
   A loud hosanna to proclaim,  
   Hosanna! Hosanna! (17)  
   While all the heav’n’s shall shout again,  
   The Heaven of Heavens (17)  
   And all creation say, Amen.  
   are filled with the praise of God. Amen. (17)
“generation upon generation” (Moses 7:24) until the Second Coming of the Lord. In “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated,” we learn that Enoch’s vision began even earlier, with the creation of Adam and his premortal estate in eternity. We also learn that he (and all men) came down from God (table 1, verses 6–7).

In the hymn version, Williams expands on the premortal existence of man and his relationship to God.

[He saw] The place of Adam’s first abode  
While in the presence of his God,  
Before the mountains rais’d their heads,  
Or the small dust of balance weighed.  
With God he saw his race began,  
And from him emanated man,  
And with him did in glory dwell,  
Before there was an earth or hell.  
(Song 1, stanzas 15 and 16)

In “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated,” we learn that Enoch saw the angel of the latter days (table 1, verse 8) whom John the Revelator describes thus: “And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth” (Revelation 14:6).

In the Pearl of Great Price, “the Lord showed Enoch all things, even unto the end of the world; and he saw the day of the righteous, the hour of their redemption, and received a fulness of joy” (Moses 7:67). In “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated,” more details are added concerning the hour of redemption and fulness of joy. The faithful Saints strike hands with Enoch, receive a celestial crown, inherit the city of God, and shout praises to the Lord when he appears (table 1, verses 15–17).

Some Final Considerations

Could Frederick G. Williams have simply penned five favorite hymns not of his own composing? There are several circumstances that militate against this thesis, several of which have already been discussed, such as the sequential nature of the ideas expressed in both the “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” and the “Songs of Zion.” In addition, these are not Protestant hymns; these are Restoration songs that rely heavily on the revelation of Enoch found in the Kirtland Revelation Book and in the book of Moses in the Pearl of Great Price. The only Restoration hymns

47. In Moses 6, Enoch speaks at length about Adam and Eve and their posterity.
at the time, 1833, were few and they were all printed in the Star, to which
President Williams, as a member of the First Presidency, had total access,
and therefore there would be no reason to pen them for his own personal
use. Second, the length of the first song (23 stanzas), makes it somewhat
impractical as a hymn, therefore Frederick G. Williams would not likely
have copied it as a favorite hymn, unless of course it was his own, based on
a gift of tongues experience.

Why did not Frederick G. Williams claim authorship of these five
songs during his lifetime? Perhaps he did. But in the first place, author
attrtribution was not included with the hymns and songs published in the
Star or early hymnals. Second, no personal journal written by Williams has
been found to date; had he kept one, he might have confided his author-
ship there. Third, Williams was, by nature, a taciturn man and avoided
the limelight. Joseph Smith said of him, “Brother Frederick G. Williams is
one of those men in whom I place the greatest confidence and trust, for I
have found him ever full of love and Brotherly kindness. He is not a man
of many words, but is ever winning, because of his constant mind. He
shall ever have place in my heart, and is ever entitled to my confidence.
He is perfectly honest and upright, and seeks with all his heart to mag-
nify his Presidency in the Church of Christ, but fails in many instances,
in consequence of a want of confidence in himself.”48 Williams had spent
much of his ministry as the scribe of the Prophet and was always in the
background, never center stage. Finally, there was essentially no author
attrtribution given to LDS hymns until 1863. The fact that Williams died in
1842, two years before the Prophet, insured that he would not participate
in the serious hymn-attrtribution-of-authors project begun in 1903 in the
Deseret News by the Church Historian’s Office. Mack Wilberg’s program
notes (which, unknown to him, referred to one of President Williams’s
hymns) give his musings on the acquaintance Joseph Smith might have
had with these early hymns:

The last movement is entitled “The Great and Glorious Gospel Light.” It
has a little nobility about it and I hope brings the piece to a close.

I can’t help but feel that Joseph Smith read these texts and perhaps
approved them before they were printed. I don’t think it’s going too far to
say that perhaps he knew some of them very well and maybe even loved
them. I am pleased to honor him by bringing them forward once again.49

The attribution of the five songs of Zion to Frederick G. Williams rests
on a number of important evidentiary steps.

48. History of the Church 1:444. See also Dean C. Jessee, ed., The Papers of
49. Transcription of Mack Wilberg’s Introduction.
1. The five songs of the manuscript are identified as being in the handwriting of and likely composed by Frederick G. Williams, and are catalogued in his name file at the LDS Archives (together with a second recently catalogued manuscript), based on the opinion of historian and handwriting expert, Dean Jessee.

2. All five songs were written as a group and numbered sequentially on two manuscript sheets in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams.

3. The two sheets containing the five songs were in the possession of Emma Smith, the compiler of the first LDS hymnal, where the four shorter songs were published. Emma Smith gave these and other documents to her second husband, Lewis Bidamon, who gave them to his son Charles Bidamon, who sold them to Wilford Wood, who gave them to the Church Historian's Office in 1937.

4. The direct inspiration for the songs is found in “Sang by the gift of Tongues and Translated,” a personal experience recorded by Frederick G. Williams in the Kirtland Revelation Book on February 27, 1833. The same ideas and phrases (some word for word) are also found in the five songs.

5. All five songs were published sequentially in the Star from May to July of 1833.

6. The songs were not titled “Poems” or “Hymns, Selected and prepared for the Church of Christ,” but “Songs of Zion,” thus retaining the original title found on the five-song manuscript and in the Kirtland Revelation Book, both in Frederick G. Williams's handwriting.

7. Four of the songs were kept as a group and published sequentially as hymns, numbers 19 through 22, in the original 1835 hymnal compiled by Emma Smith.

8. The four songs that appeared in the original 1835 hymnal continued to appear in virtually all of the twenty-six hymnals or editions published in the nineteenth century, both in England and America.

9. Only in the latter half of the nineteenth century did author attribution begin to appear in any LDS hymnal, but many of those attributions were later shown to be incorrect.

10. Three of the five songs have remained unattributed throughout the twentieth century. Of the two that were attributed, one was said to be by Parley P. Pratt and the other by Philo Dibble. The Parley P. Pratt attribution is easily shown to be incorrect. The Philo Dibble attribution is apparently based on the son’s statement given in 1903. However, since the five songs in the manuscript written by Frederick G. Williams remained together as a group when published in the Star and when published in the first LDS hymnal, it is more likely that the author of one is the author of all five.
Individually, the above ten evidentiary points are compelling. When taken together, they present a strong argument in support of Frederick G. Williams’s authorship of the five “Songs of Zion.”

The idea that Frederick G. Williams likely composed these five hymns is of course interesting and expands our admiration for and biographical understanding of the man. Even more important is the possibility that President Williams penned these hymns based on a gift of tongues experience that was recorded in the Kirtland Revelation Book along with other revelations. In some ways, “Sang by the gift of Tongues & Translated” (if not the hymns that were adapted from it) could therefore be considered personal revelation, and perhaps was even considered an inspired writing penned while President Williams was acting in his capacity as a prophet, seer, and revelator and member of the First Presidency.50 Both the recorded spiritual experience and the hymns themselves are important for the added details they provide, which augment our understanding of Enoch’s vision and the history of the world in the last days prior to Christ millennial reign.

50. The First Presidency—made up of Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery (assistant president of the High Priesthood), Sidney Rigdon, and Frederick G. Williams—formed the selection committee that chose from among the various revelations received those that should be included in the forthcoming Doctrine and Cov enants, published in 1835. See Collier and Harwell, Kirtland Council Minute Book, September 24, 1834, 61–63; History of the Church, 2:165. This one, along with others found in the Kirtland Revelation Book, was not selected and therefore was not canonized as binding scripture when the book was presented to the membership of the Church in the conference assembled.

Frederick G. Williams (frederick_williams@byu.edu), Gerrit de Jong Jr. Distinguished Professor of Luso-Afro-Brazilian Studies at Brigham Young University, is the author of eighteen volumes and more than fifty articles. After teaching for twenty-seven years at the University of California (UCLA and UCSB), he accepted an invitation to join the faculty in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at BYU. He is a grandson twice removed of Frederick G. Williams and is currently writing a biography on his namesake, who was a counselor to Joseph Smith Jr.
When Thomas Farrar Whitley was called to the Tongan Mission in 1935, he had “never heard of the place.” His reaction was not unusual. In 1935, Tonga was one of the least accessible nations on earth. Whitley and his two companions, Donald Anderson and Floyd Fletcher, spent nearly three months in transit just to get to their mission. They left San Francisco, going by boat through Hawaii, Fiji, New Zealand, and Australia. Then they had to travel back through New Zealand to Fiji, where they waited ten days for a boat going the right direction. When Whitley finally got to Tonga, he made sure he would remember the place.


2. Whitley, Anderson, and Fletcher started from San Francisco on March 6, 1935, on an ocean liner, the S.S. Monterey, with four other missionaries and the family of M. Charles Woods, newly called president of the New Zealand Mission. The ship traveled through the Pacific, dropping two missionaries off in Hawaii, and skirting the northern tip of the Tongan Islands. The ship did not stop, however, since Tonga’s major ports were over three hundred miles away in the southernmost group of the island chain. The ship traveled on to Fiji, where the three missionaries expected to find transport to their field. The people who were supposed to meet them, however, were not there, and the Fijian authorities refused to allow them to land since they had no visible means of support. Consequently, they went on to New Zealand with President Woods. Eventually they had to go on to Australia to find a ship that could deliver them to their assigned area. They finally arrived in Tonga two and a half months after they had set out from Salt Lake City. Their return trip in 1938 took another two and a half months, this time going through Hawaii. Thomas Farrar Whitley, Journal, March 6–May 18, 1935, in possession of Kristine Whitley Paulos.
He carefully recorded his mission in a daily journal, a set of papers, and some remarkable photographs.\(^3\) Taken together, Whitley’s records capture the traditional life of the Tongan people and reveal the changes that were occurring in the culture. Perhaps most importantly, they demonstrate the remarkable faithfulness of members and missionaries who helped the LDS Church recover from a series of devastating blows that had begun nearly four years earlier.

On August 17, 1932, Newel J. Cutler, president of the Tongan Mission, left Tonga to take his wife, Floy, to Hawaii for medical care. Although President Cutler expected to be back shortly, Sister Cutler’s condition was so severe that her husband was unable to return to Tonga at all. Given the exigencies of communication and travel through the Pacific in the 1930s, it was fifteen months before the new mission president, Reuben Wiberg, arrived.\(^4\) During that interim four missionaries, three Americans and one Tongan, had utterly abandoned their covenants and led members astray. They left disharmony among members of the Church and disgust among Tongans in general.\(^5\)

The Tongan Mission may well have closed had it not been for the faithful service of a strong cadre of dedicated members and missionaries. Both

---

3. Transcribed, annotated, and indexed print copies of the journal and papers, as well as records and discs of the scanned photographs, have been placed in the Church History Library, the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University, and the Joseph F. Smith Library at BYU–Hawaii along with permission to reproduce those photos and to release materials to interested researchers for personal and scholarly use.

4. The difficulty of travel through the Pacific in the 1930s is demonstrated by the experiences of Whitley and his companions in coming to Tonga, and further by the adventures the new Tongan Mission President Emile C. Dunn and his family faced the following year when he came to replace Reuben Wiberg as mission president. They left San Francisco on January 5, 1936, but had to wait weeks in Pago Pago, American Samoa, until a ship came by that could take them to Tonga. They did not arrive in Nuku’alofa until March 12. Emile C. Dunn, Journal, January 16 and March 12, 1936, microfilm copy, December 1935–August 1950, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.

5. Maurine Clark Wiberg, “As I Remember,” personal history, unpublished and undated, 11–12, copy provided by Gladys Farmer, Salt Lake City; R. Lanier Britsch, \textit{Unto the Islands of the Sea: A History of the Latter-day Saints in the Pacific} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986), 45; Ermel Joseph Morton, history of the LDS Church in Tonga, unpublished mss, copy in possession of Colleen Whitley, copy also available at the Church History Library. All four missionaries were excommunicated and the Americans returned home. The Tongan missionary returned to full fellowship; Whitley’s journal notes his participation in Church activities on several occasions.
their dedication and their way of life are demonstrated in Tom Whitley’s photographs.

Provenance and Background of Whitley’s Photographs

While many parts of the world were changing rapidly in the late 1930s, Tonga remained largely untouched. Cars were few and motion pictures were barely beginning to arrive. Few people had cameras, and fewer still took pictures of LDS congregations and activities. Whitley used a camera he describes only as a Kodak and then sent his black-and-white film to New Zealand for processing by Ralph Sanft at his drug and variety store, Ralph’s Reliable Remedies. He mailed several of the finished photos home to friends and family and carried the rest of his prints and negatives back to Salt Lake City with him when his mission ended in 1938. They remained in his possession in his Holladay, Utah, home until his death in 1975. In 1976, his wife, Dorothy, died exactly one year after her husband’s funeral. The negatives and photos were given to Whitley’s son, Tom (my husband), and me, who also live in Salt Lake City. We approached Craig Dransfield of Bountiful, Utah, who produced positive prints from each of the negatives using his collection of frames to fit all sizes of negatives. We then scanned photos and negatives and provided digital or print copies of all of Whitley’s records to family members, Tongan scholars, the LDS Church Archives, BYU, and BYU–Hawaii, along with permission to make copies for interested parties. All of Whitley’s original records, including his photographic negatives, are currently in possession of his daughter, Kristine Whitley Paulos of Provo, Utah.

Tom Whitley was both a talented and an eclectic photographer. He took pictures of a wide range of people, places, and events. The photographs’ value was greatly increased in 2002–2004, when Salote Wolfgramm and her daughters, Tisina Gerber and Taiana Brown, identified almost every person in the more than 130 photographs found to date.

Whitley served nearly his entire mission in Vava’u, the northernmost of Tonga’s three main island groups, home to the Wolfgramm family. Salote Wolfgramm was the Relief Society president for Vava’u during the time the photos were taken (and later for the entire mission), and her

6. Among Whitley’s papers are several letters from Sanft on his letterhead “Ralph’s Reliable Remedies, Ralph Sanft, Ph.C., M.P.S. N.Z. Chemist and Druggist, 201 Symonds Street (Opposite Post Office).” Down the side is a list of his services ranging from imported drugs to dog food. Correspondence from Ralph Sanft to Tom Whitley, in Thomas Farrar Whitley: Missionary Diaries and Records, Tonga 1935–1938, ed. Colleen Whitley (privately published, 2004), 297.
daughters grew up there; in many cases, in addition to names, they have also added the genealogy, marriages, children, occupations, and details from the lives of the people in the photographs. Gerber literally went many extra miles to obtain identifications; she took copies of the pictures to older Tongans now living in the Salt Lake area, to the Tongan ward, and to individuals from specific islands when it was clear that a picture had been taken on those islands.

‘Isileli Kongaika of BYU–Hawaii identified his family members and put Tom and me in contact with them. All of the missionaries named in the pictures were identified by Hyde Dunn, the son of mission president Emile Cranner Dunn and his wife, Evelyn Hyde Dunn. Hyde Dunn was seven years old in 1936 when his father was called to lead the Tongan mission. His father served as mission president for ten years, throughout World War II. In addition, Paul and Carolyn Tuitupou graciously translated records written in Tongan and explained customs and traditions mentioned in the records or evident in the photographs. Carolyn also proofread the article and checked the spelling of names.

Whitley’s records include a daily journal, correspondence, genealogy, programs, membership lists, financial statements, and statistics. Both his papers and his journal contain spelling and punctuation at variance with modern norms in both English and Tongan, as do several of the other journals and manuscripts cited here. There are several reasons for these variances. Tongan spelling and grammar was regularized in 1943 when the Tongan Privy Council established norms. For example, they declared that “b” and “p,” which are not phonemic in Tonga, would always be represented by a “p.” They also replaced the “g” with an “ng” to differentiate it from the “n.” Consequently the nation of “Toga” is now written as “Tonga.” In addition, in the 1930s, simplified English spelling was being touted by individuals and organizations ranging from George Bernard Shaw to *Time* magazine. In several cases cited in this article, so many variant spellings exist in a single quotation that the number of *sic* s in the text would be more intrusive than they would be helpful. In all quotations used here, spelling and grammar have been retained as in the original documents, although some traditional punctuation has been added for clarity.

7. The senior Dunns returned to Tonga as labor missionaries and once again as mission president, serving a total of nine missions between them. Hyde Dunn also returned to Tonga as a missionary twice, once in 1950 as a labor missionary building schools and again in 1993 with his wife, Cleona. Hyde and Cleona Dunn, interviewed by Tom and Colleen Whitley, Brigham City, Utah, September 2, 2000; Hyde Dunn, correspondence with Colleen Whitley, 1999–2004.
Today Tonga is a stronghold in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The nation has the highest per capita LDS Church membership of any nation in the world. Its members attend the temple and send missionaries to other parts of the world. This stands in sharp contrast to the situation seventy-four years ago when Thomas Farrar Whitley began keeping his records, in both words and photographs, of the way of life in Tonga and, even more, of the faithful members and missionaries who overcame tremendous difficulties to salvage and strengthen the faltering Church.


Colleen Whitley (ckwhitley5@gmail.com) is retired from teaching for the English and General Education and Honors departments of Brigham Young University. The author expresses sincere appreciation to Craig Dransfield, Paul and Carolyn Tuitupou, 'Isileli Kongaika, Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, Taiana Brown, Hyde and Cleona Dunn, and Lorraine Aston, who have made Thomas Farrar Whitley’s records and photographs accessible.
The Tongan Islands

Tonga's way of life in the 1930s was dictated by its geography. Tonga is a chain of tropical islands scattered over nearly 400 miles of ocean, with most of the population living in one of the three major island groups. The farthest south, Tongatapu, is the home of the capital, Nuku'alofa, and the center of trade and business. Ha'apai, located approximately in the middle, is known to LDS Church members as the area in which Elder John H. Groberg served much of his mission. Vava'u, the farthest north, is the area in which Tom Whitley served nearly all of his mission.

Courtesy of the University of Texas Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin.
Tin Can Mail

The northernmost Tongan island is Niuafo'ou, where the ocean currents are sufficiently predictable that letters sealed in tin cans could be dropped from a passing boat to drift into the island. From there, the letters were mailed more conventionally when a ship heading the right direction passed by. As a result, Niuafo'ou became famous as Tin Can Island. Tom sent this letter to his future wife, Dorothy Gundersen, on March 16, 1935. At the same time, he mailed one to himself at the Tongan Mission Headquarters in Nuku'alofa. Dorothy received her letter in Utah a month later, but the one Tom mailed to himself didn’t arrive until June 28.

Houses

Everything from jobs to housing depended on locally available materials. These typical Tongan homes made of pandanus leaves feature the round end design used in Tonga for centuries. These are probably the homes of Fifita Motua and Sep Tu’akelas and were next door to the Ha’alaufuli missionary home and chapel.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
The Langi family of Ha'alaufuli was among the most faithful Church members in Vava'u. They are shown here breaking coconut shells and collecting the meat. Left to right, with the eventual married names of young women and girls in parentheses: the father, Saia Langi, holding an ax, Sione Makihele, Tupou Leota (Latu), Telela Pauni, Vaingana 'Unga, Hakau Makilele ('Unga), Luseane 'Otuafi (Pauni), Lulama Langi ('Unga) and Saia's wife, 'Ana. The area is fenced to protect the food from pigs, which had been brought to the islands by white traders and, with no natural predators, quickly became a menace. "Chief of Police—a Mr. Ballard . . . told us of the Pig menace; he's killed 2000 Pigs in 2 or 3 years; it's a serious problem," wrote Tom Whitley. It's also one of the reasons roast pig was such a common part of the diet and so popular for feasts.

Truck with copra

Lihati 'Unga, son of Sioeli 'Unga, about to become the driver, stands in front of a truck, one of only four trucks in Vava'u at the time. It was owned by Lever Brothers manager Fredrich Wolfgramm and appears to bear bags of copra, dried coconut. On top of the truck, left to right, are Taukoho Langi, Motulalo Latu, Sione Makihele, and Tali Kivaha Langi. Ald Moli stands at the back. The house in the background was owned by Fifita Motua and was only two doors away from the missionary home.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
Copra house

Once the copra was harvested, it went to the beach at Ulha, Ha'apai, to the Fale Fu’a Niu, the copra house, the building on the right. There dried copra was weighed and payment made to those who brought it in.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfram, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
Loading copra onto a boat for shipping

Cora was loaded on boats like this one at the wharf. Whitley observed that the copra is “packed in sacks—weighing I should judge 150 lbs apiece—about 30 sacks are piled on the trucks—which are on tracks something like mine tracks; the boys (no matter how old they’re boys) are the engines.”

Whitley journal, May 14, 1935.
Baptisms were conducted in the ocean, like this one in the liku, the cliff or rocky side of the island. Hyde Dunn thinks this place is Ketahi, where he was baptized, and the man performing the baptism may be Saia Langi. Photo identification by Hyde Dunn.
Tithing house

Because so little cash was available, most members paid their tithing in things they grew or caught. Some of it could be shipped or sold for cash, but much of it was given to the poor or used for church activities. Here Elders Sylvan Rindlisbacher and Tom Whitley stand in front of the tithing house in Haʻalaufuli holding a contribution.

Photo identification by Hyde Dunn.
Crossing the water

Travel in Tonga inevitably involves crossing water. The Tongan Islands have both volcanic and coral bases; as a result, in several places coral reefs and sandbars provide easy access from one island to another. “Went to organize a Relief Society at the Koloa—to get there we walked & waded thru the sea in bare feet—would that be a good picture to see me with my pants rolled up and shoes in hand wading from one island to another—at low tide of course,” wrote Tom.

For land travel, missionaries sometimes used bicycles or horses, but in most cases, it was easier simply to walk, even from one island to another. In Nuku’alofa, the capital in the south, the mission owned some cars: a 1935 Ford, a 1926 Chevrolet, and a 1922 Essex. “In 1941, when Tungi, the husband of Queen Salote, died, the venerable Ford was requisitioned to bring his body from Pelehake to Nuku’alofa,” remembers Hyde Dunn.

In June 1936, the Church bought a used sailboat to make transportation easier among the islands in Vava’u. Elders Tom Whitley and Verrill Wilford Draper painted it green and white and named it *Tolofi*, “Dorothy,” after Whitley’s sweetheart in Utah. The boat even became a missionary tool. When it won a race on Boxing Day, Whitley observed, “Every one will be talking ‘Mamoga’ [Mormon] for a while.” The *Tolofi* was used for years to ferry members, missionaries, and visiting General Authorities from island to island. In off times, missionaries used it for fishing, which they did both to sustain themselves and to provide items they could sell to raise money for Church needs.

Hyde and Cleona Dunn, interview with Tom and Colleen Whitley, Brigham City, Utah, September 2, 2000; Hyde Dunn, correspondence with Colleen Whitley, 1999–2004; Whitley journal, December 26, 1936.
Missionaries from the LDS Church initially entered Tonga in 1891 but withdrew six years later, when extensive proselyting had produced only a handful of members, not all of whom remained faithful. When missionaries returned in 1907, Nopele 'Iki Tupou Fulivai invited some of the first LDS missionaries to teach in Neiafu, where they opened a branch and a school. When the Tongan government instituted education in Vava’u in the 1930s, 'Iki Tupou Fulivai became one of the first students to graduate. His wife, Levatai, was part Fijian and worked in the Relief Society. Fulivai had contact with many people from different parts of the Pacific because he was the pilot who helped bring large ships into Neiafu harbor with Fredrich Wolfgramm’s boat, Olga. Wolfgramm’s daughter, Olga, was named after his boat. Levatai later married Tevita Fauese.

Jacob Olsen

Among the faithful Saints in Tonga were several immigrants. Jacob Olsen, shown here with an unidentified child, came from Norway and had joined the Church in Tonga in 1898. “The elders then left (about two years later) Jacob went to Samoa & they left the books [records] with him. He came back [to Tonga] in 1908 & assisted in opening the mission again,” wrote Tom Whitley. When Whitley arrived in Tonga, Jacob and his wife, Fua Lupe of Tefisi, lived at Leimatua. Olsen filled many callings and helped translate the Book of Mormon into Tongan. When Jacob died, Whitley took care of the funeral and wrote to Jacob's family in Fredrikstad, Norway, informing them of his death. Whitley’s future brother-in-law, Orson Gundersen, then a missionary in Norway, reported that since the family was prominent, a notice appeared in Norwegian newspapers. It said Jacob Olsen had died in Tonga and funeral services were conducted by Pastor Tom Whitley. The name of Pastor Whitley’s church, however, was printed in English, so few readers were able to connect Jacob’s pastor with the Mormon missionaries in Norway.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgamm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown. Whitley journal, August 18, 1935; October 14–15, 1936; Dorothy Gundersen, letter to Tom Whitley, May 6, 1937.
Malakai Manu (on the white horse) and Tom Whitley (on the dark horse) pose in front of the old Methodist Church at Ha’alafuli. They are facing the main road and the Tapu Hia, or Holy Place, home to the LDS chapel, missionary home, social hall, and tithing hut. The bell in the Wesleyan chapter rang every morning at six for early services, and the minister’s voice could clearly be heard from the street outside. When this chapel burned down, the Mormons helped in building a new one.

The minister of the Wesleyan Methodists and Whitley had many long talks and, in time, the relationship between the two churches improved to the point that, as Tom wrote, “We were all invited to go to a bo hiva [evening meeting with singing] in the Wesly. church tonite in Ha’al [Ha’alafuli]—all of us went saints & all—Misi Emile [President Emile Dunn] spoke & so did F. Motua [a local member] for the Mormons—Our choir sang. . . . After meeting every one was talking about Emiles talk & the Mormon Choir.” The next day the two congregations assembled again for more pragmatic purposes: “Worked on Fence today—had all the Wesly. come over & help—Our boys bargained with them to fix & get the posts—they would fix a feed. When it was all ready & we were about half way thru the fence—we hit for kai [food] at the liku [coral or cliff side of the island]—I never saw so much kai . . . what a feed—many talks given—everyone happy because of the peace among all the churches here—before it has been so different.”

Tom Whitley with Kitione Maile

Many Tongans were called as missionaries within their own country. Here Tom Whitley stands with Kitione (Gideon) Maile, a pioneer in the Church in Nukunuku, Tongatapu. This photo was probably taken while Maile was serving as a missionary in Vava’u. Although he was illiterate, Maile had a profound knowledge of the gospel and could quote the Bible easily. His sermons became legendary.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown. Hyde Dunn interviews; notations on a print of the picture; Shumway, Tongan Saints, 13; Eric Shumway, telephone interview by Anastasia Sutherland, 2003.
Tēvita Mapa

New member Tēvita (David) Mapa is shown here with Elders Verrill Wilford Draper (left) and Thomas Whitley (center). One of the first ordinances Whitley performed after he arrived in Tonga was the confirmation of Tēvita Mapa: “Yesterday (Sunday) . . . we had a baptism service after morning service & 7 or 8 were baptized—In the afternoon they were confirmed members—I confirmed a brother David Mapa & Henry Mafi This Bro. Mapa is Sect. to the premier of Tonga—he’s been investigating the Church for quite a long time & regardless of the opposition from his family & his employer & friends he has joined the Church & he’s a wonderful man—I look forward to the time when he’ll be a leader in the work here in Tonga & I feel that he will be an instrument in the Lord’s hands to do a great work—I felt at that time to give him that blessing.”

Tēvita Mapa did indeed become a leader in the work in Tonga. Following his baptism, Queen Salote Piloevu Tupou, reacting to the bad reputation of the LDS Church, offered him a noble’s title if he would leave the Church. He refused the title and served the LDS Church valiantly in several positions including president of the Tongatapu District until his death in 1945. His legacy continued through his family. His son, Penisimani (Peni) Lātūsela Mapa, served as a high councilor and mission translation officer. The tradition has continued into the present generation.

Four women in mourning

British missionaries had introduced Christianity in the late eighteenth century, and English emissaries of both church and state added to or altered local customs. In 1890, Tonga became a part of the British Empire, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church was named the official state church of Tonga. British customs induced some changes in dress and behavior. At the same time, Tongans still maintained their own traditions. These four women, from left to right, Lepeka Kinikini, 'Ana-Malia Kinikini (who married Tavu Hakau), Foli'aki Pekipaki Kinikini, and 'Ofa Ulii, from 'Uiha, Ha'api, are in mourning. They are wearing both British black dresses and Tongan lavalavas, with woven mats tied around their waists with ropes made from braided horse hairs. Another Victorian fashion required mature women to wear clothes that covered them from wrist to ankle. For years that custom affected LDS sister missionaries, who were advised to dress in pastels with sleeves to the wrist and wear full-length lavalavas under their skirts. Even today immediate family members may wear black for up to a year after a death, though distant relatives wear black for a shorter period. Almost everyone wears black at funerals, and when Queen Salote died in 1965, everyone in the entire country wore black, and entertainments and movie theaters closed down for a year.

Faithful women in front of the chapel

A group of faithful sisters stands with Tom Whitley in front of the Ha‘alufuli chapel. The elders’ house, in the background, was most remembered for the bees that inhabited its walls. Back row, left to right: Hokau Makihele 'Unga, Tom Whitley, Ida Pauni, 'Ana Langi, Seine Sipaika (who married Founiteni Ika Koula), and Luseane Latu. Front row, left to right: 'Ana Pauni (married name Kalama-foni), Telela Pauni, Luseane 'Otuafl Pauni, and Luisa Pauni. The boy in the background is Motulalo Latu. Eric Shumway observes that the sisters truly “mothered” the Church through difficult times.

Relief Society sisters at work

Relief Society sisters from Ha’alaufuli Branch sit beside the chapel weaving tapakau mats for the floor. At the far left are ’Ofa Kongaika Naeata and ’Ana Falesi’u Pa’uni. The young girl is ’Ana Pa’ongo Latu, and her mother, Manu Mei Mo’unga Latu, sits next to her. Behind them, leaning forward, is Lase’an Latu, and behind her is Salote Fakatou Wolfgramm, and the baby with her is probably her son Charles. Salote Wolfgramm and her daughters, Tisina Gerber and Taiana Brown, have identified almost all of the people in Tom Whitley’s Tongan photos, including this one. At the right are ’Ana Tu’ifeleunga Langi and Ana Lieti Wolfgramm.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
Among those faithful saints whose descendants continue to build the Church were Viliami and 'Ofa Naeata. 'Ofa is shown here, with Tom Whitley holding her eldest son, Thomas Whitley Naeata. The Naeatas were second generation members of the Church; both were very active and worked in various callings. One of their sons, Mosese, served as president of the Papua New Guinea Mission, the first Tongan called to serve as a mission president outside of Tonga. Thomas Whitley Naeata recently retired, having worked as an electrician for BYU–Hawaii. He has served in many callings, including bishop of a Tongan ward in Hawaii. Thomas Naeata used “Whitley” as a middle name for each of his sons, and his children have continued the tradition of including the Whitley name for each of his grandsons. They have thus unknowingly helped to fulfill one of the promises in Thomas Farrar Whitley’s patriarchal blessing: “Thy name shall be handed down in future generations.” Hyde Dunn observes that they are sitting in front of a wall made of woven tapa, which is mulberry bark pounded thin enough for weaving. It was a common building material before World War II, but the skill is almost entirely lost now.

Tongan baby

“[It] is the custom here when a babe is a year old to thank the Lord for the child coming thru the first & most critical year of his or her life,” wrote Tom Whitley. When Salote Wolfgramm and her daughters, Tisina Gerber and Taiana Brown, looked at this picture, they all immediately said, “That’s a Naeata baby.” If they are right, this is a picture of Tom Whitley Naeata, son of Ofa and Viliami Naeata.

Whitley journal, June 12, 1935.
Two groups of fishermen

Upper photo: On the back of the photograph, Tom Whitley wrote, “These men are all elders & good ones too.” Left to right: Viliami Naeata Koloti, Vili Kalisiti’ane Wolfgramm, Sosaia Langi, Tom Whitley, Sosaia Naeata.


Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown. Eric Shumway, telephone interview by Anastasia Sutherland, 2003. Shumway said that not only were the men good elders, but their families have continued to serve faithfully as well.
Saia Langi

Saia Langi was one of the stalwart members of the Church at Ha’alaufuli, serving in callings ranging from scout leader to branch president.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
Tom Whitley, Hiva Fifita, and the Dunn children ready to paint
Missionaries preach, baptize, and paint. Here Tom Whitley gets some help with a service project from Hiva Fifita, who was employed in the mission home, and Hyde and Karen Dunn, eldest children of President Emile and Evelyn Hyde Dunn. On June 27, 1937, Whitley recorded the baptisms of both Hiva Fifita and Hyde Dunn.

Photo identification by Hyde Dunn.
Tom Whitley at the grave of Victor Lee

Elder Victor Lee died of typhoid fever in Ha’alaufuli in 1932. In 1935, President Reuben Wiberg, accompanied by members and missionaries, went to Ha’alaufuli to set up a headstone on his grave. The inscription reads, “Victor Lee, An elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Born at Afton, Wyo. USA, Oct. 22, 1909, Died in Tonga Aug. 2, 1932. While valiant as a shepherd of the flock, he was called to the fold of eternity.”
Ha’alaufuli Branch

Members of the Ha’alaufuli Branch pose behind the missionary home.


Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown, with assistance on spelling from Lorraine Aston.
Picnic at the beach

Kai Tunu, a Branch picnic at 'Otu-alea Beach, Ha'alaufuli, clockwise, from lower left: Siaosi Kupu Halau-fia, unidentified (back to the camera), Ula Naeata, Levai Tai, with an unidentified baby behind her, Sione Vaipapalangi Latu, Alisi Langi, Tupou Moheofo Mana Vahitau, Tom Whitley, 'Iohani Otto Wolfgramm, Fana'afi Vaitai, Vea Naeata, 'Onesi Wolfgramm, Maele Wolfgramm, 'Asinate Halaufia Manavahetau, Ta'ofi 'Otuafi Sanft, Sione 'Ulufo-nua, Epalahame Kuma Tu'aone, Sioli Fusiloa 'Unga. Hyde Dunn observes that Epalahame Tu'aone baptized him.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, and Taiana Brown.
Two views of Neiafu Harbor

The harbor at Neiafu in Vava'u was regarded as one of the busiest and most beautiful in the islands. The buildings on the far right house several significant trading firms from whom both natives and missionaries purchased essentials and luxuries: Burns Phillips, Morris Hedstrom, and Lever Brothers. In the right foreground are the wharf and rails to carry copra to the waiting boats. The white buildings to the right of it house customer services for people leaving or arriving in Vava'u.

Photo identification by Salote Wolfgramm, Tisina Gerber, Taiana Brown, and Hyde Dunn.
Goodbye

In my family, it is the word that says everything:
I love you; I want you to come back.

Only in her later years did Mother use the word
*proud*. That sounded as frothy as *love*.

Once I didn’t say *Goodbye* when my parents left
for a long day and into the night for Salt Lake.

As usual, Mother had washed and ironed the temple clothes
before layering them lightly into the two suitcases.

With my sisters and brother, I watched
from the kitchen window for headlights to announce them.

When they didn’t come, I knew I wouldn’t forgive myself.
Salt Lake was as far away as we’d ever go then.

State Street was a long corridor of sirens.
Once I grew up, I didn’t fret so much.

How many times had I practiced, unnecessarily,
being an orphan? Then before she left finally

after all the rehearsals that unhealthy year,
when the family knew she would go and not come back,

we cast unnatural words around casually,
profusely, avoiding our own *Goodbye,*

fearing, perhaps, it would snap the coffin’s latch.
We should have owned the word, released its syllables

from our tight tongues like genetic valentines,
the word both warmly complete, and open-ended.

—Marilyn Bushman-Carlton
The Patterns of Missionary Work and Emigration in Early Victorian Buckinghamshire, England, 1849–1878

Ronald E. Bartholomew

Latter-day Saint missionaries from America began proselyting in Buckinghamshire, England, in the 1840s and established the first branches of the Church there in 1849, but they did not experience the same dramatic successes their colleagues encountered in other regions of the British Isles. Indeed, most of the baptisms in this more rural county came as a result of missionary work by local converts. Several factors help explain the Buckinghamshire experience, and in many ways missionary work in this region may actually be more representative of Church growth in other parts of the world than the phenomenal conversion rates experienced in certain more industrial areas of England in the middle to latter years of the nineteenth century.

As is true of most historiography on the Church, historical analyses of Mormonism in the British Isles tend to focus on prominent individuals or principal institutions.1 J. F. C. Harrison observed that historians have typically emphasized the decisions and accomplishments of those in positions of authority or prominence. He suggests this might occur because of the difficulties associated with gathering pertinent information about “common people.”2 Despite this difficulty, Harrison says, documents relative to the “common people” are the historian’s witnesses, and “our task is to force them to speak, even against their will,” because “the real, central theme of History is not what happened, but what people felt about it when it was happening.”3

Regarding the tendency of historians to focus on larger or more prominent institutions, Andrew Phillips has noted that a closer analysis of LDS congregations from a regional perspective would bring a richness and color that might otherwise be missed. He asserted, “The diversity of local
I did my doctoral studies at the University of Buckingham in England. While studying there, I developed a close association with Professor John Clarke. One day he discovered that I was using almost all of my free time visiting various parish churches in Buckinghamshire in an attempt to learn more about my maternal ancestors, who almost exclusively originated from that county. Due to his interest in Victorian history, he challenged me to provide for him and a group of interested scholars an explanation for “the mass emigration of citizens from that county during the nineteenth century incident to the preaching of Mormon missionaries.” His main interest was Charles Dickens’s account in The Uncommercial Traveller of eight hundred Mormon emigrants who left London in 1863 aboard the ship Amazon. Dickens recorded that some of them were “plaiting straw,” a major cottage industry at that time in Buckinghamshire and adjoining counties. Professor Clarke was particularly intrigued by Dickens’s comment that, unlike others emigrating at the time, the Mormons were orderly, well kept, and appeared to be “the pick and flower of England.” This raised several questions: What social class was predominantly represented by LDS emigrants from Buckinghamshire? Were any of the emigrants aboard the Amazon from Buckinghamshire? What were the missionaries like, and what was their message and method of presenting it that could have persuaded “the pick and flower of England” to leave the motherland because of their newfound religious beliefs?

LDS historical literature contains many studies regarding missionary work, emigration, and the growth of the Church in various locales in England. Upon close examination, however, it became apparent that no study of this sort had been conducted in respect to the specific time period and location in question. It also became apparent that in order to proceed, I would need funding. I applied for and received a research grant through the BYU Religious Studies
Center. What began as an attempt to provide an answer for these inquiring scholars has evolved into an impassioned pursuit of any information I could gather regarding the genesis of the Church in Buckinghamshire. And the rest is, well, history!

I discovered that the Buckinghamshire Saints were indeed represented on the Amazon. And some of the missionaries on that vessel had served there as well. Three of the most interesting finds of this research were:

- The high level of involvement of the members in the missionary effort.
- The location of two existing buildings where LDS church services were held in the nineteenth century. In the process, I met and interviewed a centenarian who remembered witnessing baptisms by the Mormons in the pond adjacent to one of the buildings and had recorded it in her personal writings.
- The contrast between the methods used by missionaries in this rural setting as opposed to those employed by missionaries in the more densely populated, industrialized areas of the same time period, which has become my current research focus.

I am indebted to BYU’s Religious Studies Center, which funded this project. I am especially thankful for the expertise of my faithful research assistant, Careen Valentine. Professors John Clarke and Martin Ricketts of the University of Buckingham graciously provided me with office space at the University of Buckingham during my research trips during the summers of 2006, 2007, and 2008. Professor Clarke also helped me place my findings in the proper Victorian context for Buckinghamshire. I stayed at the home of Harry and Jesse Withington of Aylesbury (the county seat and location of the archives) for these past three summers and have grown to love and appreciate them. Harry and Jesse are both advanced in years but still serve faithfully in the Church. They are representative of the Saints from this rural English county that I have grown to love and admire. Truly, Buckinghamshire has become my home away from home.
circumstances makes it possible to distinguish trends and conditions that
do not necessarily correspond to national patterns.†4

This analysis will address both of these concerns, utilizing the stories
of heretofore unheralded missionaries and members who lived and worked
in this diverse region. After considering Buckinghamshire in its Victorian
context, this paper will examine the genesis of the Church in this area,
exploring patterns of missionary work and emigration in this region and
how they correspond to or diverge from national trends.

**Early Victorian Buckinghamshire**

Buckinghamshire is one of the English “home counties,” located
immediately northwest of and adjacent to London (fig. 1). Despite its
proximity to London and Bedfordshire, Mormon missionary work, sub-
sequent conversions, and emigration patterns in Buckinghamshire are
unique in many respects. For example, an exhaustive examination of
extant historical data pertaining to those who labored as missionaries in
this county during this time period shows no evidence that any Apostle,
General Authority, or other prominent Church leader worked in, visited,
or even walked through its confines. Likewise, there is no evidence that
any convert from this county ever rose to the level of known prominence
in the hierarchy of Church leadership.†5

The socioeconomic makeup of this county was also unlike other
regions that have been the predominant focus of studies of the Church
in early Victorian England. Scholars have asserted that the vast majority
of Mormon converts came from the working class living in industrial-
ized urban centers.†6 In contrast, Buckinghamshire experienced few of the
direct effects of the Industrial Revolution that transformed many other
parts of Britain in the nineteenth century.†7 Consequently, it had no major
industrial center to attract large numbers of people from elsewhere—a
pattern typical of areas where missionary work, convert baptisms, and
emigration have been more closely examined. Moreover, Professor John
Clarke argues that it would be incorrect to describe rural Buck-
inghamshire farm laborers of this time period as working class. “Class is about
more than income,” he notes. “It also involves values and perceptions,
and . . . farm workers and factory workers had a rather different take on
most things.” It would be more correct to describe the residents of Buck-
inghamshire during this period as “landless laborers” or “the rural poor”
rather than “working class.”†8

In addition, the success of Mormonism in England during this
time period (1849–1878) was subject to certain geocultural limitations.
**Fig. 1.** English counties. Buckinghamshire is one of the “home counties,” being adjacent to London. Shown are the locations of six known nineteenth-century LDS branches in Buckinghamshire, 1841–1852, along with Sherington, birthplace of the first Buckinghamshire natives to convert to the Church.
For example, while missionaries laboring in the West Midlands and North West reported success, those working in the vicinity of London described a vastly different experience. These early missionaries referred to that locale as the “seat of Satan,” “the great babylon,” and “the hardest place I ever visited for establishing the gospel.”

Empirical studies approaching this phenomenon from different disciplines have proffered diverse but complementary explanations for why this may have been so. In terms of the actual geography, John Gay suggested there was a line of demarcation that divided the country into north-northwest and south-southeast regions. He claims the line represented “a clear divide” in terms of the success or failure of post-Reformation Catholicism, the front-runner of nonconformity with the Church of England, was prominent in the eighteenth century. This same area would prove fruitful for Mormon missionaries in the following century.

Interestingly, Stephen Fleming suggests a similar, although not identical, demarcation (fig. 3):

The line from the Wash to Bristol (called the Wash-Severn line) that divides Great Britain between its Northwest and Southeast was the dividing line between the Mormons’ most and least receptive proselytizing areas in the Anglo world. The apostles added six thousand converts during their year in Britain, and at their departure 98 percent of British Mormons were in the Northwest. In 1844, 93 percent of British Mormons resided in the North and West. . . . By 1851 the numbers were less stark, down to 77 percent; however, over seven thousand British Mormons had left for America by 1850, and the numbers suggest that these individuals
Fig. 3. Location and size of LDS conferences, as reported in the *Millennial Star*, April 1844. Membership numbers do not reflect converts who had already emigrated. The gray line is based on Cedric Cowing, *The Saving Remnant: Religion and the Settling of New England*, 13. The line designates the cultural division between the religiously liberal northwest and the conservative southeast. Thanks to Stephen J. Fleming for leading me to this information.
were overwhelmingly Northwesterners. Thus the percentage of total Northwestern British Mormons in 1851, the year Mormonism reached its peak in Britain, was likely higher than the percentage still remaining in Britain. While the Wash-Severn line presents no absolute dividing line between areas of Mormon success and subregional variance certainly occurred, the line does indicate a larger trend in early Mormon British conversions.  

Regardless of where the division may have occurred, these studies provide empirical explanations for the contrasting success and failure Mormonism experienced in these two different geographical regions during the early Victorian period. Either dividing line placed Buckinghamshire in the southeastern region.

Whether due to the lack of prominent missionaries and members who served or lived in Buckinghamshire, the county’s nonindustrial and rural nature, or its geographic location, the study of Mormon missionary work and conversions in and emigration from Buckinghamshire during this time period proffers a unique perspective to early Victorian LDS Church history. With this context, this paper will address the following relevant topics:

1. Extant records of branches in Buckinghamshire and evidence that other branches may have existed.
2. Buckinghamshire natives who joined the Church, how they came in contact with the Church, and what role they played in Church growth in Buckinghamshire.
3. The religious climate in Buckinghamshire and how it affected missionary work and convert baptisms.
4. A comparison of conversion rates in this county and other regions.
5. A comparison of emigration rates in this county and other regions and factors that may have affected these rates.

The Genesis of the Church in Buckinghamshire: Nineteenth-Century Branches of Record

At the general conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints held on April 6, 1844, it was reported that a branch of eight members was located at Wolverton, Buckinghamshire (see fig. 3). The first three known families with ties to Buckinghamshire who joined the Church were originally from Sherington, which is only six miles from Wolverton. The membership of the branch at Wolverton could not have been composed of the Sherington group, however, because those early converts either
emigrated before or joined the Church after 1844. Apart from this reference to Wolverton in general conference of April 1844, no other evidence of the existence of this branch has yet come to light. Consequently, we do not know who any of the members of this branch might have been. What we do know is that rapid social and economic change caused a good deal of internal migration in Britain. In 1833, Parliament approved plans to build a railway line from London to Birmingham. Wolverton was the midpoint on this line, so a station was built to facilitate changing engines. By 1845, the railway had built some two hundred houses for its workers, along with schools, a church, and a market. In 1846, Wolverton became the site of the locomotive works of the London & Northwestern Railway. The works grew rapidly and eventually employed over two thousand men. A thorough investigation of the activities of LDS missionaries reveals no evidence that any missionaries labored in the area around Wolverton and Sherington at this time. Of course, much missionary work was taking place in London and the northwestern “home counties.” A possible—though still speculative—explanation of the Wolverton Branch is that it consisted of a single family who joined the Church earlier, perhaps in London or Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, and then relocated to Wolverton. They could have come from even further afield, since some of the more highly skilled workers at Wolverton came from the north of England.

Five years later, on April 1, 1849, the first branch of the Church in Buckinghamshire for which there are extant branch records was established in Edlesborough. Missionaries had been laboring in the neighboring county of Bedfordshire since 1837, and Edlesborough lies very close to the Buckinghamshire/Bedfordshire border. One unanswered question—which will require further exploration—is why it took twelve years for Mormonism to take root in Buckinghamshire when it grew so rapidly in the neighboring county of Bedfordshire. This question becomes particularly intriguing in light of the fact that a robust branch of the Church existed in Luton, Bedfordshire, only seven miles from Edlesborough. Luton was the chief center of commerce for straw-plaiting, the major cottage industry in both eastern Buckinghamshire and western Bedfordshire, so there would have been regular interaction between some residents on both sides of the county border.

The Edlesborough Branch was actually the reorganization of a branch at Whipsnade, Bedfordshire, which was established on February 27, 1848. It became the Edlesborough Branch on April 1, 1849, after its relocation. On April 4, 1846, Elder Elisha Hildebrand Davis, an American missionary and the president of the London Conference, baptized Benjamin Johnson, a native of Northall, Buckinghamshire, in the small community
of Whipsnade, Bedfordshire. Whipsnade was less than eight miles north of Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, where Davis had worked during the previous six months. Benjamin’s wife, Charlotte, also a Buckinghamshire native, was baptized three weeks later, on April 27, 1846, by Elder Thomas Squires, a local convert. Squires had been serving in the Hemel Hempstead Branch presidency.

The Johnsons were somewhat atypical converts because of their unusually high social status. Both were more educated and culturally refined than the typical rural or working-class converts who joined the Church in nineteenth-century England. Benjamin purportedly graduated from Oxford, and Charlotte from a girls’ finishing school. Benjamin loved music and often earned money playing the bass violin. He also played other stringed instruments, as well as the flute and the clarinet. Charlotte was known for her passion for reading the classics and memorizing and reciting poetry. Benjamin and Charlotte became the founding members of the Eaton Bray (Bedfordshire) Branch, and, with the exception of the traveling Elders, they remained the only members of the Church in the area for over five months. On December 1, 1846, Elder Squires ordained Benjamin an elder; Benjamin later served as the president of the Eaton Bray Branch.

As the Church grew in this area, the branch was divided and the Johnsons became the founding members of the Whipsnade Branch, where Benjamin again served as president. It is interesting to note that the subsequent change in the name of the Whipsnade Branch and its relocation to Edlesborough occurred at about the same time the Johnsons moved back to Northall, Buckinghamshire, a hamlet of Edlesborough.

Unlike other areas in Buckinghamshire, the Church grew quickly in Edlesborough. Under the leadership of Benjamin Johnson, the Edlesborough Branch became the largest branch in nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire, with over 160 members at its peak. It was also the only LDS congregation in Buckinghamshire listed in the 1851 Census of Religious Worship. The census record states: “170. Edlesborough. Latter Day Saints Meeting Place. Erected before 1800. . . On the 30th March Afternoon General Congregation 90; Evening General Congregation 100. Dated 31st March. Signed Benjamin Johnson, Presiding Elder, Northall Bucks.” According to local histories and historians, the building mentioned in the census record was actually a public house referred to as The Good Intent (fig. 4). An adjacent pond was used for baptisms. The building is still standing and has since been converted into two private houses. An identifying placard still stands by the building.

Historical records indicate that the real key to the growth of the Church in Edlesborough was not so much the impact of the American elders,
but rather the enthusiastic work of the locals who had themselves only recently joined the Church. In less than seven years (from April 4, 1846, to March 27, 1853), for instance, Benjamin Johnson helped bring more people into the Church than anyone else in nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire.\textsuperscript{37} Johnson was the only person the American missionary Elisha Hildebrand Davis actually baptized and confirmed in any of the three branches the Johnsons belonged to.\textsuperscript{38} In other words, the Edlesborough Branch continued to grow and prosper because of the efforts of recently baptized members who began serving as missionaries, some immediately following their baptism.\textsuperscript{39} Johnson, however, was only one of several local convert missionaries, all of whom enjoyed almost as much success. In the Edlesborough Branch alone, Benjamin Johnson baptized thirty people; Robert Hodgert, twenty-three people; George Smith, fifteen; Berrill Covington, twelve; John Mead, a priest, nineteen; and Samuel Impey, also a priest, twenty-six.\textsuperscript{40} These missionaries did not confine their efforts to the Edlesborough Branch; Benjamin baptized nearly twenty people into the Eaton Bray and Studham (Bedfordshire) branches, and each of the other local missionaries baptized members in nearby branches.\textsuperscript{41} In essence, the heavy involvement of newly baptized converts was crucial to the growth of the Church throughout Buckinghamshire.

The Edlesborough Branch grew to be nearly four times larger than any other nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire branch for which records can be located. Elder Robert Hodgert, a local convert who became a missionary, noted the success of the Church in this area: “The work continued, steadily increasing; truth was triumphant; the word was confirmed with
signs following, much to the astonishment of the people. The truth had now taken deep root. . . . Nothing else was talked about except this new doctrine and these men who are turning the world upside down.”

By 1850, the growth of the Church in this area was formally recognized by Church leaders in London, and on January 5 of that year, Elder John Banks, then president of the London Conference, transferred the Luton, Edlesborough, Flamstead, Hemel Hempstead, and Studham branches from the London Conference to the Bedfordshire Conference. Interestingly, this formal action, recorded in the Latter-day Saints’ *Millennial Star*, is the last mention of the Edlesborough Branch in any known official or Church document. This could well be the result of the large number of Edlesborough Saints who emigrated from 1851 through 1872. Of the 163 names found on this branch record, 77 (47 percent of the branch’s total membership) can be identified as emigrants. The majority of these families emigrated through the Church’s official emigration offices in Liverpool. One noteworthy exception, the George Cheshire family, emigrated through London on the famed *Amazon*; an account of their emigration was included in Charles Dickens’s *The Uncommercial Traveller*.

The next Buckinghamshire branch was presumably the one created at Simpson (fig. 5), not far from Wolverton. The first members of this branch were baptized by William Reed, of North Crawley, who had been baptized in 1845. North Crawley was a small Buckinghamshire village six miles northeast of Simpson. Reed baptized William Luck; his mother, Rosannah

**Fig. 5.** A picturesque home in Simpson, Buckinghamshire.
Button Luck; and Ellen Briant. David Cowley and William Luck’s father, John Luck, along with three other members, were baptized the next month, and Cowley was called as the first branch president.

This branch was unlike the one based at Edlesborough in two significant ways. Although Simpson was less than three miles from the Buckinghamshire/Bedfordshire border, the Simpson Branch’s origins were not linked to the activities of American missionaries working in neighboring counties, but rather to the work of a recent convert. Furthermore, the Church in the Simpson area was severely hampered by intense opposition from local landowners; these antagonists frustrated missionary activities by attempting to prevent the holding of public meetings and the establishment of a meeting place. This contrasted starkly with Edlesborough, where success may have been a consequence of the Johnson family’s high status.

Elder Job Smith, who served for a time as president of the Bedfordshire Conference, wrote of the difficulty encountered by Church members: “Proceeded next day to Simpson. Here is a small branch of the church under the presidency of David Cowley. I staid at the house of William Luck. The landlords of all the saints houses here positively forbid any meetings being held therein, consequently I had to get the saints together in a covert manner and teach them.” Although Elder Smith and other missionaries sought to minister to the Saints in this branch, the opposition continued. On December 5, 1852, Elder Smith wrote, “Called at Simpson and comforted the few saints there.” On May 30, 1853, he penned, “I . . . privately visited the Saints at Simpson.”

Despite intense opposition from local landlords, the Simpson Branch grew from the original three members to thirty, although most of that growth occurred between 1849 and 1850. As with the Edlesborough Branch, newly baptized convert missionaries made a significant contribution. One notable example was William Luck, a young convert whose efforts brought thirteen people into the Simpson Branch. Although the records of the Simpson Branch span only the years 1849 through 1853, additional records kept by members in this area have been located. A surprising twenty-nine of the eventual thirty-eight people recorded as members of this branch emigrated—an astoundingly high 76 percent, compared to the emigration rates of other Buckinghamshire branches, which ranged from 37 to 47 percent.

The third nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire branch for which records exist was established at Wooburn Green. Although this branch was not officially organized until August 22, 1850, it had its beginnings in 1849, just like the Edlesborough and Simpson branches. Unlike those branches, however, it was located on the southwestern side of Buckinghamshire, and
its ultimate origins lay in Berkshire. The first converts to move to the Woo-
burn Green area were Thomas Tanner and his family, who had joined the
Church in 1843 in their hometown of Newbury, Berkshire. Shortly after
the Tanner family arrived in Wooburn Green in 1849, Thomas followed
the pattern established by many other Mormon converts; he began to share
the message of the restored gospel with anyone who would listen. His
efforts eventually led to the first conversions of Wooburn Green natives,
Williams and Susan Beesley and their son Ebenezer, who were all baptized
by Tanner in September of 1849. Initially, the Wooburn Green Mormons
were attached to the Newbury Branch, but substantial distance led to the
establishment of a separate branch. By 1850, membership of the Church
in Wooburn Green had risen to thirty. Many joined the Church through
the efforts of American missionaries, but Tanner was responsible for ten
conversions—thus following the model already identified at Edlesborough
and Simpson. Although Tanner had more experience in the gospel, Wil-
liam Beesley was appointed as the first president of the Wooburn Branch.
This further illustrates that the involvement of recent converts was essen-
tial to the growth of the Church in Buckinghamshire.

Members in Wooburn Green, similar to the Saints in Simpson, expe-
rienced serious opposition, but the Wooburn Branch was able to meet in
public. Although a meetinghouse was not reported in the 1851 Census of
Religious Worship, a local trade directory of 1853 indicated that among
the other churches in Wooburn Green, the Mormons also had a place of
worship. It was identified as a “Mormon Chapel.” Historical evidence,
however, indicates there was no dedicated church building in Wooburn
Green, and the trade directories do not include a location for the build-
ing. The name of Henry Hancock, the second president of the Wooburn
Branch, appears in the Wooburn Green census records for the years 1851
and 1861. By carefully calculating the route followed by the census taker
and using known landmarks that existed then and still exist today (for
example, The Red Lion Inn pictured in fig. 6), it was possible to identify the
residence occupied by Henry Hancock and his family during that time period.
The 1861 census records that a “Min-
ister of the Latter-day Saints” named George Alfred Wis-
combe was also residing with
the Hancock family. It is pos-
sible that the home was used
for church meetings, and this

![Fig. 6. The Red Lion Inn in Wooburn Green.](image-url)
may have even been the “Mormon Chapel” reported in the local trade directories of 1853. This conclusion is supported by an entry in the life history of Henry Hancock’s eldest daughter, Sarah, which states, “Church leaders in Wooburn held meetings in the Hancock home.” Fortunately, this home is still standing today (fig. 7) and is included in the local historical site index as “No. 36” on “The Green” in Wooburn. The index verifies that the home did in fact exist at the time a “Mormon Chapel” was listed in *Musson and Craven’s Commercial Directory* noted above.

Life for Church members in Wooburn Green was not easy. For a while, at least, they had to contend with aggressive anti-Mormon campaigns spearheaded by the reverend of the parish church, F. B. Ashley. Reverend Ashley’s anti-Mormon lectures were published, and multiple editions circulated. His arguments corresponded closely with other contemporary anti-Mormon tracts published throughout England but appear to be the only anti-Mormon clerical publications that actually originated in Buckinghamshire during the second half of the nineteenth century. In addition, anti-Mormon sentiments were expressed in the *Bucks Free Press*, the local newspaper. These reports ranged from accounts of the Mormons in Utah purportedly rising up in treason against the United States government and publicly encouraging immorality to commentary on the pitiable condition of “innocent and deceived” emigrants who were leaving England for Utah.

Despite the opposition, Church members in Wooburn Green appeared to be content with their newfound religion and lifestyle. In contrast to the somewhat disheartened journal entries of Elder Job Smith in the Simpson area, a letter written by Elder Samuel Stephen Jones in 1872 reported, “We have very fair, lively branches at Woburn Green in Bucks, Burbage in Witts, and at Portsmouth. The Saints are rather more numerous at these last mentioned places, and evince a good lively spirit.” Another missionary, Elder James Payne, wrote that in 1876 he was “laboring with great joy and satisfaction in the London Conference. . . . On this tour I first visited Woburn Green, held meeting, and re-baptized four persons.” These letters are surprisingly positive, especially since elsewhere in England the fortunes of the Church appear to have been in decline by the 1870s.
due to the effects of religious persecution associated with antipolygamy campaigns, alleged problems in Utah, and, perhaps most of all, to general apathy and lack of religious fervor in England.  

It is possible that relatively favorable conditions at Wooburn Green may have reduced incentives to emigrate, although other factors, which will be discussed later, were also at work. Of the thirty original members, only thirteen (43 percent) can be identified as having emigrated. Included among those who did not emigrate were William Beesley, the first president of the Wooburn Branch, and his wife Susannah. However, the second branch president, Henry Hancock, and his wife, Esther, did emigrate. Interestingly, Ebenezer Beesley, son of the first branch president, married Sarah Hancock, daughter of the second branch president. The young couple emigrated in 1859 and settled in Salt Lake City. Ebenezer had shown great promise as a musician from his early years, and after emigrating he continued his musical training. He eventually became a director of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. In fact, the current edition of the LDS hymnbook attributes the tunes of thirteen hymns to Ebenezer Beesley, including “God of Our Fathers, We Come unto Thee,” which is sung to a tune Beesley named “Wooburn Green.”

The final nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire branch for which records are extant was organized at Aylesbury on March 7, 1852. Like other Buckinghamshire branches, this congregation was located near the boundary of another county; Aylesbury is close to the “tongue” of Hertfordshire, which comes within a few miles of the town. Like Simpson, membership of the Aylesbury Branch did not result from a migration of recently baptized members, but rather from the efforts of missionaries sent to the area. Elder Job Smith, then president of the Bedfordshire Conference, wrote of the significant challenges they faced. His entry of March 5, 1852, reads:

Went to Buckingham to visit Elder E. W. Tullidge, one of the travelling elders sent from our conference at Bedford to raise up a branch of the church. Found him at the house of a deist. I soon learned that he had forsaken his mission and mormonism; and that he was now a disbeliever in all revealed religion. I reasond with him but soon found that it was altogether in vain, expressed his disbelief in the Prophet Joseph, in the present authorities and the whole system and in respect to God, he did not know anything of him, but “if God should curse or otherwise punish him for disbelieving Mormonism, yea if he were consumed in hell by him he would then rise up and damn him.” At Br Underwood’s the same evening I excommunicated him from the church. And this at his own request.

Two days later, Elder Smith continued:

Next day proceeded to Aylesbury where Elder [William] T. Cope was laboring. He had labored here eight months and baptized 5 persons.
A very dull prospect presented itself, but as a family that were scattered at another place were about to move thither it was concluded to organise it to be a branch which was done on the 7th [of] March. I endeavoured to get a congregation to preach to, by sending the bellman round the town &c but could not get any body to come.  

Two months later, Elder Smith recorded:

May 11, 1852. Tuesday visited Br Cope and in consequence of his ill health released him from his labours in the ministry. . . . May 24, 1852. Next day proceeded to Buckingham found Br Underwood discouraged, counselled him to move to a branch of the church, he said he would. Next day went to Aylesbury. Found Brother Cope trying to heal up difficulties in that young branch which he had raised. Here we had a meeting and cut off two members at their own request; tried to do the best I could to set matters straight with them but I found that the elements were not there for a good branch of the church.

The Aylesbury Branch record only lists the names of three of the first five members baptized by Elder Cope, corroborating Job Smith’s story of excommunication. Providentially, the “family that were scattered at another place” and was “about to move thither” was the George Smith family. George had joined the Church a decade earlier in Hemel Hempstead and served as the president of that branch. His family had already lived in the Aylesbury area from 1838 to 1841, and when he returned there sometime after the organization of the Aylesbury Branch, he brought not only his large family of twelve but also his missionary zeal and considerable Church leadership experience. He had already brought nine people into the Hemel Hempstead and Studham branches, and upon arriving in Aylesbury, he brought an additional sixteen people into the Church, including some of his own family. His efforts helped the branch grow from five members to thirty in two years. As in the three branches examined above, most of the missionary work and convert baptisms in the Aylesbury Branch resulted from the efforts of the native English member-missionaries.

George Smith’s missionary efforts apparently had a positive effect on the general morale of the members and missionaries and made an impression on the local community as a whole. On Sunday, December 12, 1852, only seven months after the Smith family relocated to Great Missenden, Elder Job Smith wrote, “Visited Br George Smith of Great Missenden (near Aylesbury) held a meeting and had a good congregation to hear me. Next day visited the Saints in Aylesbury.” On January 17, 1853, Elder Smith noted he had “received letters of success of Elder [Richard] Aldridge in Aylesbury” who had baptized seven more people, and on May 29, 1853, he wrote, “Preached at Aylesbury. Br Aldridge is laboring here and at Buckingham. Next day proceeded
to Buckingham. Found E. W. Tullidge rebaptised, married and house keeping, and opening his house for meeting. I was much pleased with this, for although he broke loose before he is a young man of singular and peculiarly adapted talents.”

In 1854, George Smith’s family of twelve—who represented 40 percent of the membership of the Aylesbury Branch—emigrated at the request of Church leaders in Utah and were the only members listed in the Aylesbury Branch record to do so. George and Caroline eventually settled in what they called Pleasant Valley, Nevada (fig. 8). A biographical sketch of George reads: “Mr. Smith was one of the first, if not the first white man to settle along the eastern base of the Sierra Nevada Mountains; and by indomitable will and great energy, has accomplished what very few men could have done. The danger surrounding such an early settlement among the Indians cannot be fully portrayed.”

Although the Smith family were the only members listed on the official branch record who emigrated, other sources suggest at least five other people joined this small branch and emigrated after 1854. The Millennial Star paid tribute to a sister named Amelia Mary Andrews Champneys, born in Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire. She died in Ogden, Utah, in 1893 at the age of 36, and was reported to have been “a faithful Latter-day Saint.” She had emigrated with her husband, Thomas, who was also a member. In addition, Robert Price and his older siblings Samuel and Matilda emigrated in 1855, one year after the Smiths. Robert was baptized at Great Missenden in 1853 and, after emigrating, returned to England to serve as a missionary. Upon his return to America, he was called as bishop in Paris, Idaho.

Ancillary Branches

Cynthia Doxey notes the difficulty of ascertaining the whereabouts or existence of LDS branches in England during the mid-nineteenth century: “As can be inferred from the difference in the number of existing branch membership records and the number of branches reported in the Millennial Star, many English and Welsh branches of the Church from the 1851
time period are not currently documented. With only these two sources of information about the Church in Britain, we have no way of knowing more about other possible branches.”

A close examination of extant historical documents, however, uncovered evidence of two branches of the Church in Buckinghamshire during this time period, in addition to the four examined herein. One was the previously mentioned Wolverton Branch. The other is the North Crawley Branch, mentioned in the missionary journal of Elder Job Smith, who served as the president of the Bedfordshire Conference. On April 1, 1851, Job Smith recorded, “Walked 18 miles to North Crawley, where there is a small branch of the church, Wm Reed president.” The whereabouts of these branch records, if they exist, is unknown at present.

**Impact of Local Converts**

As indicated in figure 9, missionary work and convert baptisms in the four nineteenth-century Buckinghamshire branches of record followed a relatively consistent pattern. Each branch began when missionaries from America converted a small group of key individuals, who then, almost immediately following their baptisms, began proselytizing their friends and neighbors. The initial efforts of the American missionaries brought a small group into the Church and a branch was formed; this was followed by a larger group of converts resulting from the efforts of the newly baptized member-missionaries.

One reason for this pattern may have been the size of the London and Bedfordshire conferences, to which Buckinghamshire belonged. Elder H. B. Clemons reported that on his “stroll through the Bedfordshire Conference” he traveled mostly on foot to over twenty-five locations in four different counties. As late as 1874, Elder Robert W. Heyborne recorded, “During my stay in the Bedfordshire Conference I have walked,
while visiting the Saints from village to village, 1,207 miles." Missionaries assigned to labor in Buckinghamshire were required to walk several miles between branches and members’ homes, inasmuch as “the Saints are scattered—one here and one there.” This required them to be absent from most of the branches most of the time, which in turn necessitated that newly baptized members of the Church assume leadership and missionary roles.

**Church Membership Per Capita**

Attempting to ascertain Church membership per capita in the county of Buckinghamshire during this time period can be approached in one of two ways. John Gay utilized the 1851 religious census, even though it included only one (Edlesborough) of the four branches for which records are available, and found that Church members constituted between 0.1 and 0.2 percent of the population. Use of the composite 1851 census data is another way to arrive at an estimation of members per capita. Providentially, all four known branches existed in 1851, and only 14 of the 266 members had emigrated before the 1851 census. Therefore, approximately 242 members of Buckinghamshire branches would have been citizens of this county on March 30, 1851, the day the census was taken. The population of Buckinghamshire on that same date was 167,095; therefore, Church membership per capita was less than 0.2 percent, by this measure.

Figure 10 shows how Buckinghamshire compares with other counties in terms of LDS membership per capita, according to the 1851 religious census. It is important to note that this data is not representative of the actual numbers of converts.
from these counties. For example, Buckinghamshire and Lancashire had the same membership per capita in 1851. However, more than 6,700 Latter-day Saints had already emigrated by the end of 1850, many of them from Lancashire.\textsuperscript{115}

**Emigration**

As is shown in figure 11, of the 266 members on record, documentation could be found for the emigration of only 136, or 51 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch Name</th>
<th>Total Membership</th>
<th>Dates of Emigration</th>
<th>(#) and % Emigrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edlesborough</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1851–1872</td>
<td>(77) 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1851–1878</td>
<td>(29) 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooburn</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1851–1859</td>
<td>(13) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>(17) 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1851–1878</td>
<td>(136) 51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 11.** Percentage of members who emigrated from nineteenth-century branches.

One explanation for this relatively low number was the poor economic condition of Church members in Buckinghamshire. The Church established the Perpetual Emigrating Fund to aid such members. P. A. M. Taylor notes that from 1849 to 1852, approximately four thousand emigrants were aided by this fund. This suggests there were only two years when this fund could have benefited those emigrating from Buckinghamshire. Furthermore, for the years 1853 through 1856, members could benefit from this program only if they were able to provide between £10 and £13 of their own support, which, as will be shown below, was extremely difficult. After 1856, the fund never assisted more than one hundred persons per year, and they were almost entirely returning missionaries.\textsuperscript{116} Considering the years Buckinghamshire branch members emigrated (see figure 11), many members had to rely on their own resources.

Missionary correspondence highlights the indigent circumstances of the members of these branches and the effect that had on emigration rates. On February 4, 1863, Elder Joseph Bull wrote:

> In this Conference, as well as in many others, the Saints are poor as it regards the goods of this life. . . . Though surrounded by poverty and hard task-masters, with their attendant train of trying circumstances . . . many are looking forward with eager anxiety for the emigration season to open, that they may gather to the bosom of the Church. That they may do so, nothing is being left untried on their part which will help them
to accomplish this so-much-desired object. Several, who have struggled with poverty for years, will have the privilege of emigrating themselves with their own means, having a rigid economy saved out of their weekly pittances, through years of struggling, sufficient to accomplish the much-desired object.\textsuperscript{117}

This highlights several important points: (a) the impoverished condition of many of the Saints, (b) their near-universal desire to emigrate to Utah, and (c) the necessity for Saints to save for their own travel instead of relying on Church assistance.

Elder R. F. Neslen explained the difficulty facing the Saints who were seeking to acquire the resources needed for emigration:

Saturday, March 24, [1871], found me visiting around among the Saints in Stony Stratford [Buckinghamshire] and Deanshanger [Northamptonshire]. In these places I found the Saints still rejoicing in the work, and hoping fervently that their way of deliverance might be shortly opened. They seemingly have not got discouraged concerning gathering yet, although, so far as their own means is concerned, their prospects are not much brighter than they were when I became acquainted with them in 1855.\textsuperscript{118}

Later that same year, however, Elder George W. Wilkin, also writing from Stony Stratford, noted, “The Saints, as a general thing, are poor in this world’s goods, but the greater portion of them are rich in faith. Quite a number have emigrated since my arrival, and many more are expecting to go this season.”\textsuperscript{119} Despite their poverty, some gradually acquired sufficient money. More than two years later, on October 29, 1873, Elder Robert W. Heyborne reported the following, also from Stony Stratford: “We have been able to emigrate forty persons from this Conference for Utah. Considering the small number in the Conference, and the impoverished condition of most of the Saints, I feel highly satisfied.”\textsuperscript{120} He wrote again on April 23, 1874, “Considering the impoverished condition of many of the Saints through their limited wages, they are doing well in saving means for emigration, which will enable them, at no very distant day, to effect their deliverance.”\textsuperscript{121}

Stories of financial challenge, difficulty, and even tragedy abound in the personal journals and diaries of Saints waiting to emigrate. For example, Charlotte Johnson
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widow of Benjamin Johnson, was left with the responsibility of raising nine children between ages two and sixteen. Before he died, Benjamin gathered his family around him and said to Charlotte, “Mother, when you sell what little property we possess and pay off our debts you will have enough money to take you and the children to Utah. So after I die you take our family and go to Utah where you can live with the Saints and enjoy the blessings there.” Following her husband’s wishes, Charlotte sold their property and sent the necessary money to the mission office, entrusting it to a missionary going to Liverpool and then to America. He agreed to open an account in her name with the Emigrating Fund. When he arrived in Liverpool, however, he decided to keep the money and emigrate to California instead. After waiting eleven years for the Church to somehow help her recoup the money, Charlotte gave up hope of ever being able to emigrate. To her delight, Elder Franklin D. Richards, president of the British Mission, became aware of her situation and made arrangements for the entire Charlotte Johnson family to emigrate, which they did in 1868.

Trying as their own personal circumstances were, some members of the Church were moved to compassion towards their fellow Saints. When Sister Emma Austin of the Edlesborough Branch read in the Millennial Star that part of the ship Minnesota had been chartered by Mormon emigrants, she felt impressed this was the vessel that would take her family to America. Unfortunately, the Austins did not have sufficient means. But two weeks before the Minnesota was due to depart, Bartel Turner (fig. 13), a member of their branch, offered to lend them the money for their emigration. At first John Austin “hesitated to accept this generous offer, fearing that he might never be able to repay the loan,” but he finally became convinced that his family’s prayers were being answered in a miraculous way. As a result of Brother Turner’s generosity, John and Emma Austin and their ten children sailed from Liverpool on June 22, 1868. Bartel Turner and his family also sailed on the same voyage of the Minnesota.

Recent converts were not alone in their struggle to raise sufficient funds to emigrate. Expected to proselyte following the New Testament model, without “purse or scrip,” full-time
missionaries were almost completely reliant on charitable offerings for their daily sustenance, as well as for sufficient funds to emigrate. One historian noted a “systematic fund-raising was undertaken in behalf of elders returning to Zion . . . Local converts who spent their full time in the ministry were not always so fortunate . . . , but they were usually able at least to borrow the means to emigrate.”

This appears to be the case with the missionaries who served in Buckinghamshire. Elder Job Smith wrote about his fund-raising efforts for returning American missionary John Spiers while he preached in Eaton Bray, Studham, and Hamstead: “In all of these places I asked the Saints to raise funds to assist Elder Spiers to emigrate, as he was liberated to return to the valley. . . . I therefore labored faithfully to render him assistance. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday visited the branches of Luton, Hensworth, and Eaton Bray, holding meetings and raising funds for Br. Spiers.” The collection began on October 24, 1851, and by January 10, 1852, Elder Spiers had emigrated. However, when Elder Thomas Squires, a local convert who had served as a full-time missionary for “many years” expressed a desire to emigrate, he apparently experienced a longer wait, although means for his emigration were eventually provided. His life sketch records, “Finally the authorities of the Church . . . gave him the privilege of emigrating to Zion. The conference over which he presided furnished the means to defray the expenses of that journey.”

Comparing emigration rates from Buckinghamshire and other counties is difficult because, as P. A. M. Taylor notes, “The passenger lists do not include information about emigrants’ places of origin.” In fact, he contends that “figures for individual . . . counties are often too small to be relied on: a ‘trend’ might be set by the decision of two or three families.” In addition, “in no clear-cut fashion do figures for the rural element in Mormon emigration differ from those of the urban.” But some general comparisons can be made. According to historical data, 52,182 persons were baptized in England between the years 1851 and 1870; 23,066, or 44 percent, emigrated. During that same time period, 132, or nearly 50 percent, of the 266 baptized members of the four Buckinghamshire branches emigrated. Thus, the percentage of members who emigrated from Buckinghamshire during this time period was actually higher than the national average.

Reappraisal of Buckinghamshire Branches

There were at least six branches of the Church in Buckinghamshire between the years of 1849 and 1878. Records for four of these branches are
Extant although incomplete. Historical data indicate there were at least two other branches, although records for these branches are unavailable.

The first Buckinghamshire natives to join the Church did so outside the confines of the county as early as 1841. However, it was not until 1849 that the Church was formally established within the boundaries of Buckinghamshire. Unlike other areas, there is no historical evidence of any apostolic ministrations, nor were other persons of known Church prominence responsible for the establishment of Mormonism in this county. Rather, the first branch prospered under the direction of its founding member, Benjamin Johnson, and the majority of converts joined the Church through his efforts and those of other early convert missionaries. In fact, this phenomenon occurred in each of the four branches: the initial efforts of one of the traveling American missionaries brought a small group into the Church and a branch was formed. This was followed by a larger group of converts resulting from the efforts of the newly baptized member-missionaries.

The local religious climate appears to have been different for each of the four branches. The Edlesborough Branch fared well. It grew to include a membership of over 160 people. They were able to meet without any apparent opposition in a public house that had been converted into a church building. On the other hand, Simpson Branch members struggled against the intense opposition of local landowners. Consequently, branch membership remained relatively small, and they were able to meet only covertly. The members of the Wooburn Green Branch also experienced intense opposition. This came from the local clergy, however, instead of landowners. Perhaps this explains why they were able to hold public meetings in a Church member’s home and were portrayed by traveling elders as having a “good, lively spirit.” Finally, the Aylesbury Branch was extremely difficult to establish, and the missionaries assigned to this area felt “the elements were not there for a good branch of the Church.” This led to discouragement and even apostasy among these missionaries. However, when George Smith, a recent convert, relocated his family to this region, his enthusiasm had a profound influence on the missionaries who had forsaken their ministry as well as the citizens of the area, and the branch was finally able to take root.

The American missionaries who proselytized in Buckinghamshire did not experience the phenomenal success their counterparts enjoyed in other regions of England. This paper has provided several empirical explanations for this. First, Taylor and others have concluded that “Mormonism appealed mainly to an urban population, and the great majority of Mormon emigrants were urban.” Mormonism was also more successful
among the working class living and working in the industrialized centers. Buckinghamshire was rural during this time period and did not have an industrialized center, and its citizenry were not classified as working class. Gay and Fleming have also shown the propensity for nonconformist movements to be less successful in the southeastern portion of England.

Despite the small number of converts who joined Mormonism in Buckinghamshire during this time period, both numerically and per capita, a larger portion of them emigrated than their counterparts in other regions—usually against the challenges of abject poverty. Upon arriving in Utah, none of them attained prominence in the Church hierarchy. In many respects, their story is the story of the rank-and-file convert from England during this time period. Most of them were not brought into the Church by Apostles, other prominent leaders, or even missionaries from America, but rather through the untiring efforts of local convert-missionaries. And most of these converts were unable to emigrate or did not ascend the hierarchy of Church leadership and prominence themselves after their emigration.

Ronald E. Bartholomew (ron.bartholomew@byu.edu) is a visiting professor in the Department of Ancient Scripture at BYU and a member of the BYU Studies Academy. He will return to his post at the Orem Institute of Religion adjacent to Utah Valley University on June 16, 2009. He has presented his research at conferences in Europe and the United States and has authored several articles that have been published on “both sides of the pond.” His current research interest is LDS missiology in nineteenth-century rural England.
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6. James B. Allen and Malcolm R. Thorp reported that most Mormon converts came from the “working classes of the urban communities.” James B. Allen and Malcolm R. Thorp, “The Mission of the Twelve to England, 1840–41: Mormon Apostles and the Working Classes,” *BYU Studies* 15, no. 4 (1975): 512. P. A. M. Taylor noted that the vast majority of converts emigrating from 1850 to 1862 were from urban centers. He also reported that the country was approximately half urban during this time period, yet 90 percent of Mormon emigrants originated in urban areas. “Moreover, more than two-fifths of that emigration came from towns with more than 50,000 inhabitants.” P. A. M. Taylor, *Expectations Westward: The Mormons and the Emigration of Their British Converts in the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), 145–49. Tim B. Heaton, Stan L. Albrecht, and J. Randall Johnson asserted that the major source of new converts was the population most affected by the “Industrial Revolution and associated rapid population growth, urbanization, and political reform.” They indicated that “proselytizing efforts were more successful in certain industrialized sections,” and that “urban centers of the industrial heartland provided the type of people that were most inclined to join the Church.” Tim B. Heaton, Stan L. Albrecht, and J. Randall Johnson, “The Making of British Saints in Historical Perspective,” *BYU Studies* 27, no. 2 (1987): 120–21.


10. Gay examined the expansion of Roman Catholicism and Mormonism as nonconformist movements in England from a geographer’s perspective. He found that Roman Catholicism was a predominantly north-northwestern phenomenon during the post-Reformation period. He attributes this to the fact that the landed gentry had the resources to establish their own churches, and they were farther from London, which made it easier to evade the legal penalties associated with nonconformity during that time. Similarly, he found that by 1851, the peak year for Mormon conversions in England, Mormonism was also more successful in the northern and western portions of England than in the southern and eastern areas. He attributed this to the fact that Mormons were intent on emigration and so tended to gravitate towards seaport cities of Bristol, Southampton, and Liverpool. See John Gay, “Some Aspects of the Social Geography of Religion in England: The Roman Catholics and the Mormons,” in *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, ed. David Martin (London: SCM Press, 1968): 47–76. In his examination of the spiritual roots of Mormonism in England, Stephen Fleming found that a significant number of Mormon converts were former nonconformists, and that many of the nonconformist movements were rooted primarily in the northern and western portions of England. He carefully demonstrated how the belief systems of the most prolific nonconformist movements were tied to or grew out of the spiritualistic aspects of post-Reformation Catholicism, thus providing a link to John Gay’s analysis and an alternative explanation for the success of nonconformist religious movements, including Mormonism, in the northern and western regions. See Stephen J. Fleming, “The Religious Heritage of the British Northwest and the Rise of Mormonism,” *Church History* 77 (March 2008): 73–104.

11. By 1728, England was less than 5 percent Roman Catholic. However, on average the Roman Catholic land values were 5 percent of the total land tax assessments for this time period. All of the counties with percentages above the national average of 5 percent lay north of the line of demarcation as displayed in the map in figure 2. The average figure for all the counties south of the line was 2.7 percent, while to the north it was 11 percent. See Gay, “Some Aspects of the Social Geography,” 48–49.


13. Gay noted that in 1851 the Mormon movement was still in its infancy in England, and the 1851 census “must be used with considerable caution when attempting to assess the geographical distribution of Mormons.” However, he did indicate that 75 percent of the members of the Church lived in the northern and western regions, excepting London, a figure comparable to the one given by Fleming for the same year (77 percent). He indicated that although the largest percentage of Mormon converts was from Lancashire, it was not the county with the largest number of converts *per capita*. The counties with the highest
incidence of Mormon converts per capita were Hampshire, Gloucestershire, and Nottinghamshire. He also gave a list of the “home counties” that were amenable to the Mormon movement, but he excluded Buckinghamshire from that list, based on the raw number of converts and the number of converts per capita. See Gay, “Some Aspects of the Social Geography,” 59–61.


15. The first Buckinghamshire native to join the Church, based on extant baptismal and membership records, was, interestingly enough, a man named Samuel Smith. Samuel grew up in Sherington, Buckinghamshire. He was baptized by Elder Lorenzo Snow, who was then a proselytizing missionary, on December 26, 1841. Samuel’s parents, Daniel William Smith and Sarah Wooding Smith, were baptized shortly thereafter, along with Samuel’s wife. Subsequently, Samuel and his wife and children moved to Liverpool with Samuel’s parents, and “in 1843 they left England to join the Mormons in Nauvoo, Illinois.” Interestingly, Samuel’s brother, George Smith, was baptized shortly after Samuel, on January 30, 1842, at Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, by Elder John W. Lewis. There is no evidence that Samuel or his parents were influential in George’s conversion. “The next Buckinghamshire native to join the Church was George Coleman, . . . who was also from Sherington. . . . George joined the Church in 1845 and was . . . baptised by Berrill Covington. His wife was baptised later by George Smith in 1849.” Ronald E. Bartholomew, “Babylon and Zion: Buckinghamshire and the Mormons in the Nineteenth Century,” *Records of Buckinghamshire* 48 (May 2008): 234–35.

16. *Mormon Immigration Index* CD, comp. and ed. Fred E. Woods (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2000). See also George Smith and Caroline Harrison Family Group Record, Ancestral File numbers 1FRB-1T and 1TRV-PB, available online at http://www.familysearch.org, and Hemel Hempstead Branch Record, film no. 86979, Family History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City. It is important to note that family records accessed from familysearch.org are often inconsistent, informal family history records submitted by interested individuals. They are useful, however, if used with caution. Every attempt has been made herein to crosscheck information obtained from these records with as many other sources as possible to verify their accuracy.


18. See Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record, film no. 86996, item 12.


20. See Luton Branch Record, film no. 86979, Family History Library.


22. British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Whipsnade Branch, London Conference, film no. LR 1140/2, reel 6, Church History Library, Salt Lake City.

23. Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record. Edlesborough lies on the boundary between Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire and is less than three miles from Whipsnade. Eaton Bray is adjacent to Edlesborough but on the Bedfordshire side of the boundary. Maps of the period suggest Eaton
Bray and Edlesborough formed one community. See Ordinance Survey plan, 6-inch scale, Buckinghamshire sheet XXV.SW [25 SW], 2d ed., Archives, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, Aylesbury, Buckingham, England. It seems that, whatever the case elsewhere, the county boundary here bore little significance. In many missionary and member journals, the entire area is referred to as “Eaton Bray,” even though a portion of it is technically Edlesborough. This can make it difficult for researchers to be sure of exactly which village and county are being referred to, although most official church and government publications do make the distinction. For example, see Robert Hodgert, “Journal of Robert Hodgert,” January 8, 1850, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Elder Hodgert records that a decision was made at the January 5, 1850, special general conference in Liverpool to move the “Eaton Bray” Branch to the Bedfordshire Conference. However, official notes from that conference in “Special General Conference,” Millennial Star 12 (January 15, 1850): 26, refer to the same branch as the “Eddlesbro” branch. This article will make these distinctions for the purpose of confining its scope to Buckinghamshire.

24. Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record.
25. Hemel Hempstead Branch Record.
30. See Eaton Bray Branch Record. Note: Eaton Bray is less than one mile from their first residence in Northall, only one mile from their second residence in Totternhoe, and just over three miles from their residence in Whipsnade. Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record.
32. British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Whipsnade Branch, London Conference.
33. Hansen, William, Benjamin and Joseph Thomas Johnson, 30.
34. Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record.
37. See Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record. See also Hansen, William, Benjamin and Joseph Thomas Johnson, 363–65, for a
list of persons baptized, confirmed, and ordained to priesthood offices by Benjamin Johnson.

38. See Eaton Bray Branch Record.

39. For example, while the elders were confirming Thomas Squires, they ordained him an elder “before taking off their hands.” In John Paternoster Squires, “Sketch of the Life of Thomas Squires as Recorded by His Brother John P. Squires in June 1891—Book F, p. 334,” in Notes of Interest to the Descendants of Thomas Squires (Salt Lake City: Eva Beatrice Squires Poleman, 1970), 139.

40. Whipsnade Branch Record, altered to Edlesborough Branch Record.

41. See Eaton Bray Branch Record. See also Studham Branch Record, film no. 87035, items 10–11, and film no. 86979, Family History Library. It is important to note that some of these individuals’ Church membership records were later transferred to the Edlesborough Branch; Benjamin Johnson baptized a total of thirty-six. See Hansen, William, Benjamin and Joseph Thomas Johnson, 30; and Eaton Bray Branch Record. See also Kensworth Branch Record, film no. 86979, Family History Library.


44. See British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Edlesborough Branch, London and Bedfordshire Conference, film no. LR 1140/2, reel 2, Church History Library. There is no mention of this branch after 1850 in the Millennial Star or any other public or private document cited in this work.

45. Mormon Immigration Index CD. See also Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel, 1847–1868 Database; available online at http://www.lds.org/churchhistory/library/pioneercompanysearch/1,15773,3966-1,00.html.

46. “George and Elizabeth Cheshire,” Mormon Immigration Index, CD.


48. Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” April 1, 1851, 120; Simpson Branch Record.

49. Simpson Branch Record, film no. 86979, Family History Library.

50. Simpson Branch Record; Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” April 23, 1851, 123.

51. Although it can be inferred from existing data that the North Crawley Branch was organized earlier than the Simpson Branch, in the absence of any formal records for the North Crawley Branch, it is impossible to ascertain its origins or membership. William Smith Reed’s records were later transferred from the North Crawley Branch to the Simpson Branch along with three other members who appear to be his sister, brother-in-law, and father: William Cox, Eliza Reed Cox, and John Reed. See Simpson Branch Record.

52. Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” April 1, 1851, 123.


55. Simpson Branch Record.
56. Simpson Branch Record.
57. For example, the Thomas and Mary Labrum family, consisting of five members—Thomas George, Mary Elizabeth, Jane Elizabeth, John George, and Joseph Hyrum—were undoubtedly members of this branch. Not only is their emigration recorded and noted in the Mormon Immigration Index along with important information regarding their birth years, family relationships, and shipping records, their written histories validate the Immigration Index, their birthplaces and residence, and the details surrounding their joining the Church. See, for example, “John George Labrum” and “Mary Elizabeth Labrum,” in Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Index, 2:470; Biographical Record of Salt Lake City and Vicinity Containing Biographies of Well Known Citizens of the Past and Present (Chicago: National Historical Record Company, 1902), 318; and Noble Warrum, Utah Since Statehood: Historical and Biographical (Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing, 1919) 2:998 (photo), 3:998. In addition, it is likely that the Alexander George Sutherland family from Stony Stratford were also members of this branch. See Bartholomew, “Babylon and Zion,” note 99.
58. Mormon Immigration Index CD. I acknowledge that this index must be used with caution. Every effort has been made to establish family and community relationships, and only those individuals who could be positively identified as members of this branch were included.
59. British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Wooburn Green Branch, London and Reading Conference, film no. LR 1140/2, reel 6, Church History Library.
60. Newbury Branch Record, film no. 87020, items 17–20, Family History Library.
61. Wooburn Branch Record, film no. 87039, item 10, Family History Library.
62. The Wooburn Branch Record indicates that those members living in Wooburn, Wooburn Green, and Egams Green were transferred from the Newbury Branch to the Wooburn Branch on August 21, 1850. The branch name was changed from the Wooburn Branch to the Wooburn Green Branch the next day, August 22, 1850. See British Mission Historical Reports, Wooburn Green Branch.
63. British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Wooburn Green Branch.
64. See Newbury Branch Record and Wooburn Branch Record.
65. British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Wooburn Green.
66. See Legg, Buckinghamshire Returns of the Census, 1851.
67. Musson and Craven’s Commercial Directory of the County of Buckingham and the Town of Windsor (Nottingham, Eng.: Stevenson and Company, 1853). 90. Information obtained from Mr. Lawrence Linehan of Wooburn Green.
70. The building that was crucial to establishing the site of Calico Square and the building the census taker went into after leaving Calico Square was the “Anchor” public house rather than the Red Lion. The Anchor is now a private
dwelling called the Anchor House. The Red Lion was also useful in establishing the position of the Anchor public house because it is still externally labeled such. I am indebted to Mr. Lawrence Linehan for making the painstaking efforts to calculate this using the 1861 census returns and period maps of Wooburn Green.

71. Carol Cornwall Madsen, Journey to Zion: Voices from the Mormon Trail (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1997), 696.

72. The home is referred to as Clematis Cottage, reference number SU 98 NW, 6/180 in the historical site index. The “Department of the Environment List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, Borough of High Wycombe, Bucks” was published by the Department of the Environment under the terms of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1984 in London. A version of the list, updated in February 1989, is in High Wycombe Reference Library, which I visited on August 4, 2007. The list shows that the building at 36 on The Green is not a later replacement—it can only be the building where the Reverend Wiscombe was a guest of the Hancocks in 1861. Information obtained from Mr. Lawrence Linehan.

73. Reverend F. B. Ashley, Vicar of Wooburn, wrote the following regarding his interactions with the Mormon missionaries: “The Mormonites were very active long before I came, in the neighbourhood and in the parish, and at that time a priest used to preach on Sundays for three-quarters of an hour at the sign-post between the Vicarage and the church. I cautioned all I could not to stop or take any notice, but it was a real nuisance when the Holy Communion was administered, for his voice was strong, and he supposed all had left church . . . . I heard one day that the Independent minister . . . went up to him; the result was a challenge to a public discussion on Wooburn Green the following Thursday. I was sorry, and called a meeting of teachers and communicants for that evening and put a sketch of the subject before them. Platforms were erected on the Green, four Mormon preachers were brought from London, and my fears were realised. The well-meaning challenger was a novice in the matter; the Mormons had a happy hit in reply to anything he said; he appeared to be beaten, and two houses for Mormon preaching were opened on the Green for week-days as well as Sundays.

“My policy had been not to notice the subject, it was so unworthy, but the new revelation took readily; numbers joined, and the crowds that came could not be seated. As general attention had everywhere been drawn to the movement, it would not do to appear blind. The next Sunday morning . . . I went to Church not having made my mind what to do, but after the service I gave notice that I would give a lecture on Mormonism in the school-room the following Thursday. It caused great excitement. . . . I sallied out on Thursday evening, and found the road and the room blocked with people. A mill-owner who was amongst them came to me and offered his Sol-room, which was perfectly empty, and would hold a great number standing . . . . By the time I reached the Sol-room it was . . . cramped to the door. With difficulty a small table and a cask to put on it were got inside. I then mounted, and kept them listening for two hours. The quiet was intense, and I could hear nothing but now and then a gasp of sensation and the scratching of the Mormon reporters’ pens.” Cited in Francis Busteed Ashley, Pen and Pencil Sketches—a Retrospect of Nearly Eighty Years, Including about Twelve in the Artillery and Fifty in the Ministry of the Church of England by Nemo [i.e.
Francis Busteed Ashley] (London: Nisbet, 1889), 158–59. This information was also obtained from Mr. Lawrence Linehan.

74. F. B. Ashley, Mormonism: An Exposure of the Impositions Adopted by the Sect Called “The Latter-day Saints” (London: Hatchard, 1851). This pamphlet sought to clarify and expose his views on the prophet-leader Joseph Smith, the “Golden Plates” from which the “Book of Mormon” was purportedly translated, and other “Mormon Doctrines” and “Mormon Attractions.” Ashley, Mormonism, 2. His arguments corresponded closely with other contemporary anti-Mormon tracts published throughout England but appear to be the only anti-Mormon clerical publications that actually originated in Buckinghamshire during the second half of the nineteenth century. See Ashley, Pen and Pencil Sketches, 160.

75. Ashley said Joseph Smith was a false prophet who “lived a vagrant life with no honest employment,” spent his days looking for buried treasure through supernatural means, and was adept at deceiving others into believing his pretended revelations. Ashley, Mormonism, 4. He recounted the accounts of the purported altercations the Mormons had with government officials and citizens in the states of Missouri and Illinois, accusing Joseph Smith and his followers of treason, the attempted murder of the ex-governor of Missouri, and other atrocities. He discredited the Book of Mormon as a piracy of Solomon Spaulding’s work Manuscript Found and the existence of the plates from whence it purportedly originated. He also criticized the Mormon belief that God is an anthropomorphic being, because this doctrine contradicts the belief in the Holy Trinity. Ashley, Mormonism. For a list of anti-Mormon literature published between 1837 and 1860, see Craig L. Foster, Penny Tracts and Polemics: A Critical Analysis of Anti-Mormon Pamphleteering in Great Britain, 1837–1860 (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2002), 221–34. I checked each reference on the list provided by Foster against Crockford’s Clerical Directory, vols. 5–6, reel 3, World Microfilms Publications Ltd.

76. See, for example, “Mormonism” and “The Crisis of Mormonism,” Bucks Free Press, June 5, 1857, and “More News about the Mormons,” Bucks Free Press, May 21, 1858. These newspaper articles were also provided by Mr. Lawrence Linehan.

77. “Correspondence,” Millennial Star 34 (September 17, 1872): 603.

78. “Home Correspondence,” Millennial Star 38 (February 21, 1876): 124. It is important to note that although extant records for this branch terminate in 1850, it is obvious from this letter and the one preceding it that there was still a branch and that converts were joining it as late as 1876.


80. Mormon Immigration Index CD. See also Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel, 1847–68 database.

81. William Sheppard Beesley and Susannah Edwards Beesley Family Group Record, Ancestral File numbers 1H79-D3 and 1H79-F8, available online at http://www.familysearch.org. Not only do their names not appear on the Mormon Immigration Index or the Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel Database, their family group record indicates they both died in England.

83. “Ebenezer and Sarah Hancock Beesley,” Mormon Immigration Index CD.


85. Hymns of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985), 387, 404.

86. Job Smith indicated in his missionary journal that he organized this branch himself, on this date. See Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” March 7, 1852, 148–49. This is in discrepancy with Doxey, who indicated the Aylesbury Branch Record spanned the years 1851–53. See Cynthia Doxey, “The Church in Britain and the 1851 Religious Census,” Mormon Historical Studies 4, no. 1 (2003): 116.

87. Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” March 5 and 7, 1852, 147–49. “Aylesbury” was mistranscribed as “Hylesburg” in the typescript.


89. Aylesbury Branch Record, film no. 86976, items 15–16, Family History Library.

90. See Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” March 7 and May 24, 1852, 158.

91. “George Smith and Caroline Harrison Family Group Record.”

92. See Hemel Hempstead Branch Record; Studham Branch Record.

93. Aylesbury Branch Record.


96. Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” May 29, 1853, 185–86. Elder Job Smith’s assessment of Elder Tullidge proved to be accurate though perhaps only to a certain degree. E. W. Tullidge eventually emigrated to America and, after arriving in Utah, pursued an ambitious career in publishing, both in Utah and on the East Coast. His career had many ups and downs, and, sadly, toward the end of his life he became destitute. While still a member of the Church, he continued to publish articles and books hostile toward the Church and its leaders. He was finally excommunicated a second time, again at his own request. Tullidge vacillated between anti-Mormon movements, once more repeating the instability he had shown at Buckingham. Yet Elder Smith was right to say that Tullidge possessed “peculiarly adapted talents,” which would be demonstrated by his biographies of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, and perhaps most of all in his History of Salt Lake City. See Ronald W. Walker, “Edward Tullidge: Historian of the Mormon Commonwealth,” Journal of Mormon History 3 (1976): 55–72.

97. Mormon Immigration Index CD.


102. This search included all issues of the Millennial Star, known journals of missionaries who served in the Bedfordshire or London conferences,
branch records, and all archival materials of relevance from this time period. See note 14.


104. Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” April 1, 1851, 120; Simpson Branch Record.


106. For example, the missionary journals of both Robert Hodgert and Job Smith, who worked in Buckinghamshire during the relatively short time period covered by the four extant branch records (1847–53), indicate they were rarely in the same location. Job Smith changed location an average of twelve times per month while in this conference. See Smith, “Diary and Autobiography,” 90–197.


110. Gay believed that “absolute numbers tell us very little; they need to be related to the total population base,” which is why “the large numbers of Mormons . . . did not have much effect on the general total for Lancashire.” Gay, “Some Aspects of the Social Geography,” 59–60. The Edlesborough Branch constituted the majority of Buckinghamshire membership, being over four times larger than any other branch.

111. This statement is problematic, but can be adequately resolved: as already mentioned, missionary journals and official Church records do not agree on the year the Aylesbury Branch was established. See note 86. In addition, Doxey also reported that the Edlesborough Branch Record spanned the years 1847–49, but, as already mentioned, it was actually a reorganization of the Whipsnade Branch. The Edlesborough Branch was, in all actuality, organized on April 1, 1849. See British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Whipsnade Branch. Similarly, Doxey indicates that the Wooburn Branch spans the years 1843–50, based on the dates of its baptized members. However, as explained above, while originally consisting of members who lived in Berkshire, the branch was relocated to Buckinghamshire when those original members moved there. The statistical report of the London Conference for the half year ending June 1, 1851, “showed that the Wooburn Green Branch was organized on Aug 22, 1850.” See British Mission, Manuscript History and Historical Reports, Wooburn Green Branch, London Conference, film no. LR 1140/2, reel 6, Church History Library.

112. Four members of the Edlesborough Branch emigrated on the *Ellen* and departed from Liverpool on January 8, 1851. Ten more members of various branches emigrated on the *Olympus*, which left from Liverpool on March 4, 1851. The remaining 122 documented emigrants from the four Buckinghamshire branches did not emigrate until after 1851 (1852–1878). Information taken from *Mormon Immigration Index* CD. See also Mormon Pioneer Overland Travel, 1847–1868 database.

113. 1851 British census returns for each town in Buckinghamshire acquired online, http://www.familyhistoryonline.net/database/BucksFHS1851.shtml. This does not account for the North Crawley Branch, for which records are missing. One could also argue that some members of the Edlesborough Branch lived
outside of Buckinghamshire, but the existence of the Eaton Bray, Kensworth, and Studham branches, all within four miles of Buckinghamshire and Edlesborough, would seem to indicate that those living in Bedfordshire attended one of these three Bedfordshire branches.


130. Squires, “Sketch of the Life of Thomas Squires, 139.
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Mormon cinema on the Internet is a moving target. Because change in this medium occurs so rapidly, the information presented in this review will necessarily become dated in a few months and much more so in the years to come. What I hope to provide, therefore, is a snapshot of online resources related to LDS or Mormon cinema near the beginning of their evolution. I believe that the Internet will become the next great force in both Mormon cinema and world cinema in general, if it has not already done so. Hence, while the current article may prove useful for contemporary readers by surveying online resources currently available, hopefully it will also be of interest to readers years from now by providing a glimpse back into one of the greatest, and newest, LDS art forms in its infancy.

At the present, websites devoted to Mormonism and motion pictures can be roughly divided into four categories:

1. Those that promote specific titles or production companies
2. Those that sell Mormon films on traditional video formats (primarily DVD)
3. Those that discuss or catalog Mormon films
4. Those that exhibit Mormon films online

The first two categories can be dealt with rather quickly.

Promotional Websites

Today standard practice throughout the motion picture industry is for any new film to have a dedicated website with trailers, cast and crew
biographies, release information, or other promotional material, and this is true of Mormon films as well. The first of these within Mormonism was the Zion Films website launched just before the release of God’s Army in early 2000, and the practice will probably continue in perpetuity. One more recent example is the site for Christian Vuissa’s film about sister missionaries in Austria, http://www.errandoangelmovie.com.

In addition to specific films, there are sites for individual production and distribution companies, such as HaleStorm Entertainment at http://www.halestormentertainment.com, Excel Entertainment at http://www.excelfilms.com, Main Street Movie Company at http://mainstreetmovieco.com, and Lightstone Pictures at http://www.likenthescriptures.com. Straightforward commercial efforts, these corporate sites exist to promote their firms’ brand of Mormon filmmaking and their individual titles.

**Retail Websites**

Some companies, such as HaleStorm and Lightstone, also sell their own DVDs directly to consumers on these sites. Similarly, the video recordings page on www.ldscatalog.com has an extensive selection of DVD and VHS titles, all produced by the Church and available at incredibly low prices; as with all Church materials, they are priced essentially at the cost of production. In contrast to such sites, general commercial retailers consistently offer a slightly broader range of inventory. Foremost among these are LDS booksellers such as Deseret Book at http://deseretbook.com and Seagull Book at http://www.seagullbook.com.

Far more interesting, however, are websites that have no corresponding physical stores and are dedicated exclusively to selling Mormon videos. The first and foremost of these was www.ldsvideostore.com, launched by an enterprising couple in Texas around 2001. This site, which featured a somewhat haphazard layout but a spectacular selection of VHS and DVD titles at excellent prices, is now sadly defunct, as are one or two others that arose in its wake. The modern-day equivalent is the much better organized MormonMedia.com (http://mormonmedia.com), which also features music and books at reasonable prices along with media news and discussion forums, although these do not appear to be heavily trafficked. In addition, progressing technology has given us an alternative that surely will increase in importance. The site LDSfilms2go (http://ldsfilms2go.com) offers a variety of feature-length films available for download for a fee. Depending on the films’ distributors, they may be available in QuickTime or Windows Media formats, with prices at $5.99 or $10.99, respectively.
Many today may still be unfamiliar with the downloading of motion pictures as raw data without any corresponding physical video device, but such transactions are already becoming the method of choice for online use. Currently LDSfilms2go has no musical component, but the prospect of an LDS iTunes is impressive (and sites with musical mp3s such as http://latterdaysongs.com, http://www.ldstunesnow.com, and http://www.ldsmusiconline.com do exist). LDSfilms2go has the potential to allow for the proliferation of Mormon films of all shapes and varieties without the cost of creating or shipping physical DVDs. This would have at least two positive results: it would reduce overhead, increasing the profit margin for filmmakers, and it would create the equivalent of micropublishing within Mormon film—individual titles would not have to reach audiences as large as before to be successful. This would allow for greater variety within the corpus of Mormon cinema—short films, documentaries, abstract and experimental films, music videos, and all other varieties—all turning a small profit, giving some remuneration to their creators and, hence, motivating filmmakers to continue their craft. A site that combines the sale of videos with musical files, literature, artwork, sheet music, and other arts could radically restructure the production and consumption of Mormon art. In the meantime, innovative use of online distribution such as that at LDSfilms2go may even rekindle sales of traditional Mormon DVDs before taking their place and making them completely obsolete.

A more familiar model, based on rentals of physical video devices, is represented by the site LDSMovieRentals (http://ldsmovierentals.com). A Mormon version of Netflix, this site offers DVDs mailed to users’ homes for a monthly fee—$12.95 for one DVD at a time, $19.95 for two at a time. Both plans offer unlimited rentals, no shipping or late fees, and other benefits common to online rental services. The selection is good, including some mainstream films that would be of interest to Mormon viewers, such as Big Idea’s VeggieTales pictures. Even so, it is unclear if there is sufficient breadth within Mormon cinema and a large enough base of consumers who desire to receive their movies in this way to make the venture commercially viable. In any case, like LDSfilms2go, it represents another way in which the Internet is altering the landscape of Mormon film distribution.

Websites That Discuss LDS Films

Gideon Burton has frequently invoked Wayne Booth’s evaluation of Mormon literature in his discussions of Mormon cinema: “We won’t get a great artistic culture until we have a great critical culture.” In 1967, a few years before Booth made this remark, Elder Spencer W. Kimball of
the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles stated that soon Mormon-themed films would proliferate across the globe in every language and culture, “written by great artists, purified by the best critics.”² I believe that this critical purification is necessary before Mormon films will reach the state of geographical ubiquity and aesthetic achievement that President Kimball envisioned. Criticism of Mormon films has existed in sporadic works such as memoirs and masters theses since the 1960s, but it is only in the past few years that we have seen a consistent effort to seriously evaluate Mormon films at festivals and symposia and within the pages of print journals like Sunstone, Dialogue, BYU Studies, and Irreantum. This effort is commendable and must continue, but at the same time the Internet is transforming film criticism, Mormon and otherwise. It is now mainly websites and blogs, rather than traditional print journals and academic symposia, that are the locus of discussions of Mormon films. Just as the Internet continues to revolutionize the distribution of LDS films, it has also completely altered the community that consumes and evaluates them. The most important way it has done this is simply in connecting consumers who would otherwise exist in a diaspora, unable to connect with each other or to support the films: there is now a uniform, universally accessible meeting place for people to discuss, read about, and evaluate Mormon motion pictures.³

As with much of what is on the Internet, a great deal of this material is created by fans and nonspecialists—the primary example being discussion groups maintained through sites such as Google and Yahoo—and as such it is vaguely interesting but not particularly edifying or educational. Even when mediated, such forums tend to push the bounds of civility and rarely approach nuanced analysis of any particular film. As two prominent mainstream film bloggers have said: “The problem with the participatory aspects of online discourse is that they often attract people who value conflict and argument above all else,”⁴ and, “There are intelligent comments, but they’re few and far between. It’s mostly people who want to make themselves heard, even though they may have little worth saying.”⁵ Since such assessments are sadly true of Mormon film forums as well, I would like to focus here on the websites that are either the most popular or most valuable, holding them up to a standard of critical acuity that will help advance the art of Mormon cinema as evoked by President Kimball.

Before discussing other sites, I would like to mention the film portion of the Mormon Literature and Creative Arts Database (MLCAD), located at http://mormonlit.lib.byu.edu. I was involved in the development of this database and thus cannot review its content in depth, but the site is similar to the Internet Movie Database (http://www.imdb.com) but with fuller annotations and categorical classifications. While it does not feature news
of upcoming productions, streaming video, or lengthy theoretical discussions, it does provide the most complete compilation of Mormon films ever assembled, as of this writing comprising 4,427 titles. It is already arguably the greatest resource—online or not—for anyone wishing to study the breadth or history of Mormon-related films.

Long before the development of the MLCAD, however, came the first major website dedicated to LDS cinema, the aptly named Ldsfilm.com (http://www.ldsfilm.com). After the success of *God’s Army*, Thomas Baggaley and Preston Hunter became enthused about the potential for Mormon film and decided to use the Internet to discuss and promote it. They launched Ldsfilm.com as an online gathering place for the geographically dispersed Mormon film community and set about creating resources in the form of web pages for nearly every component of the budding field. The duo showed incredible prescience by utilizing the Internet to promote Mormon cinema as a definable entity. Their work was responsible for the legitimizing of Mormon film’s Fifth Wave, particularly the era’s theatrical feature films, to an extent to which they are generally not given credit. As its name implies, for years the site remained the only website dedicated to LDS film.

Today, however, the site shows its age, like an eight-year-old dinosaur from the Internet’s ancient history. As the web constantly redesigned itself with the introduction of wikis, blogs, increasingly sophisticated search-ability and design, and so forth, Baggaley and Hunter, unpaid enthusiasts who have done all their web work in addition to regular careers, have been unable to keep pace. Ldsfilm.com has been largely eclipsed by its children, a generation of younger websites like the MLCAD that cater to specific components of Mormon cinema with better and more up-to-date design. Despite this, the site is still arguably the most prominent website related to Mormon film, making it worthwhile to examine its merits and faults in greater detail.

The best thing about the site has already been mentioned: its timeliness in cohering a Mormon film community when the Fifth Wave was just forming. Beyond that, some of the best resources within Ldsfilm.com are the notices dealing with upcoming films. Baggaley and Hunter quickly established themselves as authorities in this area, and filmmakers also realized that sending a press release to Ldsfilm.com would reach a core audience better than other outlets. A few years ago, Carolyn Hart Bennett began overseeing all the site’s information concerning upcoming films, and so while other resources have proliferated, Ldsfilm.com still remains the best quick resource to find out general information about forthcoming projects and their state of development.
The site also features biographical material on Mormon filmmakers past and present, primarily in a series of pages under the rubric Bios. These blurbs are listed alphabetically under occupation and generally feature accurate, if not always up-to-date, information. A request on the site’s main page for autobiographical updates is essentially the best the webmasters can do in this regard, but another way to improve this information, particularly concerning contemporary filmmakers, would be to increase its scope to include all film-related positions and then make it searchable by occupation and location, with contact information.

Another main draw—perhaps the greatest—of Ldsfilm.com is the sheer amount of information it presents, from box office statistics to multitudinous prose essays. Ironically, however, its main drawback stems precisely from this excess of content, in that it makes the site incredibly difficult to navigate. Individual pages scroll on and on, oftentimes including different categories of information that should be accessed separately on individual pages. Thus, sought information can be nearly impossible to find, a problem compounded exponentially by the lack of a search field on the homepage.

The second major deficiency of Ldsfilm.com is a lack of critical standards, or at least their explicitness. The site is not refereed in any way, and it often seems haphazard in its checking of sources, its accuracy, and its consistency in applying criteria across multiple people and films. By the latter point, I mean that individual filmmakers may be profiled without any reference to why they are included while others with equivalent credentials are not. For instance, a Directors’ Profiles page, different from the aforementioned Bios, discusses roughly thirty individuals, a narrowed list of talent that would be quite useful except that it is unclear how or why those thirty were selected. Alfred Hitchcock is present, presumably for the slight Mormon content in his film *Family Plot*, but Wetzel Whitaker, who directed over one hundred LDS productions—including very well known titles like *Man’s Search for Happiness* and *Windows of Heaven*—is nowhere to be found.

There are also accuracy problems: the early Mormon film distributor and producer Lester Park is included as a director although he never directed a single film. The website also cites silent actor John Gilbert’s biography and discusses some of his Mormon heritage, but then fails to state that Gilbert was never baptized and was therefore not LDS.

To summarize, perhaps Ldsfilm.com is too much of a good thing. Much of the information on the site is simply extraneous. I personally feel that it has now become a historical record, a glimpse into Mormon film studies in its infancy, and I would like to see the site maintained that way.
for scholarship’s sake. However, if the webmasters want to keep it relevant, including for students of current LDS cinema, a first step must be to purge the site of at least half its content. A decrease in the amount of information would make it easier to organize the remaining material in a coherent and searchable manner, and it could then be gradually augmented within the new streamlined framework.

As I indicated earlier, it is true that Ldsfilm.com has been largely responsible for the other critical websites that have grown up in its wake. The online Mormon lifestyle journal Meridian Magazine (http://www.meridianmagazine.com, edited by Maurine Proctor and published by her husband, Scot), for instance, added discussions of cinema to its material many years ago, with articles by a variety of authors including filmmaker Keith Merrill and author/screenwriter Orson Scott Card. Meridian is exemplary for its work in applying Mormon thought to mainstream films—recent articles have discussed *The Dark Knight* and *Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull*—but unfortunately, with its light tone and predictably effusive praise of Mormon-themed films, it generally consists of light fare that serves as advertising more than criticism. While this is consistent with the magazine’s overall style, it lacks substance for the more thoughtful reader. Its archival searchability is also minimal. In contrast, where it excels is precisely in introducing new nonspecialist readers to the realm of Mormon film, preparing them to eventually consider more challenging and rewarding criticism.

Somewhat recently the group blog A Motley Vision (http://www.motleyvision.org, edited by William Morris), which is devoted to Mormon culture and literature, has taken up the cinematic gauntlet, serially and seriously addressing theoretical and aesthetic issues important to Mormon film. Like the Proctors, Morris has also utilized the efforts of many contributors, including regular film columnist Eric Thompson. Because of the assumed audience of writers, editors, academics, and literati, the work here has consistently been of a higher caliber than Meridian’s. In late August 2008, for example, both sites featured reviews of *Errand of Angels* as their main stories. Meridian’s article by Catherine Keddington Arveseth included valuable production information gleaned from a conversation with the filmmakers, but its greatest critical contribution was that the film was “absolutely believable and authentically touching.” A Motley Vision’s review was written by William Morris’s sister Katherine, also not a film specialist, but in addition to her praise for the film’s realism and drama she also touched on the film’s genricity within the canon of missionary films and the ways in which it evades mission sexism and many of the weightier
issues faced by female missionaries.\textsuperscript{8} These are topics about which much remains to be written, but at least A Motley Vision began to raise them.

The Sunstone Education Foundation (http://www.sunstonemagazine.com), now under the guidance of Stephen R. Carter and Mary Ellen Robertson, has also used its strong online presence to address Mormon film through blogs and podcasts—particularly downloadable recordings of past Sunstone Symposia—beyond what it has been able to do in Sunstone Magazine itself. Also, the new Dialogue Paperless (at http://www.dialoguejournal.com); the Association for Mormon Letters (http://www.aml-online.org), particularly its online review archive; and Brigham Young University, including BYU Studies and its online reviews of which this article is a part, all stand poised to greatly contribute to the field of Mormon film studies.

Much of the best criticism, however, will come from—and indeed already does come from—informed and conscientious individual bloggers. Mentions of Mormon film are proliferating throughout the Bloggernacle (http://www.ldsblogs.org), but individuals outside that aegis are beginning a systematic study of the field. Today the best bloggers who consistently devote their work to Mormon cinema are Gideon Burton and Trevor Banks.

Burton, whom I have already mentioned, is a well-known leader in the field of Mormon letters. In the past decade, he has chosen to broaden his field of study from Mormon literature and rhetoric to include Mormon cinema as well. Consequently, he has been responsible for a great deal of material, including a special issue of BYU Studies devoted to Mormon film, the aforementioned MLCAD, and development of a course at BYU. (Full disclosure: I have been involved with several of these projects.) His blog (http://gideonburton.typepad.com) addresses topics he teaches for the university’s English Department, such as rhetoric and English literature, as well as Mormon literature and film, but he comments on the latter frequently and incisively. For example, his coverage of the LDS Film Festival in January 2008, which came in a swift series of in-depth posts, was simultaneously broad and penetrating. Given his training in academia and his experience as an educator, the depth of Burton’s analyses generally go far beyond those on any of the sites previously mentioned.

But it is the blog started by Trevor Banks, Toward an LDS Cinema (http://ldscinema.blogspot.com), that is easily the most perceptive, broad-ranging, and prolific discussion of Mormon film online today, as Burton himself acknowledges (it was, indeed, Burton who first alerted me to Banks’s site). Banks, a Fulbright fellow in Lodz, Poland, took on two contributors in Benjamin Thevenin and Adam K. K. Figueira, who do most
of the posting now that Banks is in film school. They both have a broad knowledge of cinematic theory, history, and production, which shows in their writing. What Banks's blog lacks in timely reviews of recent films it makes up for in critical quality: some of the post titles listed under readers' favorites include "Fight Club: An LDS Reading," "Liken the Scriptures/Psychology in Film," and "Morality, Rambo, Brigham Young." The blog also excels in placing Mormon cinema within a global context, comparing it to international and avant-garde films rather than to populist American cinema alone; some posts mention filmmakers such as Bill Viola, Katsuhiro Otomo, Darren Aronofsky, Carl Dreyer, Andrei Tarkovsky, the Wachowski brothers, Krzysztof Kieslowski, Phil Morrison, Yasujiro Ozu, Aki Kaurismaki, and others. Lest the posts seem too elitist, films like Tomorrow Never Dies, WALL-E, and Transformers are also discussed. The authors assume a degree of familiarity with global film culture and are thus free to immediately delve into advanced discussions that push the boundaries of Mormon film theory. Indeed, the site's greatest flaw is perhaps that it spends so much time on global cinema rather than in the thick of Mormon film proper.

As the blog's title indicates, Toward an LDS Cinema is reaching toward an understanding of Mormon film, positing it as a future entity toward which we're moving. This yearning makes it the online resource most committed to advancing Mormon cinematic arts through the purifying criticism President Kimball called for decades ago. The downside of such criticism is that the blog might at times be so infused with global cinema and film theory that it loses noncineaste readers unversed in these areas. More prosaic sites like Ldsfilm.com can therefore serve as a gateway toward the more serious criticism of Toward an LDS Cinema and other forthcoming sites that will eventually amplify its critical acumen.

A final word may be in order on the social and interactive nature of online criticism, blogs in particular. Because they are not edited, blogs have gained a reputation for both meandering writing and quickly composed posts, which can lead to either flaccid analysis (including overly exuberant praise) or, on the other hand, acerbic attacks, shot off in the heat of an impassioned moment. Such a perception is probably exaggerated, however. In well-composed blogs like Burton's and Banks's, not much is apt to be written off the cuff. Far more important than their amateur nature is their communal nature. Film blogs have received a great deal of attention for their dispersion and interactivity: they are instantly accessible to anyone throughout the globe and, through user comment sections, allow for lateral communication between online readers not possible with print journals. The concept of a group of film buffs gathering together is
certainly not new—note, for instance, the Surrealists in Madrid in the 1920s, the Cahiers du Cinema critics in Paris in the 1950s, and hordes of others in that city and New York through the 1970s. What the Internet adds to the equation is the ability to transcend geography and connect with like-minded people from any corner of the globe. This equates readers with authors in a way reminiscent of the Church’s use of a lay clergy, enabling all to preach, edify, and rejoice together. Also, it coheres a global community that otherwise simply could not exist. This intellectual gathering, with participants in stakes scattered throughout the earth, is akin to the Church’s nineteenth-century physical gathering. Church leaders often describe broadcast technology’s unifying potential, but this power is greatly enhanced when communication flows in both directions.

That is not to say that the Web is an Edenic utopia of online commiseration. As non-Mormon film blogger Stephanie Zacharek stated: “The idea of the Web as a democratic, participatory medium is very grand, but the reality is a total mess.”9 While this is true, the occasional arguments, tangents, and red herrings should not distract from the Internet’s immense potential as the Church grows throughout the earth. In contrast to Zacharek, Jonathan Rosenbaum, one of the most prominent film critics of our time, said: “Within my own experience, I would say that the ‘participatory’ aspects of film writing, including criticism and scholarship, have helped to create a new form of community, and I would further submit that those who consider this claim overblown probably haven’t been participants or members of this community, except indirectly.”10

The result of continued online criticism combined with an intelligent discussion from all concerned Latter-day Saints will be nothing less than the continued refinement of Mormon cinematic aesthetics. Returning to President Kimball, the criticism itself will be purified and, through the Internet, reach people in every corner of the globe, preparing the way for the films to follow.

**Websites That Exhibit LDS Films**

At present, there are more websites dedicated to discussing Mormon films than to showing them. Yet while an informed and accessible discussion of Mormon cinema is absolutely essential for Mormon film to mature, the arena in which it will do so will largely be online distribution. Like blogs and criticism but to an exponentially greater degree, the growth of viral video has enormous potential to link Latter-day Saints across geographical boundaries; to a great extent, it is through online films and videos that the Saints of tomorrow will commune with each other.
Christianity is the fastest growing religious movement in the world, and the LDS Church is near the cusp of this growth. Development in the Southern Hemisphere—Africa and Latin America—is particularly pronounced, and in coming years we can expect to see continued growth in developing nations, former Communist regimes, and other areas. Such places are not suitable markets for Mormon motion pictures like the theatrical features that have been released since God’s Army or even most of the productions produced by the Church itself. The way to incorporate these areas into a global Mormon culture is through small-scale viral videos about common Church activities and regular rank-and-file Church members. Even better than just receiving such productions, Saints in these areas could cheaply produce their own films and send them to Church members elsewhere. In this way a worldwide cinematic web would develop, fostering deep concern and fellowship between Latter-day Saints who will never have the opportunity to meet in person. Of course, today many Latter-day Saints in developing nations cannot access the Internet to the extent possible elsewhere, but as the technology and accessibility increase, we must be prepared.

Musings about the democratization of cinema are not limited to Mormonism. Recently, the journal Studies in Documentary Film published a special issue about the aesthetics of viral video on YouTube and elsewhere. A theme across several of the essays is that such videos represent a quick flow of two-way communication rather than polished works of art. Craig Hight describes them in this way:

The explosion of [user-created material] reinforces a kind of “YouTube” aesthetic; amateur footage, edited on a desktop, intended almost as throwaway pieces of culture, often produced as a direct response to other online material. This kind of online environment provides for both the flowering of the work of new documentary auteurs, and also their swamping within an ocean of more mediocre offerings.

Later, Bjorn Sorensen compares modern online videos with Alexandre Astruc’s concept of a camera-stylo from 1948, when 16mm film and television were presenting new opportunities for the avant-garde. With these technologies and the bright future presented France at the end of World War II, Astruc envisioned a breakthrough for film as a medium, no longer only as strict entertainment but also as a fundamental tool for human communication. As he said:

With the development of 16mm and television, the day is not far off when everyone will possess a projector, will go to the local bookstore and hire films written on any subject, of any form, from literary criticism and novels to mathematics, history, and general science. From that moment
on, it will no longer be possible to speak of the cinema. There will be several cinemas just as today there are several literatures, for the cinema, like literature, is not so much a particular art as a language which can express any sphere of thought.13

Sorensen draws the following conclusions from Astruc’s essay that are applicable to Mormon film today: (1) New technology provides new means of expression. With each advance in motion picture technology, it changes “from being exclusive and privileged to a common and publicly available form of expression”; think of video blogging via modern webcams. (2) “This, in turn, opens space for a more democratic use of the medium. (3) It also opens up new possibilities for modern (contemporary) and different forms and usages.”14

Compare the democratic prospect of the camera-stylo with the following sentiment of John Grierson, the man who coined the word “documentary” and helped advance its form as much as anyone else in history, years after Astruc wrote his article. He stated that Cesare Zavattini, a prominent neorealist filmmaker,

thought it would be wonderful if all the villages in Italy were armed with cameras so that they could make films by themselves and write film letters to each other, and it was all supposed to be a great joke. I was the person who didn’t laugh, because I think that is the next stage . . . the local film people making films to state their case politically or otherwise, to express themselves whether it’s in journalistic or other terms.15

Such a situation is exactly what the Internet has now enabled. Within Mormonism it is now possible to create a proliferation of short and cheap videos—fiction, documentary, and experimental—in conversation with each other throughout the globe. A few sites are already in place to support this dialogue.

The website best positioned to create this revolution in Mormon filmmaking is MormonWebTV (http://www.mormonwebtv.com). This site, administered by Kent Olmstead in Phoenix, Arizona, has, over the past few years, established itself as a Mormon version of YouTube. The similarity is more than passing, in fact, for the site operates by linking to videos already hosted by YouTube, thus allowing Olmstead to avoid duplicating a preexisting service and save valuable server space. The fact that MormonWebTV so closely resembles YouTube is not to its discredit; rather, it represents an innovative use of the larger site, winnowing down its immense material to create a clearinghouse for the Mormon niche audience. Where this could eventually become a liability is when it runs aground of YouTube’s ten-minute limit on video length; in the near future it would be
desirable for MormonWebTV to offer pictures of twenty minutes, thirty
minutes, or longer.

MormonWebTV features a well-designed simple interface and is
at present fairly easy to navigate. As of this writing it features 357 vid-
eos, which can be accessed through a complete list (unfortunately not
alphabetized) or seven subject headings such as humor, music, and mis-
sionary; one category devoted to theatrical films, primarily trailers, unfor-
tunately uses the name “Mormon Cinema,” thus perpetuating the myth
begun by Ldsfilm.com that Mormon cinema consists exclusively of films
released in theaters, when in reality every video on the site constitutes a
part of the corpus. In addition to these categories, three helpful fields on
the main page list eleven videos under the title “Featured Videos”; seven-
teen under “Newest Videos,” perhaps the most useful group; and fifteen
more under “Popular.” How featured and popular videos differ is not
specified. All of these menus make it possible to quickly find most types of
videos desired, but in the future as the number of videos surges beyond 357,
a search field will be absolutely essential.

On my visits to the site, I have found no great art and many pieces
that bordered on the insipid (for example, the featured video in mid-
September was a still image of conservative radio host Michael Medved
with a recording of an inane conversation he had with an excommunicated
Mormon paranoiac—or prankster). There was also some abuse in the post-
ing of videos—particularly a series about putting inappropriate objects in
blenders—with no relation to Mormonism. But among the detritus there
is always something to engage, and viewers must remember that viral
video does not as yet lend itself to high-end productions. In addition to the
aforementioned promotional material for theatrical films, the two main
categories of video seem to be comedies or spoofs and documentaries or
nonfiction pieces. The former are not merely parodies, although one can
find Mormon send-ups of Napoleon Dynamite, Spiderman, The Princess
Bride, The Brady Bunch, Extreme Makeover, and even a Pepsi commer-
cial. Mormon-themed pictures are also fair game, whether they’re real—
Saturday’s Warrior—or imaginary—The Visiting Teaching Movie and The
Best Three Years. There are riffs on other aspects of Mormon culture such
as missionary training, Mormon dress and grooming, home teaching,
families, and Deseret Industries. Some videos approach these topics from
a very oblique angle: one of the most popular, with 3,371 hits at present, is
Ask a Mormon Ninja, a well-made spot in which, as expected, a Mormon
ninja comments on ninja skills, martial arts-enhanced missionary work,
ninja sacrament meeting, and other aspects of Mormon ninja life. This is
one of the freshest and most engaging videos on the site, although it could
benefit by losing at least sixty seconds. Two others particularly worth viewing are the superhero missionary spoof *Shoes the Right* (in Spanish) and the *Star Wars* send-up *CTR Wars*, although both are a little rough around the edges. Undoubtedly MormonWebTV’s greatest undiscovered gems are the two Lego Book of Mormon animations, one with German intertitles and one with spoken English. These are inexplicably classified as instructional videos, though the strawberry jam spurting from Laban’s plastic torso is a far cry from the traditional seminary video. Indeed, in my opinion the greatest moment in recent Mormon film history is a Lego Ammon dismembering his Lamanite foes to the strains of John Williams’s pounding *The Phantom Menace* score.

The site’s nonfiction videos range from professional spots produced by the Church itself, such as a short piece about humanitarian aid sent to Myanmar in the wake of Cyclone Nargis, to amateur vodcasts of a single individual simply talking to his own personal webcam. Within this broad range of material, some pieces fall short while others reach a level of thematic accomplishment despite their lack of technical sophistication; in this way, these unpolished films are like the quick cinematic missives envisioned by Astruc and Grierson, a notebook sketch rather than a finished portrait. One engaging piece, for instance, entitled *Road Trip to General Conference*, uses still images and audio to recount the journey of a group of girls from California to Salt Lake City in order to be present as Thomas S. Monson is sustained President of the Church. The film, which runs just over four minutes and is labeled as a rough cut, has as much to do with the conference crowds and the girls’ social interactions—including a Latin dancing excursion—as it does with the conference sessions themselves. Even though no well-defined portraits emerge, we are given a glimpse into the girls’ discipleship through their desire to be present for a historic occasion. Also worth viewing are video tributes to President and Sister Hinckley, photographic tours of multiple temples throughout the world, and historical items on a variety of subjects. These range from *Priesthood Revelation Anniversary*, a professional-quality production on black Latter-day Saints and the 1978 revelation on the priesthood that includes sit-down interviews and archival visuals, to *Carthage Jail Walkthrough*, a single handheld shot in which a tourist walks through the place of Joseph Smith’s martyrdom. The effect of this piece is slightly unstable and frenetic—the cameraman goes too fast—but surprisingly sincere. Though more nonfiction films will add to the site’s appeal, what is most missed at present is a separate category for documentaries.

MormonWebTV features many films that are neither documentaries, comedies, nor promotional material for larger films. These include
excerpts from television programs, ranging from conservative Mormon political pundit Glenn Beck to an Australian comedy show that apparently frequently invokes Mormonism for laughs. There is also a smattering of institutional Church films like *Faith in Every Footstep* (1997); my favorite among these is the *Homefront Jr.* spot “Who Broke My Window?” which I memorized as a child in the 1980s.

The inclusion of these films indicates one way in which Mormon-WebTV or another similar site could expand: by creating an online Mormon cinémathèque, a video equivalent of the MLCAD that streams video of all extant institutional Church films from the 1910s to today. Due to copyright, such an undertaking would best be undertaken by the Church Audiovisual Department itself. Although nothing of this magnitude is apparently on the horizon as yet, the Church is beginning to provide online video through various outlets.

The first and most important of these is the website of BYU Broadcasting (http://www.byub.org) and particularly its premiere satellite and cable station BYUTV (http://www.byutv.org). On this site, viewers may watch streaming video of the station’s live broadcast by clicking on the “Tune in Now” link near the top left corner of the main page. First-time users are required to register, and return users will still have to click through a few pages (the destination site’s address is http://www.byu.tv) and perhaps download a new media player to get to the video, but overall accessing video is quick and intuitive. Once video, which can be enlarged to full screen, is streaming, viewers can navigate back to the beginning of the program but not forward to the end. A broadcast schedule is available in the lower portion of the screen, and it is through this feature that additional programs (that have already aired) can be accessed. This design gives a good degree of searchability, although it would be nice if viewers could search alphabetically at any time and access any program that has ever aired on BYUTV.

BYU Broadcasting rightly sees satellite, cable, and Internet distribution as the heart of its future and the most effective way it can bring the university community and mission of the Church to the world. BYUTV has expanded its broadcast range immensely since its January 2000 launch, but through the Internet it is already available worldwide. A few years ago, video downloads of BYUTV in China were triple those in the United States, for instance, and such figures can only be expected to increase.

The Church’s main website LDS.org (http://www.lds.org) is not so obviously imbued with cinematic content, nor should it be. But the Church has definitely revolutionized its use of the Internet within the past five years, and high quality video content is therefore scattered throughout
the Church’s sites. For instance, LDS.org’s Broadcast page (http://www.lds.org/broadcast, available by clicking on “Gospel Library—General Conference” on the main page and then “Broadcasts” on the subsequent page) contains links to BYUtv and BYU Radio Network, audio files of the complete standard works, and links to videos like President Hinckley’s address to the National Press Club. These are all available in a column to the left of the Broadcast page, while links in the center provide access to audio and video files of general conferences, CES firesides, Christmas devotionals, and other meetings. The oldest of these is the general conference of April 1997, though I suspect more sessions will eventually be added.

The Church’s relatively new website Mormon.org (http://www.mormon.org), designed as an interface for those curious about the Church’s basic beliefs, does not require as much navigation to access video content. The center of the homepage—indeed essentially the entire page—features a still headshot accompanied by querying taglines (“What is the purpose of my life?” “Does God really know me?”) along with a play-button link to start a video. After two introductory videos, a link invites, “You too can find answers to these questions.” A page loads with a list of videos of individuals delivering an impromptu monologue under two minutes in length. These films represent a quantum leap forward in Church advertising. At the end of each video, brief biographical information of the speaker, including baptism date, is given in voice-over with B-roll action footage of him or her; this is designed to illustrate that these are real people speaking in their own words about their actual thoughts and experiences. Compare this with the Church’s videos of two decades ago, when fictitious characters in films like What Is Real? (1990), Together Forever (1987), and Our Heavenly Father’s Plan (1986) gave similar testimonies but in totally scripted and therefore artificial ways. By allowing real Church members to simply tell their stories and bear their testimonies, today’s spots, while still promotional, have stripped away virtually all of the artifice and therefore evince a much greater respect for viewers’ intelligence and agency. The result can only be salubrious.

Since launching Mormon.org, the Church has supplemented it with an additional site entitled Jesus Christ, The Son of God (http://www.jesuschrist.lds.org). This site has an extremely easy-to-find Multimedia page that features Church films and presentations: Special Witnesses of Christ, The Restoration, The Bread of Life, Finding Faith in Christ, the 2007 First Presidency Christmas Devotional, and, the most recent addition, “The Only True God and Jesus Christ Whom He Hath Sent,” a two-minute excerpt of a general conference address by Elder Jeffrey R. Holland. Some of these are the longest Mormon films available online.
These sites represent different approaches the Church is using to update its multimedia presence, something that has become a particular emphasis of Elder M. Russell Ballard, who heads the Church Public Affairs department. In this capacity, Elder Ballard has spearheaded the Church’s efforts to establish a media and online presence, and mainstream sites like YouTube have not escaped his attention. To counter the barrage of anti-Mormon videos available on YouTube, the Church itself has now posted a number of short films, including a series of specially made short interviews with Elder Ballard answering questions—sometimes basic, sometimes challenging—about the Church. For example, “How Do Mormon Beliefs Differ from Other Christians?” can be seen at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LZGY_uSuH_g&feature=related; and “Is There Scientific Proof Authenticating the Book of Mormon?” is at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3AQTr9oB8lw&feature=related. Together these two videos have had over 38,000 views, not a large number by YouTube standards but not inconsequential either. These efforts represent an innovative and rather technologically savvy way for the Church to promote itself. Recognizing that the Church as an institution can only have so much sway in a democratized (and skeptical) media environment, Elder Ballard has also called on Church members to use blogs, online video, and other technologies to make their individual voices heard (his request to do so, given in a commencement address at BYU–Hawaii on December 15, 2007, can be seen on YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PEsjYm6Av4w; full text of the address is available at http://newsroom.lds.org/ldsnewsroom/eng/news-releases-stories/using-new-media-to-support-the-work-of-the-church). Young Church members have responded en masse, and their online contributions represent the same unscripted authenticity as the Church’s new advertisements but to a degree completely unattainable by the Church Audiovisual and Public Affairs departments.

The best of these resources predates Elder Ballard’s advocacy by several years. One of the most exciting developments in recent Mormon film history is the development of the Fit for the Kingdom project, and the Internet has been central to its growth. This movement began around 2000 as a proposal for a series of short films for traditional broadcast by BYU Broadcasting. When this was rejected, the filmmakers—led by BYU film professor Dean Duncan and then-student Ben Unguren (now on the faculty)—turned to the Internet (http://fitforthekingdom.byu.edu), which in fact proved to be a much better venue. At present there are twenty films available for online viewing, most lasting between three and ten minutes. They are documentaries, each profiling a single Church member or common Mormon activity such as scripture study or girls’ camp. They
eschew traditional narrative structures and extraneous formal elements like a musical score in hopes that by focusing on the deceptively simple discipleship of ordinary Latter-day Saints they can reveal something extraordinary about discipleship and spirituality. To that end the Fit for the Kingdom films are the premiere example of a group of productions gathered together in a single website around an individual theme. This can set the precedent for future sites built around Church history, Latter-day Saints of shared ethnic backgrounds, or the Church in specific geographical areas. At present, the Fit for the Kingdom site features some of the best Mormon filmmaking of the past eight years as well as supplementary printed material designed to encourage new filmmakers to contribute productions. The webmasters retain the right to post or not post any submitted film, but this caveat, obviously ubiquitous in the broadcasting industry, is accompanied by an offer to assist in any stage of production or postproduction; recently the group received, helped revise, and posted its first film from a contributor who was previously unconnected to the movement, indicating that the films are beginning to gain recognition throughout the Church. Fit for the Kingdom thus displays the group mentality and interactivity of MormonWebTV but with a critical purpose and vetting procedure that consistently yields productions of a much higher quality than on that site.17

Beyond this, there are numerous other websites and blogs that contain a scattering of Mormon-themed videos. The best of these is the blog LDS & Mormon Videos (http://mormonvideos.blogspot.com), maintained by an anonymous blogger evidently in Provo. The site, which has been active since April 2008, does not offer criticism but instead links to “the best and most accurate videos about Mormons . . . from Youtube.” Although such an endeavor duplicates much of the content of MormonWebTV, it does so in a format that is different enough to make itself viable. Each post features one video, often with a brief introduction geared toward non-Mormons, with nothing else. This makes for a much simpler and quieter interface than MormonWebTV’s, which can seem somewhat busy with its myriad of videos and categories. LDS & Mormon Videos, by contrast, allows users to search through its subject tags, like those of any blog, but its draw is to discover what one person deems particularly interesting at any given time. With fifty-two postings in the past year, LDS & Mormon Videos has the potential to become a rival of MormonWebTV but with a much different purpose and ambience.

The site Entertainment4lds (http://www.entertainment4lds.com) serves as a hub for Mormon media-related websites, including many already discussed here. It therefore serves as a gateway to online film
rentals, video stores, and other traditional outlets, but it also features a listing of favorite Mormon YouTube videos.

Many sites contain videos geared to one particular theme. Blacklds.org (http://www.blacklds.org) has an excellent Video page that features content about African American Latter-day Saints. Similarly, the Church’s Genesis Group for African Americans (http://www.ldsgenesisgroup.org) has a Media Presentations page that currently includes speeches from the 2006 Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society conference in Salt Lake City. Individual Church units are beginning to post their own videos as well. In my own stake in New York City, the stake history committee recently uploaded two videos by a non-Mormon journalist about the history of the Church in Harlem (the committee’s website is http://www.nycldhistory.com; the videos are at http://www.nycldhistory.com/nycldhist/index.php?title=Harlem). One can even find videos in the online Mormon dating service LDSPlanet.com (http://www.ldsplanet.com), where users can create their own video profile and view the profiles of others. The list of pertinent sites, obviously, goes on and on.

Finally, in addition to sites maintained by Latter-day Saints, there are mainstream websites, primarily YouTube (http://www.youtube.com), that happen to have numerous videos with Mormon content (including, by default, every video also included at MormonWebTV). A YouTube search for Mormon-related keywords is a risky but rewarding business, as it generally turns up mountains of material divisible into three categories: First, there are all the accumulated anti-Mormon films and videos from the 1980s forward, much of which is quaint but some of which is genuinely offensive. Second, there are now a large number of blasé vodcasts about Mormons and politics or Mormon beliefs or other topics. These videos, which are generally directed to those outside the Church, are not always the most engaging for Latter-day Saints themselves, but the written comments underneath can be interesting, particularly as irate viewers spar with the video’s creator over the merits of Mormon theology. Third and most important, there are many videos that are both positive in their outlook on the Church and interesting in their content as well. Many of these are also hosted on MormonWebTV, but enough are not that YouTube remains a profitable place to search for new Mormon web content. If that does not satisfy the true Mormon cineaste, a Google search of the term “Mormon videos” returns 1,910,000 hits.

In summary, there is an incredible amount of material on the Internet relating to Mormonism and motion pictures. The Internet is revolutionizing how films are discussed, consumed, and even created. Mormon filmmakers and critics can take advantage of this sea change by understanding
the strengths of viral video and group film criticism, thus allowing these two areas to nurture each other. As President Kimball implied, a great critical tradition will create a great cinematic tradition, which will in turn further inform good criticism. Through the Internet, isolated Latter-day Saints throughout the world can then connect and commune with each other. Such quickly executed productions can transform the video camera into a camera-stylo and the productions into film letters between Latter-day Saints. This will not only fulfill the visions of President Kimball, John Grierson, and Alexandre Astruc, but also, to a degree, of all the prophets who have foreseen the Saints of the Church of God spread upon the whole earth, establishing interconnected stakes of Zion, strengthened through their unity.

The Church of Jesus Christ is not a film studio or a cinema club, but we must realize that to a great extent it will be through the creation and consumption of amateur online video that the Saints in Bangkok, Medellín, Lagos, Kiev, Reykjavík, and New York City will be able to stand united in Zion, mourning with those that mourn, comforting those that stand in need of comfort, and standing as witnesses of God at all times, in all things, and in all places. At that time, it will not seem unfitting to pay tribute to those who pioneered the way for Mormon cinema to grow, mature, and flourish on the Web.

Randy Astle (randy@randyastle.com) is a New York City–based filmmaker, author, and screenwriter specializing in scripts for preschool television. He received his MA from the London Film School and has published widely on the history of LDS film. His films have shown at the LDS Film Festival in Orem, Utah, the Festival du Film Mormon in Brussels, and the Lingos Film Festival in New York City. His website is http://www.randyastle.com, and he blogs about children’s literature and media at http://balloonred.blogspot.com; he is currently preparing a website to exhibit documentaries about Latter-day Saints in New York.
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*American Religions and the Family: How Faith Traditions Cope with Modernization and Democracy.*  

Reviewed by Loren Marks

This fifteen-chapter volume addresses two key questions: (a) How do various American religions negotiate the pressures of *modernization*, such as technology, the speed of life, and consumerism? and (b) How do various American religions wrestle with challenging aspects of *democracy*, such as heightened individualism, the social reconstruction of morality, and the waning acceptance of traditional authority? Chapter-length responses to these questions are offered by a carefully selected array of social scientists, historians, theologians, and legal scholars.

The volume is stimulating, readable, and relevant. The lead editor, Don S. Browning, summarily states, “Studies about the effect of religious thought and behavior on American society have never been more timely or more important. People around the world are discovering that recent global political and economic events cannot be understood in their fullness without comprehending something about religion” (vii–viii). Indeed, a working knowledge of the relationships between cultures and religions is important, and this book offers much to facilitate that understanding.

The editors frame the volume by commenting on the accelerating pace of life and dramatic moral shifts that have occurred in recent years. They then offer a framework that identifies how different faiths have responded, countered, and adapted to these changes. Included in this faith-response framework are the five approaches of *evolution* (flexibly bending with the times and environment); *accommodation* (integrating some environmental and cultural shifts while rejecting others); *modulation of distinctiveness* (adjusting or heightening distinctive aspects of religious identity in response to events or trends); *transformation* (altering a religion so that it...
will fit into a new cultural setting—the Americanization of Buddhism, for example); and strategic limitation (which involves carefully limiting the use of potentially damaging but also beneficial cultural developments—for example, the LDS Church’s use of the Internet for public relations but outspoken stance against Internet pornography).

Two extensions of this five-part framework not highlighted in the book are that, first, the framework is useful not only in analyzing major religions, it is also applicable to individual congregations. Second, and perhaps most importantly to LDS readers, the framework is a valuable heuristic device in considering our families. Indeed, many readers may find themselves internalizing some elements of the book by asking if and when they (and their families) have “evolved,” “accommodated,” or engaged in “strategic limitation” in connection with often dangerous modern cultural forces (8). Whether or not the dominant themes of the book lead to personal introspection, the volume offers plenty of food for thought, as the following chapter overviews indicate.

Paul D. Numrich drives home a key theme in his chapter “Immigrant American Religions and the Family” (20) by citing one study wherein two-thirds of the immigrants surveyed “either strongly or somewhat agreed with the statement that ‘America is an immoral, corrupt society’” (26). For many such immigrants, pursuing the financial American Dream involves high moral risks, particularly for their children.

W. Bradford Wilcox and Elizabeth Williamson, who address mainline Protestant family ideology and practice, observe that a core contradiction of this tradition seems to be that there is much of politically “walking right, [and] talking left” (52.) Specifically, the authors argue that despite the many leaders and intellectuals in mainline Protestantism who condone and even promote alternative family forms, much of the involved, lay membership is comprised of more traditional, nuclear families.

Margaret Bendroth’s discussion of Evangelical Christians illustrates that the gulf between Evangelical rhetoric and dominant American culture seems to be considerably wider than the rift between how mainstream Americans and Evangelicals actually live. Whether discussing family values, male headship, or the waning Promise Keepers movement, Bendroth sees Evangelicals as different, but not as different as many insiders (or outsiders) view them to be.

Raymond Bucko’s chapter, entitled “Native American Families and Religion,” utilizes the metaphor of Native Americans as the fragile “miners’ canary” (65) that is the first to fail in the toxic, gaseous mineshaft, thereby alerting others to danger. Bucko outlines violence, oppression,
religious intolerance, and government usurpation as some of the hazardous cultural “gases” to which Native American families have been exposed. As an aside, a cursory knowledge of LDS history will sensitize the reader to parallels between some of the challenges faced by both Native Americans and early Mormons.

Julie Hanlon Rubio’s “Marriage, Family, and the Modern Catholic Mind” (87) focuses on ethics, papal encyclicals, and formal documents that have been issued across time, particularly during the twentieth century. Rubio reviews scholarly criticism of these documents, including calls to “get real about sex” and other family-related issues (93). Rubio tends to sympathize with scholarly critics and contends that because “the church is not ‘real’ about sex or gender, it has found it difficult to be recognized as a prophetic critic of modernity” (95).

Robert M. Franklin’s chapter, “Generative Approaches to Modernity, Discrimination, and Black Families,” does not shy away from controversial topics including racism, discrimination, the effects of slavery, interracial marriage, and gendered (dual) moral standards of sexual behavior. Franklin not only describes African American families in connection with religion, he also goes a step further than most of the authors in the volume and offers recommendations regarding what needs to change and how it might be done—including a call to African American churches and mosques to play a stronger and more explicit role in supporting families.

The chapter on The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is authored by David C. Dollahite, the editor and coeditor of two previous volumes that outline the real-world value of “The Family: A Proclamation to the World.” Dollahite uses the Proclamation as an outline and directly cites much of it during the course of the chapter. Dollahite, an LDS convert at 18 and a full-time missionary at 19, softens his convert’s zeal and enthusiasm, but they are never far from the surface. Dollahite’s perspective results in a more subjective but “close to home” chapter that offers a rich portrait many LDS readers may profitably share with nonmember friends.

Following additional chapters on Jewish, Confucian, Buddhist, Hindu, and Islamic families, the late Lee E. Teitelbaum addresses the state of family law in modern America. The volume concludes with David A. Clairmont’s explanation of some challenges that accompany the effort to understand and appreciate the distinct visions of family life in American religion. He finishes the volume by stating that “the personal and social complexities of religious life” have become “one of the defining issues of our time” (255).
For me, the volume was a worthwhile read, not only because the diverse authors informed and offered insight, but also because the book’s central messages implicitly prompted a series of intensely personal- and family-level questions. These introspections might be circumscribed by the question, “Am I most influenced by ever-changing modern American culture or by the faith I profess?”

Loren Marks (lorenm@lsu.edu) is Associate Professor at Louisiana State University in the School of Human Ecology. He received his BS and MS at Brigham Young University and his PhD from the University of Delaware. He has authored 35 publications on religion and/or family life and is married to Sandy Martindale, also a BYU alum (BS, 1998). They have five children and actively serve in the Baton Rouge Louisiana Stake of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Among the various apocryphal titles mentioned by the early Church fathers is the Gospel of Judas, a Coptic version of which was recently found in Egypt, purportedly taken from a limestone box together with several other texts during an illegal raid of a burial cave in 1978. Before its first publication by the National Geographic Society in 2006, it was apparently sold, stolen, recovered, sold again, then again, frozen, thawed, and repossessed, such that by the time the work of conservation finally began in 2001, the pages of the Gospel of Judas had been broken into numerous pieces, some of which have probably been lost forever.¹ Thanks to the efforts of Rodolphe Kasser, Florence Darbre, and Gregor Wurst, the surviving fragments (about 85 percent of the text) were conserved and reassembled.

In April 2006, a transcription of the Coptic text of the Gospel of Judas was posted on National Geographic’s web page. Based on this “preliminary edition,” National Geographic published an English translation of the Gospel of Judas by Rodolphe Kasser, Marvin Meyer, and Gregor Wurst, in collaboration with François Gaudard. The book, which also features commentary by Kasser, Meyer, and Wurst, as well as by best-selling author Bart Ehrman, sold well and quickly due to its claim that in the Gospel of Judas, to cite Ehrman’s commentary, Judas is portrayed “not as the evil, corrupt, devil-inspired follower of Jesus, who betrayed his master” but “instead Jesus’ closest intimate and friend, the one who understood Jesus better than anyone else, who turned Jesus over to the authorities because Jesus wanted him to do so.”² If it were not for this claim, the Gospel of Judas would not have received much attention. But as it was, the text became a topic of conversation for several months in various settings, including a panel discussion by a few BYU professors on April 15, 2006. Since the papers prepared in conjunction with that panel discussion were published in BYU Studies later that year,³ its readers may be interested to know that


Reviewed by Grant Adamson
the work of the National Geographic team has also faced mounting criticism from scholars like April DeConick (best known for her work on the Gospel of Thomas).

The central point of DeConick’s book *The Thirteenth Apostle* is that, contrary to what the National Geographic team has written, the Gospel of Judas does not portray Judas positively; rather, “he is as evil as ever” (61). DeConick’s criticisms of the portrayal of Judas by the National Geographic team are not limited to issues of translation and interpretation, weighty as these may be, but include the transcription and restoration of fragmentary or otherwise difficult passages of the Coptic text. To some extent *The Thirteenth Apostle* is also a criticism of two other monographs, *The Lost Gospel of Judas Iscariot* by Bart Ehrman and *Reading Judas* by Elaine Pagels and Karen King. Both books, like all early publications on the Gospel of Judas, are dependent on National Geographic’s “preliminary edition” of the Coptic text.\(^4\) One example of DeConick’s criticisms must suffice. According to the translation of the National Geographic team, Gospel of Judas 46:24–47:1 reads: “In the last days they will curse your ascent to the holy [generation].” DeConick argues that this translation is based on a faulty transcription and emendation in the “preliminary edition” of the Coptic text, and that what Jesus actually tells Judas is: “You will not ascend to the holy [generation].” This “terrible mistake” was corrected in the critical edition of the Gospel of Judas published by National Geographic in mid-2007. Unfortunately, by then it was too late for Pagels, King, and Ehrman (54–57), to say nothing of other scholars and the general public. Although it deals with such specialized topics as Coptic language and Sethianism (the phenomenon that produced the Gospel of Judas), DeConick’s book is readily accessible to nonspecialists; it contains general introductory chapters on early Christianity, an annotated bibliography of further reading, a summary of Sethian literature, a collection and discussion of patristic statements on the Gospel of Judas, and a series of answers to basic questions someone unfamiliar with the Gospel might ask.

DeConick’s sharpest criticism in *The Thirteenth Apostle* is directed not at the National Geographic team but at the society itself for the way it handled publication of the Gospel of Judas. National Geographic had its team members sign a nondisclosure statement and did not release facsimile images of the manuscript until over a year after the initial publication of the Gospel of Judas—thus making it impossible for other scholars to check the team’s work. DeConick writes, “Certainly National Geographic has had its exclusive, an exclusive that may have been very profitable for National Geographic, but it is a profit at the expense of our field, not only
in the terms of what the Gospel of Judas actually says,” she continues, “but also in terms of our reputation as professors and scholars” (181).

_The Thirteenth Apostle_ has prompted several responses in print and online, including one from the National Geographic Society and several from team member Marvin Meyer. At issue is more than just the academic debate over “what the Gospel of Judas really says” as a second-century Sethian text, since for many people the portrayal of Judas (whether historical or not) has strong theological and political implications. Apparently some have found in DeConick’s book a weapon to use against the blasphemies of the National Geographic team, while others see it as yet another demonization of Judas and manifestation of anti-Semitism. Though the number of scholars on her side is increasing (in fact, DeConick has never been alone), overall Meyer does not seem to be backing down, at least from the possibility of a good Judas, and the academic debate no doubt will continue. National Geographic released a revised edition of its original publication of the Gospel of Judas in mid-2008, and DeConick’s book will be reissued in an expanded version later in 2009.

Grant Adamson is a graduate student at Rice University and presented at the Codex Judas Congress, March 13–16, 2008. He received his BA and MA at Brigham Young University.

In his latest monograph, Ramsay MacMullen, emeritus professor of history at Yale University, takes a wonderfully fresh look at the early Christian councils. At the beginning of his study, MacMullen recognizes the primacy of the Council of Nicaea (AD 325), whose definition of the Supreme Being forms the basis of the majority Christian view on the nature of God. The Nicene Creed was “made formal and given weight by majority vote and supported after much struggle by later assemblies, notably at Chalcedon (AD 451)—likewise by majority vote. Such was the determining process. Thus agreement was arrived at, and became dogma widely accepted down to our own day” (vii). Although MacMullen recognizes that this process has been “studied to death,” in this work his approach is to “focus on those persons who made up the great mass of any council”; “it is the whole contributing mass that I like to understand—how people, lots of people, really behaved. . . . In the making of any event such as emerged from Nicaea or Chalcedon, figures great and small, high and low, had all to contribute. . . . It is for readers of history then to decide who counted the most, or perhaps whom they find most interesting” (viii).

Before analyzing the councils, the author includes five introductory chapters. The Introduction proper encourages readers to imagine that they are visiting from Mars and come to the subject at hand from an objective distance, “taking nothing for granted” (i). MacMullen provides a useful table identifying the councils that were convened during the three centuries between AD 253 and 553. The table includes dates and locations and attempts, where possible, to indicate in parentheses the number of bishops in attendance (2–4). The bishops who attended came from a variety of social, educational, and economic backgrounds. Some, like Ambrose,
could count imperial senators among their acquaintances. Others (a small percentage) could not even sign their names. Some were extravagant in their displays of wealth and power. Some were well schooled in rhetoric or philosophy and used their training in their formal speeches. However, the records also reveal that there was also “a great deal of common speech” on display (8–11).

Chapters 2 through 5 address four “shaping elements” that influenced the way the councils came to their conclusions: the democratic element, the cognitive element, the “supernaturalist” element, and the violent element. The democratic element describes how the Church councils functioned in a manner similar to “the secular decision-making groups or assemblies,” such as the Roman Senate and town councils. The interplay between the local aristocracy, the clergy, and the populace was critical in the outcome of the Church councils. The aristocracy possessed political clout, “but their power was never absolute” (21). The clergy enjoyed an important aura of religious awe, but their position was dependent upon the confirmation of the crowd. The populace had numbers and made use of the practice of chanting, the frenzied practice of which would sometimes turn to violence, to ensure that their position was also considered in the debates.

The cognitive element centered on theological debates. Different Christians interpreted scriptural passages in different ways. The development of the concept of heresy in the second century meant that there were increasing debates over orthodoxy (“correct beliefs”). Sometimes the issues were so subtle that only a select few of the clergy were able to grasp the nuances of the debates, thus creating a gulf “separating the elite (as they may be called) from ordinary Christians” (34). Nevertheless, the ordinary Christians became a part of the debate through two means: the use of song and the use of sloganeering names and phrases. The songs were “aimed at changing minds [and] also at confirming and inspiring the converted; or they were used, perhaps invented on the spot, in contests over doctrinal wording, ‘praise the Father in the Son,’ and so forth” (38). MacMullen quotes Brent Shaw to show that slogans were developed, “reducing beliefs . . . to ‘aberrations’ of one individual. . . . The intent is . . . ‘marginalizing’; but it is also didactic. It encapsulates a cluster of ideas in a single word, . . . thus providing a neat convenient handle by which occasionally to recall with veneration, or more often to offer for attack, or to throw away in disgust, whatever the named individual had defended” (39).

The “supernaturalist” element explores the impact of the divine on the council voting. “Wherever there is debate, there must be force in majority. . . . Democracy teaches the equation, many = good; therefore, more = better. Yet a truer understanding of the Christian community suggests
instead, or also, the equation, many = God. In voting, a power beyond the human might assert itself” (41–42). But if there was the possibility of divine favor, there was also an awareness of the opposite, the influence of the devil. It was divine favor that brought about a majority of votes. To acknowledge or supplicate the pneuma (Spirit), a copy of the Bible became a prominent fixture in the councils. “Theological argument that went off the tracks invited God’s rebuke” (47). Thus Arius’s ignominious death was viewed as God’s retribution for his heretical teachings. In contrast, a person who performed miracles was viewed as someone who enjoyed divine favor. Thus, in an anti-intellectual wave that swept through the Church, monks, whom bishops had sometimes viewed as being “insubordinate or worse: thugs and fanatics” (53), began to wield considerable power, and by the Constantinopolitan council (AD 532), they were “sitting together with bishops in large numbers; and more generally, from the sixth century on, in the East, bishops were recruited only from monasteries” (54).

In the fifth chapter, MacMullen explores the violent element: “Our sources for the two and a quarter centuries following Nicaea allow a very rough count of the victims of creedal differences: not less than twenty-five thousand deaths. A great many, but still only a small minority, were clergy; the rest, participants in crowds” (56). The majority of these deaths were the “targets of fury”; only a handful were bishops who died “in the custody of secular powers” (56). A major spark for the violence was episcopal elections, where creedal preferences “could be at least a contributing factor, sometimes really the only one, in street fights, stabbings in the church, brawls in the public squares, and general ruff stuff” (59). If the general populace objected to an appointment, armed forces were often brought in. But violence also was stirred up from the pulpit. Sermons were often designed to agitate the populace against someone who taught “heresy.” “Chrysostom recommends, no doubt to applause, that his listeners should not hesitate to give a good punch in the face to misbelievers” (63). It was with the violent element, or the fear thereof, that the power of the emperor was most evident in the doctrinal debates.

In the final two chapters, MacMullen integrates all of these elements to examine the events leading up to, and encompassing, the Council of Chalcedon. His analysis describes the maneuvering to bring together two seemingly divergent goals: ecumenicity and ensuring that the “right” people were in the majority. After all, to ensure that the decision of the council was lasting, it must be recognized to represent the whole Church, but issues like the choosing of the site for the council, the wording and distribution of the invitations, the seating arrangements at the council, and
the voting blocks were all orchestrated to make sure that the vote was, to a large extent, predetermined.

This book is a must read for anyone interested in the early Church councils. The author has an excellent grasp of the primary sources. His use of firsthand accounts to illustrate his arguments adds life to his analysis. Likewise, he is conversant with the scholarly debate surrounding the councils. He relegates, however, most of this aspect to the endnotes. Thus, both scholar and lay reader will find this volume a treasure trove to be savored and enjoyed.

Gaye Strathearn (who can be reached via email at byu_studies@byu.edu) is Assistant Professor of Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University. Strathearn received her MA in Near Eastern Studies at BYU and her PhD in religion from Claremont Graduate University. Her publications include “The Gnostic Context of the Gospel of Judas,” BYU Studies 45, no. 2 (2006): 27–34.

Erratum

Amelia Fillerup (Hutchings)  Mayhew H. Dalley

In BYU Studies 47, no. 3 (2008), page 116, we mistakenly identified Amelia Fillerup (Hutchings) as Mayhew H. Dalley. In the images above, Hutchings and Dalley are identified correctly.