International Journal of Mormon Studies

Volume 5

2012

Publication Details

The *International Journal of Mormon Studies* is a European based internationally focused, peer–reviewed online and printed scholarly journal, which is committed to the promotion of interdisciplinary scholarship by publishing articles and reviews of current work in the field of Mormon studies. With high quality international contributors, the journal explores Mormon studies and its related subjects. In addition, *IJMS* provides those who submit manuscripts for publication with useful, timely feedback by making the review process constructive. To submit a manuscript or review, including book reviews please email them for consideration in the first instance to submissions@ijmsonline.org.

International Journal of Mormon Studies (Print) ISSN 1757–5532
International Journal of Mormon Studies (Online) ISSN 1757–5540

Published in the United Kingdom

http://www.ijmsonline.org

International Journal of Mormon Studies

Volume 5, 2012

Contents

Publication Details

Editorial

Patriotism and Resistance, Brotherhood and Bombs: The Experience of the German Saints and World War II
Steve Carter 6

Origins and Development of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Historic County Durham, 1843–1913
Ronald L. Bartholomew 29

The Species Debate: God and Humanity in Irenaeus and the Latter-day Saints
Adam J. Powell 64

"Those Who Receive You Not": The Rite of Wiping Dust Off the Feet
Daniel L. Belnap 81

The Holy Ghost in LDS Ritual Experience: Preparation for Exaltation
James D. Holt 128

Embodiment in Mormon Thought: Ambiguity, Contradiction and Consensus
Aaron S. Reeves 139

Review – Mormon Convert, Mormon Defector: A Scottish Immigrant in the American West, 1848–1861
Reviewed by David M. Morris 165

Review – The Mormon Rebellion: America's First Civil War
Reviewed by Carter Charles 170

Review – Why I Stay: The Challenges of Discipleship for Contemporary Mormons
Reviewed by Polly Aird 178

Review – Tiki and Temple: The Mormon Mission in New Zealand, 1854–1958
Reviewed by Gina Colvin 183

Review – Flunking Sainthood
Reviewed by Samuel M. Brown 186

Review – The Development of LDS Temple Worship
Reviewed by Mauro Properzi 188

Review – The Mormon Menace: Violence and Anti–Mormonism in the Post–bellum South
Reviewed by Jordan T. Watkins 193

Article Contributors

Editorial

David M. Morris
Editor

In a year that some have described as the *Mormon Moment*, due to the media exposure of a Mormon standing for the US presidency, Mormon Studies once again enlarges the academic world. One need only look at current releases of university presses, which demonstrate this interest, many of which are reviewed here. In this issue articles are featured on intellectual and historical foci, as well as theological analysis.

We, as always, extend our appreciation to those who took time to blind peer–review articles and review books fairly and formative as possible. As an editorial board we hope you will enjoy the contents of this issue.

If you wish to make a comment or suggestions on its improvement, please feel free to email us at editorial@ijmsonline.org.

PATRIOTISM AND RESISTANCE, BROTHERHOOD AND BOMBS: THE EXPERIENCE OF THE GERMAN SAINTS AND WORLD WAR II

Steve Carter

The rise of Hitler and the Second World War had an enormous effect throughout Europe, particularly Germany. In the Third Reich, there was a great loss of life—both soldiers and civilians—destruction of property as cities were bombed and a disruption of people's way of life. As with other Germans, Mormons suffered greatly. Many German Latter–day Saints served patriotically in the military—a number of whom lost their lives. LDS congregations were decimated due to the destruction of buildings where they worshiped and the scattering and deaths of civilian members. As members of an American–based denomination, cut off from Church headquarters in the United States, German Mormons had to avoid running afoul of the Nazis while at the same time maintaining cohesion, integrity and order within the Church institution itself.

THE LATTER–DAY SAINTS IN GERMANY UP TO WORLD WAR II

In the mid–nineteenth century Mormonism was introduced to Germany and although the denomination remained quite small, missionary efforts prior to, and following World War I, won many new converts to the religion. By the end of the 1920s, LDS membership in Germany had reached 13,000 and represented the largest pocket of Latter–day Saints outside the USA.

When the National Socialists came to power in 1933, the Mormons were able to avoid persecution. The Latter–day Saints adhered to their "accommodation" policy, adopted in 1890, in which they would abide by the national laws, avoid confrontation with secular authorities, remain apolitical, and be loyal citizens[1] as outlined by the LDS

[1] Douglas F. Tobler and Alan F. Keele, "The Saints and the Reich: German Mormons under Hitler," unpublished essay, copy in author's possession, 2, 6–9; Douglas F. Tobler, "The Narrow Line: The Experience of the American Mormon Missionaries in Hitler's Germany, 1933–1939," unpublished essay,

Twelfth Article of Faith.[2] What harassment Mormons endured was carried out by local Nazis and varied by location. There was no national policy against the Mormons, nor did the national Nazi party target them.[3]

Throughout the 1930s, Mormons strove for "acceptance" in Germany. The Nazis tolerated the Latter–day Saints believing that they could do some good for the Reich like the Baptists and Methodists. LDS missionaries continued to proselyte and even helped stage the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games. After the Olympics, however, the Nazis begin to grow suspicious of the Mormons. Nevertheless, they scaled back on religious harassment in general during the final years of the 1930s because of their preparation for World War II. As the international situation worsened, the Mormon Church evacuated its American missionary force from Germany twice: once temporarily during the Sudeten crisis of 1938 and permanently in late August 1939 just days before the outbreak of war.[4]

THE NEW LDS LEADERSHIP IN THE REICH

The evacuation of American missionaries in August 1939 necessitated entrusting Church leadership to native Germans. Since World War I, American mission leaders had been turning more leadership responsibility over to native Germans, and while many larger branches and some districts were led by locals, as late as 1938, a number of congregations still relied on the American missionaries.[5] The

---

photocopy in authors' possession. See also, Steven E. Carter, "The Mormons and the Third Reich, 1933–1946" (Ph.D. diss., University of Arkansas, 2003), 22, 57–61.

[2] *Pearl of Great Price*, Articles of Faith 1:12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honouring, and sustaining the law.

[3] Carter, "Mormons and the Third Reich," 71–76; Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 13.

[4] For a thorough review of this period, see Carter, "Mormons and the Third Reich," chapter 3 and especially chapter 4.

[5] "East German Mission Manuscript History, 1938–1959," manuscript on file in Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, entry for 31 December 1939; Gilbert W. Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany: A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints*

1938 evacuation had reinforced in the minds of Church leaders the urgency of preparing Germans for leadership positions.[6] In both German missions,[7] LDS leaders identified the most devout and capable individuals to assume leadership duties in the event of war.[8]

During the 1939 evacuation, branch, district and even mission presidencies were turned over to the locals. In the West German mission, Friedrich Biehl was chosen as "acting mission president" while Herbert Klopfer was appointed to preside over the East German mission.[9]

Most of the newly appointed leaders took their positions seriously. Commenting on the leadership change in a conference address in 1940, European mission president, Thomas E. McKay, reassured the Church that the German Mormons were in capable hands.[10] Although the new German church leaders were devoted to their duties, many lacked experience in ecclesiastical administrative matters.[11] Even

---

in Germany (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1970), 106. In the East German mission alone, 23 of the 65 branches had been under the leadership of American missionaries.

[6] Notes from Conversation with Douglas F. Tobler, 30 April 1998, Provo, Utah; Tobler, "The Narrow Line", 17–18. Apostles James Talmage and John Widtsoe both supported the proposal, while Richard Lyman, president of the European mission during the late 1930s, opposed it. See also "Chronik der Gemeinde Bielefeld, 1896–1996," 1 Auflage 1—150, Archives, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 44–45, 48.

[7] In Germany there were two missions: The West German Mission headquartered in Frankfurt am Main and the East German Mission headquartered in Berlin.

[8] Ralph Mark Lindsey, Oral History, interviewed by Matthew Heiss, 1990, typescript, The James Moyle Oral History Program, 19–20. See also Walter H. Speidel, Oral History, interviewed by Steve Carter, 1 May 1998, tape recording/typescript, 5–6. The American District President in Stuttgart designated his German Counsellor to succeed him if and when the American missionaries were withdrawn again.

[9] "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1939. "Quite a number of those people who are now in charge of the work have been born in the Church; they understand the Gospel and are well qualified to carry on...."

[10] *Conference Report of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints* (Salt Lake City, Ut.: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints), 5 April 1940, 49.

[11] Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 22.

McKay, who had publicly praised them, had his reservations. Shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, while still in Europe, McKay sent a circular letter to the German branches encouraging the leaders and individuals to follow the prescribed program of the Church.[12] After contact with the mother Church in the United States was lost completely in 1941, these leaders were left alone to guide the denomination through the Second World War.

"NORMALCY"

The first priority of these new LDS officials was to ensure the continued function of the Church. From 1939 until 1941, worship meetings and conferences were held on a regular basis; and as with most other denominations,[13] Mormon branches reported increased attendance.[14] The LDS community also observed special religious commemorations such as the 110th anniversary of the founding of the Mormon faith.[15] By utilizing a handful of "local missionaries,"[16] Ger-

[12] "West German Mission Manuscript History, 1938–1968," manuscript on file in Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, entry for 25 September 1939; "Chronik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe," comp. Karl Lutz (Karlsruhe, Germany: Gemeinde Karlsruhe, Kirche Jesu Christi der Heiligen der Letzten Tage, 1997), Archives, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 103.

[13] Ernst C. Helmreich, *The German Churches Under Hitler: Background, Struggle, and Epilogue* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1979), 347. Helmreich refers to a Gestapo report from 12 November 1939 in which the agent monitoring the Catholics noted that church attendance was better with many soldiers present.

[14] Letter from Ema Klopfer, wife of President Herbert Klopfer, to Heber J. Grant and Counselors, 16 April 1940, in "East German MSS History," entry for 16 April 1940. "Our districts and branches are in good condition; meetings are being held regularly and are, as a rule, well attended.... Spring conferences are being held in all districts of the mission. Those already conducted...have without exception shown a wonderful spirit, perfect preparation and comparatively large attendances. A good number of friends have been visiting us for these conferences too." See also "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1939.

[15] Letter from Ema Klopfer to Heber J. Grant and Counsellors, 16 April 1940, "East German MSS History," entry for 16 April 1940.

man Mormons carried out successful proselyting activities during the war as well.[17] For example, during the first eight months of 1940, fifty–five individuals converted to Mormonism in the East German mission.[18] Throughout the war, there were on average sixty conversions per year in that mission alone.[19] Encouraged by their successes, ecclesiastical leaders in Germany sent enthusiastic reports to Salt Lake City—reports that pleased and reassured the Mormon hierarchy.[20]

However, German Mormons soon faced the realities of the war. When hostilities broke out, many Latter–day Saints were called to arms. By the spring of 1940, over six hundred Mormons were in uniform; seven had already died for the fatherland.[21] These numbers continued to climb throughout the war, and the results were immediately obvious. Friedrich Biehl presided over the West German mission until early 1940 when he was drafted. Christian Heck succeeded Biehl until he too left to serve in the *Wehrmacht*. Both Biehl and Heck eventually lost their

---

[16] "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1939. In late 1939, the East German mission reported twelve natives still engaged in missionary work and the administration of the mission office in Berlin.

[17] Since 1933, both missions had used part–time "local missionaries" to supplement the full–time missionaries in their work. After the departure of the Americans, local missionaries shouldered much of the proselyting activities. See "German–Austrian Quarterly Reports, 1930–1937," manuscript on file in Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 1933, circular letter #7. See also Walter H. Speidel, Oral History, interviewed by Steve Carter, 30 April 1998, 8.

[18] Letter from Johanna Berger to Thomas E. McKay, 9 September 1940, "East German MSS History," entry for 9 September 1940.

[19] "Report Tells of Saints in Europe," *Church News*, 24 November 1945, 5.

[20] Letter from Thomas E. McKay to the East German Mission, c/o Johanna Berger, 10 April 1941, "East German MSS History," entry for 10 April 1941. "We congratulate you upon your splendid report of conditions in the East German Mission.... [The First Presidency and other General Authorities] were all very much interested in the progress being made and wish me to congratulate you on the splendid manner in which you are looking after the East German Mission.... They are especially pleased to know that all the meetings are being held as usual, especially your fall and spring conferences."

[21] *Conference Report*, Thomas E. McKay, 5 April 1940, 50.

lives on the Eastern Front.[22] From 1942 on, pro–Nazi Anton Huck led the West German mission. Conditions were similar in the East German mission. Herbert Klopfer entered military service soon after the outbreak of hostilities. During the first couple of years of the war, Klopfer's military assignment kept him close to Berlin where he conducted mission affairs both through his wife and through his counsellors, Richard Ranglack and Paul Langheinrich, via correspondence and telephone.[23] However, in 1943, Klopfer was transferred away from Berlin and eventually died on the Eastern front in the closing weeks of the war.[24] The loss of leadership at all levels severely disrupted the Mormon community, and resulted in the elevation of individuals with relatively little experience in Mormon administration to positions of great responsibility.

ATTITUDES OF AMERICAN AND GERMAN MORMONS

In the 1930s, Church authorities in Utah were isolationists, advocated strict American neutrality in international affairs and condemned warfare in general.[25] Moreover, fearing atheistic Communism[26]

[22] Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany*, 105. Friedrich Biehl was killed in battle on the Russian Front on 3 March 1943. Christian Heck, wounded by the Russians, died on 19 April 1945.

[23] Ibid., 106.

[24] Ibid., 107–110.

[25] Robert Jeffrey Stott, "Mormonism and War: An Interpretive Analysis of Selected Mormon Thought Regarding Seven American Wars" (M. A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1974), 81–82. See also *Conference Report*, J. Reuben Clark, 4 April 1937, 23–25; *Conference Report*, Heber J. Grant, "Message of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints," 6 October 1939, 8–9; *Conference Report*, Reed Smoot, 7 October 1939, 45–47; Joseph F. Merrill, "Address to the Salt Lake City Rotary," 18 May 1937, Joseph F. Merrill papers, Special Collections, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[26] *Messages of the First Presidency*, comp. James R. Clark (Salt Lake City, UT: Bookcraft, 1975), VI: 16–18; *Conference Report*, David O. McKay, 8 October 1939, 104. Most of the general authorities viewed atheistic Communism as a greater threat to building the "Kingdom of God" on earth than Nazism. Although David McKay kept in close contact with his brother, Thomas, who was still in Europe, and was well informed on the perils of Nazism, even after war broke out, he still reiterates his concerns over Communism.

and worried about endangering their fellow Mormons in Germany, [27] they said little about Nazism. After the German invasion of Poland, however, American Mormons became more vocal in their opposition to Hitler. In the early 1940s, Church–owned *Deseret News* published two articles—"If Christ came to Germany," by Arthur Gaeth, and "The Christian Aspects of Totalitarianism," by Nephi Morris[28]—both were highly critical of the Nazi regime and argued that Nazism was the antithesis of the teachings of Christ. The publication of these twin articles in the LDS–owned newspaper indicated tacit Church endorsement.[29]

After the United States entered the war in 1941, however, the views of American Mormons changed. Confronted with the problem of Latter–day Saints opposing each other on the battlefield and not wanting to take sides, general authorities approached war in terms of "patriotic duty" as prescribed in the Twelfth Article of Faith. There was also an underlying religious view that the war was caused because the belligerent nations had rejected God's laws.[30]

German Mormons had already accepted the "patriotic duty" of military service two years before their American coreligionists. Although most German Mormons were apolitical, they served in the *Wehrmacht* because they believed it was their religious duty to defend their homeland.[31] They also believed that it was their responsibility to support their

[27] Conversation with Tobler. According to Tobler, some general authorities viewed the Church in Germany as the model for Mormonism abroad and did not want to endanger their brethren.

[28] Arthur Gaeth, "If Christ Came to Germany," *Deseret News*, 25 January 1940, Church Section 1, 6, 8; Nephi L. Morris, "Christian Aspects of Totalitarianism," *Deseret News*, 17 May 1941, Church Section 3. Gaeth had been a missionary in Germany as well as the first President of the Czechoslovakia Mission. He had also read *Mein Kampf* and *The Myth of the 20th Century*. See also Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 31–31–A.

[29] Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 31–31–A.

[30] Stott, 84.

[31] Klaus Hansen, "Growing Up in Hitler's Germany," *Queen's Quarterly* 103, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 81; Notes from phone conversation with Walter Kindt, 6 February 1999. See also Alfred P. Schultz Journal, in "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1939, (original journal on microfilm in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints Historian's Office). Schultz wrote, "[m]any things have happened in politics in that year. Hitler had made several proposals to Poland which naturally had not been accepted. On the contrary,

government as enjoined by the Twelfth Article of Faith. Like most Germans, the LDS community was not enthusiastic about the conflict. Nevertheless, as Douglas Tobler and Alan Keele state, German Mormons "in their continued naiveté and accommodating mind–set" supported "a patriotic effort."[32] Mormons, such as Erna and Herbert Klopfer and Johanna Berger of the East German mission office, expressed their patriotism in letters to Church headquarters in Salt Lake City in which they related how LDS men were loyally and religiously serving the country and their belief that God was on their side.[33]

There were some, however, who went beyond national loyalty and became actively involved in Nazi politics. In the West German mission, numerous individuals in leadership positions, including members of the mission presidency, expressed sympathy for National Socialism or became Party members.[34] As one Mormon wrote after the war,

> some of the presiding brethren...were 100 per cent Nazis and tried to preach national socialism instead of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.... The Saints were asked to pray for the "Fuerher" [sic] in their meetings and in their homes and regard

---

Poland made a military treaty with England and France, and drove Germans out of the country. Refugees reported of horrible persecutions so that the Fuhrer had to declare war to Poland."

[32] Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 22.

[33] In one letter, Erna Klopfer writes: "[h]undreds of LDS men are serving their country as loyal citizens true to the teachings of their religion. The Lord is with them.... All is well in the East German Mission. Everyone is doing his duty. God bless our leaders of this country and His Church." See Letter from Erna Klopfer to Heber J. Grant and Counsellors, 16 April 1940, "East German MSS History," entry for 16 April 1940. Johanna Berger wrote to Thomas E. McKay: "the prayers at the time of services are also for those who stand far away protecting the nation and fighting for the rights of our country." See Letter from Johanna Berger to Thomas E. McKay, 9 September 1940, "East German MSS History," entry for 9 September 1940. Herbert Klofper wrote to Alfred C. Reese, former East German mission president: "[t]hanks to the bravery of the German army our land has been spared the ravages of war.... As long as this struggle of our nation at this time is for the protection of the German homeland and the German people, we believe that God will help us. This gives us peace at this difficult time." Letter from Herbert Klopfer to Alfred C. Rees, 15 August 1941, in "East German MSS History," entry for 15 August 1941

[34] Scharffs, Mormonism in Germany, 101.

> him as a divinely called man, who had to prepare the world for the United Order. A lot of foolish things must have been said by these brethren and the people did not always know where the Church stood in this matter. Many were under the impression that we as a Church were in favour of Nazism. Attempts were made to harmonize Hitlerism with Church doctrines, even to prove that the Nazi party was organized after the pattern of our Church.[35]

Although most Mormons professed national loyalty and support for Hitler's war, a small group had second thoughts and believed that the war was futile.[36] Alfred Schultz wrote in his journal:

> [I]n June we were told that we were in war with Russia. This made me very sad, causing a certain foreboding and anguish which cannot be described. Although our troops advance speedily, I cannot be very enthused about the victories.... The Destroying Angels had been sent out and none can hold back. We are longing for peace and are praying that it will come soon, for the war has lasted too long already and the people are getting tired of it. Many casualties on both sides.[37]

Klaus J. Hansen recalls his father's attitude about the war:

> [i]t came as a profound shock when my father, home on furlough from the military (...in 1944), gathered us together, closed the door, and launched into a frank discussion on the fate of Germany.
>
> The war was lost, he said, or in any case had better be, for it was an unjust war, and had been so from the beginning.[38]

Others understood the evil nature of Nazism and the negative consequences a German victory would have on religion in general and

[35] "Report Tells of Saints in Europe," 5. See also Sharffs, *Mormonism in Germany*, 101.
[36] Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 7; Alan F. Keele and Douglas Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes," *Sunstone* 5 (November/December 1980): 28.
[37] "East German MSS History," entry for Wednesday, 31 December 1941.
[38] Hansen, "Growing up in Hitler's Germany," 81.

Mormonism in particular. As Tobler and Keele write, "[Mormons]...began to see through the pervasive Nazi propaganda. Rosa Böhringer, Johnannes Kindt, Walter Krause and President Willy Deters of Bremen were among the Saints who either overtly opposed the regime or else dragged their feet while praying for German defeat in the war and the regime's early demise."[39] Some Latter–day Saints became outspoken in their criticism of the regime.

THE HELMUTH HÜBENER GROUP

One of the most significant events experienced by the Latter–day Saints in the Third Reich was both tragic and controversial. This was the case of the Helmuth Hübener group.[40]

In 1941, Helmuth Hübener, an intelligent sixteen–year–old from the Hamburg–St. Georg branch, began listening to BBC broadcasts on shortwave radio.[41] Convinced that the British propaganda was

[39] Keele and Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes," 28.

[40] Helmuth Hübener has been recognized as a figure in the resistance movement. For example, see, Annadore Leber, Willy Brandt and Karl Dietrich Brachter, eds., *Revolt of Conscience*, trans. (Berlin: Mosaik Verlag, 1954). In recent years, more attention has been paid to the Helmuth Hübener group. See, for example, Joseph M. Dixon, "Mormons in the Third Reich, 1933–1945," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* v. 7 (Spring 1972): 75; Rudi Wobbe and Jerry Borrowman, *Before the Blood Tribunal* (Salt Lake City, UT: Covenant Communications, Inc, 1992); Karl–Heinz Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, ed. and trans. by Blair R. Holmes and Alan F. Keele (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995); Robin K. Berson, *Young Heroes of World History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 135–143; Keele and Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes"; *Truth and Conviction*, Documentary DVD (Provo, UT: Covenant Communications, 2002). For a German perspective, see, Ulrich Sander, *Jugendwiderstand im Krieg: Die Helmuth–Hübener–Gruppe, 1941–1942* (Bonn: Pahl–Rugenstein Verlag Nachfolger GmbH, 2002).

[41] Those who knew Helmuth Hübener described him as exceptionally intelligent. He possessed an exquisite understanding of political issues and was well versed in Mormon theology and scriptures, often explaining complex ideas to friends and debating LDS dogma with branch members and missionaries. Some thought he was somewhat arrogant. See Wobbe and Borrowman, 14–15, 18; statements by Karl–Heinz Schnibbe, Douglas Tobler, Alan Keele and Otto

accurate,[42] Hübener and two friends from his branch, Karl–Heinz Schnibbe and Rudi Wobbe organized a resistance group.[43] All three teens had been turned off by Nazi anti–Semitism and brutality.[44] Moreover, they were concerned about the growing influence of the National Socialists in their own branch as the branch president, Arthur Zander, and his first counsellor were both members of the Nazi Party.[45] Helmuth, using a branch typewriter and mimeograph machine,[46] com-

---

Berndt Jr. in *Truth and Conviction*, Tract 2; Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 29. See also Marie Sommerfeld, Oral History, interviewed by Douglas Tobler, transcript, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 18.

[42] Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 29–30. According to Schnibbe, Helmuth believed German victory was impossible. "'Just think about it,' he said. 'England, France—it is strategically impossible! It just can't be. Germany is cut off, has no raw materials, everything will collapse.' He put two and two together and figured out what many had not. 'Listen, an army needs so much gasoline every day, and this and that. It goes okay for a while, but then comes to a halt when nothing more is available.'" Commenting on Hitler's invasion of Russia, "Helmuth also said to us, 'It cannot succeed!' He had thought about it a lot and was firmly convinced of it. Thus it came about that he invited me to visit him...." See also Statements by Tobler, Keele, Schnibbe and Philip M. Taylor in *Truth and Conviction*, Tract 5.

[43] Schnibbe was 17 years old and Wobbe was 15 years old at the time.

[44] All three had been horrified by *Kristallnacht* in 1938 and the notorious anti–Semitic film *Jud' Suess*. Nazi brutality struck close to home when Heinrich Worbs, a member of their branch, was arrested and sent to a concentration camp for speaking out against the regime and when Solomon Schwarz, a Jewish friend who had converted to Mormonism was forced to wear the yellow star and live in a ghetto. See Tobler and Schnibbe statement in *Truth and Conviction*, Tract 3; Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 21–23, 45–46. Wobbe and Borrowman, 18–19, 25–26.

[45] Branch president Arthur Zander and first counsellor Freidrich Jakobi were both active Nazis and promoted National Socialist ideology at church. They wore their uniforms to meetings and forbid Jews (in particular Solomon Schwarz) from attending services. Zander frequently locked the doors of the chapel compelling members to listen to Hitler's speeches on a radio. For the youth, this raised theological questions about what to do in the event of a conflict between God and Caesar. Keele and Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes," 21–22; Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany*, 102–103; Wobbe and Borrowman, 31–32.

[46] Since Hübener possessed typing and shorthand skills, he was called to serve as an assistant branch clerk in the Hamburg–St. Georg branch. Because of his

posed a series of leaflets which he and his comrades disseminated around Hamburg.

Hübener and his friends eluded the Gestapo for several months. However, when he tried to expand his resistance activities, Helmuth was denounced by a co–worker and was arrested on 5 February 1942. Soon thereafter, Schnibbe and Wobbe were apprehended as well. Immediately, Zander excommunicated Hübener from the Church for being a traitor who had violated Mormon doctrine enshrined in the Twelfth Article of Faith. Mission records indicate that Hübener was expelled for "listening and spreading news of foreign broadcasts."[47] Zander also claimed that Hübener had jeopardized the Hamburg Mormon community. Therefore, the Nazi branch president resorted to excommunication to demonstrate his loyalty to the Party as well as to distance himself, his congregation and the whole LDS community from Hübener's actions. After the war, Hübener's membership was formally reinstated by the First Presidency of the Church.[48]

In August 1942, the Hübener group went on trial before the infamous *Volksgerichtshof* (People's Court) in Berlin. The court sentenced Wobbe to ten years and Schnibbe to five years in prison.[49] The

---

position, Helmuth had access to the branch typewriter and mimeograph machine which he utilized for his pamphlets.

[47] "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1941.

[48] In 1946, Otto Berndt and Max Zimmer, acting mission president of the Swiss mission discovered Hübener's membership record and wrote on it: "Excommunication was done by mistake." In 1948, the First Presidency formally reinstated Hübener's membership, overturning the spurious excommunication. Otto Berndt, district president in Hamburg, refused to countersign the excommunication, so Zander went above Berndt's head and had Anton Huck, acting mission president of the West German Mission approve it. Berndt's opposition to Hübener's excommunication did, however, prevent Schnibbe and Wobbe from being cut off from the Church as well. "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1941. In particular, see Berndt Statement under the same entry.

[49] See records of the Volksgerichthof, "In Namen des Deutschen Volk in der Strafsache gegen...Helmuth Günther Hübener,...Rudolf Gustav Wobbe,...Karl Heinz Schnibbe,...Gerhard Heinrich Jacob Jonni Düwer," photocopy on file in Helmuth Hübener papers, special collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. For an English translation, see Document 52, "Verdict of the People's Court," in Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 220.

judges were not as lenient with Hübener. They sentenced him to death for listening to enemy broadcasts.[50] On 27 October 1942, Helmuth Hübener was beheaded at the Plötzensee prison in Berlin.

The Gestapo, suspicious of Church complicity and adult involvement in the Hübener affair, launched a thorough investigation of the LDS community in Hamburg as well as mission headquarters in Frankfurt. The secret police interrogated several prominent Hamburg Mormons including district president Otto Berndt but concluded that Hübener had acted on his own.[51] Had the authorities discovered anything incriminating that linked Berndt to the Hübener group, it no doubt would have led to full–scale persecution of Mormons in Hamburg, and perhaps throughout Germany.[52]

Nazi policy at the time of Hübener's arrest was to defer religious persecution until after the war. Prosecutors during Hübener's trial made little mention of the trio's religious affiliation,[53] except to state that the accused were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints.[54] The lack of attention paid to Hübener's religion did not go unnoticed by officers of the Hitler Youth who suggested that the People's Court look into possible connections between the Church and Hübener's crimes.[55] Obviously, inspectors could have investigated further, but instead seemed content to let the issue rest for the time being.

---

[50] Decree Extraordinary Radio Measures, 1 September 1939 in Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 154–146.

[51] Berndt Statement in "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1941.

[52] Keele and Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes," 24.

[53] Klaus J. Hansen, "Foreward: History and Memory," in Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, xiii.

[54] See records of the Volksgerichthof, "In Namen des Deutschen Volk in der Strafsache gegen Hübener, Wobbe, Schnibbe, Düwer," Their Mormon religion is only mentioned as part of their backgrounds.

[55] "It is regrettable that in the judgment of the People's Court against Hübener the question remained open, whether and to what extent the religious sect to which Hübener belonged is to be ascribed as the intellectual originator of Hübener's crimes." Document 58, Letter from National Socialist German Worker's Party, Hitler Youth/Youth Leadership of the Reich, Office of the Hitler Youth Jurisdiction to Chancellery of the Führer of the NSDAP, Central Office for Clemency Cases, RE: Clemency Case Helmuth Hübener, Hamburg, 15 September 1942, in Schnibbe, *When Truth was Treason*, 238.

A more significant indicator of the regime's policy on religion and its connection with the Hübener case occurred during the Gestapo interrogation of Otto Berndt. When finally released, Berndt was warned that after the war and the elimination of the Jews, the Mormons were to be done away with.[56] Similar threats were made to other religious leaders at the time including Bishop Galen of Münster.[57] Officials were willing to ignore the question of religion until after the war.

The Hübener case presented a conundrum for the Mormon Church and its accommodation policy with secular governments.[58] Many German Mormons at the time of his arrest believed that Hübener was a "heretic" because "he had violated the Twelfth Article of Faith."[59] To conclude otherwise would have raised troubling questions regarding the accommodation policy and trying to co–exist and maintain amicable relations with the Nazi regime as emphasized by American leaders before the war. Did the German Mormons compromise? Had other Latter–day Saints emulated Hübener and defied the regime, would they have jeopardized the whole LDS community? Otto Berndt confided to Schnibbe later that had he known what Hübener was doing, he would have joined the group.[60] However, Berndt understood the dilemma German Mormons faced. When a 1969 article praising Hübener ap-

[56] Berndt Statement in "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1941.

[57] Helmreich, 350.

[58] The Church ignored the Hübener case and shunned the surviving members of the group, Schnibbe and Wobbe, for nearly fifty years and in 1976, cancelled a play about Hübener produced at Brigham Young University. The Hübener case simply ran counter to the Mormon accommodation policy with secular governments. See Karl–Heinz Schnibbe, Oral History, interviewed by Steve Carter, 2 May 1998, Holladay, Utah, tape recording/typescript, 11 and David C. Nelson, "The Hübener Syndrome: How Mormons Remember Church History in Nazi Germany," Unpublished paper presented at the Mormon Historical Association Conference, May 2000, Copenhagen, Denmark, 11. In recent years, however, the attitude toward Hübener has changed. In 1992, BYU again staged the play, *Hübener*, without interference. *Hübener* has also been performed in the greater Salt Lake City area. Finally, the Hübener Group was recognized at the 2003 Freedom Awards Gala at Brigham Young University. See also, Leigh Dethman, "America's Freedom Festival: Nazi Resister lives in S. L. and love Liberty" *Deseret Morning News*, 3 July 2003.

[59] Keele and Tobler, "The Führer's New Clothes," 26.

[60] Schnibbe, Oral History, 3.

peared in *The Improvement Era*, (one of the rare times Mormon literature even mentioned Hübener),[61] Berndt, responded in a scathing editorial letter:

> That which Brother Huebener [sic]... did... was very commendable, but it was not inspired by the Church. As I recall, the Church, represented by the missionaries and the mission presidents, which are the voices of the First Presidency, has taught us to be subject to the laws of the land. If you try to make a hero out of Helmuth Huebener, how do you classify those who did follow the laws of the land? Are they cowards?[62]

War Conditions and Mormonism After 1941

The years 1942 to 1945 brought unimaginable hardships to Germans as civilians were killed and cities destroyed by Allied bombing while more and more men were sent to the fronts. This period, in particular, was the most challenging faced by Mormons during the entire Third Reich.

Soon after the outbreak of hostilities, Allied air forces began bombing German cities, bringing the war to the civilian population. By 1945, over 600,000 civilians had been killed, millions left homeless, Mormons included. Most LDS congregations lost members in air raids. Paul Müller of Karlsruhe died in an air raid shelter in 1940, while Heinrich and Maria Dröscher and Margaretha Meier of Bielefeld perished during a bombing.[63] After the intense bombing of Hamburg in 1943, the St. Georg branch reported twenty–eight congregational members had died and 90 per cent of the branch had lost their homes. [64] The story was repeated across Germany.[65] By 1945, 85 per cent of

[61] Jay M. Todd, "The Church Among the German Speaking People," *Improvement Era* (March 1969): 7–8.
[62] Otto Berndt, Letter to the Editor, *Improvement Era* (May 1969): 100–101.
[63] See "Chronik der Gemeinde Bielefeld," 51; "Chronik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe," 103.
[64] "West German MSS History," entry for 3 August 1943.
[65] For example, the Königsberg branch reported thirty–five families had been bombed–out after an attack. See "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1943.

Mormons were homeless[66] forcing many to find alternative quarters or leave the cities altogether, dispersing the LDS community throughout the Reich.[67] The bombings also destroyed many Mormon meeting halls,[68] as well as the East German mission office.[69]

It was not uncommon for air raids to disrupt worship services. In 1941, for example, the Bremen district was unable to hold conference because air attacks were "constantly keeping the population of the city of Bremen in tension."[70] This was not the last time Bremen was unable to hold conferences due to the bombings.[71] Many branches experienced similar disruptions. In 1942, air raids interrupted Sunday services in the Wilhelmshaven branch twice in one day.[72] In most branches, "[i]t became customary during every meeting for a member of each branch presidency to listen to the radio for information on coming air raids."[73]

A critical issue faced by most churches in the Reich was the conscription of clergymen into the armed forces.[74] As noted, many LDS

---

[66] Scharffs, Mormonism in Germany, 117.

[67] "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1944. See also Hansen, "Growing Up in Hitler's Germany."

[68] Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany*, 105, 114. In Hamburg, for example, by 1944, three of the four branch meeting halls had been destroyed and the fourth was badly damaged. In April 1945, it too was finally destroyed.

[69] "East German MSS History," entry for Monday, 22 November 1943. According to Erna Klopfer, "Mission office was temporarily moved into the home of the second counsellor, [Paul] Langheinrich.... After a few days, both of us went into the ruins of the destroyed mission office to see whether or not we could find anything there. Everything was burned. At last, we discovered the safe. It had to be removed from its position. It was hard work, and in vain. The heat had penetrated through the metal, the papers were burned, and the coins were melted into one piece." For the duration of the war, mission headquarters were located in the home of Paul Langheinrich of the mission presidency.

[70] "West German MSS History," entry for 7 February 1941.

[71] Ibid., entry for 31 May 1943.

[72] Ibid., entry for 29 November 1942.

[73] Scharffs, Mormonism in Germany, 104.

[74] Helmreich, 306–308, 352–354. By 1943, over 41 per cent of ordained and 78 per cent of non–ordained ministers in the Evangelical Church had been drafted. Such depletion of clergymen took its toll on that denomination. In contrast, most Catholic clergymen in accordance with the Concordat were immune to conscription.

leaders were called to arms which nearly paralyzed the Church. In December 1941, one district president complained that it was difficult to hold conferences because "there were only a few who could work, for many had been called into the military service."[75] However, in 1943 the army High Command ceased inducting Protestant "officiating clergymen." Such protections were extended to other denominations including the Mormons.[76]

With the men being drafted, the mounting civilian deaths and the evacuation of women and children from the cities[77] attendance at Mormon worship services fell. [78] By 1944, most branches consisted of "children, young mothers, and older couples. Nearly all of the young and middle–aged men of the branch who had not been killed in the war remained in the German army or in POW camps."[79] Due to the circumstances, some branches functioned on a limited basis or altered their meeting schedules. For example, the Bielefeld branch held only one meeting on Sundays at 4:00 pm to allow people to return to their homes before air raids began.[80] It was not uncommon for several congregations to combine either.[81] After the bombing of Dresden in 1945 and the destruction of the Altstadt branch facilities, the displaced con-

[75] "East German MSS History," entry for Wednesday, 31 December 1941.

[76] Helmreich, 354. According to the provision, however, a clergyman was subject to the draft if he held another job. Since the LDS Church relies on a lay ministry and most of those serving in ecclesiastical positions held other employment, the 1943 military exemption technically would not be extended to LDS officials. Though subject to the draft, no mission leaders in either mission were called up after 1943. Apparently, governing authorities, at least for the time being, were content to allow Mormons the same privileges.

[77] For example, see Hansen, "Growing up in Hitler's Germany",

[78] Branches such as Bielefeld, Wuppertal and Karlsruhe experienced a drastic decline in attendance at church meetings. See "Chronik der Gemeinde Bielefeld," "Chronik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe" and "Entwicklung der Wuppertaler Gemeinde der Kirche Jesu Christi der Heiligen der Letzten Tage," Microfilm, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[79] Garold and Norma Davis, "Behind the Wall: The Church in Eastern Germany," *Ensign* (April 1991): 22.

[80] "Chronik der Gemeinde Bielefeld," 49–50. The branch president also alternated the meetings: One week was Sunday School was held, the next a Sacrament meeting.

[81] "West German MSS History," entry for 3 August 1943.

gregation met with the Neustadt branch.[82] A more common practice was for branch presidents to conduct meetings with the few members still remaining in individuals' homes.[83] In other areas, Mormon leaders simply dissolved congregations, some of which had been large such as Stettin, Breslau and Königsberg, because there was no one left in the branch.[84] One branch president summed up the situation in 1943:

> The conditions in the branches are becoming increasingly more difficult. The lack of food is more and more noticeable. The constant air–raids make the people nervous and irritable. There are only the real faithful Saints coming to the meetings now. However, these are in sufficient numbers to carry on the work.[85]

During the war, both Protestants and Catholics began efforts to aid their needy countrymen[86] and Mormons followed suit. In 1943, the Relief Society organized an assistance program (Hilfswerk) in which Latter–day Saints donated clothing, food and furniture for those in

[82] Davis and Davis, "Behind the Wall," 22.

[83] Fred Gassner and Erich Bernhardt, Oral History, Interview by Justus Ernst, 8 June 1985, transcript, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 28. See also "Chronik der Gemeinde Bielefeld," 49–50; "Chronik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe," "Entwicklung der Wuppertaler Gemeinde."

[84] Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 32. For example, the Stettin branch, before the war, boasted an average attendance at meetings of approximately one hundred persons. By 1942, this number had shrunk to around forty. In March 1945, the branch president, with only six members in attendance dissolved the branch completely. See also Douglas Tobler, "Before the Wall Fell: Mormons in the German Democratic Republic, 1945–89," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 25 no. 4 (1992): 14.

[85] "West German MSS History," entry for 1 January 1943.

[86] Helmrich 334, 446. Bishop Theophil Wurm assembled a group of leading Protestant churchmen who created an Evangelical church aid society to oversee relief efforts. The German Association of Catholic Charities (*Deutsche Caritasverband*), which had not been dissolved by the Nazis, coordinated Catholic relief during and after the war.

need and stored them in five warehouses throughout Germany. [87] Branches and districts also set up local relief programs.[88] Although most of these warehouses were bombed or captured by invading armies, they nevertheless provided for the needs of destitute Mormons during the war and served as the foundation for post–war relief measures.[89]

Throughout the war, Mormons patriotically served in the *Wehrmacht*. Their experience in the military varied greatly. Herbert Klopfer, stationed outside of Berlin, held a clerical position in his military unit until 1943, which enabled him to conduct mission affairs out of his office. Although Klopfer enjoyed this privilege,[90] it was an isolated case and he was often monitored and questioned by the Gestapo about his religious beliefs and activities.[91] Most Mormons in the *Wehrmacht* reported general ridicule endured by young religious people; others faced outright harassment. [92] John Dahl was denied promotion after revealing that he had been a Mormon missionary because his commanders feared that with his ties to an American religion, he could be a spy.[93] It should also be noted that there were those who received

[87] The locations for the warehouses were Breslau, Spreewald, Berlin, Kreuz and one in the Erzgebirge. See Memorandum, RE: Statement by Paul Langheinrich to Justus Ernst, "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1942.
[88] Scharffs, Mormonism in Germany, 111.
[89] "Report Tells of Saints in Europe," 5.
[90] Erna Klopfer comments on her husband, Herbert Klopfer, "East German MSS History," entry for 19 March 1945. According to Erna Klopfer, her husband had won the respect of his commanding officers who allowed him this privilege.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Speidel, Oral History, 30 April 1998, 6.
[93] John A. Dahl, Oral History, interviewed by Steve Carter, 21 March 2000, Salt Lake City, Utah, tape recording/typescript, 23. "My commander for the detachment said...'Hans,... Why did you have to tell them you fulfilled a mission for the Mormon Church? You were the top on our list.' But the commander, they feared I was an agent, a spy. That's why I was never promoted." See also, *Saints at War: Experiences of Latter–day Saints in World War II*, ed. Robert C. Freeman and Dennis A. Wright, (American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications Inc., 2001) 83. Dahl states, "But any expected promotion was not granted. I found out much later from one of the lieutenants of our regiment the reason why I was not promoted. Here are his words, as far as I remembered them: 'Why did you mention in your vita that you are a member

regular promotions and honours throughout the war.[94] This indicates that in the military unit officers rather than the *Wehrmacht* itself determined the degree of harassment.

On the home front, Mormons also faced harassment because of their ties to an "American" religion. Once, during an air raid, an LDS woman was accused by her neighbours of having allowed missionaries to spy before the war and who now were bombing them.[95] Such remarks, though, were made by those who themselves were under great stress. In other cases the harassment on the home front was real. One historian observes that "[a] few German saints were released from their Church assignments at this time because of the pressure applied by the Nazi party, which threatened to take their jobs from them if they continued to officiate in the Church."[96] Alfred Schulz, for example, revealed that his son was unable to obtain a teaching position because of his Mormon membership, indicating the capricious nature of the local officials.[97]

THE SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS

Throughout the war years, Mormon leaders had the daunting task of maintaining the integrity of their doctrines and practices. Some inexperienced Church officials, isolated from the United States, initiated unauthorized rituals and procedures in worship services, but these changes were not significant. On the other hand, they made few, if any,

---

of an American church? This made you suspect of being an agent for America.'"

[94] "West German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1941. Erich Leis and Friedrich Peters received the Iron Cross second class and Leis was promoted to "Unteroffizier (sergeant)."

[95] Speidel, Oral History, 30 April 1998, 12.

[96] Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany*, 107; "East German MSS History," entry for Thursday, 31 December 1942. Alfred Schultz reported that "[a] colleague, who knew the Mormons, made it very hard for me on my job, and had told the officials that I was preaching against the Party. I was asked to come to the Gestapo where I was questioned. I could produce evidence that this was not true. Nevertheless, I was told to resign from all offices held. I was also told to leave this religion alone. I discussed these matters with the District President, who said it would be the best to release me from all my offices which was done at the fall conference."

[97] "East German MSS History," entry for 31 December 1942.

doctrinal changes.[98] One should not assume that the Church remained completely insulated from the political atmosphere of the Reich. Some branches, such as Strasbourg, struggled to resist Nazi influence,[99] while others, like the St. Georg, were presided over by Party members who tried to preach National Socialist ideology to their congregations.

The war itself raised questions in the minds of German Mormons about the morality of combat. Although Mormon doctrine condemns warfare except in self–defence and as a last resort, Latter–day Saints are not pacifists.[100] There were individuals within the Latter–day Saint community, such as Erich Kramer, commandant of the General Pape Street jail, who saw no contradictions between theology and armed conflict.[101] On the other hand, numerous Mormons struggled with a moral dilemma. Many Mormons served in Hitler's armies because they had been taught to support the "powers that be."[102] Others realized that to object to military service would endanger the whole LDS community.[103] While serving under arms, many Mormons endeavoured to avoid immoral deeds. One LDS mother counselled her son to refuse any order that would require him to commit a "grievous sin" even at the cost of his life.[104] Apparently such concerns were common as many Latter–day Saint men sought assignments in which they would not have to take another's life. Klaus Hansen recalls that when

[98] Commenting on this, historian Joseph Dixon writes, "[s]ome local church authorities had instructed the members to rise whenever Church officers came into the service, a practice generally reserved to show respect for the president of the Church. In meetings, however, the members continued to testify to the divinity of the Mormon Church and did not repudiate the divine call of the General Authorities in the United States." Dixon, 74.

[99] "Report Tells of Saints in Europe," 5.

[100] Doctrine and Covenants 98:16, 33–37. Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," 9.

[101] Frederick Kempe, *Father/land, A Personal Search for the New Germany*, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1999), 92–96, 175–191, 269–282. The name Kramer is an alias Kempe used to hide the identity of his relative at the request of his family.

[102] Hansen, "Growing up in Hitler's Germany," 81.

[103] Conversation with Kindt.

[104] Speidel, Oral History, 1 May 1999, 8.

his father was drafted he requested to be assigned as a medic.[105] Likewise, Karl–Heinz Schnibbe of the Hübener group found a silver lining in his imprisonment in that he did not have to serve in a military capacity where he would have had to take another's life.[106] Unfortunately, other Latter–day Saints found themselves on the front line.

The issue of the Holocaust also raises moral questions. Mormons, along with their fellow countrymen, witnessed the persecution of Jews during the pre–war years. The extent to which German Mormons knew about the slaughter of the Jews after 1941 varied from case to case. Latter–day Saints who fought on the eastern front heard accounts of the atrocities early on.[107] One Mormon actually helped construct Auschwitz; he later suffered a mental breakdown.[108] Others serving in different theatres of war only heard of the Holocaust at the end of the conflict. [109] Some dismissed the rumours of the Holocaust as enemy lies.[110] Then there were those under Nazi influence who believed that Hitler was rounding up the Jews to send them to Palestine, thus bringing about the "gathering of Israel" as predicted in the Bible and by Mormon leaders.[111]

As with other small religious denominations in the Third

---

[105] Hansen, "Growing up in Hitler's Germany," 82. In this capacity, he not only avoided having to kill, but also helped to save many lives. He even helped deliver babies while he was in Poland.

[106] Schnibbe, Oral History, 4.

[107] Dahl, who was serving in Lithuania in 1942, was greatly disturbed when a group of soldiers invited him to see a mass grave. Dahl flatly refused to do so. Gassner had a similar experience. En route to the front, Gassner saw women and children working on the railroad tracks. When he inquired who they were, the guard informed him that they were Jews who would soon be "sent to Byalistok and there they are to be gassed." See Dahl, Oral Interview; Gassner and Bernhardt, Oral History, 13.

[108] Dixon, 74.

[109] Gassner and Bernhardt, Oral History, 13.

[110] Walter Speidel, who was a POW in a camp in Alabama, recalled seeing several films documenting the horrors of Buchenwald before his release in 1946. Initially he discounted these films as mere propaganda, but after viewing them several times, he came to the horrifying conclusion that such crimes had been committed by his fellow countrymen. Speidel, Oral History, 1 May 1999, 9.

[111] Gassner and Bernhardt, Oral History, 12.

Reich, such as the Methodists, Latter-day Saints kept quiet about the plight of the Jews until the details of the Holocaust became known.[112] Given their philosemitic traditions, this raises disturbing questions. What did German Mormons know about the condition of the Jews? Should they have seen the Holocaust coming? Were they afraid? What could they have done to aid their "brethren?"[113]

CONCLUSION

When the war ended in 1945, contact between German Mormons and Church headquarters was once again re-established through LDS soldiers in the American army. During the war years, the LDS community had suffered staggering losses both materially and spiritually. Yet, it also had managed to avoid destruction. Most meeting facilities as well as the East German mission office lay in ruins. Many Church members had lost their homes and possessions—a number were refugees. Of the more than 14,000 German Mormons over 600 soldiers and civilians had died, or five per cent of the LDS population in the Reich.[114] Among the dead were mission, district and branch leaders.[115] In the years to come, the LDS Church in Germany needed and received great assistance from the USA to aid the needy and reorganize church structures. Nevertheless, in spite of Hitler's reign of terror and war, Mormonism in Germany had survived for five and a half years virtually on its own—though not without difficulty.

[112] Douglas F. Tobler, "German Mormons as 'Righteous Gentiles': Trying to Save a Few Jewish Friends," unpublished essay, photocopy in author's possession, 3. See also Helmreich, 375.
[113] Speidel, Oral History, 1 May 1999, 9–11
[114] Scharffs, Mormonism in Germany, 116.
[115] Ibid., 116. Acting mission presidents, Friedrich Biehl and Christian Heck of the West German mission and Herbert Klopfer of the East German mission. Other local leaders who lost their lives during the conflict were district presidents Martin Hoppe of Breslau, Carl Goeckeritz of Chemnitz and Erich Behrndt of Stettin.

Origins and Development of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Historic County Durham, 1843—1913

Ronald L. Bartholomew

On May 12, 1851, Joseph Foster Doxford and his wife Charlotte were baptized in Chilton Grange, County Durham, England. Shortly thereafter they became the first members of the newly organized Trimdon Grange Branch, where Joseph was appointed president. During his presidency he laboured extensively as a local (or "member") missionary, a practice common at the time, performing baptisms and confirmations in that branch and the nearby Five Houses Branch. Two and a half years later, on December 7, 1853, he was called as president of the Crook Branch and while in that service he expanded his labours as a local missionary, proselytizing the first ten members of the Marley Hill Branch. Later on July 4, 1856, he was again appointed branch president, this time of the newly created Trimdon Branch. However, this assignment came to an abrupt end on December 16, 1856, when he was "called out" by visiting Apostle Ezra T. Benson to leave his business, family and branch presidency to serve as a full-time travelling elder in the Newcastle Conference. His first assignment was in the Jarrow Branch, where he proselytized several new converts, and baptized every member on record of the newly organized Usworth Colliery Branch. After two more years, he was assigned to continue his labours as a travelling elder in the United States, immigrating without Charlotte and their children. He preached in Pennsylvania from 1858–1862, proselytizing enough people to organize two new branches. In 1860 he sent for Charlotte and the children, and in 1862, after serving 11 years, having been the president of three branches and a local and full-time missionary, he and Charlotte finally migrated to Utah with their family, along with many of the saints from the branches he had organized in Pennsylvania.[1]

[1]. All of this information was acquired from the family of his descendent and namesake, Joseph Doxford. Copies of all the biographical and family history documents are in the possession of the author.

The Durham Conferences in its Victorian English Context

The experience of Joseph and Charlotte Doxford was not unique to new converts of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the nineteenth century. However, some aspects of missionary work and convert baptisms in historic County Durham were unique, primarily due to local factors. From 1843, when the Church was first established in County Durham to 1913, the year coal production reached its zenith, the residents of County Durham were living on the forefront of the Industrial Revolution. Neighbouring Newcastle-upon-Tyne had previously been the country's most important coal exporting centre, but during this period the majority of the nation's coal came from County Durham, and its coal ports began to rival the previously held monopoly at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. As a result, the importance of the proliferation of collieries as Durham's primary industry cannot be overstated. However, County Durham's Victorian heritage also includes other important industries, such as the lead and iron works that dotted the countryside. In addition, Sunderland had become the world's largest ship building centre, and as such, the most important in the county and the country, with additional ship-building centres at Tyneside, Teesside, and Hartlepool. In the midst of the expansive growth of these various industries, County Durham also became home to two of the most revolutionary innovations of the modern era. The world's first railways emerged here as an important part of the colliery industry, and Joseph Swan patented the world's first incandescent electric light bulb in 1878, a full year before America's Thomas Edison. Swan's hometown, Gateshead, became the first city in the world to be lit by this revolutionary invention. It was in this socio-economic context that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was first introduced, and then flourished in County Durham.

These various industries and innovations attracted money and labour. This, in turn, led to a veritable population explosion. County Durham grew from a rural area dotted with small villages to an important industrial centre, with the population expanding from 86,267 in 1831 to nearly 500,000 by 1911—with most of the growth being attributed to the need for labour and the availability of jobs in the

expanding colliery industry.[2] However, this explosive growth was also a socio–economic paradox. As Beynon and Austrin have correctly observed, "Mining was an industry centrally involved in capitalist expan-expansion. In that sense it was clearly part of the 'modern' world. However, with its expansion, so too did 'traditional' relationships of power and authority maintain themselves."[3] In fact, the very nature of the coal mining industry allowed for the strengthening of the position of the landowning class within the county. Rural and industrial elements were held together as the old ruling class regulated the emerging capitalist economy. Therefore, on the Durham coalfield, county society with its institutions remained intact as coal production increased.[4]

---

[2]. In significant ways, the Victorian history of this county is the history of coal mining, with the extraction, movement and utilization of the mineral significantly determining the population and employment patterns and settlement types. At the beginning of the 19th century the county was producing no more than 2,000,000 tons; at the turn of the 20th century output reached 41,500,000 tons. Over the same period the number of miners rose from fewer than 10,000 to 165,000. The significance of the latter statistic is put into context when compared with the employment in agriculture. In 1800 farming was the leading occupation, employing perhaps 10 times more people than mining; by the turn of the 20th century the roles were reversed, with miners now many times more numerous than agricultural workers. The result was the creation of dozens of new colliery or pit villages, a new feature in the Durham countryside. Mineral and mineral lines were thus interdependent—and both were the basis for a distinctive industrial growth as the century progressed. In the words of Timothy Eden, "coal begat locomotion and locomotion begat more coal and more coal begat more industries." Despite this growth, however, studies have shown that the vast majority of those migrating in to County Durham were from the northeast of England—in other words, the migration was provincial. These miners were extremely mobile, in that they moved frequently from mine to mine, but their occupational immobility left little room for outsiders. In fact, it was the commonly held view of government officials and mine owners alike that "Pitmen must be bred to work from their childhood. Their number cannot be recruited from any other class... the increase of the pit population comes solely from internal sources." See Roger Charles Norris and Douglas Charles D. Pocock, *A History of County Durham* (Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore, 1990), 51, 55 and 57.

[3]. Terry Austrin and Huw Benyon, *Masters and Servants: Class and Patronage in the Making of a Labour Organisation* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1994), 9.

[4]. In fact, to list the coal owners in the nineteenth century is to produce a roll call of the area's major landed families, ranging from the Church to Dukes,

In contrast to the urbanization that occurred in the cotton towns, where masses of people migrated away from the agricultural caste system dominated by the landed gentry and towards the cities and factories, thus discarding traditions of the past on multiple levels, County Durham experienced no such social revolution. The coal pits were inextricably connected to the landed gentry—the same families that owned both the land and the coal that was being taken from it, and so County Durham's own industrial revolution was simply a shift from one landed industry to another.[5] Across the county, agriculture was simply replaced by coal and the rural villages were replaced by company towns. Instead of industrial urban centres emerging throughout the countryside, the colliery population was as scattered as the coal pits.

Another aspect of the socio–economic condition of the Durham coalfield was the paternalism of these landowners. During the early stages of the development of the coalmines, the colliery row living conditions were deplorable. However, over time the conditions of the tied housing improved, and the mine owners eventually provided medical treatments and education for their pitmen and their families as long as they remained in their employ.[6] This paternalistic order was formalized with the "bonding" of employees, who were required annually to enter into a bond, or a legally binding agreement with their employers. For those who were able to obtain a bond, this legally binding contract ensured the pitmen of secure employment, housing and

---

Baronets and Squires. Although independent capitalist developments often took place in the form of sub–contracting (leasing Church lands or other lands and thereby taking all the risks), these efforts were either taken over with land purchases or joined hands with the landowners for profits sake. See Austrin and Benyon, Masters and Servants, 16.

[5]. For example, in 1867 the Second Earl of Durham obtained and income of £27,000 from the tenant farmers on his agricultural estates. In the same year his coal profits (excluding the lessee's payments) amounted to £52,000. See Austrin and Benyon, *Masters and Servants*, 18.

[6]. In addition, these wealthy land and mine owners saw themselves as more than capitalists—they saw themselves as occupying positions of respect and honour with public rights and responsibilities. Not only were the pitmen and their families totally dependent upon the landowners, the landowners acted towards their pitmen in terms familial relationships—as a husband would to a wife and his children. This even included the welfare of the families of the victims of mining disasters. See Austrin and Benyon, *Masters and Servants*, 25.

such, but also reduced them to "bondsmen" or slavery status, technically punishable by law and imprisonment.[7] Essentially, mine labourers were bought and sold by their mine owners, much like black slaves in the US South. This situation can be seen more clearly from a letter one pit supervisor wrote to his pit owner: "What we have to guard against is any obvious legislature interference in the established customs of our particular race of pitmen. The stock can only be kept up by breeding—it never could be reinvented from an adult population... [B]ut if our meddling, morbid, humanity mongers get it infused into their heads that it is cruel and unnatural slavery to work in the dark and to be imprisoned twelve hours a day in the pit, a screw in the system will be let loose."[8] The bonding of pitmen continued through 1872, until it was finally abolished through the efforts of the Durham Miners' Association, formed in 1869 and the successor to three earlier short–lived labour union movements.[9] Despite the efforts and growing strength of trade unionism, there were still periodic lapses in work opportunities, as the mine owners either experienced or created market fluctuations in coal production. The extant historical records from Church members regularly reported the indigent circumstances of unemployed miners. However, coal remained king in historic County Durham, and the population continued to expand as not only the colliery industry, but related shipping, railway, and metallurgical industries all drew in a huge numbers of labourers. This complex social construct not only retained some Mormon converts in the county, because of opportunity and need for labour; it also facilitated Church

7. Of this, Benyon and Austrin summarized the positive, as well as the negative aspects of such a paternalistic order: "In the nineteenth century the Durham coal owners operated a sophisticated system of labour and regulation and control....It was a system which was based upon previous rural forms and relationships which in mining (in contrast to the other expanding industries) was extended and developed rather than curtailed by capitalist expansion. In this, the bond represented the detailed system for hiring and regulating labour. It was a contract that extended beyond wages, establishing (via "free" housing and coal) economic control into the very fabric of civil society.... So to it was used as a flexible method for disciplining labour... miscreants could be dealt with by the law through fines and imprisonment" for such misdemeanour's as absenteeism or attempting to hire on with another mine owner. See Austrin and Benyon, *Masters and Servants*, 21–32.

8. Austrin and Benyon, *Masters and Servants*, 28–29.

9. Norris and Pocock, *A History of County Durham*, 58.

growth during a time of mass emigration and declining success in missionary work throughout the rest of the British and European Missions.

It is the thesis of this article that the beginnings of the Church in historic County Durham followed a pattern similar to that experienced in other areas of Great Britain: American missionaries may have initiated proselytizing efforts, but the majority of convert baptisms were the result of the efforts of native converts serving either as local member missionaries or full–time travelling elders. However, unlike the decline in missionary success and convert baptisms experienced in other areas of the British Mission toward the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, the success of proselytizing efforts and convert baptisms in this county accelerated. This article will examine the historical development of the Church in historic County Durham, focusing on a combination of missionary and local factors as possible explanations for the distinctive phenomena. Issues in this article will address include:

The nature of assigning local converts to serve as full–time missionaries;

The role and impact of local converts who engaged in what we would term "member missionary work."

Other factors which might explain the somewhat unique, accelerated growth of the Church in County Durham throughout the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries.

Missionary Work and Convert Baptisms

As early as 1840, during his first mission to England, Brigham Young instructed that full–time missionaries should be chosen from among members whose circumstances would permit them to devote themselves entirely to the work of the ministry.[10] Unlike the American missionaries whose calls were typically announced by a member of the First Presidency during general conference in Salt Lake City, it was the

[10]. Brigham Young, "Minutes of General Conference," *Millennial Star*, July 1840, 70.

responsibility of the pastors[11] and conference presidents serving as missionaries in England to call recent converts to full–time missionary service.[12] For example, Henry Lunt, who was supervising several conferences as a "pastor," mentioned calling up local elders living in County Durham into full–time service as travelling elders in his personal writings.[13] Members called out to full–time service in the Durham Conference found it difficult to leave their livelihood for full–time service. Pastor William J. Smith noted: "I called out Morrey Elobis to preach the Gospel in the streets and alleys and warn the people. I[t] was quite difficult to get the Elders to doo [sic] their duty. The opposition was so strong."[14] However, many in the County Durham responded to the call. Joseph Foster Doxford is one example.

LDS historian Ronald Walker observed: "The American missionaries might take the lead, but duly ordained English converts carried the ministerial load. This practice allowed Mormonism to shed whatever image it might have possessed as a foreign intruder. Indeed it facilitated the conversion of former preachers . . . to secure Mormon membership and Mormon priesthood on the same day and continue without interruption their errand for the Lord."[15] In fact, William G. Hartley correctly observed that most "of the [British] mission's conference presidents, branch presidents and missionaries" [16] came from the ranks of the British converts. This was definitely true for those serving

---

[11]. "Pastors" were full–time missionaries who supervised several conferences and reported directly to the British Mission president. See William G. Hartley, "LDS Pastors and Pastorates, 1852–1855" in *Mormons in Early Victorian Britain*, ed. Richard L. Jensen and Malcolm Thorp (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1989), 200.

[12]. Brigham Young, "General Instructions to Pastors, Presidents, and Elders," *Millennial Star*, April 11, 1857, 232–233.

[13]. See Henry Lunt, "Home Correspondence," *Millennial Star*, April 26, 1856, 266–67 and "Home Correspondence," *Millennial Star*, August 2, 1856, 494.

[14]. William Joseph Smith, *Life and History of William Joseph Smith*, 35, MS 17577, Church History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[15]. Ronald W. Walker, "Cradling Mormonism: The Rise of the Gospel in Early Victorian England," *BYU Studies* 27, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 25–36.

[16]. Hartley, "LDS Pastors and Pastorates, 1852–55," 200. He also notes that they were likely to emigrate. To replace them and to train and supervise their successors presented a formidable challenge.

in the Durham Conference (1856–1883); of those engaged in missionary work, only 19% can be positively identified as American nationals, with 78% British natives. While the nativity of 3% could not be accounted for, if they were British—which is highly likely—that would mean that 81% of those who engaged in active proselytizing in the Durham Conference were of British, rather than American nativity.

Member Involvement

In addition to those called up from the ranks of new converts to serve as full–time missionaries, there is abundant historical evidence that full–time travelling elders mobilized the efforts of the local membership.[17] For example, Elder William R. Webb reported to President Albert Carrington that proselytizing efforts were "energetically carried on by the travelling elders and local priesthood,"[18] and full–time missionaries at a district conference mentioned that "in their outdoor preaching [we] were cheerfully assisted by the local priesthood."[19] Historians James B. Allen and Malcolm Thorp note that, as a result, "the number of missionaries was greatly expanded and most new baptisms were performed by these local missionaries."[20] This was definitely the case during the period of 1856 to 1883 when County Durham had its own conference; extant records indicate that 78% of convert baptisms were performed by English converts. It is evident from journals that many new members perceived that sharing the gospel was part of their divinely appointed duty. Poll asserts that because of this, "most con-

[17]. Richard D. Poll, "The British Mission during the Utah War, 1857–1858," in *Mormons in Early Victorian Britain*, ed. Richard L. Jensen and Malcolm Thorp (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1989), 228.

[18]. William R. Webb, "Correspondence: Interesting Report from Newcastle: A letter Written on January 20, 1881, from William R. Webb to President Albert Carrington," *Millennial Star*, January 31, 1881, 73–75.

[19]. William R. Webb, "Minutes of Newcastle and Durham Conference, October 5, 1879, Temperance Hall Tenant Street Stockton on Tees," *Millennial Star*, October 13, 1879, 652–656.

[20]. James B. Allen and Malcolm Thorp, "The Mission of the Twelve to England, 1840–1841: Mormon Apostles and the Working Class," *BYU Studies* 15, no. 4 (1975): 15.

versions occurred among the relatives and friends of active members."[21]

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LDS CHURCH IN COUNTY DURHAM

Facts relative to the historical development of the LDS Church in County Durham confirm this pattern. What follows is the fascinating story of how the LDS Church began and developed in five separate geographical areas, in chronological order of incidence, within historic County Durham. Important details are included with regard to key individuals involved in the beginning stages of that development, whose names and contributions have heretofore remained almost entirely anonymous.

The LDS Church began in Historic County Durham when the Sunderland Branch was organized on August 13, 1843, at Hylton Ferry, in South Hylton, at the home of William Knox.[22] This branch was unique in two important ways: first, the Church in Sunderland has remained intact from 1843 to the present. This is despite the fact that Church membership in Great Britain grew dramatically through 1850, but then experienced a steady decline in growth due to persecution, emigration, or the general apathy of the British people, which in most cases led to the eventual termination of the branch. Second, while the boundaries and name–titles of various administrative units in the British Mission were under constant revision during the Victorian Era[23] (including those in historic County Durham), the Sunderland unit also appears to be unique in that it has retained its original geographic designation throughout its 168–year existence. This distinction can be partially explained by the efforts of new converts–turned–local missionaries like William Knox and his companion Ebenezer Gillies. Following his baptism and the organization of the Sunderland Branch at his home on August 13, 1843, Knox served as a local missionary in the area from February 1846 to February 1849,

[21]. Poll, "The British Mission during the Utah War," 228.
[22]. Sheila Laverick Hughes, *Sunderland Ward History*, 2005, 3 vols., MS 19667, Church History Library, 1:7.
[23]. Poll, "The British Mission during the Utah War, 1857–1858," 225.

proselytizing 82 converts into the branch.[24] He also served as the branch president from January 10, 1847 to March 8, 1849, until he emigrated to the U.S. with his family.[25] His companion, Ebenezer Gillies, performed over 45 baptisms and confirmations, one of which was Isaac Burnhope,[26] who was later instrumental in the growth and development of the branch at South Shields.[27]

The contributions of these two local missionaries are representative of the service provided by countless local and foreign missionaries, whose tireless efforts established and perpetuated the Sunderland Branch throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, despite formidable opposition, such as the Sunderland anti–Mormon riots of 1913, which ended in the tragic death of Elder Ralph H. Hendricks.[28] In addition, other local factors also contributed to the sustained growth of the Church in this area. For example, the area comprising Sunderland, Monkwearmouth and Bishopswearmouth grew from a population of 24,000 in 1801 to over 150,000 by 1913,[29] because of the need for labour in the limestone quarries, in the Wearmouth and other collieries, and in the steadily growing shipbuilding industry.

The next incidence of the Church in County Durham involved thirteen different branches in a relatively small geographic area—all within an eight-kilometre radius. Unlike the Sunderland Branch, which maintained its single autonomous state from its inception; between the years 1848 to 1871 each of these thirteen branches intermittently combined with each other until they finally became a single branch at Castle Eden, which eventually died out. The history and development of the Church in this area is representative of how

---

[24]. *Sunderland Branch Record*, film no. 87035, Items 15–24, Record of members, 1943–1904, Family History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.

[25]. Hughes, *Sunderland Ward History*, 2005, 1:8–9.

[26]. *Sunderland Branch Record*, Record of members, 1943–1904, Family History Library.

[27]. *South Shields Branch Record*, film no. 87033, Items 1–8, Record of members, 1848–1948, Family History Library.

[28]. Hughes, *Sunderland Ward History*, 2005, 2:49–50.

[29]. Norris and Pocock, *A History of County Durham*, 64–65.

membership growth typically occurred and was managed in historic County Durham during the Victorian Era.

The origins of the eventual Castle Eden Branch began in Thornley, located in its geographic centre, where a successful colliery opened in 1835—only the third in the Easington district. This led to a population increase from 50 inhabitants in 1831 to 3,306 by 1861. [30] A branch of the Church was organized here on June 18, 1848 as part of the Carlisle Conference, and John Carmichael, a travelling elder from Scotland, was given charge over it.[31] This branch continued until July 4, 1856, when the Trimdon Branch absorbed it.[32]

Several months later, a branch was organized at Kelloe in the spring of 1849. John Caffrey, a local elder who proselytized more than half of its membership, was appointed as president.[33] While the population of the small village of Kelloe was not impacted dramatically by the Industrial Revolution, population in the surrounding area grew from 663 in 1831 to 12,867 in 1861, primarily due to the opening and extending of coalmines. It appears from extant historical data that most of this growth occurred in the neighbouring colliery town of East Hetton.[34]

Emerging at about the same time was the Coxhoe Branch, which was organized on April 6, 1851, and then after a short lapse, reorganized on January 13, 1853.[35] The coal pit at Coxhoe was sunk in 1827 and the colliery opened in 1843; as a result, from 1801 to 1841 the population experienced a similar increase, growing from 117 resi-

[30]."Thornley,"http://www.durhamrecordsonline.com/literature/thornley.php.
[31]. William Speakman and Ebenezer Gillies, "Conference Minutes," *Millennial Star*, September 15, 1848, 278–279.
[32]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, Microfilm LR 1140–2, Reel 6, "Trimdon Branch," Church History Library.
[33]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Kelloe Branch," Church History Library.
[34]. For more information regarding Kelloe at that time period, See John Marius Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=4214.
[35]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Coxhoe Branch," Church History Library.

dents to 3,904.[36] It appears that the Kelloe and Coxhoe Branches, about two kilometres apart, were inextricably interconnected. On January 8, 1857, they were combined under the name of the Kelloe Branch, and the Coxhoe Branch president, local elder William Nichols, was released.[37] Interestingly, by 1862 the combined unit was renamed the Coxhoe Branch,[38] and in 1865 its name was changed to the New Durham Branch. Like all the other branches in this area, it was eventually absorbed into the Castle Eden Branch in 1871.[39]

Just one month after the creation of the Kelloe and Coxhoe Branches, another branch was organized on May 14, 1851, at nearby Trimdon Grange, just over two kilometres away.[40] On September 11, 1852, it was renamed the Five Houses Branch,[41] after a mine pit in Trimdon Grange that had opened in 1845.[42] Joseph Foster Doxford, who was baptized in Chilton Grange and became an elder while on the roster of the Five Houses Branch, served as the first and only branch president of the Trimdon Grange Branch.[43] This branch was absorbed, along with five others, by the Trimdon Branch on July 4,

---

[36]. For information regarding Coxhoe at that time period, See http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=2747 and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxhoe.

[37]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Coxhoe Branch," Church History Library.

[38]. *Members of Durham Conference 1862*, film no 86995, Item 23, Record of members, 1817–1871, Family History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.

[39]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch," Church History Library.

[40]. *Trimdon Grange Branch Record*, film no. 86995, Items 21, Record of members, 1817–1871, Family History Library.

[41]. *Five Houses Branch Record*, film no. 86998, Item 15, Record of members, 1852–1856, Family History Library.

[42] See: http://searches2.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/ENG-DURHAM/2007-01/1169642960.

[43]. All of this information was acquired from the family of his descendent and namesake, Joseph Doxford. Copies of all the biographical and family history documents are in the possession of the author.

1856,[44] and eventually became part of the Castle Eden Branch in 1871.[45]

Eleven days after the inception of the Trimdon Grange Branch, the Shincliffe Branch was organized on May 25, 1851.[46] A coalmine shaft was sunk here in 1837, and the Shincliffe colliery opened two years later in 1839.[47] Like the other villages in this area that had organized branches of the Church, Shincliffe was inhabited chiefly by colliers,[48] and incident to the sinking of coal pits and the subsequent establishment of a colliery, the population grew from 367 in 1821 to 2,123 in 1871.[49] Local missionaries John Routledge and Josh Nesham were responsible for proselytizing almost the entire membership of this branch.[50] On April 4, 1854, this branch was re-

---

[44]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Trimdon Branch," Church History Library.

[45]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch" Church History Library.

[46]. Or Dec. 16, 1851—there is a discrepancy in the histories. Elder John Higbee visited the saints in Shincliffe on 24 June 1851, and held a council meeting, which suggests the May date may be correct. Grant Allan Anderson, official communication from the LDS Church Historical Department (letter written to Mr. K.R. Gilderoy), 21 February 1986.

[47]. For Information regarding the sinking of the coal mine shaft see http://www.dmm.org.uk/colliery/s027.htm; information regarding the colliery see http://www.dmm.org.uk/colliery/index_s.htm.

[48]. For period information regarding Shincliffe, see Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=4281.

[49]. See Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/DurhamStOswald/Shincliffe.html; obviously population growth between 1821 and 1831 due to collieries.

[50]. In addition, on 18 July 1852, four members who were originally in the Thrislington Branch were transferred to this branch, meaning they either moved from Thrislington (modern day Comforth) to Shincliffe, or their records were transferred when the Thrislington branch was dissolved. Although a Thrislington Branch obvious existed at one point, no further historical information regarding this branch has surfaced. Thrislington is in Durham, but no longer a village today. See Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, http:// visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=2417 and "Thrislington," http:// dmm.org .uk/colliery/t003.htm. Shincliffe Branch Record, film no. 87032, Item 4–5, Record of members, 1851–1853, Family History Library.

named the Durham Branch, since Shincliffe was an extension of the larger county town. After it became the Durham Branch, Alexander Black served as president from 1856 to 1863.[51] During that time he also laboured as a local missionary, proselytizing over 60 converts.[52] This branch was renamed the New Durham Branch in 1866, and finally became part of the Castle Eden Branch in 1871.[53]

Three months after the establishment of the Shincliffe Branch, the Wingate Branch was organized on August 31, 1851, continuing through April 6, 1854, after which its members also became part of the Trimdon Branch in 1856. However, when the Trimdon Branch proved to be short–lived, the Wingate Branch re–opened in 1857.[54] Like all the other villages in this area, Wingate was a colliery town. It was only inhabited by 30 farmers before the arrival of the coal industry; the 1835 population being only 115, but growing to 2, 456 by 1841.[55] Elder John Carmichael, from Scotland, previously mentioned as the first branch president of the Thornley Colliery Branch, was instrumental in proselytizing most of the membership of this branch.[56] He laboured vigorously as a travelling elder in this area, proselytizing 35 new converts in the Sunderland, Hartlepool, Wingate, and Five Houses Branches.[57]

---

[51]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch," Church History Library.

[52]. *Durham Branch Record*, film no.86995, Item 20, Record of members 1850–1877, Family History Library.

[53]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch," Church History Library.

[54]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Trimdon Branch, Wingate Branch," Church History Library.

[55]. For information regarding Wingate, see http://durhamrecordsonline.com/literature/wingate_grange.php.

[56]. *Wingate Branch Record*, film no. 87037, Item 39–40, Record of Members 1848–1853, Family History Library.

[57]. *Five Houses Branch Record*, film no. 86998, Item 15, Record of Members 1852–1856, Family History Library. Sunderland Branch Record, film no. 87035, Item 15–24, Record of Members 1943–1904, Family History Library. *Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no. 87038, Item 11–12, Record of Members 1864–1948, Family History Library. *Wingate Branch Record*, film no. 87038, Item 39–40, Record of Members 1848–1853, Family History Library.

On December 5, 1852, at a meeting held in a school room, the Easington Lane Branch was organized.[58] Easington Lane is not the same as Easington Village or Colliery; it was a small village then and remains one today.[59] Apparently men working in the colliery lived here with their families. Robert Gillies, who joined the Church in his home country of Scotland in 1842,[60] served as branch president. Like John Carmichael, he worked tirelessly as a local missionary to establish the Church in this area. He had previously served as the president of the North Shields Branch,[61] and as a local missionary proselytizing new converts in the Durham and South Shields Branches.[62] While serving as the president of the Easington Lane Branch, he also laboured as a local missionary until he emigrated in 1856.[63] He was responsible for

---

[58]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Easington Lane Branch." Church History Library.

[59]. For information on Easington Village and Easington Colliery, which later combined and became a town called "Easington," see http://durhamrecords online.com/literature/easington_colliery_village.php and http://en.wikipedia .org/wiki/Easington, County Durham. For the distinction between Easington Lane and Easington Village, Colliery, and town see http://g.co/maps/mpmu3 and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Easington_Lane.

[60]. *Easington Lane Branch Record*, film no. 86996, Item 1 , Record of Members 1842–1855, Family History Library.

[61]. Speakman and Gillies, "Conference Minutes," *Millennial Star*, September 15, 1848, 55. On December 12, 1847 he was appointed president of the North Shields Branch.

[62]. For an account of his missionary labours and baptisms and confirmations performed, see *Durham Branch Records* and *South Shields Branch Records*. *South Shields Branch Record*, film no. 87033, Item 1–4, Record of Members 1848–1948, Family History Library. Durham Branch Record, film no. 86995, Item 20, Record of Members 1850–1877, Family History Library.

[63]. On April 19, 1856 he emigrated to the U.S. where he eventually settled in Beaver Utah and died in Farmington Utah, October 6, 1866. http://www.familyorigins.com/users/l/o/v/Marilyn–G–Loveridge/FAMO1–0001/d23.htm#P11990. Of interest but of no importance to this history, is the fact that after arriving in Utah his daughter Annie married Maximilian Parker, and their first son was Robert LeRoy Parker, who became known as the infamous out–law of the Western United States, "Butch Cassidy." See BMR, 91–119 (FHL #025,691) http://lib.byu.edu/mormonmigration/voyage.php?id=327&q=robert%20gillies.

the baptism and confirmation of 56 members of the Easington Lane Branch, which continued through 27 December 1857.[64]

On March 24, 1855, the Castle Eden Branch was first mentioned in the LDS Church records.[65] The branch membership remained relatively constant until the Trimdon Branch absorbed it on July 4, 1856.[66] Significantly, this branch re–emerged in 1871 as an amalgamation of all branches in this area.[67] Similar to the Easington Lane Branch, the Castle Eden village never had a direct connection with coal mining. It has always been an agricultural village with very ancient roots. Castle Eden Colliery (about 1840–1893) was actually about two kilometres away and situated in the sub–district of Monk Hesleden and not Castle Eden. Castle Eden village did occasionally take in overspills of miners, but the census numbers indicate there were only 491 inhabitants in 1851, which only increased to 693 by 1871 and 880 by 1881. However, in Monk Hesleden, the nearby colliery village, the population grew from 490 in 1841 to 1,495 in 1851, most likely supplying many of the membership of this branch. In 1871 when all the branches in this area were combined under the name of Castle Eden, the population of Monk Hesleden was 1,636 and grew to 2,421 by 1881 and 3,819 by 1891.[68]

As has been mentioned, the Trimdon Branch was organized July 4, 1856, from the Five Houses, Thornley, Castle Eden, Wingate, and Trimdon Grange branches, with Joseph Doxford as president.[69] The population of this village exploded incident to the coal industry, reporting only 382 inhabitants in 1841, but increasingly dramatically

64. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Easington Lane Branch," Church History Library.
65. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Castle Eden Branch," Church History Library.
66. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Trimdon Branch," Church History Library.
67. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch," Church History Library.
68. For information regarding Castle Eden see (http://www.durhamrecordsonline.com/literature/castle_eden.ph) and (http://durhamrecordsonline.com/literature/castle_eden_colliery.php).
69. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Trimdon Branch," Church History Library.

to 1,598 in 1851, 2,975 in 1861, and 3,266 by 1871.[70] A significant event in the short history of this branch occurred when the members reported a tremendous Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit including the gift of tongues and angelic visitations on September 14, 1856. Despite this, the Trimdon Branch was reported "nearly broken up" by October 4, 1857.[71] This undoubtedly led to the reorganization of the Wingate Branch that same year,[72] and the eventual reorganization of the Coxhoe branch in 1863.[73] However, by 1871 they were all combined again under the name of the New Durham Branch.[74]

The Haswell Branch was first mentioned in the historical record on June 1, 1870.[75] Like other colliery towns, Haswell grew from 263 inhabitants in 1831 to 5,763 by 1871.[76] While it is not known how early this branch was organized, it combined with all others in this area as the Castle Eden Branch on July 16, 1871.[77] From the time

---

[70]. For more information see Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894. http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/Trimdon/index.html .

[71]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Trimdon Branch," Church History Library.

[72]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Wingate Branch History," Church History Library.

[73]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Coxhoe Branch History," Church History Library.

[74]. In addition, the 1862 list of branches in Durham includes a "Brandon Branch" with four members. Inasmuch as there is no other historical documentation regarding the branch in this location, and because it is in the vicinity of these other 13 branches, it is believed it also eventually became part of the New Durham Branch. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliffe Branch History," Church History Library.

[75]. On June 1, 1870, George Peterson made a list of each of the branches in the Newcastle District. Haswell was listed with 33 members on this date. *Haswell Branch Record*, film no. 86995, Item 23 , Record of Members 1847–1900, Family History Library.

[76]. For more information on South Hetton/Haswell See http:// durhamrecordsonline.com/literature /haswell .php.

[77]. On July 16, 1871, the Haswell and New Durham (Coxhoe) branches were combined and called the Castle Eden Branch (I am assuming with the Castle Eden branch as well). Apparently after the break–up of Trimdon Branch, the Saints first gravitate to Wingate and then finally to Castle Eden (with the saint

the Trimdon Branch was organized by combining five separate branches in 1856, the rate of convert baptisms and membership numbers decreased dramatically, at least partially due to emigration. I have not been able to locate any extant historical documents regarding any of these thirteen branches or their members after 1871. The historical account from this area, if not the Church itself, abruptly disappears.

The first mention of the Church in the South Shields area was at a District Conference held on June 18, 1848, although a branch had not yet been organized there.[78] While the Church in South Shields did not enjoy the longevity of the Sunderland Branch, the branch record still spans an entire century: from 1848 to 1948.[79] This can at least partially be explained by the sizeable population in this area. Unlike the small colliery towns mentioned above, the population of South Shields was already 12,000 in 1801, and grew to over 80,000 by the turn of the century.[80] Although the coal industry was strong here, South Shields was not entirely dependent on coal, having several maritime industries, including shipbuilding, which helped sustain the population and the Church membership.

Like most of the branches in historic County Durham, the initial growth of this branch can be primarily attributed to the efforts of local missionaries. One of the first and by far the most prolific was Isaac Burnhope, who was baptized on June 5, 1847 by Ebenezer Gillies of the Sunderland Branch.[81] This pattern was common, as new con-

---

from the Haswell/New Durham areas). When it re–emerges, most of the people who had been members of these other branches are on the branch record. The latest date on the branch record is 1855. No one on this record is baptized after 1855, and I can find no further mention of the Church in this area after 1871. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Shincliff Branch History," Church History Library.

[78]."Conference Minutes," *Millennial Star*, September 15, 1848, 279.

[79]. *South Shields Branch Record*, film no. 87033, Item 1–4, Record of Members 1848–1948, Family History Library.

[80]. For more information on South Shields, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_South_ Shields and Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894 at http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/SShields/. It was also famous for its maritime industries including shipbuilding.

[81]. *Sunderland Branch Record*, film no. 86995, Item 23, Record of Members 1847–1900, Family History Library.

verts who had been ordained to the priesthood would engage in proselytizing activities in the neighbouring towns on nights and weekends, bringing in new converts, who themselves would begin preaching as soon as they were ordained. After proselytizing 31 people in the South Shields Branch[82] while labouring as a local missionary for 21 years, Isaac finally emigrated to Utah.[83]

The next three branches to emerge in this area either originated or were perpetuated through the efforts of a single local missionary: Joseph Foster Doxford. He organized the Marley Hill Branch at Marley Hill Colliery in February 1854, proselytizing more than half of the membership himself. Despite his efforts, the branch only remained until September 8, 1855.[84]

The next branch he worked in was the Jarrow Branch, which was actually a reorganization of the Wallsend Branch that occurred on June 22, 1856.[85] Jarrow, situated on the south side of the Tyne River directly across from Wallsend, Northumberland, was greatly impacted by the Industrial Revolution. Although it had a colliery, its primary industry was shipbuilding. Established in 1852, Palmers Shipyard employed 80% of the population until 1934. Despite having a relatively large population of 3,835 in 1851, it nearly doubled to 6,494 by 1861,

---

[82]. *South Shields Branch Record*, film no. 87033, Item 1–4, Record of Members 1848–1948, Family History Library.

[83]. According to the Mormon Migration Index, he left for Utah on June 4, 1868 from Liverpool and arrived in Utah August 19, 1868. See http://lib.byu.edu/mormonmigration/results.php?q=isaac+burnhope and see http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=41943284. Unfortunately, he died February 15, 1869, and his obituary reads: "Died: At the residence of Thomas Wallace, his son–in–law, in this City, of erysipelas, Elder Isaac Burnhope, aged 60 years and 3 months. Deceased was lately from South Shields, England, and has been sick since his arrival on the 19th of last August. Mill. Star, please copy." *Deseret News Weekly*, 17 Feb 1869, 20.

[84]. *Marley Hill Branch Records*, film no. 87018, Item 12–13, *Record of Members 1854–1855*, Family History Library. See Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894. For more information about Marley Hill, see http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner /genuki/DUR/Whickham/.

[85]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Jarrow Branch History," Church History Library.

and quadrupled to 24,361 by 1871.[86] Notwithstanding this population growth, because of the emigration of many members, the Jarrow Branch was combined with the South Shields Branch in 1859, [87] was reorganized in 1868,[88] combined again with South Shields and Murton on January 11, 1891, returned to Wallsend in 1904, and was finally reorganized again in 1905, remaining until 1911.[89]

After labouring in the Jarrow Branch, Elder Doxford organized the Usworth Branch on 26 November 1858.[90] Geographically, it was very close to Jarrow, and he brought all 21 members of this branch into the Church. Usworth was a colliery town; in fact, there was not a village there prior to the opening of the Usworth Colliery in 1845.[91]

---

[86]. For more information about Jarrow, see Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894, http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/JarrowTown/ and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jarrow.

[87]. Jarrow becomes part of the South Shields branch March 13, 1859. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Jarrow Branch History," Church History Library.

[88]. Jarrow is reorganized on March 13, 1868, *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Jarrow Branch History," Church History Library.

[89]. Jarrow returned to Wallsend 1903–1904, but returns to Jarrow in 1905 (see below) and stays there through 1917. On Sunday, February 8, 1904 indicates that the decision was made to change the name of the Hebburn branch to the Hebburn–Wallsend branch. I also have a 1904 branch record of the Hebburn–Wallsend branch. Hebburn was in historic County Durham, and Wallsend was in historic Northumberland County. On July 23, 1905 the decision was made to change their meeting location to Jarrow (DCBH–2), or effectively combine with the Jarrow Branch. On March 5, 1907, the *Hebburn Branch History* indicates the travelling elders were removed from the Jarrow branch on account of no tracting (the area having been so thoroughly tracted out.) Hebburn branch history continues through January 2, 1910. The Jarrow branch record continues through 1917. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Jarrow Branch History," "Hebburn Branch History," Church History Library.

[90]. *Usworth Branch Record*, Film no. 87037, Items 5–6, Record of Members, 1858–1859, Family History Library.

[91]. For more information regarding Usworth, see John Marius Wilson, Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales (1870–72) at http://visionofbritain.org.uk /place/place page.jsp?p_id=3440.

Later this branch was dissolved, and the members became part of the Spennymoor, Newcastle, Jarrow or Wallsend Branches.[92]

The next branch to emerge in this area was at Seaham.[93] Little is known about the origin of this branch because the only extant historical evidence of its existence is a November 1862 list of branches in the Durham Conference.[94] Seaham as a town has a rich history, extending back for centuries, but prior to the Londonderry family's personal and business exploits, this small hamlet had a population that numbered as few as 153 residents up through 1841. However, after the establishment of the Seaham and Seaton collieries, the population grew to 2591 by 1861. A careful analysis of the historical record reveals that it likely grew into what later became the Murton Branch, which was organized May 25, 1879.[95] Like Seaham, Murton had been a sleepy village until the onset of the Industrial Revolution, growing from 98 residents in 1831 to 4710 in 1881.[96] Even with this population increase, the Murton and Seaham branches merged with the Jarrow and South Shields Branch on January 11, 1891, and continued as such through 1894.[97]

---

92. *Spennymoor Branch Record*, film no.87033, item 15, Record of Members 1880–1895, Family History Library. *Newcastle Branch Record*, film no.87021, item 1–7, Record of Members 1836–1922, Family History Library. *Jarrow Branch Record*, film no. 87006, item 13, Record of Members 1849–1917, Family History Library. *Wallsend Branch Record*, film no. 87037, item 11, Record of Members 1858–1859, Family History Library.

93. For more information regarding Seaham, see http://visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=788. Population changes in the 19th century, see http://durhamrecordsonline.com /literature/old_seaham.php.

94. Members of Durham Conference 1862, film no 86995, Item 23, *Record of members, 1817–1871,* Family History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City.

95. Murton Branch Record, film no. 87020, Item 7, Record of members, 1878–1882, Family History Library.

96. For more information on Murton, see http://www.durhamrecordsonline.com / literature/murton.php.

97. Murton Branch Record and branch record entitled "Jarrow and South Shields Branch" Library British Film 87006 Item 16 Murton Branch Record, film no. 87020, Item 7, Record of members, 1878–1882, Family History Library. Jarrow and South Shields Branch Record, film no. 87006, Item 16, Record of members 1878–1882, Family History Library.

Two other branches that existed in this area, but for which there is limited historical documentation, were the Consett and Leadgate branches. According to the Sunderland Branch History, an Elder W. B. Preston organized a branch in Consett on Sunday, December 1, 1867.[98] Consett was a centre for the iron and steel industries during this time period.[99] While there is no historical evidence for this branch besides this single entry in Elder Preston's journal, there was a coking coal pit sunk here that for a time was name the "Saints Pit" or "Latter-day Saints Pit" because, it is noted, all 123 pitmen were members of the Consett or Leadgate Branches.[100]

The last two branches in this area emerged towards the end of the nineteenth century. On July 23, 1893, the Hebburn Branch was organized by President Anthon H. Lund, who at that time was a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and the European Mission president.[101] Interestingly, Hebburn was not a colliery town in 1893; most of the inhabitants of this town were employed in chemical works and shipbuilding.[102] About the time the Hebburn Branch was closed (January 25, 1911), a robust branch emerged in nearby Gateshead, comprised of 429 members, with the first baptisms occurring in 1909

98. See Hughes, *Sunderland Ward History*, vol. 1 (1843–1900), 44, MS 19667, Church History Library.

99. For more information on Consett, See http://www.keystothepast.info/durhamcc/K2P.nsf/K2PDetail?readform&PRN=D6768.

100. Sheila Laverick Hughes, the author of the *Sunderland Ward History* referred to several times in this document, has done extensive research into the "Latter-day Saint Pit" at Consett. Copies of personal correspondence between her and the LDS Church Historical Department establishing a branch in Leadgate, as well as her other published and unpublished notes verifying the Latter-day Saint Pit in Consett, are in the possession of this author.

101. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hebburn Branch," Church History Library.

102. However, the Hebburn Branch History mentions that missionaries opened a "new field of labour" in Hebburn Colliery on June 18, 1904 "and had good success." For information on Hebburn, see http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=905. This would explain the lateness of the branch—most of the population was employed in shipbuilding and chemical works, not coal. Other local histories agree—see http://tvwiki.tv/wiki/ Hebburn. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hebburn Branch," Church History Library.

and continuing through the early 1940s.[103] It would appear from historical patterns and extant data that Gateshead likely became the new gathering place for all Latter–day saints in this area (with the exception of South Shields) after 1917.[104]

Moving south and east down the coast, the next area of Church growth was at Hartlepool, where a branch was organized in 1849.[105] Hartlepool was originally a shipping and fishing town, with large iron and brass works, but it was drawn headlong into the Industrial Revolution when it became part of an important coal exporting centre, with population increasing from 1,330 in 1831 to 9,503 in 1851.[106] The first local missionary in this area was Robert Blackett, a shipwright. He was baptized while living in London on August 30, 1841, and his wife Eleanor followed him one week later. Robert was active as a local missionary in London, proselytizing many there. Eventually the couple moved to Hartlepool where he could practice his trade, and Robert and Eleanor became the first two residents of County Durham who had been baptized into the LDS Church.[107] Beginning April 15, 1849 he served as a local missionary and the first president

---

[103]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hebburn Branch," Church History Library. Gateshead Branch Record See http://www.londonfhc.org/content/catalogue?p=England,England,Durham, Gateshead&f=1.

[104]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Jarrow Branch," Church History Library.

[105]. On 14 Jan 1849, it was moved that Thomas Campsey, living at Hartlepool be ordained a priest. There are conflicting records, one stating that this branch was organized on 15 April 1849 with Robert Blackett as president. A second record states this branch was organized on 15 of June 1849. All of this information comes from the *Hartlepool Branch History*, *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hartlepool Branch," Church History Library.

[106]. For more information regarding Hartlepool, see the 1887 edition of John Bartholomew's Gazetteer of the British Isles at http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=946. See also, Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894, http://joinermarriage index.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki /DUR/HartlepoolTown/index.html. There was no mining activity in the Hartlepool area.

[107]. Lynne Watkins Jorgensen, The First London Mormons: 1840–1845: "What am I and my Brethren here for?", Thesis (M.A.), Brigham Young University, Department of History, 1988, pages 53, 113, 144, 161, 162, 193, 196.

of the Hartlepool Branch, where he brought 48 people into the Church[108] before he emigrated in 1856.[109] The success he and others experienced during that time period led to two other branches "growing out of" the Hartlepool Branch: both the Stockton and Feasby Branches.[110] However, it appears that Robert and Eleanor must have been successful in persuading most of the members Robert had proselytized to emigrate with them, because the branch record indicates that the Hartlepool Branch was dissolved in 1856 "due to a lack of members."[111]

This branch re–emerged in 1876 and records show its continued activity through 1910.[112] John Jackson was the local missionary responsible for much of this resurgence and growth, proselytizing 26

[108]. *Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no. 87001, Items 31–33, Record of Members, 1842–1904 Family History Library.

[109]. On May 4, 1856 he emigrated to the U.S. from Liverpool. See Mormon Migration Index: http://lib.byu.edu/mormonmigration/person.php?id=9627&q=robert%20blackett. After crossing the plains by handcart (see: http://www.lds.org/churchhistory/library/pioneerdetails/1,15791,4018–1–50904,00.html), he and Eleanor settled in Nephi, Utah, where he lived until his death on December 19, 1878, at 71 years of age. See http://www.findagrave.com/cgi–bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=66062252.

[110]. *Hartlepool Branch History*, entry for Saturday December 10, 1853. The Stockton–On–Tees Branch will be discussed later in this paper, but no other information regarding the Feasby Branch is extant in any historical document extant—no branch record, branch history, or other mention of it. What is more, there is no extant evidence of a location by that place name in the historic county of Durham. However, there is mention of a "Faceby Branch," which, like the rest of these branches, was part of the Newcastle Conference. See http://jakesbarn.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view& id=30&Itemid=1.

[111]. *Hartlepool Branch History* indicates that the branch became disorganized in 1856 due to lack of members. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hartlepool Branch," Church History Library.

[112]. The *Hartlepool Branch History* contains *Millennial Star* entries regarding this branch from Thursday, May 18, 1876 through 1910. It also includes this statement: "The genealogical record of this branch showed that 37 members registered for baptism between 14 February 1849 and May 28, 1903." The last entry showing five persons were baptized on August 25, 1910. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hartlepool Branch," Church History Library.

people into the Church.[113] Like his predecessor Robert Blackett, he also served as the branch president.[114] However, unlike Robert, John never was able to emigrate, but continued to serve faithfully here for 40 years.[115]

Like Hartlepool, Stockton had no collieries, being beyond the most southerly reaches of the Durham coalfield. However, it had always been a large port town on the Tees River, with a population of over 4,000 as early as 1801. In consequence of the formation of the railways to the coalfields and the progress of trade in the port, Stockton's population grew to 5,006 by 1831, and to 10,172 by 1851.[116] Perhaps because of this phenomenal growth, on December 7, 1851, at a session of the Newcastle–upon–Tyne Conference, it was resolved that the five scattered members of the Hartlepool Branch[117] at Stockton–On–Tees be organized into a branch, and Benjamin Robinson was ordained an elder and appointed to preside.[118] However, two months later President Robinson emigrated,[119] and the small branch

---

[113]. *Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no. 87001, Items 31–33, Record of Members 1842–1904, Family History Library.

[114]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Hartlepool Branch," Church History Library.

[115]. The *Sunderland Branch History* mentioned John Jackson as an elderly man who had served faithfully for 40 years, taken from an excerpt in Elder Frederick A. Mitchell's mission journal, Sunderland, Thursday 14th Dec. 1899: "Then we called on bro. John Jackson, an elderly man. He is an Elder, and with his wife, now old and feeble. Have been in the Church some 40 years. The old lady is confined to her bed the greater part of the time. At her request we administered to her. Elder Haslem administered the oil, and I sealed the anointing. These are good people." See Hughes, *Sunderland Ward History*, 2005, vol. 1 (1843–1900), 74.

[116]. For information regarding Stockton, see *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894 at http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/Stockton/index.html and http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.jsp?p_id=867 and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stockton–on–Tees.

[117]. Mention is made of the existence of the Stockton and Feasby branches, "having grown out of the Hartlepool branch" See *Hartlepool Branch History*.

[118]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Stockton–On–Tees Branch History," Church History Library.

[119]. See Mormon Migration index: http://lib.byu.edu/mormonmigration/results.php?q=benjamin+robinson access July 28, 2011.

was dissolved. It was later reorganized on Oct. 9, 1853[120], with William Littlefair as branch president, and he served faithfully until his death on September 26, 1877.[121] Brother Littlefair also served as a local missionary in both this and the Hartlepool Branch. He laboured fearlessly, despite the intense opposition that prevailed at that time. On Sept. 2, 1875, travelling Elder Andrew Galloway reported that "Brother Littlefair and the brethren from Stockton have been very diligent this summer, preaching in the market place every Sunday evening to large meetings, but have met with a great deal of opposition. About three weeks ago brother Littlefair was very much abused at the close of the meeting by certain parties who formed a mob.... Sunday evening the 29th... brother Littlefair spoke for an hour and a quarter to about one thousand persons. It was the most unruly meeting I have attended in years."[122] Upon Brother Littlefair's death, Thomas Mitchell, another local elder, became branch president and served for many years, and, like the Hartlepool Branch, the Stockton Branch continued robust until 1910.[123]

The Hartlepool and Stockton Branches remained the only LDS Church units in south County Durham for almost 50 years. On May 15, 1900, the Darlington Branch was organized, and it continued with a sizeable membership through 1925.[124] At the beginning of the

[120]. Stockton–On–Tees Branch History contains a detailed twenty–two–page record of this branch from 1851 through 1913. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Stockton–On–Tees Branch History," Church History Library.

[121]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Stockton–On–Tees Branch History," Church History Library.

[122]. Andrew Galloway, "Correspondence," Millennial Star, October 11, 1875, 654. Elder William Littlefair also published a broadside advertising his lectures, entitled, "The inhabitants of Hartlepool and surrounding neighbourhood are respectfully informed, that a course of six lectures will be delivered, in Mr. Bell's school room, Darlington Street, by the following elders of the Church of Jesus Christ, of Latter–day Saints. [1854]; See http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/MormonBib/id/2729.

[123]. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Stockton–On–Tees Branch History," Church History Library.

[124]. The *Darlington Branch Record* also includes the very small "Skelton" branch membership. Incidentally, on the first page, the name "Darlington" is scratched

nineteenth century Darlington was just a small market town, but due to the development of the Stockton and Darlington Railway, Darlington became the centre of the industrial district in South Durham and is regarded as the birthplace of the modern railroad.[125] Just five months after the organizing of this branch, the West Hartlepool Branch was also organized, on October 29, 1900. It appears that this branch was formed from a collection of members who had been baptized previously in other locations. Baptisms here continued through August of 1930.[126] Like the other towns in this southern region, West Hartlepool was an outgrowth of the railway and shipping interests of the coal industry, and this dock and the town that became associated with it were actually created in 1839 by a railway entrepreneur who was frustrated with the situation at Hartlepool. By 1881 West Hartlepool had grown to 28,000 residents, more than twice the size of Hartlepool, and it continued to expand in population until it exceeded 63,000 by 1900, the year this branch was organized.[127] Although both of the original branches at Hartlepool and Stockton vanished after 1910, the branches at Darlington and West Hartlepool continued to thrive through 1925 and 1930 respectively, presumably incident to the port and railway industries, with their expanding populations.[128]

The final area that experienced the organization of branches of the Church during this period was geographically situated in the southwest corner of the Durham coalfield in or around Bishop Auck-

---

out and replaced by "Skelton," but this must have been done after 1925. *Darlington Branch Record*, film no.86994, Item 3, Record of Members 1900–1929.

125. For more information on Darlington, see http:// visionofbritain.org.uk/place/place_page.p_id=785andhttp://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Darlington. jsp?

126. *West Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no.87038, Items 11–12, Record of Members 1864–1948, Family History Library.

127. For more information regarding Old Hartlepool and West Hartlepool, see http://www.englandsnortheast.co.uk/Hartlepool.html, and http://visionof britain .org.uk /place/place_page.jsp?p_id=273.

128. *Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no. 87001, Items 31–33, Record of Members 1842–1904, Family History Library. Stockton Branch Record, film no. 87034, Items 12–15, Record of Members 1845–1913 Family History Library. Darlington Branch Record, film no. 86994, Item 3, Record of Members 1900–1929, Family History Library. West *Hartlepool Branch Record*, film no. 87038, Items 11–12, Record of Members 1864–1948, Family History Library.

land. The first branch in that area was organized at Crook sometime in 1853, with Joseph Doxford as president.[129] Crook was a tiny agricultural hamlet until coal was discovered there in 1844. It was very close to the surface and was therefore easier to mine, and at one time there were 26 operating pits in and around the vicinity. Of course this created a population explosion, and the number of inhabitants increased from 538 in 1841 to 3,946 in 1851.[130] The saints in Tottingham, Spennymoor and B'yers Green were included in the Crook Branch until October 1, 1854, when the branch was divided, and the original Crook Branch's name was changed to the Witton–le–Wear Branch.[131] A likely reason for this was the labours of a local missionary named David Richards. David was from Wales and relocated to Witton Park because of the iron works there. He was a puddler, or one who turns pig iron into wrought iron through a process called puddling, which was a highly skilled art. He was baptized on March 8, 1857, and began serving as a local missionary shortly thereafter. Beginning in April 1857, he baptized most of the people on the Witton–le–Wear Branch record (13).[132]

---

[129]. Crook Branch Record, film no.87038, items 43–44, Record of Members 1852–1860, Family History Library.

[130]. There were over fifty collieries in this area! See http://www.dur.ac.uk/4schools/Localhistory/history.htm.

[131]. According to the Crook Branch History, at a council meeting held Oct. 1, 1854, the name of the branch was changed from Crook to Witton le–wear. However, according to the Witton–le–Wear Branch History, a the meeting was actually held on September 30, 1854: "At a session of the Newcastle Conference held on September 30, 1854 the Crook Branch was divided, and the Whitton–le–Wear Branch was organized, with W. Jones as president." It is likely both histories are accurate, in that it was a two–day conference. The Witton–Le–Wear branch record continues through December 27, 1857, with 9 members, including 2 elders. Citation: Crook and Witton–le–Wear Branch Histories. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Crook Branch History, Witton–le–Wear Branch History," Church History Library.

[132]. See Witton–le–Wear Branch Record. He immigrated with his wife Margaret and their children on March 30, 1860, and arrived in the Salt Lake Valley August 27 of the same year. He lived until April 22, 1902. See http://lib.byu.edu/mormonmigration/person.php?id=91784&q=david%20richards and http://lds.org/churchhistory/library/pioneerdetails/1,15791,4018–1–22767,00.html . All of the family members listed in these immigration and

Witton–le–Wear was also a coal town that eventually had 22 collieries, the first pit sunk in 1796. However, the coal industry did not have a dramatic impact on the population at the time of this branch, being only 918 in 1851 and 1,366 in 1861.[133] Perhaps this is one reason the historical record of the Witton–le–Wear Branch indicates that: "The Witton–le–wear Branch was called the Crook Branch until 1 Oct. 1854 [and] it became part of the Evenwood Branch 18 Mar. 1860."[134] However, the Evenwood Branch closed the very next year in 1861 and became part of the Tottingham Branch.[135]

The saints in Tottingham were organized into their own branch on 1 October 1854, the day the Crook Branch was divided into this branch and the Witton–le–Wear Branch.[136] The village of Tottingham was located southeast of where Coundon is today. The population of this area in 1801 was only 163, but doubled every 10 years in the 1820s and 1830s, and then slowed by 1851. In 1856 it was said that the village was chiefly occupied by the colliers employed in the neighbouring mines.[137] The Tottingham Branch history continued

---

overland trail records are on the Witton–le–wear branch record, confirming this is him and his family. Witton–le–Wear Branch Record, film no.87038, items 43–44, Record of Members 1852–1860, Family History Library.

133. For more information regarding Witton–le–Wear, see Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whelan, London, 1894, http://joiner marriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner /genuki/DUR/WittonleWear/index.html.

134. See Witton–le–Wear Branch Record. For information regarding Evenwood, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evenwood. Witton–le–Wear Branch Record, film no.87038, items 43–44, Record of Members 1852–1860, Family History Library.

135. *Evenwood Branch Record*. All members listed on the Evenwood branch record were transferred to this branch from the Witton–le–wear branch. There are no records after 1861. I believe this branch eventually combined with the Tottingham Branch which continued much longer—until 1874. Tottingham Branch Record, film no. 0086995, Item 22, Record of members, 1864–1874. Evenwood Branch Record, film no. 86997, Item 10, Record of Members 1853–1861, Family History Library.

136. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Tottingham Branch," Church History Library.

137. It is impossible to find a community by the name of "Tottingham" in any contemporary records, but see http://trunkcallsblog.blogspot.com/2008/09 /tottenham–and–coundon–county–durham.html, and http://keystothepast.info

for almost 20 years, through March 1, 1874, having taken in the saints from the former Crook, Witton–le–Wear, and Evenwood branches. [138] Perhaps one of the main reasons for the success of the Tottingham Branch over the others was the labour of local missionary William Coulthard, who served in 1860 in both the Tottingham and Evenwood Branches. He later served as the branch president of the Tottingham Branch from 1866 through 1874,[139] and then after its dissolution in 1877 he became the president of the South Church Branch in 1877. In all, he proselytized over 60 converts in these three branches, most of them in Tottingham. One of his converts was Abraham Smurthwaite, who became an important local missionary in the South Church Branch.[140]

The next emerging branch in this area was at Spennymoor, which was first mentioned in the November 1862 list of branches in the Durham Conference.[141] According to the branch record, it was re–organized on Oct 31, 1880, although there were upwards of 50 members baptized before that reorganization date.[142] Spennymoor was built on coal mining, but in 1853 the Weardale Iron and Coal Company opened its great ironworks at Tudhoe. As a result, many hundred emigrants came from the Midlands, and with the opening of the mine at Page Bank and with the sinking of a new pit at Tudhoe in the 1880s;

/miner/projects.nsf/02cf2b6f291f16de80256dd7002f1598/2b8ec7c37d021e9080256e86003371ae?OpenDocument. See also http://lastrp.com/?page_id=3610.

138. See *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Tottingham Branch," Church History Library. Tottingham Branch Record, film no. 0086995, Item 22, Record of members, 1864–1874.

139. Tottingham Branch Record, film no. 0086995, Item 22, Record of members, 1864–1874.

140. South Church Branch Record, film no. 86995, item 22, Record of Members 1875–1883, Family History Library.

141. Members of Durham Conference 1862, film no 86995, Item 23, Record of members, 1817–1871, Family History Library, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Salt Lake City.

142. Spennymore Branch Record, film no. 87033, item 15, Record of Members 1880–1895, Family History Library.

more workers came from Wales and Lancashire. [143] As a result, this branch continued to add members until about 1890.[144]

Interestingly, May 23, 1875 is the date of the first baptism on the South Church Branch records, which is just shortly after the Tottingham Branch record ends. Because of this, and the fact that William Coulthard moved his branch presidency from Tottingham to South Church, it appears that the branch formerly known as the Tottingham Branch became the South Church Branch.[145] South Church grew from 296 inhabitants in 1831 to 1,274 in 1881, primarily due to the coal and limestone works.[146] This branch continued for only eight years, from 1875 to 1883, but in that time they added nearly 200 new converts, primarily due to the diligence of two local missionaries, Abraham Smurthwaite and Thomas J. Parmley. As already mentioned, William Coulthard baptized Abraham Smurthwaite on July 28, 1870 in the Tottingham Branch.[147] Beginning in 1875, he served as a local missionary in South Church, where he proselytized 51 converts before he emigrated in 1881. Of note, one of those converts was Thomas Parmley, who was baptized on July 23, 1876. Thomas also served as a local missionary, bringing 21 converts into the South Church

---

143. See: http://parishes.durham.gov.uk/spennymoor/Pages/HistoryofSpennymoor.aspx.

144. Spennymore Branch Record, film no. 87033, item 15, Record of Members 1880–1895, Family History Library.

145. Tottingham and South Church Branch Records. See also "Tottingham Branch History." Notice that the Church leaders of the Tottingham Branch History are the same men who are performing the majority of the ordinances and have their names recorded in the South Church Branch Record. South Church Branch Record, film no. 86995, item 22, Record of Members 1875–1883, Family History Library. Tottingham Branch Record, film no. 0086995, Item 22, Record of members, 1864–1874.

146. See Wilson, *History, Topography and Directory of Durham*, Whellan, London, 1894, http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/AucklandStAndrew/index.html. There were eleven collieries, the first one being sunk in the 1830s. In 1870–72, John Marius Wilson's Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales described Auckland St Andrew like this: "Coal and limestone are extensively worked." See http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/descriptions/entry_page.jsp?text_id=879580.

147. Tottingham Branch Record, film no. 0086995, Item 22, Record of members, 1864–1874. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Tottingham Branch," Church History Library.

Branch.[148] In 1879 he was made the president of the branch,[149] a position he occupied until he also emigrated in 1881.[150]

Coinciding with the dissolution of the branch at South Church was the organization of a branch at Pelton, which occurred on April 15, 1883, with many people being baptized in 1909 and 1910. The branch continued through 1912, and then it merged with the Shildon Branch, which was organized on July 13, 1913, and continued through 1928.[151] During the time when the Church organization seems to have shifted to Pelton, there are records of six people being ordained at Witton Park,[152] and the Crook Branch was reorganized in 1889 and again "temporarily" in 1891.[153] Still, the Church organization was only able to maintain stability in Pelton. It is difficult to ascertain exactly why the Pelton Branch is tied to the South Church and Shildon Branches, because Pelton is 35 kilometres away, and South Church and Shildon are only a distance of 3.5 kilometres apart.

---

148. South Church Branch Record, film no. 86995, item 22, Record of Members 1875–1883, Family History Library.

149. Record of him representing the South Church Branch as its president at district conferences was noted twice in the Millennial Star. See John Irvine, "Minutes of a Conference," Millennial Star, April 14, 1879, 225; and C.L. French, "Minutes of Newcastle and Durham Conference," Millennial Star, October 13, 1879, 652.

150. On June 7, 1888 he was ordained a high priest and made the Bishop of the Pleasant Valley Ward in Carbon County, Utah, by Heber J. Grant. See Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4 vols., (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1936), 4:438.

151. Shildon Branch Record, film no. 87032, item 2, Record of Members 1904–1931, Family History Library.

152. For more information regarding Witton Park, see http://www.durham.anglican.org/userfiles/file/Durham%20Website/News%20and%20Events/Vacancies/Parish-profile-witton%20park.pdf.

153. According to the Crook Branch History, On February 10, 1889 the Crook branch was organized again. The branch was represented by Elder Orson Merrill at a Newcastle-upon-Tyne Conference 1–2 Nov. 1890. At a subsequent meeting on 22 Feb 1891, the branch was given a "temporary organization" with Thomas Naylor as the temporary president. On 26 March 1891 Elder George A. Rimington wrote in the MS (53:228) that there were no organized branches in the district of Spennymoor. But on 4 Nov 1900, it is referred to as the Crook District. *British Mission Manuscript History and Historical Reports, 1841–1971*, "Crook Branch," Church History Library.

Despite this, the Pelton Branch grew out of the South Church Branch in 1883, and was absorbed by the Shildon Branch in 1913.[154] Perhaps this is an indication of just how spread out Church membership in this area became at the turn of the century, incident to both emigration and the increasing unpopularity of the Church. Pelton, of course, was a colliery town,[155] and Shildon was drawn into the Industrial Revolution because of its involvement in the railway industry.[156]

THE EFFECTS OF GEOGRAPHIC CONDITIONS

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the history and development of the Church in historic County Durham during the seventy–year period of 1843–1913 was the increase in the rate of convert baptisms in successive decades. County Durham experienced a reverse trend from the rest of the British Mission: 71% of convert baptisms that occurred in the entire British Mission during the seventy–year period of 1843 to 1913 occurred during the first 22–year period of 1843 to 1865. In contrast, only 21% of the overall baptisms occurred in County Durham during that same period. Conversely, only 16% of baptisms that took place in the entire British Mission during the 70–year period of 1843 to 1913 occurred during the last 30–year period of 1884 to 1913, compared to 63% of convert baptisms occurring in County Durham during the same time period. See Table 1 below:

British Mission Total Convert Baptisms, 1843–	County Durham Total Convert Baptisms, 1843–1913: 2,756

[154]. Shildon Branch Record, film no. 87032, item 2, Record of Members 1904–1931, Family History Library. South Church Branch Record, film no. 86995, item 22, Record of Members 1875–1883, Family History Library.

[155]. For more information regarding Pelton, see http://visionofbritain.org.uk/place /place_page.jsp?p_id=3173.

[156]. For more information regarding the important town of Shildon, see" Wilson, Topography and Directory of Durham, Whellan, London, 1894, at http://joinermarriageindex.co.uk/pjoiner/genuki/DUR/AucklandStAndrew/index.html, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shildon, and http://www.keystothepast.info/durhamcc/K2P.nsf/K2PDetail? readform&PRN=D6881. Shildon It also had 10 collieries nearby.

1913: 105,092 (100%)	**(2.62% of Mission Baptisms)**
1843–1855: 55,397 (53%)	1843–1855: 525 (19%)
1856–1865: 18,613 (18%)	1856–1865: 134 (5%)
1866–1875: 8,677 (8%)	1866–1875: 106 (4%)
1876–1883: 6,280 (6%)	1876–1883: 243 (9%)
1884–1893: 3,807 (4%)	1884–1893: 421 (15%)
1894–1903: 5,074 (5%)	1894–1903: 610 (22%)
1904–1913: 7,244 (7%)	1904–1913: 717 (26%)

Table 1: Comparison of Baptismal Rates by Conference and Mission

How can we account for the dramatic increase in convert baptisms in County Durham during the thirty–year period of 1884 to 1913, especially considering the fact that overall, the rate of convert baptisms was declining elsewhere in the British Mission? I believe this can best be explained by local factors: Coal production reached its zenith in 1913, and mining and associated industries in this county required an ever–increasing workforce throughout this seventy–year period. This in turn led to a sustained population explosion. Interestingly, according to the British census returns, the population increase during the thirty–year period that most closely coincides with the time period in which convert baptisms were increasing in County Durham (while decreasing elsewhere), was the most dramatic population increase in the history of County Durham—going from 329,385 in 1881 to 492,503 in 1911—a 50% increase in total population. It is likely that this had an effect on the increased rate of convert baptisms.

Conclusion

The Durham Conferences was situated in the context of the Industrial Revolution in Victorian England. The most unique aspect of the Church during the first seventy years of its existence in County Durham was the accelerated rate of convert baptisms occurring during the final 30 years—coinciding with the apex of coal production in that county. While every other conference in the British Mission was experiencing a reduction in convert baptisms and total membership,

caused by several factors, including the declining public perception of the Church as well as its emigration policy, the Church in County Durham experienced a significant increase in convert baptisms. This can be partially explained by the population explosion experienced in County Durham, incident to the demand for labour in the expanding coal and related industries.

In addition, the significant contribution made by converts who laboured as local or full–time travelling missionaries led to the establishment of 34 branches and 2,756 convert baptisms during this seventy–year period. The majority of those engaged in proselytizing activities were local converts, and as a result, the majority of convert baptisms resulted from their efforts.

Many of these branches had their beginnings in the relatively small colliery villages that dotted the countryside, eventually fading away by the turn of the century, due to emigration and migration to other areas. On the other hand, areas where Church growth continued during the final three decades were the larger urban centres like Sunderland, South Shields, Jarrow, Hebburn, Gateshead, Hartlepool, Stockton, Darlington, and West Hartlepool. These larger towns had one thing in common: None of them were colliery towns, and while they were involved in different aspects of the coal industry, their sustainable growth seems to be attributed to the fact that they were engaged in a diversity of industries, including metallurgy, shipbuilding, chemicals, and the railroad. Therefore, while the continued growth of the Church and the county population is directly and indirectly attributed to the coal industry, during this seventy–year period sustainable Church growth required more than a colliery town—it required a diversity of industries in a larger urban centre.

The Species Debate: God and Humanity in Irenaeus and the Latter–day Saints

Adam J. Powell

Beginning with B.H. Roberts in the early 20th century, a number of LDS scholars have engaged with the writings of the early Christian fathers. This paper follows the precedent set by those individuals such as Hugh Nibley, Keith Norman, and Jordan Vajda. These scholars investigated potential connections between LDS teachings and those of specific Christian fathers like Irenaeus. He has been cited as an early proponent of deification, creation ex nihilo, and baptism for the dead. This work addresses only the first two of those doctrines. Though the past few decades have witnessed a general consensus within Mormon Studies regarding the disparity between early Christian beliefs and LDS teachings, a thorough examination of the God/Human relationship in Irenaeus is warranted.

By utilizing recent scholarship, this study exhibits the theological and anthropological connection between creation ex nihilo and theosis in the second–century bishop's thoughts. This link distinguishes Irenaeus from Mormonism. The LDS notion of eternal progression witnesses no delineation between God and humanity. Irenaean deification depends on the ontological distinction resulting from having been created from nothing.

The relationship between the Creator and the Creation in Irenaeus and in Mormon thought has been articulated in terms of kind versus degree.[1] The distinction relies heavily on two issues. Despite the

[1] This language is used explicitly in Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2007), 315. Similar terms are employed by LDS philosopher David L. Paulsen in his works on the nature of God: 'Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses' (*Harvard Theological Review*), and 'Divine Embodiment: The Earliest Christian Understanding of God' (*Early Christians in Disarray*). It is worth noting that these terms have been employed by a wide range of philosophers and theologians, ranging from the aforementioned to their distinctly different usage in G.K. Chesterton's discussion of the lack of evolution in the human race (*The Everlasting Man*, 34).

claims of some Mormon writers, belief in creation *ex nihilo* (creation out of nothing) separates the Early Church from that of the Latter–day Saints (hereafter, LDS).[2] This disagreement is, in fact, of the utmost importance for any discussion of Irenaean theology. If humans were created from an eternal material, they are not necessarily contingent beings in the sense of owing their very substance to the one, self–existent God. Contingency, in this case, refers to absolute dependence on supernatural power for existence. If not contingent in this manner, certain individuals may indeed possess a transcendent *gnosis* (Gr., 'knowledge') rooted, perhaps, in matter, which has always been. Further, they may originate from inherently evil matter or even a different creative deity (both are "Gnostic" claims refuted by Irenaeus).[3]

Additionally, one must explore the definition of deification found in LDS and Irenaean texts, as this is integral to the discussion. As Daniel Keating points out,

> It is crucial, however, to recognize a distinction between the content of the doctrine of deification and its characteristic vocabulary...In other words, we cannot simply follow a terminological trail in order to discover what the content of this doctrine is.[4]

The potential for equivocation is certainly strong in any case involving a heterodox religious group attempting to establish significant connection with the orthodox. This study will assay the importance of creation theology before heeding Keating's warning and entering the somewhat murky depths of *theosis* language and belief.

---

[2] In Mormon parlance, early Church also has reference to the period of the nascent nineteenth century Mormon church; however, in this context it refers to the common Christian acceptance of early century Christendom.

[3] In his work, *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus was chiefly concerned with refuting the Gnostics. This religious sect held that only they were privy to the special knowledge of the spiritual world. They also believed that the god of the Old Testament was not the same god revealed in Jesus Christ, that physical matter was evil, and that there was no continuity between the Hebrew Scriptures and the writings of the apostles and evangelists.

[4] Daniel A. Keating, *Deification and Grace* (Naples: Sapientia, 2007), 8–9.

CREATION EX NIHILO

The orthodox position on creation is creation *ex nihilo*, or creation out of nothing. In this view, God made the earth and its inhabitants from no pre–existing material. God is, therefore, truly the creator of everything that exists. He was, in this view, not limited as an artist is inhibited by his or her chosen medium. God created any material necessary for the achievement of His divine will.

The Mormon concept of time demands that God created the earth by organizing chaos.[5] Matter is eternal and, thus, was already present as the Father initiated the creative process recorded in Genesis. This LDS understanding of creation is undoubtedly sourced in the authoritative texts of the church. The origins of the foundational beliefs, however, may have been more philosophical. Fawn Brodie pointed to Thomas Dick's *Philosophy of a Future State* as influential on Joseph Smith's thoughts.[6] In this text, astronomy and metaphysics collaborate in support of the thesis that matter is eternal. As a result of this reading[7], Smith began to view the act of creation in a novel fashion. His subsequent teachings, additions to the *Doctrine and Covenants*, and portions of *The Pearl of Great Price* may reflect this philosophical influence.[8]

These principles differ drastically not only from the confession of orthodox Christians but also from the thoughts of Irenaeus himself. In the second book of *Against Heresies* the bishop repeatedly affirms creation *ex nihilo* in the midst of arguing against the special knowledge

[5] Ostling & Ostling, 304.

[6] Fawn M. Brodie, *No Man Knows My History: the life of Joseph Smith* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 171.

[7] Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 85. Givens lists Dick's *Philosophy of a Future State* as one of three titles donated to the Nauvoo Library by Joseph Smith around 1843. One might presume, then, that Smith had read this book as it was in his possession.

[8] *The Book of Mormon*, *Doctrine and Covenants*, *The Pearl of Great Price* (Salt Lake City: Intellectual Reserve, Inc., 1981). Doctrine and Covenants 93:29, 'Man was also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be.' See also, *History of the Church* 6:311 and *Abraham* 3:18,22.

claimed by 'Gnostic' leaders.[9] Chapter Ten of *Against Heresies* is dedicated to Irenaeus' refutation of the Valentinian creation myth. The Valentinians held that the Demiurge created the material world out of materials derived from Achamoth, a female emanation of Sophia.[10] In opposing this creation account, Irenaeus explicitly avers that 'God is in this point pre–eminently superior to men that He Himself called into being the substance of His creation, when previously it had no existence.'[11]

Later, he repudiates both the notion that humans can know the ineffable mysteries of God and the Valentinian belief that the Demiurge, who created all men including those with special *gnosis*, was of an animal nature. On the first issue, he expresses his belief that 'all things were made by God' but that the details of the creative act are beyond human reach.[12] Though the context clearly concerns 'Gnostic' mythology, it is difficult to dismiss the explicit affirmation that God created 'all things'. This is supported two chapters later, when the bishop discusses the irrationality of believing that an inferior being (the Demiurge) could produce a superior being (the pneumatics). On this second point, he asserts that there is one God who made all things through his will, thus everything is inferior to the sole Creator.[13] Perhaps the most frequently quoted passage from Irenaeus in support of creation out of nothing occurs in book four. There, Irenaeus quotes from the first mandate of the *Shepherd of Hermas* in order to support his views: "First of all, believe that there is one God who created and finished all things, and made all things out of nothing. He alone is able to contain the whole, but Himself cannot be contained."[14] When these conspicuous statements are combined with various others from the third and fourth books of

[9] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* (hereafter, *AH*), Ante–Nicene Christian Library: Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, vols. 5 and 9, ed. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868), II.28.7. These leaders included Valentinus, Marcion, Saturninus, and Basilides.

[10] This is the Ptolemaic myth of the western Valentinians. In *AH*, II.10.3, Irenaeus mentions that moisture came from the tears of Achamoth, and solid substance came from her sadness.

[11] *AH*, II.10.3

[12] Ibid., II.28.7

[13] Ibid., II.30.9

[14] *The Pastor of Hermas*, in Ante–Nicene Fathers: Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D.325, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868), II.1.

Against Heresies, there can be little doubt that Irenaeus affirmed creation *ex nihilo*.[15]

Keith Norman and Philip Barlow have both addressed the task of drawing comparisons between the early Christian concept of *theosis* and the Mormon doctrines of eternal progression and exaltation. In doing so, each has espoused the notion that the earliest forms of deification gradually morphed in order to become more compatible with the belief in creation *ex nihilo*. Norman says, '...the principal reason the doctrine of Divinization could not survive in the church's theology proper was that it conflicted with the doctrine of creation ex nihilo to which most 'orthodox' Christians adhered by the middle of the third century.'[16] This follows his claim that Irenaeus was the 'first explicit advocate of divinization'.[17]

Barlow echoes Norman in asserting that this doctrine of creation inhibited the spread of *theosis*. In fact, he asserts that a 'fundamental' connection exists between the thoughts of deification expressed by the 'earliest church fathers' and those of Mormonism, adding that these similarities preceded the 'creedal formulations of the Trinity or of creation ex nihilo.'[18] Their belief, then, suggests that the earliest Christian fathers held a specific view of deification, which was incompatible with the theology promulgated by the creeds of the mid–fourth century.[19]

---

[15] *AH*, III.8.3; IV.20.7. Compare the portion of book III, 'There is one God the Father, who contains all things, and who grants existence to all' to Acts 17:28, 'For in him we live and move and have our being.' In the passage from book IV, Irenaeus appeals to John 1:3 as well as Psalm 33:6 for additional support. *The Holy Bible*, New International Version (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984). All scripture references are taken from this translation unless otherwise noted.

[16] Keith Norman, 'Divinization: The Forgotten Teaching of Early Christianity,' *Sunstone* 1 (1975): 17.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Philip L. Barlow, 'Unorthodox Orthodoxy: The Idea of Deification in Christian History,' *Sunstone* 41 (September–October 1983): 16, 19.

[19] It should be noted that both scholars present a rather nuanced view of the relationship between Mormon exaltation and Irenaean deification. For instance, Barlow (16) unreservedly points out that he does not "wish to be misunderstood as implying that any or all of the thinkers referred to herein thought of theosis just as the Mormons do." Their argument hinges more on

Claiming Irenaeus as a proponent of divinization may seem justified in light of much of his diction. To imply, however, that his view of deification was incompatible with creation *ex nihilo* is to betray a fundamental misunderstanding of Irenaean theology.[20] In fact, Norman himself composed an insightful work on the soteriology of Athanasius in which he explicitly remarks, "Long before Athanasius' time, the view that every creature, even matter itself, came into being *ex nihilo* by the fiat of God, was adopted almost universally by ecclesiastical Christianity."[21] As J.T. Nielsen highlighted, the progress of humankind was initiated, not with the first sin of Adam, but at the moment of creation.[22] In the *Dispositio*[23] (economy) of salvation, the inevitable result of creation from nothing is the need to experience advancement. Thus, Irenaeus may be both an early advocate of a form of *theosis* and of the standard creation doctrine of his day.

DEIFICATION AS QUALIFICATION

Any discussion of ontology and natural/supernatural relationships that combines Patristics and LDS theology must touch on varieties of deification. Perhaps there can be no more influential thought for the individual than the notion that, by any number of events and efforts, one can become 'deified'. This is unequivocally crucial to the formation of identity amongst religious adherents. Self–actualization is, indeed, taken to a new height if conceived of within the

---

the assertion that Augustine began to alter the understanding of *theosis* from a more literal progression to godhood to a sort of mystical union.

[20] In fairness, Keith Norman published an article ('*Ex Nihilo*: The Development of the Doctrines of God and Creation in Early Christianity,' *BYU Studies* 17 (Spring 1977)) a bit later in which he explicitly claims Irenaeus as the first Christian to formulate a creation *ex nihilo* doctrine. The confusion, however, still remains. How can Irenaeus be an early proponent of both creation *ex nihilo* and *theosis* if the two doctrines are fundamentally incompatible?

[21] Keith Norman, *Deification: The Content of Athanasian Soteriology* (PhD Diss. Duke University, 1980), ch.5.

[22] J.T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp, 1968), 62.

[23] *On the Apostolic Preaching*, 6. 'Christ Jesus our Lord, who was revealed...according to the economies of the Father.' The Greek word *oikonomia* (Latin, *disposition*) refers to the organization of someone's affairs and is used in early Christian writers to refer to God's ordering of the plan of salvation.

framework of deification. To wonder at the potentiality of becoming a god is to posit the metaphysical as the ideal for the material.

After presenting his audience with a handful of examples of deification among orthodox Christians, LDS scholar Stephen Robinson claims that the theology of the Mormons represents 'the same theology and the same goal.'[24] Robinson argues that the doctrine of deification is the same in LDS thought as it is in the thoughts of notable Christians such as Athanasius and Irenaeus. Unfortunately, Robinson does not appear to tackle the substantial evidence that stands in opposition to his thesis.

John McGuckin has defined the patristic concept of deification as 'the process of sanctification of Christians whereby they become progressively conformed to God.'[25] McGuckin goes on to say that this 'bold use of language' was intended to connote the transformative component of the salvation process, the element that would later constitute one half of the concept of 'justification'.[26] Similarly, for Eastern Orthodox scholar Jaroslav Pelikan, the patristic view of deification was synonymous with salvation.[27] For the Church fathers, this was the abil-

[24] Stephen Robinson, *Are Mormons Christian?* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1991), 63. This view is perhaps stated too strongly by Robinson. Certainly, other LDS scholars such as Norman, Barlow, Grant Underwood, and Jordan Vajda have been careful to allow the early Christian fathers their own, unique forms of deification.

[25] John A. McGuckin, *The SCM Press A–Z of Patristic Theology* (London: SCM Press, 2005), 98.

[26] Grant Underwood, 'Justification, Theosis, and Grace in Early Christian, Lutheran, and Mormon Discourse,' *International Journal of Mormon Studies* 2 (2009): 206–23. Underwood provides a summary of the transformation that *theosis* underwent as the language changed to 'justification' and then to 'sanctification'.

[27] Jaroslav Pelikan, 'The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition,' *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 155, 266, 345. Eastern Orthodox scholars such as Pelikan are important for investigations into patristic notions of *theosis* because, as Norman and others have expressed, the tradition of *theosis* was preserved in the Eastern Church. In fact, the most renowned scholars of Irenaeus such as John Behr and Mathew Steenberg are member of the Orthodox Church. The history of LDS scholarship suggests, however, that no consensus exists on this issue. For example, Stephen Robinson (pp.61–63) believes that the patristic

ity to participate in the communicable attributes of God such as grace, power, honour, et cetera.[28]

These early writers, particularly Irenaeus and the Alexandrians (Clement, Origen, Athanasius, and Cyril), sought the optimal means by which their audience might comprehend the transforming nature of Christ's work. To such an end, these individuals borrowed similar language from their Greco–Roman culture.[29] The result was not *apotheosis* with its pagan connection to earthly rulers and the reliance on succession for the attainment of divinity but *theosis*, a process whereby individuals may participate (κοινωνία) in the divine nature because of the atoning work of Christ.[30]

Kallistos Ware's definition of deification echoes the voices of the early writers. In fact, his view aids in the comprehension of the Greek Fathers, as the former (as far as it represents the entire Eastern Orthodox Church) depends on the latter. For Ware, *theosis* is necessarily linked to the image and likeness, and it is the process of assimilation

---

understanding has been preserved in the Eastern Church, whereas Daniel Peterson and Stephen Ricks think otherwise (*Offenders for a Word* [Provo: FARMS, 1992], 92).

[28] Chris Welborn, 'Mormons and Patristic Study: How Mormons Use the Church Fathers to Defend Mormonism,' *Christian Research Journal* 28.3 (2005): 5.

[29] Demetrios Constantelos, 'Irenaeos of Lyons and His Central Views,' *St.Vladimir's Theological Seminary* 33.4 (1989): 355. Constantelos explains this well: '...it is beyond any doubt that Irenaeos (sic) was very familiar with Greek thought, and Greek was his native tongue. Following the example of the Apologists such as Justin and Athenagoras, he sought to expound the teachings of Christ in terms understandable to the Greek–speaking world. Irenaeos' (sic) thought was in harmony with that of the Apologists, Justin the Martyr in particular, and other Greek Fathers such as the Alexandrians, the Antiochians, and the Cappadocians who were realists and saw Christianity in it historical and cultural context: they did not seek the dilution of Christianity by Hellenism, but the Christianization of Hellenism and indeed of the whole Cosmos.'

[30] This language originates in 2 Peter 1:4, 'Through these he has given us his very great and precious promises, so that through them you may participate in the divine nature and escape the corruption in the world caused by evil desires.' This passage is utilised by Irenaeus and the LDS as the launching point for discussion of deification. The word 'participate' comes from the Greek *koinonia* (koinwnía), which is more commonly translated to mean 'communion or intimacy with'.

to God by grace.[31] Deification is, again, synonymous with salvation, but it also entails a separation of essence:

> The idea of deification must always be understood in the light of the distinction between God's essence and His energies. Union with God means union with the divine energies, not the divine essence: the Orthodox Church, while speaking of deification and union, rejects all forms of pantheism...The human being does not become God by *nature*, but is merely a "created god," a god *by grace* or *by status*. (Original emphasis)[32]

As Irenaeus maintains a similar partition, his understanding of progression must be examined under this light. The development of each individual is not the means but the goal itself.[33] This is perhaps the distinguishing feature of early Christian deification. In the bishop's own words,

> God differs from man, that God indeed makes, but man is made; and truly, He who makes is always the same; but that

[31] Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), 219.
[32] Ibid., 232.
[33] Irenaeus so adamantly emphasizes the developmental process over the final attainment in his writings that he eventually came to hold a special position in the theories of religious philosophers. The bishop's teachings on the advancement of the individual now represent 'Irenaean Theodicy'. This solution to the problem of evil existing in the world of a good God relies on Irenaeus' understanding of necessary maturation. Irenaean Theodicy utilizes the words of Irenaeus, such as those found in *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, which explicate how Adam 'was a young child, not yet having a perfect deliberation.'[33] John Hick, perhaps the most widely known proponent of such a theodicy, describes the Irenaean–based theory in these words: 'The Irenaean claim is not that each evil which occurs is specifically necessary to the attainment of the eventual end–state of perfected humanity in the divine Kingdom. What was necessary was a world which contains real contingencies, real dangers, real problems and tasks and real possibilities of failure and tragedy as well as of triumph and success, because only in a world having this general character could human animals begin their free development into "children of God".' John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 375.

> which is made must receive both beginning, and middle, and addition, and increase...God also is truly perfect in all things, Himself equal and similar to Himself...but man receives advancement and increase towards God. For as God is always the same, so also man, when found in God, shall always go on towards God.[34]

Here lies the connection between creation *ex nihilo* and deification. That which is made from nothing is necessarily in need of progression. Julie Canlis expresses the Irenaean concept well by drawing a close connection between creation and individual growth: "Our ongoing status of being created is the corollary of God's ongoing creation – not due to sinfulness, but to the way that God has structured creation for participation. Growth is not a deficiency but is inextricably linked to anthropology as made..."[35] She goes on to say that progress is essentially a component or fulfilment of our status as Creation.[36] This does not mean, however, that the bishop possessed no belief in an ultimate salvation experience. On the contrary, his understanding of participation involved a sort of final hope of intimacy.[37] This communion was not one of absorption into the divine; it maintained the complete individual (body, soul, and spirit).[38]

A number of similarities do exist between the *theosis* of Irenaean theology and LDS exaltation. For instance, there is a special value placed on the progression process as well as on Peter's notion that individuals should participate in the 'divine nature'. This maturation process is itself catalysed by the participation and occurs within a divinely sanctioned soteriological scheme, the *Dispositio* for Irenaeus and the Plan of Salvation for LDS. Jordan Vajda highlights a teleological similarity between the two:

---

[34] *AH*, IV.11.2; IV.20.7. In chapter 20, Irenaeus articulates his view that the Word of God was sent to reveal God to humanity so that the latter might have something 'towards which he might advance'.

[35] Julie Canlis, "Being Made Human: The Significance of Creation for Irenaeus' Doctrine of Participation," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58.4 (2005): 445.

[36] Ibid., 447.

[37] In the words of Irenaeus, this is *adsuesceret* or being accustomed to God. This is said to occur in both directions, God becoming accustomed to humanity and humanity to God (*AH*, III.20.2).

[38] Constantelos, 355, 361.

> the doctrines of *theosis* and exaltation are functionally equivalent while being ontologically distinct. In other words, in both cases the results of human divinization are equivalent—humans come to possess divine qualities and attributes, a new manner of life, which they did not possess before and which they could not attain of their own volition.[39]

Though the particulars are distinct, each involves a sort of intimate relationship between God and humans, which facilitates the necessary development.[40]

In *Doctrine and Covenants* section 88, one encounters a clear similarity between LDS exaltation and the patristic view of deification: 'and the saints shall be filled with his glory' (D&C 88:107). Here, the doctrine of exaltation is said to include participation in the communicable attribute of divine glory; however, the remaining portion of the verse illuminates a significant distinction: 'and be made equal with him'. In Mormon doctrine, eternal progression can result in becoming equal with Father God. Often, this is expressed as synonymous with receiving God's inheritance. Those who enter the Father's kingdom are also given all that the Father has.[41] This goes beyond the communicable attributes to include, among others, a sort of omniscience.[42] Joseph Fielding Smith even claimed, 'those who are worthy to become his sons...would be heirs of the Father's kingdom, possessing the same attributes in their perfection, as the Father and the Son'[43] This echoes the teaching that Joseph Smith presented to church elders in Kirtland in the winter of 1834/35.[44]

---

[39] Jordan Vajda, *Partakers of the Divine Nature* (BYU: FARMS Occasional Papers), ch. 5, 'Theosis and Exaltation: In Dialogue.'

[40] Underwood, 214.

[41] D&C 84:34–38.

[42] Ibid., 93:27–28.

[43] Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation*, vol.2 (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft Publishers, 1955), 35.

[44] Joseph Smith, *Lectures on Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1985), 60. 'and all those who keep his commandments shall grow up from grace to grace, and become heirs of the heavenly kingdom, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ; possessing the same mind, being transformed into the same image or likeness, even the express image of him who fills all in all; being filled with

Later in *Doctrines of Salvation*, Joseph Fielding Smith explicitly asserts that men may become perfect just as God is perfect.[45] This is clearly an allusion to the words of Peter, 'but just as he who called you is holy, so be holy in all you do; for it is written: "be holy, because I am holy"' (1 Peter 1:15–16). In the LDS Church, scripture is often interpreted in a literal manner, facilitating the pragmatic approach to religion that has existed from the very beginning of the Mormon tradition. In this case, Peter's words are not taken as an exhortation or charge with Christ's holiness as the ultimate model toward which one should strive. Instead, the holiness of Christ is literally something, which humans have the opportunity to inherit.[46]

Through the developmental process, including the highest level of commitment and obedience to the Church, an individual may become an heir to God's kingdom. Again, this is taken in a literal sense, so that those who become heirs are not only equal (joint–heirs) to Christ but also look forward to the future time in which they receive all that the Father enjoys. Logically, then, the attainment of exaltation is the attainment of godhood. Joseph Fielding Smith expresses the logic well. Quoting from *Doctrine and Covenants* 76:59, he says, 'and if they receive his fullness and his glory, and if "all things are theirs, whether life or death, or things present, or things to come, all are theirs," how can they receive these blessings and not become gods? They cannot.'[47]

In attacking the 'Gnostic' teaching that the demiurge was separate from the God of the New Testament, Irenaeus uttered a profound statement germane to the present discussion. He rhetorically asked, 'Now to whom is it not clear, that if the Lord had known many fathers and gods, He would not have taught His disciples to know one God?'[48] Here, the bishop is castigating the 'Gnostic's for 'inventing' other gods. His reprimand extends to their application of the term 'gods' to mythical fabrications.

---

the fullness of his glory, and become one in him, even as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one.'

[45] Joseph Fielding Smith, 45.

[46] It is important to note that this eventual exalted state is only attainable after many ages in the Celestial realm. In LDS belief, it is not to be expected in the mortal life on earth.

[47] Joseph Fielding Smith, 39.

[48] *AH*, IV.1.2

THE CREATOR/CREATION RELATIONSHIP

In *Against Heresies*, one encounters an explicit delineation between the Creator and the Creation:

> the origin of all is God, for He Himself was not made by anyone, but everything was made by Him. And therefore it is proper, first of all, to believe that there is one God, the Father, who has created and fashioned all things, who made that which was not to be, who contains all and is alone uncontainable.[49]

He is not only careful to make this distinction, but also claims that the created have a later origin than the Uncreated.[50] In the Bishop's reasoning, the fact that God creates humanity necessarily means that humanity is ontologically separate from its maker.[51] In fact, this chronology results in an infantile and subordinate position to the Creator. Humanity is situated in a receptive position, prepared to accept God's glory.[52]

This relationship of God to humanity hinges on the concept of recapitulation (Latin, *recapitulans*). Christ, acting as a sort of second Adam, summed up God's *Dispositio* in his divine and human natures. In conquering death, obeying his Father, being born of a virgin, et cetera, Christ set humanity back on a path of 'divine destiny'.[53] Irenaeus elaborated on this concept in *Against Heresies* partly in response to 'Gnostic' assertions concerning material evil.[54] The life of Christ is set over and against the life of the first man. Just as Adam lacked patience,

[49] On the Apostolic Preaching, 3.
[50] *AH*, IV.38.1
[51] Ibid., IV.3.1; V.36.1
[52] Ibid., IV.14.1
[53] The terminology of 'divine destiny' is borrowed from McGuckin, 185.
[54] *AH*, III.16.6, III.23.1; *On the Apostolic Preaching*, 32. Here, Irenaeus expounds his idea that Christ had a 'likeness of embodiment to Adam' and was essentially recapitulating the first man in order to sum 'up all things in Himself.' *AH*, V.20.2 also expounds on recapitulation as a refutation of the Valentinian teachings reported in I.3.4 in which there are said to be two Christ's as the result of Sophia's fall from the Pleroma.

maturity, and self–discipline, so Jesus diligently obeyed and carried out God's will. Consequently, there is restored potential to 'see God'.

Irenaeus presents his readers with a poignant expression of this belief:

> Now it was necessary that man should in the first instance be created; and having been created, should receive growth; and having received growth, should be strengthened; and having been strengthened should abound; and having abounded, should recover; and having recovered, should be glorified; and being glorified, should see his Lord. For God is He who is yet to be seen, and the beholding of God is productive of immortality; but immortality renders one near to (*proximum*) God.[55]

The bishop's terminology is important. He sets, as the ultimate goal of humanity, the 'beholding of God'. Noteworthy, however, is the fact that equal emphasis seems to be placed on achieving proximity to God. Immortality is, perhaps, penultimate. It is for this reason that Christ's recapitulative work is significant. The often quoted line from the preface to the fifth book of *Against Heresies*, 'our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself',[56] must be interpreted in light of this recapitulation doctrine. Without the *theanthropos*, or God–man, humans would have no hope of seeing 'He who is yet to be seen'. There is a crucial component of reciprocity at work.[57] God became man, and man now may approximate God.[58]

---

[55] *AH*, IV.38.3

[56] Ibid., V Preface

[57] See, Adam Powell, 'Irenaeus and God's Gifts: Reciprocity in *Against Heresies*, IV.14.1,' presented at *XVI International Conference on Patristic Studies*–Oxford University (2011).

[58] Ibid. IV.33.4. 'Or how shall man pass into God, unless God has passed into man?' Underwood rightly notes that this 'exchange formula' is just that, exchange. It is not change. As he states it, 'the "exchange" signifies an exchange of characteristics and attributes, not a change in being or substance (212).' Constantelos offers valuable insight into Irenaeus' concept of the creator/created relationship: 'His anthropocentrism however is rooted in his theocentrism. Man and God are not placed at opposite poles but on the two ends of the same pole. Each one moves toward a meeting with the other. Man searches and God responds and moves forward to seek. The two meet in the

In Mormon theology, the relationship of God to humanity is quite different. Of note is the notion that God and humans are of the same species.[59] This is strikingly at odds with the Irenaean notion of the Uncreated/Created divide. The doctrine of pre–mortal existence is, of course, paramount to LDS faith. The intelligence in each of us has no beginning or end.[60] Clothed by a spirit body, we each existed with God from the beginning. In this teaching, then, one encounters the LDS understanding of the link between God and humanity. The events of the first two chapters in Genesis comprise a formation rather than a creation. This formation is articulated in terms of reproduction, resulting in the belief that humans are truly the offspring of God.[61]

In contrast, Irenaeus saw Adam (the representative of every individual) as having been created with an animal nature composed of body and animated by soul.[62] Absent from this concept of the individual is the idea of 'spirit'. Irenaeus joined with Paul in claiming a carnal nature as part of the self.[63] The bishop was interested in emphasizing the value of this physical characteristic, or *plasma Dei*.[64] He may have

---

person of the Logos, the eternal God who appears among men as the Emmanuel. Thus Christ becomes the end of one process and the beginning of a new one (p.361).' God's economy includes the extension of His son toward humanity. That is the principal movement of God toward His creation, bridging the ontological gap.

[59] Stephen E. Robinson, 'God the Father,' *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 2, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), 549. Robinson explicitly states, 'Gods and humans represent a single divine lineage, the same species of being, although they and he are at different stages of progress.'

[60] *The Pearl of Great Price*, Abraham 3:22. 'intelligences that were organized before the world was.'

[61] For a thorough explication of these beliefs, see Blake Ostler, *Exploring Mormon Thought*, vols. 1–3 (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books).

[62] *AH*, I.5.4. Irenaeus is, of course, using the Gnostic terminology of 'animal' man and redefining it in order to oppose them.

[63] Ibid. III.20.3. Irenaeus twice quotes from the seventh chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans. He first cites 7:18, 'I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my sinful nature.' Then, 7:24 is quoted, 'What a wretched man I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death?'

[64] Ibid. IV.20.2–4. Nielsen, 56. Nielsen is justified in highlighting the pivotal role that the physical played in Irenaeus' theology. The various Gnostic movements all denigrated the material body, finding support in Paul's claim that

noted the role of the spirit in God's *Dispositio*, but he did not claim any previous existence preceding the animal nature of Adam. In the act of God's creation (*ex nihilo*), the individual came to be.

Joseph Smith saw the orthodox view of creation and everlasting life as irrational. For the Mormon prophet, eternality implied exemption both from termination and from origination. In *Doctrine and Covenants*, Smith claims that 'intelligence' cannot be 'created or made'.[65] This belief influences the way in which LDS view God's relationship to time. If humans were with God in the beginning and had no essential moment of initial creation, then God and humanity are both subject to a linear timeline. This line extends infinitely in both directions.[66] Every person is at a certain location along this linear continuum that not only applies to time but to eternal progression.[67]

In the early Church, special care was taken to maintain an essential distinction between God and His creation.[68] This gulf may constitute the most significant difference between Mormon exaltation and the 'participation' of Irenaean anthropology.[69] Participation is an

---

'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor. 15:50). Irenaeus wished to show that possessing earthly bodies was a unique aspect of the *plasma Dei* and was necessary for the redemptive work of the *theanthropos* (God–man), Jesus Christ.

[65] D&C 93:29.

[66] Ostling & Ostling, 304.

[67] Robinson, *Encyclopedia*, 549. 'The important points of the doctrine for Latter–day Saints are that Gods and humans are the same species of being, but at different stages of development in a divine continuum.'

[68] This is especially the case with Clement of Alexandria (*The Instructor*, 3) and Justin Martyr. The latter going so far as to say that there is no God other than the God of the Old Testament (*Dialogue with Trypho*, 11 and 56).

[69] Though LDS affirm that Heavenly Father sits eternally in a place of authority over us, deification is an act of addition not communion. Simply stated, as an individual is deified, another deity is added to reality. In D&C 76:58 and 121:28,32, Smith speaks of multiple 'gods' and the ability of those in the Melchizedek Priesthood to achieve godhood. Logically, then, the process of becoming a god would mean that another deity has entered reality, thus the need for the plural form of the term. This is, undoubtedly, the doctrinal outcome of Smith's creative excitement upon learning that the Hebrew *Elohim* is in the plural form in the Old Testament. Related to this concept is the belief that these gods are progressing. Smith said, 'God himself was once as we are now, and is an exalted man...' (*King Follett Discourse* (Eborn Books, 2008), 5).

incessant state of communion with that which is otherwise separate.[70] By seeing the unseen God, humans may know the inconceivable and associate with deity. This is possible only as a function of Christ's recapitulative work within the saving scheme of the *Dispositio*. In creating humans from nothing, God contains and defines them; the redemptive plan begins. This is Matthew Steenberg's concern when he repeatedly emphasizes the role of God's economy in Irenaean thought. Steenberg says that, for Irenaeus, humans are born into economy; Adam was created (out of nothing) by God to exist within a scheme of advancement.[71] In other terms, human contingency allows for human progress, ever maintaining and minimizing the ontological partition between Creator and Created.[72]

The Heavenly Father's authority results from his having progressed enough to reach full exaltation; the reward for which is spiritual procreation. Consequently, the LDS notion of 'self' in relation to Divine hinges more on shared experience, the lack of it in the case of Father God's authority over mortal humanity and the potential for it in the case of deification. Whereas Irenaeus promulgates a divine communion void of ontological homogeneity, the LDS present the faithful not with divine union but with uniformity of process resulting in a sort of essential reproduction.

[70] Irenaeus, *On the Apostolic Preaching*, 31, 40. Jesus Christ is said to call 'man back again to communion with God, that by this communion with Him we may receive participation in incorruptibility.' This is almost verbatim from his earlier comments that Christ was sent so 'we might, in all ways, obtain a participation in incorruptibility.'

[71] M.C. Steenberg, *Of God and Man* (New York: T& T Clark, 2009), 41–52. Steenberg is considered by many to be one of the leading authorities on Irenaeus. It is worth noting that he concludes his chapter on Irenaeus with a brief discussion of the constitution of man within Irenaeus' work. Ultimately, Steenberg resolves the inherent difficulty of comprehending Irenaeus' beliefs on body, soul, and spirit by claiming that the bishop did not see spirit as a component of the individual. Dependent on God for their existence, humans (body and soul) require advancement (through the Son and Spirit) toward that which will be pleasing in God's sight, a chance to see the unseen Father and participate in His incorruption.

[72] Ben C. Blackwell, *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria* (PhD Diss. Durham University, 2010), 56. Blackwell succinctly summarizes the Irenaean view by stating "the goal of humanity is not to transcend that distinction of Creator and creature but to fulfil it by God becoming reproduced in them, as a portrait reproduces the person."

"Those Who Receive You Not": The Rite of Wiping Dust Off the Feet

Daniel L. Belnap

Many ritual behaviours, particularly the formal institutional rituals more commonly known as the ordinances of the gospel, have textual counterparts in the scriptures that provide meaning for the acts. This may lead one to assume that ritual continuity—when a ritual retains both meaning and form from one time or place to another—exists across the dispensations, yet just because the ritual behaviour in one dispensation is similar to the ritual behaviour of another does not necessarily mean continuity exists. While some of rituals may retain the same basic structure from dispensation to dispensation, ritual innovation often occurs either because the ritual's role with the gospel has changed, or more commonly because the symbolic landscape established by the culture in which the ritual interacts has changed.

The extent to which such change takes place differs from ritual to ritual. Sacrifice, for instance, is radically different in terms of practice today than that performed in the Old Testament, whereas the sacrament exhibits minimal change; still it would be inaccurate to say that the sacrament has gone unchanged.[1] To assume continuity is understandable, as it provides a means by which an affinity between the modern dispensation and older ones is established. But this does not mean that recognizing potential discontinuity between our ritual practice and those who have gone before does not need to be a negative experience; instead it can be one, which edifies our appreciation and understanding of the ritual.

The following study explores the value of recognizing continuity and discontinuity in ritual by examining the rite of wiping the dust off one's feet. Originally attested in Christ's instructions to his disciples concerning their missionary labours, the rite was restored in the early part of this dispensation as recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants. As we shall see, though similarities in both meaning and form exist in

[1] See Matthew 26:26–29; Mark 14:22–25; Luke 22:19–20; 3 Nephi 18:5–12, 28–31; 3 Nephi 20:1–9; Moroni 4–5; Doctrine and Covenants 20:75–79.

the ancient and modern ritual practices, discontinuity may best explain the ambivalence with which the rite of the wiping the dust off one's feet is understood by the average Latter–day Saint.

The New Testament Texts

Found in the synoptic Gospels, the texts describing the purpose and manner of the rite of shaking or wiping the dust off one's feet are part of Christ's instructions to his disciples concerning their missionary labours. The first of these textual versions in order of canonical appearance is Matthew's:[2]

> And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence.
>
> And when ye come into an house, salute it.
>
> And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you.
>
> And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city. (Matthew 10:11–15)

Mark's version of this instruction is similar, though abbreviated and missing any mention of a blessing based on the worthiness of the inhabitants:

> And he said unto them, In what place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city" (Mark 6:10–11).

[2] All scriptural quotes are taken from the KJV.

Finally, Luke also includes this instruction, though considerably pared down:

> And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart. And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them (Luke 9:4–5).

Yet this pared–down version is then followed by an extensive set of instruction to the newly called Seventy in chapter 10:

> And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house.
>
> And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again.
>
> And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.
>
> And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you:
>
> And heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.
>
> But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. (Luke 10:5–12)

Predominant among all of the above ritual texts is the motive as to why the disciples would dust their feet—the lack of reception experienced by the disciples in their various ministerial locations.

Though the reason for the rite is clear within the texts, there has been no consensus among New Testament scholars as to the origin of the rite. Many associate this rite with rabbinic references that mention the need to be cleansed from contamination acquired while on Gentile territory.[3] In this sense, the lack of reception is equated with uncleanliness, and therefore the rite is a cleansing rite similar to the rabbinic one. Such an interpretation, while understandable, neglects other elements within these texts that suggest another origin, namely rites associated with hospitality.

Hospitality in the Old Testament. Hospitality has long been recognized as an important part of ancient Mediterranean culture[4] and was

[3] The number of New Testament commentaries that refer back to the Jewish explanation are too many to number here though this explanation can be found in commentaries a hundred years old to those that have been published within the past ten years. For a partial list see T.J. Rogers, "Shaking the Dust off the Markan Mission Discourse," in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27, no. 2 (2004): 169–192, particularly 180f. Some LDS commentaries have included this explanation in their own explanations, for instance see Hoyt W. Brewster, *Doctrine and Covenants Encyclopedia* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1988), 513: "Ancient missionaries shook the dust from their feet against those who rejected the gospel, for they 'were to be considered as pagans with whom the Jews held no social intercourse. Even the dust of their dwellings and their cities, was to be treated as defilement, necessitating a cleansing.'" Brewster is quoting directly from Hyrum M. Smith's and Janne M. Sjodahl's earlier commentary on the Doctrine and Covenants. *Doctrine and Covenants Commentary* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1923), 126).

[4] Robert Ignatius Letellier, *Day in Mamre, Night in Sodom: Abraham and Lot in Genesis 18 and 19*, Biblical Interpretation Series 10 (Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995), 155: "In nomadic societies of the ancient Middle East hospitality to a stranger was a sacred obligation, a manifestation of social graciousness that touches the deepest values . . . The guest is sacred and it is an honour to provide for him . . . Jewish theology developed the consciousness of hospitality providing the possibility of expiating sins (Barakhot 55a; Sanhedrin 103), a notion that Jesus himself touches on in the house of Simon." For more on ancient Near Eastern hospitality see, Andrew Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in its Mediterranean Setting* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005); Jean–Jacques Glassner, "L'hospitalité en Mésopotamie ancienne: aspect de la question de l'étranger," in *Zeitrschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archologie* 80, no. 1 (1990): 60–75; Michael Herzfeld, "'As in Your Own House': Hospitality, Ethnography, and the Stereotype of Mediterranean Society," in *Honour and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed.

the primary means by which the unknown and therefore dangerous outsider could be assimilated and rendered harmless.[5] In this process, the host and guest each had definable, if not always explicit, responsibilities to ensure that a productive social relationship was established.[6] Displayed in a number of ways (offering of meals, rest, and so forth), one of the rites associated with hospitality was the washing of the guest's feet.[7] The rite can be found throughout the Old Testament, one

---

David D. Gilmore (Washington D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987), 75–89; T.R. Hobbs, "Hospitality in the First Testament and the 'Teleological Fallacy'," in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 95, no. ???? (2001): 3–30; Scott Morschauser, "'Hospitality,' Hostiles and Hostages: On the Legal Background to Genesis 19.1–9," in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27, no. 4 (2003): 461–85; Robert C. Stallman, *Divine Hospitality in the Pentateuch: A Metaphorical Perspective on God as Host*, Ph.D. diss. for Westminster Theological Seminary, 1999, unpublished.

[5] Ancient hospitality from an ancient Near Eastern perspective differs from our modern understanding of hospitality. While we tend to associate hospitality with service, or selfless acts by one party, rendered because of the individual's moral or ethical stance, ancient hospitality required reciprocity between the two parties to transform the unknown and therefore dangerous into a recognizable and therefore controllable state. In other words, hospitality was not expected to be a selfless act on the part of the host, but a ritualized process by which the guest is introduced into the family structure and rendered harmless, subjugated to the authority of the host (for a greater critique of this principle see Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 1–4; see also T. R. Hobbs, "Hospitality in the First Testament").

[6] T. R. Hobbs, "Hospitality in the First Testament," 11: "As a guest, a stranger is in a liminal phase, and may infringe upon the guest/host relationship: by insulting the host through hostility or rivalry; by usurping the role of the host; by refusing what is offered. On the other hand, the host may infringe: by insulting the guest through hostility or rivalry; by neglecting to protect the guest and his/her honour; by failing to attend to one's guests, to grant precedence, to show concern." It should be pointed out that hospitality also played an important role in the Book of Mormon to facilitate movement from stranger to household member. In Alma 8, for instance, the hospitality displayed by Amulek as he "receives" Alma leads Alma to bless Amulek and his entire household and then remain in the household for days. This hospitality is later reciprocated when following their missionary labours in Ammonihah Alma takes Amulek into his own house (Alma 8:19–22; Alma 15:16–18).

[7] Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Social World of Ancient Israel: 1250–587 BCE* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 85: "In the world of the Bible, people would bathe their entire body, as well as simply

of the more well-known occurrences being Abraham's provisions of such for his unnamed guests as recorded in Genesis 18:4: "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree." While it is unclear whether Abraham or one of his servants did the washing, the verse suggests that it was the host's responsibility to provide both the space and means to wash the feet. A generation later, Abraham's servant is shown similar hospitality in Laban's household, including water to wash both his and his men's feet (see Genesis 24:32). In 1 Samuel, following the death of Nabal and David's request for Abigail's hand in marriage, Abigail offers to wash the feet of David's messengers upon their arrival (see 1 Samuel 25:41).

The Old Testament also contains examples of inhospitable behaviour. For instance, Abigail's hospitality contrasts, even reverses, the inhospitality proffered by her husband Nabal (see 1 Samuel 25:36–38). The book of Judges is replete with inhospitable acts from Jael's slaughter of Sisera (see 4:18–22), to Manoah's inability to recognize the value of his guest (see 13:8–23), to the cruel treatment inflicted upon the unnamed Levitical woman (see 19:14–30). Though only one of these examples mentions the washing of the guest's feet, the worsening inhospitality depicted within the book suggests that Israel's inhospitality is equated with its spiritual state.[8] Perhaps the most infamous example

---

wash their face, hands or feet. To some extent bathing and washing were understood as part of personal hygiene. Feet get dusty, so it was customary to provide water for guests to wash their own feet. But to a greater extent bathing and washing signified a change in social status. Hosts washed the feet of strangers to signify that they were now completely in the care and under the protection of their household."

[8] Jo Ann Hackett, "Violence and Women's Lives in the Book of Judges," *Interpretation* 58, no. 4 (2004): 356–64, 64: "The complex interweaving of these stories throughout the book of Judges argues for an underlying system of meaning that sees in women's bodies a substitute for a unified Israel." See also Athalya Brenner, "Introduction," in *Judges, A Feminist Companion to the Bible* 4 (2nd Series), ed. Athalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 13: "Violence against women is routinely considered or committed, probably as an extended hyperbole symbolic of the disintegrating social order." Many have noted the mistreatment as an essential part of the literary structure of the book, used to demonstrate the increasing depravity and lack of community experienced by Israel. See also Don Michael Hudson, "Living in a Land of Epithets: Anonymity in Judges 19–21," in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 49–66, who explores the growing anonymity of the characters,

of inhospitality and its negative consequences is the narrative in Genesis 19 of Lot, his guests, and his fellow townspeople. In this instance, Lot shows proper hospitality by providing water for the washing of feet, but the town asks for the guests to be delivered to them without promising the guests safety. As we shall see, this account plays an important role in the New Testament instructions.

HOSPITALITY, CHRIST'S TEACHINGS, AND DISCIPLESHIP

In the New Testament, rites of hospitality are often expressed in the teachings of Christ. Matthew 25 suggests that hospitality defined the true disciple of Christ: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory . . . then he shall sit. . . . Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father. . . . For I was hungered and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me" (Matthew 25:31–36).

The reader is told that though the true disciple may not have done these things to Christ directly, doing them for others is the same as doing them unto Christ: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (v. 40). Thus, via substitution, hospitality lies at the heart of the disciple's relationship with Christ.[9] As for those who do not demonstrate hospitality, Christ

---

specifically women, as the book progresses. As a literary technique used to further suggest Israel's disintegration as a society, "Anonymity gives the implicit impression that every individual within Israel was dangerous because every individual was doing right in his or her own eyes . . . by viewing the anonymity of the concubine the reader gets the impression that 'every' concubine from Dan to Beersheba could be raped, murdered and dismembered . . . the anonymity of the characters assumes and characterizes the universality of the wickedness of the abusers and the dismemberment of the victims in that society. Anonymity disintegrates individuality to depict universal dismemberment. . . . from the independent, powerful women in the beginning of the book (Achsah, Deborah) who participated in the division of the land and the protection of the tribes, the narrative has spiralled down to portray nameless women who are divided by the tribes" (60–1). See also Daniel I. Block, "Unspeakable Crimes: The Abuse of Women in the Book of Judges," in *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 2 (1998): 46–55.

[9] The relationship between substitution and hospitality is also found in 2 Samuel 10, with the death of the Ammonite king, in which David sends two

declares, "Depart from me, ye cursed. . . . For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink" (v. 41). The concept of reciprocity used here to describe the consequences of hospitable vs. inhospitable behaviour reflect the real–life effects of hospitality where reciprocity is the foundation of the guest–host relationship.[10]

---

servants as a sign of respect to the newly appointed king, Hanun. Upon their arrival, the counselors of the new king recommend ritually humiliating the messengers, which they do by shaving off half of their beards and cutting their clothing down to the waist and sending them away. David, upon hearing of humiliating inhospitality displayed, promptly gathers his army and marches to war soundly defeating the inhospitable Ammonites. In this case, the messengers are not individuals acting of their own accord but represent the one who sent them, and any action taken against them or on their behalf symbolically reflects on the sender, thus inhospitality against them is inhospitality against David. John T. Greene, *The Role of Messenger and Message in the Ancient Near East: Oral and Written Communication in the Ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Scriptures: Communications and Communiqués in Context*, Brown Judaic Studies 169 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 42: "messengers are 'extensions' of one's power and will." See also Susan Niditch, *"My Brother Esau is a Hairy Man": Hair and Identity in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 98: "The action of the Ammonites incenses King David, for the emissaries are an extension of his person and his power, and he goes to war and roundly defeats the Ammonites."

[10] Because of the social nature of ritual, reciprocity often plays an important role in ritual behaviour. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, revised ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 100–101: "Perhaps the most significant form of social interaction in the limited–good world of the first century is an informal principle of reciprocity, a sort of implicit, non–legal contractual obligation, unenforceable by any authority apart from one's sense of honour and shame . . . for example, the acceptance of an invitation to supper, of a small gift, or a benefaction like healing was equivalent to a positive challenge requiring a response. It signalled the start of an ongoing reciprocal relationship. To accept an invitation, a gift, or a benefaction with no thought to future reciprocity implies acceptance of imbalance in society." For more on the importance of reciprocity in the social kinship structure of Hellenistic Palestine see Seth Schwartz, *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010), and Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 17–20. In LDS ritual behaviour this can be seen for instance in rituals, both formal and informal. An example of formal reciprocity are those rituals associated with the temple; for an informal ritual tradition, the shaking of all the individuals' hands after having been confirmed, ordained, or set apart.

The sermon ends with reference to the extended hospitality to be offered to the righteous and the inhospitality that will be experienced by the wicked: "And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (Matthew 25:46). The preposition *into* (Greek preposition *eis*) suggests that *life eternal* is being used here not to describe a state of being, but a place, thus the righteous are invited into God's home by the gracious hospitality of God. The wicked, on the other hand, are to go away to another place, their inhospitality reflected in God's eschatological inhospitality.[11]

The hospitality rite of washing of feet played its greatest role in Christ's final series of teachings and reinforced the theme of divine hospitality found throughout. Immediately following the Last Supper, as recorded in John 13, Christ proceeds to wash the feet of his disciples. Upon reaching Peter, the Apostle challenges Christ's actions, first by expressing that he never wants Christ to wash and wipe his feet (see John 13:8). Importantly, Peter is not saying that he does not need his feet washed, only that he desires that Christ not be the one to do it. While the washing of feet is a sign of hospitality, in the Old Testament the guests themselves or perhaps the servants of the host wash the feet, not the hosts. In this light, it is more likely that Peter feels that Christ may be shaming himself by doing the act himself.[12]

[11] Hospitality may lie at the core of other principles in Christ's teachings. For example, in Matthew 7, the sequence of ask, seek, and knock ends with the promise that the one who knocks shall be answered, or in other words, received into the house. This perspective is further elucidated when the imagery of knocking is applied to Christ as the stranger as in Revelations 3:20 "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." In this reference the hospitality foundation is clear. Receiving Christ is actually inviting him into the home and providing a meal for him.

[12] The role of honour will not be discussed in any great detail here in this paper, but honour and shame are integral to the importance of hospitality. See Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: insights from cultural anthropology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 27–51. See also Herzfeld, "As in Your Own House," mentioned earlier. Herzfeld's piece is part of a larger collection of studies all concerning honour and shame in the Mediterranean culture.

Christ's response is that if the rite is not performed then Peter can have no part with him (see John 13:8).[13] Peter then exclaims that if this is the case, then Christ should wash not only his feet, but his hands and head as well (see John 13:9), the assumption being that if the washing of feet allows one to have "part" with Christ, then the washing of everything demonstrates Peter's full commitment.[14] Christ then tells Peter that if he had been washed in that manner then the purpose would have been to become clean, but purity was not the intent of this rite (see John 13:10). In fact, according to the Saviour, the majority of the disciples were already clean. Moreover, the text implies that he washes the feet of Judas who the author says is the one who is unclean. Thus the purpose of the rite is not solely to clean, and apparently not to purify, but it is associated with "having part with him."[15]

[13] The term here for "part" (*mēros*) can mean both a designated geographical area as well as a particular set of circumstances that defines a person at any one given time and as such is used at least once to refer to the place and state one experiences following judgment. See also Matthew 24:51; Luke 12:46, which translate meros as "portion."

[14] Arland J. Hultgren, "The Johannine Footwashing (13.1–11) as Symbol of Eschatological Hospitality," in *New Testament Studies* 28, no. 4 (1982): 539–546, 542–43: "It is clear that in the present text of the Fourth Gospel the footwashing has a soteriological significance (13.8b), and that being 'clean' (13.10–11) is a prerequisite for salvation. But it would be incorrect to conclude that the footwashing represents a form of cultic washing or purification." Christ himself suggests that the rite is not to be viewed as a rite of purity.

[15] The Joseph Smith translation includes the following conclusion to the verse: "Now this was the custom of the Jews under their law; wherefore, Jesus did this that the law might be fulfilled." This addition suggests that what Christ was doing was not unique but commonly recognized as part of the Law of Moses. Unfortunately, it is unclear which specific instruction found in the Law of Moses is being referenced or even which washing the commentary refers to (is it the washing of feet Christ is performing or the washing of hands and feet?). In Exodus 30:19–21, we are told that Aaron and his sons, as priests, are to wash hands and feet prior to service in the tabernacle so that they do not die. Yet other than this injunction to the priests, no mention is made of Israelites being required to wash feet outside of the norms of hospitality. In light of this, it is possible that the priestly injunction may also be referencing hospitality rites. The laver is consecrated unto God, even anointed by God's representative, and thus may represent the water the host provides for his guests.

Following the washing and wiping, Christ sits down again and asks, "Know ye what I have done to you?" (John 13:12). He then proceeds to answer providing the disciples with an understanding of the proper relationship between the master and the servant—the one sent and the sender. He does this by first acknowledging his role as master, declaring the correctness of calling him as such, and then stating that if he as Master washes their feet, then they should do likewise to each other. The reasoning is based on the fact that the "servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him" (v. 16). But this in turn reveals Christ's role as the Father's servant, thus he is not, ultimately, the host, but is instead the servant, at least in terms of hospitality, washing the feet of his Master's guests.

Using language similar to that found in the foot–dusting texts, Christ then teaches that whoever received the disciples received him. Though "receiving" is often understood to refer to the host's responsibilities, it may also refer to the responsibilities of the guest as he or she is to "receive" the host's hospitality. In this particular instance, the disciples are designated as guests, thus this hospitality rite acts as a sign of their "receiving" Christ. Yet, in his explanation, Christ also reinforces the substitution of disciple for Christ that we have seen earlier: "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me" (v. 20), which relies on the "receiving" responsibilities of the host. In other words, Christ also speaks to the disciples who will go out and seek to be received by others.

This back and forth of hospitality responsibilities is given one last twist as Christ then establishes: "he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" (v. 20). The anonymity of the one doing the "receiving" can now speak to both the missionary experience, as the disciple will represent Christ, and to the immediate situation of the Last Supper, in which Christ represents the Father.[16] Thus the rite becomes the means

[16] This may have had some impact on the later Greco–Roman convert who would have known the classic Greek narratives of gods visiting unawares. That these traditions were still known and believed is witnessed in Acts 14, where the city of Lycaonia mistook Barnabus and Paul to be Jupiter and Mercury (Zeus and Hermes), two Greek deities who were often found in disguise bestowing blessings on the hospitable and leaving curses behind on the inhospitable. For more see Adelbert Denaux, "The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)hospitality in Luke–Acts: Its Old Testament and Greco–Roman

to symbolize the role of hospitality in Christ's teachings concerning the Father and his kingdom, as well as the means to demonstrate one's "receiving" of Christ. The rite is then followed by an extended sermon in which Christ repeatedly speaks of the Father's kingdom and of his going to prepare God's abode for the guests. In John 14, for instance, Christ's promises that he was going to go before the disciples to prepare a place and "receive [them] unto [himself]; that where [he is], there [they] may be also." In fact, as one reviews John 13–17, hospitality and the attendant roles of guest, host, and servant act as a foundation to the entire discourse.[17]

Inhospitality and wiping dust off one's feet. In many ways, the rite of wiping dust off feet may be thought of as the reverse of the footwashing rite, utilizing the social institution of hospitality to provide the meaning behind the act.[18] At the heart of the rite is whether or not the missionaries are received (*dexomai*) by the household, village, or city to

---

Antecedents," in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 255–279.

[17] Even the commandment to love one another may reflect hospitality responsibilities. In Deuteronomy 10:18–19, Moses describes God as one who: "loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment." This image of God as the hospitable host here is the reason behind the commandment to Israel to love the stranger: "Love ye therefore the stranger; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." Back in John 13:34, the commandment to love one another is followed by Christ using himself as a template to demonstrate that love— "as I have loved you." If one equates demonstrating love through hospitality, as God himself does in Deuteronomy 10, then it is possible that the "as I have loved you" refers to the act of the feet washing, a rite that connotes acceptance and place within the household. In both cases, it is about accepting the other, the stranger, a lesson that the disciples will need to have learned and internalized approximately fifty days later.

[18] Andrew Skinner, *Gethsemane* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2001), 41: "Jesus instituted the ordinance of the washing of the feet as 'a holy and sacred rite, one performed by the saints in the seclusion of their temple sanctuaries,' according to Elder Bruce R. McConkie (Doctrinal New Testament Commentary, 1:708). It appears to be an ordinance of ultimate approbation by the Lord and, in a fascinating way, stands in direct contrast to the ordinance of wiping dust off the feet, which seems to be the ultimate earthly ordinance of condemnation by the Lord, performed only by his authorized servants."

which they are ministering.[19] Though the Greek term *dexomai* means in the most general sense "to receive" it was one of a constellation of terms used to describe Greco–Roman hospitality responsibilities, specifically the general responsibilities of the host "to receive" the guest, thereby taking care of their needs and providing them shelter. If the guest was sent by another and was therefore an emissary or ambassador, then reception could also include the message as well as the general needs.[20]

The instructions concerning the rite of wiping dust off the feet are part of a longer series of instructions concerning the hospitality offered to the disciple–missionary. Hospitality was to play a fundamental role in the missionary effort, as is witnessed by Christ's instructions that the missionary was to travel without money, extra clothes, and particularly provisions. Thus the missionary was entirely dependent upon the hospitality of strangers for sustenance. These injunctions were then followed by the responsibilities the missionary had as guest within the home. Both the Mark 6:8–11 and the Luke 9:3–5 instructions state that the disciple was to stay in the individual household that took them in until they left the place, and the Luke 10:2–11 instructions state explicitly that the missionary was to remain in the house, eating and drinking what was placed before them.

It is within this larger context of hospitality we are told that if the disciples were not received then the rite would be performed. While Matthew's version states that the rite can be performed against an individual house as well as the city (see Matthew 10:14), both Mark's and both of Luke's versions only mention performing the rite against the city in which the missionaries were not received. Unfortunately, even with the larger context of hospitality, it is unclear whether the rite was

[19] This Greek term is used throughout the Greco–Roman era and is recognized as one of the primary words used to describe hospitality, specifically the act of welcoming the guest into the home. See Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 54, 93, 130–131, 188. See also Denaux, "The Theme," 257: "According to Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida (*Greek–English Lexicon of the Greek New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, New York, 1988) the notions of 'visit', 'welcome, receive', and 'show hospitality', belong to the semantic domain of 'Association' . . . the notion of 'welcome, receive' can be expressed by . . . dexomai."

[20] The term is used throughout the letters of Paul and of the other apostles to describe their physical reception by the church communities as well as reception of the message (see Acts 2:17; 2 Corinthians 7:15; 11:4; Galatians 4:14; Philippians 4:18; Colossians 4:10; Hebrews 11:31; and 3 John 1:9–10).

given in response to a lack of physical hospitality, or to non–reception of the message. Matthew's and Mark's versions state that "whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words" shall be the recipient of the rite (Matthew 10:14; see Mark 6:11).[21] Whether hearing meant accepting and therefore receiving cannot be ascertained. Luke 9 merely mentions "whosoever will not receive you" will experience the rite, while Luke 10 states that rite is to be performed with the warning that the Kingdom of God was near, suggesting that the inhabitants had also forfeited their right to be a part of the kingdom when they refused to offer hospitality to the missionaries (Luke 9:5; see Luke 10:11).

In terms of the rite itself we know that it involves the removal of accumulated dirt from the feet, though it is not clear what exactly that entails. Three of the four Gospel texts use a form of the verb *tinassō*, which means to shake or brush. Matthew's account simply instructs the missionary to "shake off the dust of your feet" (Matthew 10:14). Similarly, the Luke 9 account mentions that it is the "very" dirt of the feet that is to be brushed off (v. 5). Mark's version recounts that it is the dirt on the soles of the feet that is to be brushed off (see Mark 6:11).

Unlike the above three references, the final one in Luke 10:10–11 describes the rite in a verbal declaration that the disciples are to say when they experience inhospitality: "But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the king-

[21]Speaking particularly of this ambiguity as found in Mark's text, T. J. Rogers states: "Some scholars have chosen to favour one part over the other...This bias toward one to the exclusion of the other is as unnecessary as it is undesirable. In all likelihood, these are not two separate types of rejection, but one and the same. For the evangelist there is no significant difference between refusing to offer hospitality and refusing to hear the gospel of Christ. But this functional similarity should not obscure the rhetorical distinction that accounts for the inclusion of the two parts. The rejection of hospitality is the focus, since it is mentioned prior to the reference to the refusal to hear the message. Also, the greater context of the passage, particularly the immediately preceding verse (6.10), which discusses hospitality explicitly, suggests where the evangelist's main concern lies" ("Shaking the Dust," 179). Unfortunately, he does not address the even more ambiguous texts of Luke, which say nothing of hearing the word at all.

dom of God is come nigh unto you." Here, the verb used to describe the rite is *apomassō*, which means to wipe off, but no mention is made of specifically of the feet, though the similarities between the rest of the Luke 10 text and the others seem clear. Assuming that Luke 10 understands that it is the feet that are wiped off, the rite, as described in the four gospel texts, appears to consist of removing the shoe and wiping or brushing the dirt from the feet, most probably the sole. In this, the rite functions like the hospitality rite of feet washing, as both are performed to remove the dirt that one acquired by travelling. Yet whereas the latter is offered by a gracious host to welcome one into the home (the receiving of the guest), the former is performed when one is openly rejected and the expected hospitality not offered.[22]

Significantly, none of the texts concerning the rite of wiping dust off one's feet mention water, which may emphasize the rite as a response to inhospitality. Because they were not received, they were not offered water for their feet and thus the traveller is forced to clean their own feet without water. In this light, the positive reciprocity that one would expect from normal hospitality, including a blessing pronounced on the house by the guest, is inverted by performing the act outside of the proper setting of the home; thus negative reciprocity results as the inhospitality is returned in the form of a curse, by a rite that should have led to a blessing, but which now leads to condemnation.[23]

---

[22] Rogers, "Shaking the Dust," 182, again using the Markan text states: "the dust–shaking serves as a testimony, as evidence that hospitality had not been offered. Had the twelve entered the town and been extended hospitality, as v. 10 [Mark 6:10] directs, they would have been admitted into a house and their feet would have been washed according to custom. Thus, they would have been without dust on their feet to shake. However, any town not offering hospitality would likewise not wash the feet of the apostles. Accordingly, upon leaving, their feet would remain soiled from the dust of the road, which, when shaken off, serves as evidence that hospitality was not offered. Thematically, this solution fits the best of any hitherto proposed. The preceding context sets up the mission as one that requires hospitality as a factor for success (vv. 8–9), and then explicitly presents this arrangement in the imperative (v.10). Following this, the protasis of v. 11 introduces a condition where the twelve are refused hospitality. In natural thematic sequence, the apodosis too should pertain to matters of hospitality, specifically the consequence of refusing to offer it."

[23] The same pattern can be seen in the ritual of the Latter–day Saint sacrament, which may also be seen through the lens of hospitality. In 1 Corinthians 11:29,

That the rite may be associated with inhospitality is also reflected in the association of the city or household against which the rite is performed with Sodom and Gomorrah. Alluded to as the paradigmatical example of divine retribution, the destruction of these two cities was explained in later literature as the result of their hostility instead of hospitality towards Lot's guests.[24]

While the apparent focus of the Sodom and Gomorrah account is the perverse sexuality threatened by the townspeople, the sexual violence may be understood as the manner by which the inhospitality took expression.[25] Thus, by associating the town or household that

---

Paul states that one who "eateth and drinketh unworthily" will "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Similarly, when instituting the sacrament in the New World, Christ himself warns of partaking of the sacrament unworthily: "And now behold, this is the commandment which I give unto you, that ye shall not suffer any one knowingly to partake of my flesh and blood unworthily, when ye shall minister it; For whoso eateth and drinketh my flesh and blood unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to his soul" (3 Nephi18:28–29). The angel who spoke to King Benjamin associated drinking damnation with partaking of the cup of the wrath of God, thus the sacrament is either a rite in which one may attain a spiritual state in which the Spirit is always present or one in which the drink becomes the cup of God's wrath.

[24] See Ezekiel 16:49. See also Weston W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 231 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 158: "From the evaluation of Sodom as the prototype of divine judgment it follows that the actions of the Sodomites are archetypical instances of wickedness, especially with reference to (a) overbearing arrogance, inhospitality, and lack of compassion for the socially weak and disadvantaged."

[25] Robert Ignatius Letellier, *Day in Mamre,* 158: "The violation of social norms in the attack on Lot's house and the integrity of his guests (with the intended sexual violation of course inflaming the situation) is already a radical disruption of order in the social fabric. . . . The nature and limits of the rights of sojourners in the ancient Orient are still not well understood, but H. Brunner has pointed out by reference to Ch. 22 of the Insinger Papyrus of the Ptolomaic period that these rights in Egypt could be frighteningly fragile. A sojourner could expect to be roughly received by the local populace, could be cursed, and rejected, even subjected to the 'crime of women' (Egyp. *btw n shnt*) which means the crime of violating a man as if he was a woman (ie. sodomy) for which no redress was possible." In these circumstances, both the violation and the homosexual nature of the rape become less sexual sins per se as manifesta-

does not "receive" Jesus' disciples with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the rite of wiping dust off feet as a response to inhospitality is further emphasized.

Of course, one of the challenges to these texts is that they do not describe any actual ritual performance. Instead they are what can be called prescriptive texts prescribing what should happen, not necessarily what did happen in reality.[26] Of greater value to understanding how ritual affected the given society are those ritual texts that can be called descriptive texts because they describe what actually happens in the ritual experience.[27] Acts 13:50–51 is the only descriptive text that we

---

tions of social violence and hatred in which a helpless traveller is brutalized by a local community in a gratuitous act of rejection and humiliation." See also, J. A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, early Jewish and early Christian Traditions* (Kampen, the Netherlands: J. H. Kok Publishing House, 1990), 37: "The fact that Lot is prepared to surrender his virgin daughters rather than his guests to the lust of the mob suggest that the emphasis is on the social aspect of their sin and not on the sexual aspect itself . . . The Sodomites are engaging in an anti–social act of violence and oppression. It is not for nothing that this is expressed in the motif of perverse sex. This is not only to show that the Sodomites wanted to 'humiliate' and 'demasculinize' the guests. The Sodomites make natural intercourse impossible by violating the social fibre of the community as represented by the motif of hospitality." Demasculinization and inhospitality are also related in the narrative concerning David's envoys to the Ammonites, see Niditch, *My Brother Esau*, 98: "The shaved beard and the ripped robe are potent symbols; the Israelites will not allow themselves to be unmannered or overpowered; that they are mere women is, on the other hand, precisely the message that the ill–fated Ammonites sought to send."

[26] Prescriptive texts are numerous in the scriptures. Most of the book of Leviticus, for instance, is made up of prescriptive texts. Though highly detailed, Leviticus 1 does not detail how bloody or messy the rite of animal sacrifice is, nor does it detail how long before the items begin to decay, and so forth. Prescriptive texts are difficult to interpret as they more often reflect the ideal of the writers or redactors and not necessarily the manner in which the society in question actually practiced or understood the ritual. For this, descriptive texts are helpful in determining meaning as we see the rituals put into actual, historical practice. An example of the difference between the two types is Leviticus 1–8 (prescriptive) and Leviticus 9 (descriptive).

[27] Ritual can actually be described textually as one of three types: 1) prescriptive, or an idealized description of prescribed ritual behaviour, 2) descriptive, or a description of an actual ritual event, and 3) a fictional passage describing a

have for our rite in the canon. In the passage we are told that Paul and Barnabas are expelled from the city of Antioch in Pisidia by the city leadership whereupon: "they shook off the dust of their feet against them." Unfortunately, the text is rather sparse, but what we do have suggests that inhospitality is the primary reason for the performance of the rite. Though this is not the only city in which Paul and his companions experienced persecution, it is the only city recorded in Acts to have officially expelled them from its environs. Thus, in Antioch of Pisidia, the two were not received and therefore performed the rite of the wiping dust off the feet.

In summary, shaking or wiping dust off the feet, as recorded in the New Testament, appears to be a rite that fit within a cultural continuum of hospitality and its attendant rites, particularly the washing of feet. It was performed in response to inhospitable behaviour exhibited by the inhabitants of a city or household, described as those who do not "receive" the missionary disciple, which reception may have included at least listening to the message proffered. Because they have not been offered the opportunity to wash their feet as expected, the offended disciples were to respond to this inhospitality by wiping off their own feet without water.[28] The consequences of this act were left unsaid, though the warning that those who had the rite performed against them were to experience a worse judgment than even Sodom and Gomorrah

---

non–real ritual event. While the third textual type is not often found in the scriptures we will encounter this form later on in the paper.

[28] Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 140, 143: "Inhospitality shown to the travelling apostles appears to represent both a moral lapse as well as a rejection of the message and ministry of Jesus. These apostles are functioning as emissaries of Jesus. They carry out their mission by the authority and power that Jesus grants to them. Thus, when potential hosts reject these men, they are simultaneously rejecting the one who sent them as well as the message they bring. The rejection of Jesus, his apostles, his message, and his ministry, then function as a testimony against these inhospitable people. When Jesus' apostles experience rejection and inhospitality, they are supposed to wipe the very dust off their feet that should have been washed off if their potential hosts had taken the appropriate actions and made sure the travelers' feet were washed (9.5). . . . Jesus instructs his disciples to protest a community's inhospitality in the city streets by wiping the dust from their feet that would have accumulated during their travels. At that point, the dust functions as evidence that the townspeople have not acted properly. If they had properly received Jesus' disciples, the townspeople would have washed this dust off of their guest's feet."

in the Day of Judgment, two cities recognized for their inhospitality, is found in three of the four texts.

WIPING DUST OFF FEET IN THE DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS

Approximately two thousand years later, the rite of dusting off one's feet again appears, this time in the context of latter–day missionary work as found in the Doctrine and Covenants where five prescriptive texts concerning the rite are found. Unlike the New Testament texts, these do not provide different accounts of the same instruction, but instead are given over a two year period five different times. As we shall see, the texts demonstrate an evolving understanding of the rite and its significance.

Section 24:15. The first of these texts is in section 24 as part of the instructions given to Oliver Cowdery in July 1830 before he began his missionary work. Following reassurances that miracles similar to those promised to the New Testament missionaries would occur for him as well, Oliver is told: "And in whatsoever place ye shall enter, and they receive you not in my name, ye shall leave a cursing instead of a blessing, by casting off the dust of your feet against them as a testimony, and cleansing your feet by the wayside" (v. 15).

The similarities between this rite and the New Testament version are apparent: both incorporate inhospitality terminology ("receive you not") and both are performed with the removal of dust from the feet. But there are also intriguing differences. The first is the manner in which the missionary was to be received. None of the New Testament texts speak of reception needing to be in the name of Christ. This distinction might be a reflection of changes to the nature and practice of hospitality as well as the understanding as to what hospitality was. It is safe to say that certain elements of ancient Near Eastern hospitality would no longer be significant in the same manner they would have been in the past; for instance the washing of the guest's feet is not as commonplace in 1830 as it was in biblical times. Moreover, hospitality was now understood to have been one of the primary characteristics of true Christian living.[29] Though this may seem to be no different than

[29] Christian hospitality is still a subject of interest today. For more on this subject see John Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as*

the expectation of hospitality in the ancient world, the near universal recognition of Christianity among the Western world would have implications if one were to ask for reception in the name of Christ.

The reference also establishes the rite as a mechanism to cursing. Though cursing is found throughout the scriptures, it is unclear what exactly cursing entails or what is involved in bringing a curse about. It is often associated with the sealing power, subordinated under the general principle that whatsoever one seals on earth is sealed in heaven.[30] Moreover, as one reviews those scriptures that speak of cursing, the principle generally relates to the consequences that result from covenant breaking in which an individual is beset by afflictions or adversities that restrict their general prosperity.[31] Richard Draper has posited that this is ultimately done not through any explicit divine action, but by divine withdrawal from a given society.[32] In other words,

---

Promise and Mission (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Thomas W. Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger: Dimensions of Moral Understanding* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Luke Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness amid Moral Diversity* (Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006); and Arthur Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger: A Christian Theology of Hospitality* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006).

[30] Doctrine and Covenants 132:46–47: "And verily, verily, I say unto you, that whatsoever you seal on earth shall be sealed in heaven; and whatsoever you bind on earth, in my name and by my word, saith the Lord, it shall be eternally bound in the heavens; and whosesoever sins you remit on earth shall be remitted eternally in the heavens; and whosesoever sins you retain on earth shall be retained in heaven. And again, verily I say, whomsoever you bless I will bless, and whomsoever you curse I will curse, saith the Lord; for I, the Lord, am thy God."

[31] Another definition is that of Gregory A. Prince, *Power From On High: The Development of Mormon Priesthood* (Salt Lake City: Signature Press, 1995), 107–108: "Not to be confused with profanity, the ordinance of cursing consisted of a formal act with the intent of causing an adverse effect on an individual or group."

[32] Richard D. Draper, "*Hubris* and *Ate*: A Latter Day Warning From the Book of Mormon," in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 3, no. 2 (1994): 12–33, 22: "Both the Old and New Testaments testify to the reality and power of God's curse. Do not be misled into thinking a curse is something that it is not. Too often a cursing is seen as activating some kind of destructive force—some hex, spell, or enchantment which, by virtue of a supernatural nexus of operation, brings harm to its recipient. Nothing could be further from the truth. A "curse" denotes something delivered up to divine wrath and dedicated to de-

God's curse is ultimately separating himself from interaction with the offender. If such meaning is applied to this rite, the ritual is then one of separation in which the offending lack of hospitality will lead to separation from God.

Finally, the rite now appears to include a second step of "cleansing [one's] feet by the wayside" after one has already cast off the dust. What "cleansing" means is unclear, though, as we shall see, the other Doctrine and Covenants texts speak of the washing of one's feet as part of the overall ritual process associated with the wiping the dust off one's feet. We have already seen that washing is not found in the New Testament texts, perhaps intentionally to highlight the inhospitality of the household or city. While washing would fulfil the purpose of removing the dirt, it also creates ritual ambiguity in that washing often carries the connotation of moral or ethical cleansing, an aspect of the rite that appears to be missing from the New Testament form.

Section 60:15. The second reference to dusting off one's feet was delivered to the elders of the Church a little over a year (August 8, 1831) after the revelation to Oliver Cowdery: "And shake off the dust of thy feet against those who receive thee not, not in their presence, lest thou provoke them, but in secret; and wash thy feet, as a testimony against them in the day of judgment." Like the section 24 text, this also includes allusions to the New Testament texts, including the performance of the rite against those "who receive thee not" and the eschatological consequences that result for those who do not. Yet there is also material not found in either the section 24:15 text or the New Testament texts, in particular, the explicit emphasis on the private nature of the rite's performance.

The instructions suggest that the rite be performed in secret "lest thou provoke" the recipients, a concern not found in the New Testament texts. The difference may again be a result of cultural change. It is possible that in Judea the act would not have offended as much as shamed the community, hospitality being part of a larger social structure involving shame and honour. This social dynamic, while present to some degree, did not have the same importance in early modern

---

struction . . . God's curse does not consist of divine action but rather of divine inaction. When a people sin to the point that judgment must come, destruction results; but it comes because of the removal of God's Spirit, prophets, and restraining hand."

western culture. Moreover, it is possible that because of the general Christian environment, performance of the act was perceived through the lens of the New Testament and therefore the negative valence was recognized, thus importance of performing it in secret.

Of course, this brings up the question as to whom the rite is for. Presumably it is an indictment against the one who had not "received" the missionary. Yet if the individual does not witness the act, then the purpose of the rite is essentially for the one performing the rite. This perspective gains further strength when one recognizes that the instruction divorces the performance from detrimental emotional responses on the part of the performers by implying a period of time between the initial encounter and the performance itself. Thus this new set of instructions may have had the intent of limiting the frequency of performance, by suggesting a "cooling off" period from the immediate emotional response to the offense.

Section 75:19–22. Five months later, in January of 1832, in a set of general instructions to missionaries we are told: "In whatsoever house ye enter, and they receive you, leave your blessing upon that house. And in whatsoever house ye enter, and they receive you not, ye shall depart speedily from that house, and shake off the dust of your feet as a testimony against them. And you shall be filled joy and gladness; and know this, that in the day of judgment you shall be judges of that house, and condemn them; and it shall be more tolerable for the heathen in the day of judgment for that house."

Like other instructions in the Doctrine and Covenants, this one again addresses non–reception, but unlike the other two also includes instructions concerning reception, specifically that the missionaries leave a blessing on the house that does receive them, instruction similar to that found in the Matthean and Luke 10 references.[33] The consequences are again to be experienced at the Day of Judgment.

The text also expands on the responsibilities of the performer addressed in the section 60 text, as the reader is now told that the missionary was to leave the situation "speedily," perhaps to avoid escalation

[33] Yet even this similarity differs slightly. The Lukan text suggests that a blessing was to be placed on the house upon entrance and before other hospitality elements were experienced, not after the reception has been provided.

and potential violence between the missionary and the offender. Yet the quick response allows for the potential of a hasty decision on the part of the missionary, meaning that while they may have been physically separated from the scene, if they interpreted "speedily" to mean a small probationary time between the encounter and the performance of the rite, it was possible that the wrong decision may have been made. The negative potential for a quick response is tempered by the next set of instruction, which lays out the responsibility of the performer. We are told that the performer was also required to judge the household at the Day of Judgment. Thus, the rite no longer witnesses against others in terms of their salvation, but one that has bearing on the missionaries own eternal responsibilities. This understanding has the potential of instilling within the missionary reluctance toward frequent performance, relegating the rite to occasional use.

Though we are not told the specific consequences of the condemnation, we are told that those condemned will be worse off than the heathen, who have displaced Sodom and Gomorrah as the object of comparison.[34] Alluding to the heathen, who were understood as those who were not Christian, instead of Sodom and Gomorrah, suggests that "receiving" was now understood primarily in terms of message and not hospitality.

Most important, we are told that when performed properly, the performer should experience joy and gladness. These two positive emotional results are found elsewhere in the scriptures often denoting the emotional state of the righteous, particularly in their praise of God's delivering power and presence and can be contrasted with negative emotional responses such as a sense of vindication or satisfaction of vengeance; if the latter are experienced then one can expect the rite has failed.[35] Again, this suggests that the focus of the rite is no longer on the household or city but on the missionary himself.

[34] The term "heathen" shows up three times in the Doctrine and Covenants (45:54; 75:22; 90:10). In all three references, the term appears to refer to those who do not possess the Gospel message. In the 1800s the term also connoted non–Christians. Whether or not the term as used in all of the Doctrine and Covenants texts should be understood in this manner is unclear.

[35] For more on ritual failure see When Rituals go Wrong: Mistakes, Failure, and the Dynamics of Ritual, ed. by Ute Hüsken (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007)

Section 84:88–93. The fourth passage is found in section 84:88–93 and is itself part of a larger passage concerning missionary work:

> And whoso receiveth you, therefore I will be also, for I will go before your face. I will be on your right hand and on your left, and my Spirit shall be in your hearts, and mine angels round about you, to bear you up.
>
> Whoso receiveth you receiveth me; and same will feed you, and clothe you, and give you money.
>
> And he who feeds you, or clothes you, or gives you money, shall in nowise lose his reward.
>
> And he that doeth not these things is not my disciple; by this you may know my disciples.
>
> He that receiveth you not, go away from him alone by yourselves, and cleanse your feet even with water, pure water, whether in heat or in cold, and bear testimony of it unto your Father which is in heaven, and return not again unto that man.
>
> And in whatsoever village or city ye enter, do likewise.
>
> Nevertheless, search diligently and spare not; and wo unto that house, or that village, or city that rejecteth you, or your words, or your testimony concerning me.

This is the most detailed of all the prescriptive ritual texts, both in the New Testament and Doctrine and Covenants, concerning the rite of wiping dust off the feet and is the only Doctrine and Covenants text that explicitly substitutes the performer for Christ himself ("whoso receiveth you receiveth me").[36] Moreover, the "receiving" is explicitly

---

and Ronald Grimes, Ritual Criticism: Case Studies in Its Practice, Essays on Its Theory (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990), 199–205.

[36] The principle of receiving Christ is found throughout the Doctrine and Covenants, many of them incorporating entrance imagery. For instance, in section 132 we are told: "For strait is the gate, and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and continuation of the lives, and few there be that find it, because ye receive me not in the world neither do ye know me. But if ye receive me in the world, then shall ye know me, and shall receive your exaltation; that where I am ye shall be also" (21–23).

associated with specific hospitality responsibilities: feeding the guest, providing clothing for the guest, and providing funds, reminiscent of the responsibilities outlined in Christ's sermon recorded in Matthew 25 describing the hospitable nature of the true Christian disciple.

Yet, for all of its detail, this entire passage reveals one of the more frustrating elements of studying ritual. While there is greater detail in places, the text is opaque in others making it difficult to discern the full–ritualized environment. For instance, unlike the other Doctrine and Covenants texts, there is no mention of shaking the dust off the feet; instead we are provided with much greater detail concerning the act as a washing. Specifically, though the temperature does not seem to be a factor, we are told the water must be pure, suggesting running water rather than standing water. Coupled with the verb *cleanse*, the use of pure water suggests a rite of purification, but from what the missionary needed to be purified is not mentioned nor is that verb even employed in the text. Thus, while the detail suggests that the instruction is significant, the reason for the significance is not explained.

Another unique feature of this text is that it separates the testimonial from the physical act by stating that one is to wash his feet and then "bear testimony of it unto your Father." This change in the rite's structure is notable in that it makes the act repetitious, the verbal element performing the same purpose as the physical element. As with other modern innovations to the rite, the redundant nature of these two elements may point to a loss of the original symbolism, as those from the New Testament time period would have simply understood the inherent symbolic nature of the act. [37]

[37] Ritual often has built–in redundancy, part of which has to do with the inherent danger of ritual situations. Because ritual plays a functional role in establishing, maintaining or dissolving social relations, ritualized environments are often characterized by the loosening of social boundaries, which may result in inappropriate behaviour and violation of social norms, thus the purpose of the ritual or its meaning is repeated in various ways within the ritual experience. For example, the dedication of the tabernacle, as described in Exodus 40, is reinforced not only in a series of physical acts (the washing and anointing and offering of sacrifice as found in 1–11, Leviticus 9), but also in the clothing itself and in changes of scent from one state to another (. All of these have the same general purpose, to denote the transforming nature of the tabernacle (see Exodus.

Finally, this text states that once this rite has been performed the performer is never to return to that the household or city again. This suggests that the community against which the rite has been performed has forfeited the opportunity for future salvation, a sobering consequence which furthers the increasing sense of responsibility placed on the performer that the former Doctrine and Covenants texts had begun to establish and which may also suggest that the rite was to be only used after all other options have failed.

As if to emphasize this last principle, the passage ends with the injunction to "search diligently and spare not", followed by a woe declaration on those who "rejecteth you, or your words, or your testimony concerning me." While this last clause may be referring to the rite in question, it appears that the subject has now become more generalized, the reception referring to the overall gospel message, and not specific rites of hospitality, a development in the rite that we have seen in earlier references. This seems more likely as one continues through the section, for those that do reject the message will be scourged for their wickedness and taken from the face of the earth.

Section 99:4. The last reference recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants concerning this rite was recorded in August of 1832; John Murdock is told prior to missionary labours that: "[And] whoso rejecteth you shall be rejected of my Father and his house; and you shall cleanse your feet in the secret places by the way for a testimony against them." Though small in comparison to section 84, this passage is the most explicit concerning the reciprocal inhospitality that the rite implies in the New Testament.[38] As the passage makes clear, rejection of the messenger will led to rejection by the Father and his household; in other words, the offender will experience divine inhospitality for their own rejection of the his messengers.[39] Unfortunately, it is unclear as to

[38] Intriguingly the verb "reject" now takes the place of "receive" as found in all the other references, both in the Doctrine and Covenants and New Testament.

[39]Throughout the scriptures, the term house is used to describe both the physical building in which people live and the household, which includes the genetic relations and servants who reside within. As such it becomes a term used to describe the entire family structure of tribes, such that we can speak of the house of Judah, house of David, and house of Israel. Though the terms God and house together usually describe the temple, there are a few references in which God and house refer to the social setting; for instance, in 1 Timothy

what "rejected" here refers. If one takes the perspective of the New Testament texts, then the rejection carries the primary nuance of hospitality; if taken from the perspective of the other Doctrine and Covenants texts, then the rejection appears to be the gospel message itself, and of course this is complicated by the fact that there appears to be overlap between the two anyway. As to the rite itself, little is mentioned that hasn't been already discussed. Again, the rite is described as a cleansing of the feet, which assumes a washing but is not explicitly described as such and the injunction to do this in secret has been noted already.

Joseph Smith's 1835 Letter to the Elders. Beyond these five references in the Doctrine and Covenants, there are no other canonical texts that mention the rite in the modern era. But there is at least one prescriptive text found in the writings of Joseph Smith which adds to our understanding of the rite. In a letter delivered to the elders of the Church in November 1835, Joseph described the responsibilities the missionary had in certain socio–cultural relations, such as the parent/child, husband/wife, master/slave/servant:

3:15, we are told that the house of God is "the church of the living God." In 1 Peter 2:5, it is worthy priesthood holders who are a "spiritual house"; later in the letter Peter tells us that judgment: "must begin at the house of God (4:17)" or the sacred society of the church. In Doctrine and Covenants 85:7, we are told of one "mighty and strong" who will "set in order the house of God" and "arrange by lot the inheritances of the saints." In all of these, it is the house as social unit and not house as physical structure that in discussed. In Section 130:2, we are informed, "the same sociality that exists here exists there only coupled with eternal glory." In light of the dual use of "house" Doctrine and Covenants 132:18 and its mention of the "house of order" may refer to house as social unit, in that the entire verse describes those who are to be received or not received. Moreover, it is the relationship between mortals and the gods and angels that is the focus, not a building. God's household is one of order, thus the one who does not approach the proper way cannot be received either by him or the other members of the household. Finally, because the house of God is described as one of order, the theme of divine hospitality also fits within another prevalent biblical theme, that of cosmos vs. chaos. For more on the house as social unit see David J. Schloen, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*, Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant 2 (Winona Lake, IN: (Eisenbrauns, 2001).

> It should be the duty of elders, when they enter into any house, to let their labours and warning voice, be unto the master of that house: and if he receive the gospel, then he may extend his influence to his wife also, with consent, that peradventure she may receive the gospel; but if a man receive not the gospel, but gives his consent that his wife may receive it, and she believes, then let her receive it. But if the man forbid his wife, or his children before they are of age, to receive the gospel, then it should be the duty of the elder to go his way and use no influence against him: and let the responsibility be upon his head—shake off the dust of thy feet as a testimony against him, and thy skirts shall then be clear of their souls. Their sins are not to be answered upon such as God hath sent to warn them to flee the wrath to come, and save themselves from this untoward generation. . . . It should be the duty of an elder, when he enters into a house to salute the master of that house, and if he gain his consent, then he may preach to all that are in that house, but if he gain not his consent, let him go not unto his slaves or servants, but let the responsibility be upon the head of the master of that house, and the consequences thereof; and the guilt of that house is no longer upon thy skirts: Thou art free; therefore, shake off the dust of thy feet, and go thy way.[40]

As one can see, this text points to a number of ways in which the rite had changed from the New Testament version not the least of which is that reception of the missionary is in no way tied to hospitality. Whereas in the Doctrine and Covenants texts the reader is unsure exactly what is meant by "receive," in the letter reception is tied directly to receiving the gospel message. We are also told that the performance of the rite displaces the missionary's responsibility toward the household, thus if the man of the house refuses to let the other members of the

[40] Joseph Smith, "Letter to the Elders of the Church," *Messenger and Advocate* 2 (Nov 1835): 209–212; *History of the Church*, 2:259–264. This letter is often quoted as it explains well the responsibilities of missionaries, but intriguingly, the paragraph concerning the rite is often left out. For example, it is missing in both Alma P. Burton's *Discourses of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1977) and Donald Q. Cannon, Larry Dahl, *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997).

household "receive" the gospel, then the missionary is to leave, shake the dust as a testimony against him (the father), and in so doing, the missionary is no longer responsible for the spiritual welfare of the house. Moreover, the rite of wiping dust off the feet is associated with another similar rite, that of shaking one's clothing, a purification ritual.

Shaking versus wiping. Because Joseph associates the rite of wiping dust off one's feet with the rite of shaking one's clothing, it may help to review briefly the rite of shaking one's clothing historically and see if the parallel exists anciently as well. Like texts for the wiping dust off one's feet, canonical texts concerning the shaking of clothing are few in number, though intriguingly, there are no prescriptive texts, only descriptive ones. In those instances where one shook one's clothing, hospitality does not seem to be at issue, but instead becoming clean from the sins of the offender is apparently the purpose. The only biblical text describing the shaking of clothing is in Acts 18, when, during a confrontation with a group of blasphemous Jews, Paul shook his raiment and said unto them, "your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean and will henceforth go unto the Gentiles" (Acts 18:6).

In terms of comparison, while this rite signifies separation from the performer and the offender, as the rite of wiping dust off feet does, there is no terminology suggesting that reception, or hospitality, is at issue. Instead, the act exemplifies Paul's claim that he is clean from the blood of the assembly similar to purpose behind the removal of the clothing by those who stoned Stephen as described in Acts 7. In both cases, it appears that the rite of taking off and shaking the cloak or clothing represents a separation on the part of the performer from liability of the offense (coincidently, blasphemy in both events). [41]

Jacob in the Book of Mormon gives us perhaps the most details concerning the rite of shaking of clothing as the record suggests he performed this rite repeatedly. The first reference is in 2 Nephi 9:44, where

[41] The association of blood and sin is of course an old one stemming from the Garden of Eden account. The equating of clothing with one's moral status is also an old one beginning in the garden. Moreover, the association of clothing with accountability is one found elsewhere as well, see Acts 22:22–23, where, following Paul's recounting of his vision, the audience: "then lifted their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live. And as they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air."

the rite's performance does not appear to be associated with any antagonism to the message or inhospitality experienced by the prophet: "Remember my words, behold I take off my garments, and I shake them before you…wherefore, ye shall know at the last day, when all men shall be judged of their works, that the God of Israel did witness that I shook your iniquities from my soul, and that I stand with brightness before him, and am rid of your blood." Though the overall theme of his message is one of hope and security, Jacob explicitly states that his performing of the rite is to act as a witness that he is no longer to be held accountable for his audience's "blood," or in other words, their spiritual welfare concerning the message.

Later, in his own book, Jacob stated that he and the other leaders of the Church "did magnify our office unto the Lord, taking upon us the responsibility, answering the sins of the people upon our own heads if we did not teach them the word of God with all diligence; wherefore, by labouring with our might their blood might not come upon our garments, and we would not be found spotless at the last day" (Jacob 1:19). As before, Jacob expresses his concern for the sins of the people and particularly that he will be held accountable, as symbolized by their blood on his clothes. Finally, at the beginning of his temple discourse recorded in Jacob 2–3, Jacob states, "To magnify mine office with soberness, and that I might rid my garments of your sins, I come up into the temple this day that I might declare unto you the word of God" (Jacob 2:2). Like the preceding verse, it is unknown whether the rite was actually performed, but it is alluded to with the mention of ridding his garments of the people's sins, effectively demonstrating that Jacob's intended purpose is to not be held accountable for the sins of his people.

In all four references just cited, the rite of shaking one's garment is entirely concerned with the participant's personal accountability as the audience's spiritual leader. In these cases, once the prophet has fulfilled their responsibility of declaring God's word the rite of shaking the clothing becomes a witness that they are clean of any consequences if the particular instruction is not kept. Only in the Pauline account is there any indication that the audience is antagonistic to the prophetic message, in fact it is entirely possible that Jacob's audience not only received the warning, but changed their own behaviour accordingly. At any rate, it is clear that historically, (in)hospitality has nothing to do with this rite, thus the practice of shaking off one's cloth-

ing is, at least canonically, practically and ritualistically distinct from wiping dust off one's feet.[42]

Yet, in Joseph's letter to the elders elements of the shaking of clothing and wiping dust off the feet have clearly overlapped. The amalgamation of the two may reflect the changing perspective as to the purpose of wiping dust off one's feet. First, as the letter demonstrates, hospitality is no longer the implied meaning when one speaks of "receiving" the missionaries, instead reception means accepting the gospel message. Second, in the Doctrine and Covenants texts one can trace a change in the focus of the rite from the offender to the performer, particularly in those texts that developed the missionary's responsibility concerning the rite. Thus the rite of wiping dust off one's feet was performed when the missionaries felt they had fulfilled to the best of their abilities the stewardship to deliver the message, a rite that is now functionally equivalent to the shaking of one's clothing.[43]

---

[42] Many LDS commentaries include Nehemiah 5:12–13 as a text describing the shaking of clothing. Yet the context of the Nehemiah passage makes clear the purpose that his particular performance is not the same as that of Jacob's or Paul's shaking. Nehemiah's performance is similar to treaty oaths found elsewhere: "Then I called the priests, and took an oath of them, that they should do according to this promise. Also, I shook my lap, and said, So God shake out every man from his house, and from his labour, that performeth not this promise, even thus be he shaken out, and emptied." As this text demonstrates Nehemiah is not symbolically making himself clean of their sins but establishing divine retribution if they do not live up to their oath. The distinction between purpose or function and form is an important one for those who study ritual because many rites may appear similar to one another and yet have completely different meanings, like shaking and dusting. For more on treaty curses see Delbert R. Hillers, *Treaty–Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964).

[43] There is no official record that indicates the rite of shaking one's garments has been practiced in this dispensation. There is mention of its performance by Parley P. Pratt as a missionary according to the journal of Ashbel Kitchell, a Shaker elder (the following keeps the original spelling and grammar): "We continued on friendly terms in the way of trade and other acts of good neighborship until the spring of 1831 when we were visited on Saturday evening by Sidney Rigdon and Leman Copley, the latter of whom had been among us; but no likeing the cross any to well, had taken up with Mormonism as the easier plan and had been appointed by them as one of the missionaries to convert us. They tarried all night, and in the course of the evening, the doctrines of the

Nineteenth-Century Performances of Wiping Dust off the Feet

In terms of descriptive texts, unlike the scriptural canon, we have a number of personal journals from nineteenth-century mission-

---

cross and the Mormon faith were both investigated; and we found that the life of ~~Christ~~ self-denial corresponded better with the life of Christ, than Mormonism...Sabbath morning matters moved on pleasantly in sociable chat with the Brethren, until I felt to give them all some council, which was for neither to force their doctrine on the other at this time; but let the time be spent in feeling the Spirit, as it was Rigdon's first visit... A little before meeting, another one came from the Mormon camp as an assistant, by the name of Parley Pratt. He called them out, and enquired [sic] how they had got along? and was informed by Rigdon and Leman, that I had bound them to silence, and nothing could be done. Parley told them to pay no attention to me, for they had come with the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the people must hear it, &c. They came into meeting and sat quietly until the meeting was through, and the people dismissed; when Sidney Ridgon arose and stated that he had a message from the Lord Jesus Christ to this people; could he have the privilege of delivering it? He was told he might. He then read the following Message [the text of D&C, section 49]. At the close of the reading, he asked if they could be permitted to go forth in the exercise of their gift and office—I told him that the piece he had read, bore on its face, the image of its author; that the Christ that dictated that, I was well acquainted with, and had been, from a boy; that I had been much troubled to get rid of his influence, and I wished to have nothing more to do with him; and as for any gift he had authorized them to exercise among us, I would release them & their Christ from any further burden about us, and take all the responsibility on myself. Sidney made answer—this you ~~are~~ cannot do; I wish to hear the people speak. I told him if he desired it, they could speak for themselves, and steped back and told them to let the man know how they felt; which they did in something like these words; that they were fully satisfied with what they had, and wished to have nothing to do with either them or their Christ. On hearing this Rigdon professed to be satisfied, and put his paper by; but Parley Pratt arose and commenced shakeing his coattail; he said he shook the dust from his garments as a testimony against us, that we had rejected the word of the Lord Jesus. Before the words were out of his mouth, I was to him, and said;--You filthy Beast....I then turned to the Believers and said, now we will go home and started...they all followed us to the house...Sidney stayed for supper...He was treated kindly and let go after supper. But Leman tarried all night and started for home in the morning." For the full account see Lawrence R. Flake, "A Shaker View of a Mormon Mission," in *Brigham Young University Studies* 20/1 (1979), 94–98.

aries giving us insight into how they practiced, and therefore understood, the rite.[44] As one reviews these descriptive texts, while there is a variety in the manner by which the rite is described, a pattern emerges as to how the individual missionaries thought about the rite. First and foremost, as one might expect, it is clear that the missionaries performed the rite when the gospel was not received by those who they encountered, regardless of whether hospitality was offered or not. For instance, in John Murdock's missionary journal, he records: "We . . . laboured from morning till noon endeavouring to get a chance to preach, but we were not successful. I was turned out of doors for calling on the wool–carder to repent. After dinner we took leave of the two ladies and the family with which we had dined and wiped our feet as a testimony against that city."[45] Though no mention is made as to whether or not he was "received," it would appear that common hospitality was enjoyed by the missionaries. Murdock explicitly mentions that he had been fed by at least one household and in another, even though he was eventually "turned out of doors," had been clearly invited in originally (you cannot be turned out, if you weren't invited in).[46] Yet, in terms of being able to preach, they were "unsuccessful" and thus wiped their feet against the city (including the two families that entertained them, presumably).

William E. McLellin, who records in his journals that he performed the rite no less than six times during his mission, recounts

[44]Most of the accounts that follow can be found in the Mormon Missionary Diaries Collection found in the Digital Collection of the L. Tom Perry Special Collection department of the Brigham Young University Harold B. Lee Library. The collection holds the diaries of 220 missionaries, most from the 19th–early 20th centuries. Of these only 20 mention the performance of wiping dust off the feet. Space does not allow for each individual account in the paper itself so the reader is directed to the appendix at the end of the paper.

[45] *John Murdock Journal and Autobiography* (Archival Manuscript, Special Collections of Harold B. Lee Library), 14 June 1831. As for the performance of the rite, it appears that Murdock is using the New Testament text to describe his own practice since wiping does not appear in any of the Doctrine and Covenants texts, but is the New Testament verb.

[46] In fact, the text above suggests that Murdock may have been an ungracious guest by his condemning his host in the host's own home, which would have justified, at least following the norms of hospitality, turning him out of the house.

performing the rite after having been invited to speak before a Campbellite gathering. According to his account, they asked him to stop speaking, which he did after bearing his testimony, whereupon they then invited his companion to speak for ten minutes as well.[47] As in Murdock's account, the missionaries are given space and time to deliver the message. Neither missionary was cast out or not given a chance to speak, the audience simply did not accept the message.

Approximately fifty years later, Jesse Bennett recorded in his journal while on a mission to Samoa that in a particular village the chief rejected the message, but invited the missionaries to stay for breakfast, whereupon the elders read them "the words of the Saviour, when you go from one city if they do not receive you flee to another." At this the local minister got upset, asked them to leave, which they did and "shook the dust off of our feet against them and went on our way rejoicing."[48] Similarly, Sidney Ottley describes his experiences in New Zealand, where, in one particular village they met three members of the church and an "aetheist (sic.) who has been a great friend to the Elders for 16 yrs," yet this did not deter them the next day from being "glad to shake [Wanganui's] dust from our feet."

One humorous account can be found in the journal of Ellis Seymour Heninger, who in 1900 recorded that as a missionary in the southern states he had been invited to spend an evening with acquaintances. The evening was apparently an enjoyable one, ending with ice

[47] *The Journals of William E. McLellin*, 1831–1836, eds. Jan Shipps and John W. Welch (Provo, Utah and Urbana and Chicago, Il: BYU Studies and University of Illinois Press, 1994), November 18th, 1831 (61). The other performances also demonstrate that non–reception of the message not inhospitality was the cause for performance. In one case, the rite was performed as the elders find a schoolhouse they were scheduled to speak in still locked up. In another, the rite was performed following a confrontation with a preacher who charged them fifty cents for breakfast, and in yet another the rite was performed when a tavern keeper "abused" the two elders after they had asked for bread and milk without paying for it. Finally, in the last one, after having been invited in to speak before a gathering and after having done so for two hours, following which the elders asked for monetary donations and having received none, the two felt that they had done their duty and "we wiped the dust of our feet and we also cleansed our feet in pure water" (182–183).

[48] The Journals of Jesse Bennett, 1869–1949, vol. 1, 1889–1890, September 14–15, 1889, 53–5.

cream and cake. The following morning, the elders went tracting in the suburbs of the same city and "shook the dust of our feet against the people," again, presumably against those of whom they enjoyed their company the night before. [49]

In other accounts, performance of the rite appears to have been a reaction to disappointment. Oliver Huntington describes the difficulties of finding an audience during early winter in 1849. According to his journal, the ground was covered in snow and it was extremely cold, thus no one was willing to listen to them outside nor were they successful in finding a room to preach. He writes that he and his companion decided to try the village again in warmer weather. He then states that he and his companion felt like shaking the dust off their feet but decided against it.

While the accounts suggest that the rite was performed sometimes without much thought, but understood to be simply what one did following rejection, others journal entries depict concern by the specific elder as to the appropriateness of the rite in the case of basic rejection. William Robinson, a missionary in Colorado, writes in his journal entry for November 28, 1897 records while there was lack of hospitality and general disinterest in the gospel while on his mission in Colorado, he decides not to perform the rite: "Not a soul to hear us at either of the three meetings we appointed for to–day, yet we desire to be compassionate and instead of shaking the dust off our feet as a testimony against them we prefer to repeat those immortal words of the Master: 'Father forgive them for they know not what they do.'" Elder Nephi Pratt expressed similar misgivings in his 1906 conference report concerning the missionary labours in the Northwest: "We have oftentimes felt appalled at the indifference manifested in the larger cities . . . and have sometimes thought that all had been done there, . . . but we had a doubt whether we ought to shake off the dust from our feet."[50]

Thus from the journals themselves, we can conclude that within the first century of the church in this dispensation, the rite functioned primarily to signify those who had not received the message of the Restoration, whether hospitality was offered or not to the mis-

[49] Journal of Ellis Seymour Heninger, vol. 1 1899–1900), September 11–12, 1900, 116–7.
[50] Conference Report, April 1906.

sionaries. While for some elders, the rite expressed their own disappointment or discouragement, there also seems to have been an undercurrent of uncertainty as to whether or not rejection merited the rite's performance. In this we see a developing sense that missionary work may include more than one presentation, an approach that is simply taken for granted in modern missionary work. Also significant is of the accounts reviewed by this author only two ever suggested that immediate results to the rite were expected following the performance, an outcome of the rite as understood today that is almost universal.[51]

Shaking Dust off Feet in the Latter Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century

Following Joseph Smith's letter of 1835, there does not appear to be any more official instructions concerning this rite though a letter dated May 22, 1842, titled *An Epistle of the High Council of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints in Nauvoo to the Saints scattered abroad* concludes with following instruction: "Brethren, with all these considerations before you, in relation to your afflictions, we think it expedient to admonish you, that you bear, and forbear, as becometh Saints, and having done all that is lawful and right, to obtain justice of those that injure you, wherein you come short of obtaining it, commit the residue to the just judgment of God, and shake off the dust of your feet as a testimony of having done so." The letter is signed by the stake presidents and high council of Nauvoo, and not by the presiding quorum of

[51] Journal of Oz Flake, vol. 1, 1897–1998, 179, Southern States Mission: "April 14, 1898—some of the people are very careless about our work some are interested while others are opposed. But it seems to me signs enough are given the people a preacher last year made a big fight against two of our Elders (Jones & Com) in this state they washed feet against him and in 4 days he died another Minister recently made a big fight against two of our boys, in Webster County (Porter & Com.) kept them out of an appointed and waged war on them and in two weeks dropped dead in his pulpit. There is often just such signs and others. Such as healing the sick and yet the people say all these signs are done away with but they have no proof of it. While we have plenty of evidence that it is they are not "there are none so blind as they who will not see.'" The second account is found in Lucy Mack Smith's commentary concerning a performance of the rite by her son Samuel and discussed later in this paper (see note

the church. Because it was published in *Times and Seasons*, of which Joseph Smith is the chief editor, one may presume it was at least unofficially approved of by the First Presidency. In the letter those members who wish to gather with the Saints to Nauvoo but are unable to do so are instructed as to what to do if threatened with loss of land or other economic means by those antagonistic to the Church.[52]

Because the letter is not for missionaries, it is not surprising to find no reception terminology common to the other ritual texts described above, yet this in and of itself is intriguing since all other references to this rite so far have been in the context of missionary work. Though texts describing actual performance are found overwhelmingly in missionary journals, this instruction suggests that the rite was understood as more than merely a missionary one, but one that could be used for cases of general persecution, particularly of violent nature, of non–travelling members, and only as a last resort; in these cases reception of the gospel message is tangential, if at all important. Unfortunately, examples of shaking dust off one's feet for the purpose of general persecution outside of the missionary field are quite rare, so it is unknown as to how common this specific form of practice was in the early church period.[53]

---

[52] *Times and Seasons*, vol. 3. The names of the signed are: William Marks, Austin Cowles (Presidents), Charles C. Rich, James Allred, Elias Higbee, George W. Harris, Aaron Johnson, William Huntington, Sen., Henry G. Sherwood, Samuel E. Bent, Lewis D. Wilson, David Fullmer, Thomas Grover, Newel Knight, Leonard Soby (Attestators), Hosea Stout (Clerk).

[53] The one account that is known of the performance of the rite of wiping dust off the feet for general persecution of non–missionary saints is described by Brigham Young in the *Documentary History of the Church*, vol. VII, 557: "The labours of the day having been brought to a close at so early an hour, viz., eight–thirty, it was thought proper to have a little season of recreation. Accordingly, Brother Hanson was invited to produce his violin, which he did, and played several lively airs accompanied by Elisha Averett on his flute, among others some very good lively dancing tunes. This was too much for the gravity of Brother Joseph Young who indulged in dancing a hornpipe, and was soon joined by several others, and before the dance was over several French fours were indulged in. The first was opened by myself with Sister Whitney and Elder Heber C. Kimball and partner. The spirit of dancing increased until the whole floor was covered with dancers, and while we danced before the Lord, we shook the dust from our feet as a testimony against the nation."

Following this instruction nothing more is known until 1899, when correspondence between Ben E. Rich, then president of the Southern States Mission, and the First Presidency via George Reynolds suggest that Church leadership believed wholesale practice of the rite in the Southern States Mission was not necessary. In February 1899, President Rich wrote to the First Presidency asking for advice. According to his letter, President Rich stated that a letter from one of the conference presidents was being circulated in the Southern States mission who instructed the missionaries to close individual counties by washing their feet against the given county and then recording when, at which stream and by whom the rite was performed. President Rich, on the other hand, was concerned about performing the rite indiscriminately as was often done in the past and therefore wrote to Reynolds hoping for a response from the First Presidency.

Responding to this letter, Reynolds stated (presumably with the authority of the First Presidency behind him), "If an elder feels that he has just cause and is moved upon by the spirit of God to wash his feet against a person or persons who have violently or wickedly rejected the truth, let him do so quietly and beyond noting it in his journal let him not make it public." While the rite is still performed for the sake of rejection, this marks the first known time that the rite being performed under the influence of the Spirit is mentioned, and explicitly associates violent behaviour of the non–member with a consequent performance, though the violence is explicitly expressed in the rejection of the message, not violent removal of property, as suggested in the 1842 letter.

Though the Rich–Reynolds correspondence suggests that the First Presidency was revising the way they understood the rite in both performance and meaning, it is not until 1915, with the publication of *Jesus the Christ* by James Talmage that a "public" statement is made. Though the study did not claim to represent the official voice of the First Presidency, Talmage's ecclesiastical authority and secular excellence, gave the work quasi–canonical status.[54] In a one of the footnotes, Talmage addressed the rite in the following manner:

[54] James E. Talmage, *Jesus the Christ: A Study of the Messiah and His Mission According to Holy Scriptures both Ancient and Modern* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, Deseret News, 1915),The work's status with regards to the canon is admittedly a little confusing. Though not one of the

> To ceremonially shake the dust of the feet form one's feet as a testimony against another was understood by the Jews to symbolize a cessation of fellowship and a renunciation of all responsibility for consequences that might follow. It became an ordinance of accusation and testimony by the Lord's instructions to His apostles as cited in the text. In the current dispensation, the Lord has similarly directed His authorized servants to so testify against those who wilfully and maliciously oppose the truth when authoritatively presented (see Doc. and Cov. 24:1; 60:15; 84:92; 99:4). The responsibility of testifying before the Lord by this accusing symbol is so great that the means may be employed only under unusual and extreme conditions, as the Spirit of the Lord may direct.[55]

While the purpose behind his study was to explore the life and ministry of Christ, Talmage utilized the revelations found in the Doctrine and Covenants as well. It is also clear that this interpretation differs in significant ways from the canonical forms. As he often did throughout his book, Talmage gave comparative contextual material concerning the rite of shaking the dust off one's feet. Unfortunately, he did not also provide the bibliographical data to the Jewish sources, thus it is unclear whether or not these sources did in fact say what Talmage said they did (a "cessation of fellowship and a renunciation of all responsibility for consequences that might follow"). Thus his contextual commentary cannot be understood as particularly useful in understanding the rite.

Of greater value is the manner by which he describes the rite using latter–day sources and terminology. It is in Talmage's description that the rite is first described as an ordinance, the term used by Latter–day Saints to describe formal ritual behaviour enacted under the authority and power of the priesthood, primarily for those rituals

---

standard works, we are told in the introduction that "the completed work has been read to and is approved by the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve.

[55] Ibid., 345.

necessary for salvation.[56] Thus, even though the priesthood is not mentioned anywhere in Talmage's text or in any of the canonical ones, by naming the rite as an ordinance, the performance of the rite becomes one of the ritualized ways to exercise the priesthood.

Moreover, his commentary concerning the rite appears to reflect an amalgam of the purpose for the rite as found in the 1842 letter for non–missionaries and the 1899 First Presidency letter which was for missionaries. The note arises within the context of the Christ's instructions to his disciples prior to their missionary labours, but the purpose of the rite, as explained in the footnote, is not in response to hospitality or rejection, but malicious opposition to the missionary work. Talmage, apparently following the lead of the First Presidency in the 1899 letter, also suggests that the rite should be used rarely, "under unusual and extreme conditions" and only "when the Spirit of the Lord dictates," though what constitutes "unusual and extreme" is left undefined, reflecting the same ambiguity concerning appropriateness as the letter. Regardless of the challenges Talmage's commentary may well be the most recognized text concerning the rite of wiping dust off the feet within LDS literature. As we shall see, its influence can certainly be felt in twentieth–century texts concerning the rite.

Shaking Dust Off Feet since Elder Talmage's Time

In the twentieth century, discussion of wiping dust off the feet has fallen into three categories. The first of these are statements made by General Authorities, which may be found in either public addresses or in published works. Such texts are quite rare. In fact, over the past century and a half only three references to the rite have been men-

[56] Not all ordinances, as understood this way, are necessarily salvific. The general church priesthood manual, *Duties and Blessings of the Priesthood: Basic Manual for Priesthood Holders, Part B* describes two types of ordinances: "Ordinances that are necessary for us to return to Heavenly Father include baptism, confirmation, the sacrament, conferral of the Melchizedek Priesthood (for brethren), the temple endowment, and temple marriage...The Lord has given many priesthood ordinances that we may receive or perform for guidance and comfort. These include the naming and blessing of children, administering to the sick, patriarchal blessings, father's blessings, blessings of guidance and comfort, and dedication of graves."

tioned in a general conference setting. The first, though technically in the nineteenth century, is in an 1899 general conference talk by John Taylor who paraphrases the New Testament texts in a larger context of missionary work.[57] The second is the address by Nephi Pratt was described earlier. Finally in April 1968, Elder S. Dilworth Young mentions the performance of this rite when describing the role of witnessing by the Quorum of the Seventy. Unfortunately, it is unclear as to whether he was describing on–going practice, actual responsibilities of the Seventy, or his own earlier missionary experiences.[58]

There are also in this first category a few comments made by General Authorities in their own studies. J. Reuben Clark addresses the rite in his book *On the Way to Immortality and Eternal Life*, focusing on the manner by which the rite absolved one from the sins of the other.[59] He also suggests that the ability to perform the rite is a key of the priesthood. Joseph Fielding Smith addressed the rite in his study, *Church History and Modern Revelation* and mentioned that performance of the rite cleanses the missionary of the "blood" of the wicked.[60] John

[57] John Taylor, General Conference, April 1899: "I say this is the way Christ is going to Judge the world, for He gave a special commandment that when you should go into a house or a city you should enquire who is worthy to receive you, and if they do so, let your peace rest upon that household and say unto them, 'the kingdom of God is nigh unto you; but if they reject you shake the dust off your feet as a testimony against them, for it shall be more tolerable in the day of judgment for the city of Sodom or Gomorrha than for that city or household that rejecteth you.'" Interestingly, President Taylor is not directly quoting a specific New Testament passage since the term "reject" does not appear in any of the KJV New Testament texts.

[58] Elder S. Dilworth Young, *Conference Report*, April 1968: "There have been times when we thought that if we approached a man, and he, hostile because of stories he had heard about us, or suspicious because we were strangers, rebuffed us, then we had done our duty by shaking off the dust of our feet against him. We have not done that duty until we have given him a fair chance to learn that his prejudices are unfounded. To find families and show them by our love that we are truly followers of Jesus Christ is our manifest duty."

[59] J. Reuben Clark, *On the Way to Immortality and Eternal Life: a series of radio talks* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970). The book is a compilation of a radio series by President Clark beginning in 1949.

[60] Joseph Fielding Smith, *Church History and Modern Revelation*, vol. 1 (Salt Lake City: Council of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints, 1953), 206: "When our Lord sent forth his disciples to proclaim

A. Widtsoe also mentions the rite in his study *Priesthood and Church Government* under the chapter concerning missionary work, though he provides no commentary on it at all and simply quotes Joseph Smith's letter discussed earlier in this paper.[61] Bruce R. McConkie also addresses this rite in both *Mormon Doctrine* and his New Testament studies, such as the *Mortal Messiah*. His comments are brief and are similar to those of Talmage, emphasizing the role of the Spirit in determining whether or not the rite should be performed.

The difficulty here is trying to discern as to whether or not these sources reflect official church stances. Both Smith's and Widtsoe's studies became manuals of instruction for priesthood meetings, but texts by non–apostles were also used and approved of by the First Presidency prior to correlation for church classroom material. In terms of official texts by the church, no instruction appears to have been provided except for that found in the canon and Joseph Smith's letter. [62]

The second category of discussion is that found in LDS scriptural commentaries, predominantly Doctrine and Covenants commentaries, of which the first was Hyrum Smith's and Janne Sjodahl's series published in 1927 and which relied on the same supposed Jewish tradition references by Talmage for the contextualization of the rite.[63] While there are a number of commentaries spanning the

---

the gospel message he instructed them to shake off the dust of their feet as a testimony against those who opposed them...The elders were to seek out from among the people the honest in heart and leaven their warning testimony with all others, thus they would become clean from their blood."

[61]John A. Widtsoe, Priesthood and Church Government in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1939).

[62] The General Handbook of Instructions emerged in 1960; there are earlier publications such as the Handbook of Instructions for Bishops and Counselors, Stake and Ward Clerks (published from 1928–1950), and even earlier texts such as the Annual Instructions and Circular of Instructions (interchangeable titles from 1890–1923). In none of these are there instructions concerning the performance of this rite. Nor are there any in any Handbook of Instructions for Mission President's Handbook of Instructions (the earliest of which seems to be 1959).

[63] Hyrum Smith and Janne E. Sjodahl, *The Doctrine and Covenants: containing revelations given to Joseph Smith, Jr., the prophet/with an introduction and historical and exegetical notes by Hyrum M. Smith and Janne M. Sjodahl* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Printed by Deseret News Press, 1927), who provide commentary to the

past century, the majority of them rely on the words of the General Authorities mentioned above, predominantly Smith's *Church History and Modern Revelation* and Talmage's insights, as well as Smith's and Sjodahl's commentary (which indirectly appears to be utilizing Talmage).[64] These generally repeat the same understanding (the necessity of having the Spirit, the rareness of actual performance, the non–differentiation between wiping dust off one's feet and shaking clothing), but more recent commentaries have begun to emphasize that priesthood keys, and therefore specific priesthood authority, are necessary to perform the rite.[65]

---

rite for section 24, 60, 103. For section 24, they provide Jewish tradition like Talmage, though they do not provide sourcing for either. For section 60, they state that the rite is in response to rejection of the message, but then also add "scoffers and persecutors" to the list of those who are to receive the rite. Finally, in section 103 they give no background, but simply state that God will deliver the judgment.

[64] See Hoyt W. Brewster, *Doctrine and Covenants Encyclopedia* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1988) quotes both Smith and Sjodahl as well as Joseph Fielding Smith's *Church History and Modern Revelation*, similarly Daniel H. Ludlow, *Companion to the Study of the Doctrine and Covenants*, vol. 2 (Salt Lake City, Utah : Deseret Book Co., 1978) quotes these two sources. L.G. Otten, C.M. Caldwell, in their study, *Sacred Truths of the Doctrine and Covenants*, vol. 1 (Springville, Utah: LEMB, c1982–1983) use Smith and Sjodahl as their sole source, though in their second volume they quote Smith's CHMR directly. Richard Cowen in his study, *Answers to Your Questions Concerning the Doctrine and Covenants* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1996) utilizes CHMR. Two more recent commentaries both use Talmage's commentary for their description of the rite. also H. Dean Garrett, Stephen E. Robinson, *A Commentary on the Doctrine and Covenants*, Vol. 3, (Salt Lake City, Utah : Deseret Book Co., 2000–2004), and Craig Ostler, Joseph Fielding McConkie, *Revelations of the Restoration: a commentary on The Doctrine and Covenants and other modern revelations*, (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 2000) quote Talmage directly.

[65] Craig Ostler, Joseph Fielding McConkie, *Revelations of the Restoration: a commentary on The Doctrine and Covenants and other modern revelations*, (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 2000), "After the call of the Twelve in our day, we would understand this authority to rest with them, as it did anciently, or to those to whom they directly give it. The authority to perform the same has not been given to missionaries generally. Those performing this ordinance are further directed that it not be done in the presence of those they are testifying against "lest thou provoke them, but in secret; and wash thy feet, as a testimony against them in the Day of Judgment" (D&C 60:15). See commentary on Doc-

Finally, this rite is described in anecdotal accounts most often related in the missionary field.[66] Of the two anecdotal collections used for this study, all anecdotes were second hand accounts that missionaries were told about in the mission field and never performed or experi-experienced themselves.[67] Though the specific locations are different, the elements of the accounts are similar. Stressed in each are the serious and unique nature of the performance, the almost immediate destructive consequence on the building or city, and most importantly the importance of being led by the Spirit. Many of these accounts suggest that only a mission president or general authority can perform the rite, though this may be a result of the relative lateness of the collections (both gathered in the early 1980s) and thus reflect the growing trend within the commentaries as to the role of priesthood and priesthood keys to performance.

One particular element of these anecdotes is worth mentioning and that is the belief in immediacy of result. In all of secondary accounts, within days or weeks of the performance, the specific residence, business, community or town was destroyed.[68] This represents a striking

---

trine and Covenants 75:20–21." See also H. Dean Garrett, Stephen E. Robinson, *A Commentary on the Doctrine and Covenants*, Vol. 3, (Salt Lake City, Utah : Deseret Book Co., 2000–2004), 16: "Cleanse your feet even with water. This is an apostolic responsibility not extended to other missionaries. The action described here is a variation on shaking the dust off the feet."67

[66] This paper used two folklore collections. The first collection [Curtis Webb, "Dusting Off of ohe Feet" (Logan: Utah State University, Fife Folklore Archives, 1980)] includes 14 anecdotes; the second [Carolyn S. Hudson, "Dusting of The Feet" (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University/ L. Tom Perry Special Collections, 1983)] includes 15.

[67] These texts would fit within the third category of ritual texts described earlier in the paper: unreal ritual texts. This type of text can be characterized as fiction, but fiction that describes an actual ritual activity, thus its value is in determining the role of the ritual within a given culture's imagination. Whether practiced or not, the presence of unreal ritual texts demonstrates that the rite, even if simply imagined, defines certain cultural practices. The non–historicity of the anecdotal accounts concerning wiping dust off feet places them within the domain of fiction, yet they clearly have a function similar to actual practice in defining the missionary and missionary work and have a clear place within the mission's imagination.

[68] A few at least appear to be later explanations for phenomena that happened while missionaries were present. For instance, one account related in 1983 told

contrast between the actual performance accounts of nineteenth–century missionaries since in the latter it does not appear that the missionaries expected immediate destruction.[69] Thus by the end of the

---

of a performance in "1970 or 1974" in which two missionaries dusted their feet against the city of Huarez, Peru. A week later an earthquake struck killing the inhabitants. Indeed there was an earthquake that struck Huarez in May of 1970, which killed approximately 20,000 inhabitants, yet this earthquake killed between 75,000 and 80,000 Peruvians total. Thus it appears that a significant, random and traumatic event was given meaning by suggesting that at least a localized aspect of it was the consequence of the performance of this rite.

[69] The only nineteenth century account that suggests immediate consequences is that of Samuel Smith, the brother of Joseph, who is recorded as washing his feet against an individual who promptly died of smallpox within two weeks. Unfortunately, this event is only described in Lucy Mack Smith's history and not Samuel's own words. According to Lucy, Samuel had been thrown out of an inn when he offered to sell a Book of Mormon to the proprietor. Two weeks later, Samuel and his parents passed the same inn and saw a small–pox warning on the inn. Upon meeting a local inhabitant they asked what happened and were told that the innkeeper and two of his family had contracted smallpox, supposedly from a traveller, and died. The individual also said that he knew of no one else contracting the disease. This is followed in the account by Lucy's interpretation of the event: "This is a specimen of the peculiar dispositions of some individuals, who would purchase their death for a few shillings, but sacrifice their soul's salvation rather than give a Saint of God a meal of victuals. According to the Word of God, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for such persons," (this is page 480 of *Lucy's Book: A Critical Edition of Lucy Mack Smith's Family Memoir*, ed. by Lavina Fielding Anderson [Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2001]). While Lucy's explanation, particularly in paraphrasing the New Testament texts, suggests that she believed the deaths were the result of Samuel's act this is not stated clearly. Moreover, one needs to take into account that these memoirs were written in 1844–45, twenty–five years after the event itself. Lucy also tells us that Samuel washed his feet in the month of June 1830, at least two weeks before the first Doctrine and Covenants set of instruction was made available. Thus, either Samuel had received earlier instruction on the rite, or had performed it without any instruction, or Lucy's recollection of the event has been affected by the later Doctrine and Covenants instructions. In any case, since the account is not Samuel's, but Lucy's, who was not an actual eyewitness of the event, and recounting it twenty–five years later, this influential account appears to be the first of the anecdotal texts for this rite. Intriguingly, the account emphasizes not the rejection of the message per se, but the lack of hospitality provided.

twentieth century, the rite, though still associated with missionary work, in terms of form, effect, and purpose does not resemble the canonical versions, or even 19th century practice.

Conclusion

As demonstrated above, the rite of wiping off the dust from the feet of an individual has a long, rich history noted by significant changes reflecting new cultural mores. While the rite is predominantly a mission field ritual, the 19th century saw a different culture than that of Late Antiquity Palestine where hospitality no longer had the same cultural importance. For instance, latter–day instruction that the rite be performed in private lest it offend others differs dramatically from the instruction in Luke 10 in which those who are not received are to go out into the street and declare their rejection while performing the act publically. The rite changed again in the latter half of the 19th century.

The original missionary strategy, both in the New Testament and in the early part of this dispensation, was to go into a city or town, minister, and then move on to the next city without returning. In such cases, the rite of dusting off of feet makes sense as it conveys both the judgment for those who rejected the message and acts as a witness that the missionary could do no more for the people. Yet as the documents show, some missionaries were beginning to question the necessity of this rite and by the last few decades of the 19th century, coinciding with greater availability to more effective transportation (and therefore communication), missionary work had changed in that once a missionary companionship was moved from a particular area, these areas weren't abandoned, but received new missionaries. In other words, missionary work in a given area was now seen as an on–going experience with multiple missionary companionships and conversion of an individual a continuing process, not one limited by an initial rejection of the message, thus eliminating the need for a rite such as the dusting off of feet. Even the rite as a response to persecution, an early 20th century innovation, becomes ineffectual in this enhanced missionary culture, as the church's response to persecution was to view such as simply a greater missionary opportunity.

Yet even if the culture both inside the church and outside in the mission field changed to the extent that actual practice of this rite

was no longer necessary, the rite continued to have an impact on missionaries. As noted above, though none of the late 20th century missionaries had performed the rite themselves, they all knew of a performance in detail, having had the account transmitted to them by older missionaries in the mission field. In this, the oral telling of its practice, even if the account is fiction, can have a ritual–like outcome, specifically a greater communal sense of solidarity among the missionaries.

In most cases, missionaries are placed in new, foreign environments, meeting previously unknown individuals, also for many this is their first real time away from home for an extended period of time, all of which can be an unnerving experience. The formalized structure of the missionary's daily agenda provides an infrastructure by which they may define themselves within the new environment. Central to this is their relationship to other missionaries and the history of the mission itself, as both establish the value of the missionary's experience. The transmission of accounts concerning the wiping of dust off of one's feet emphasizes the power missionaries have to bring about change, reminding the missionary that God is watching over him or her, while at the same time reinforcing the need for obedience to the formalized structure of missionary life. Moreover, since each account is placed in a specific geographical setting within the mission area, the stories provide a sense of control over an unknown, and potentially dangerous, environment. All of these elements empower the missionary thereby making them more effective missionaries.

But the rite may have significance beyond the mission field as an example of just how innovative our ritual practice is. The manner, in which the dusting off of the feet has changed from dispensation to dispensation, even within a dispensation, demonstrates that ritual reflects changing cultural environments and needs. By understanding its origin, evolution in terms of performance and function, the rite of wiping the dust off one's feet may be a model by which we can examine the other, more prominent ritual behaviour in which we as Latter–day Saints engage and, in so doing, gain even greater appreciation and understanding as to who we are and what we are meant to do.

THE HOLY GHOST IN LDS RITUAL EXPERIENCE: PREPARATION FOR EXALTATION

James D. Holt

Pneumatology is not a word that is used within Mormon writings, but Mormon theology does elucidate a work of the Holy Ghost that is evident in the world and in the Church that can be explored.[1] In examining a Latter–day Saint pneumatology one is faced with a paucity of specific material; with the exception of a small number of books the Holy Ghost has not been the subject of a systematic analysis.[2] While being critically linked with other areas, the role of the Spirit in individual and institutional practice is an area, which needs exploring in greater depth than, has been done previously. The extent to which the Holy Ghost has been ignored is exemplified in the writings of Davies; he argues that in certain aspects Mormonism can be seen to be distinctly binitarian concluding:

> in the starkest and most unqualified of terms, the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit has been of primary historical significance within practical Mormon living but of secondary importance within its technical theology.[3]

---

[1] The Holy Spirit is a term used interchangeably with the Holy Ghost in Latter–day Saint teaching. There is no difference between what is meant. See Douglas J. Davies, "The Holy Spirit in Mormonism", *International Journal of Mormon Studies*, vol. 2:2009, 23–24, (23–41).

[2] Specific works are generally devotional in nature, for example, Joseph Fielding McConkie and Robert Millet, *The Holy Ghost* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989).

[3] Douglas J. Davies, *Joseph Smith, Jesus and Satanic Opposition: Atonement, Evil and the Mormon Vision* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010). In this binitarian discussion Davies goes further than is appropriate in relation to current Latter–day Saint practice, and relies on aspects of *The Lectures of Faith* (Lundwall, nd) and their attendant outworkings. However, the argument does recognize that more thought needs to be given to the work of the Holy Ghost.

This article will explore a small area of pneumatology and leave many areas that will need further exploration elsewhere, . It will seek to place the Holy Ghost as central in the theology of ritual ordinances. It will suggest that while Latter–day Saints believe that outward ordinances are not salvific in themselves they are channels of the Holy Ghost, which is the active medium of the grace of Christ to make sanctification and exaltation possible.

The further role of the Holy Ghost in relation to ritual is the application of the "Holy Spirit of promise", (D&C 132:7) which has a role in the sealing of all "covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations" (D&C 132:7). This function of the Holy Ghost is ratification of the covenants and ordinances that occur.

The use of these ordinances in uniting the participant with the Holy Ghost (and thus the Godhead) in preparation for exaltation will be explored in the final section of this paper. The crucial role of the Holy Ghost in the exaltation of humanity will be developed with a focus on the united nature of exaltation.

The most obvious manifestation of the Holy Ghost in Latter–day Saint teaching is within a discussion of the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift of the Holy Ghost is the right to the constant companionship of the Holy Ghost by the recipient throughout their lives (as long as that person remains worthy of it).[4] This reception of the Holy Ghost, through the physical ordinance of confirmation, is a crucial step in joining the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints (Article of Faith 3). [5] Latter–day Saints believe that the ordinance of baptism by water must be followed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost through confirmation and the laying on of hands. The gift of the Holy Ghost, in Latter–day Saint teaching, can only be received by the laying on of hands "by one having authority" (Article of Faith 5), but there are examples of

[4] The Holy Spirit is seen by Latter–day Saints to remain with a person while they are worthy of it, or do not sin. When a person sins they withdraw themselves from the Spirit (see Mosiah 2:36). The Holy Spirit cannot abide with that person until repentance is undertaken and the atoning blood of Christ takes effect again in the person's life.

[5] Latter–day Saints only use the word sacrament when referring to the Eucharist. All "sacraments", in the mainstream sense of the word, are described as ordinances.

people receiving manifestations of the Holy Ghost prior to the administration of the ordinance in scripture and Latter–day Saint writings. These manifestations should not be confused with the reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost and its associated right of constant companionship. For example:

> Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized, which was the convincing power of God unto him of the truth of the Gospel, but he could not receive the gift of the Holy Ghost until after he was baptized. Had he not taken this sign or ordinance upon him, the Holy Ghost which convinced him of the truth of God, would have left.[6]

Evidences of the manifestations of the Holy Ghost prior to baptism are prevalent throughout Latter–day Saint teaching and culture: "Joseph Smith did not have the gift of the Holy Ghost at the time of the First Vision, but he was overshadowed by the Holy Ghost; otherwise, he could not have beheld the Father and the Son".[7] Rector and Rector (1971) collected together a number of conversion stories which highlighted manifestations from the Holy Ghost that converts had experienced prior to being baptized.[8] It is important to note, however, that if the manifestations were not heeded, then the Holy Ghost would withdraw its influence. "Every man (sic) can receive a manifestation of the Holy Ghost, even when he is out of the Church, if he is earnestly seeking for the light and for the truth. The Holy Ghost will come and give the man the testimony he is seeking, and then withdraw; and the man does not have a claim upon another visit or constant visits and manifestations from him".[9] The teaching of prevenient promptings of the Holy Ghost is more inclusive than could be supposed. Latter–day

[6] Joseph Fielding Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1938), 199. Cornelius was "probably the first gentile to come into the Church not having previously become a proselyte to Judaism" who received the truth of the Gospel before baptism. The differentiation between the Holy Spirit before and following baptism is echoed in the writings of Pinnock: "In experience the Spirit may be manifested before baptism, as with Cornelius, but water remains the public sign of the Spirit's coming (Acts 10:44–48)" (1996: 124).

[7] Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation* (Salt Lake City: Deseretbook, 1999), vol 1: 42–43.

[8] Spencer. J. Palmer, *The Expanding Church* (Salt Lake City: Deseretbook, 1978).

[9] Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation,* 1999, vol 1: 42.

Saints accept that the Holy Ghost provides manifestations to those outside the Church; they may serve a preparatory role but the Holy Ghost is not limited to the Church. The personal preparation that the Holy Ghost serves could still be used as a hopeful basis for judgement, being partially based on the knowledge a person acquires.

> It seems as though Latter–day Saints would suggest that spirit given truths find their fulfilment in these ordinances. Therefore, all other religions and people are, at best, incomplete and awaiting fulfilment by the Holy Ghost. A person can go so far, but must receive the Holy Ghost within the constraints of the ordinances of baptism and confirmation in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints.

In Latter–day Saint teaching one of the most important roles of the Holy Ghost is that of sanctifier. *The Book of Mormon* specifically identifies this role:

> Yea, will ye persist in supposing that ye are better one than another; yea, will ye persist in the persecution of your brethren, who humble themselves and do walk after the holy order of God, wherewith they have been brought into this Church, *having been sanctified by the Holy [Ghost]*, and they do bring forth works which are meet for repentance— (Alma 5:54 emphasis added; see also Alma 13:11–12).

For Latter–day Saints the blessing of sanctification through the Holy Ghost is available to all through the baptism of fire and the ritual of confirmation.[10] Sin and carnality are taken away through the atonement of Christ with the active involvement of the Holy Ghost: "It is 'by the blood' (Moses 6:60) – meaning the blood of the Saviour– that we are sanctified. But it is through the cleansing medium of the Holy Ghost that the regenerating powers of that infinite atonement are extended to mortal man".[11] By the power of the Holy Ghost, Latter–day Saints believe that, iniquity, carnality, sensuality, and every evil thing is burned out of the soul as if by fire; the cleansed person is literally born again of the water and the Spirit.[12] This is impossible without the Holy Ghost:

[10] The reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost.
[11] McConkie and Millet, *The Holy Ghost*, 110–111.
[12] Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1979), 73.

> Man's natural powers are unequal to this task; so I believe, all will testify who have made the experiment. Mankind stand in some need of a strength superior to any they possess of themselves, to accomplish this work of rendering pure our fallen nature. Such strength, such power, such a sanctifying grace is conferred on man in being born of the Spirit — in receiving the Holy Ghost. Such, in the main, is its office, its work.[13]

Sanctification, in Latter–day Saint teaching, is a process; it "is an on–going work of the Holy [Ghost], one that deals with the gradual purification of my state".[14] As a person "endures to the end" (2 Ne. 31:20), they are able to continue further through the sanctification process which "consists in overcoming every sin and bringing all in subjection to the law of Christ".[15]

This process of sanctification entails the removal of sin and its replacement with Christ–like qualities. The Holy Ghost is not just a passive channel for the atonement. Rather, the Holy Ghost actively

> quickens all the intellectual faculties, increases, enlarges, expands, and purifies all the natural passions and affections, and adapts them, by the gift of wisdom, to their lawful use. It inspires, develops, cultivates, and matures all the fine–toned sympathies, joys, tastes, kindred feelings, and affections of our nature. It inspires virtue, kindness, goodness, tenderness, gentleness, and charity. It develops beauty of person, form, and features. It tends to health, vigour, animation, and social feeling. It invigorates all the faculties of the physical and intellectual man. It strengthens and gives tone to the nerves. In short, it is, as it were, marrow to the bone, joy to the heart,

[13] Brigham H. Roberts, *The Gospel and Man's Relationship to Deity* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1966), 170.

[14] Robert L. Millet, "The Process of Salvation", in R. Keller, & R. L. Millet (eds.), *Salvation in Christ: Comparative Christian Views*, 141–181, (Provo: Religious Studies Centre: BYU, 2005), 158.

[15] Brigham Young, "How and by whom Zion is to be built– Sanctification– General Duties of the Saints". In G. D. Watt (Ed.), *Journal of Discourses* (vol. 10 (1863) 170–178), (London: Latter–day Saints' Book Depot), 173.

> light to the eyes, music to the ears, and life to the whole being.[16]

Sanctification by the Holy Ghost (through the atonement) takes place initially when a person is baptized and receives the gift of the Holy Ghost. Sanctification through the atonement and the Holy Ghost is renewed each week in the ritual of the sacrament: "The process of cleansing and sanctifying through the baptisms of water and of the Holy Ghost can be continued weekly as we worthily partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper".[17] The importance of an on–going relationship with the Holy Ghost throughout a person's life is reiterated when discussing sanctification. Latter–day Saints believe that living close to the Holy Ghost, and partaking of the sacrament in the ritual of the sacrament sanctifies a person's soul, making them prepared to meet God on judgement day with clean hands and a pure heart:

> And no unclean thing can enter into his kingdom; therefore nothing entereth into his rest save it be those who have washed their garments in my blood, because of their faith, and the repentance of all their sins, and their faithfulness unto the end. Now this is the commandment: Repent, all ye ends of the earth, and come unto me and be baptized in my name, that ye may be sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost, that ye may stand spotless before me at the last day (3 Ne. 27:19–20).

It is impossible for this sanctification to take place without reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost. This can only be done "by the laying on of hands by those who are in authority" (Article of Faith 5). As such, only baptized members of the Church have the potential to be sanctified, and only those so sanctified can return and live with God and receive exaltation. It is important to note that Latter–day Saints believe that these outward ordinances are not salvific in themselves; they do "not forgive sins or save us... for exaltation is in Christ the Person. Rather, baptism and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are

---

[16] Parley P. Pratt, *Key to the Science of Theology [1855]* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1978), 61.

[17] D. T. Christofferson, "Justification and Sanctification", *Ensign*, June 2001: 24).

channels of divine power that help to activate the power of God".[18] The Holy Ghost is the active medium of the grace of Christ to make sanctification and exaltation possible: "The Holy Ghost is the midwife of exaltation. He is the agent of the new birth, the sacred channel and power by which men and women are changed".[19]

In Latter–day Saint teaching the Holy Ghost is sometimes referred to as the "Holy Spirit of promise" (D&C 132:7),[20] which has a role in the sealing of all "covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations" (D&C 132:7). This function of the Holy Ghost is ratification of the covenants and ordinances that occur. Smith has explored this further and describes it as a "stamp of approval" promising the blessings of the covenants through a person's faithfulness. If covenants are broken Latter–day Saints believe that the "Holy [Ghost] withdraws the stamp of approval".[21] McConkie has used baptism as an example of this seal placed by the Holy Ghost:

> An unworthy candidate for baptism might deceive the elders and get the ordinance performed, but no one can lie to the Holy Ghost and get by undetected. Accordingly, the baptism of an unworthy and unrepentant person would not be sealed by the Spirit; it would not be ratified by the Holy Ghost; the unworthy person would not be justified by the Spirit in his actions. If thereafter he became worthy through repentance and obedience, the seal would then be put in force. Similarly, if a worthy person is baptized with the ratifying approval of the Holy Ghost attending the performance, yet the seal may be broken by subsequent sin.[22]

---

[18] Robert L. Millet, *After All We Can Do: Grace Works* (Salt Lake City: Deseretbook, 2003), 76.

[19] Robert L. Millet, "The Process of Salvation", 146–147. The use of the word "channel" suggests passivity with regard to the Holy Ghost; this should not be assumed, as the Holy Ghost is an active participant in this process.

[20] Although this thesis, and Latter–day Saints, refers to the Holy Ghost, one exception is the description of his role as the Holy Spirit of promise. For this reason the terminology is retained.

[21] Joseph Fielding Smith, 1999, vol. 1: 45

[22] McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 362.

Latter–day Saints do not just apply this ratifying seal of the Holy Ghost to baptism but to all of the ordinances of the Gospel: baptism; confirmation; ordination to the Priesthood; washing and anointing; endowment; and Temple marriage. If these ordinances (and their attendant covenants) are not sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise then they "are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the Resurrection from the dead; for all contracts that are not made unto this end have an end when men are dead" (D&C 132:7).[23] Latter–day Saints believe this seal is kept in place by a person's righteousness and can be removed as people withdraw themselves from the Spirit (see Mosiah 2:36). In order to receive eternal life a person must have the Holy Spirit of Promise sealed to their ordinances:

> An act that is justified by the Spirit is one that is sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise, or in other words, ratified and approved by the Holy Ghost. This law of justification is the provision the Lord has placed in the Gospel to assure that no unrighteous performance will be binding on earth and in heaven, and that no person will add to his position or glory in the hereafter by gaining an unearned blessing.[24]

In Latter–day Saint theology, a further condition for eternal life is to have received the various ordinances; these are efficacious only through the Holy Ghost because of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The Holy Spirit of Promise (meaning the seal placed on a person's ritual ordinances and kept there through righteousness) is a prerequisite to exaltation; without it "he cannot obtain it [exaltation]" (D&C 131: 3).

As a sealing force, and other roles of the Holy Ghost including being the impetus for a change of heart suggests that exaltation can only be fully realized within the Church of Jesus of Christ of Latter–day Saints. To hope for exaltation a person must be a new creature, and this is only possible by living a life in close relationship with the Holy Ghost.

> That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me (John 17:21).

---

[23] The immediate context of the passage is marriage (D&C 131 and 132) but it can be applied to all ordinances.

[24] Bruce R. McConkie, *A New Witness for the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1985), 408.

An important understanding of what exaltation is as a unity with the Godhead is possible, as exemplified through the life of Christ. Christ became one with the Father through obedience to his commandments and the aligning of his thoughts and goals to the Father. As joint heirs with Christ, Latter–day Saints believe that to receive the same inheritance of Christ (exaltation), they must strive to develop this unity throughout their lives (and even beyond). Latter–day Saint beliefs about prayer are an example of how this unity is important for the development of a person's relationship with Christ:

> As soon as we learn the true relationship in which we stand toward God (namely, God is our Father, and we are his children), then at once prayer becomes natural and instinctive on our part (Matt. 7: 7–11). Many of the so–called difficulties about prayer arise from forgetting this relationship. Prayer is the act by which the will of the Father and the will of the child are brought into correspondence with each other (KJV BD: Prayer).

Latter–day Saints believe that the example Christ set, in terms of his eternal destiny and the way he achieved the unity with the Father, is a crucial outworking of a Christology. To an extent, in this way, Latter–day Saints could be seen to adopt an examplarist Christology, in that Christ provided the ultimate example. This understanding of exaltation reinforces that if a person is to receive exaltation they must develop a relationship with the Godhead during mortality to hope for a continuation of that relationship beyond the grave (as an aside I would argue the service that is given in Church is a preparation for exaltation as unity is built).

In Latter–day Saint theology the Church functions as a place where an individual's relationship with the Godhead can be similarly worked out and centred. Davies extends his exploration of Latter–day Saint ecclesiology further in suggesting that "the Church framework within which they 'know' him [Christ] is of primary and not secondary importance. In theological terms, ecclesiology is foundational as the setting for Christology".[25] However, perhaps Davies does not go far

[25] It would have been possible for an ecclesiology to be located in either a discussion of Christology or pneumatology. It is purely arbitrary that it receives its exploration in the chapter on pneumatology and no suggestion of primacy of

enough in stressing the importance of ecclesiology; since ecclesiology is also deeply related to the classical treatment of the Mormon understanding of the Holy Ghost. Latter–day Saint ecclesiology is similarly foundational as the setting to receive the Holy Ghost. The Church's most important function is as a channel for the blessings of the atonement of Christ and the reception of the Holy Ghost.

The President/Prophet of the Church is believed to hold all the priesthood keys. Priesthood keys have been defined as the "right to direct the work of the priesthood".[26] It is only through the exercise of these keys that Latter–day Saints believe the priesthood ordinances can be carried out. The ordinances of the Gospel are essential to exaltation as evidence of faith and also channels for the atonement and the Holy Ghost. The necessity of these ordinances within the boundaries of the Church is exemplified in a revelation given to Joseph Smith who enquired whether people who had previously been baptized required rebaptism: "although a man should be baptized an hundred times it availeth him nothing, for you cannot enter in at the strait gate by the law of Moses, neither by your dead works. For it is because of your dead works that I have caused this last covenant and this Church to be built up unto me, even as in days of old" (D&C 22:2–3).

Latter–day Saints, therefore, believe that God accepts only ordinances carried out within the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints. Ordinances as expressions of faith are only efficacious when that faith is centred on a true understanding of Christ and his work. But, more importantly, for Latter–day Saints, ordinances are necessary for the effects of the atonement and the Holy Ghost (sanctification, guidance, sealing) to be in force, as prerequisites for exaltation.

The Church becomes the body of Christ "created, ordered, and sustained by the Charismatic inspirations of the Breath of the risen

---

importance is intended. See Douglas J. Davies, *An Introduction to Mormonism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 242–243.

[26] Russel M. Nelson, *Ensign*, May 2005: 40. All of these keys (right of presidency and authority) are held by the President of the Church; but he delegates aspects of them to leaders throughout the world. For example the Bishop holds the keys for the ward, the Stake President the keys for the stake, and the Temple President the keys for the Temple.

Jesus".[27] The members of the body of Christ work in conjunction with Christ and the Holy Ghost to "bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:37). This is evidenced through the role of ordinances, the importance of teaching and believing orthodoxy, and of communal service. All of these actions within the Church are important but they are only given full life and efficacy when joined with the atonement of Christ and the influence of the Holy Ghost. The various functions of the Church reinforce both a Christological and pneumatological exclusivism: the communal service nature of the Church serves as a preparation for the unity that is exaltation; therefore, a participation in this service is crucial for exaltation. The hierarchical nature of the Church establishes orthodoxy that is necessary for exaltation; the ordinances that are a focus for the reception of the blessings of the atonement through the Holy Ghost can only be conducted within the structure of the Church.

Thus, the Holy Ghost and the atonement become crucial factors in the ritual ordinances of the Latter–day Saints, and their ultimate exaltation.

[27] Donald L. Gelpi, "The Theological Challenge of Cjarismatic Spirituality" *Pneuma*, 14:1–2, 1992,185–197 (187).

EMBODIMENT IN MORMON THOUGHT: AMBIGUITY, CONTRADICTION AND CONSENSUS

Aaron S. Reeves

Joseph Smith's religion redeemed not only the spirit but the body as well. However, embodiment has not always been a primary concern for LDS leaders, theologians and scholars. As a result, discussions of the salvific importance of the body have often being veiled behind other issues or concerns, such as chastity or the Word of Wisdom. Consequently, the body has become an absent–presence in Mormon thought. Using a sociological frame provided by Synnott, this essay seeks to examine how Mormons have thought about the body by using a set of metaphors that have been present in Western society more generally, namely: Tomb, Temple, Self and Machine. In addition to this I have added the metaphor of the body as 'divine' to this typology. In considering the different facets of this typology I draw evidence from the shifting ideas and discourses of the body that have been present throughout the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints in an attempt to highlight the struggle for consensus amidst the contradictions and ambiguity that has followed those earliest embodied speculations. I argue that the significance of Joseph Smith's embodied theology has not yet been fully explored or realised.

In the general introduction to the first volume of the *Joseph Smith Papers Project*, Bushman and Jessee comment that Joseph's religion was "of the body as well as of the spirit."[1] Part of the originality of Mormonism is the materialist ontology[2] that under–girds much of its doctrine and practice. For Bloom, "we underestimate [Joseph's] genius when we fail to see that he desired an ontological change in his followers, a new mode of being, however high the cost."[3] This change had as

[1] Richard Bushman & Dean Jessee, *General Introduction: Joseph Smith and His Papers* in The Joseph Smith Papers, Journals, vol. 1 (Salt Lake City, UT.: Church Historian's Press, 2008) xxiv.

[2] Max Nolan, 'Materialism and the Mormon Faith', *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, vol. 22, no. 4, (1989) 64–77.

[3] Harold Bloom, *The American Religion* (New York: Chu Hartley Publishers, 1992) 103.

its ground the body. The 'flesh' is a miracle in its complexity and beauty; and yet Latter–day Saints have often been involved in denigrating it by associating bodies solely with the 'Natural Man' (see Mosiah 3:19). This essay, although not claiming to be exhaustive, will attempt to present a preliminary discussion of some of the ideas surrounding the Mormon 'body' and also some of the potential implications to religious experience.[4]

As a precursor to this discussion of Embodiment in Mormon Thought, one explanation is provided for why the body has not been as prevalent as it might have been in discussions of Mormon theology. This section will argue, borrowing from Shilling that the body is an absent–presence in Mormonism and in Western thought more generally. Through this it is possible to observe that the body is enacted in a variety of incommensurable ways. Consequently the body's place in Mormon thought will be analysed by using a sociological frame provided by Synnott which refers to the body as a series of different metaphors, i.e. Tomb, Temple, Self and Machine. Subsequently, by drawing upon discourses that are readily available in Mormon thought I have added to Synnott's typology by discussing the body as a symbol of Divinity.

This essay is not an attempt to provide a systematic theology of the body, but instead to discuss and interrogate some of the metaphors that surround the body, which are and have been prevalent in Mormon discourse. Being aware of the great difficulty that trying to pin down the body brings with it, I will not define the body except to state that I accept that there is a material, sensual body, which is inseparable from the Subject. Specifically, the intention here is to track some of the different themes common to Western society and also some that are unique to Mormonism. However, I accept that trying to unpack the distinction between the two is something that has proved notoriously difficult to do.

[4] This paper will not discuss the history of embodiment in Judeo–Christian thought, for an excellent paper on this topic see and David L. Paulsen, 'The Doctrine of Divine Embodiment: Restoration, Judeo–Christian, and Philosophical Perspectives', *BYU Studies*, vol. 35, no. 4 (1996) 7–94.

AN ABSENT–PRESENCE

The issue of the body, despite the apparent emphasis in Joseph's thinking, emerges only in certain contexts. It seems central to LDS articulations of God, especially when trying to distinguish their views from other religious denominations. Further, the body is invariably in discussed in manuals and lessons on the Word of Wisdom or Chastity; yet these may often be veiled references and do not reflect the centrality that embodiment had in Joseph's religious thinking and experience. In some LDS writings, the body is an absent–presence, as is also the case in much Western thought.[5] For Shilling the body is an absent–presence, because it was, at one point, so rarely discussed but was equally always there. As A.N. Whitehead famously quipped, 'No one ever says, here am I, and I brought my body with me.'[6] However, in another sense it is also an absent–presence in that a great deal of the literature concerning embodiment believes that discourse, society or people constructs the body. Shilling wants to see both how the body is constructed and also how the body constructs. Using Foucault, Shilling argues that the actual materiality of the body can never be grasped because it lies behind 'grids of meaning imposed by discourse.'[7] Reluctantly, to an extent, Shilling accepts that this may be so but is also critical of how Foucault, and others,[8] have readily failed to see how the body can impose upon discourse or society.

In relation to Mormon thinking, the body has not received the attention that it deserves despite being implicitly raised in many theological and academic discussions. This neglect is ironic however, as Cazier points out in his thoughtful reflection on embodiment, for "despite living for an eternity as intelligence, then a spirit child, I only occasionally catch glimpses, now and then, of my spirituality. As far as I can tell, I am inextricably immersed in the flesh."[9] Perhaps the LDS

---

[5] Chris Shilling, *The Body and Social Theory*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage, 2003).

[6] Alfred North Whitehead, *Modes of Thought* (New York: MacMillan, 1938), 156.

[7] Shilling, 'Body and Social Theory', 70.

[8] See Bryan S. Turner, *The Body and Society*, 2nd ed., (London: Sage, 1996) and Erving Goffman, 'The Interaction Order', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 1 (1983) 1–17.

[9] Paul Cazier, 'Embracing the Flesh: In Praise of the Natural Man', *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, vol. 31, no. 2 (1998), 115–25 (98).

emphasis on spirituality has caused some to overlook that the flesh is (perhaps) our primary experience in mortality, and if it is accepted that mortality is more than a happy accident, which Mormons do, then they should also consider what this situation is supposed to be offering people through the flesh. The absent–presence is a conceptual blind spot which results from keeping the body as an implicit after–thought in considering spirituality and religion. Yet despite being ignored it cannot be completely forgotten. Even though Joseph Smith offers the seeds of a radically different vision of embodiment these have not been fully developed within LDS theology; perhaps because of other conflicting views which have been inherited from the cultural milieu of the Church.

However, the body is ever–present because of its centrality to the 'Plan of Salvation' and also the everyday experiences of living out that plan. This absent–presence is observed by the literal way that God must remind Abraham that his view of the Universe is "according to the time appointed unto that whereon thou standest" (Abr 3:4). This bodily–centrism, which is often repeated in this revelation (see Abr 3:5, 6, 7, 9), directs the reader's attention to the process by which Abraham's body serves as a reference point for his experiences. Perhaps the structure and phenomenological perception of our bodies[10] makes their influence negligible; thus the need for frequent reminders. Nibley's frequent references to the Latin root of the word 'Temple' as a place to get one's bearings on the universe is an embodied reference point.[11] For an empty temple does not function in any of the intended ways. Further if "all spirit is matter" (D&C 131:8), as Joseph teaches, then flesh is merely a different form of matter and is co–eternal with it.[12] There-

[10] See Maurice Merleau–Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception: An Introduction*, (London: Routledge, 2002).

[11] Hugh W. Nibley, 'The Meaning of the Temple', *Temple and Cosmos: Beyond This Ignorant Present*, ed. by Don E. Norton (Salt Lake City and Provo: Deseret Book Co., Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1992) 19.

[12] There are indications that this was also taught during the Nauvoo period. See specifically the comments from Joseph Lee Robinson's Journal in Charles R. Harrell, 'The Development of the Doctrine of the Pre–existence, 1830–1844', *BYU Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, (1988), 75–91 (87). See also George Q. Cannon G.Q., Dec 23 1894, 'Prophet of the Nineteenth Century', *Collected Discourses 1886–1898*, ed. Brian H. Stuy, vol. 4, (Burbank, Calif., and Woodland Hills, UT.: B.H.S. Publishing, 1989).

fore materiality is part of divinity and cannot be 'Other' to spirit; for they are of the same substance (however that is to be described). However, this 'metaphysical monism'[13] does not seem to have become predominant within Mormon discourse concerning the body[14] and this slippage might also be the source of the ambiguity, which allows constructivist accounts of the body to predominate.[15] The absent–presence of the Mormon body is more evident because of this lack of clarity and yet this also makes it both a fruitful point from which to consider Mormon thought and practice.

Aside from the absent–presence in Mormon discourse of embodiment and the absent–presence in academic thinking there is a third sense in which the body could be considered an absent–presence. Givens has examined the formation of Mormon culture[16] and specifically considers the collapse of sacred distance as one of the paradoxes that plagues Mormonism. This paradox has a specific relevance to the body;[17] for example, it is possible that certain LDS–specific forms of embodied practice have generated a unique set of religious experiences and values. "Mormonism has... become a particular way of presenting the body",[18] one that is in part an absent–presence. Thus the body is produced as an absence in its emphasis on modesty or certain cultural norms of dress whereas the 'present body' is emphatically located in our ordinances and the way that our buildings 'embody' priesthood hierar-

[13] Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: OUP, 2007) 42.

[14] Benjamin E. Park, 'Salvation through a Tabernacle: Joseph Smith, Parley Pratt and Early Mormon Theologies of the Embodiment', *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, vol. 43, no. 2, (2010), 1–44. Park argues that dualistic approaches to the body and spirit were common in the early revelations and because they were later canonized this ambiguity persists. Moreover, Park recognises that Mormon monism is not really monism proper but is a form of dualistic monism.

[15] Daymon M. Smith, 'The Last Shall be First and the First Shall be Last: Discourse and Mormon History', (Ph.D Dissertation: University of Pennsylvania, 2007).

[16] Givens, *People of Paradox*.

[17] Givens, *ibid.* 37.

[18] Mathew N. Schmalz, 'Teaching Mormonism in a Catholic Classroom', *Sunstone Magazine*, no. 134, (2004) 46–51.

chy[19] and cosmological principles.[20] There is not space to discuss all of these ideas in this essay, but they serve as indications of the multiple ways that bodies can be enacted.[21]

It is upon these enactments that this essay intends to focus. Mol argues that in tracing the ontology of the body in a specific context, it is important to be sensitive to the various ways that bodies are constituted through practice. From her research Mol observes how the body is multiple (it is always more than one but does not become fragmented into being many). From within Mormonism it is possible to observe a similar multiplicity; these bodies are not necessarily coherent but there are often attempts at creating this coherence. Thus another way the absent–presence of the body is observable in Mormon culture is through being cognisant of this 'body multiple';[22] for in seeking for this coherence some bodies are abjected and become absent whilst others are objectified and become present. Consequently, as a means of sensitising myself to this multiplicity I have followed a typology outlined by Synnott in order to explore and elaborate the ways that the Mormon body is enacted.

THE SOCIAL BODY

Recent interest in the Social Sciences toward embodiment has resulted in broad and diverse theories relating to how such a perspective can enhance understanding of social life.[23] A number of theorists have argued that how people view the body is central to the development of

[19] A classic example is the structure of the Kirtland temple which was separated according to ecclesiastical position. This same pattern is maintained on a smaller scale in our modern chapels where we have the local leadership raised and segregated from the congregation as a means of ensuring that the power relation of the observer/observed is maintained. The body of power is totally visible while the subjects are also positioned so that they are observable to that leader. For a discussion of this see Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (London: Peregrine, 1979).

[20] Nibley, *The Meaning of the Temple*, 15.

[21] Annemarie Mol, *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

[22] Mol, 'Body Multiple'.

[23] Turner, *The Body and Society*.

an individual's ontology.[24] In addition Potter has noted that a materialist ontology must invariably influence the way that we talk about the world, our narrative, and that such a view is perhaps incommensurable with other types of discourse, especially regarding religious experience.[25] James E. Talmage clearly recognised the individuality and centrality of the body in LDS doctrine when he wrote "[Latter–Day Saint's] regard the body as an essential part of the soul. Read your dictionaries, the lexicons, and encyclopaedias, and you will find that nowhere... is the solemn and eternal truth taught that the soul of man is the body and the spirit combined."[26] Further the idea that God is embodied[27] and the material cosmology of the plan of salvation[28] all contribute to the importance of the physical element to the LDS view of the Universe and the process of apotheosis.[29]

However, as Synnott describes in his monograph on the social body, there are a number of broad characterisations of the body through Western thought. Synnott takes a historical approach, noting that at different times specific bodily paradigms have predominated, and yet Synnott is also conscious that none of these conceptions are completely disregarded. In contemporary society, Synnott argues, each view is currently still available in some guise, but often in contradictory ways. This essay then, following Synnott, argues that Mormon thinking on the body can be fruitfully discussed from within these categories. Synnott's discussion focuses of four bodily typologies: Tombs, Temples, Machines and/or the Self.[30] This variation is a reflection of the ambig-

[24]Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1984).

[25] R. Dennis Potter, 'Post–mortem Materialism: A Mormon Approach to Embodiment' delivered at *Sunstone Symposium* (28/7/2005) [online] accessed https://www.sunstonemagazine.com/shop/products/?product_id=940&category=3

[26] James E. Talmage., *Conference Report, October 1913*, Third Day–Morning Session 117.

[27] Joseph F. Smith J.F, John R. Winder & Anthony H. Lund, *Editor's Table: 'The Origin of Man'* in Improvement Era, Vol. 13. No. 1. (Salt Lake City, UT.: 1909) 75–81.

[28] Hugh W. Nibley, The Meaning of the Temple, 15.

[29] This is no more clearly observed than in D&C 130:22–3 or 131:7–8.

[30] Anthony Synnott, *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*, (London: Routledge, 1993)

uous nature of bodies. Butler writes "the thought of materiality invariably moved me into other domains... I could not fix bodies as simple objects of thought".[31] For the early Greeks the body (*soma*) was associated with the tomb (*sema*). Such a view, although unpopular with some, was influential on other important thinkers, such as Plato. As a result Plato describes the body as something, which enslaves the soul (spirit). Although Synnott draws upon the theology of Paul to posit the Christian idea of the body as a Temple (see 1 Cor 3:16–7) it is interesting to note that he also writes that the man of sin is dead (to spiritual life) and that it must be crucified in order to begin a new life in Christ; thus the body is also a tomb (Rom 7:24). It is from Descartes, and later Marx and other nineteenth century writers, that Synnott derives the conceptualisation of the body as a Machine.[32] Lastly, the Body has been, especially within the last century, associated with the Self.[33]

Not wishing to analyse Synnott's historical categorisation,[34] this paper will discuss how these conceptions work within the paradigm of the 'Mormon' body. It seems untenable to maintain that such discrete constructs form a universal conception of the body and so it would be more fruitful to discuss how the contemporary bodily paradigms influence and shape current understandings. Thus Foucault outlines that discursive formations "are directly connected to the body";[35] they hold, inscribe and delimit bodies. Consequently such formations can overlap and contradict while producing bodies. Within Mormon thought these conflicting discursive formations are evident and may therefore result in a theological and experiential tension for some Mormons in relation to their bodies. Therefore I accept, with Shilling, that Foucault's discussions of discourse are vital to understanding the body and in addition it

[31] Judith Butler, *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*, (London: Routledge, 1993), xi. This is not an attempt to engage with Butler or her thought, but merely to highlight the difficultly that thinking about the body has posed for Western philosophers.

[32] Anthony Synnott, *The Body Social*, 22.

[33] Ibid., 7.

[34] There is not space to discuss whether these historical categories emerged at the times he claims. Moreover, as this discussion is located within the context of Mormonism it seems logical to retain a focus upon contemporary discussions of the body.

[35] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge*, Vol. 1, (London: Penguin, 1998), 151.

is essential that due consideration is given to the role that the body has in shaping these discourses is. However, that Foucault's view of the body has also been criticised for abjecting some forms of embodiment I have followed Mol's conception of the body as multiple.

THE BODY AND THE FALL

How Mormonism theorises the fall becomes essentially linked with how Plato and Paul viewed the body.[36] Jewish legend, according to Ginzberg, has a number of traditions that focus upon the embodied importance of the Garden of Eden narrative.[37] Adam and Eve experience an embodied shift as a result of the fall, which brings about physical and spiritual death (to use Mormon concepts) (see Al 42:1–9). Similarly, although not explicit in the Genesis text, we learn from drawing upon other sources that some changes occurred to the bodies given to our first parents. They became able to have children and some form of physical suffering was given to both genders (2 Ne 2:22–3). Such a story highlights that the body is immediately implicated in mortality and also, by consequence, in redemption.

Important for this discussion is the link between the bodily change brought about by the fall and the environmental change that subsequently resulted from this. Mormon thought emphasises that prior to the fall fruits and flowers came forth spontaneously[38] while it seems that after the fall Adam and Eve had to work to produce the means of survival (Gen 3:17–9).[39] This ontological and material shift was part of the divine descent into mortality.[40] It appears, following this logic, that God intended that Humans experience a particular materiality in order that they progress. This materiality is often characterised in

[36] See Plato, *The Republic*, (London: Penguin, 2007); Bruce Chilton, *Rabbi Paul: An Intellectual Biography*, (London: Image Books, 2005).

[37] Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews: From Creation to Jacob*, vol. 1. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998 [1909]), 55–58, 69–74.

[38] Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. London: Latter–day Saints' Book Depot, 1854–1886, vol. 19 (1887), 6.

[39] Bruce R. McConkie, *Sermons and Writings of Bruce R. McConkie*, ed. Mark L. McConkie, (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1998), 201.

[40] M. Catherine Thomas, *Alma the Younger (Part 2): Man's Descent*, (Provo, UT.: Maxwell Institute, 2009) [online] accessed at http://mi.byu.edu /publications /transcripts/?id=44.

the standard works as being lost or fallen; both the earth and the Self (2 Ne 25:17; Al 12:22).

The earth is fallen in that it has moved away from the influence of God[41] and it's nature changed, as discussed earlier (Gen 3:17–9). The fallen self is a little more complex as it relates to the body. Man is described as lost and fallen because it seems that mankind is lost in regards to where they are from and where they are going, or what their ultimate goal is. Being lost in this regard emerges from the veil of forgetfulness that is associated with being born into mortality and therefore with gaining a body. Man is fallen because, as Thomas writes, they are reduced in power and spirit from the pre–mortal life because of being born into a sinful world.[42] Here it is possible to detect two strands of thought upon the concept of 'fallen'. The fallen earth and individual situates this shift in a specific spatio–temporal location while there is also a sense that fallen refers to a spiritual separation from God. Such strands are not wholly similar yet neither are they easily separated, and they are both available motifs in modern Mormonism.

At the very least it is clear that most of these speculative theologies (i.e. a focus upon a physical, or embodied, separation) generated concerning the body have their roots in nineteenth century Mormonism.[43] According to Daymon Smith there was shift from the body being the locus for Mormon speculative theology to the mind.[44] This shift, he argues, had wide implication for how the body was conceived of and spoken about in Mormon discourse. Hence many of these theological innovations are rooted in an unfamiliar theological milieu and this shift might represent a lack of concern for the body in Mormon thought more generally. This might reflect an increasing ambiguity (and in some cases out–right rejection) concerning questions centred upon the Heav-

[41] Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols., (London: Latter–day Saints' Book Depot, 1854–1886) vol. 17, (19 July 1874), 143; see also Joseph Smith Jr., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, selected and arranged by Joseph Fielding Smith, (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1976), 181.

[42] M. Catherine Thomas, Alma the Younger, Part 2: Man's Descent.

[43] Douglas J. Davies, *An Introduction to Mormonism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[44] Daymon M. Smith, 'The Last Shall be First and the First Shall be Last: Discourse and Mormon History', (Ph.D Dissertation: University of Pennsylvania, 2007).

enly Mother or Polygamy or Adam–God. For these ideas are rooted in a nineteenth century theology of the body, which has, now been jettisoned. The result is a series of doctrinal fragments and a few isolated canonical statements that hardly provide a clear theology of embodiment.

Returning to this fallen body, it is clear that trying to understand Mormon ontological claims regarding the subject requires a understanding of the narratives of the fall. Another of the primary implications of this fall is an ontological shift in the relationship between the spirit and the flesh. For example, Elder Ballard taught that it is because our bodies are made of unredeemed matter that they are susceptible to temptation, this is an interesting note in light of the previous statements but also in reference to the role of the body in furthering progression through weakness.[45] Thus, in this instance, the body prior to the fall had a different nature and or a different relationship with the spirit than after. Stephen Robinson provides a more recent example of this position, in his book *Believing Christ.* He argues that the mortal body and the spirit 'fidget' with each other in a way they seemingly did not prior to the fall nor will they after.[46]

From this it is clear that the fall enacts a dualism between spirit and flesh. In this form of discourse spirit and body are opposed, though capable of harmony through divine intervention and therefore works against the metaphysical monism posed earlier. Moreover, often in this dualistic model of embodiment the body is seen as a tomb where it is weak, carnal, sensual and devilish. However, Joseph is clear that all beings that have bodies, even mortal bodies, have power over those that

[45] Melvin J. Ballard, 'Our Channels of Power and Strength', *Improvement Era*, Vol. 26. No. 11. (1923). Ballard seems to have obtained this view from Brigham Young. Young said: "The spirit is influenced by the body, and the body by the spirit. In the first place the spirit is pure, and under the special control and influence of the Lord, but the body is of the earth, and is subject to the power of the devil, and is under the mighty influence of that fallen nature that is on the earth." (Cited in Monte S. Nyman and Charles D. Tate, Jr., eds., *Mosiah: Salvation Only through Christ* (Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1991), 152.)

[46] Stephen E. Robinson, *Believing Christ: The Parable of the Bicycle and Other Good News* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1992), 19.

do not.[47] Though this 1841 expression from Joseph reflects an implicit dualism it is clear that the body is conceived in a different relation to the spirit. This presupposes that neither the flesh nor the spirit is the cause or source of sinfulness, as suggested in other LDS writings. This has been addressed more recently in an article from the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* Van Der Graaf argues that Mormons do not see the flesh opposed to the spirit but rather LDS's should 'strive for righteous harmony between the two'.[48] This harmony seeks health and training for the body and perfection and discipline for the spirit. Though in this latter view the body is not considered opposed to the righteous spirit, there is still a sense that without training the body cannot achieve this righteous harmony. Therefore the notion of fallen flesh still presents itself in LDS discourse though the form of this discourse differs widely.

All of the aforementioned accounts of the fallen body assume a literalistic reading of the Eden narrative, though this is done to differing degrees and it is manifest in different forms. More recently Steven L. Peck has attempted to provide a means of situating the fall, Adam & Eve and Eden within a LDS vision of evolution.[49] For Peck, it is possible to view the fall 'less literally' and instead view it as a 'process of a spiritual and material coming together'.[50] In this view the fall becomes 'a fall into materiality'.[51] Dualism underlines this approach and therefore Givens' 'metaphysical monism' would raise important questions for such a perspective. Why is this coming together a 'fall', for example, if they are the same substance? Why is it that 'natural evils' only follow this 'coming together' and why did they not persist prior to it? Such questions are not intended as a critique but attempt rather to highlight assumptions that such a view, rooted as it is in the Mormon and wider Christian traditions, brings to theological discussions of the body. It is evident that in a whole variety of ways the body is conceived of as a Tomb, or fallen, in Mormon theology and practice.

---

[47] Joseph Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith,* selected and arranged by Joseph Fielding Smith (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1976), 190.

[48] Kent M. Van Der Graaf, 'Physical Body' in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* (4 vols.), ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, (New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1992), 1080.

[49] Steven L. Peck, 'Crawling out of the Primordial Soup: A Step Toward the Emergence of an LDS Theology Compatible with Organic Evolution', *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, vol. 43, no. 1, (2010), 1–36 (25).

[50] Peck, ibid., 25.

[51] Peck, ibid., 25.

THE BODY AS A TEMPLE

Aside from the general theme of the fallen body there is, in addition, another thread that attempts to situate the body as a Temple. For Synnott, as previously mentioned, this notion is tied to Pauline theology; however it is apparent that his reading, though similar to a wide number of LDS readings of the epistles, betrays a superficial appreciation of the complexity of Paul's position. When LDS writers (and others) declare that the body is a temple, what do they mean? These statements are generically applied to all and are therefore suggest a contradiction between a body, which is simultaneously fallen, and a temple.[52] It is possible that these statements, invariably using Paul's declaration in an uncritical fashion, are situating an emotively significant archetype for Latter–day Saints (i.e. the temple) in relation to the body in order to facilitate an increased respect for the body. In this view the temple is a divine gift with divine possibilities rather than an object which is essentially divine. However, that these generic statements, collapsing temples and bodies, are made by many Church leaders in official capacities and settings (such as General Conference) provides a fertile context for a literalistic reading of these texts. Yet, how these same writers would attempt to articulate the tension between the fallen body and the body as a temple is unclear.

One possible explanation has been described by Elder David A. Bednar, then President of Ricks College. Elder Bednar suggests that our bodies are temples and that they are not inherently fallen; though they do exist in a fallen world which influences our bodies. He then describes how the body is not of necessity sinful but is susceptible to a greater degree of influence from the fallen world surrounding the body than the spirit is. This enacts a dualistic approach to the body where the body seems to be other another form of material to the spirit. Similarly this view accepts a particular version of the fall one perhaps most closely aligned with Ballard's view or the flesh. At the very least it is clear that trying to articulate the body as a temple automatically implies notions of the fall.

[52] See Susan W. Tanner, 'The Sanctity of the Body', *Liahona*, (Nov 2005), 13–15; Boyd K. Packer, 'Ye Are the Temple of God', *Ensign*, (Nov 2000), 72–74; Dieter F. Uchtdorf, 'See the End from the Beginning', *Liahona*, (May 2006), 42–45.

That these references to the body–as–temple persistently utilise Paul's text (see 1 Cor 3:16–7; 6:19), understanding his writing is necessary for an appreciation of how the body is enacted in this way. He writes, for example, that the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is a member of the Godhead. It is clear that Synnott links this text with notions of dedicated or consecrated spaces which are capable of receiving God's presence (D&C 109:5). Such strands of thought are similar to Mormon thinking upon temples and the body. It is the idea of immanent presence, both of the self and of God that makes the temple a powerful concept; for in LDS theology these spaces of communion and presence are central to facilitating the reception of the blessings God offers to His people. The body as temple therefore allows God to be in a situational immanence with the follower of Christ. It is noteworthy the Temple is often an absent–presence in terms of God's person/glory in relation to temples and this can be re–applied to embodiment as well.

There is not the space to provide a detailed survey of Paul's theology of the body. There is not a consensus on the hermeneutical questions of his intended meaning though there is a sense in which both Synnott and many LDS writers have used Paul's comments as proof–texts. Firstly, according to Brown, early Christians saw the body in a number of different ways.[53] Hill has highlighted that there are at least three schools of thought regarding what Paul means by his use of the temple metaphor: first, it could be associated with Greek philosophical thought which connected the Gods and the body, second, it might reflect notions of corporatist solidarity (i.e. the body is a temple and the individual becomes part of that body/community) and third, it might be referring to certain Gnostic notions of a primal or pre–contaminated body.[54] Hill himself argues that there is a fourth possibility which draws upon a Greek temple in the vicinity of Corinth in order to use a familiar metaphor of the broken individuals who are healed through joining the body of Christ.[55] From this, it is possible to argue that individualistic notions of the body as a Temple may well be the result of a

[53] Peter Brown, The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity, (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1989).
[54] A. E. Hill, 'The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 99, no. 3, (1980), 437–9
[55] Hill, *ibid.*

Hellenized view of subjectivity that have continued to influence LDS theology.

This individualism is prominent in discussions that refer to the body as a Temple. For example, Talmage argued that the body and the earth follow a similar redemptive narrative; in that they are both born, baptised, die and are resurrected.[56] It has already been observed that nineteenth century Mormonism saw such parallels as central to their soteriology, i.e. the literal fall of the earth and Adam & Eve. The temple also became endued with salvific power and the Garden of Eden has been strongly connected with Temple narratives. According to Parry, for example, the Mosaic temple was structurally similar to Eden and was supposed to symbolise an embodied walk back into the presence of the God.[57] Lenet Read also notes that the Mosaic temple was a symbolic construction of the body of Christ, thus again linking the idea of bodily presence.[58] Such accounts represent, in some sense, an attempt to make timeless certain ideas through a process of abstraction, which Daymon Smith argues is symptomatic of the contemporary rational spirituality that can be observed in the LDS Church's culture.[59]

These analogies between temples, bodies and the earth are elaborated in a variety of important ways. The earth is in part redeemed by the sanctification of a delineated space through dedication.[60] This space is located amidst a fallen world and like the body, which is also fallen, must be redeemed through a process of sanctification. Thus the body through covenants experiences preparatory sanctification. Then when the body moves into the sacred spaces of the inner temple they

[56] James E. Talmage, *Articles of Faith,* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1981), 341.

[57] Donald W. Parry, 'Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary', *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*, ed. Parry D.W. (Salt Lake City and Provo: Deseret Book Co., Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1994), 126–52 (134–135).

[58] Lenet H. Read, *Unveiling Biblical Prophecy*, (San Francisco, CA.: Latter–day Light Publications, 1990) 47.

[59] Daymon M. Smith, *The Last Shall be First and the First Shall be Last: Discourse and Mormon History*, (Ph.D Dissertation: University of Pennsylvania, 2007), 466–469

[60] George Q. Cannon, *Gospel Truth: Discourses and Writings of President George Q. Cannon,* selected, arranged, and edited by Jerreld L. Newquist (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1987), 366.

are privileged to enter the presence of God; thus the temple as a repository of glory provides such glory to those who enter and so the body becomes a recipient of the glory of the temple (see D&C 109:12–3). Moreover, as this experience is repeated a change is wrought in the body that overcomes the nature of the fallen individual until they are "redeemed from the Fall" (Eth 3:13) like the brother of Jared and are born again like Christ.

In understanding this, a crude, but perhaps instructive example can be highlighted: the body in its mortal guise seems to be comparable, in these descriptions, to the Kirtland Temple, as a preparatory Temple which leads the way to a higher temple such as Nauvoo.[61] This notion of a preparatory temple has been argued elsewhere but from a different perspective. Douglas J. Davies writes, "theologically, it is as though the temple moves back out into the wider world in and through [the temple] garment."[62] In this regard therefore it may be that the body becomes a Temple, for Mormons, only for those who have been endowed and had the garment placed upon them. Therefore Synnott's argument that early Christian's viewed the body as a temple once it has been crucified is readily re–appropriated by Mormons today, for this crucifying of the flesh was part of the set of rites that initiated the individual into the Christian community.[63]

However there is also a sense that the body is made sacred because of Christ's atonement. This view has been articulated by one of the current apostles, Elder Jeffrey R. Holland, in an article entitled '*Of Souls, Symbols and Sacraments*'.[64] In his view, following Paul, the body is purchased by Christ through his blood and as a consequence 'we are not our own'. In substance, the body is made holy through Christ and has become a repository for the Holy Spirit as a result. As the Holy

[61] T. Edgar Lyon, 'Doctrinal Development of the Church During the Nauvoo Sojourn, 1839–1846', *BYU Studies*, vol. 15, Number 4, (1975), 435–446 (441).
[62] Davies, *An Introduction to Mormonism*, 217.
[63] Hugh W. Nibley, 'Early Christian Prayer Circles', *Mormonism and Early Christianity,* edited by Todd M. Compton and Stephen D. Ricks, (Salt Lake City and Provo: Deseret Book Co., Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1987), 49.
[64] Jeffrey R. Holland, *Of Souls, Symbols and Sacraments* in Morality, (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1992); see also David A. Bednar, 'Ye Are the Temple of God', Ensign, (Sep 2001), 14.

Spirit, in Mormon theology, is a personage of spirit, being able to experience his influence and presence in the body is associated with being prepared to receive God in the body. Because the Holy Spirit can dwell in a person it can therefore make them a Temple.

Further the body can also be considered in the context of being crucified through suffering as a precursor to a newness of life. Thus, as Jesus' body was a mechanism for the experience of suffering and death, so too are the bodies of all other people, the vehicles through which we suffer and are crucified. This idea seems rooted to the words Jesus was reported to have said regarding his body being a temple which would be destroyed and raised again (see Matt 26: 61; John 2:18–22). Suffering, sacrifice and consecration seem to be three themes, which have been tied together in an attempt to consider how the body can be a sacred space and the source of an abundant life. Dunn argues that when Paul counsels the saints to offer up their bodies he is asking them to offer up themselves 'precisely as bodies, themselves in their corporeality... the dedication expressed in their embodied relationships' was equivalent of Israel's sacrifices.[65] Though this is clearly not a singularly Mormon idea the controversy, which has been present in some Christian traditions regarding the limits of suffering that, might be experienced by Jesus have not crept into the LDS mainstream as yet.[66] Discussions of Kenosis and embodiment, however, do raise important questions for a Mormon theodicy.

In considering these various ways of thinking about the body as a temple, it is clear that they enact different understandings of the fallen body discussed earlier. Clearly the body–as–temple motif is used as a metaphor in order to reinforce the view that people are children of God and it is also situated as the result of a process of sanctification. Moreover there are also those who argue that the body is a temple because of

[65] James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul*, (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2006), 58.

[66] Anthony Maas, 'Kenosis', *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 8, (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910), [online] accessed on 8 June 2010: http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08617a.htm. Blake Ostler has provided a modified kenotic theory of Christ's condescension but this has not been present in LDS public discourse or in Church–sponsored manuals; see Blake T. Ostler, *The Attributes of God*, vol. 3, Exploring Mormon Thought [Salt Lake City, UT.: Kofford Books, 2001], 458–64.

the atonement of Christ, which has purchased the body (or soul). Thinking about the body as a temple in terms of receiving God's presence in a specific spatio–temporal location reinforces the anthropomorphism of God and the fall. Contrastingly Elder Holland's view of the body is one which situates the fallen body in terms atonement, sinfulness and righteousness and reinforces an *a fortiori* conception of the body–as–temple. One consistent pattern is observable across this variety and this pertains to persistent attempts to situate the fall, redemption and the temple in the theological context of embodiment. Regarding the body–as–temple is one area where the absent–presence of Mormon embodiment recurs, for it is frequently used as a motif but this repetition allows a great deal of slippage between these domains. The result is an ambiguous body that is not easily captured.

THE BODY AS SELF OR MACHINE

In this section both the Machine and the Self are discussed in relation to the body primarily because the body as machine is not as dominant in Mormon thinking, even though there is some evidence of this view. Synnott roots the conception of the body as machine in Cartesian philosophy and the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century.[67] His argument is not that the body is just a machine but rather that the body is animated by some other force. This dualistic approach, though common in Mormonism generally is usually viewed, as has been observed, in a different way. Within Mormon discourse the body is at times seen as something that needs to be disciplined, controlled and put to work in order to make it effective for salvation. Scripture refers to the importance of bridling the passions of the flesh (see Al 38:12) and are interpreted as relating to exerting a degree of control over a part of the 'soul' that will lead people astray. In this sense the body is a vehicle, a means to an end, but one that must be mastered; not loved and expanded. Thus in trying to reconcile these many and varied aspects of the Mormon body it is no wonder that there might be some schizophrenia regarding how Mormons are to feel about their bodies. Is it to be abhorred or adored? Are Latter–day Saints to reject it or rejoice in it? These contradictory forms of discourse between the body–as–temple and the body as something to be controlled, or as merely a material

[67] Anthony Synnott, *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*, (London: Routledge, 1993), 22–23.

instrument of the spirit,[68] suggest a disordered understanding of Mormon embodiment.

Regarding the body and subjectivity, Joseph Smith has taught that some parts of the body are eternally part of the self and that the body is essential to certain forms of action. These statements have generated some controversy (even when they were first said), but they perhaps provide an interesting foundation for a unique notion of LDS selfhood. As stated earlier, to regard the body and spirit as a soul in this life and the next seems to place a high currency on what bodies might mean to Latter–day Saints. Various forms of Physicality will inevitably be constitute of various forms of subjectivity and are therefore connected with Mormon ideas of eternal progression. Perhaps the 'imperfect' marks of the crucifixion were retained in the 'perfected' body of Jesus because he loved the scars obtained through his sacrifices for those he loved.[69]

In an interesting reflection upon the body, and in contradistinction to the mechanistic view of the body sometimes espoused in the LDS faith, Paul R. Cazier writes: "most of the time I feel as though I am not the owner of a body, but a body itself."[70] This again raises those difficult questions regarding what a body *is*? Faulconer has written that

> The bodies of flesh and bone with which I am familiar do not shine, have blood, cannot hover, can be wounded and die, must move through contiguous points of time–space––in short, they are not at all like the bodies of the Father and the Son. So what does it mean to say that the Father and the Son

[68] David A. Bednar, 'Ye Are the Temple of God', *Ensign*, (Sep 2001), 14.

[69] There has been some discussion regarding why this occurred. President Joseph F. Smith taught that we will be resurrected with "the wounds in the flesh" that we received in mortality. President Smith continues by teaching that "a person will always be marred by scars, wounds, deformities, defects or infirmities, for these will be removed in their course, in their proper time, according to the merciful providence of God." ('Our Indestructible, Immortal Identity', *Improvement Era*, vol. Xii, (June 1909). This implies that we will lose these scars over time. Joseph Fielding Smith however, teaches that these changes will occur "almost instantly" (*Doctrines of Salvation*, 3 vols., edited by Bruce R. McConkie [Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954–1956], vol. 2: 294). Thus there is some ambiguity regarding why Jesus had his scars and what they mean for the resurrection.

[70] Cazier, 'Embracing the Flesh', 98.

> have bodies... Given the vast difference between what we mean by the word 'body' in every other case and that to which the word refers in this case, one can legitimately ask whether the word 'body' has the same meaning in this case that it has in the others.[71]

Paulsen for example, tries to avoid these problematic issues by defining the 'body' in terms slightly looser than those suggested by Faulconer. Paulsen uses "the term corporeal to mean having a body of any kind including those comprised of spirit matter as well as flesh and bone".[72] In addition he uses "the term embodied to mean having any sort of body whether spirit, mortal or exalted."[73] Accepting that the Spirit body is a form of embodiment makes sense in the light of Joseph's revelations and yet similar questions can be asked of this form of (spirit) body that Faulconer asks of God's body.

In addition, using Faulconer's questions on divine embodiment indicates that part of the absent–presence that is observable regarding human embodiment in LDS thought is perhaps tied to how God's body is also both simultaneously absent and present. What can be positively said about God's body (and by implication His subjectivity) is limited. For example Blake Ostler has argued that God is not constrained by his body, for His light and influence expand throughout the universe.[74] If this is so then it becomes unclear what relationship these bodies can have for the influence of one is very different from the other. God is therefore omnipresent through the influence of His light or spirit and is also in a specific spatio–temporal locale. God is both simultaneously absent and present. Consequently, these questions are suggestive because of the implications they have for how LDS thinkers approach and understand subjectivity.

Because discussions of the Self in LDS theology have most often been directed toward 'Intelligence' rather than the body it is important to consider how Intelligence might relate to embodiment.

---

[71] James E. Faulconer, 'Divine Embodiment and Transcendence: Propaedeutic Thoughts and Questions', *Element: A Journal of Mormon Philosophy and Theology*, vol. 1, no. 1, [online] http://www.smpt.org/docs/faulconer_element1–1.html

[72] Paulsen, 'The Doctrine of Divine Embodiment', 8.

[73] Ibid., 8

[74] Blake T. Ostler, *Of God and Gods*, vol. 3, *Exploring Mormon Thought*, (Salt Lake City, UT.: Greg Kofford Books, 2008).

Debates concerning the ontological status of Intelligence have moved through a number of phases.[75] Ostler has categorised three broad strands of thought concerning this topic.[76] He argues that B.H. Roberts' view (which is also the one adopted by Madsen) was that Intelligence referred to an uncreated essence that had the properties of free–will, autonomy and consciousness.[77] Another perspective can be derived from Bruce R. McConkie and Charles W. Penrose who believed that intelligences were separated from Intelligence (which was uncreated) and that these intelligences were then begotten as spirit sons and daughters or God.[78] Finally, Ostler argues that Joseph Smith (and he tentatively agrees) believed that spirits were autonomous intelligences and were also co–eternal with God.[79] What is noteworthy about these three paradigms is how the corporeal body is missing completely and that the body as a form of spirit matter is only 'essential' to one of them. It is difficult to tell which strand is currently predominant in Mormon culture primarily because such references are often deleted from official manuals.[80]

Clearly the body (either spirit or matter) has a contradictory connection with the Mormon view of selfhood, it is concurrently accepted as part of the soul and as essential to the trajectory of LDS apotheosis whilst being excluded from ideas surrounding the essential 'self'. However, it is possible that this opposition might reflect a greater emphasis upon becoming rather than being in Mormon theology and that the body can incorporate into this model of becoming. Despite these differences it is common to all of them to view the self, as did Truman G. Madsen, with the capacity of 'enlargement'.[81]

---

[75] Kenneth W. Godfrey, 'The History of Intelligence in Latter–day Saint Thought', *Pearl of Great Price: Revelations from God*, ed. Charles D. Tate & H. Donl Petersen, (Salt lake City, UT.: Deseret Book, 1989), 213–35.

[76] Ostler, 'Of God and Gods', 5–6.

[77] B. H. Roberts, *Immortality of Man* in Improvement Era, vol. 10, (April 1907), 401–423; see Truman G. Madsen, 'Eternal Man', *Five Classics*, (Salt Lake City, UT.: Eagle Gate, 2001), 7–70.

[78] Ostler, 'Of God and Gods', 5

[79] Ibid.

[80] Godfrey, 'The History of Intelligence', 232.

[81] Madsen, 'Eternal Man', 19; see also William Clayton report of King Follet Discourse in *The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo*

Though Ostler would agree with this final assertion, he has taken a contrasting view of embodiment to the more orthodox discussions raised earlier. His more nuanced position regarding the body–as–Self,[82] which is similar to Paulsen's, focuses upon the ambiguous role of the body in Mormon theology. Specifically, Ostler concedes that God is embodied (either spirit or element) but that this is not essential to his divinity. The consequences of this shift for Mormon thought have not been adequately spelt out, but at the very least it suggests a radical reformulation of the meaning of the body for this life. For example, it would undercut any notion of the body being an essential part of a person's progression toward becoming like God. Yet this formulation is problematic, for example, Ostler's view raises important questions concerning the necessity of a corporeal resurrection and the relation that the body and the spirit have in his theology.

The Body and the Divine

Such a discussion inevitably raises questions about the role of the body in connecting with God and seeking to emulate him and in doing this I will move this discussion beyond the realm of Synnott's four–part paradigm of the social body in an effort elucidate some of the more unique aspects of Mormon thought concerning embodiment. Consequently, some of the themes, which have already been discussed, will be taken up again and elaborated in greater detail. As noted already, Ostler's theology raises questions about the necessity of the body to existing as a divine person and yet in a wide variety of other LDS theologies (both systematic and unsystematic) the body is central to what it means to be divine. Considering the body as (or possibly) divine encourages questions pertaining to the role of sexual practice and the fallen status of human beings.[83]

In the view of Bloom, part of Joseph's religious genius was how he melded "the sacred–ness of sexuality" with "the sacred mystery of embodiment" and concluded, "without [this] godhood would not be possible."[84] From a different perspective, and in a different setting, Jef-

---

Discourses of the Prophet Joseph, compiled and edited by Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook [Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980], 355–360.

[82] Ostler, 'Of God and Gods', 301.

[83] Turner, 'The Body and Society'.

[84] Bloom, 'The American Religion', 103.

frey R. Holland draws out a similar conclusion when he writes that "human intimacy is a sacrament,"[85] where a sacrament is defined as "one of a number of gestures or acts or ordinances that unite us with God and His limitless powers."[86] However it should be noted that currently this view of human sexuality is reserved for monogamous heterosexual intimacy. This is pertinent because Bloom's comment emerges from his discussion of Joseph's practice of polygamy whilst Holland's is spoken to a group of University students in a now monogamous Mormon cultural and theological context.

This complexity is heightened when recent debates regarding homosexuality are also highlighted. For example, Christopher Bigelow has argued, 'in order for same–sex marriage to be accepted by Mormons, we would need to become convinced that God himself could conceivably engage in such a union, including its sexual implications'.[87] The extensions that can be drawn from each of these arguments are evidently very different. For example Bloom's argument could be used to view sex and polygamy as part of a revolutionary kinship system.[88] Contrastingly Bigelow's contention seems to be that sexual intercourse is a divine act, which is essential to God's divinity because He is still creating life through this process (and viviparous birth). Further Holland's argument seems to situate sex as a creative, life–giving and ultimately atoning act but one that connects us with God via a form of sexual liturgy. Evidently the ambiguity of sexual practice within a Mormon context is problematised by the shifting understanding of 'sex as a sacrament'.

In addition to these concerns, sexual fulfilment has become of increasing concern to Latter–day Saints. Church–owned bookstores have begun to sell 'popular' guides to sexual satisfaction.[89] These texts link specifically erogenous body parts like the clitoris, with a literalistic reading of the creation and therefore conclude that the sex act and the

[85] Holland, 'Of Souls', 162.
[86] Holland, *ibid.*, 162.
[87] Christopher Bigelow, 'Why Mormonism can't Abide Gay Marriage', Sunstone Magazine, (2007).
[88] See Richard L. Bushman, Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling: A Cultural Biography of Mormonism's Founder (New York: Vintage Books, 2007).
[89] Laura M. Brotherstone, And they were not Ashamed: Strengthening Marriage through Sexual Fulfilment, (Salt Lake City, UT.: Inspire Book, 2004).

accompanying orgasm are divinely sanctioned. That these books have found a market suggests something significant about sexual discourse in the LDS context. Initially this indicates the potentially irreconcilable interpretations that emerge from the varied socio–political contexts.[90] Here again we see the absence–presence of Mormon embodiment. For example it is possible to contrast this popular literature with official statements which regular decry the use of pornography or any sexual activity prior to marriage. As Holland notes, such acts must be done in the right way. What is clear from the preceding discussion is that the sex act itself, and even orgasm, are not of necessity divine; for it is divine only if engaged with the right type of person (i.e. someone of the opposite sex) and in the right context (i.e. inside of marriage). If this is not the case then those individuals 'crucify the son of God afresh' according to Holland.[91]

Clearly, sexual practice is an integral, if often unspoken, feature of the Mormon view of divinity and more importantly of the role of embodiment in the experience of divinity. What is most notable about this discourse is the frequency with which male sexual deviance qua masturbation/pornography is openly discussed[92] while other sexual practice or even discussions of encouraging intimacy are rarely ever heard in a public setting. Embodied sexuality is also part of this absent–presence observable in the Mormon tradition.

In addition to discussions of sexuality and embodiment, the human experience of joy is associated with other types of body–practice. Givens notes that as the Saints travelled across the plains they danced, sang and played music. The importance of this is that, according to Givens, "dancing is... in many ways just an emblem or a symbol of a kind of righteous reveling in the physical tabernacle that [Mormons] believe is a stage on our way to godliness itself."[93] Such actions were a

[90] Armand L. Mauss, *The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation*, (Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois Press, 1994).
[91] Holland, 'Of Souls', 162.
[92] A recent exception to this is Elder Jeffrey R. Holland's sermon at the April 2010 General Conference in which he made reference to female use of pornography; see Jeffrey R. Holland, 'Place No More for the Enemy of my Soul', *Ensign*, (May 2010), p44–46.
[93] Terryl L. Givens, *The Mormons*, PBS, 30th April 2007. Interview transcript [online] accessed at http://www.pbs.org/mormons/interviews/givens.html

celebration of the body and the experiences that could be attained through it. Embodied celebration emerged from Joseph Smith and seems again to have been set in stark contrast to the rigid Puritanical views that placed high value on an ascetic lifestyle. This incongruence between what Joseph felt and was taught about life created some guilt in his early years.[94] Yet, it would be unfair to characterise Smith as hedonistic for there were times when Joseph begun to be concerned about how the dance was performed; he did believe it had the propensity to foster sinfulness.[95] Here again the tension between potentially sacramental embodied actions which can also be profane. Recent research by Nielsen and White has found that the body is a site for the exercise of power[96] and therefore a symbol conformity or rebellion.[97] Thus bodily control or restraint is still balanced against a vision of the body as a source of joy.

Yet, for Mormons, because "embodiment in its most specific and abstract forms is central to articulating [their] vision of the divine",[98] physicality is part of spirituality. It seems that they cannot be easily separated. In this regard Jepson has written about the role of our corporeality in our spirituality by examining the role of physical conflict in our relationship with God. He concludes, "physical events are spiritual".[99] Though this article provides insight into how embodiment can be understood within Mormonism, there is clearly an absence of the female experience in this article; for it draws upon very male–oriented motifs. Can females draw upon this physicality in the same way as men? If the female bodily experience is different to men (which in some ways it appears to be) what impact does this have on Jepsons argument? Or how has the absence of female spiritual leaders from our scriptures

[94] Leonard J. Arrington, 'Joseph Smith', *The Presidents of the Church*, (Salt Lake City, UT.: Deseret Book, 1986) 8.
[95] Givens, People of Paradox, 134
[96] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (London: Peregrine, 1979)
[97] Michael E. Nielsen & Daryl White, 'Men's grooming in the Latter–day Saint's Church: A qualitative study of norm violation', *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, vol. 11, no. 8, (London: Routledge, 2008) 807–825.
[98] Schmalz, 'Teaching Mormonism in a Catholic Classroom', 46–51.
[99] Rick Jepson, 'Godwrestling: Physicality, Conflict and Redemption in Mormon Doctrine' in *Sunstone Magazine*, no. 139, (Salt Lake City, UT.: Sunstone Education Foundation, 2005) 27.

impacted upon the availability of this narrative of 'Godwrestling'? Jepson does not deal with these issues. Further, at the end of the article Jepson seems to vacillate between using this idea of 'Godwrestling' as a metaphor for spiritual growth and using it as an idea for understanding how our physicality brings us closer to God.[100] It seems that the force of his insight is the latter; for it is not that physical struggle can be compared to spiritual struggles but that physical struggles are invariably spiritual.

Conclusion

Considering embodiment as an absent–presence is a useful concept through which this topic can be considered in Mormon thought. Polygamous sexual practice cannot be separated from heterosexual monogamous discourse; neither can the temple be adequately separated from the tomb. These bodies are enacted in a variety of ways and with differing significance. It is clear that the materialist ontology of Mormonism is a central feature of its theology; but a lack of systematic or authoritative theological discussion coupled with shifting cultural trends has allowed the body to become a fluid concept, which easily assumes the meanings and prejudices of the theologian. In this regard, Merleau–Ponty's phenomenology of perception is especially apt, for it directs our attention to the situated–ness of our bodily experience;[101] perhaps this represents a process by which commentators on the body can attempt to come to terms with this variability. Because Mormonism is embedded in an extensive history of theological and philosophical concepts of embodiment and subjectivity it has been and will be difficult for LDS thinkers to appreciate the implications of Joseph's religious genius. At the very least, it is clear that the challenge of his theology 'of the body'[102] will provide a fruitful ground for further investigation of the Mormon religious experience. Central to Joseph's religion of the body is the message, expressed by Whitman, that *"whoever you are, how superb and how divine is your body"*.[103]

---

[100] Jepson, 'Godwrestling', 27.

[101] Maurice Merleau–Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception: An Introduction*, (London: Routledge, 2002).

[102] Park, 'Salvation through a Tabernacle', 1.

[103] Walt Whitman, 'Starting from Paumanok', *The Complete Poems of Walt Whitman*, (London: Wordsworth Poetry Library, 1995), 20.

Review – Mormon Convert, Mormon Defector: A Scottish Immigrant in the American West, 1848—1861

Reviewed by David M. Morris

Polly Aird, *Mormon Convert, Mormon Defector: A Scottish Immigrant in the American West, 1848–1861,* (Norman, Oklahoma: Arthur H. Clark Co., an imprint of the University of Oklahoma Press, 2009). Hardcover: 320 pages ISBN–13: 978–0870623691. $39.95

Polly Aird's recent book, *Mormon Convert, Mormon Defector: A Scottish Immigrant in the American West, 1848–1861* (Norman, OK: Arthur H. Clark Co., 2009) describes the journey of Peter McAuslan, a nineteenth century Scottish Presbyterian, a calico print designer by trade, and Mormon convert travelling from his homeland in Scotland to California via Utah.

The study of dissent, which arguably is this book's main genre is yet to receive much attention by scholars. Some have attempted to write about dissent but have become polarised by a confessional or an anti–LDS position. Interestingly, where research has been published, it has been authored on account of their own familial relationship to the main character in their narrative, rather than being an attempt to particularly fill an emerging genre. This certainly seems to be the case with this book. Aird relies mostly on McAuslan's documents that were written after he had left Mormonism. One letter in 1860 to Robert Salmon, one of his 1849 Scottish converts, is particularly insightful in understanding the feelings and circumstance of McAuslan.

In terms of positioning this book within recent publications, it could easily sit with Edward Leo Lyman, *Amasa Mason Lyman, Mormon Apostle and Apostate: A Study in Dedication* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2009) and to some extent the latter part of Ron Watt's excellent biography of G. D. Watt (*The Mormon Passage of George D. Watt: First British Convert, Scribe for Zion* (Utah State University Press, 2009). While these accounts are all of former Mormon converts, the main difference is found in the hierarchical location of each narrative. Lyman's work is from the perspective of a dissenting Mormon Apostle,

Watt's book is from the perspective of a prominent Mormon convert and Utah industrialist, and Aird's is from below from the perspective of the grassroots Mormon.

As Aird states in the prologue 'we must first turn to [McAuslan's] background to begin to discover the man that he became.' (30) Therefore Aird commences this book with two contextual chapters detailing the state of the industrial revolution, printing processes, social unrest and agitation in Scotland. Chapter Three continues in the same vein with a contextual background in terms of the religious landscape of the 1830s and 1840s in Scotland and the accompanying religious excitement and fervour. By 1843, this religious fervour had spread to McAuslan's wider family (Adamson) who began to respond to the message of Mormonism, a new religious order based in America. As part of the Mormon belief system, they began to anticipate emigrating to America. However, following the death of Joseph Smith Jr., the religion's prophet and charismatic leader, British emigration was put on hold for nearly four years. By 1848, the *Latter–day Saints' Millennial Star*, the Mormon periodical in Britain, began advertising and encouraging emigration once again (66). By February 1848, Peter's grandmother and uncles began to depart for America and at this point Peter appears to begin 'seriously considering Mormonism for himself.' (67). However, he was not baptised until eight months later in October 1848 (73).

The following year, 1849, McAuslan's friends and lodgers, Robert and Mary Salmon were baptised into Mormonism, having experienced a vision. By 1851, McAuslan had baptised at least three more persons (81). Aird informs us of contention and disruption in the Glasgow conference of the Mormon Church during 1851, resulting in over 100 excommunications and difficulties with church leaders, especially Elder Clements. Shortly thereafter, the leader in question ordained Peter an elder. Peter at this stage continued to baptise and did not appear to be disillusioned (84). Even with the Church's public announcement of the practise of polygamy in 1852, a great proportion of Peter's family, including parents and a sibling, continued to emigrate, leaving Peter and his two sisters behind (90). Peter followed in 1854 with his fiancé whom he married prior to sailing at Liverpool (97).

As part of a larger group of Scottish Mormons they commenced the seven–month journey and the first of three voyages towards the Americas. The first voyage was through the means of a steamer to Liv-

erpool, and then the onward Atlantic voyage to New Orleans on board the *John M. Wood*. During the Atlantic voyage, a clear pattern of community and discipline was enforced (112) as well as the occasional event of birth, marriage and death. Chapter Eight describes the third voyage on–board the *Josiah Lawrence* from New Orleans to Kansas City via the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. This voyage reminded some of being transported like cattle. Aird also details the outbreak of cholera (118) and the 'tricks' used by the captain to bypass official inspections or minimise delays due to overloading or disease while sailing to Kansas City (123). Seeds of discontent were beginning to develop; however, it was not until the conclusion of their journey where these seeds began to develop into a paralysing burden.

In Utah, the realisation of abrasive relationships with the United States and the locally imposed martial law caused many families to become discouraged. Apparent acts of violence were seemingly perpetrated under the direction of Mormon Bishops, leaders of the Seventy and ultimately Church President Brigham Young. Particularly poignant were the murders in Springville during March 1857 of William Parrish and his son, who having become disillusioned had decided to relocate to California. However, they were mortally prevented from doing so. Simply known as the 'Parrish–Potter murders', the murders of William R. Parrish, his son and Duff Potter (killed mistakenly for one of the Parrish's) (176) were followed by an apparent lack of judicial address that led McAuslan to have difficulties in dealing with the apparent consent of Mormon leaders. This act was followed by reports of castrations and other punishments in the community. Within six months the massacre of 120 Arkansas emigrants on their way to California at Mountain Meadows, Southern Utah, led Peter McAuslan to seek the protection of the now resident US Army. With their protection in 1859 he requested safe passage to California where he lived out his remaining years until 1891 when he died at the age of 78 (285).

Aird's narrative of the McAuslan family's journey from Scotland to Utah to California is an excellent, well–researched and fluid read. It is particularly strong in terms of contextualization and scene setting. What enhances this work is the treatment of tumultuous events during complex times of nineteenth century upheaval. The writing focus is the main protagonist, Peter McAuslan, who provides a rare insight to pioneer Mormon studies. While some might claim it is a study of dissent, or others detailing it as a narrative of apostasy, it is

undeniable that there were voices at odds with the Church's leader Brigham Young, including McAuslan's former mission president Orson Pratt.

Examining local leaders, who administered or interpreted Church leaders' instructions on the periphery, enhances the discussion of the role of discipline in Utah and the Church. Aird weaves a fair assessment of the facts available and is even handed in their interpreting them. However, one difficulty that might be contended is the way that the complex dynamics of Mountain Meadows murders, local punishments beatings including castration, impending military action and the aggressive Reformation can all be rolled into a seamless singular narrative. It seems too simplistic on occasions.

What is at the heart of this book is the struggle between blind obedience and exercising one's own agency. Perhaps it is this quandary that leads an author into developing a study of dissent. While reading *Mormon Convert, Mormon Defector*, there was a *feeling* of familiarity of Fanny Stenhouse's account of migration, polygamy and the emphasis on Mormon leaders' control. Similarly, the apparent inequality of the conditions in which leaders travelled, as compared to migrant converts travelling from the British Isles to Utah, where leaders were riding carriages, taking trains and berthing in on–board cabins rather than the basic conditions that emigrants suffered.

While the narrative itself runs fairly smoothly, I am concerned that the intent or actions of the protagonist are frequently speculative. This highlights the frailty of supporting empirical evidence of earlier episodes of Church life and family conversion. For example phrases such as:

'Although it is impossible to know if Peter held similar sentiments' or
'One can imagine Peter's emotions' (72)
'Probably' (86)
'Peter must have regularly visited' (91)
'Peter left no writings on his thoughts about these explanations' (120)
'The possibility of employment may well have attracted Peter to Spanish Fork'. (172)
'Although Peter McAuslan did not record his thoughts for 1858, one can follow the probable tracks of his increasing disillusionment.' (206)

The most concentrated first–hand accounts from McAuslan are found in the Epilogue and penultimate chapters and are presented in the form of letters written between 1884 and 1886 (264) to family members and others including early converts in Scotland. Each letter reflects an aspect of post–Mormonism. It would have been nice to hear more about the dislocation and feeling of isolation or fellowship that his extended family experienced as they remained in Utah and Mormonism. I wonder whether they perceived McAuslan's actions a rejection of Brigham Young's authoritarianism or if other difficulties existed For example, was tithe paying (a requirement of the Mormon Reformation), the only obligation that McAuslan failed to observe, or did he reject invitations to participate in plural marriage; Aird denies that polygamy was part of the reason. (180) Thankfully, this is the nature of historical research, one that continues to ask further questions.

One concern that I have are the sweeping statements that appear to reinforce a notion that Utah and its leaders were lawless, violent and bloodthirsty. There is also the characterising of individuals in a sensational manner for example; 'Four Mormons went with them, including the notorious killer Porter Rockwell' (201). As an historian, I am uncomfortable with this characterisation, not so much from a theological position, but from that of empirical evidence. Questions come to mind, such as who considered him to be notorious, at what point in his colourful life was he being identified, was it when he was a bodyguard to Joseph Smith or Brigham Young, or when he was an appointed marshal? Even his biographer, Harold Schindler, conceded that there were only a handful of verifiable accounts, mainly in connection with his role as a lawman. I am sure that Schindler would have been more than happy to connect multiple deaths with Rockwell if the case was proven.

In conclusion, even with its minor shortcomings, Polly Aird has invested many years in this familial research. It remains authoritative on the experience of Peter McAuslan and sheds light on discipline in Utah in the 1850s. It has also become a reference for the Parrish–Potter murders. I would gladly recommend this book, as it considers those who have been socially and spiritually ignored or redacted from history.

Dr David M. Morris
Hon. Research Associate, Durham University
davidmmorris@hotmail.com

REVIEW – THE MORMON REBELLION: AMERICA'S FIRST CIVIL WAR

Reviewed by Carter Charles

David L. Bigler and Will Bagley, *The Mormon Rebellion: America's First Civil War, 1857–1858*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011: $34.95.

America's First Civil War, the bold subtitle of *The Mormon Rebellion* – not the Battalion – sums it all: David L. Bigler and Will Bagley, two independent historians, are out to strike a heavy blow to common wisdom and set the record straight, providing "a balanced and accurate reinterpretation" (xi, 9) of relations between the Mormon Church and the United States, and "shed new light on [that] important, colourful, and largely forgotten episode of America's past" (9). The outcome is a fourteen–chapter, heavily documented and illustrated volume on nineteenth century Mormon history in Utah.

The book focuses on the specific one–year timeframe of 1857–1858 when 2,500 U.S troops were ordered and were marching towards Utah to unseat *de facto* governor Brigham Young, facilitate the enforcement of America's law in the Territory with a non–Mormon governor (11, 132, 182), and remind the Mormon "Zealots" that allegiance to civil authorities could not be a simple declamation of faith on paper (3).[1] A quick chronological retrospective shows that it took the Mormons only a decade after their arrival in Utah (1847) to find themselves back in square one, that is, being enmeshed in a major conflict because of their refusal to dissociate politics from their religion. And this is illustrated in the title of the first chapter and the first two quotations, which welcome the reader into the book (10). From there, the authors proceed to lay down the general context in which Mormon vs. "the Others" relation should be read: a context of continued armed conflicts from Missouri to Illinois, and from there to Utah where they hoped to finally establish a religious kingdom away from the rest of

[1] The Mormons then must have decided to suspend the declaration "We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law", the 12th of their thirteen "Articles of Faith" penned by their first prophet.

America (142). The authors show that the Mormons' hope did not anticipate how U.S. territorial expansion and the discovery of gold in California would alter the plans of "the newly born theocracy" (32) and create the conditions of quarrel with the federal government.

Throughout the book, Bigler and Bagley provide readers with opportunities to observe how a mid–nineteenth century U.S president, James Buchanan, was torn between his respect for local, democratic autonomy – he "defended the 1854 Kansas–Nebraska Act" which made slavery, one of "the twin relics of barbarism" with polygamy, a local matter (4) – and his duty to maintain national continuity "[...] the supremacy of the Constitution and laws" of the United States everywhere in the country (Ibid). Yet, Buchanan was not on "a crusade against [the Mormons'] religion" (Ibid, 299). It is shown that his main goal was to see that Brigham Young's plans to create an independent state within the Union – as Joseph Smith had done at a smaller level in Nauvoo, Illinois – did not go through (18). Failure to prevent it would have established a vexing precedent for a country already at the brink of dislocation.

Contextualization of the Mormons' armed conflict with the United States is developed at much length in the book. Roughly seven chapters progressively take the reader into the heart of the matter, the U.S army's operations, beginning in chapter 8 (180). After the introductory scene (11), the conflict is mentioned every now and then (53, 93) until page 132 when, on June 24, news of the decision to send the army to Utah began to arrive in the Territory. Official confirmation would come shortly thereafter with the arrival of Captain Stewart Van Vliet and his escort: he was sent ahead of the expedition to "line up forage and supplies for the troops and animals nearing the territory" (144–145). His arrival in Salt Lake City coincided with the beginning of what would become known as the Mountain Meadows Massacre (146), developed in chapter seven.

From the eighth chapter on, the authors take the readers into the particulars of the expedition as it enters the Salt Lake Valley: changes in leadership (Johnston becomes the head of the expedition), approach strategy, and the first problems in the ranks due to desertion (181). Those particulars are unfolded until Utah's new governor, Alfred Cumming, is honourably escorted into Salt Lake City by Mormons – not by the U.S army–to take his post (301). That is followed by Brigham

Young's capitulation and acceptance of Buchanan's general pardon as presented by his commissioners, ruining Johnston's men's hope of a fight with the traitorous Mormons (315, 319).

Those who choose to go beyond this brief summary and read the book will discover why it required a lot of determination, patience, military operations, and diplomacy to see that this significant but unfortunately "largely forgotten" (9) chapter of American history comes down to us under one of the many names we know it today, The Bloodless War. Well, "bloodless" only if casualties are considered on a direct, army–to–army basis. Otherwise, you read about the murder of people who "landed in a place [...] torn by [religious] fanaticism,[2] war fever, and paranoia" (232). Such were the fate of five out of six men trying to meet up with Johnston's army (232, 234–35), the fate of a U.S. army sergeant shot by a Utah civilian (336), and, there is of course the fate of the victims of the infamous bloodbath that took place at Mountain Meadows (164).[3]

Some readers may find the book to be history repeating itself. The authors do not always highlight the parallels but those familiar with Mormon history will easily cross–reference Brigham Young's hellfire rhetoric such as "[...] the evil which they design towards us will fall upon their own heads, and it will grind them to powder" (157) and "I shall carry the war into their own land" (206) with Sidney Rigdon's speech in Missouri in 1838 which said: "And that mob that comes on us to disturb us; it shall be between us and them a war of extermination; for they will have to exterminate us: for we will carry the seat of war to their own houses, and their own families [...]".[4] We know what happened afterwards.

The "war fever, and paranoia" context spoken of by the authors and which have led to those types of "rhetorical assault[s]" (44) will also lead readers to the specifics of Mormon strategy to strike an alliance

[2] Readers should refer to Bigler and Bagley's fifth chapter, which deals with the Mormon religious awakening called "Reformation". The authors describe the period as "the most fearful spiritual upheaval since the 1642 Salem witch hunts" (94).

[3] According to the authors' estimate, the number of victims should be upped to at least 140 (177).

[4] Cf. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, Harper Collins, 1999, 34.

with Indian tribes in the Territory (76),[5] their guerrilla tactics to halt the U.S army's progress[6] and to even effectively keep it at bay for a long time in inclement weather conditions (225, 228). To that list should be added a local militia which almost doubled the size of the U.S army on paper (11) and whose knowledge of the terrain compensated for formal military training, for the most part of them. This advantage allowed them to carry out decisive stampede and destruction raids against the U.S army's cattle, provisions, and ammunitions.

In spite of the above Mormon guerrilla successes on the U.S army, the authors object to the notion of "blunder" for Buchanan, putting it rather on the side of Brigham Young for having misled his followers (356–57). Their argument is that "Buchanan's decision to order troops to Utah, often called his blunder, proved decisive and beneficial for both Mormons and the American republic" (356). Everyone can concur to the latter part of the argument: it was a well–motivated and beneficial decision. On the one hand, it was one of those decisions which made it possible for Mormonism to be what it is today, a worldwide religious movement and not one of those utopian nineteenth century groups which get to be remembered only in the footnotes of American history. On the other hand, it allowed the federal government to make it clear that the vast western lands were not a *no man's land*.

But, when it comes to the blunder, it will become obvious to readers that it was not Buchanan's *decision* which is referred to as such but rather the way he went about *implementing* that decision. As the authors themselves have pointed out more than once in the book, "he [...] underestimated the Mormon problem" (261, 5). All the "problems" the U.S. army encountered, the delays, etc. testify to the fact that he had committed a major managerial mistake, a blunder.[7] And you may

[5] Beside trying to create "a distinction in the minds of the Indian tribes [...] between the Mormons and the people of the United States" (76), you read in several other places in the book how the Mormons tried to convince them to join their cause against the United States to avoid being killed as well (142, 162, 197, etc.).

[6] Several passages in the book refer to those tactics. See for instance pages 203, 212, 217, and on.

[7] You read here and there passages like "lack of cavalry support", which must have inspired the title of the chapter (181), that "[Johnston] anticipated no

fairly wonder if such lines as "a theocratic command structure functioned with efficiency that made Washington's fumbling performance look almost comical by comparison" (189) are not simply another way of saying that he had made that mistake.

Besides the "war fever" spoken of, the authors also provide elements that show that there was also a "war of communication" which made it difficult to tell "whose word should be believed in the often conflicting accounts [...]" (154). Considering the context, it is fair to question the validity of some of the testimonies Mormons consigned on paper. Still, some readers may come away with the sentiment that *The Mormon Rebellion* is a collection of evidence against Brigham Young and his coreligionists. There is no doubt that the Mormon Church under his leadership applied a policy of obstructionism (332) and of defiance towards Washington. But as illustrated below, several passages show a most regrettable tendency on the part of the authors to almost systematically question the validity of statements made by anyone on the Mormon side of the conflict and to present with negative undertone anyone who did not encourage a war with the Mormons and who sought a peaceful way out.

Colonel Thomas L. Kane, "ardent defender of the oppressed" according to the authors (281), known to have headed the Mormon Battalion in 1846, is depicted as a "naïve" and zealous convert to Mormonism (282) in this historical sequence. He becomes someone who "had a remarkable ability to be blissfully unaware of – or simply to ignore – the most grotesque manifestations of the Mormon theocracy" for an act which the authors acknowledge that he may not actually have heard about (286). Kane was out to find a peaceful solution because he thought his previous contacts with Brigham Young and the Mormons had made him a natural go–between. Before starting off for Utah, we learn that he had gone to meet with President Buchanan to offer his services (Ibid). Although not officially commissioned to negotiate (283), it goes without saying that once on the field, he had to meet both sides of the conflict. His role with regard to Washington is downplayed even though he carried a letter signed by Buchanan "commending him 'to the favorable regard of all officers of the United States'" (291): he is not presented as Buchanan's envoy. Paradoxically, he becomes "[Brigham]

---

resistance" (186), that the U.S. army's hesitancy and incapacity to retaliate (217), its lack of "effective intelligence" (243), etc.

Young's agent, if not his mouthpiece" (290) simply because he carried a letter from Young to Johnston. If he was not an official envoy for Buchanan, you wonder how he went on to become Brigham Young's emissary while nothing says that the Mormon leader had officially commissioned him. You wonder if non–substantiated suspicion of his having been converted to Mormonism is enough to make him *a posteriori* the Mormon leader's envoy.

The treatment reserved to Senator Sam Houston, former president of "The Lone Star State" is also intriguing. His experience as a revolutionary and former president of Texas is mentioned in the book. But the authors do not tell us how that experience played or not in his choice to become what they call "the faith's champion in Congress" (298). In fact, you may fairly wonder whether Houston was actually a "champion" of Mormonism or of state/territory's rights and of diplomacy: we read on the same page that he "advised the president to appoint a commission to settle the conflict".

Even the governor named to replace Brigham Young, Alfred Cumming, is presented as a man who fell under the spell of Brigham Young (317) "who controlled the levers of power in Utah Territory" with his coreligionists (348).[8] The authors actually refer to him and Kane as "the self–important pair of peacemakers" (300). There are fair grounds to question the way Governor Cumming handled certain issues. It is however puzzling when you read passages where the authors present in a critical way decisions he made to ward off armed struggles between the Mormons and U.S troops once in Utah (Ibid) – we are told that Cumming protested the army's occupation of a site near Great Salt Lake "before it occurred," as if it was not in his prerogatives to anticipate possible conflicts – but on the other hand, the authors have nothing to say about that same decision made a few hundred pages before by General William S. Harney when he mandated Van Vliet to open the way of the expedition (145).

Likewise, Parley P. Pratt's polygamous widow, Eleanor McLean, is presented as an "emotionally unhinged", "troubled" woman who provided an "overwrought" (157), "heart–rending account of Pratt's murder" (137), thus hinting at possible exaggeration and casting doubts

[8] Cf. middle of last paragraph, page 312, and page 314 where Cumming is said to have found a new allegiance in Brigham Young.

on the validity of what she said. Fair enough: it is not impossible for emotions to have influenced the way she described what happened. Contrastingly though, you wonder if even understandable rancour and want for revenge did not make it at all into the testimony of Mexico war veteran, Major William Singer who reported that Mormon authorities seized his property, shot five of his cattle and that he feared for his family (40). Beside fear, nothing in the book says whether there was any emotion that could cast any doubt whatsoever on his testimony, or that of any other non–Mormon for that matter.

Some readers may also find quarrel with Bigler and Bagley on their subtitle and the assertion that America did not have one but two civil wars. For them, "the nation's first civil war" was the Utah Rebellion (3, 11) which has either been ignored by previous historians or become a "carefully constructed [Mormon] legend (x). This final point cannot but remind of the role of history at the root of Mormon identity and the battle between "equal" historians, as the authors diplomatically term it (xi), and unequal (?) ones to have the last word in recounting the Mormon past. Both sides usually agree on what happened; but the answers often differ when it comes to who did what and in what capacity (178).[9] As for the rebellion against Washington, the authors may have exaggerated a bit in calling it a war. It lacked a lot of the ingredients that could have qualified as such: the same authors tell us that "except for the episode's acquisition of its unfortunate nickname, none of it ever happened" (x),[10] that there were "no pitched battles" (3). Consequently, the presence of a question mark after the subtitle would have been more than welcome; it would have made it less assertive and less provoking.

Still, if the conflict does not qualify as a "war", the fact that the authors call it such is quite instructive. It tells of an attempt to replace the Mormon Rebellion where it rightly belongs, that is, in the American tradition of political engagement for autonomy, even for separatism if need be. Thus, without excusing none Mormon non–democratic,

[9] The passage here refers to Brigham Young's role in the Mountain Meadows massacre. But you could find the same divergent presentation on whether it was Joseph Smith "the prophet *and* mayor" or simply "the mayor" of Nauvoo who ordered the destruction of *The Nauvoo Expositor*.

[10] The pronoun « it » here refers to « the Utah Expedition, the Mormon War or, [...] 'the unsung and inglorious Civil War of 1857–1858" (Ibid.).

non–republican attitudes during the time the authors have focused on, it is important to see Brigham Young not only as religious leader but also heir of an American tradition. Indeed, religiously motivated or not, Brigham Young's denunciation of what he called "that odious, tyrannical, and absurd system of colonial government which emanated from the British throne" (83), his revolutionary call to sever the links with Washington (129) is strikingly reminiscent of Thomas Paine's "'Tis time to part".

Carter Charles
University of Bordeaux, France
c_jcharles@hotmail.com

Review – Why I Stay: The Challenges of Discipleship for Contemporary Mormons

Reviewed by Polly Aird

Robert A. Rees, ed., *Why I Stay: The Challenges of Discipleship for Contemporary Mormons.* Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2011. Hardback: $24.95.

In this volume, editor Robert Rees has compiled "Why I Stay" presentations given at Sunstone Symposium in Salt Lake City between 2003 and 2010. His introduction gracefully ties together the individual stories that follow. "Deciding whether to stay in or leave one's faith tradition," he writes, "is among the most difficult and soul–wrenching decisions a person can face. There are those who feel firmly rooted in their religion for a lifetime; other bolt from a church, temple, or mosque suddenly, impulsively, and ultimately; still others lapse, as Emily Dickinson said of the passing of summer, 'as imperceptibly as grief.'" (vii). Rees then comments on the essays themselves: "What seems evident from the personal expressions of faith, challenge, and devotion in this collection is that many contemporary Latter–day Saints remain committed to the Church in spite of personal difference or spiritual dissonance over beliefs, doctrines, and practices" (ix).

Towards the end of the introduction, Rees writes, "In Mormonism, as in any religion, there are markers of devotion or, perhaps one might say, orthodoxy—signs and symbols, formulaic phrases, communal rituals that generally indicate a person's unquestioned involvement with and acceptance by their religious society. For example Mormons are famous for declaring with absolute certainty, 'I know,' but there are some who, in spite of a lifetime of seeking, are unable to speak such words" (xv). Rees continues that most of the writers in this volume find "something of great value in their lifetime of devotion in spite of periodic estrangement and occasional (or even persistent) discomfort. Some are held by their own faith, others by the faith of family and friends. Some stay in the hope that their continuing activity may result in their being, to use C.S. Lewis's phrase, 'surprised by Joy'" (xvi).

I cannot here describe each essayist's reasons for staying with the Church, so instead I will concentrate on themes and statements that strike me as memorable. The readers of the *International Journal of Mormon Studies* will find that many of the writers discuss their missions

in widely scattered countries. A recurring factor in staying is family roots. All the writers except one were born into Mormon families, many with long taproots into earlier generations. Thomas F. Rogers says he is "locked in by extensive ancestral and familial ties" (3). J. Frederick "Toby" Pingree declares "I am a Mormon to my bones. My ties to the Restored Church must be intertwined with my DNA" (79). Lael Littke writes, "The Church is my culture, the tribe I belong to" (138). And Karen Rosenbaum says when asked why she stays, "'It's who I am.' I was dealt a hand from a Mormon deck" (158).

And yet being Mormon is not the same for all. Lavina Fielding Anderson, the only essayist who has been excommunicated, has a different view. She describes herself as "being *of* but not *in* the Church" (83). She continues, "Although I am no longer a Church member, I *am* still a Mormon. . . . The Church had power over my membership but does not have power over my Mormonness, which I continue to claim as my own destiny" (89). Music rates high as a reason for staying. William Bradshaw wants to "keep singing the songs, especially the children's songs with lyrics that ring true" (19). And Robert Rees, the volume editor and author of one of the essays, writes, "I stay because I love to sing Mormon hymns. Joining my voice with others on Sundays is a spiritual, kinaesthetic experience." Hymns, he says, "unify a congregation in a way that transcends their differences" (184).

But boredom is a problem for some. Mary Lythgoe Bradford says, "If ever I would leave the Church, it would be out of sheer boredom." Part of her reaction comes from "the deadening influence of assigning subjects to speakers" (111). Molly Bennion echoes Bradford, writing, "Frankly, most of the social activities at Church bore me or conflict with activities I would rather do. Church classes usually bore me even more. . . . The boredom is more than mind numbing and exhausting. I come to Church hoping to be refreshed and invigorated, healed from the wounds of a week's work and energized to face the challenges of the next week. Instead I can leave weary, frustrated, demoralized, and hungry, both spiritually and intellectually" (148). But still she stays: "I once asked Lowell Bennion why we should attend worship services when the experience is too often unsatisfying. He said, 'To serve and to bless, to be served and blessed.' That advice has helped me" (154).

Some of the essayists cope with such problems by being selective in their activities. Molly Bennion writes that she has "become

rather picky in what I will and will not do to help at Church. I will do anything meaningful, but I will not attend useless make–work meetings (149). Karen Rosenbaum says "I attend sacrament meeting and sometimes Sunday school, but not Relief Society and rarely stake meetings. I have said no to many Church callings that I felt I could not, in conscience, perform" (159). D. Jeff Burton finds his definition of staying has changed over the years: "Early in my life, it meant toeing the line in every behavioral aspect of Mormonism. In recent years that need has relaxed and broadened. I am less active in Church meetings . . . but I still consider myself a stayer" (66).

Others keep attending because the Church needs them. Claudia L. Bushman writes that she stays because "The Church needs her intellectuals, people who can talk to secular thinkers who dismiss Mormonism, and not be ruffled. . . . . The Church needs people, particularly women, who speak out in frank ways during lessons and discussions, to give courage to those who have things to say but do not dare to say them" (36–37). Morris A. Thurston writes, "I stay, hoping that my voice and others can help prompt changes for the good. . . . It is my Christian responsibility to speak as honestly as I can and as humbly as I am able. I stay because I believe that doing so can make a difference" (63–64). On an especially positive note, Cherry Bushman Silver finds that being a part of the Church "adds zest to life" by "exploring ideas with fellow believers, those acquainted with the terms and issues of Mormondom who have a sense of what is genuinely at stake" (16).

Doubts are difficult. For Rosenbaum, certainty is elusive: "I have never been able to say 'this is true' about spiritual life in general or about Mormonism in particular. Despite decades of immersion in Mormonism, despite prayer and study, I feel I *know* almost nothing" (157). Rees writes, "The Church is not a particularly friendly or hospitable place for people who have doubts or questions or who risk speaking out on moral issues" (186). Although Thurston finds some things in the Church and its doctrine make no sense, he understands that "God had given me the right to think and seek personal revelation, and I saw that it was my responsibility to exercise that right in formulating my views on troublesome issues" (56).

But ambiguity is a part of life. Armand L. Mauss has come to understand that "living indefinitely with ambiguity is a sign of intellectual maturity, not weakness" (41). William D. Russell, a member of the

Community of Christ and thus the only non–LDS writer in the book, has earned a master's of divinity at a Methodist seminary. He writes, "I think the question of whether a Church is 'true' is an absurd concept. No institution is fully good. No book is fully true, not even a book alleged to be the most perfect one ever written. No pope, no prophet, no archbishop is perfect. Ambiguity reigns everywhere, in churches and in society" (122).

Several see the Church as a solely human institution. Mauss points out that "the Church has, throughout its history, functioned mainly as a human institution. Since I expect the Church usually to operate as a human institution, and its leaders as human beings, I am occasionally disappointed but never disillusioned" (42). Fred Christensen queries, "Is it any surprise that some defining doctrines of the Church have changed? Polygamy, the bedrock doctrine of early Mormonism, the practice for which my ancestors sacrificed everything, is now considered a sin. . . . We have renounced the communal economics we called the United Order. We have reversed ourselves on the gathering of the ten tribes, the stain of a dark skin, and advice against birth control. We have softened the temple ceremony and accommodated the temple garment to more modern styles" (129–30). He continues, "The strength of the Church is its social organization, not its doctrinal philosophy that is forever changing. We are fundamentally a social organization with doctrinal issues giving us something to talk about" (131).

Social and humanitarian concerns are mentioned by a few. Referring to his master's studies, Bill Russell writes, "Courses on Christian ethics and Christian social concern gave me a greater awareness of the religious significance of social and political issues. . . . I was disappointed with my Church during this time. . . . Our leaders were relatively unconcerned about the Civil Rights Movement and other social and political issues that had clear moral implications" (117). But gradually the Community of Christ took on issues of nonviolence and civil rights for blacks and women. "If the Church had not changed its direction, I would not be actively involved in it today," he writes (121–22). Among the LDS essayists, Thurston "would like to see the Church spend more resources on humanitarian service and less on proselytizing" (62).

After a while the themes begin to blend. Nevertheless I was touched by the essays, each written with openness and sincerity. Sunstone Symposium offers a supportive and sympathetic venue in which

to share struggles and triumphs. The book is particularly interesting to me since it is the flip side of dissent, the history of which has been the focus of much of my writing. Here instead are people bound to their faith "by countless silken ties of love and thought," as Rees quotes from a Robert Frost poem (xvii). Although dissenters often have compelling reasons for leaving the Church, finding a way to keep those ties from breaking certainly leads to less disruption in a person's life and less heartache for family and friends. As Burton states it, "there are people who would be hurt if I went away" (69).

My only negative reaction was to a couple of instances of provincialism. When I read that Russian Orthodox believers worship "trance–like," turning off "critical faculties and hypnotically chanting, fingering beads, or repeating set prayers" (4), I was startled. There is, of course, much more to Orthodox Christianity than that. Likewise when I read that "In sha' All'a" means "God wills it!" I was surprised (6). "Insha Allāh" means rather "God willing" or "if it is God's will" and is used across the Arabic–speaking world in the same sense we might say, "I'll see you in June, God willing!"

On the other hand, I was heartened by Gregory A. Prince's statement, "There was a time—and some of you will understand that certitude peaks at about nineteen years of age—when I thought God was only within Mormonism. I have subsequently witnessed too much of him in other churches and elsewhere to deny that his presence is everywhere, and I have come to realize that it is not up to me to tell God where he can spend his time" (95). The writers here are all mature intellectuals who have long considered where they stand in relation to the Church. It seems a given to me that members in their sixties to eighties, the ages of these writers, are unlikely to leave at this stage in their lives. Many had considered leaving at some point, but as Littke writes, "One thing led to another, and there I was, still in the pews" (137). I would have enjoyed reading the perspective of people in their thirties, forties, or fifties when leaving is perhaps a more viable or pressing possibility. Nevertheless, this book is an outstanding tribute to lives of faith and struggle. I highly recommend it.

Polly Aird
Seattle, Washington
pollyaird@earthlink.net

Review – Tiki and Temple: The Mormon Mission in New Zealand, 1854—1958

Reviewed by Gina Colvin

Marjorie Newton, *Tiki and Temple: The Mormon Mission in New Zealand, 1854–1958*.Draper, Utah: Greg Kofford Books, 2012. Paperback. 343 pages. ISBN: 978–1–58958–1210. $29.95

While the written histories of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints in the United States have been characterized by the meticulous attention to its genesis and evolution, the same cannot be said in the case of Aotearoa New Zealand. Aside from some important contributions by Hunt (1977) and Britsch (1986) the Mormon story in the South Pacific has appeared in the annals far too infrequently. Newton's scrupulous history of the church's formation in Aotearoa New Zealand is thus a welcome addition to the bibliography.

Newton's history of the New Zealand mission spans a period of 104 years of from the first halting efforts to stake a religious claim in the colony, to its culmination in the dedication of a temple in Hamilton in 1958. The Mormons were latecomers in the competition for religious market share, arriving some two generations behind the Anglicans, the Methodists and the Catholics. It was never going to be an easy road to establish themselves as a credible church alongside their well–established opponents. By the time Augustus Farnham and William Cooke initiated missionary work in Wellington in late 1854 it was likely that story of the Mormons was familiar to the growing population. Sensationalist news about the Mormons that was carried in both the settler press and the newspapers at 'home' in England positioned the church as an oddity, full of deviance and avarice. Add to this a colonial regime that privileged British culture and tradition, this young, callow, presumptuous and under–resourced American faith must have looked like the pathetic cousins.

Yet Newton's painstaking analysis of primary sources, including mission correspondence, mission diaries, mission minutes and papers

attest to a mission history full of optimism, faith, resilience, sacrifice and sheer bloody–mindedness.

As she reviews the first attempts to find converts, it becomes clear that the early years of the church in Aotearoa New Zealand were characterized by fluctuation and instability as European converts made their way to Utah leaving gaps in congregations and consequently gaps in leadership. The church was thus consistently 'managed' and 'run' by the missionaries who frequently rotated through the mission with regularity. Maintaining consistency of personnel emerges as a constant drawback in finding a way of making the church locally relevant in the same way that the Church of England was able to do with its permanent ministry, its stable parishes and its commitment to building beautiful churches and establishing elite schools.

It would appear from Chapter Two that the turn to pursuing Maori converts changed the nature of the mission from one in which new white adherents were encouraged to 'gather', to one in which an independently run, largely brown church, became an inevitability. The challenge was however to religiously colonize Māori enough that they could be trusted as the Mormon stronghold in Aotearoa New Zealand. Frequent attempts to facilitate cultural adjustments, to honour the 'spiritual' orientation of Māori while corralling them into conformity were met in the record with frustration. Surely, it was hoped, a school would go some way to civilise and fit Maori with a more sympathetic disposition to the way in which white Mormons in Utah 'do things'? Thus, as Newton's work affirms, the building of the Māori Agricultural College, and a Temple became an important measure in the early church in Aotearoa New Zealand to 'finish' a uniquely Mormon Māori identity.

Newton's history captures those subtle tensions that seem to characterize the first 100 years of the church in Aotearoa New Zealand. It chronicles a period years in which the LDS church was a struggling, resource poor, new religion that grappled constantly with the implications of its 'Americanness' in a place that was (and probably continues to be) largely unreceptive to its idiosyncrasies and orthodoxies.

Having said this however, Newton writes as a classically trained historian as she unselfconsciously wades through the records. While an early disclaimer acknowledges her subjectivity and the gaps in her interpretation of the documents there is little in her book that conveys a

sense that her audience might include indigenous readers and descendants of those original 'Native' converts. While she assembles the data, and mines the record in order to establish an objective historical account, the effect is that the work doesn't inflect a much needed post–colonial orientation. By virtue of the resources she accumulated, the weight of the narrative voice continues to belong to the Utah church, present in New Zealand at the time as presidential and authoritative. Māori on the other hand are positioned as Other, savage (albeit 'noble'), spiritually capable but morally aberrant, requiring the heavy hand of the mission to mitigate for their cultural lapses. This sometimes romanticized account of the halcyon days of the New Zealand Mission, full of divine heroics by white men in brown spaces, continues to be an important myth with significant currency in the Utah church. But the church in 2012 is more than Utah or even the United States. This is why the cultural turn is much needed in the writing of history, so that as an indigenous scholar I am not left to sift through yet more accounts of my people as petted savages under the heavy hand of an ecclesiastical weight from afar.

Newton has produced a fine work, dense, historically rigorous and an important contribution in the study of the LDS church outside of the United States, and as she rightly points out will be a seminal resource from which a more nuanced account will hopefully be assembled.

Dr Gina M. Colvin
University of Canterbury
gina.colvin@canterbury.ac.nz

Review – Flunking Sainthood

Reviewed by Samuel M. Brown

Jana Riess, *Flunking Sainthood: A Year of Breaking the Sabbath, Forgetting to Pray, and Still Loving My Neighbor*. Brewster, Mass.: Paraclete, 2011. Paper: $16.99.

When someone asks, once again, whether Mormons are Christians, just hand them this book. Jana Riess, one of the freshest writers in the Mormon tradition, has delivered an elegant, exciting, and ultimately inspiring memoir of spiritual struggle that highlights the best from the traditions (largely Protestants and Catholics) to which Paraclete Press addresses its considerable output while quietly affirming the power of the tradition (Latter–day Saint) from which Riess writes. I see in this book several elements that affirm core LDS ideas and experiences, including a productive merger of "faith" and "works," a tender relationship to communal rituals/ordinances, and a faithful eclecticism. Because this review is intended for a Mormon venue, I focus here on those Mormon elements, but I should be clear that this book is of great importance for people of any faith tradition.

As Riess eloquently explains, she began the project as an attempt to immerse herself in devotional literature from various traditions, tying the reading to specific spiritual practices. What she discovered midway through was that she was failing at every practice she pursued. With the help of her editor (and perhaps divine inspiration), Riess retooled the memoir into an honest assessment of what it means to yearn for sanctity and fail, repeatedly. In this frank and often playful assessment, Riess hits on the kind of balance of grace and "works" that can come from the productive merger of Mormon and creedal Christian sensibilities.

Though Mormonism has been associated with the Pelagian heresy (Pelagius was a British monk who waged and lost a war of words with Augustine of Hippo over whether humans could play an active role in their own salvation), Riess demonstrates just how effectively Mormonism can inform the traditional doctrines of Christianity without veering fully into the Pelagianism with which they are often associated. Work we must, but the lunch is free, to paraphrase the late

Mormon scholar Hugh Nibley in one of his best devotional moments. It is the failing struggle and the ultimate victory in Christ's grace that redeems us. The beautiful works are not necessarily the works completed but the projects undertaken in the light of God's power.

I was struck by how much ritual resonated for Riess and for me as I accompanied her on the journey. The practices that she saw as important enough to return to after the book were fasting and Sabbath observance. Both of these were less about the self–help psychologized religion so familiar from the American landscape and more about the meaning of physical activities in the creation and maintenance of community. Some of the prayer practices she describes seem like so much pop psychology, and her lack of engagement with certain types of self–focused prayer thus resonated with my own sense about similar practices. (She did, however, stick with the formalized Jesus Prayer.)

There is a self–aware eclecticism in this spiritual memoir that for me recalls the earnest quest for the fragments of ancient religion that characterized early Mormonism. Riess's eclecticism feels Mormon to me from beginning to end, an eagerness to find all that is good and true throughout the world.

The epilogue is a great thunderclap in this book. I won't give away all the details, but in retrospect Jana's year as an unsuccessful pilgrim prepared her for an emotionally taxing encounter with a deeply troubled man. We yearn for holiness, we hunger for Christ, and we find him at the bedside of an emaciated, moribund gambler who abandoned his family decades earlier. Loving the fractured means loving Christ, both because the fractured are Christ and because we are all of us fractured.

Dr Samuel M. Brown
University of Utah
smb@samuelbrown.net

Review – The Development of LDS Temple Worship

Reviewed by Mauro Properzi

Devery S. Anderson, ed. *The Development of LDS Temple Worship, 1846–2000: A Documentary History*. Salt Lake City: Signature Press, 2011. Hardback: $49.95

The Development of LDS Temple Worship (DLTW) is the third volume in a remarkable documentary history that focuses on Mormon temple practices from the year 1842 through the end of the last century. The first two volumes, also edited by Devery Anderson with the assistance of Gary J. Bergera, are more narrow in temporal focus as they deal with *Joseph Smith's Quorum of the Anointed: 1842–1845* and with *The Nauvoo Endowment Companies: 1845–1846* respectively. Conversely, DLTW spans over 150 years of Mormon policies, questions, adjustments, and explanations, which are related to temple admittance, ordinances, clothing, construction, functioning, etc. The wealth of information it contains, collected in almost 500 pages of text, and the focus on primary sources as opposed to their interpretation, combines to create a reference volume which is likely to be widely used and studied for many years to come.

Yet, this is not a book for scholars only, whether historians, theologians, or Mormon Studies analysts; Latter–day Saints from most walks of life will find its content accessible, enlightening, and highly engaging. Indeed, any initial concern that Church members may experience in approaching this book, given the sensitive and sacred nature of the topic, should soon be resolved through the recognition that the editor's intention is not to create an expose of LDS temple worship. For example, readers will find no description of signs and tokens, or of specific wording in ordinances like initiatories and sealings, which "temple–endowed" Mormons would not discuss publicly. At the same time, the editor does not shy away from including excerpts from personal diaries and correspondence of individuals who have since passed on, omitting full names when the nature of the issue is considered to be sensitive. In other words, Anderson has tackled the difficult task of navigating the fuzzy realm of the "permissible" in Mormon discussions of temples. Although it is inevitable that both sceptics and believers will take issue on his specific setting of boundaries I believe that he has

largely succeeded by showing both courage and sensitivity in espousing a reasonable middle ground which will not alienate either dispassionate scholars or faithful Latter–day Saints.

As a documentary history DLTW does not present a specific argument nor does it suggest an interpretative framework within which to place the sources it makes use of. It is descriptive rather than proscriptive and it is a collection of voices rather than a single mind at work. Still, where there is no thesis to evaluate there is an internal organization to assess. Furthermore, although it employs a variety of sources DLTW brings them together into a coherent whole, thus painting one distinguishable picture of Mormonism's approach to the temple and its practices. After all, the editor frequently cites "official" LDS sources, including "Messages of the First Presidency," the "History of the Church," the "Church Handbook of Instruction" as well as excerpts from the diaries of the highest Church authorities, namely Presidents Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff, Heber J. Grant, and David O. McKay, to name only a few. In short, if there is any overarching conclusion about 'the' Mormon view and experience of temples it is likely to be drawn from these very sources. In the very least, the picture that emerges from DLTW suggests some theological implications which are worth a thoughtful analysis.

The book's organization is quite straightforward and strictly chronological. Eight chapters comprise the bulk of the text, each covering about two decades of documentary history with the exception of the first (1846–1880) and the sixth and seventh chapters, which narrow their focus to a single decade each. Within each chapter the organization is also strictly chronological so that sources are listed according to the date associated with their production or publication. Footnotes with brief biographical information as well as useful clarifications by the editor assist the reader in perusing the wealth of transcribed documents. A twenty–two–page photograph section is included between the third and fourth chapters of the volume and a list of abbreviations of the most frequently cited sources as well as twelve pages of short biographies of principal characters precede the introduction to the book. A detailed index amounting to seventeen pages completes the collection

Clearly, the editor has attempted to make the volume as reader friendly as possible. Since reading documentary history can feel like a tedious endeavour at times this is indeed a welcomed characteristic of

the book. Yet, I believe Anderson could have succeeded even further by internally organizing each chapter in some form of thematic fashion rather than strictly chronologically. Indeed, since some cited sources appear as either completely identical or very similar in content the strict chronological order employed sometimes separates the same quotations by a few pages. The reader is then led to wonder whether he/she has already read that particular passage. Instead, a thematic organization could facilitate the reading experience by always placing very similar or identical transcriptions right next to each other. Moreover, subsequent reference searches would also benefit by subcategorized citations about garments, temple recommends, sealing questions, second anointing, etc. within the specific chapter in which they appear. The few citations, which do not fit a clear thematic category, could be placed into a final "miscellaneous" section within each chapter. This is the only criticism I have for the organization of the volume, which is otherwise impeccable.

The introduction is the most important section of the book for the hurried reader because the editor provides a fine summary of the several hundred pages of documentary history that follow it. In these pages Anderson presents a well thought–out collection of 'highlights', which are organized both chronologically and thematically. As a result, the introduction reads like a fascinating and dynamic story and the editor ensures both clarity and coherence by focusing on some of the central issues that emerge from the documents. For example, he traces the development of temple garments, beginning with the time when markings were cut on the initiate's underclothing through the years of distinction between "ceremonial" garments worn in the temple and "modified" garments for daily wearing. He also highlights the increasingly restricted exposure of church membership to the ordinance of second anointing as both numbers of initiates decreased and as the "recommending" responsibility for these ordinances was ultimately placed exclusively in the hands of the Quorum of the Twelve and of the First Presidency. Anderson further discusses modifications of policies relative to black members' ability to participate in temple ordinances as well as addressing the recent move toward a more egalitarian approach toward women in allowing them to be endowed when a spouse is not a member of the LDS Church.

Yet, what the introduction can do in highlighting dynamism it cannot quite do in conveying the low speed of its actualization. In other words, to read the introduction is to fast–forward the real progression

of the development of LDS temple worship, which is as fraught with resistance to change and attrition as it is open to modifications and adjustments. This tension emerges clearly from the documentary history itself and it is a theologically significant reality to consider because I believe it to lie at the very root of Mormonism's nature. Armand Mauss called it the tension "between the angel and the beehive," or the strain between the eternally ideal and the pragmatic, whereas Terryl Givens wrote of it in terms of a paradox, namely of the drive to search vs. certainty. Whichever terms are used to describe it, it is clear that Mormonism, like most other religions, has had to navigate the dangerous waters of *change* vis–à–vis the calmer but often unsatisfactory seas of the status quo. As a religion that has continued to expand *with its temples* in different times, places, and cultures, DLTW provides several illustrations of these very tensions.

For example, the recent focus on the "spiritually" protective nature of the garments versus a nineteenth century view about their power to shield from physical evil points toward greater resonance with Western cultural sensibilities and a move away from the "magical" milieu of early Mormonism. On the other hand, the fact that the full–length ceremonial garment remained in use in LDS temples for decades after the approval of the modified style indicates that any change in this department required a time of adaptation and transition. This is only one of several examples where it is apparent that Mormon authorities have attempted to balance the need for historical modifications with the security that comes from the rigidly unchanging. The preferred direction of explanation for any modification has generally involved the reduction of doctrine to core eternal principles while maintaining the symbolic expressions of those same principles as changeable. Still, DLTW points to the fact that most innovations have been accompanied by some difficulties thus underlining the fact that Latter–day Saints as a whole prefer to lean on the side of certainty as opposed to the searching end of the spectrum, to use Givens' terminology.

It is not surprising that temples should be places where Mormons expect to experience an unchanging reality. Indeed, they are believed to symbolize the eternal realm like no other places can on this planet. Yet, to return to Mauss' analogy, focusing on both the present human condition with one's eyes firmly looking upward to the eternities to come has involved several questions of "translation." For example, given the LDS belief in the eternal bond of a "sealed" family

union, how does one transpose that union to the hereafter when there have been second or third marriages, children from different spouses, excommunications, etc.? DLTW shows that Mormon authorities have gone at great length in addressing these questions but it also highlights that the same authorities recognize that some situations do not presently have an answer and that individuals must trust the love and mercy of an omnipotent God to make it all work out in the end. In other words, to wax theological for a moment, there cannot be certainty in all the details, but only in the overarching plan and in the plan's creator.

Furthermore, there is probably no better illustration of compromise between the ideal and the pragmatic than the early twentieth–century requirement to abide by the Word of Wisdom in order to qualify for a temple recommend. The requirement itself was accompanied by a call for leniency toward older individuals who had acquired habits involving tobacco and other prohibited substances. Similarly, from a socio–anthropological perspective much could be written about second anointings. Could their progressive "removal" from the general membership run parallel to shifting dynamics of authority, which have consolidated the separation between the hierarchy at headquarters and a worldwide membership? These and many others are the questions that could be explored in and through DLTW. For this and other reasons previously highlighted this is a book that will continue to be discussed, quoted, and referenced for the foreseeable future. Its malleability and theological potential, which is certainly characteristic of documentary histories, is even more pronounced by the fact that DLTW presently stands alone as a publication of its kind. In short, the book itself is the ultimate illustration of the sought for, somewhat resisted, and certainly slow in coming innovation, clarification, or modification related to the temple which its pages so aptly describe in many of its finer aspects throughout the history of the LDS Church.

Dr Mauro Properzi
Brigham Young University
mauro_properzi@byu.edu

Review – The Mormon Menace: Violence and Anti–Mormonism in the Post–bellum South

Reviewed by Jordan T. Watkins

Patrick Q Mason, *The Mormon Menace: Violence and Anti–Mormonism in the Post–bellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. Hardback: $29.95

In *The Mormon Menace*, Patrick Mason adeptly traces the contours of anti–Mormonism in the late nineteenth–century South and explains how proselytizing, polygamy, and extra–legal violence shaped southern reactions to the threat of the Latter–day Saint (LDS) Church. Mason attends to the ways in which southern honour, characterized by a communal estimation of the individual and often deployed to protect or avenge the virtuous female, provided justification for illicit actions against Mormon missionaries. While granting that anti–Mormon violence paled in comparison to racial and political attacks against African Americans, Mason contends that "Mormonism was unique in the way it inspired southerners to set aside general norms of civility and religious tolerance" (13).

In his thematic treatment, which primarily relies on newspapers and periodicals, Mason provides two case studies of anti–Mormon violence—the murder of Joseph Standing (1879) and the Cane Creek Massacre (1884)—explores the ecumenical, bipartisan, and national nature of attacks on polygamy, outlines three overlapping southern approaches to its eradication—vigilantism, evangelism, and legislative reform—and quantifies and qualifies southern anti–Mormon aggression. Though focused on anti–Mormonism and its violent aspects, Mason also describes how Utah Mormons constructed an oppositional identity in relation to southern hostilities and suggests that the LDS emphasis on difference contributed to the violence. While he provides a rather focused account, Mason is not simply filling a gap in the historiographical record. He uses southern anti–Mormonism to address some of the larger issues facing post–bellum American society, including questions about the limits of religious toleration, the process of national healing and reunion, and the politics of domesticity. In Mason's account, Mormons are both subjects and objects, illuminated by the light of

southern and national contexts, while also providing new perspectives from which to survey late nineteenth–century American culture.

Mason argues that polygamy propelled southern anti–Mormonism. In two of his most illuminating chapters, he traces the emergence of a national bipartisan anti–polygamy movement, most evident in the widespread support of *Reynolds v. U.S.* (1879) and the Edmunds Act (1882), and describes the ecumenical nature of the southern Protestant repulsion toward the practice. Building on Sally Gordon's study on anti–polygamy legislation, Mason characterizes the national campaign against polygamy as a second Reconstruction.[1] He also makes use of David Blight's argument in *Race and Reunion* to describe the southern reversal on federal intervention, shrewdly explaining that "anti–Mormonism...served to subsume regional and partisan identities by uniting southern Democrats with their erstwhile northern Republican foes in a common religious and national cause" (100).[2] To highlight this shift, Mason demonstrates how Representative John Randolph Tucker of Virginia refused, despite his condemnation of polygamy, to support the Edmunds Bill, only to later change his position and back the federal crackdown on LDS Church.

At times Mason attends to Mormon responses to anti–Mormon violence and this subject receives extended treatment in the penultimate chapter. LDS speakers used the memorial services of Elders John Gibbs and William Berry to reinforce their identity as a persecuted people with ties to suffering saints of the primitive church and forbearers of the immediate past. In describing how Utah Mormons positioned themselves within a tradition of religious persecution, Mason utilizes the scholarship of D. Michael Quinn, R. Laurence Moore, and Jan Shipps.[3] Persecution narratives emerged in the pages of the *Deseret*

[1] Sally Barringer Gordon, The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth–Century America (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

[2] David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[3] D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), 93; R. Laurence Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 25–47; and Jan Shipps, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition* (Urbana: University of Illinois University Press, 1985), 51–54. See also D. Michael Quinn, "Us–

News, missionary reports, and autobiographies. Mormons pinned the violence on the southern press, local anti–Mormons, and a bigoted Protestant leadership. As Mason argues, "violence and other forms of resistance experienced in the church's southern hinterland considerably shaped Mormon identity in the western hinterland" (151).

Mason's study is sensibly structured, well written and carefully argued. He admirably narrates a neglected story in southern and Mormon history and in the process illuminates national developments and explores broad themes. I'm left with only a few questions. Mason rightly stresses the qualitative and quantitative differences between racial violence against African Americans and religious violence against Mor-Mormons, while still addressing points of overlap. He explains how questions of honour and manhood informed southern attempts to check LDS proselytizing efforts and, in doing so, notes the parallel characterizations of the Mormon "home wrecker" and the "black beast rapist" (66–68). Beyond these loose rhetorical connections though, one wonders if southerners racialized Mormons or contributed to the claim that these practitioners of polygamy had committed what one scholar labels as "race treason."[4] If southerners did not view Mormons as a "new race" or a "new ethnic group," that also begs some explanation.[5]

Them Tribalism and Early Mormonism," *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* 29 (2009): 94–114.

[4] Martha M. Ertman, "Race Treason: the Untold Story of America's Ban on Polygamy," *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law* 19, no. 2 (2010): 287–366.

[5] On the claim that Mormon polygamy produced a "new race," see Roberts Bartholow, "Sanitary Report–Utah Territory," in *Sickness and Mortality in the Army of the United States*, prepared by Richard H. Coolidge (Washington: George W. Rowman, 1860), 302. On the idea of Mormons as an ethnic group, see Dean L. May, "Mormons," in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, edited by Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), 720–731; and Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1987), 282. Understanding Mormons in racial terms presents a number of potential problems, including equating race with non–racial projections of difference, universalizing race, and implicating the targets of racism in the construction of race. See Barbara J. Fields, "Whiteness, Racism, and Identity," *International Labour and Working–Class History* 60 (Fall 2001): 48–51; and Peter Kolchin, "Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America" *The Journal of American History* 89 (June 2002): 161–163. Describing Mormons in terms of ethnicity likely presents its own range of possible conceptual flaws.

Perhaps the answer is simple. The presence of a perceived real racial other and the development of scientific racism ossified racial hierarchies in such a way as to preclude the racialization of a white other. Forthcoming works by W. Paul Reeve and J. Spencer Fluhman will likely shed some light on these and related issues.[6] W. Paul Reeve's forthcoming work, *Religion of a Different Color: Race and the Mormon Struggle for Whiteness*, will likely shed light on at least some of these issues.

Mason does not pretend to offer a complete account of the Mormon experience in the post–bellum south and indeed he explains that his work is "less about the experience of Mormons in the South than the reaction of southerners to their presence" (11). Still, at times Mason's discussion seems to present the South as monolithic and this owes in part to his focus on necessarily circumscribed anti–Mormon reactions and representations. In other words, the emphasis on southern anti–Mormonism, a phenomena constrained by narrow views of the Mormon other, can be mistaken for a consensus southern response to and representation of Mormonism. Mason does note instances of southern hospitality and even highlights a few cases in which non–Mormons risked their person and property to aid and defend the missionaries. And yet, while we should not collapse southern anti–Mormonism with southern responses to Mormonism, Mason's efforts rather successfully demonstrate that southern reactions to Mormon presence often partook of anti–Mormon sentiment.[7] Mormon proselytizing efforts, their polygamous beliefs and practices, and notions of southern honour all contributed to this sentiment. The reach of this

[6] W. Paul Reeve, *Religion of a Different Color: Race and the Mormon Struggle for Whiteness* (New York: Oxford University Press, under contract); and J. Spencer Fluhman's work on nineteenth–century American anti–Mormon rhetoric, which is forthcoming with the University of North Carolina Press.

[7] James B. Bennett's recent article, which analyses late–nineteenth century anti–polygamy writings of African Americans in the Methodist Episcopal Church, supports Mason's claim of southerners' nearly unanimous disdain for polygamy while adding more voices and new perspectives to southern anti–Mormonism. He also addresses issues of racial contestation. Bennett, "Until This Curse of Polygamy is Wiped Out: Black Methodists, White Mormons, and Constructions of Racial Identity in the Late 19th Century," *Religion and American Culture* 21 (Summer 2011): 167–194.

sentiment may have also had to do with antebellum North/South debates about slavery.

This is not to suggest that the South's response to Mormonism was monolithic after all, but perhaps the extent to which post–bellum anti–Mormon sentiment permeated southern discourse about Mormons corresponds with an antebellum proslavery consensus. Southerners were hardly of one mind on slavery and indeed some in the Upper South preferred racial exclusion to racial subordination, but most agreed that the institution, legitimated through historical and biblical explanations, was divinely ordained.[8] Thus, as Eugene and Elizabeth–Fox Genovese note, when Mormons defended the widely condemned practice of polygamy on similar grounds this "plunged Southerners into a quandary." Indeed, Mason suggests that this quandary persisted into Reconstruction, as southern Democrats remained opposed to federal intervention and to some extent awkwardly sided with Mormons until the menacing threat of polygamy overwhelmed their erstwhile intransigent position on popular sovereignty. But it seems that much of the political and economic appeal of this position had been wiped away by the Emancipation Proclamation and the subsequent military defeat. Mormon arguments for polygamy had undermined the South's stance on slavery and sovereignty, which likely fuelled their shift from a careful defence of their anachronistic system to a wholesale castigation of Mormonism's relic of barbarism.[9]

Pointing out Mason's relative neglect of antebellum slavery, though, is tantamount to critiquing a book that he did not write. Indeed, one of *The Mormon Menace*'s great strengths is its tight and focused discussion and incorporating antebellum debates over slavery into the mix might have overwhelmed the focus on post–bellum anti–Mormonism. Mason's work, in short, gives us a lot to think about and directs us to ask further questions. In attempting to answer these questions, *The Mormon Menace* will prove invaluable.

---

[8] Lacy K Ford, "Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race, Slavery, and State–Building in the Jacksonian South," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19 (Winter 1999): 713–737.

[9] Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth–Fox Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the South Slaveholder's Worldview* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 513–15, quote on 514.

Article Contributors

RONALD L. BARTHOLOMEW received a B.A. and an M.A. degree from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah and a Ph.D. in the Sociology of Education from the University of Buckingham. He holds a Faculty position at the Orem University LDS Institute of Religion and adjunct faculty positions in Ancient and Modern Scripture at Brigham Young University, Provo and Idaho. His research interests include nineteenth century LDS missionary work in Victorian England as well as Ancient Scripture and Church History.

DANIEL L. BELNAP received a B.A. in International Relations from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; an M.A. in Ancient Near Eastern Studies from BYU; and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Northwest Semitics from the University of Chicago. His main areas of interest include Hebrew Bible, Ugaritic studies, Ritual studies as well as the cultural and sociological influences in the Book of Mormon.

STEVE CARTER received a B.A. from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, in 1990. In 1994, he received an M.A. in History from Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas, and in 2003, he earned a Ph.D. from the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Arkansas. Research interests include nineteenth and twentieth century European history, modern German history and Mormon history.

JAMES D. HOLT is Senior Lecturer for Religious Education at the University of Chester. He holds B.A., Masters and Ph.D. (Mormon Theology) degrees from the University of Liverpool and an M.Ed. (Religious Education) from the University of Birmingham. James also lectures and researches extensively on Mormonism, and aspects of the writings of J.R.R. Tolkien.

ADAM J. POWELL is a doctoral candidate at Durham University. His multidisciplinary research blends the social sciences, historical theology, and Mormon studies in order to analyse the development of identity and soteriological beliefs among the second–century Christians and early Mormons.

AARON S. REEVES is a Research Associate at the University of Cambridge and a doctoral candidate in Sociology at the University of Essex, England. His research interests include social stratification, cultural engagement, health, and embodiment. Aaron teaches research methods and the sociology of health and illness; he also writes for the Mormon blog, *By Common Consent*.